LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 8 November 1988

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Anne Levy) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m.

The Clerk (Mr C.H. Mertin) read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act Amendment,

National Crime Authority (State Provisions) Act Amendment,

Telecommunications (Interception).

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The PRESIDENT: I direct that the following answers to Questions on Notice as detailed in the schedule which I now table be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 16, 17, and 18.

COMMUNITY WELFARE GRANTS PROGRAM

16. **The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism: In respect of the community welfare grants program in 1986-87, how many applications were received and what was the total value of the applications?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: There were 364 applications received with a total value of $6.7 million.

FRAUDULENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

17. **The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism: How many instances of fraudulent use of emergency financial assistance were detected in the past financial year and does this figure reflect the incidence of fraudulent use of such assistance?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Four cases of fraudulent use of emergency financial assistance were referred to the police for investigation in the financial year 1987-88. Three involved forge and utter and reflect the annual incidence of such cases. The person concerned in the fourth case had been to a number of offices over some months and provided false information to obtain assistance. This form of abuse has almost been eliminated by DCW offices using the electronic mail facility on the Justice Information System to check whether other locations have had contact with particular emergency financial assistance clients.

FINANCIAL COUNSELLORS

18. **The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism: In respect of a commitment by the Minister of Community Welfare to appoint 15 part-time financial counsellors in country locations in 1988-89—

1. To which locations are the counsellors to be appointed?

2. How many hours have been allocated to each country location and what is the hourly rate of payment?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The replies are as follows:

83

1. Leigh Creek, Ceduna, Port Lincoln, Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, Kadina, Nuriootpa, Clare, Berri, Mount Barker, Murray Bridge, Naracoorte, Millicent, and Mount Gambier.

2. Each location has notionally been allocated eight hours per week. This includes a component for community education and social action initiatives. The actual demand and usage of hours will vary from location to location. The Manager of the Financial Counselling Service is responsible to ensure that the allocated hours are used to help those families and groups in greatest need. The rate of pay for financial counsellors is currently $13.71 per hour.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner):

Reports, 1987-88—
- Riverland Development Council Inc.
- South Australian Planning Commission.
- The Treasury of South Australia.

Rules of Court—Supreme Court—Supreme Court Act 1935—Documents, Injunctions and Costs.

Legal Practitioners Act 1981—Regulations—Certificate Fee.

National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972—Regulations—Coorong Park Fees.

Remuneration Tribunal—Report relating to Determination No. 11 of 1988.

By the Minister of Corporate Affairs (Hon. C.J. Sumner):

Trustee Act 1936—Regulations—State Government Insurance Commission.

By the Minister of Tourism (Hon. Barbara Wiese):

Reports, 1987-88—
- Eyre Peninsula Cultural Trust.
- South Australian Film Corporation.
- South Australian Meat Corporation.
- South Australian Meat Hygiene Authority.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. Barbara Wiese):

Building Act 1971—Regulations—Australian Standards.

Local Government Act 1934—Regulations—Dogs on Beaches Fee.

Public Parks Act 1943—Report *re* disposal of portion of reserve, Davies Road, Sandy Creek.

Corporation of the City of Noarlunga—By-law No. 11—Foreshore.

City of Port Lincoln—
- By-law No. 2—Renumbering of by-laws.
- By-law No. 3—Fences, hedges and hoardings.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS: CORRUPTION ALLEGATIONS

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Madam President, yesterday I indicated through the media that I would be making available to the Clerk of the House of Assembly details of my visits to Italy since 1970 to try to overcome once and for all the continuing allegations from the Opposition that I have improper associations with some members of the Italian community and, in particular, that I am linked in some way to the Mafia. I regret that this action has become necessary, but the Leader of the Opposition continues to say (*Sunday Mail* 6 November 1988) that he wants my associations fully investigated so that the whole issue can be cleared up once and for all.

I realise that the privacy of some of the persons whom I visited may be affected. However, I can only appeal to the Opposition and others who may wish to peruse the material to use their discretion in its use and to make it public only if there is a compelling public interest reason for doing so. I will ask the Clerk to keep a note of all requests to peruse it and to advise them of my concerns about breaches of privacy. Having said that, however, I place no strictures on its use. The manner in which it is used will be a decision for the individual who seeks access to it. However, if someone uses it in a way that breaches the basic civil liberties of those concerned, it will be his or her responsibility. It will take me some time to collect the material, but I hope that I can arrange for it to be deposited before the end of the week or early next week.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a further statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Madam President, I advise that today I have written to the Leader of the Opposition and provided him with a copy of the full transcript of the Mr X-Wordley conversations.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: We have already got it.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Okay. The Government is not prepared to table the transcript in Parliament. To do so would trample upon the civil rights and liberties of innocent individuals named in the document and would violate their privacy. In addition, there are criminal proceedings pending in respect of at least one of the individuals named in the transcript. The name, address and occupation of that individual is the subject of a suppression order and there is, of course, the issue of *sub judice*. Moreover, there are matters relevant to enforcement of the law which militate against the public release of the transcripts. Whether or not the Opposition Leader chooses to table the transcript or otherwise publish it is a matter for him to weigh up and determine. I point out to the Council that the document provided to the Leader has not been tampered with; its contents and quality are as provided to the Government.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: We have already got that.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Leader of the Opposition indicates that he already has the Mr X tapes.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: We have said that before.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: You have not said it before.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: What you said is that you have seen them. I have read the transcript. You said that you had seen them. As Attorney-General I have decided to make the transcript available to the Leader of the Opposition to put beyond all doubt that the Government has nothing to hide and is sheltering no person. I would also remind the Council that the matters raised in the transcript have been and are the subject of inquiries by the police. The information has been made available to the National Crime Authority which, if it considered there to be any appropriate basis for investigation, would be able to carry out discreet and appropriate investigations without the abuse of civil rights and away from any atmosphere of public disclosure of ill-founded and irresponsible allegations. I should also say that the final paragraph of my letter to Mr Olsen is as follows:

> In making the transcript available to you, I also draw your attention to the context in which the names of Mr Grassby and Mr Wran appear in the transcript (page 186). There is no direct evidence in the transcript that you will see of any impropriety or wrongdoing by those persons—the statements made are hearsay and without corroboration. All of the transcript material, as you are aware, has been made available to the National Crime Authority. If they consider there is any appropriate basis for investigation, they will be able to carry out an investigation without the abuse of civil rights of the individual concerned, which was entailed by you publicly naming these people under parliamentary priviledge.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Madam President, since the Parliament last sat members will be aware of the debate that has been conducted in the community about allegations of corruption and associations with the Mafia made by the Liberal Party about me.

An honourable member: That is not so.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: We will get to it. Try the question Mr Lewis put on the Notice Paper, please.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: That was a question.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Democrats: the arbiter! Fair question?

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: I am on your side this time.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Fair question?

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: No.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The balance of reason has returned.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: What I have to say I regard as extremely serious, about allegations of corruption and associations with the Mafia made by the Liberal Party about me. Although the matters have all now been publicly aired, I wish to formally place on record in this Chamber the circumstances that have led to these events. I have said and I maintain that my family, including my parents, have been the victims of a dreadful slur. I suppose it is easy for other members to be blase about the whole matter. For me, that is impossible. Some say 'Why bother? No-one believes it,' and it is true that many people I know do not believe it now. But the stock-in-trade of the smear is to make the allegation and hope that some of the mud will stick and that the recipient's reputation is thereby diminished.

How many South Australians still believe it, I do not know, but I suppose there will always be some. The reality of the past 18 months is that many did believe it, including the *Sunday Mail*. Others say, 'You're too sensitive, don't worry.' Words are easy. Would you be sensitive if, on arrival home from overseas on a Saturday in May 1987, you found your staff at the airport saying that the *Sunday Mail* was going to name you as the local politician being questioned by the NCA for involvement in a possible murder conspiracy; drug related conspiracy allegations; that the inquiries were associated with former crime boss Robert Trimbole; and that (and this is the *Sunday Mail* article):

> Federal investigations confirm the allegations concerning the South Australian politician and former Federal MP relate to the Victorian coronial inquiry into murdered drug couriers Douglas and Isobel Wilson.

Is it being over-sensitive to recall that I had to engage lawyers and fight for six hours to ensure that my name was not published? My simple denial, the Premier's denial the day before and that of the Minister of Labour (Hon. F.T. Blevins) were not accepted until I sent a letter from my lawyers—six hours after I had arrived home and discussed this matter. My cynical friends say that I should have simply denied it and let them publish and be damned. Undoubtedly, I would have been much richer now had I followed their advice, but I did not want my family put through the horrendous trauma.

If I knew then what I know now, perhaps I would have taken that advice. I have now had the trauma, the hurt, the

continuing rumour and smear for 18 months. These included the usual slur from the Hon. Mr Lucas, on a question on drugs on 27 August 1987, when he accused me of being deliberately evasive in response to a question asked by him as to whether a senior South Australian politician had been questioned in relation to drug-related conspiracy allegations as suggested by the *Sunday Mail*. I do not want this explanation to be unnecessarily political, but I cannot help observing that the Leader of the Opposition has in the past few days elevated evasion to an art form.

Then this year the rumours started again. My staff would report that rumours were going around that I was connected with the Mafia, and that I had stayed in a Mafia villa in Italy. I knew I was innocent, but each rumour hurt. If I came out and denied it, as one media outlet later wanted me to do, then I was in the classic bind. There is a classic question about when you are going to stop beating your wife. By denying it publicly I would draw attention to it. Again, I said that I did not want to put my family through that.

Further, the arrival of Chris Masters of *Page One* ensured that the rumour tempo increased. He was investigating my alleged Mafia links. He was asking why I had made so many visits to Italy. This is coming back to me as I am sitting in my office.

He was alleging to police that I had stayed in Mr A's holiday villa in Sicily. He inferred to the police that there may have been some improper behaviour by me in relation to the Mr A prosecution, despite the fact that even the Moyes case had been briefed to independent counsel, Mr Michael David. This was at the NCA's request, to ensure complete propriety in the matter, because of the Crown Prosecutor's previous association with Moyes.

I repeat: he was asking why I had made so many visits to Italy. This is what was coming back to me—I ask honourable members to just sit and think about that, to sit and think about what I am saying. This is what he was saying, these were the rumours that were coming back into my office, from my staff and through the rumour mill of politics. He was investigating my alleged Mafia links. He was asking why I made so many visits to Italy. He was alleging to police that I had stayed in Mr A's holiday villa in Sicily. He inferred to the police that there may have been some improper behaviour by me in relation to the Mr A prosecution, despite the fact that even the Moyes case had been briefed to independent counsel.

As I have said, this was at the NCA's request, to ensure complete propriety in the matter because of the Crown Prosecutor's previous association with Moyes. Then there was Masters interview with me. He put the allegations about Mr A's holiday villa. I denied them, and at least on that point he took it no further. I believe that he told members of the Liberal Party—they, however, continued the slur. But then Masters found another angle—and I quote from his program:

> There is another far more sinister explanation for why some senior public officials may be reluctant to tackle the issue of public corruption. *Page One* found and spoke with an Adelaide woman who worked as a prostitute in a prominent brothel. She asked us to disguise her identity.

Was I being targeted—again? I believe I was. During my 36-hour defamation-free zone, one media outlet—indeed the same one as Masters'—Channel 10, asked all the questions in the Masters program, namely:

> Did I frequent a brothel in Prospect? Had I been videoed? Was I being blackmailed? Did I know Miss Y, a well-known brothel owner?

All questions were emphatically denied. Then there is the saga of recent days, the Mr X tapes, the senior Liberal sources in last Thursday's *News* targeting a senior Government MP, and the Dr Eastick reference to whether the Premier would resign 'if one of his Ministers had had an association with a person shown to be involved in official corruption'—that is a direct quote. Then, as to honourable members and those who do not think that I was being targeted for a Mafia link, I would ask everyone in this House to read Question on Notice No. 148.

I would ask the Hon. Mr Stefani, in particular, to read Question No. 148. I would ask him in particular: if he had to go to Italy, as he does, and if someone had suggested this about him and the roles were reversed, how would he feel about having a question like that placed on the Notice Paper? There was the Dr Eastick reference, and then, as I said, the notorious Question No. 148, linking me, by innuendo, but linking me, with the Mafia in Plati, in Calabria.

What I tried for 18 months to avoid, so as to protect my reputation, was now inevitable. The Opposition would not name me directly, despite a challenge from the Premier to do so. I named myself—and the memory of the past few days is history. The Leader of the Opposition is now saying that he was not promoting these rumours. I do not believe that. No-one—I repeat no-one—in the media believes that. But even if it were true, they had no compunction about letting the rumours run. After 13 years in politics I know that these things could not be given credence without at least the tacit support of the Leader of the Opposition. He could have stopped them immediately.

How many Liberals knew of the tactics? Did the Leader of the Opposition mention it to them? Will all members opposite take collective responsibility for what happened? Did they not know what was happening? Do they have the superior order excuse? Why did not some of the members here, whom I had regarded as my friends, simply ask me whether the rumours were true? I would like to think that at least some honourable members opposite were not aware: if they were, my faith in human nature, I can assure you, has been devastated.

I would like to think that at least some members opposite were not aware of the facts I have outlined here today. Frankly, I do not think it is an unreasonable request, in the interest of fairness and justice, to ask that a public apology be made to me and my family by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Olsen. If he is not prepared to do it, I can only hope that my parliamentary colleagues in this place, a good number of whom I have sat opposite now for many years and some of whom I have regarded as friends, would have the decency to accede to my request for an apology. In fact, I am prepared to join with them in ensuring that decency returns to political life and debate in this State.

QUESTIONS

CORRUPTION ALLEGATIONS

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Has the Attorney-General received from the Federal Parliament's National Crime Authority Monitoring Committee or any member of it or person associated with it a request that the balance of the NCA's report on allegations of corruption in South Australia be provided to that committee? Has the Attorney rejected that request and, if so, why?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Here we go again! They are attempting to continue the slur.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Just answer the question.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will answer the question all right. I will get the correspondence about the matter. I heard

the question asked in another place. I will get it and when I have got it I will answer the question. The answer to the first question is 'Yes', and the answer to the second question is 'No'. Before the day is out, I will advise the Council. I do not want any slur from members opposite that somehow or other I am covering up. That is again the implication in the question. You people will not give up. I will take you on in the community, I can tell you that now. The Hon. Mr Davis knows about it. I was with the Hon. Mr Davis at functions on Sunday. He knows what is going on in the community—you people do not. You people do not know what is going on in the community at this moment, I can assure you.

The Hon. J.C. Irwin interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: You would know, wouldn't you, Jamie Irwin? I am not going to get personal about you or your family, but you would know. I bet that people close to you are not very happy.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: So does the member for Fisher know about you.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: If you want to know something about the member for Fisher, I will tell you something. That was in response—I am not sure what you are talking about.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: You know what I mean.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: What about Goldsworthy?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Do you think that accusing somebody of perhaps overimbibing—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Every day before six o'clock.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Just a minute—relates to murder or to being involved in the murder of Donald Mackay?

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: We never said that.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am not suggesting you have said it, but you have not stopped it.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You mentioned the *Sunday Mail* and Chris Masters.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Yes, and the Liberal Party.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: The *Sunday Mail* and Chris Masters.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Come on! I am prepared to rely in this case on the assessment of the media. You will be judged—you have been judged already, I can assure you. I do not want to go into the other matter, but that was a response to your launching a vicious personal attack on the Hon. Dr Cornwall in this House. You brought up—

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: That's when he called me—

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Just a minute! In this place you brought up the subject of the honourable member's behaviour at a private party.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Why is he on that back bench now?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Legh, you were with me on Sunday, mate; you know what happened.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: So, people believe it, do they? Is that what you are saying? Are you saying that you heard people say that they believe that I have associations with the Mafia? Is that what you heard Sunday? I bet you did not go to the Italian Festival. I can assure you that you would not have heard it there. Why is the Opposition continuing this slur? Why is it continuing this attack on me? I cannot understand it, I honestly cannot understand it. The first question today from the Opposition again implies a cover up. That is what members are suggesting.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Okay. There are little innuendoes.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Can't we ask you questions any more?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: You can ask questions, sure. You can ask questions, there is no problem, and I will answer them.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Sure, and I will answer it. It will be answered, and I will answer it properly. I have already said that the answer to the first question is 'Yes'. The answer to the second question was 'No'. I will get the letters and I will disclose the correspondence to you. I can do that.

Later:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: We received a letter of request from Mr P. Cleeland, MP, Chairman, Joint Committee on the National Crime Authority, Parliament House, Canberra. I then sought the views of the Chairman of the National Crime Authority, Mr Justice Stewart. I do not have the letter referring the matter to him, but his reply is as follows:

Dear Attorney-General,

I write in answer to your letter of 23 September 1988 concerning the request of Mr Peter Cleeland, MP, the Chairman of the Parliamentary Joint Committee on the National Crime Authority, for you to make available to the joint committee a copy of the interim report made by the authority in respect of certain investigations in South Australia conducted pursuant to South Australian reference No. 1.

As requested by you I have sought the views of the honourable the Attorney-General, Mr Lionel Bowen, MP, and he has informed me that he takes the view that while it is a matter for yourself and your Government, he would prefer that the report should not be released to the parliamentary joint committee. During the conversation that I had with the Attorney-General when I sought his views, we discussed the inter-governmental committee, section 59 (5) of the National Crime Authority Act 1984 and compared the position of the inter-governmental committee with that of the parliamentary joint committee. I believe that the Attorney-General took those matters into account in coming to the view which he conveyed to me. Section 59 (5) provides:

> The authority shall not furnish to the inter-governmental committee any matter the disclosure of which to members of the public could prejudice the safety or reputation of persons or the operations of law enforcement agencies and, if the findings of the authority in any investigation include any such matter, the authority shall prepare a separate report in relation to the matter and furnish that report to the Commonwealth Minister or Minister of the Crown of the State by whom the relevant reference was made.

As far as the authority is concerned, it has always been its view that any decision to make the report available to others is one for the Government of South Australia.

I repeat that section 59 (5) provides:

> The authority shall not furnish to the inter-governmental committee any matter the disclosure of which to members of the public could prejudice the safety or reputation of persons—

and I emphasise 'reputation of persons'—

> or the operations of law enforcement agencies . . .

It was on that basis—and frankly I believe that enough reputations have been besmirched in this episode—that the decision was made, and that was conveyed to Mr Cleeland in the following terms:

I refer to your letter dated 8 September 1988 requesting that I release to the joint committee a copy of the interim report of the National Crime Authority following its investigations in South Australia conducted under South Australian reference No. 1.

I should indicate that I have sought the views of the National Crime Authority and of the Commonwealth Attorney-General in relation to the release of the interim report.

Any decision to make the report available is one for the Government of South Australia. However, the National Crime Authority has indicated in the interim report that the report contains findings the disclosure of which to members of the public could prejudice the safety or reputation of persons or the operations of law enforcement agencies.

I have also noted the restrictions on disclosure by the National Crime Authority to the inter-governmental committee contained in section 59 (5) of the National Crime Authority Act 1984. I have taken these matters into account, and I regret to advise that, in the light of all the circumstances, I consider it not appropriate for the report to be released to the joint committee.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Could the Attorney-General say whether any of his State or Federal parliamentary colleagues had warned him, at any time, that he should not associate with the man who was referred to by the Attorney-General as Mr A in an interview reported in the *Advertiser* of 5 November 1988 and who is currently before the court on serious charges? If so, who issued that warning, when was it given and what was the Attorney's response?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I have no knowledge. Are you suggesting that a Federal colleague warned me? Is that the implication?

The Hon. L.H. Davis: The question was whether any State or Federal Parliamentary colleague—

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Had warned me. When?

The Hon. L.H. Davis:—at any time that you should not associate with the man referred to by you in that *Advertiser* article.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Mr A. When is it that I was supposed to be told this?

The Hon. L.H. Davis: I asked 'if'.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: You tell me. You are making the allegations.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: He is just asking a question.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Just a minute. You tell me when that is, Julian. Is this fair? Is this fair? You know the person as well as I do; you know his father-in-law as well as I do.

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: I don't know him.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: No, and I don't know him either. You people are absolutely astonishing. If you want me to go through it, I will repeat: before I met Mr A, he was referred to me, I had a house in Moonta Bay: he had bought a house in Moonta. He was referred to me by his father-in-law—whom the Hon. Mr Stefani knows.

The Hon. J.F. Stefani interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: You do not know him at all? Never met him?

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You just made the allegation.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Okay, okay. That is fair enough. Fine. You have never met him? The Hon. Mr Stefani has apparently denied that he knows—

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: I don't know the man. You had better retract that. I don't know the man.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I know; I am just saying—I am just going on. I am repeating it.

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: Get the story straight. I don't know the man and I don't know his father-in-law.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is what I was merely ensuring that you were saying.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I was not.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You said he knew the man.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Okay. Well, I said he knew—

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: I have not been to the shack; I have not been on his boat—

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am not talking about him.

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: —to his wedding, or his—

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am talking about his father-in-law.

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: Well, I don't know the man.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Do you know his father-in-law?

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: I don't know who you are referring to. I don't know the man. End of story. I don't know—

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Do you know his father-in-law?

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: Who are you talking about?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: You don't know his father-in-law?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: Am I supposed to know everybody?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: No. All right, we will accept that Mr Stefani knows neither Mr A nor his father-in-law. I will accept that. No-one in the Opposition apparently accepts the denials that I make on various things. I repeat: the story is—and I have given this already—why am I being confronted? Why didn't Mr Olsen come and put all this to me on Thursday night, on the *7.30 Report?* Why didn't Mr Olsen approach me during Friday? Why didn't he come forward with the allegations? I gave 36 hours of immunity.

He did not come forward. Mr A was referred to me because he had a shack at Moonta Bay. I had a shack at Moonta. Mr A I knew; his father-in-law I knew. His father-in-law referred Mr A to me, because his father-in-law found out that I had a shack at Moonta Bay. At the time I met him I was not aware of any of his alleged improper activities. I was not aware, and I am not now aware of any such suggestion emanating from the Hon. Mr Davis—either before that or now.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: In the interests of further clarifying that aspect, and in the light of the fact that the Attorney-General is on the record in the *Advertiser* of Saturday 5 November in a so-called 'question-and-answer' session, we have got to put it all on the record and get it straight. I therefore ask the Attorney-General, as chief law officer of the Crown, whether he has discussed this issue and this man, Mr A, with the Premier, whether as Premier or the Opposition, before Thursday 3 November and, if so, what was the result of the discussion.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Have I discussed Mr A with the Premier—is that the question? Well yes, I have discussed Mr A.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Before last Thursday?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Yes, I believe I made the Premier aware. I certainly made the Police Commissioner aware.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: No, I cannot remember with precision.

NATIVE VEGETATION

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Environment and Planning, a question about native vegetation regulations and Gumeracha.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: My questions relate to the destruction of eight large gum trees on section 218, hundred of Talunga, near Gumeracha, by well-known Adelaide builder Caj Amadio without the consent of the Native Vegetation Authority. The trees, one of which was about 1 000 years old, were felled early in September this year on a property not yet even owned by Caj Amadio. Settlement is not due until February 1989, when he purchases the property. Many residents of the area were outraged at the felling.

The offence was reported to the Gumeracha District Council and referred to the Native Vegetation Authority. The Native Vegetation Authority considered the matter on 3 October 1988, when it was prepared to prosecute. However, they later had a meeting with Mr Amadio on the site and told him to make an application to clear the trees.

Members should bear in mind that the trees had been cut down over a month before. Caj Amadio lodged an application on 21 October to seek permission to remove gum trees as shown in a sketch but no reason was given. The Native Vegetation Authority then posted out permission for the trees to be cleared.

The NVA knew the land did not belong to Amadio; it knew the trees were already destroyed; and it must have suspected or even known that Amadio knew he was breaking the law when he felled the trees without permission. Mr Amadio is a leading builder and developer. He must have known of the law regarding tree clearance. He added insult to injury by writing to the Gumeracha District Council on 18 October, concerned that he was being held up by the NVA from removing the stumps. That brief letter, dated 18 October, to the Gumeracha District Council, is as follows:

Dear Sir,

Re Gumeracha vineyard development

Work on the above project has been delayed due to the Native Vegetation Authority prohibiting us from digging out the stumps left in the ground from where we cut the gum trees. They are requiring from council a reply in the affirmative to the question if we as developers sought approval to remove the necessary trees to develop the vineyard.

As discussed with you, the practice of tree clearing and planting is a common occurrence on rural land. We feel that, because our land activities are exposed to the public, we have encountered these very costly and frustrating hindrances. We ask council to consider our problem in a balanced view and reply in the affirmative to the NVA so that this matter can be closed and we can get on with our work.

In fact, the letter asked the council to lie to the Native Vegetation Authority. The council had not even been consulted about the trees, let alone giving its approval. My questions are:

1. Is it common practice for the Native Vegetation Authority to retrospectively grant permission for illegal tree felling?

2. What caused the NVA to change its mind regarding prosecuting Mr Amadio?

3. Will the Minister thoroughly investigate the matter and instruct the department to institute prosecution proceedings if the facts as I have outlined are correct?

4. Does the Minister agree that the facts I have outlined make a mockery of the Native Vegetation Authority?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will obtain a reply for the honourable member.

OCCUPATIONAL SHARE SCHEME

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Employment and Further Education, a question about quotas for the 1988-89 occupational share scheme.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: The Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, Senator Robert Ray, recently released the occupational shares list for 1988-89, which shows a decline in the quota under this scheme from 3 300 in 1987-88 to 2 900 for 1988-89. For the information of members, the occupational share scheme is a quota list of occupations for which there are shortages in Australia.

The list is compiled by the Commonwealth Department of Employment, Education and Training, and shares in the quota are allocated only in those occupations where domestic education, training and retraining were unlikely to be able to satisfy Australian needs over the next few years. People from overseas within these occupational groups are encouraged to apply for migration to Australia. These occupations listed in 1988-89 include electronic and industrial engineers, quantity surveyors, computing professionals, nurses, tool and die makers, plumbers, vehicle mechanics, chefs/cooks, cabinetmakers, and upholsterers (to name a few).

As I stated earlier the ceiling for applications under the scheme for 1988-89 will be 2 900 compared with 3 300 in 1987-88. This fall has been attributed to the increased emphasis given by both the State and Federal Governments to domestic education and training. In the light of this, can the Minister representing the Minister for Employment and Further Education inform the Council of the following:

1. Which of the professions and occupations listed on the 1988-89 occupational share scheme are required in South Australia?

2. What strategies and policies has the State Government embarked upon to end our State's reliance on obtaining these qualified professionals from overseas?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will seek an answer to those questions and bring back a reply.

CORRUPTION ALLEGATIONS

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: My question is to the Attorney-General. During the period that the Hon. C.J. Sumner was Attorney-General in 1979 and since becoming Attorney-General again in November 1982, has he had any briefing from the police or the NCA on the criminal situation in South Australia? In particular, have people suspected of being involved in organised crime been named in those briefings and, if so, in this context was the man now known as Mr A named to him?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I have already answered that question. I did that frankly during the time that I was prepared to open myself up for 36 hours to be asked questions by anyone. I did not see the Hon. Mr Lucas come forward—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: There's a question there.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It's a question and there's a nice little innuendo in it, as always; another little—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You have seen more innuendos in recent times than anyone else.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Well, I will ask anyone in the community—and I will distribute it to anyone in this community—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Answer this question.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will. You are the one who is interjecting. Just get it straight. The notorious question 148 will live in infamy. I will give that question to anyone (and I mean anyone) in this community just straight, and I will ask them, 'Do you believe that that attempts to link me with the Mafia?'

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Why don't you answer the question?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am getting to it. You are interjecting—you are not a serious person; you are not a serious politician. If you think that you are ever going to be Minister of Education—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: I am asking about this question.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will get to it if you stop interjecting—you are saying that I am seeing innuendo in things. That was your interjection.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You said—

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I know. Then you interjected back to me and said, 'You see a lot of innuendos in things.' Right! I refer back to that notorious and infamous question 148, and I challenge any reasonable person in the community, in this Parliament, outside the Parliament—no matter

where (I do not care)—in the country, in the city: I challenge them to look at that question and deny that it does not attempt to link me with the Mafia. The only people in South Australia who think that that question does not attempt to link me with the Mafia are the Liberal members of this Council.

There is no one else in the community who believes that that question does not link me with the Mafia. Ask any media representatives. I do not know whether or not you have been talking to them, but ask any media person. I challenge you to ask anyone. Ask them in my presence—without any notice. Ask any media person whether they believe that question 148 attempts to link me with the Mafia. Ask anyone. Universally, that is what the media say; that is what the broad mass of South Australians say, and you had better believe it.

I can tell the Hon. Mr Lucas and the people who have asked the question today to try to continue this attack on me: this will cost you dearly. It will cost you dearly in terms of support in this State. I am prepared to put up my credibility against that of yours at any time. I am prepared to debate any one of you people anywhere—at any time.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Are you willing to answer the question?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Yes, I will get to it. I am getting on with it.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Answer the question!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Just a minute.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Just answer the question!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will answer it tonight on the *7.30 Report*. I want to answer it with you on the *7.30 Report*.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Answer it now.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Okay.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will get to it. I want to answer it tonight on television.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Why don't you answer it now?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Because I prefer to answer it tonight on the *7.30 Report*.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: What are these people? Just what are they doing? I will answer it now, but will you come on the *7.30 Report* when I answer it tonight?

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You will not need to.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Can you believe what is going on?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Madam President, the honourable member asked me a question about what happened—this is what they are up to—in 1979.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: And since 1982.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: About what happened in 1979 and my so-called association with Mr A, as I recall it, it was in 1981 when he had a house at Moonta Bay and I had a house at Moonta Bay. The association began when his father-in-law, who is well-known in the Italian community—he would be known to everyone in that community. I can hardly think of a person who would be better known in the Italian community than his father-in-law. His father-in-law suggested to him that he call on me at Moonta Bay. That happened when I had a holiday shack at Moonta Bay. I have described my association with him there and that has all now been made public—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: That is not the question.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I know it was not the question.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Then what are you talking about?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Frankly, I am trying to defend my honour against the slurs and innuendo that you people are trying to put up. So, I do not recall 1979 for five months when I was Attorney-General. I do not recall receiving a briefing from the police, although of course I may have. That is now almost 10 years ago. The so-called association—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Will you check your records?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I do not have any records from 1979. For goodness sake! Do you live in some kind of unreal world? Why should I check my records? Are you suggesting that I had an improper association with this person?

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: I am just asking you a question: did you have a briefing?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I do not recall in 1979 having a briefing from the police of the nature that you have outlined. Certainly, since 1982 there have been briefings from the police on a number of matters. I do not recall, except for recent times of course. Certainly, from early after our election in 1982—I do not recall having a briefing which mentioned this particular individual. Obviously, I have become aware of him because he is the subject of certain proceedings in which I have responsibility. That is the answer to the question.

INTELLECTUALLY DISABLED SERVICES COUNCIL

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking a question of the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Health, about the Intellectually Disabled Services Council.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: The Intellectually Retarded Persons Project Report in 1981 set the pattern for the direction of services in South Australia for persons with an intellectual disability. Five years later the then Minister of Health (Hon. Dr Cornwall) commissioned Michael Steer to conduct a review of the Intellectually Disabled Services Council (IDSC). The Steer report has been released, and most of the recommendations have received a favourable reaction, from what I have been told. Recommendations included updating the information and client record system, deinstitutionalisation, greater coordination at Commonwealth and State level and funding service developments. However, some people have expressed concern to me about the recommendation that refers to moving away from the provision of direct services to brokerage, systems coordination, individual client planning, and management.

I attended a public meeting on 27 September at the Education Centre and, at the end of that meeting, I had discussions with people who expressed to me a deal of frustration and confusion about what the proposed changes would mean in terms of outcome for their families. It is clear that the parents needed direct services but it is unclear which agency would provide those services and the level of resources required to implement those recommendations.

The IDSC has identified a number of major gaps in services. These include accommodation services for adults, vocational day services, country service, educational support services, and services to support the transition from school to adult life, intensive training/behavioural management services, respite care, and family support services. The unmet needs indicate that practical supports are required initially, not case-managers. It has been suggested to me

that there are considerable discrepancies between the policy and practices of departments and agencies involved in early intervention. For example, the Childrens Services Office, which has a mandate to serve children from 0-6 years of age, has refused services to children with an intellectual disability in more than one metropolitan region.

The Education Department states that it has a range of options but, in fact, has very few choices, particularly when local access to school support services is concerned. Some agencies are, apparently, effectively limiting the availability of their services to persons with intellectual disability by having them on the lowest priority or requiring another more appropriate service. The expectation is that as the IDSC has trained personnel in this area, it would provide the services. The essence of the complaints made to me is that the Government is taking the IDSC away from service delivery. It is actually increasing its funding, but the bodies who will now become responsible for service delivery are being inadequately resourced.

My questions are as follows: what benefits and additional services are to be provided to families as a result of the implementation of the Steer Review recommendations? Secondly, what attempts are being made to meet the substantial gaps in services as previously outlined? Thirdly, what additional resources are to be allocated to the IDSC to move away from hands-on services and for generic agencies (already often under resourced) to expand existing services? Finally, many agencies have demonstrated that they are reluctant to provide services to persons with intellectual disability. What level of commitment has been secured from generic agencies that this discrimination will cease, and that persons with an intellectual disability will have equal access to services?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will refer the questions to my colleague and bring back a reply.

CHILD ABUSE

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Community Welfare, a question about child abuse.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The Minister's statement on child abuse in the Legislative Council on Wednesday 2 November posed more questions than it answered, and I therefore raise the following questions to which I would appreciate an answer in the near future.

Who comprise the specialist child abuse assessment team at the Adelaide Children's Hospital, and what are the qualifications and experience of each person in that unit? Which specialist services will be provided at the Flinders Medical Centre? What are the so-called 'sensitive guidelines' that have been developed for interviewing children? What is the cost of the training package being piloted through the Southern Women's Health and Community Centre? Through which seven centres in the State is that program being conducted and at what cost? When will the joint interviewing procedures be in place?

I understand that they are now being worked on by the Department for Community Welfare and the police. My last question is in respect of the Minister's statement that the Minister of Community Welfare would not be intimidated by ill-informed reactionary responses to such a major social problem as child abuse.

I trust that the Minister can confirm that she was not reflecting on members of the Opposition in recent questions we have asked on this subject, as all questions quoted were based on judgments by senior judges of the Children's Court or the Family Court. If she was not reflecting on the Opposition, perhaps it would be of interest to know who the Minister was referring to in respect of 'ill-informed reactionary individuals'.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will refer those questions to the Minister of Community Welfare and bring back a reply.

CORRUPTION ALLEGATIONS

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: Does the offer the Attorney-General made before, to debate the matter of corruption, still stand? In particular, does the offer apply to the Hon. Mr Lucas?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Last week I was forced—there is no other word for it—to name myself in this Parliament as the individual who had been targeted by smear and innuendo for the past 18 months. Murder, drug trafficking, conspiracy, association with the Mafia—and it goes on. How members opposite can come into this place and laugh this off today as if nothing had ever happened, I do not know.

The Hon. M.S. Feleppa: You ask the Italian community if they know what's happened.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Hon. Mr Feleppa knows the Italian community as well as I do. I think the Italian community is proud of me, and I am proud of it. I think the Italian Government is proud of me, and I like Italy, and I will tell anyone who wants to listen that I am not going to back off from my relationship with the Italian community because of this racist slur which is being perpetrated on me by members opposite. Frankly, I am absolutely bewildered at the attitude of the Hon. Mr Stefani. He is a prominent member of the Italian community, and was put in the Liberal Party on the back bench to liaise with the Liberal Party.

An honourable member: He got there on his ability.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I know.

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: Who brought the Italian community into the public arena? You did!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Hon. Mr Stefani is saying that I dragged the Italian community into the public arena. How?

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: By saying that if you did not speak Italian you would not be involved.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I wouldn't have been.

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: I speak Italian. The honourable member opposite speaks Italian and 70 000 other people in South Australia speak Italian.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Involved in what?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is a point of order before the Chair.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: On a point of order, Madam President, I ask you to rule that this exchange is out of order and should not continue.

The PRESIDENT: I completely agree with you. Repeated interjections are out of order.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: But they are very instructive. The Hon. Mr Stefani has said that I have dragged the Italian community into this. The reality, Mr Stefani, is that the Liberal Party has done that: you tried to link me with the Mafia.

The PRESIDENT: I would ask that remarks be addressed through the Chair.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: You are a lawyer, Mr Burdett.

An honourable member: What did we say?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: You said that I went to Plati and that my accommodation and expenses were paid by the Mafia.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: As I pointed out on Friday, you could have asked the question as follows: has the Attorney-General visited Plati or Calabria since 1980? If I had said 'No', you did not have to put all the other stuff in about 'il capo'. Il capo dell, opposizione—the Leader of the Opposition!

An honourable member: They are looking for mileage.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Frankly, I do not know whether they have conducted any polls lately. I do not know whether anyone rang up and conducted a few polls at the weekend, but I tell you this: the reality is that John Olsen has no credibility left in this community—and you had better believe it.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: By way of interjection the Hon. Mr Stefani has accused me of dragging the Italian community into this issue. His words were: 'I speak Italian, the Hon. Mario Feleppa speaks Italian, but I am not involved.'

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: In what?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: In what?

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: I did not say I was not involved.

An honourable member: You did.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The record is taken down here—there is a *Hansard,* and you cannot correct it, either.

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: Don't worry about it.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am not worrying about it; I would think that the honourable member is the one—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I would ask that remarks be addressed through the Chair.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Okay, but I am answering the question as to whether I am prepared to debate them.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: It has nothing to do with Mr Stefani; the question was about me.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: No, I want to debate him, on television, tonight.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will go further—I will debate the honourable member on Radio Italiana. Does the honourable member want to do that?

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: When you say you want to debate 'him', are you talking about the Hon. Mr Lucas?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: No, I am now talking about the Hon. Mr Stefani.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: And you—anyone who wants to debate me, anywhere, any time, on any media—this is the offer that I made. The honourable member's question was, 'Does that offer still stand?', and the answer is 'Yes, it still stands, anywhere, any time.' Why did not the courageous Mr Olsen appear on the *7.30 Report*? On the matter of debate, the Hon. Mr Olsen would not come near me, Thursday night and all day Friday. The only way he was able to get on any radio program with me was on the Keith Conlon show—and his firm condition was that it would not be a one-on-one debate. That was the situation—he would not have a one-on-one debate.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: He would not have a one-on-one debate with me, and what did the courageous Mr Olsen do on Friday afternoon? He would not even have a general press conference.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: He talked to the press.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: He talked to the press—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Exactly.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I know how he talked to the press, because I was here, and after they left his office they came down to my office. And I ask all members opposite to just bear this in mind, all those people who have been chiacking about me today, continuing their attack on me—as that is what they have done: they have continued their attack on me today, and they are not denying it. On Friday afternoon the courageous Mr Olsen was not prepared to be in the same room with more than one journalist.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: That is nonsense. That is an outright lie. Go and speak to them.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: You can have more questions to you by one-on-one than you can otherwise.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Where is the media? Why aren't they here? Bring me the media, please!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: That is not the truth.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will rephrase it: he was not prepared to have more than one television camera journalist in the room with him at any one time.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: That's not the truth, either.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is what they told me.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Were you there?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: No.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Exactly, you are saying that you were not there.

The PRESIDENT: Order, Mr Lucas!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The media know that they saw them one-on-one—they made appointments for it. One appointment was at quarter to four, 4 o'clock was the next appointment, 4.10 was the next, and about 4.20 was the last—and, of course, it was done at the end of the day, you see, because they thought they were going to get the last say on the media battle. That was what it was all about. And we had this phone five page letter, which contained further allegations against me and which the Police Commissioner immediately repudiated. That is what happened.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Is this Thursday or Friday?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Friday.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: I was talking about Thursday.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am talking about Friday afternoon.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is too much unseemly interjection and carry-on. I would remind honourable members that repeated interjections are out of order, and all proceedings in the Council must be addressed through the Chair. There is 10 minutes of Question Time left, and I would ask all members to adhere to Standing Orders.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will repeat—and in case members opposite are in any doubt about it they can check with the media, and if I am wrong I will apologise—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: This is on Thursday?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: No, on Friday—I have never mentioned Thursday.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: On Thursday all the media was there. This is the point you are making.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: On Thursday, he gave a general media conference, and on Thursday night he would not come on the *7.30 Report* with me. I have not been referring to Thursday. I have been referring to Friday. On Friday afternoon the Hon. Mr Olsen, the courageous Mr Olsen, was not even prepared to have a general press conference. So, after my challenge to him, after he had allowed these slurs and smears and innuendoes—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You challenged him Thursday.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Can I finish my answer, Ms President?

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Well, answer the question.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Repeated interjections are out of order.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: What happened was that I challenged them when I walked out of here. If the honourable member wants to know about debating—because the question is about whether I am prepared to debate members of the Liberal Party—I can say that I walked out of here and I went straight up to the press conference and I asked a Liberal member—I asked Mr Olsen, Dr Eastick and Mr Griffin—to come with me and debate the issue.

The Hon. Peter Dunn: Anybody for that matter.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Anyone, and I will: I will debate anyone, anywhere. However, no-one arrived. That was the first time. That evening, on the *7.30 Report*, I again said that I would debate the matter, but no-one arrived. Again, all through the media on Friday morning I said that I would debate them, but no-one arrived. On top of that, on Friday afternoon Mr Olsen was not game to have a general press conference. He organised individual appointments. That is what happened. The media knows that.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You had individual ones on the weekend, too.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Yes, but at separate times.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Oh, so it is different for you.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You admit it.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I have called the Hon. Mr Lucas to order.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I can assure the honourable member that if they both turned up at the same time I would do a general press conference. But the Hon. Mr Olsen would not do it; he organised specific times so that they were separate. In other words, I repeat my accusation: the Hon. Mr Olsen was not game enough to have more than one television journalist in his office at the same time interviewing him. If that is not correct, then members opposite can correct me. Frankly, I do not think that you people know what goes on. But that is what happened.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: That's not exceptional.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I can tell you what, in a crisis like this, for the Leader of the Opposition not to give a—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: You are upset, so it is a crisis.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Well, I frankly believe it is a crisis for the Leader of the Opposition. I frankly believe that.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Frankly, I think that if there was not a crisis before now there certainly will be, after today's performance. Today members opposite—and frankly I am quite staggered—have shown no sensitivity towards me or my family. They have continued the attack on my good name, the attack that they started several months ago. They have continued that attack on my good name, and I guess all that can be said is that, ultimately, the community will judge members opposite—and I think they will judge them a little bit sooner than they expect, in the sense that if there is any basis to the impression that I got on the weekend, then there is little doubt that as a result of this attack on me Mr Olsen's credibility is very much on the line.

WAR CRIMES

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about war crimes.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: Most Australian citizens would know by now of the pending legislation before the Federal Parliament which seeks to introduce measures designed to provide the mechanism for prosectuion of war crimes. In an article written by Dr Anthony Endrey, QC, which appeared in the March 1988 edition of the *Ethnic Reporter*, he raises the question of the Government's intentions to equally apply the prosecution measures to all war crimes, and states:

> The evidence given by the Government's Special Investigator, R.F. Greenwood, QC, before the Senate committee recently, considering certain aspects of the Bill, disclosed that the Government had hitherto expressly confined its investigations of 'war criminals' to the German side and, even there, its attention was solely focussed on political refugees from the Soviet Union, Hungary and Yugoslavia. Not even German and Italian 'war criminals' were being looked at, even though the hotbeds of Nazism, respectively Fascism, were in those countries. And what about Japanese war criminals who had much closer connection with Australia?

In recent weeks I have been informed that officers from the Federal Department of Social Security have been visiting the homes of various Australian citizens of eastern European origin, seeking information about the date of their arrival in Australia, the place and date of birth and other information.

These inquiries have been undertaken in New South Wales, Victoria and, more recently, South Australia and members of the ethnic community are upset and totally disgusted by the selective inquiries undertaken by officers of a Government department, which, on face value, appear to have no good reason or justification for their visit. All Australian citizens of eastern European origin have been advised to give only their name and address, and to seek the assistance of a lawyer. My questions to the Attorney-General are as follows:

1. Is he aware of any inquiries undertaken by the Federal Government in South Australia or interstate?

2. What action does he intend taking in view of the reports received about this matter?

3. Will he give an undertaking to this Chamber that he will contact the appropriate Federal Government department to ascertain the appropriateness and reasons for the inquiries?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will obtain the information for the honourable member. In the brief time that I have left, I advise that I was at the Ukrainian community on Sunday and told it that this community cannot live by way of smear, innuendo, or guilt by association.

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: Answer the question.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I said that I will get the information. I am going on.

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: Your theatrical performance goes on.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That's right. You think that it is a theatrical performance?

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: You admitted it.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: These people are juvenile, adolescent, non-serious politicians. That is the reality. This is probably the most extraordinary day that I have seen in my life in Parliament. You are not serious contenders for anything, not even for decency.

PAROLE

Details additional to those supplied on 1/11/88:

	Original Offence	*Breach of Condition*
27.	Possess Amphetamine for Sale Selling Amphetamine	Reporting
28.	Possess Methophetamine for Sale Possess Appliance to administer Drug Possess Indian Hemp	Drug Assessment
29.	Drive Motor Vehicle without Consent Trespass Assault Offensive Language	Absconding
30.	Assault	Reporting
31.	False pretences Drive Under Influence	Absconding No alcohol
32.	Murder	Reporting
33.	Counsel another to commit Felony Accessory	Absconding
34.	Wound with intent to do Grievous Bodily Harm	Reporting
35.	Drive whilst Disqualified Breach of Recognizance	Reporting
36.	Break, Enter and Larceny (4 counts) Larceny (2 counts) Drive without Consent	Absconding
37.	Larceny (8 counts) Receiving (2 counts) False Pretences	Reporting Absconding
38.	Canteen Break and Larceny Garage Break and Larceny False Pretences (2 counts) Illegal Interference with Motor Vehicle Illegal Use of Motor Vehicle Drive whilst Disqualified	Absconding
39.	Produce Cannabis Produce Cannabis for Sale	Leave State
40.	Club House Break and Larceny Break, Enter and Steal Illegal Use Illegally on Premises	Reporting
41.	Burglary	Absconding Reporting

FIREARMS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 November. Page 1149.)

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I support the second reading. I am not entirely prepared for this speech as I believed that I would be speaking after dinner. The timing has come as a surprise to me. I acknowledge that I was less than impressed to receive advice last Friday from the office of the Minister of Emergency Services that the second reading explanation read into *Hansard* by the Minister of Local Government last Wednesday evening was the wrong one and that a new version was still being typed. I finally received a copy of the revised version from *Hansard* at 5.10 p.m. on Friday and am pleased that I bothered to wait around for it as the content, tone and length of the revised second reading explanation, as I am sure the Hon. Mr Gilfillan will attest, is radically different from Wednesday's two paragraph effort. This exercise serves to reinforce the concerns expressed by Liberal members in another place last week that the Government's approach to this important issue of the control of firearms can only be characterised as a saga of vacillation extending over at least one year. This is the third Bill to be presented to Parliament in the past 12 months but the first to be debated in this place.

I suspect that this explains the strenuous efforts made in the revised second reading explanation to present the Government's actions as a rational, planned and justifiable process to develop a workable system of firearm control. Certainly the Government has a lot of explaining to do. Over the past 12 months the Government has retreated quite dramatically from its original position, a position which, upon consultation and reflection, it could not sustain. In the view of a wide cross-section of the South Australian community, the first Bill last December was considered a draconian response to the issue of the control of firearms. Whilst Government members are now seeking to argue otherwise, no doubt exists that the first Bill was an emotive response to community concern about the violent and tragic use of firearms in multiple murders in Victoria, the Northern Territory, Western Australia and the United Kingdom during 1987, as was the Prime Minister's initiative in late December in calling the special Premiers' conference to pursue Australia-wide firearms legislation.

Since that Premiers' Conference various Governments, including the Bannon Government, have gradually withdrawn their earlier solid support for a variety of resolutions passed that day. In February the Minister of Emergency Services, in another place, withdrew the December Bill and proposed a further Bill and regulations which, in turn, in April this year, were referred to a select committee of members of the House of Assembly for consideration and report.

The Bill before us today is the product of that select committee's deliberations. Indeed, it is a superior piece of legislation as a result of the deliberations of the select committee. The committee achieved consensus on most issues, but not all, and I will shortly highlight some of the issues where members differed in their views and where the Liberal Party believes amendments are necessary.

In preparing for this debate—although not giving sufficient time to such an exercise—I admit that I have not read the 482 foolscap pages of evidence or the three full folders of material that were placed before the committee by various interested parties. However, I have read with interest the select committee's report and the *Hansard* of the four debates in the other place over the past year, including the noting of the select committee report.

All this reading confirmed the complex nature of the firearms issue and that it appears to have been a much easier task to reach agreement on the need for controlling firearms rather than on the nature and extent of those controls. Certainly, there are diverse and strongly-held views abounding in the community on the subject and, I suspect, also in this Parliament. Community views range from those who do not wish any control over firearms at all (involving a repeal of the Firearms Act); to those who would wish to confine the use of firearms to the metropolitan area alone; and to those who would wish to ban firearms altogether. In these circumstances I accept that it is not an easy task to reconcile these competing views. Indeed, over the past few weeks I have not been surprised to be informed that there are individuals and organisations who continue to argue that the Bill does not go far enough, or others who argue that it goes too far.

The Liberal Party strongly supports the need for a strict but fair and well-managed Firearms Act. We seek to ensure

that the laws governing the possession and use of firearms address the interests of community protection as well as the interests of the police in their crime prevention and criminal detection work on our behalf. In addition, the Liberal Party recognises the legitimate interests and needs of farmers, veterinary surgeons, and the like, and those who choose to pursue shooting as a recreation or sporting activity.

My interest in this legislation stems from a longstanding concern about the increase of violence in our society in general, and particularly the increase in domestic violence, to which I will now refer. The Australian Institute of Criminology has reported that approximately 42 per cent of offences with firearms occur in the home, and that up to 50 per cent of homicides involve a spouse, other relative or family acquaintance. Members may also recall the findings reported in February this year following a national quantitative survey of 1 504 men and women aged 18 years and over to determine their attitudes to domestic violence. Of that number, some six per cent considered that threatening or using a weapon on one's wife was justifiable in some circumstances. If that percentage was extended across the adult Australian population, it would represent an estimated 700 000 adult Australians who considered that to threaten or use a weapon against one's wife was justifiable in certain circumstances.

I am not suggesting that in each of those circumstances a firearm would have been used, or that a wife would have been threatened with a gun, but certainly weapons were involved. In addition, in recent times Mr Richard Harding has explored the subject of violent crime in the home involving the use of firearms. Mr Harding presented these findings in a book entitled *Firearms and Violence in Australian Life.* Mr Harding's work was cited by Ms Carmel O'Loughlin, Director, Domestic Violence Prevention Unit, when she gave evidence to the select committee. Ms O'Loughlin referred to Mr Harding's work, as follows:

> However, one factor stands out—the bulk of such crimes occur within the context of the family or arise out of some existing social relationship. The availability of a firearm at the time the critical incident is developing crucially affects the nature and outcome of the confrontation invariably for the worse. Those who keep guns for protection against strangers or unspecified external threats are more likely to use them against their family or acquaintances. Alternatively, they may find that a family member or an acquaintance uses them against themselves.

Further, Ms O'Loughlin stated:

> The big thing with domestic violence is not so much the actual use . . . but the fact that so many women and children have told shelter workers that all the man has to do is take out his gun to clean it and they know. It takes a long time to kill people with a knife but, with a gun, a person can be murdered very quickly and the threat of that is enough to bring the women into line. When the man says, 'Jump', they do not ask, 'Why?' They do anything they are told in order to avoid that threat. While guns are in the house, they live within the shadow of that threat for their whole being.

That is certainly the case in many instances. I have family members who live on farms and who have guns, and I can readily acknowledge that not all persons who have guns in the house—like many of the farmers who are members of this place—would use them in a threatening manner towards their wife or children. However, there are certainly people who face the prospect of domestic violence in their daily lives and the threatening use of firearms.

Therefore, beyond the issue of domestic violence and firearms, I am concerned about other facts related to the use or misuse of firearms. Work is available, and estimates have been made, that suggest that a person is four times more likely to be killed with a firearm than with any other weapon. As a society we are also facing a dramatic increase in the incidence of suicide with firearms, particularly among young men. I recently attended a conference organised by the Young Liberals of South Australia on the subject of youth suicide, and many of the findings and discussions were quite disturbing.

Meanwhile, firearms are the main weapon used in armed robbery and, according to the Australian Bankers Association, rifles and shotguns accounted for 55 per cent of weapons used in Australian bank robberies in 1986-87. These figures represent some most disturbing and ugly trends in our society, and the select committee has confirmed that today there is an expectation of and need for tighter controls on the possession and use of firearms.

Having made that statement, I am certainly not blind to the fact that laws to control the use of guns will not wholly contain the criminal use of guns. The Bill before the Council arising from the select committee's recommendations contains a large number of positive features. One such change, which I believe will be particularly useful in cases of domestic violence, is the proposal to widen the power to cancel a firearms licence and to order the disposal of firearms.

Another important change is to clause 12 (3), which increases the minimum age for obtaining a firearms licence from 15 to 18 years. This clause, like so many other provisions in this Bill, provides for exemptions. In this instance it is proposed that the exemptions from the licensing requirements be expanded to ensure that junior shooters have the opportunity to participate in legitimate shooting activities under the supervision of a parent, guardian or coach. A further exemption, which was contained in the original Bill, applies to a junior who is related to or employed by a person who holds a firearms licence and who is engaged in primary production.

Further positive features of the Bill include the introduction of minimum standards, and the requirement that a permit be issued for each firearm purchased, following an assessment by the Registrar that the person making the application is a fit and proper person to own the firearm. Another is the increase in the penalties for licensing offences. This matter has been argued by the Liberal Party for well over a year and was one of our major criticisms of the original Bill. Further, the changes in relation to the purchase of ammunition avoids the paper work which would have arisen from the proposals in the earlier Bills. The recognition of firearms clubs is a very important change to this Bill, and one which the Liberal Party strongly supports. The proposal to ban silencers is to be commended, as are the modifications to the earlier proposals to extend controls over self-loading rifles and shotguns.

In addition to the range of measures that it has endorsed, the Liberal Party has some misgivings about some of the provisions in this Bill. It continues to be concerned about the storage provisions in relation to the steel security cupboards. It has been pointed out, not only in submissions before the select committee but also by members in the other place, that this provision will ensure that those who seek to steal guns or to gain access to them will now know that they have merely to look for this rather large and hardly discreet steel security cupboard.

Members of the other place who were previously pharmacists have highlighted that since they were required some years ago to implement similar measures they found that they did not redress the problems as anticipated. The Liberal Party is particularly concerned about whether the Government will provide sufficient resources to ensure that this Bill is workable. Earlier, I said that the Liberal Party was determined to see that we not only had effective legislation but also that it was workable and enforceable. We are concerned that with the variety of new provisions in this Bill and without a substantial increase in resources the

provisions will not be fulfilled to the satisfaction of farmers, firearm clubs, or to the community's expectation in general.

Certainly, the matter of resources is of some concern because the police budget this year does not provide for a substantial increase in police officer numbers. It would be most disheartening if resources for firearm control were taken from community policing. There is no doubt that we need the manpower on the ground and not have it involved in bureaucratic paperwork (and a lot of bureaucratic paperwork is involved in this measure).

From the date of the proclamation of this Bill a person who wishes to acquire a firearm will, first, have to apply for a licence and, secondly, have to seek a permit to purchase it. If a person passes both those stages he or she will have to wait for one month before they can purchase the firearm, after which they will then have to register it and obtain permission to use it for nominated purposes. By any reasonable standard that seems to be an extremely cumbersome bureaucratic process. One wonders what real purpose it will serve. Even a person with a fear of firearms and a concern about their use in the community would have to question whether those procedures were fair, reasonable and necessary to own and use a firearm.

My view is that, as well as being cumbersome, they are rather farcical procedures. The Liberal Party is aware that the present registration provisions are not being enforced. As the Hon. Dr Ritson raised in a series of questions that he asked in this place over some time, the registration procedures in this State are in disarray.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: We cannot be sure of that. In six months the question has been asked five times, and a reply has not been provided.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I am sure that the Government has something to hide, and I look forward to the Hon. Dr Ritson's contribution to this debate. Certainly, his arguments will further confirm the strength of the Liberal Party's wish to amend the Bill so as to delete the provisions for the registration of what is commonly known as longarms (not shorter weapons which can easily be concealed and which the firearm lobby distinguished as being shorter weapons: pistols and shotguns). During the Committee stage I look forward to moving an amendment in relation to this. Generally, I support the Bill.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: The Democrats support the second reading of the Bill. I point out that the Bill was referred to a select committee in the House of Assembly. In this case that would not have occurred had it not been for the Democrats' insistence that a Legislative Council select committee be set up to look at the Bill. That then would have allowed for what, in my opinion, is a more effective select committee process than pertains in the House of Assembly.

Well over 12 months ago the Democrats moved a motion calling for a select committee to look at the effect of videos and media exposure of firearms in conjunction with an assessment of firearm legislation. That motion was defeated by both the Liberals and Labor, but I will not go over its history. However, I point out that the misuse of firearms and the development of a dangerous and unhealthy attitude to firearms in the community has been a matter of concern to us for some time, and has really cried out for action.

We do not take issue or criticise target shooting. Firearms used as sporting equipment is part of the reasonable use of firearms, and some of the legislation deals with the training of young people to take on that sport and become proficient at it. It was of interest that the select committee report contained some recognition that personnel involved in the security industry will be required to comply with established training procedures before they obtain a licence to work in that industry. I believe that that was largely as a result of me referring a key witness on this matter to the select committee (someone actually involved in the security business).

One of the major concerns of the Democrats about the select committee report and the Bill is its lack of retrospectivity, and we will move amendments in relation to this. In fact, the select committee's report almost prides itself in not containing any aspect of retrospectivity in relation to people owning and holding licences for firearms at the time the Bill comes into effect.

This is rather alarming, and I will be speaking more on that point in Committee. It seems pointless to us that, if there is legislation which has been devised to make the community safer and the use of firearms more competent in the hands of those who own them, that that should not apply to people who already have firearms. We reject completely the move in the Bill to absolve any present licence holders or firearms owners from any retrospective aspects of the Bill.

The select committee report has virtually shown an acceptance of self-loading or semi-automatic weapons, and we have had serious concerns about that type of weapon in general terms. Certainly, we believe that there is no place for it in the metropolitan area or in the hands of the general public. One of our amendments will be directed at defining the semi automatic weapon as a dangerous weapon and, therefore, subjected to much more rigorous restraint before the Registrar authorises anyone to own or use a semi-automatic weapon.

The report backed away from the obligation of firearm dealers and sellers of ammunition to maintain specific records of purchasers of ammunition. The Democrats believe that it is a proper and reasonable requirement that there be a full record kept of the names and addresses of any purchasers of ammunition and the quantities and types of ammunition that are involved.

It is interesting to read in the report that in respect of ammunition the committee recognises that certain individuals in the community without the relevant firearms licence legitimately collect ammunition, and that such *bone fide* collectors should be permitted to purchase ammunition. I cannot see why someone who does not have the relevant firearms licence should be able to purchase and store live ammunition. If it is a particular fancy of an individual in our community to collect ammunition as a hobby or as some sort of adornment to the house, perhaps we should allow that freedom, but there seems to be no point in allowing that enthusiasm to collect to extend to the collection of live ammunition.

I intend to move an amendment to restrict the storing of ammunition to people other than those who have relevant firearms licences to ammunition which is not live. It is to be welcomed in the legislation and in the report that firearms clubs assume a significant role. They have a privileged and an important position to fulfil and, therefore, they must be expected to be up to certain high standards concerning the rules laid down, the requirements that they are expected to follow, and the adherence to those standards.

It is my hope that the firearms clubs will act as the surveillance arm of this legislation to a large extent, particularly as it applies to their members. On the question of storage, I was interested to hear the Hon. Diana Laidlaw mention that it is an issue of concern to her and other members of the Liberal Party. We do not believe that there have been adequate minimum standards set for storage of

firearms and, in particular, as you would recognise, Mr Acting President, the Democrats have been very reluctant to see the private possession and ownership of firearms in the urban metropolitan situation at all. We will be insisting that there be a safe and thorough storage of any firearms held in the metropolitan area in particular, but also in the rural situation as well. We have amendments that will be seeking to stiffen up the minimum standards of storage.

The select committee's report questioned the registration system, and I gather from the Hon. Diana Laidlaw's remarks and the questions that have been levelled by the Hon. Dr Ritson that the Liberals have serious concern about the way that the registration system is working. I would not hold my breath, but I notice that the committee recommends that the Registrar cause a review to be undertaken into the registration system with a view to improving its accuracy and maximising its operational benefits.

Bearing in mind that the Commissioner of Police is the Registrar and is a busy person, I would like to think that there will be other inputs that will be reviewing the system and the registration of firearms as a result of this legislation. The report refers to the authorising or seeking authority for the Family Court to order confiscation of firearms and recommends:

> ... that the Attorney-General consult with his Federal counterpart with a view to empowering the Family Court to make orders for the disposition of firearms in relation to matters coming before it where the court is satisfied that a real danger exists that the firearm may be used in a domestic disturbance.

Fair enough. How much better it would be not to have firearms in that situation at all and so prevent that risk. That is a point I would make about storage: I question the value of storage being not just to prevent the theft of firearms, because it is also designed to make it more difficult, certainly for those people who are in the house or who normally live in the house, on the spur of the moment to be able instantly to acquire the firearm in an operational situation resulting in a consequential death or maiming as a result.

Certainly, if there had been a time delay or process before the firearm could be extracted, there is a much better chance that the original intended offence would not have occurred, or perhaps the intended victim could have escaped. On the question of the Registrar's looking at the registration system, the committee also foresaw that there would be varying interpretations of the Act. The report states:

> The committee ... recommends that the Registrar prepare and make public a policy statement in relation to the administration of the Act for the guidance of police members and the public alike.

That is a strange recommendation. I believe it throws some doubt on the clarity of the legislation or the expected proficiency with which the Act will be administered. Again, bearing in mind that the Registrar is the Commissioner of Police, I would not hold my breath about his being able to spend much time complying with this request. Collectors are given a favourable position in the report and to a certain extent in the legislation. As to *bona fide* collectors, one can assume that the Registrar is expected to supervise the accrediting of *bona fide* collectors.

However, the Democrats have serious misgivings that this so-called *bona fide* collection of firearms could be a way of getting round the intention of the legislation. Someone who would not have been entitled to own a certain type of firearm may well be able to pose as a *bona fide* collector and, in that guise, have access to the firearm. There are some good aspects to the new regulations which are included and referred to in the select committee report. There is a much more clearly defined classification of firearms, but I wish to refer to the security categories which I mentioned before, as shown under the heading 'Securities of Firearms'. Neither 3 *(b)* nor 3 *(f)* are defined for use in any of the regulations. 3 *(b)* provides:

> Methods of securing firearms are listed below in order of increasing security.
> *(b)* by means of a trigger lock, and
> *(f)* locked in a steel and concrete strongroom.

Even in 3(Ae) of the new regulations, under the same heading, dealing with a person having possession of more than 12 pistols, all pistols must be secured by the method referred to in subregulation 3 *(e)*, which is locked in a safe. It seems to us that anyone in possession of 12 pistols has an incredibly dangerous and bizarre collection of firearms, which are dangerous under any terms of reference, and they should be subjected to the most extreme form of storage the legislation will allow. That, of course, would mean being locked in a steel and concrete strongroom.

Rather surprisingly, in the regulations primary producers, for whom I have sympathy in that they require the use of firearms as part of their livestock management, hardly need to have pistols; therefore I have no sympathy with the regulation which exempts the primary producer so that he or she is able to have a pistol. In the new Act, the registration can be refused if the Registrar deems that a person is not a fit and proper person to possess the firearm for which registration is being sought. We are very concerned that this is a subjective judgment. It will be very difficult for a Registrar or officer representing the Registrar to make that determination objectively.

If the Registrar is not satisfied that the applicant is a fit and proper person to possess firearms, on whom is the onus put? Is it on the Registrar to determine the character and health of the applicant or is the onus on the applicant to prove his or her character and health to the Registrar? Is 'fit and proper person' defined? Mental and physical health, fulfilment of requirements with regard to firearms use, safety considerations—who provides this training and testing?

I move to some other observations of a more general nature before referring specifically to one or two matters in the Bill. As I indicated before, the Democrats have been very concerned about what was recognised at the time of the ghastly Hoddle Street and Queen Street massacres. The community was very concerned then about the conditioning of people by video and other media outlets; almost a psychological acceptance of firearms as a means of problem-solving. I think that the influence of violence seen in films, videos and on television, has led to a passive acceptance by the viewing public of shootings and killing.

There has been a glorification of gun-wielding detectives (*Miami Vice*, *Magnum*, etc.) and revenge-seeking ex-soldiers (*Rambo*, etc.). Contrast the US perspective of firearms (perfectly natural to shoot first and ask questions later) with the UK attitude, which used to be the helpful bobby with the simple stick as a means of defence and enforcement. This argument could carry through to the recent introduction of large firearms being carried by South Australian police and viewed by some of us—including me—as a provocative and hostile visual impact without which we would have been much better off.

The Australian Institute of Criminology, in a document entitled 'Firearms and Violence in Australia, No. 10' quoted some statistics which I would like to read. Dealing with the increasing rate of ownership, we see that there are 3.5 million guns of all types at present in Australia. The ratio has changed from 1979 when there was one gun for every six people, until today where we have one gun for every four people. There was a higher concentration of armed households in Queensland and Tasmania, which could

explain why these States were less inclined to change existing gun laws.

The Hon. Peter Dunn interjecting:

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I have not seen it related specifically to Queensland. Queenslanders, according to this pamphlet, are more paranoid about crime, one in three gun owners claiming to possess a weapon for crime prevention. The firearm is the most commonly used weapon for instances of murder. Victims of violent crime are more liable to suffer significant injury from being shot than from other forms of assault. By far the greatest majority of robberies from financial institutions involve the use of firearms. The most common means of committing suicide involves the use of firearms.

The Institute of Criminology makes no secret of the fact that it believes that Australia would be better off with a lower incidence of firearms in the population and with what are sometimes called tougher gun laws. I hope that we are not becoming immune to or brainwashed by the profusion of media stories, and I am talking about the print medium in this context, where the *Advertiser* and other South Australian papers have printed a profusion of articles dealing with gun accidents and gun abuse. I have listed a few of them here, starting on 2 November with the *Advertiser* headline, 'Watered Down Gun Control Bill Passes', which refers to the fact that the article considered that the Bill as we have it is a watered-down version of the Government's original intention.

On 13 October there was an article under the headline 'Underworld Hunt for Police Killers', referring to the killing in Melbourne of the two hapless young police officers. We have had other headlines such as 'Husband and Wife Die in Murder-Suicide'; 'Man Shot Girl Because he Liked her, Court Told'; 'Five Shots Fired at City Home'; 'Boy Three Shoots Mother Dead'; 'Coroner Stresses Need for Firearms Training'; 'Police Warn Against Use of Guns to Tackle Crime'; 'Guard who shot Girl Criminally Stupid but no Case to Answer'; 'Bankers Want Tougher Gun Laws'; and so on.

The instance of such acts is frequent and repetitious and, unfortunately, I think we are now at the point where people who have not immediately confronted such acts or who have not immediately read or heard of some horrific massacre, tend to take the incidence of firearms in our community and the misuse of them as being unavoidable. The Democrats do not believe that that should be so. We believe that there are very good arguments for much stronger restriction on the sale, possession and ownership of firearms in our community. We believe that the type of firearm which has been described as a semiautomatic should be banned, except for a very minimal select use, which would need to be justified, individually, to the Registrar, and not in any way accepted as a class of ownership.

In conclusion, I indicate that the Democrats will be moving amendments to deal with certain matters, most of which I have already referred to. They include the definition of a self-loading firearm, to be defined as a dangerous firearm and therefore subjected to the same controls as other previously defined dangerous firearms. We will seek to insert a definition for 'pistol' to mean 'a firearm that is designed to be used with one hand'. We will seek to amend the matter of security of firearms with a replacement provision that would require all firearms to be locked in a safe made of steel or some other material approved by the Registrar or, if the bolt of the firing pin of the firearm can be removed and stored in a locked container, the firearm must then be locked in a cabinet made of steel or other material, approved by the Registrar, which cabinet is to be securely attached to the inside of a building.

The Democrats make no apology for this extra emphasis on security of storage. The difficulty will be in ensuring that the provisions are supervised and complied with. In this respect I hope and expect that the registered firearms clubs will play a hands-on role.

I think it is important to pick up a point that the Hon. Ms Laidlaw made about the need for adequate personnel to administer this legislation and the need to look seriously at involving people other than police officers in the registration, licensing and further supervision that will be required. I hope that this matter can be addressed to some extent during the Committee stage. I hope to have the Democrats' amendments on file shortly so that members can deliberate on them at their leisure. However, I shall quickly refer to them at this stage.

The Democrats will seek to have a licensed dealer in ammunition keep records in relation to each sale of ammunition, the date of the sale, the name and address of the purchaser of the ammunition, and the type and quantity of the ammunition sold. We will also seek to delete clauses 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the schedule, which removes the immunity from retrospectivity. Once a licence comes up for renewal, it would then be subjected to the legislation currently in force. This means that a person currently holding a firearms licence would be entitled to continue in possession of that firearm as though the Act had not come into operation until the renewal of the firearms licence is required. The other amendments are only consequential and are not substantial in terms of the Bill.

The Democrats have serious concerns about the storage and possession in the metropolitan area of firearms of any type. We believed that our original proposal, that all such firearms should be stored in armouries, was unlikely to receive sufficient support in this place, and thus we will not pursue that matter. We will instead, during the Committee stage, put forward proposals which are practical and which will increase some obligation on gun owners and dealers.

The Democrats hope that this legislation and its administration will be effective in reducing the overall number of firearms in our community and in increasing the safety of those firearms as far as the users and the general public are concerned. However, I must emphasise that this is only a part and a minor proportion of the overall problem. We must address the philosophical attitude that the community has as regards firearms. I do not believe for a moment that we should rest with the current state of affairs. Concerning the handing down of the Federal Parliament's report on the issue of the influence of violent and erotic material on the public, I believe that far too much emphasis has been put on the rather innocuous aspects of non-violent sex, to the neglect of the indoctrination to which we are subjected by the constant barrage of the glorification of guns.

Guns as weapons are just not on as far as the Democrats are concerned. Firearms as sporting equipment and as tools for helping in the management of vermin and livestock have an acceptable role. However, unless we can blend all those aims into what emerges from this Parliament as the correct attitude to firearms in our community, we will from time to time, tragically, be exposed to the sort of ghastly massacres which occur and a repetition of the domestic homicide and injury that takes place. So, with the qualifications that I have addressed in my second reading speech and with the recommendation to the Council to look seriously and earnestly at the Democrat amendments in Committee, the Democrats support the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. R.J. RITSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADOPTION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 3 November. Page 1203.)

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The Opposition supports the second reading of this Bill to introduce a new Adoption Act. Members may recall that in October 1987 the former Minister, Dr Cornwall, introduced a Bill, subsequently referred on his initiative to a select committee of the Legislative Council. The principal and most sensitive feature of the Bill was the proposed change for adopted people and birth parents to have access to information about each other upon the adopted person reaching the age of 18 years. Earlier the Liberal Party released a position paper on the subject of adoption, and I believe that the conclusions in the paper were the principal reason why the Government referred the Bill to a select committee.

Our recommendations for change in this sensitive area differed markedly from those put forward by the Government in a discussion paper on the subject and subsequently endorsed by the Government and contained in this Bill introduced in October 1987. The Government proposed in the Bill, not only in respect to all future adoptions after the proclamation of the new Act but also in all adoptions up to the changes, that adopted persons and relinquishing or natural parents would have access to identifying information with one proviso: a period of six months in case there was resistance to the provision of that identifying information. The Liberal Party believed that that was totally unacceptable because it meant that irrespective of whether or not a person wished to provide that identifying information, contrary to earlier stated wishes that were legally binding and still are today, they would be counselled for six months and whatever their wishes, that identifying information would be provided. We believe that is totally unacceptable for adoptions that took place up to the proclamation of any new Act.

The Liberal Party recommended that the only fair provision would be for a veto to apply if either the adopted child, having reached 18 years or over, or the relinquishing parent so wished to apply for a veto on identifying information. That ultimately was the recommendation of the select committee. The Hon. John Burdett and I were proud to serve as Liberal members on that committee. I believe that he shares my delight that, after a great deal of soul searching and after discussion with and cooperation from witnesses before the committee, the select committee came to share the view we had presented as the Liberal Party some 12 to 18 months ago.

I spoke at great length on provisions in the original debate, outlining the background to adoption practices in this State when the original Bill was presented last October. I do not intend to go over all those issues today, but I highlight a few facts in regard to this subject of retrospectivity on the understanding that this will continue to be the most controversial part of the Bill. Until 1966 adult adoptees could have access to their original birth certificates. In 1966, total secrecy of records became possible, although not mandatory unless all parties agreed. Therefore, adopted children were treated as though they had been born into the adoptive family and had the right to inherit from adoptive parents, with the removal of the right to inherit from natural parents. The change, allowing secret adoptions in 1966, was retrospective.

On reflection I suppose it is somewhat an irony that, in the same year as Parliament made secret adoptions retrospective, the principle that the welfare and interests of the child concerned should be regarded as the paramount consideration, was also incorporated into the Act, although it remained confined to Part III of the Act. The paramount consideration of the child will be extended to cover the whole Act rather than be confined to Part III of the Act as has been the case to date.

Other important changes to adoption practices in this State since 1966 have occurred. First, essentially the number of non-relative children now available for adoption has declined markedly. Last year just over 40 Australian placements were made. That is of enormous significance to the point that the Liberal Party makes with respect to the people eligible to adopt children. Whilst the number of healthy white Australian non-relative children available for adoption is declining, there has been a marked increase in the number of married couples seeking to adopt. The Government discussion paper recommended that this should lead to the closing of the prospective adoptee list, yet the Government proposes to extend the range of people eligible to adopt by broadening the criteria to include *de facto* couples. The Liberal Party believes that this is a basic and impractical contradiction. We also object to *de facto* couples being eligible to adopt for the very reason that as a Parliament we have a very responsible job in recommending the way in which children be adopted away from their natural parents.

The Liberal Party wishes to ensure that, to the greatest degree possible, that child is placed in a family relationship that will not only provide care, nurturing and development but will also provide permanency. There is no doubt that a marriage situation remains the most permanent family situation for a couple today, particularly when compared to a *de facto* situation.

Material has been provided by the Australian Institute of Family Studies in a letter to the Hon. Mr Burdett. The letter, signed by Dr Don Edgar, states:

> In a recent institute survey it was found that in cases where a woman was in a *de facto* relationship at the time of the birth of a child about 20 per cent of these relationships had ended by the time the child was only 18 months old.

According to Dr Edgar this suggests a relatively high break-up rate in *de facto* relationships, even in those with very young children. By comparison, Dr Edgar goes on to note that:

> In respect to the breakdown of marriage after five years, you can take those married in 1976-77 as an example. Among these people 7.7 per cent had divorced after five years and a further 10.7 have divorced between the fifth and the tenth years of marriage. We can predict that a further 14 per cent or 15 per cent will divorce in the future.

My comment in relation to those statistics is that, in respect of *de facto* couples, the research indicates that 20 per cent of relationships had ended by the time the child was 18 months old. However, after five years of marriage 7.7 per cent had divorced and a further 10.7 per cent had divorced between the fifth and the tenth years. In respect of marriages, while there certainly is a break-up rate, the rate between the fifth and the tenth years amounted to 17 per cent compared to 20 per cent after 18 months for a *de facto* couple. I suggest that, on that basis alone, we should be looking critically at the permanent relationships of *de facto* couples.

The Bill states that marriage relationships means a relationship between two persons cohabiting as husband and wife or *de facto* husband and wife. As I understand it, that does not stipulate any length of time for that cohabitation. Therefore, the information provided by the Institute of

Family Studies in respect of placement is particularly relevant.

In addition, I note that the proposal in this Bill seems to be a contradiction to what the Government is seeking to do with respect to amendments to the Community Welfare Act, to which the Minister alluded during the Estimates Committee examinations of the community welfare line in September. At that time the Minister noted that the department was looking at the placement principles for a child, recognising that in foster care and the like one of the difficulties faced by the department in placing children was short-term arrangements.

The Minister stated that, where no reconciliation was possible, the department was, where possible, looking for long-term placement. Therefore, the department recognises that, for a child, long-term care, nurturing and development are important and that the stability of those relationships is important. However, we find in this adoption area that the department is prepared to extend the list of eligible people to adopt to include people in *de facto* relationships where the permanency of the relationships is not nearly as great as that of people who have legally committed themselves to marriage.

I will briefly comment on a number of other matters incorporated in the new Bill that arose from the select committee's report. Last October the Liberal Party called for a definition of 'Aboriginal' because it accepted that the special provisions in this Bill for the adoption of Aboriginal children required such a definition. The Liberal Party is also very pleased to see that Aboriginal placement principles are included in this Bill; that was not the case in the original measure.

The select committee spent a lot of time considering the issue of adoption by single people. This issue raised considerable concern among sections of the community. In fact, it raised alarm in a number of quarters. The select committee and the Liberal Party are comfortable with the provisions in this Bill. There are in the community a number of special needs children who would otherwise be confined to institutional care. It is wonderful to believe that there are some extraordinary single people in the community who are prepared to devote themselves to the care of a severely disabled child—a special needs child—and be prepared to adopt that child. It was our privilege, as members of the select committee, to meet some of those wonderful women who have given a lot of hope, love and care to such needy children.

The Liberal Party appreciates enormously the help that has been provided to the Hon. John Burdett and me, personally as members of the select committee, especially by members of Jigsaw, the Australian Relinquishing Mothers Society and the Adoptive Parents Support Group. Members of those groups have been most diligent in making representations and have always been freely available to answer questions on a personal basis and to speak to the select committee. I am particularly pleased, after all their lobbying and efforts, to see change in this sensitive area of adoption and that these people will soon see some positive results for their efforts. There is no doubt that there is extreme need for change in this area.

Many people are currently not legally entitled to know their former identity or to have access to their birth certificate only by reason of the fact that they are adopted. I am pleased to be party to this measure, which will see that situation reversed, where all central parties agree in respect of the relinquishing or birth parents and the adopted child, now adult.

I repeat that I am particularly pleased also that, in respect of adoption to this date, a veto provision has been included in this Bill. As was recommended by the select committee, I understand that there will be three different types of veto: a complete veto on the release of the birth certificate and other information; a veto on the release of current information and on contact (in this instance the birth certificate would be released); and, thirdly, a veto on contact (in this instance a birth certificate would be released with other information, including genetic and medical histories).

These changes are a most welcome and long overdue step. I trust that they will bring much happiness and reward to many people in our community who have been touched by this issue of adoption. It is with enthusiasm that I support the second reading of this Bill.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I rise to speak briefly to this Bill. I, too, support it. It is fair to say that adoption is an important subject and, as befits such a subject, it has been around for a long time and has been subject to a lot of public scrutiny. A Government working paper was available for public discussion and comment for some time. When the Bill was introduced the then Minister readily agreed to submit it to a select committee. That committee sat for some time and interviewed a number of witnesses with all sorts of differing views in regard to parts of the Bill.

As the Hon. Diana Laidlaw mentioned, the recommendations of the select committee were unanimous with the one exception of the question whether prospective adoptive parents ought to be married or whether they could be *de facto*. In every other respect the decision of the select committee was unanimous. It did recommend changes in the Bill, as the Hon. Diana Laidlaw has said.

One would probably have thought at the outset that agreement would not be reached on such a Bill, but it was. The contents of the Bill have been subjected to a great deal of public scrutiny and, while I know that some groups are not satisfied, I suggest that there has been greater consultation and, in general, agreement on this issue. The issue has always been more controversial than one would expect, and more so than one would find in most cases.

The Bill differs from the present Act in a number of respects. I suppose that the particular single aspect of the Bill (if there is one) is that of openness in adoption as opposed to the secret adoption which did not, by law, have to apply but has applied since the change of the previous legislation in 1966. There was no real argument about openness in regard to future adoptions that are made on that basis in the first place, but there will be openness in adoption when the adopted child attains the age of 18 years.

The question was retrospectivity: what about adoptions which occurred under the previous law? Of course, many adoptive parents said that they had adopted children on the understanding that there would be secrecy and that the facts would never be publicly revealed. That was a dilemma to everyone concerned—to members of the select committee, to members of the Liberal Party who considered the proposals, to witnesses who gave evidence before the select committee, and to everyone else concerned.

The Bill as previously presented did not provide any veto provisions, as the Hon. Diana Laidlaw has said, and it was a recommendation of the Liberal Party committee which deliberated (as set out in the position paper which was promulgated) that there be a veto on the part of the relinquishing mother or the adopted child upon the adopted child attaining the age of 18 years. That position, regarding identifying information, was taken up by the select com-

mittee and is contained in this Bill. The veto applies for a period of five years and can be renewed.

It is fully understood that there are circumstances, in respect of past adoptions, where it is quite proper for the relinquishing mother, in particular, or the adopted child to say, 'No, I do not want to have any part in it', and the Bill does provide for that. I think that there was a breakthrough, since there is a change that has been agreed by the select committee and implemented by the Government, from the previous Bill to the present Bill.

As I mentioned before, the only aspect on which there was not agreement in the select committee (and this is referred to in the select committee's report) was the question of the criteria for prospective adoptive parents, as to whether they had to be married or whether *de facto* couples of five years standing were eligible to be adoptive parents. As the Hon. Diana Laidlaw mentioned, particularly against the background that there are so few Australian placements, there did not seem any need to broaden the criteria.

She mentioned the statistics provided by the Institute of Family Studies. In addition, I would mention the philosophical viewpoint. The argument which I have used in the Council previously and which the Hon. Diana Laidlaw has also used is that we consider that in the interests of the adopted child—and that is the paramount consideration—it was not appropriate that people who were not prepared to make a lifelong commitment to each other should make a lifelong commitment to the child. However, we were not successful in that in the select committee, and we take that as it comes.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw also mentioned that because of the small number of Australian placements the question of overseas adoptions has become of considerable importance, and the Bill deals with that matter appropriately. I am pleased to support the Bill, which had a very substantial measure of bipartisan support and community and general support on behalf of interested people. It has also been subjected to a very commendable amount of public scrutiny.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 November. Page 1228.)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Ms President, I draw your attention to the state of the Council.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): The only matter that was worth replying to in this debate was the contribution of the Hon. Dr Ritson, who talked about matters relating to child sexual abuse and the manner whereby those matters are investigated. I appreciated the support that he gave me in that speech in my role as Attorney-General, and I am certainly prepared to provide him with a reasoned response to the matter. As I said, I appreciate that. The response has been prepared by the department and, if the Hon. Dr Ritson wants to discuss it with me, he can do it informally.

Over the past two years the Department for Community Welfare has undertaken an extensive review and refinement of its child protection policies, practices and procedures. This review incorporated the recommendations of the Task Force on Child Sexual Abuse and the Bidmeade review of the department's role in the application before the courts involving the removal of children from their families. As a consequence of this review, extensive staff training has been undertaken and new policies and practices put in place.

In addition to DCW improving its practices, the Health Commission has funded the establishment of a specialist child assessment centre at the Adelaide Children's Hospital, which will significantly improve the medical diagnostic assessments of allegedly abused children. All of the above notwithstanding, the department continues to monitor the literature on this complex topic and will continue to refine its practices if found necessary.

The Hon. Dr Ritson also raised the issue of audiovisual recording of interviews with children. This is the subject of a working party being chaired by a senior officer of the Crown Law Department. The department supports the idea of audio/video recording of interviews with children. The branch head circular from the department referred to by the Hon. Dr Ritson was released on the advice of the Crown Solicitor's office to clarify with workers that tape recordings should not be taken until all of the legal and technical issues relating to the policies and practices of this procedure have been clearly determined.

These include the nature of the training of staff; the ownership of the tapes and the admissibility of the tapes as evidence. These precautions were taken to prevent injustices occurring in cases which may be dismissed for technical evidentiary reasons rather than on the actual evidence.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 7 passed.

First schedule.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I have had discussions with both the Minister representing the Minister of Health and the Minister of Health about answers to questions. In the budget debate I indicated that there were some problems last year with obtaining answers to questions. In fact, the majority of questions were only answered at the end of February, having been asked at this stage. I found that totally unsatisfactory. Indeed, I had to pay for some information—which I do not intend to do this year, although I do require the information.

I would expect there to be a reasonable attempt to answer questions because a number of questions were asked in the Lower House which were put on notice. That was a couple of months ago and I have not yet had a single reply. So far, the record is not good. Will the Minister indicate that reasonably prompt replies will be provided to the majority of questions? I understand that some questions will require details and no Minister agrees to answer every question. I understand that. It occurs even in Estimates Committees. As to the questions not answered, I will take them up on the basis that they should be answered because they are all reasonable questions. I seek an indication from the Minister that there will be an attempt this year to clean up the show and give reasonably prompt responses, say, within three weeks, because a number of questions have already been on notice for two months in another place as a result of the Estimates Committees. The past arrangement has always been that we would have answers to questions put on notice in Estimates Committees of the Lower House within 10 days. Somehow that has gone out the door.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese interjecting:

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I am not reflecting on all Ministers. Some Ministers have been reasonable and have given information even on the day, but this has not been a good area. Health is a difficult area because there is so much information that is required. Health covers an exten-

sive number of areas. It is the biggest single area of monetary expenditure. I seek that assurance from the Minister before I commence my questions.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: This is a matter that I have taken up with the Minister of Health in another place. The Minister has indicated to me that he will do his best to provide replies to as many questions as possible within a three week period, following the asking of the questions today. As the honourable member has indicated, there will possibly be some issues that will require longer in order to prepare replies. The Minister has given me the undertaking that he will provide answers to questions that the Hon. Mr Cameron might pose within the shortest possible time, and, hopefully, within three weeks.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I thank the Minister for that, and I will be monitoring progress quite closely. We do not have FOI in this State, so it is difficult to obtain information except from the Estimates Committees. I would therefore like that to occur. I have a long series of questions, which I accept the Minister will take on notice, because no officers are here, and I do not want 35 officers sitting here for the night while I ask individual questions (I understand that that was the number in the Lower House). There is a big enough shortage of funds in the health portfolio without tying up people on overtime to that extent. However, I hope that the information is available, as the Minister says, as soon as possible, and I accept that assurance at this stage. My questions are as follows:

As to public hospitals, how many positions have been lost in the past financial year. In each of the major public hospitals how many wards have been closed, and how many beds have been closed, in the past 12 months? When I say the major hospitals, I mean the Adelaide Children's Hospital as well. What is the total number of beds actually available for patient use at each of the major public hospitals as of 1 November 1988? What was the position on 1 November 1987?

Excluding the Children's Hospital, how many beds have been available for patients for each month during the past year, at each of the major public hospitals? On how many occasions during that period were each of the hospitals full, and how many patients were turned away from each hospital due to a shortage of beds? Might I indicate that that information, I understand, is now held on computer and should be readily available.

At the Julia Farr Centre, how many nurses are available to look after patients in each ward at night? What is the nurse/patient ratio on night shift, and what is considered by the Health Commission to be a safe nurse/patient ratio? How many wards and beds are empty at the centre, and how many rehabilitation beds are available for patients?

How many cars permanently or regularly available to Health Commission employees for travel between work and home have been fitted, or are about to be fitted, with private registration plates? During the past financial year what was the total amount of sick leave taken by Health Commission employees? How many of those days leave were not covered by a medical certificate? How many days sick leave not covered by a medical certificate were taken on a Friday, a Monday, or the day immediately before or after a public holiday? Could we have that information for each individual hospital and Health Commission unit?

How many land or building sales were made last financial year of assets owned or formerly under the control of the Health Commission? Can those sales be itemised giving the location of the property, the sale price, and the names of both the agent and the buyer and whether the sale was conducted by auction, advertised sale or private negotiation? What Health Commission properties are planned for sale this year?

On the Hampstead Centre, during the health estimates in another place questions related to budget cutbacks to the Hampstead Centre and plans by the Health Commission to close another ward there. Although the Minister and a commission officer provided some answers, several questions remained unanswered. Will the Minister confirm that the Hampstead Centre has had a cut of at least $300 000 in its budget this year—or $722 000 in real terms—and this was the main factor influencing the decision to close a further 25 nursing home beds from the centre?

Will the Minister explain how the transfer of patients out of these beds will be, to use his and his adviser's words 'voluntary' when patients knew nothing of the plans until told of them recently, and it has been assumed the ward closure will be completed by 1 November? Is the Minister confident that a 50-bed nursing home facility at Hampstead will be sufficient for demand when the existing 75-bed nursing home there has an average capacity of about 90 per cent and there is a shortage of nursing home beds in the district?

I now refer to metropolitan hospital budgets. Will the Minister detail what total savings in dollar terms the Health Commission has sought from each of Adelaide's seven major hospitals this financial year; in other words, how their allocations vary markedly from that contained in the Estimates contained in the blue book, where it appears cuts of almost $13 million are being sought?

As I understand it, some additional amounts are contained in the budget which are not disclosed in the blue book, and I would like to know what those amounts are for each hospital and the identity of each additional amount.

As to funding for domiciliary care, in relation to replies given by the Minister during the health Estimates Committee on 14 September, will he confirm that Commonwealth funding for the Geriatric Assessment Program for 1988-89 will be about $161 000 to make up the shortfall in Health Commission funding? If not, will the commission make up any shortfall so that the Minister's assurances to the Estimates Committee on 14 September that 'there has been no cut at all to domiciliary care' are honoured?

In relation to country hospitals, have the Angaston, Naracoorte, Penola and Wallaroo hospitals collectively had budget cuts of between 7 per cent and 11 per cent this financial year? If not, how do their allocations now vary from those contained in the blue book? If the cuts are as detailed, what were the reasons for them? What effect are these cuts likely to have on the delivery of services at these hospitals? Have regional hospitals at Murray Bridge, Port Pirie, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln and Whyalla collectively had budget cuts of more than $2 million this financial year, as detailed in the blue book? If not, what, individually, are their new allocations? If the detailed cuts are correct what were the reasons for the cuts? What effect will it have on services and patient treatment? Of course, we have already seen in Murray Bridge a waiting list of 15 months.

Has the Minister now obtained the latest construction cost estimates for the community health centre at Clare? What are the estimated annual running costs of that proposed centre? What are the detailed plans now for this centre? Is there now a new area health plan for the Mid North? What are the details of that plan and who was in charge of it? What are that person's qualifications?

Has the Minister now got the estimated annual costs for transporting patients from the Blyth district to Clare for either treatment at the health centre or acute care at Clare Hospital? What are the estimated annual costs for trans-

porting patients from the Clare district to the Blyth Hospital for nursing home care? How will patients be transported between the two centres? Who will be manning the transport? How many staff will be employed at the Clare Community Health Centre in the specialties of: diabetic education services, mental health services, drug and alcohol counselling, child sexual abuse counselling, physiotherapy, occupational therapy, speech therapy, and podiatry? What other specialties will be catered for at the centre and how many staff will be assigned to such duties?

On the matter of community health centres, how many trained medical staff and nursing staff worked in each of the 32 community health centres in South Australia under the control of or funded by the Health Commission at 30 June 1988? How many of the following professions worked in the above community health centres: social workers, speech pathologists, nutritionists, other health workers, clerical, and administrative staff? What were the corresponding figures for 30 June for each year from 1982 to 1987?

How many client contacts were recorded for each of the above community health centres in the year ended 30 June 1988? What were the client contacts for each of the above professions, at each of the community health centres? What were the corresponding figures for the financial year ended 30 June 1982 through to 1987? What auditing procedures for these community health centres are carried out and what auditing is done with respect to client contacts and the reasons for those contacts at each health centre? What were the results of that auditing?

Has the commission obtained data on the time each employee at those 32 health centres spends on various activities during a typical working day? If so, what is the breakdown of daily activities for the various categories of employees at the centres? For example, a 1985 pilot study into four southern suburban health centres found 27 per cent of the time of all staff was spent on administration, another 15 per cent was spent on staff or professional development, 20 per cent on planning and preparation, with only 17 per cent spent on nursing clients' ailments and 4 per cent on illness prevention.

How many motor vehicles were available to staff at each health centre as at 30 June 1988? What was the total mileage for all these vehicles for the past financial year? How many motor vehicles were available to health centre staff at 30 June for each year 1982 to 1987? What were the annual mileages recorded by those vehicles for each financial year from 1982-83 to 1986-87? How many vehicles as of 30 June 1988 were available on a take home basis to staff employed at health centres?

What auditing is done of the kilometres travelled by vehicles outside of usual health centre working hours? Are log books kept and are they available for scrutiny? What auditing of log books is undertaken by the Health Commission? How many more Child and Family Health Service centres are to close in the coming 12 months? What are the names of these centres, and what are the reasons for these closures?

As to the Lyell McEwin Health Service, has the Minister a reply yet to the following question which was asked during the Estimates Committee hearing on 14 September:

In the last annual report for the Lyell McEwin Health Service, statistics showed that in 1986-87 health nursing made more than 41 000 contacts—a rise of almost 37 000 in three years. What constituted 'client contact' in the above figures?

Further, is it a legitimate measure of the services provided at the health service? Is the dramatic rise in client contacts over this period an important consideration when staff numbers or budgetary allocations are being reviewed? How many of those contacts were repeat visits to clients by health service staff? How many were repeated once, twice or on more occasions during that period? What was the total number of staff employed at Lyell McEwin who were associated with community health nursing for the years 1982-83 to 1987-88 inclusive? What were the total numbers of staff with medical or nursing qualifications employed at the Lyell McEwin Health Service during the same period? How many new staff were approved for appointment to the Lyell McEwin Health Service in 1987-88, and what were their positions and salaries? How many motor vehicles were available for use by the service's community health centre during the same periods?

What are the reasons for the increase in non-medical outpatient department contacts, which have risen from 1 849 in 1982-83 to 11 750 in 1986-87? What was the total number of live births at the health service for 1987-88? How many operations were performed at Lyell McEwin Health Service in the 1987-88 financial year? As of 1 September 1988, how many orthopaedic surgeons were available to treat patients at Lyell McEwin Health Service? How many high-dependency (intensive care) beds were available? What staff positions still remained vacant at Lyell McEwin as of 1 October 1988? How long have those positions been vacant? How many patients were transferred from Lyell McEwin to other hospitals in the 1987-88 financial year? How many patients were transferred from Lyell McEwin to other hospitals from 1 July 1988 to 1 September 1988?

In relation to the Modbury Hospital, as at 1 November 1988 how many nursing staff were assigned to the various wards at that hospital? What is the total number of nurses at the hospital? What was the position as at 1 November 1987? As to the Adelaide Children's Hospital, what was the total number of wards and bed capacities at the Children's Hospital for each of the last 12 months? On how many occasions during that time were the wards full, and how many patients were turned away from the hospital due to lack of beds?

As to the Central Office of the South Australian Health Commission, what penalty payment has the Government incurred by the delayed occupation of the Health Commission's new Citi Centre building on the corner of Pulteney Street and Rundle Mall, if any? How long will it be before all Health Commission employees are relocated in the new building? When will all the office accommodation now held by the Health Commission be vacated?

Does the Minister believe that the $4 million bill for fitting out the Citi Centre building is justified? Does the Minister now have details, sought at the Estimates Committee hearing on 14 September, relating to the following questions? What is the total cost of new furniture bought, or on order, for the Health Commission's Central Office? What specific items were purchased or have been ordered, and what was the cost of each?

Further, what was the total cost of furniture purchased for the Minister of Health's office? What specific items were bought, and what was the cost of each item? What was the total number of Central Office employees as of 1 July 1986, and what were their various positions? What are the corresponding figures for 1 July in 1983 to 1985, and 1987? What was the position as at 1 July 1988? How many staff have been, or will be, attached or newly employed in the Health Commission's Information Branch? What is the branch's budget allocation for 1988-89? What will its chief functions be?

How many staff from Central Office have been relocated to other hospitals or health units? Have these employees, formerly at Central Office, occupied existing vacancies, or have the hospitals or health units received approval and

funding to create additional positions? How do wages and salaries for the relocated staff show up in financial statements of Central Office and their new place of employment? How many positions have been reduced in the hospitals or health units that have accommodated former Central Office employees?

Which senior employees of the South Australian Health Commission are entitled to use a credit card for entertainment? How much money was spent on entertainment by each of these people in the past financial year? What are the names of the people taken to lunch or dinner, and what were the purposes of these lunches or dinners? What is the total cost of these annual fringe benefits paid to senior employees who have entertainment costs paid for them? How much money was spent on providing away from home accommodation for senior South Australian Health Commission employees in the past 12 months? What was the average nightly cost for accommodation for senior South Australian Health Commission employees working away from home in the past 12 months?

Which of the commission's senior executives are provided with vehicles as part of their employment packages? What were the total kilometres travelled in the past year by each of these vehicles? Are log books kept for each vehicle? How much fringe benefits tax is paid annually for each vehicle?

In relation to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, does the Minister now have replies to the following questions asked at the Estimates Committee hearing on 14 September: On how many occasions in the last financial year has the radiotherapy equipment at the Royal Adelaide Hospital been out of commission? What was the duration of those periods when that equipment was out of use? What are the respective ages of that equipment? From where were the spare parts obtained? What has been the effect on waiting periods for patients either already on radiotherapy treatment for cancer or beginning such treatment?

How many people are currently on the Royal Adelaide Hospital's Oncology Department's waiting list for treatment, either for surgery or other treatment? What was the situation as at 30 June 1988? What are the average and maximum waiting periods for receiving treatment in that department? Is the Minister aware of the very high demand for radiotherapy treatment in South Australia, and a corresponding acute shortage of modern radiotherapy machines and trained staff, so that only 30 per cent of public patients can receive follow-up therapy on a long-term basis? What steps are being taken to remedy this acute situation? A recent paper by the Director of the Royal Adelaide Hospital's Radiation Oncology Department, Dr David Wigg, provided details pertinent to the above and said that, in Australia about 9 000 patients with invasive cancer were not treated due to a lack of funding for equipment and trained staff.

Is the Minister aware that the Adelaide City Council is not prepared to provide a long-term lease for a car park to be built for use by RAH staff and patients on the south side of North Terrace and as a result, several unions have decided to retain bans on that site, jeopardising work starting on the car park? Have those bans now been lifted or are they still in place?

As to the Flinders Medical Centre, what was the total number of live births at FMC in the 12 months to 30 June 1988? How many new staff were appointed to the Flinders Medical Centre in 1987-88? What were their positions and annual salaries? How many administration staff were employed at the FMC as of 30 June 1988? What was the position at the end of the 1986-87 financial year? How many people were removed from the Flinders Medical Centre's elective surgery waiting list in the year ended 30 June 1988 because the person wanting surgery had passed on? How many people were removed from the list in the same period because they had obtained surgery elsewhere? How many elective surgeries were cancelled in the year ended 30 June 1988 at Flinders Medical Centre due to a shortage of beds? How many surgical procedures were cancelled at FMC in the same period due to either theatre time being unavailable or insufficient time to perform the operation?

In relation to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, how many patients were transferred, for various reasons, from the QEH to other hospitals in the past financial year? To which hospitals were they transferred and what were the reasons for those transfers? How many patients were removed from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital's waiting lists for elective surgery in the period from 1 July 1988 to 1 September 1988 because the person requiring surgery had died? How many were removed from the list during the same period because they had sought operations elsewhere? How many cancellations for elective surgery have been made in the above period due to a shortage of beds? How many cancellations for elective surgery have been made due to theatre time being unavailable?

As to Noarlunga Health Centre, how many motor vehicles are attached thereto and who has use of those vehicles? What was the cost in 1987-88 of providing services to each person using the Noarlunga Health Centre?

As to Noarlunga Hospital, is the Minister of Health now in a position to tell the Legislative Council and the people who will be the new joint venturer with the Government of the Noarlunga Hospital? If not, why not? What will be the respective financial investment in dollar terms of the Government and the joint partner? What will be their individual ongoing financial obligations on an annual basis? Who will be responsible for running the private section of the hospital? Where will the licensed beds for the private hospital come from? How much will the Government, or its venture partner, pay for those beds? Does the Minister believe this cost is justified in view of the fact South Australian private hospitals at present are running at only 55 to 60 per cent occupancy? Which of the joint partners will be responsible for running the kitchens, operating theatres, outpatient department and various other sections of the Noarlunga Hospital?

As to waiting lists, would the Minister now provide a detailed breakdown, by specialty, of the number of people waiting for elective surgery at each of Adelaide's seven public hospitals, showing how many have been waiting for 15 months, 18 months, two years, 30 months and three years, 40 months and four years or longer for surgery? I would like each list according to the time factor. How many patients have been removed from the lists in the year ending 30 June 1988 because they have had operations done elsewhere? How many operations have been cancelled at the Queen Elizabeth, Lyell McEwin, Royal Adelaide and Modbury Hospitals and Flinders Medical Centre in the past 12 months after patients have been admitted for surgery? How many patients have been contacted in the past 12 months and told that their planned elective surgery has been cancelled? What was the breakdown of these cancellations hospital by hospital and what were the reasons given for these cancellations?

How many operations have occurred in elective surgery at Adelaide's major public hospitals in the year ending 30 June 1988? What was the figure for 30 June 1987? How many people waiting for elective surgery received operations at near-city hospitals up to 30 June 1988? How many have received such operations since then? Can the Minister pro-

vide details to the Committee of which hospitals have treated such patients prior to, and since, 30 June 1988?

Has the Minister replies to the following questions asked at Estimates on 14 September? How many beds have been closed in Adelaide's seven major hospitals—either permanently or temporarily—in the 12 months to 30 June 1988? If closed temporarily, for how long were they closed and for what reason? What effect have these bed closures had on waiting lists at the hospitals involved? What bed closures, and cancellation of surgery sessions, took place at each of Adelaide's seven public hospitals during the Christmas 1987 and Easter 1988 periods? How long were the closures and surgery cancellations in place, and what effect did they have on waiting lists?

As to public hospitals, how many private patients were operated on at each of Adelaide's five general public hospitals (RAH, FMC, QEH, Lyell McEwin and Modbury) in the 12 months to 30 June 1988? How much money was recovered as a result? How many public patients were operated on in the same five hospitals during the same period? What was the average cost of providing casualty services at each of Adelaide's public hospitals on a per patient basis in the 12 months ended 30 June 1988? What proportion of patients treated at casualty sections of these hospitals were considered emergencies and what proportion were out-patient type cases?

How many medical and nursing staff, by gradings or position, were employed at each of Adelaide's seven public hospitals as of 30 June 1988? What are the respective approved levels of staffing at each of these hospitals? How many administrative staff were employed at each of the seven hospitals as of 30 June 1988, and what were their respective positions? What was the corresponding situation at 30 June 1987, 1986, 1985, 1984, 1983 and 1982?

What is the hourly rate paid to visiting medical officers (VMOs) employed in South Australian public hospitals? What has been the same rate of remuneration for VMOs for each of the past five years? How much are VMOs paid for on-call services and what has been that rate for each of the past five years? How many visiting orthopaedic surgeons are appointed at each of the major hospitals and what have been the corresponding totals for each of the past five years?

What arrangements have been made for the provision of casualty services during normal hours and after hours at the Whyalla Hospital, and what is the remuneration for visiting medical officers providing those services at Whyalla? What is the corresponding rate of remuneration for VMOs at each of the hospitals at Mount Gambier, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln and Berri?

What was the cost, both for the balance of the last financial year and for a full 12 month period, of the second-tier wage increases awarded to public hospital employees working at Adelaide's seven major hospitals? What offsets were obtained by employees who obtained second tier wage increases? When were hospitals granted additional funds to cover the additional costs involved in paying these second tier wage increases? How much has been allowed in the major public hospitals' budget for 1988-89 to cover extra costs associated with these rises? Does this figure show up in the blue book (and, if so, where) and in the Program Estimates and Information for 1988-89? What additional funding for South Australian hospitals has been provided or budgeted for to allow payment of the two-stage 5.5 per cent wage increases which are likely to be claimed following the recent Arbitration Commission wage ruling?

As to hospital budgets, is the Minister now in a position to say whether he will provide me with copies of all specific relevant budget correspondence sent to all hospitals and health units under the control of the Health Commission which details their allocations for 1988-89, specific cuts and/or special grants, and a breakdown of wages and salaries and goods and services funding, which was provided by the former Minister of Health last year on a per page basis? I trust that this year I as a member of Parliament will not be placed in a position of having to pay for information.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: An outrage.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Yes, I thought it was.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: A scandal and an outrage.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Yes, it was unbelievable. Will he also provide copies of all directives to hospitals and health units from the commission in the 12 months to 30 June 1988 relating to funding and financial reporting? What information is required by the commission on a daily, weekly, monthly or annual basis from each hospital or health unit (that is, financial, medical, statistical, staffing, property and equipment, capital replacement information)?

What have been the results for each unit of this information? Can we be provided with that information in a collated form for each health unit covering the 12 months to 30 June 1988? I presume that detailed information would be available nowadays, because the health units themselves and the CEOs tell me often that they spend a large proportion of their time providing information to central office. I presume that, because of the detail that they are required to provide, that information will be available in an easily read collated form for the Committee, the community and the people in the hospital units concerned.

I gather that the South Coast District Hospital at Victor Harbor was given a budget cut in July 1988 as a penalty for overrunning its budget in the 1987-88 fiscal year. Will the Minister provide all correspondence between the Health Commission and the hospital on this subject?

Was the budget cut withdrawn and, if so, for what reason? What other public hospitals and health units recorded budget overruns for the 1987-88 fiscal year and what was the total value of those overruns for 1987-88? What other hospitals or health units which ran over budget in 1987-88 have suffered penalties in their budget allocations for 1988-89 as a result, and what is the toal value of those penalties? Has any other hospital had the penalty withdrawn and, if so, what are the names of those hospitals and the reasons?

As to mental health, has the Glenside hospital budget for 1988-89 been reduced by almost $2 million—or more than 6 per cent—compared to last year as detailed in the blue book? If not, what is the new allocation? What were the reasons for this major reduction in funding? What effects will this cut have on services and patient care at this mental institution?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will be very happy to refer those questions to the Minister of Health and bring back replies in the shortest possible time. As I indicated earlier, the Minister will be attempting to reply to as many questions as possible within three weeks.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE (Minister of Tourism): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Since major amendments were made to the State Transport Authority Act in 1981, it has become apparent in the light of day-to-day experience that further amendments are

required particularly in the areas of property, transit infringement notices and obstruction of vehicles.

During negotiations concerning the construction of the new headquarters building for the authority, several deficiencies came to light in matters involving the authority's powers to acquire land, purchase shares or establish a company, establish and operate car parks and apply its regulations to areas not its property such as the North Terrace underpath under North Terrace. Following advice received from the Crown Solicitor, the provisions of this Bill will rectify these problems.

With regard to fare avoidance, the current wording of the Act places the onus of proof on the prosecution and this in certain instances seriously impedes successful prosecution. For instance, in the case of a passenger overriding the value of a ticket, the onus of proof is on the prosecution to prove that the passenger knew what the correct fare was and deliberately paid a lesser amount. Under strict liability for fare offences the onus of proof is on the passenger to prove that it was a genuine mistake. Strict liability for failure to pay fares is enforced in Victoria, New South Wales and Western Australia.

There is no provision under the current Act to prohibit the placing of dangerous objects on rail tracks. On occasions track electrical circuits have been short-circuited causing abnormal operation of signals and level crossing devices. Inclusion of provisions in this Bill relating to obstructions to the public transport system will further improve the safety level on public transport. The Bill also provides for flexibility with regard to the issue of expiation notices. It will empower the authority to accept late expiations and reduce expiation fees in appropriate cases.

The provisions of this Bill also empower the making of regulations prohibiting disorderly and offensive behaviour of persons whilst on any authority premises, not just on vehicles as at present. The regulations may extend to property which is associated with a public transport system but which does not belong to the authority. As it is intended that the principal Act will be reprinted as soon as these amendments come into operation, a list of statute law revision amendments is attached in the schedule to the Bill. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for commencement on a date to be fixed by proclamation, with the usual power to suspend provisions. Clause 3 increases a penalty for non-disclosure of interests from $500 to a division 8 fine ($1 000).

Clause 4 amends section 17 of the principal Act which deals with the general functions of the State Transport Authority. The amendments expand the powers of the authority. In particular, it empowers the authority to set up companies to carry out functions on its behalf or related functions and to acquire and dispose of shares, securities and other interests in bodies corporate with the approval of the Governor. The Governor's approval is not required for acquisition of interests in a strata unit or strata corporation. Section 17 is also amended in view of the Government Management and Employment Act 1985 to make clear that authority employees are not public servants.

Clause 5 repeals section 18 of the principal Act and substitutes a new provision. The new section gives the authority power to acquire land for the establishment, extension or alteration of a public transport system or for any incidental or related purpose. Clause 6 substitutes the heading immediately preceding section 23 and inserts section 22a. This provision permits the authority to set up and operate car parks for the convenience of public transport users. Clause 7 increases the penalty for hindering STA employees from $500 to a division 8 fine ($1 000).

Clause 8 repeals sections 25 to 29 of the principal Act and substitutes three sections. New section 25 deals with the payment of fares and charges for services provided by the authority. Subsection (1) provides that where a service is provided to a person and he or she fails to pay the appropriate fare or charge fixed under the Act that person commits an offence and is liable to a division 9 fine ($500). Subsection (2) creates an evidentiary aid by providing that, in the absence of proof to the contrary, an allegation that a particular service was provided to the defendant will be accepted as proved.

Subsection (3) provides two defences: first, that the failure to pay was attributable to an honest and reasonable mistake on the part of the defendant; secondly, that the defendant did not have a reasonable opportunity to pay. New section 26 makes it an offence to obstruct the public transport system. The maximum penalty fixed is a division 5 fine ($8 000). New section 27 provides that a person may expiate an offence against the Act by payment of an expiation fee. The authority is granted a discretion with respect to extending the time for payment and reducing the amount of the fee payable in particular cases where appropriate.

Clause 9 amends section 31 of the principal Act by making incidental changes to the regulation-making power. Regulations may be made dealing with the behaviour of persons while on the authority's vehicles or premises, or while on premises that do not belong to the authority but are associated with one of the authority's public transport systems. Regulations may be made relating to liquor licences for the authority's premises. Regulations may be made fixing, and providing for the manner of payment of, fares and charges. Regulations may also be made in relation to the carriage of luggage and dealing with abandoned goods. The maximum penalty that may be prescribed for a breach of regulations is a division 9 fine ($500).

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

BOATING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE (Minister of Tourism): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The objects of this Bill are twofold. First, the Boating Act 1974 has been in operation in its present form since 1980 and it is now considered appropriate to amend the Act to satisfy current day requirements and to streamline administrative procedures in the interests of the boating public.

The Bill proposes a number of significant amendments in relation to registration of motor boats. Approximately 45 000 motor boats are registered under the Act and the department has for some time been concerned that the registration procedures currently in force are in some cases inefficient and cumbersome. Amendments proposed provide for the issue of a temporary registration permit to enable a motor boat to be operated legally in those instances where an incomplete application for registration is submitted. At present no such provision exists and this has caused difficulties for the boating public on occasions. Provision

is also made to allow transfer of registration in cases where a motor boat changes ownership. Approximately 8 000 registered motor boats are bought and sold each year and this new facility will simplify procedures for the boating public by introducing transfer arrangements similar to those applying to motor vehicles.

The Bill also provides for the issue of a temporary licence to operate a motor boat. This is a new procedure intended to overcome present inconsistencies and the problem of visitors to this State who do not have an equivalent licence to operate a boat. It is not intended that a pass or fail test be associated with the issue of the temporary licence but rather that there be a means of certifying that the applicant is conversant with the operation of the type of craft to be hired and has been made aware of the relevant navigation and safety rules. The department will liaise with the operators of various classes of vessels, particularly larger powered vessels and charter yachts, in order to ensure that potential hirers are forwarded information about the safe operation and navigation rules applicable to the craft. Where appropriate the department will produce information booklets for this purpose. It is intended that a charge be made for the issue of a temporary licence to operate a motor boat.

The second major object of this Bill is to introduce a licensing system for persons who carry on a business of hiring out boats, commonly known as 'hire and drive' boats. The department has in most instances managed to maintain a reasonable standard of safety of hire and drive vessels by way of recommendations to operators of the various types of craft. However, without formal legislation, the department is poorly placed to effect any safety standards on vessels operated by persons who choose to ignore these recommendations. Section 18 of the Australian Transport Advisory Council's Uniform Shipping Laws Code contains the provisions developed by the Association of Australian Ports and Marine Authorities in respect of hire and drive vessels and is in use in other States.

In recent years there has been a substantial increase in aquatic recreational activities generally. Consequently, many existing and potential owners of vessels are keen to participate in these developing commercial opportunities. Obviously, not all craft are adequate for their intended use, and there is growing concern in regard to the safety of persons, particularly groups of young persons, who may be at risk on craft which are unsuited to the area of operation or lack proper safety equipment. South Australia is the only State which does not have regulations controlling these hire and drive vessels.

The department proposes to issue annual licences to operators of hire and drive vessels subject to compliance with certain conditions which will include satisfactory inspection of construction and equipment of the various vessels and their designated areas of operations. Inspection of small vessels, for example, catamarans, small power boats and other small craft operated close inshore and within inland waters will be inspected by marine safety officers (boating inspectors). Larger vessels, particularly those with overnight accommodation, and vessels operating offshore will be inspected by the department's marine surveyors, and it is intended that the fees for inspection of these vessels will be the same as those for commercial vessels. Therefore, charges for these vessels currently subject to survey under the Marine Act will remain the same. Charges for inspection of small craft will be less and appropriate to their size and the degree of work involved.

It is also proposed that the licensing requirements for various classes of vessels be introduced progressively over 12 to 18 months from the time of commencement. This will ensure orderly administrative procedures and permit consultation with the operators of various classes of vessel. Provision is made to permit existing vessels which are otherwise safe but below the required standard to continue to operate for a specified period, at the expiry of which the designated standards must be met.

The department has for some time been criticised for its lack of consistency and control over hire and drive operations. The Boating Industry Association of South Australia has previously voiced its concern in this regard and related matters are raised in the recently released draft Murray Valley resource management plan. This Bill should go a long way towards addressing these problems.

A further amendment sought to be made is the addition of the offence of operating a boat, skiing or using a surfboard while there is more than .08 alcohol in the blood. Finally, sundry other minor administrative changes to facilitate the operation of the Act and to provide for an increase in penalties, which have applied since 1974, are proposed in the Bill. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for commencement on proclamation. Clause 3 inserts a definition of 'registered' and 'unlicensed person'. Clause 4 provides a more sophisticated power of delegation, including a power for the Director to delegate his or her powers to Public Service employees. The Director may delegate the power to issue temporary motor boat operator's licences to persons who are licensed under the Act to hire out boats. Delegations may be subject to conditions.

Clause 5 increases a penalty from $50 to division 11 ($100) and modernises the format of the provision dealing with exclusive use of certain waters under licence from the Minister. Clause 6 repeals Part II which deals with the registration of motor boats and substitutes a new Part. New section 11 sets out the application of the Part. Certain classes of boats may be exempted. New section 12 creates the offence of operating an unregistered motor boat under power on waters controlled by the Minister. The penalty is increased from $200 to division 9 ($500). A similar defence as is in the Act as it now stands is provided for a person who has made due application but has not been notified of the outcome.

New section 13 sets out the requirements for applying for registration of a motor boat. New section 14 provides that the Director may refuse registration if the boat does not comply with prescribed standards or carry prescribed equipment, or is unseaworthy. Provision is made for the issue of permits pending determination of an application, and for the refund of fees in case of refusal to register. Registration is for 12 months. Common expiry dates may be fixed for owners of more than one motor boat. The Director is required to keep a register.

New section 15 provides for registration numbers to be assigned and certificates and labels to be issued. If a new number is assigned to a boat at any time, a new certificate must be issued. New section 16 creates the offence of operating a registered boat without its label being properly affixed or its registration number being properly displayed. Again the penalty is increased from $200 to division 9 ($500). The same defences as are in the Act at the moment are provided. The offence of operating a boat while displaying a false registration number or another boat's number also carries the new penalty of a division 9 fine. New section 16a

provides for transfer of registration on due application being made to the Director and on payment of the prescribed transfer fee.

New section 16b provides for cancellation of registration if registration was improperly obtained or if the registered owner applies for cancellation. Registration labels (if not lost or destroyed) must be surrendered to the Director. Provision is made for the refund of fees. Clause 7 provides for the issue of temporary (not more than 60 days) motor boat operator's licences. It is also provided that licences may be granted subject to conditions. The offence of failure to comply with a licence condition carries a penalty of a division 9 fine.

Clause 8 increases two penalties from $200 to division 9 ($500). Clause 9 inserts a new Part IIIA that provides for the licensing of hire and drive boat owners. New section 23a creates the offence of carrying on a business of hiring out boats of a prescribed class without being licensed under this Part to do so. The penalty is a division 9 fine. New section 23b sets out the requirements for applying for a licence. The applicant must make the boats that are to be hired out in pursuance of the licence available for inspection. Fees will be payable for inspections, but no licence fee is proposed.

The applicant must be 18 or over, and the Director must not issue a licence unless satisfied that the applicant is a fit and proper person to hold a licence and that the boats to be hired meet all the prescribed requirements. However, the Director may grant a licence despite non-compliance with these requirements provided that the boat in question is not unsafe and also that the licence is granted subject to conditions requiring compliance with a specified period. Failure to comply with conditions carries a penalty of a division 9 fine. New section 23c provides that the term of a licence is one year. New section 23d provides for the transferability of licences under this Part; transfers are subject to the approval of the Director, which may be conditional. New section 23e provides for the cancellation of licences if improperly obtained or if the licence holder is found guilty of an offence against the Act or contravenes a licence condition. A cancelled licence must be surrendered to the Director.

Clause 10 repeals the section of the Act that deals with the reporting of boating accidents and re-enacts it in substantially the same form but with penalties increased to division 9 fines and with an additional provision permitting the reporting of accidents at police stations.

Clauses 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 all increase penalties. The penalties for operating a boat in a manner dangerous to any person or while under the influence of drugs or alcohol are rationalised by increasing the fine significantly (from $200 to division 8 ($1 000)) and by dropping imprisonment as an alternative. Clause 12 also introduces the offence of operating a boat, waterskiing or using a surfboard while there is more than .08 alcohol in the blood. Supporting provisions relating to breath testing are provided. All the evidentary and blood sampling provisions of the Road Traffic Act 1961 are applied.

Clause 17 effects consequential amendments to the powers of entry and inspection and further provides that a person apparently carrying on a business of hiring out boats may be required to produce his or her licence. The penalty for failing to comply with a police officer's directions or requirements is amended by increasing the fine to division 9 and dropping imprisonment altogether. Clauses 18 and 19 increase penalties.

Clause 20 re-enacts the section of the Act that deals with the enforcement of the Act. The provision permitting prosecution only by the police or persons authorised by the Minister is dropped. A provision is inserted extending the period for commencement of prosecutions to 12 months. Clause 21 repeals the penalty provision that is redundant now that penalties appear at the foot of each offence. Clause 22 effects consequential amendments to the evidentiary provisions. Clause 23 strikes out from the section dealing with fees the provision that currently prevents differential fees being prescribed for the registration of motor boats. Clause 24 amends the regulation-making power by making it clear that regulations can vary according to the various classes of persons or boats, etc., to which they are expressed to apply, and by empowering the incorporation of codes or standards into the regulations.

The Hon. PETER DUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

[Sitting suspended from 5.58 to 7.45 p.m.]

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate in Committee (resumed on motion).
(Continued from page 1298.)

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: As I indicated during my second reading contribution, during the Committee stage I want to ask questions about the ASER project. The ASER project has several elements and, in setting the scene, I want to ascertain whether it was budgeted under these separate elements—the casino, the Convention Centre, the hotel, the car park, and the common areas (and an exhibition hall is to come). Am I correct in making that judgment?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I am not sure what the honourable member is getting at; he might have to be more specific. I will indicate my understanding of the question he is asking. There is no doubt that the exhibition hall is budgeted separately from other aspects of the ASER development because we have only just decided to construct it. With respect to the other aspects of the development, I think it would be true to say that the public and the commercial aspects of it have been budgeted separately as far as the Government is concerned.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I thought I would establish that first because there has been some suggestion that elements of the project are intertwined and that it is impossible to separate them out from a cost point of view. I would have thought that that would not be the case and I am pleased to have an assurance on that point. There are three areas where the Government has a contractual commitment to pay rent—the Convention Centre, the car park and the common areas. In each case the ASER agreement stipulates that the Government should pay 6.25 per cent of the capitalised cost of construction. What was the capitalised cost of construction of the Convention Centre and the car park?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: There are a lot of separate contractual commitments for each of the three areas to which the honourable member referred, but as was, I understand, indicated during the Estimates Committee for the Premier, the capital cost as indexed to 30 June was indicated to be $76 million for those three areas. It is indexed at the rate of 6.25 per cent, as the honourable member indicated, plus CPI, which in this case was 6.29 per cent this year.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Is the Minister saying that that $76 million covers the final cost of the Convention Centre, the car park and the common areas? Is that all elements of

the common areas or the 40 per cent interest in the common areas?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: It includes only 40 per cent of the common areas, as is the agreement for the Convention Centre, but it does not include additional cost elements since 30 June, and there have been some small additions to that amount that I indicated earlier.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Is landscaping included in the common areas? Is that an additional cost? If so, is it a significant additional cost? In response to the matter to which the Minister referred, namely, the spendings beyond 30 June, what was that money spent on—presumably the common areas?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Landscaping costs are included substantially in the figure indicated, but there was some additional landscaping required by the Government chiefly on the northern bank of the Torrens near the development and the cost for that was met by the Government. The additional costs referred to primarily are for the common areas but there has also been some small additional cost associated with the southern car park, which at 30 June had not been completed. There has been some additional cost there. Although I am unable to put an exact figure on the additional cost since 30 June, it is estimated to be less than $5 million and possibly closer to $2 million or $3 million. That is as specific as I can be at this stage.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: On 3 September 1987 advice was given that the package of the car park/Convention Centre and the Government's share of the common area was originally estimated to be $46 million, but a figure of $77 million was indicated last September, and that is the figure that I have now been given. Last year it was mentioned in September 1987 that the Government did not expect the subsidy to exceed $3.7 million for the year for the Convention Centre. The actual deficit for 1987-88 was about $4.4 million. Is the Government concerned at that over-run? What is the main reason for the variation in the budget of the Convention Centre?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The figure of $46 million for the estimated capital cost for the Convention Centre referred to by the honourable member was used in 1984 based on the estimated cost of a completely different structure from that which we now have in the Adelaide Plaza Development. We now have a Convention Centre about one-third bigger than the original plans would have allowed, and in many respects the facilities have been considerably upgraded on those first designs. So, it is not reasonable or fair to compare that first estimated capital cost figure with the figure of $76 million that I quoted a moment ago. It is like comparing apples and oranges: we are talking about completely different structures which would have completely different costs.

With respect to the deficit figure for the Convention Centre, it is important to look at the Auditor-General's Report, which indicates as clearly as it is possible to indicate the outcome for this year and the Government's contribution to the operations of the Adelaide Convention Centre. I refer to page 22 of the Auditor-General's Report, where the Auditor-General indicates that the deficit for the year on the convention operations was $3.4 million, towards which the State Government contributed $2.8 million.

If that is followed through, it can be seen that the operational profit for the Convention Centre for this last financial year was about $600 000, which is not a bad effort when it has been operating for such a short time. Certainly, it is encouraging to see the Convention Centre in its first 12 or 18 months of operation being able to contribute to its own existence in the way that it has and that over time the contributions by the State Government are diminishing. This year the estimates for deficit funding for the next three years have been revised downwards because of the excellent operating performance of the Convention Centre during its first financial year.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Those were the figures given in response to questions in another place.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: That is correct. During the Estimates Committee I indicated that the figures had been revised downwards and I was able to make the comparisons with the original estimates that were made. Certainly, that means that the Convention Centre is shaping up very well as a commercial operation, and we hope we will see these projections met if not revised downwards again after this next full financial year of operation.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: My final question about the Convention Centre relates to its use for sporting functions. Quite a good deal was made of the proposition that the Convention Centre as a multi-purpose venue would be used not only for dinners, conferences and exhibition space but also that it had a facility to provide seating accommodation for 2 500 people in a setting which would lend itself to tennis matches, boxing and perhaps basketball. Some queries have been raised—and I must say that they are merely anecdotal—about the centre's capacity to handle sporting events, given the size that is left after the seats come down. Will the Minister advise as to the success of the Convention Centre in attracting sporting events? Are there any limitations in its use for sporting events which were originally envisaged when the Convention Centre was planned?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: It is the view of the management of the Convention Centre that there are some sporting events for which the centre is not particularly suitable. I suppose that some of these things are learned through trial and error, since we are dealing with the first purpose built convention facility of its kind in Australia. With all new facilities there is a period during which the venue must be tested in particular operational modes. The Convention Centre was tested in almost every conceivable mode during its first nine months of operation, and the strengths and weaknesses of those various modes emerged as a result.

It has become clear that there are some sporting events for which the Convention Centre is not particularly suitable, but it was never promoted as being a fixture that would be an ideal venue for such events, although it had the capacity to cope in some shape or form with some of those things. As a result of experience, the management of the Convention Centre has come to the conclusion that there are some events for which it will probably not accept bookings in future.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Can you give some examples of that? Is tennis one?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I do not know, and I will take that on notice and provide the answer. I just do not recall the list of sporting events which the management now feels would probably not be appropriate—not necessarily because the event cannot be catered for, albeit in less than ideal conditions but, more particularly, because the adverse publicity which emerges from occasions like that when the venue is not ideal is much too damaging for the reputation of the Convention Centre, and it is better to simply refuse those applications for use than to suffer the adverse comments of people who expect ideal conditions from a venue which was not designed to be a sporting venue but to be a convention centre which may be adaptable for some sporting fixtures. In order to preserve the reputation and standing of the Convention Centre, the management is now taking

a fairly cautious line on these issues. I will be happy to provide examples of the sorts of events which it is felt are no longer appropriate.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I now turn to another element of the ASER project, namely, the proposal to build an exhibition centre to the west of the office building and adjacent to North Terrace. When ASER was first planned, was any consideration given to the fact that an exhibition centre may one day be part of the ASER site?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Yes.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Did any discussion take place with people with expertise in the arrangement of exhibitions in Australia about the nature and size of that exhibition hall?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: At various stages along the way there was extensive consultation with people who had had experience in staging exhibitions as well as people experienced in staging conventions with exhibitions attached. The Government engaged consultants to study the matter in some depth prior to any decisions being taken about the construction of an exhibition hall in South Australia, in order to get the best possible value for money exhibition hall as an adjunct to our Convention Centre.

There has been some confusion in the minds of people in South Australia and elsewhere about what we have in mind with the construction of this exhibition hall. A view was expressed by some people in the exhibitions business that, for a large number of exhibitions, the proposed exhibition hall was not big enough for their staging. But I think that those people are labouring under a misconception about what we are looking for. We are not looking to provide a venue for the staging of major exhibitions in South Australia; we are looking for a venue which will add to the capacity of the Convention Centre to cater for conventions which wish to have collocated exhibition facilities.

The consultant's report indicated very clearly that the exhibition hall so proposed, which would provide some 3 000 square metres of exhibition space, in conjunction with the Convention Centre itself, will be quite adequate to allow the Adelaide Convention Centre to bid for about 75 per cent of the world's convention business very successfully, in terms of the space available in the combined complex. Some of the criticisms that emerged early in the piece have now been answered since discussions have taken place with various exhibition organisers as to what we are trying to achieve with the construction of this exhibition hall.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: The Minister will be aware that in August, I think it was, I raised a matter of concern to a number of people in the exhibition industry who were critical of the fact that the exhibition hall covered only 3 000 square metres. As a starting point, I can refer to the General Manager of the Adelaide Convention Centre, Mr Peter Van der Hoeven, who indicated in an article in the *Australian* in May 1988 that recent surveys had shown that about 60 per cent of conferences were now held with a parallel exhibition because of the growing tendency for conventions and conferences to seek sponsorship and that that inevitably led to the need for exhibition space, which enabled sponsoring companies to display product.

I have had subsequent discussions with Trevor Riddell, the Managing Director of Riddell Exhibition Promotions, whom I quoted in my question to the Minister, back in August. He is arguably the most authoritative person on exhibition space in Australia, having been President of the Melbourne Covention and Visitors Bureau for eight years and a leader in the exhibition industry with his own company in Melbourne. He indicated that a survey had been carried out on the use of convention centres and exhibition halls in the one complex, and it showed that exhibitions represented 60 per cent or slightly higher occupancy and convention centres 40 per cent. He said that a strong argument exists to construct an exhibition hall. He went on to give examples of several national exhibitions held in conjunction with conferences, which have grown very sharply in recent years. There has been a significant trend in Australia for a sharp increase in the space required for exhibitions associated with major conferences. He held to the view that the 3 000 square metre exhibition hall to be constructed in Adelaide is far too small, even for some exhibitions to be held with conferences.

I take the point that it has not been designed to replace the space at Wayville but that it will be used to attract conferences which would be held in conjunction with exhibitions. I was very concerned to receive last week, in response to my question on notice on the exhibition hall, a reply stating that the geography of the site for the exhibition hall will make it impossible and prohibitively expensive to expand the exhibition hall beyond the 3 000 square metres indicated. Certainly, there is 2 000 square metres additional space in the Convention Centre, and I accept that, but on many occasions that space will be taken up with a convention.

The other point that has emerged in my discussions with Mr Riddell and other people around Australia on this point is that exhibition centres are more likely to pay their way than convention centres, which is a reassuring point given that the Convention Centre has an element of subsidy in it. Did the Government look at the siting of an exhibition hall in the overall planning of ASER, because it would seem that arguably the office building could have been relocated elsewhere to allow a greater area for an exhibition hall. It would seem that there has not been a proper element of flexibility in the planning of the overall ASER complex, resulting in this small area of only 3 000 square metres for the exhibition hall due to be built shortly.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: In many ways it is rather difficult to answer this question but, as I understand it, the office building itself was an important component commercially of the ASER development. It would have been a much less attractive commercial proposition, obviously, if it had not been part of the development.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: I was not saying that the office building should not be there but that a different configuration of buildings perhaps could have given more flexibility for more space for the exhibition section.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The development on the site is constricted by the available space. It is not possible, as I understand it, to extend beyond the bounds of the area now to be developed as an exhibition hall. The costs would be prohibitive, if in fact it were possible. It is not a proposition that could be entertained because it would throw out completely all of the costing elements that have been brought to bear on this project—bearing in mind that the Government, using taxpayers' funds, was very keen to have an exhibition hall which would be self-supporting as quickly as possible, but which, nevertheless, would be sufficiently large to allow the Convention Centre to operate effectively.

Our consultants report indicates that the configuration we have, with the Convention Centre being some 2 000 square metres, plus the exhibition hall of 3 000 square metres, will enable us to bid for the vast majority of business internationally. The occasions when the full convention facility will be used in the Adelaide Convention Centre will probably form the minority of occasions during the course of a year. A large number of conventions requiring exhibition space that one would expect to come to the Convention

Centre may use a combination of conference space within the Convention Centre, plus exhibition space in both the Convention Centre and the exhibition hall itself, thereby providing in all cases quite sufficient exhibition space for the organisations that choose to book our venue.

As the honourable member indicated, it was never the intention that the exhibition hall should replace the Centennial Hall facilities at Wayville. I believe that many people in the exhibitions industry did not fully appreciate that when the matter was first raised, which led to the range of views, like the one expressed by Mr Riddell in the early stages of planning.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: They did not believe that the Wayville facilities were of a national or international standard. That is a point generally held within the industry.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: It is also important to note, though, that some people in the national exhibition industry will talk about what they view as being the optimum size for exhibition space anywhere in Australia, but when you press some of those people on whether or not they would ever book such space in a State the size of South Australia they would tell you that they would not be inclined to do so because, in their areas of activity, they do not believe that the catchment area or population size is sufficient for them to bring an exhibition of that size to such a location.

Therefore, it is important not to get hung up on the statements made by some representatives of the exhibition industry about their views on optimal size. One must also ask whether or not they would use the facility if it were provided. I suggest that in some cases some of those people would not be prepared to use it. We must be rational and prudent in the judgments that we make in investing taxpayers' money in facilities of that kind. We must make sure that we get the best value for the dollar. Based on our assessments and those of our consultants, the Government believes that our configuration places South Australia in a very strong position in the international conventions market.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I do not want to prolong the argument, but there are obviously differing points of view on that. I have spoken to half a dozen national exhibition organisers who fully understand the situation at Wayville, who did have money and who were prepared to recommend Adelaide, but felt that it was limiting itself because of the size of the exhibition centre that has been planned on the ASER site.

In mid-1987, the then Acting City Planner of the Adelaide City Council was quoted as describing the western face of the proposed building as 'harsh and visually uninteresting'. He described the car park access area as a 'massive unrelieved and conspicuous surface'. I have seen only one model of the exhibition hall. Have there been any modifications to that design? I ask that question because the design is one aspect of the ASER program that I want to refer to later, and it concerned me to read that comment from the Acting City Planner in mid-1987.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I do not know which model the honourable member has viewed. The designs for the exhibition hall have been refined. I do not know whether the Acting City Planner at the time viewed the most recent plans or the earlier plans. There have been modifications to the plan and, as I indicated, refinements to the design which, I am pleased to say, have also led to a reduction in the estimated costs with an increase in space and car parking facilities. That is a rather pleasing achievement to report.

The refined plans have been approved by the Adelaide City Council, presumably endorsed by the council's planning officers and, if any reservations there expressed by a previous officer at some other time, I think that those views are not held currently.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: A very detailed and well researched article on the exhibition centre, written by Tim Lloyd, appeared in the *Advertiser* on Saturday 5 November. Mr Lloyd made a novel suggestion which I had not seen before. Given that the Government has been badly skewered by its failure to fulfil a dogmatic commitment that it made at the 1985 State election, namely, to build an entertainment centre, had the Government looked at the feasibility, to quote Mr Lloyd, of scrapping the proposed exhibition hall on the ASER site on North Terrace and incorporating it in the entertainment centre. I am not saying that I subscribe to that view but it was an interesting proposal put forward in a very thoughtful article.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: That matter was considered by the Government. As the honourable member would know, it is very difficult in these tough economic times for the Government to finance an entertainment centre as was originally envisaged by the proponents of an entertainment centre. In the early stages of planning for the exhibition hall, the question of whether or not the structure could be used to double as an entertainment centre was addressed. The suggestion was dismissed fairly quickly because the additional cost that would be associated with the conversion of this proposed structure to make it suitable as an entertainment venue would have destroyed the economic viability of the exhibition hall.

A number of facilities that would be required in an entertainment centre will not be required in the exhibition hall; I refer, for example, to dressing room facilities, toilets, backstage equipment, and so on. The cost of the structure would be changed quite considerably. For that reason it was decided that it would not be feasible to adapt the exhibition hall design to meet those needs. The search for a cost effective way of providing an entertainment facility goes on.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: The casino was, of course, the first element of the ASER project that was completed. The Opposition understands that it is operating profitably and making a contribution in the order of $10 or $11 million annually to Government revenue. It was foreshadowed earlier that down the track part of the equity in the casino would be floated off to the general public. That suggestion has been aired publicly. Of course, we know that the casino is owned in equal parts: one-third by Pak-Poy Kneebone, one-third by Kumagai and one-third by the South Australian Superannuation Fund. Is the Minister in a position to know whether there have been any recent discussions about selling off part of the equity in the casino to the public by way of, perhaps, a public float? If so, presumably it would be the share owned by the South Australian Superannuation Fund or perhaps a share of both Kumagai's and SASFIT's interests in the casino which may be sold off to make public equity available in the casino.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I am certainly not aware of any discussions to that effect and I am not sure that it would be in our interests to reveal them if they had taken place.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I turn now to the office building, which is another controversial element of the ASER project. My understanding is that initially the Government committed itself to take 11 floors—not just to guarantee the rental of those floors but to physically move a department or part of a department (it was strongly suggested that it would be the Premier's Department) into the office block.

That was very much part of the early planning of the ASER project. Will the Minister confirm that?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The Government's commitment was effectively to underwrite half the space in the office building. How that might be achieved was a decision for the Government to make, should that have had to be put into effect. It has not yet come up as far as I am aware. I guess it would be decided at the time how the commitment would be met, if that was necessary.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: The office space in the 'ASER grey' office building immediately to our west is 22 000 square metres in total, and the Government is committed to paying market rates for half that: 11 000 square metres. I believe that the going rate for that office building is in the order of $250 a square metre, which would mean that on an annual basis the Government would be committed to paying $2.75 million if that space was not otherwise let. Will the Minister confirm that?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: If the honourable member's arithmetic is correct, that is probably about right.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: When does the Minister expect the office building to be completed? It was originally scheduled for completion in mid-1987, but the unions have had the project by the throat for some time. The completion date was revised for May, then August and then September 1988. Will the Minister give the latest estimate of when the 'ASER grey' office building will be completed?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: It is anticipated that the building will be completed before Christmas.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: When will it be available for occupation?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I understand that it will be available for occupation as soon as it is completed.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: The answers are not necessarily the same. There is fitting out and so on, so it could be January or February before it is available for occupation. To what extent has the office building been leased at this stage?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: As the honourable member knows, I am not in a position to reveal that. The commercial confidentiality of the project must be protected. The honourable member would also be aware that similar questions were asked during the Estimates Committees and were not responded to by either the Premier or Ian Weiss from ASER Nominees. It is not appropriate that such information be provided, even if I knew what the answer was. No other organisation in this State that leases office space of that kind would expect to have to reveal that information publicly. There is no reason why this particular commercial operation should do so, either.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I would not want to accuse the Minister of being naive, but I would have thought that she could go to any major real estate operator in the central business district and ask what percentage of space is left in the office building they are managing, and that they would tell her. In fact, one can drive around Adelaide, if one wishes, and see how much space is left in certain buildings; signs actually tell you. To suggest that the ASER office building operates on a different basis than other office buildings is remarkable. I hope that this Government will try very hard to operate in the marketplace like anyone else who puts up an office building in Adelaide.

I now turn to the colour of the office building. As the Minister would be aware there has been some discussion about this. It is one of the elements in what has been an exciting saga of the ASER story, and I hope that the South Australian Film Corporation is alert to the commercial possibilities of the project. I asked for a letter which confirmed that the colour of the ASER office building would be other than sandstone. Initially, in his public response, the Premier said that matters such as this were absolutely private and how dare anyone ask for information such as this. But, somehow, I did receive it. In fact, I received it in this Chamber in response to a question. The letter, dated 11 August 1986 and addressed to the Hon. D. Hopgood, Minister for Environment and Planning, Department of Environment and Planning, 55 Grenfell Street, Adelaide, states:

Dear Sir,

ASER OFFICE BUILDING

On 11 July 1985 a regulation under the Adelaide Railway Station Development Act was promulgated in which the design of the ASER office building was defined in general terms.

Since that date detailed design development has been carried out, resulting in considerable refinement to the design. In particular, further consideration has been given to the colour and finish on the building. These matters were not specified in the July 1985 regulation, though in the final submission by ASER there was a brief reference to the facade as being of precast concrete. Earlier submissions had indicated that the finish would be either concrete or grey/bronze aluminium.

The facade selected is aluminium cladding in a gunmetal grey finish. The rationale for the choice as explained by the architect John Andrews International is as follows:

> The finishing treatment we have selected is a warm grey metallic finish—

and incidentially 'warm' has a small 'w'—

> which will maintain the metallic nature of the surface and, at the same time, sit comfortably with the stone-like finish of the rest of the development.
>
> On the streetscape it is also seen as an echo of the Parliament House and some other buildings in North Terrace. The finish will be 'gunmetal' anodising (or possibly a fluorocarbon coating of similar appearance), combining the 'metal' look of the facing with the main background colour of the precast concrete.
>
> There are of course other colours and materials included in the external palette of the ASER project; off form concrete which appears in the vertical lift and stair elements in the hotel Convention Centre and office building; bright metal which recurs in the *porte-cochere* and the wrap around toilet walls in both the Convention Centre and the office building; and the tinted glass throughout all of the buildings. All of these contribute to the visual unity of the development.

The appearance of the facade is considered to be consistent with the ASER Development Plan, as is the refined design as a whole, and is being brought to your attention to complete the picture presented of the ASER development.

The letter is signed, 'Yours faithfully, I.S. Weiss, Chairman.' Some 15 or 16 months later the colour of the office building burst on the firmament of Adelaide in a front page article dated 6 December 1987, with the headline 'ASER colour switch storm. Critics see red.' That article was followed by a number of other articles over a period of some six weeks.

We had the remarkable spectacle of the Premier expressing shock, horror and dismay at the colour. In the *Sunday Mail* of 6 December the Premier was quoted as saying that he had always believed the office tower colour would blend with the whole project and that he would call for a report about why the colour had changed and whether the Government had been informed. Press reports in January claimed that the Premier was outraged at the colour change; he called it incongruous. Of course, he was joined by the Lord Mayor, Steve Condous, who was terribly disappointed at the change and said that there was nothing the council could do about it. There was also very sharp criticism from the well known architect and civil trust member, Neil Platten.

What happened was that the Premier then, in what was a masterly exercise of media manipulation, tried to convince—and I think largely did convince—an unwitting Adelaide media that in fact his Government had not been in receipt of the information all the time that it was going to be gunmetal grey. Finally, Mr Bannon admitted that no-one could do anything about it because it would cost the

Government $1.75 million to paint the grey aluminium panels and that there would be ongoing costs for maintenance; or alternatively, the panels could be recoated using a special long-life bonding method which would cost between $4 million and $4.2 million. That of course was a foul-up of some dimension.

How was it possible for such a foul-up to occur, given that a letter was sent from Mr Ian Weiss, the Chairman of ASER, to the Deputy Premier, and given that the Premier presumably, and/or other members of Cabinet, were regularly briefed on the ASER project?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I have no personal involvement with or knowledge of the letters between the ASER management and the Minister in the Government who was the person to be notified about such changes. All I can do is refer the honourable member to *Hansard* at the time that this was an issue, because I am sure that he will find all of the replies that he is looking for that relate to this matter. They were given by the people who were directly involved in the circumstances. The honourable member knows as well as I do that this matter has been raised in Parliament, both in this place and in another place. The matter has been covered extensively by a number of people.

I know that the Hon. Mr Davis fancies himself as something of a painter and decorator and he probably has strong views on the colour scheme for Adelaide's buildings. He would probably like to be consulted on these matters because of his vast experience and expertise in this area. It is also true that the honourable member has never supported the ASER development, despite the fact that, as it proceeds and as the various elements of it open up and become operational, it is clearly an addition to Adelaide's and South Australia's capacity to attract tourists, conventiongoers and various other people to our State, and despite the fact that it helps to strengthen and broaden the range of Tourism product that we can promote nationally and internationally. The Hon. Mr Davis has a long record of picking on almost all aspects of the development, whether they are significant or trivial aspects, in his attempt to denigrate the far-sightedness of this Government and all the people who were involved in the development of the project itself.

The Hon. Mr Davis will raise these issues repeatedly at his peril because, the more the development becomes known, the more it becomes used by people in South Australia and people from elsewhere in the world, the more his opinions on these issues pale into insignificance and the more they demonstrate his capacity for being totally out of touch with what is good for the State. I advise the honourable member to stick to things that he knows, like painting and decorating, and to cease picking on these aspects of the development which the vast majority of people in South Australia now recognise as being an important and beneficial development for the economy of South Australia.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I was on the side of the Premier and the Lord Mayor in this case, yet the Minister savages me. It is grossly unfair. Back in 1986 the ASER public relations team put out an elaborate full colour production of the various elements of the project, and I studied these with interest. As the Minister has observed, I had a great interest in the project, and I looked at the colours of the various elements. It was clear to me that the office building was to be in the same stone colour as other buildings. In the end we had the hotel, which has been completed in October of this financial year, some 16 months behind schedule. The photograph of the ASER model shows that the liftwells and service areas were to be the same colour as the rest of the project, a honey or sand colour. In fact, they are rough cast concrete.

As the Minister knows, there has been much criticism. I have been told by people that one reason for this colour change is to save cost. Has the Government heard this criticism? It has been manifest in the public arena. There was comment in the *City Messenger* only last week. As I mentioned in my second reading speech, if one stands on the Festival Centre Plaza or on North Terrace and looks at the eastern aspect of the Hyatt Hotel it looks like a multi-storey concrete meat safe. No-one can say that it is a pretty sight. With its large commitment to the project, has SASFIT expressed concern about it? Has it been involved in discussions about that aspect? Is what we see the final product?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I understand that what we see is the final product, which is what the architect intended. It was the architect's choice that the liftwells would be in the concrete colour that we have.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: At page 7 in the *City Messenger* one writer comments:

> The two unadorned grey concrete pillars on either side of the building are an aesthetic disaster.

Certainly, I have no qualms about the inside of the Hyatt, and I mentioned that in my second reading speech. The inside finish is magnificent. The writer in the *City Messenger* last week makes the point:

> In North Terrace you look at the Hyatt over Parliament House and the Hyatt roof boasts two hot water tanks in plain view for all to see. If they are not hot-water tanks, then they look damn like them. I can assure you that such obvious obscenties would never get council approval on top of a suburban house.

That is the sort of feedback that I am getting. As I stated in my second reading speech, many people do not believe that the project is finished.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: It seems that the honourable member is an expert on architecture as well as painting and decorating. I do not understand the line of questioning that this man goes on with constantly every time he gets an opportunity in this place by attacking the ASER development. One's appreciation of architecture is very subjective. Some people in South Australia would rather see no change and no new buildings at all. Some people do not like new buildings at all. There will be people who will criticise the ASER development and any other new structure in this city. There are others who do not like new buildings and who do not like the shape of this or some other building which is built in the city.

The fact is that those matters are subjective judgments and people are entitled to them, but it does not befit the honourable member, with his responsibilities as a public figure, to be constantly trotting out these subjective judgments in opposition to this development which, by any objective judgment, has been an enormous success and which will grow in success as a contributor to the State's economy, both in terms of revenue to the State and as a provider of jobs for South Australians.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Are you saying that no questions should be asked?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I am not suggesting that questions should not be asked. I am saying that the honourable member tends to raise any objection, no matter how petty or trivial, in opposition to this project. He is grossly out of touch with majority opinion in this city and in this State on the development and its success. I suppose that everyone has a view about particular aspects of the architecture or the merit of the interior decoration, as we do with any new structure, but for the honourable member, who is a public figure, to be using the time of this Parliament to raise those issues in this way which is designed not to be at all constructive about the work of the ASER development or about the contribution it is making to this State

but, rather, to continue his campaign against the ASER development, is not only exasperating, but is irresponsible.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I am not a lap-dog of the Government and I am here to represent the interests of the people and to protect their money, and the Minister would know that there has been an enormous blowout in the cost of this project. The industrial disputation has been enormous, and I have raised the matter of several major blunders, which has been taken up not only by me but also by other public figures. I have that responsibility: I do not shirk it.

I want to deal with the hotel and several important questions of current concern about subcontractors and their payments, and the owners' involvement in what I think is a very trying time for quite a few of the contractors and subcontractors. I take it that some of my questions will have to go on notice, but, first, how many contractors and subcontractors either have gone into liquidation or are experiencing financial difficulties due to the ASER project? Perhaps I can give the Minister some background. This is a matter of importance, because I have had telephone calls from many subcontractors. One can imagine the situation where a subcontractor has contracted to go on the hotel site for 12 months and has ended up spending 26 months there. It has dislocated their work program and has involved them in additional cost. Many of them have virtually gone to the wall. I know of at least one who has gone to the wall.

The Hon. T. Crothers: What colour is the wall?

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: For a subcontractor who has just gone bad, I think that is a very flippant and uncalled for remark. I could elaborate, if the Hon. Mr Crothers wished, on a few examples of people who have been waiting for months for payment. My question, if I can repeat it after that most unwanted and inappropriate interjection, is: how many contractors and subcontractors have gone into liquidation or are experiencing financial difficulties due to the ASER project, the unforeseen delays and the continued industrial disputation?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I do not think that is a question the Government would be in a position to answer. The business of subcontractors and whether or not they have been paid is not a matter in which the Government has any involvement. Subcontractors have entered into contracts with the head contractor (who, in this case, would probably be Sabemo), and any problems that there have been in fulfilling those contracts is a matter between the respective subcontractors and Sabemo. It is not a matter in which the Government has any involvement, and I would be surprised if the Government was in a position to provide responses to the honourable member's question.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: This again shows the naivety of the Minister when it comes to business matters. The fact is that the builder certainly does pay the contractor: the Minister got that part right. But the owners—and that includes SASFIT with a 50 per cent interest in the ASER project—have to approve the claims by the builder or claims on him by subcontractors. One of the very severe criticisms to emerge from this project is that the owners have not involved themselves sufficiently in the resolution of conflict. They are standing by, waiting to see who they have to speak to later, like jackals at a feast, it would seem.

My question centres around the fact that the traditional arrangement involving the architect has broken down on this site in a most remarkable way, and I will explain this to the Minister—who probably would not understand this. The architect's traditional role is to act as an umpire between the builder and the client who, in this case, is the ASER Property Trust, with the South Australian Superannuation Fund which, of course, is an arm of the Government, whether the Minister likes it or not, having a 50 per cent interest. There is a public duty here, particularly when we have people going to the wall as a result of lack of control and bad industrial relations on the site. But the halfway role of the architect who, as I have explained, is an umpire between the builder and the client, in this case has disappeared because, during the project, he came under the direction of the builder. No-one was notified of this change. It is most irregular and unusual for that to happen on a major building project and it meant that the parties to the project, the subcontractors, contractors and builders, did not have anyone to go to to solve any problem. The Minister should know that, by way of background. My second question which, again, I ask her to take on notice is: how many cases of arbitration and/or litigation are proceeding as a result of ASER?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I am not in a position to answer that question. I will seek to provide answers, but this question may fall into the category of the previous one.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Again, could the Minister confirm what I have just stated: that the architect's role on the project was varied from the traditional role of umpire and referee, and that led to very big problems on the site? Is the Minister in a position to explain why that occurred? If not, could she take that on notice?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: As I understand it, there have been variations to the contract, but this is a matter upon which I—and probably the Government—am not in a position to provide answers, because, essentially, the points the honourable member is making, whether accurate or not (and I am not in a position to judge since I do not have knowledge of the specific contractual arrangements relating to the Hyatt Hotel) relate to contractual matters between the parties that have been operating on the site. It is not a matter in which the Government has a direct responsibility. However, if it is possible to provide the information, I will do so.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Will the Minister advise whether money is still being paid by ASER to the builder for works outstanding?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will take that question on notice.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Is there any restriction on the paying of money to the builder by ASER and, if so, will the Minister indicate whether any money is being withheld and why? I ask that question because a number of the contractors are having difficulty receiving payment. It is not clear to them at least whether it is because Sabemo has not received the money or whether Sabemo is hanging on to the money. As the Minister should know, some contractors are on a knife edge in terms of survival. The matter has received publicity in recent days and it is a matter of great concern to many subcontractors, particularly those in the finishing off trades and involved with the completion of the hotel project.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: This again is a matter that is between the parties on the site, but I understand that a number of subcontractors have made claims against the builder. I believe that the builder does not accept those claims. Those matters will be resolved, presumably, according to the normal procedures that apply in these instances. These are not matters in which the Government has any direct role or responsibility.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: My final question is in relation to the development of the railway tracks, another element of the ASER project. I understand that modifications had to be made to the track units—the beds that carry the rails

into the station area—which meant that the end result was that they are not in compliance with Australian standards. That serious allegation has been made to me. Will the Minister take that question on notice and bring back a reply?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I have not heard that allegation and I will have to take the question on notice and bring back a reply.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Last year I raised questions about the Central Linen Service. I received answers in February, as did the Hon. Martin Cameron, to questions asked on 22 October. The answers were helpful in explaining some of the background of the Central Linen Service. I wish to raise a few other matters. I realise that the Minister will not be in a position to answer them immediately, but I ask them on the basis that they will be answered by the relevant Minister, hopefully within the period of three weeks indicated by the Minister as being the time within which the Hon. Martin Cameron's questions will be answered.

My first question on the Central Linen Service relates to a loan proposed to be written off which, of course, has the effect of reducing the interest burden on the Central Linen Service. Will the Minister indicate the reason for that, what the saving will be and how that can be equated with a similar situation in the private sector? A private sector operator is not in such a fortunate position as being able to have a debt written off and thus save the interest outlay. What is the likely interest saving to the Central Linen Service as a result of that decision?

I would like details of interest rates payable by the Central Linen Service over the last financial year and up to the present time. Note 5 to the accounts in the Auditor-General's Report refers to total interest as $1 894 000, less interest capitalised. I also seek information on why the interest was capitalised.

With regard to the conduct of the operation of the Central Linen Service, the previous Minister of Health indicated that there was an intention to make the service compete on all fours with the private sector, but there are some areas which suggest to me that that is not occurring. I have not been able to find in the Auditor-General's accounts for the Central Linen Service for the last financial year any reference to an amount being paid to the State Treasurer as though the Central Linen Service were a company subject to Federal income tax. Honourable members will remember that the State Bank, for example, has a provision in its Act that it will pay to the State Government an amount which is the equivalent of the Federal income tax that it would have paid if it were a private sector bank. If the Central Linen Service is to be on all fours with the private sector, one would expect that if there is a profit some provision ought to be made for a payment to the State Government for what would otherwise have been income tax.

Also, will the Minister indicate whether any council rates are paid by the Central Linen Service and, if not, why not? Further, what is the Government's attitude to the payment of stamp duty on the linen which it hires out to hospitals and other agencies?

That particular stamp duty is under that section of the Stamp Duties Act which deals with rental business, and it applies to any business where goods are let or bailed or otherwise rights are given over them to use those goods, other than books. As I understand it, the private sector is required to pay the rental business duty under the Stamp Duties Act but, again, there appears to be no provision for that in these accounts. I would like some explanation of the Government's understanding of application of the rental business duty to the Central Linen Service.

I note that in the accounts of 30 June 1988 there is provision for an advance to the State Clothing Corporation of $272 000. What activity does that relate to, what are the terms of the advances, including interest rates and the due date for repayment, and why were the advances made? With respect to the acquisition of plant, is there any exposure to adverse currency fluctuations? There was an indication last year of the possibility of adverse currency fluctuations. I would like some information about the position in the last financial year with respect to currency fluctuations: what actually occurred in relation to the Central Linen Service in that respect? Is there any further exposure to currency fluctuations?

There is a provision in the accounts for linen replacement. That appears to have gone down over two successive years. In the year ended 30 June 1988 the provision was $1.480 million, whereas in the previous year it was $1.532 million. The linen issues to production were lower in the last financial year than in the previous year. However, I would like an explanation as to why the provision is again lower this year.

In item six of the accounts there is reference to a profit of $29 000 on the sale of fixed assets. What were the fixed assets sold and in respect of which profit was made? In item 8 of the accounts there is reference to the South Australian Health Commission being a debtor for $1.837 million. What is the nature of that indebtedness and what are the terms and conditions of repayment, including interest, if any, and how was that debt incurred?

Borrowings increased by $2 million to $15 million. According to the Auditor-General's Report that amount was primarily utilised to finance the final stages of the re-equipment program and the purchase of linen. What items were purchased with that $2 million? What borrowings are envisaged for 1988-89 and what are the terms of those borrowings? In respect of what items is such borrowing expected? What is the productivity of the Central Linen Service?

There may be other questions arising from the answers to these questions. However, I propose that having received the answers, I will subsequently put further questions on notice. I have questions in relation to the Attorney-General's portfolios, but in view of the time and the need to have this Bill passed today, I propose to put those questions on notice and await—hopefully for not too long—appropriate replies.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Obviously I am not in a position to respond to the questions that the honourable member has raised tonight. However, I will certainly be happy to seek replies and bring them back in a reasonable time.

First schedule passed.

Second schedule.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: The matters I propose to raise pertain to the capital works program for the South Australian Health Commission. I alerted the Minister, in general terms, and produced some documents last week about these matters in the hope that the Minister may be able to provide a reply. On 12 March 1988, the then Minister of Health, speaking to the ME Syndrome Society Support Group, referred to an electron miscroscope for the IMVS. 'ME' stands for myalgic encephalomyelitis, which is also known as chronic fatigue syndrome, and I sometimes wonder whether the Government suffers from that. The syndrome is an extremely distressing condition involving fatigue, weakness, muscular weakness, pain, twitching and spasm, skeletal or joint pain, urethritis, burning, itching, numb skin, paralysis and a further list, which is twice as long.

I have been told by the marriage partners of sufferers that one has only to live with a sufferer to realise the appalling and tragic nature of the condition. Its causes and treatment have not been established. There are over 6 000 sufferers in South Australia. A distinguished South Australian researcher, Dr Mukherjee, who is a world leader in research into the condition, says that what is necessary for the research to continue is an up-to-date electron microscope at the IMVS. The present one is out-of-date and takes five hours to do five minutes work. Such a microscope would cost about $500 000 and would have many other uses besides the ME syndrome, including cancer research. The former Minister of Health, in the speech to which I have referred, said, in March this year:

As you know, the question of available time with an electron microscope has been a matter of discussion for more than nine months. Senior staff of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science have been asked to pursue all practical avenues of addressing this need, and to include the purchase of any necessary equipment as a top priority in the 1988-89 capital works program. I believe it is important that this research work is finalised.

I have had very many disagreements with the former Minister of Health, but I do know his *modus operandi* and that he does his research and homework before he makes promies and that, if he made a promise of that kind, it would have been in the knowledge that it was able to be carried out. It may be said, perhaps, that it is not precisely in terms a promise, but it is as near as damn it is to swearing. He certainly gave the indication to the support group, and they took up and accepted that. He certainly gave the indication which they understood as meaning that they would get their electron microscope.

Mrs Linda Drysdale, the Chairman of the support group, has had a deputation to the Minister of Health with the Director of IMVS. She has also written to the Premier. She has received from both letters which in the usual sort of political terms indicate that they are not going to get their microscope—not in this current budget at any rate. The purchase of the microscope is on the list for IMVS but it has a relatively low priority which indicates that certainly it will not emerge in 1988-89.

Following the former Minister's speech, was a special application for capital works funding made and, if so, when and, if not, why not? I would have thought that, following the speech of the former Minister, IMVS would make a special application for funding for the 1988-89 budget because the speech was made in March. Was an application made, because I understand that when Mrs Drysdale interviewed the present Minister she could not get a straight answer to that question. Was a special application made and, if so, when was it made and, if not, why was it not made? Also, when will such a microscope be purchased. I ask the Minister (who has been very considerate so far in acceding to process our requests as soon as possible), that a satisfactory answer be given before February and as soon as possibel because to these poor sufferers it is a matter of extreme urgency, as has been very apparent in the requests that have been made of me.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The honourable member was kind enough to give me warning that he intended to ask questions about this matter, but I must confess that I have been unable at this stage to acquire sufficient information to be able to answer the questions that the honourable member has asked of me tonight. I will therefore have to place his questions on notice and bring back a reply as soon as I am able to do so. What I can say is that the current Minister of Health has been talking with Lyn Drysdale, the President of the ME Synrome Society, about this matter and, as I understand it, discussions are continuing on the question to which the honourable member has referred.

However, I am not in a position to answer the specific questions that the honourable member has raised tonight, so I will refer them to the Minister of Health. I will bring back a reply and seek to do so in the same time frame that I suggested to the Hon. Mr Cameron in relation to the health questions that he asked earlier this evening.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I understand that the time frame that was mentioned in regard to the Hon. Mr Cameron was about three weeks, and I will accept that. I accept what the Minister has said, as I must do because she does not have the answers. However, I stress that the sufferers of this disease regard this matter as being of extreme urgency. Their fears would be very much allayed if they could be assured of the position, whatever it is, in that time frame, and that the matter was being closely looked at. Because of their plight I would ask the Minister of Health to give close attention to it and to give us a clear and specific reply within a few weeks, as was said.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I am aware that this is a sensitive matter that is of enormous concern to the sufferers of ME syndrome. The Minister of Health is aware of their concerns and of the importance of the issue to them. I am sure that if it is possible to prepare a reply for the honourable member within three weeks the Minister will do that. If it is not, I am sure that a reply will be available fairly soon thereafter.

Second schedule passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY OF OPERATIONS OF THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TIMBER CORPORATION

The House of Assembly intimated that it had given leave to the Hon. R.K. Abbott to attend and give evidence before the committee if he thought fit.

AUSTRALIAN FORMULA ONE GRAND PRIX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

TRUSTEE COMPANIES BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

LAW OF PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

TRAVEL AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.43 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 9 November at 2.15 p.m.