

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 15 April 1992

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

PETITION: PUBLICATION STANDARDS

A petition signed by 45 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to stop reduced standards being created by publishers of magazines and posters debasing women was presented by Mr Becker. Petition received.

PETITION: AGED ACCOMMODATION

A petition signed by 4 446 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to provide hostel accommodation for the aged in Port Lincoln was presented by Mr Blacker. Petition received.

PETITION: IMPORT RESTRICTIONS

A petition signed by 148 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to restrict imports and set tariffs to protect Australian producers was presented by Mr Lewis. Petition received.

PETITION: BANKING SYSTEM

A petition signed by 133 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to re-regulate the banking system was presented by Mr Lewis. Petition received.

PETITION: AUSTRALIAN LOGO

A petition signed by 138 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to introduce a clearly identifiable logo to be displayed on all Australian produced and packaged goods was presented by Mr Lewis. Petition received.

QUESTION

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

WINE GRAPE PRICING

In reply to **Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey)** 19 February.
The **Hon. LYNN ARNOLD**: Indicative prices when set prior to vintage were only ever meant to be guide prices and not the actual prices for grape varieties. The indicative prices were determined by regional committees in New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia after taking into account the winegrape supply and demand estimates previously determined at the Three Region Wine Grape Pricing Committee meeting held in Mildura in November 1991. If the supply and demand parameters changed

significantly there was an understanding that the indicative prices could be adjusted. However, if the parameters remained unchanged it was accepted that actual prices received for a variety could vary around the indicative price depending on such factors as the quality of the particular grapes and/or the desire of the purchaser to acquire those specific grapes.

At this stage of the vintage (expected to be completed by about the end of April), there is not enough reliable information available to determine the actual spread of prices received for winegrapes for the 1992 vintage. The Department of Agriculture will be reporting on the operation of the indicative pricing system at the conclusion of the 1992 vintage, which should give an indication of what range of prices were paid for individual varieties of winegrapes and an overall assessment of the indicative pricing process. Prior to setting indicative prices for the 1993 vintage, it will be necessary for the Three Region Wine Grape Pricing Committee to meet again. If there have been any problems or shortcomings with the scheme's operation during the 1992 vintage, they should be resolved at this meeting. At this stage, I can see no reason to seek a meeting with my counterparts in the other States to discuss alterations to the current indicative pricing scheme.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MARCEL SPIERO

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS**: Yesterday (Tuesday 14 April 1992) I reported to the House that the Department of Correctional Services had completed its investigation into the escape of Marcel Edward Spiero from Yatala Labour Prison.

An honourable member interjecting:

The **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS**: It was with the bloke who did the same thing for New South Wales.

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

The **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS**: Following the statement, it was alleged there was a discrepancy between yesterday's statement and a previous statement to the House on 19 February 1992 on the details surrounding the escape of the prisoner. To refresh the House's memory, on 19 February 1992, I said:

The Dog Squad was booked for the escort at 4 p.m. on Monday, 10 February 1992 and was instructed to be at Yatala Labour Prison at 9 a.m. on 11 February 1992, in readiness for the escort to commence at 9.10 a.m.

On 14 April 1992 I told the House:

Written instructions that a Dog Squad escort was required for the escort of this prisoner were given by a senior officer at Yatala Labour Prison at approximately 8.15 a.m. on 11 February 1992.

Mr Speaker, there is no discrepancy between the two statements. The booking for the Dog Squad escort on Monday, 10 February 1992 was made by phone by the Movement Control Chief, who then prepared the paperwork for the following day. The next day, 11 February 1992, at approximately 8.15 a.m., the Manager of Prison Services asked whether the Dog Squad had been booked for the escort of the prisoner. When told the booking had been made, the Manager of Prison Services wrote the instruction 'ensure Dog Squad escort' on Spiero's escort form, as referred to in my statement to the House yesterday.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SACON

The **Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Housing and Construction)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. M.K. MAYES**: In the House last week I made a statement in reply to the allegations contained in the *Advertiser* newspaper report of 6 April 1992. It was reported

that the Hon. R. Lucas had claimed wastage of \$1.3 million on consultancy expenditure in relation to the computer system in SACON, and he also questioned why a new system, estimated to cost \$2.5 million, was being planned so soon after the implementation of the interim system. Yesterday in the other place, the Hon. R. Lucas alleged that I had misled Parliament in that statement. I totally refute that allegation. In my statement, I indicated that the \$1.3 million related to total expenditure on the interim system (FMS), of which \$450 000 only was for specialist consultant advice, contract programming and training. In addition, I explained that, due to the necessity to meet information requirements caused by the acceleration of the commercialisation program of SACON, and to address the concerns of the Auditor-General, the program for introducing an integrated information system estimated to cost \$2.5 million has been brought forward from 1995.

There are no documents within SACON that I am aware of that conflict with the information I have provided and I have not misled Parliament. Yesterday the Hon. R. Lucas and the members for Bragg and Hayward, in different places, questioned the initial estimated costs for the financial management system (FMS) in SACON and referred to a report on this matter. The report dated 5 September 1989 and entitled 'The SACON FMS project—Analysis of Estimated Costs and Benefits' did estimate the cost of implementing the new financial management system at \$324 000. A further report dated 27 September 1989 revised that estimated cost to \$388 000. As I stated to the House last week, the cost of developing and implementing the new system totalled \$1.3 million, which is the total cost of transferring and interfacing computer systems from the ageing Cyber computer at the Government Computing Centre.

The significant increase in cost over the initial estimate was due to a change in the scope of the project. The nature of these interfaces in a changing and increasingly commercial environment was particularly complex. Additional development and processing effort, together with additional contract programming resources in order to complete the interfaces within the agreed timeframe, were required. In response to the member for Bragg's question regarding savings in computer processing costs, I can confirm that the estimated savings of \$210 000 per annum are now being realised. A post implementation review of the project was conducted and, although at that time the cost savings envisaged had not been realised, I can now confirm that they have. A reduced processing charges agreement has been concluded with State Systems to that effect.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—

South Australian Planning Commission Report on proposed development at the Waite Campus by the Department of Agriculture.

Port Stanvac Refinery Development—Correspondence from Petroleum Refineries (Australia) Pty Ltd to the Department of Environment and Planning.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: OIL REFINERY

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Yesterday the member for Bright raised the issue of an SDP over land near the Port Stanvac refinery and during the grievance debate expressed 'anger and concern' over the way in which the rezoning was handled. Unfortunately, the 'anger and concern' was not based on fact. The facts are indeed quite different from those presented by the member for Bright who, on two occasions, told the Parliament that the buffer distance between the refinery and the northern residential zone is 350 metres. The Port Stanvac oil refinery is located on sections 581 and 582, which are zoned 'special industry'. Adjacent to the northern boundary of these sections Petroleum Refineries (Australia) Pty Ltd owns two further sections 577 and 575, which are zoned 'general industry' and are undeveloped.

Adjacent to the northern boundary of section 575 is section 572. This is the subject of the SDP and interim approval for a plan which formally establishes a landscape buffer between section 575 and a small residential zone at the north-east end of section 572. The distance is actually one kilometre from the boundary of the refinery site to the north-east residential zone, and in fact from the actual refinery the distance is about 1.5 kilometres. It is quite appropriate for the buffer around a special industry site to include areas zoned for general industry and, in this case, the buffer has been further reinforced by the SDP to formally include a landscape zone.

Clearly, any development on sections 577 and 575 zoned 'general industry' will need to be compatible with the residential zone on the north-eastern side of the 350 metre buffer, and I can assure the House that this requirement will be met by any future development. I also point out that the residential zone created by the SDP is adjacent to section 569 which was already zoned residential R2 and is also 350 metres from section 575—the general industry zone. I would now like to deal with the claim by the member for Bright that Petroleum Refineries (Australia) Pty Ltd 'is not satisfied' by these decisions. During the development of the SDP, the refinery operators were consulted at length and I visited Port Stanvac for discussions with Mr D.P. Young, General Manager of the company.

Following negotiations between the Department of Environment and Planning, the company and the Marion and Noarlunga councils, Mr Young wrote to the department on 22 May 1991 advising agreement to the proposals contained in the SDP, and I table a copy of this letter. The member for Bright also made the outrageous claim that I know of refinery plans to expand and that I am proposing to put this in jeopardy with the loss of 1 000 jobs. I am not aware of any specific plans by the refinery to expand, although my discussions with Mr Young did include the need to consider future requirements.

However, following yesterday's allegations by the member for Bright, my office contacted Mr Young, who confirmed that his company was considering its options to meet increasing market demand. These options include expansion at Adelaide, Altona or Singapore. The House in general will be interested to learn that the Adelaide site has a number of advantages including the size of available land on the special industry site, the greatest distance of neighbours and the cheapest construction costs. Mr Young confirmed the buffer zone is not an issue and that the company's decision would be on other criteria. The company confirmed yesterday that the current buffer distances are adequate.

Mr Matthew interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: That is what the man has told me. The company has also advised me that the call for a 2 kilometre buffer ignores the fact that it does not exist

around any major industrial plant in Victoria; is not based on the findings of any comprehensive scientific study; and relates to community amenity and not risk. The member for Bright has embarked on a campaign of misinformation and created unnecessary concern among local residents and is placing at risk the possibility of additional employment in the southern region. Finally, I wish to reiterate my advice of yesterday that the supplementary development plan is currently before the Advisory Committee on Planning following the process of public consultation required by sections 41 and 43 of the Planning Act, and I will wait for advice from the committee before proceeding with the SDP.

Mr Matthew interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: You must be—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bright and the Minister for Environment and Planning will come to order.

QUESTION TIME

STATE CREDIT RATING

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Treasurer confirm that the two reductions in the State's credit rating by Moody's since 1991 will increase the State's cost of borrowings by about \$46.8 million a year—equivalent to the cost of 1 000 teachers' salaries for a year, 1 350 police salaries, or 1 500 nurses—and, since he has claimed credit in the past for high credit ratings, will he now declare his responsibility for today's second reduction by Moody's since May last year? This estimate of the additional cost is based on information obtained by the Opposition a few minutes ago from the Sydney money markets. The latest downgrading is based on a debt of \$7.2 billion on which South Australia faces an interest rate .7 basis points above New South Wales.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As usual, the Leader jumps in, attempts to paint the worst possible picture and throws in a few figures for good measure. In fact, I am advised that the announcement by Moody's today will not increase the cost of the State's borrowings because it simply confirms the rating already given by Standard and Poor's, and the market adjusted to that some time ago. It is nonsense for the Leader of the Opposition to throw this up as a new and major factor with which the State must deal.

In terms of responsibility, it is certainly worth looking at the reasons that Moody's give. They refer to the medium-term impact, and I stress that, of the State Bank's recapitalisation and of the debt and debt servicing position. That is acknowledged; that is unavoidable. The consequences of our not stepping in with the indemnity package would have been catastrophic. The fact that we had the ability to do so indicates the underlying strength of the South Australian financial position, which is recognised in the markets.

Mr S.J. Baker: We are worse than New York.

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Another reason given—

Mr D.S. Baker: What was the second one?

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —is the State's limited policy response so far to adjust to this. This is where I would like the Opposition to clearly declare itself. What Moody's call the State's limited policy response, I might say, was something like a nearly \$200 million reduction in our recurrent expenditure and the loss of some thousands of jobs in the State Public Service, which we had had to undertake to meet the financial stringencies. However, the rating agencies

would like us to go much further. I know that the Opposition Leader wants us to go much further because he said he would have an across the board 9 per cent cut. I am sure that that at least would create some favourable reaction, although it might not change the ratings. But what about the people of South Australia? What about the calls we have had—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: What about the calls we have had—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —from the member for Adelaide for increased health and hospital funding, or from a member in another place about the education budget and how it should be increased, or from each and every backbencher who keeps asking for more expenditure? That is why I say the Opposition should make up its mind. Is the Leader of the Opposition speaking for other Opposition members when he says that we should slash and burn and create scorched earth or is it the spokespersons in the various areas who say we should spend more?

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The real truth, Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. The Deputy Leader has drawn the attention of the Chair on several occasions in the first question. I ask him to pay regard to his conduct because he is well aware of the results if he continues as he does. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The real answer is to do as we have done, which is strike some sort of balance between the need to constrain and reduce our budget expenditures and the need to ensure that we keep our debt under control, but, in a recession, not to impose the hardship of massive cuts in our services in the community. The Opposition ought to come clean because that is what it is on about. Opposition members are saying that, in this recessionary period, we should listen to those overseas who tell us not to have a limited policy response but, presumably, to have a comprehensive policy response, because that is what it means. They had better be honest to the people of South Australia.

It is a legitimate point of view. I am not suggesting that, as part of his ideology and doctrine, the Leader of the Opposition should not say that there must be this massive cut, but he has to accept the fact that he has to answer to the schools and the school communities. He has to answer to those seeking health services, and so on. He has to answer to those in the community looking for law and order. Unless he is prepared to do that and unless all his members are prepared to do that, he should simply shut up about this issue, because the Opposition has nothing to say. Finally, the agency concedes 'the continuing effects of the national downturn on the State's finances and economy'.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Let us just deal with that. 'Marvellous', says a member of a Party that is advocating zero tariff options in this country. 'Marvellous', says a member of the Opposition, which is supporting a general consumption tax which would raise inflation and interest rates in this country. 'Marvellous', says a member who can see the dismantling of manufacturing industry costing this State dearly, and he wants to go even further. That is a disgrace, and again I call on members of the Opposition to

say where they stand. Do they want to support the continuing dismantling of our industry? Do they want to see South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—on the front line of the economic problems that we are having to deal with in this country? I do not, and my colleagues and I are doing something about it. What do we get from the Opposition?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Well, a classic instance—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —is the textile, clothing and footwear industry. In 1989 a plan was brought down to lower protection and rationalise the industry. It was a difficult plan to accomplish but, nonetheless, something that had to be in the interests of efficiency. On the basis of that, a number of companies, including some in this State, undertook major capital expenditure to improve their efficiencies in the context of that plan. Out of the blue in 1991 the Federal Government cancelled that—changed it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Just wait: I will come to you in a minute.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member can bide his time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order. The Premier will resume his seat.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is normal for the Premier and every member of this House to direct their comments through the Chair and not to say, 'I will get to you.' The Premier should direct his comments through the Chair.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is upheld. The Premier will direct his remarks through the Chair. And the member for Bragg was out of order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. In 1991 that change was made, and it has put intolerable pressure on a number of operators in the TCF industry, including some here in South Australia. We have protested against that vigorously. We claim that there should be a moratorium during this period of recession on that revision of the plan. It makes sense because, while we obviously have to improve our competitiveness and while we have to keep our levels of protection under control and reducing, we cannot handle that and a recession at the same time.

That is what we have been saying. We have formed a task force under the chairmanship of my colleague the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, we are working with the industry and we are recognised as doing what is appropriate for this State. What has the Opposition done? Nothing! Where have they been? Nowhere. There is absolutely stone silence. Indeed, in response to the chortles of the member for Bragg, who joins with his colleague in not worrying about the effect of the recession on South Australia, on the contrary, their spokesperson at the national level is making statements that these changes are not quick enough.

The close colleague and friend from the South-East of the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Ian McLachlan, says, 'Not quick enough. I want this industry dismantled immediately and not by slow cuts and death over the next few years.' I

am prepared—and I am concluding on this point, Mr Speaker—to stand up and take responsibility in those areas in which I have responsibility; I am prepared to analyse those reasons: but I am not prepared to listen to hypocrisy from a Party that wants to cut expenditure while they spend and a Party that wants to look after industry while they support policies to cut tariffs to the bone. It is unacceptable. This House will not cop it, nor will the public of South Australia.

SEWERAGE PROJECTS

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Water Resources indicate whether the programs to provide sewerage systems in the Mount Lofty Ranges have been upgraded to coincide with other environmental initiatives outlined in the draft management plan she has released?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am very pleased to inform the House that the remaining unsewered pockets of Stirling South-West will be sewered this year using \$1 million that I have allocated for Hills sewerage works from the environmental levy program. This program and policy will target the high pollution areas to be decided after consultation with the local council and will be more cost effective as the E&WS Department will be able to deal with groups of sewerage connections.

The E&WS Department will provide householders with a timetable outlining when their area is likely to be sewered. Once Stirling South-West is completed, Aldgate North and Piccadilly will become top priorities. I believe that all members of this Parliament as well as the local members will welcome this announcement of policy direction. This follows closely on the announcement that work will begin this month on a \$2.7 million upgrading of the Hahndorf sewage treatment works.

I would also like to remind members that other projects involving sewerage in the Hills include the expenditure of up to \$791 500 towards the cost of constructing the Kersbrook septic tank effluent disposal scheme and an investigation into upgrading operations at Gumeracha which is expected to be completed by June this year. I have highlighted those works because they form part of the ongoing package which this Government is supporting and implementing with a view to improving not only the amenity for Hills residents but also the water quality in the Hills catchment area.

CREDIT RATING

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Treasurer. In the light of today's credit rating reduction by Moody's, what explanation does the Treasurer have for telling the House last week that the Standard and Poor's negative credit rating review was 'nothing new' and merely 'reproduced in an annual report' when, in fact, the report released last week was its monthly ratings bulletin for April 1992? The report claims that our net debt was \$7.8 billion last June rather than the \$6.6 billion reported by the Treasury. Standard and Poor's explain their negative credit outlook for South Australia as based on the Government's failure 'to reduce costs and slow the growth of program expenditures which do not appear to stabilise State indebtedness in 1992-93 or to gradually restore the financial position of the State'.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I agree that it is difficult for the Deputy Leader when he is programmed into doing

something that is typed out for him to actually change in mid-stream, but in the light of that question I can well understand why we will see him sitting on that bench on the Opposition side for only another week.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. I warn the Deputy Leader.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think the Deputy Leader asked a question about the Standard and Poor's item last week. It was certainly raised in this place because I remember responding to the content of it. The item summarised their position on their annual review, and there was nothing new in what they said about South Australia. The very comments that the Deputy Leader quotes in his programmed question were, in fact, the very issues that I addressed a moment ago in response to the Leader of the Opposition. I do not know what he was doing; he was probably trying to work out how to pronounce some of the words in the question.

WOOMERA HOSPITAL

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): My question is directed to the Minister of Transport representing the Minister of Health. Will the Minister advise whether any decision has yet been reached by the Federal Government regarding the future of the Woomera Hospital? I have been contacted by the Port Augusta Hospital board, which has an interest in this matter, to ascertain whether a decision has yet been reached or when it is likely that it will be reached.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will refer that question to my colleague the Minister of Health on his return from the ministerial conference.

MEDICARE

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): Does the Premier agree with the majority of governments around Australia that the Medicare system has failed; that, in the words of the Western Australian Health Minister at yesterday's Health Ministers' conference, the system is unjust on the basis of access to the public health system; and what position does he intend to take at the Premiers Conference on 11 May to avoid further decay in the public health system? At yesterday's meeting of Health Ministers in Sydney the Health Ministers of New South Wales, Tasmania, the Northern Territory and Western Australia voiced strong opposition to entering a Medicare agreement without a clear role being identified for private health insurance. Our Minister of Health appears to have been silent on this.

The Western Australian Health Minister was quoted as talking of elderly people in pain being unable to get hip replacement surgery in a public hospital. The most recent figures available show that the percentage of South Australians with private health insurance has declined from 70 per cent in 1984 to just under 40 per cent last year, confirming widespread doubts about the future viability and equity of the public health system.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: One of the spending shadow Ministers gets to his feet, and I am delighted to hear from him but, before he starts asking me questions, perhaps he should sort out the internal blue within the Liberal Party about whether it wants to spend or save.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Well, he can try to hand it out, Mr Speaker, but he wants to shout me down.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Adelaide is out of order. I warn the member for Adelaide.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not recall interrupting the honourable member when he was asking his question, despite the inflammatory way he asked it; but, be that as it may, if he cannot cope, he had better calm down.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much background noise.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: A number of vital questions relating to Medicare are under discussion at the Health Ministers' conference at the moment and, following the report I get from the Deputy Premier when he returns, we will determine the position we will take at the Premiers Conference on 11 May. However, my advice is that Commonwealth, Victorian, South Australian, Queensland and ACT Ministers have all reaffirmed their commitment to the fundamental principles of Medicare. So, our position is clear: in fundamental terms, the Medicare system is right: it is a correct approach to health care and we support it. It is true that Liberal Health Ministers from Tasmania, New South Wales and Western Australia have not endorsed that commitment, but that is not our position and, in attempting to suggest it is, the honourable member is wrong.

I might say that the Liberal Party is all about dismantling this, because it believes in the privatisation of health services; it believes that every person should be forced into private health insurance, and at the same time it will whack 15 per cent on the cost of everything everyone has to buy. We reject that agenda. We believe that social justice and equity are fundamental parts of any health system and, if the honourable member is disavowing the policy of his colleagues at the national level, I would like to hear from him.

PORT ADELAIDE LANES

Mr De LAINE (Price): Can the Minister of Lands inform the House of the situation in relation to the ownership of and responsibility for the maintenance of the many narrow lanes at the rear of residential properties in the Port Adelaide area? Many narrow lanes still exist in the Port Adelaide area. These lanes were initially established to allow night carts to remove sewage. The lanes are a nuisance to residents, because they allow access for thieves, people dump rubbish in them and they become overgrown with weeds. Local councils state that they do not own them but do not know who does. They say that the responsibility rests with the residents, but many of these people are elderly and cannot physically keep them tidy or pay someone else to do so.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for the question. I am sure that this applies to other members who represent reasonably old areas. I have done some investigative work on this issue and advice from my colleague the Minister for Local Government Relations indicates that most lanes in the area were created in the 1800s for service access, as the honourable member has said, to the original subdivision and therefore the lanes are the property of the original private developers.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I was accused last night of being a school teacher, but I would have thought that that is fine. Obviously it is not possible, because of the time lapse since the 1800s, to trace the owners and to work out who owns those laneways. Port Adelaide council has shown

appreciation for the problem associated with the lanes and I understand that ideally its solution is that it would like to declare the lanes as public roads, subsequently close them and then offer them for sale, possibly to the adjacent land-owners. Therefore, I am prepared to ask the Department of Lands to assist the council with this proposal. However, as you would know, Mr Speaker, as your electorate is under this council area, many lanes are used for access to adjoining properties and residents would not support their closure. I understand that the Port Adelaide council is exploring alternatives for the future maintenance of the private lanes. The short answer is that there will probably be a mixture of the two solutions and we will do everything as a Government to facilitate a solution to this ongoing problem.

HOSPITAL WAITING LISTS

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): In view of the Premier's statement just now about social justice, equity and health care, how can he justify the financial constraints—that is, the rationing of access to our public hospital system—which means that a 75 year old pensioner, needing a second knee replacement, has to wait three years for an operation, which his doctor said in October 1990 was needed urgently? A constituent of mine, Mr Bill Hiscock, has written to me concerning a series of letters and telephone calls he has had with the Royal Adelaide Hospital regarding his knee surgery. After a considerable number of communications, he eventually had the knee, originally diagnosed as the better one, replaced in February this year. However, he has been told that the original bad knee, which was said to need urgent attention in October 1990, has drastically degenerated further in the meantime, and he will have to wait 15 months or more for further surgery. His letter concludes:

Now the Government system is holding up the operation another one and a half years—
that is three years—
it surely isn't right. It certainly is not fair.

I have done my best to help—what about you?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In relation to the individual case mentioned by the honourable member, if he can provide those details I will certainly follow it up and see what can or cannot be done in that instance. The extent to which one can deal with the burgeoning demand for and access to health services depends on the funding available for it. If we follow the international ratings agency option, the 10 per cent suggested by the Leader of the Opposition, or we forced everyone, including presumably constituents of the honourable member, into private health insurance, perhaps those fortunate enough to be able to pay may get access. They can do that anyway. We have a good private health and hospital system. People can take out health insurance and get immediate access. In the cases where they cannot, the public system comes in.

With regard to the funding question, I can certainly justify what I said a moment ago about supporting the basic principles of Medicare. It is an appropriate system. As the Minister of Health said yesterday, there are nonetheless a number of issues that must be addressed in the next round of negotiations for a further agreement. Patient access to hospitals and better funding from the Commonwealth and through Medicare for the hospital system are vital, and they are on the agenda. It is not a situation of our saying, 'Yes, we like the system and we like it as it is', because that is certainly not the case. Many improvements can be made to it.

Much better funding should be provided, and that is under negotiation at the moment. The Ministers of Health have agreed to refer that to heads of Government and the Premiers Conference for further consideration. In the meantime, it is a far better alternative than tearing it up, scrapping the system and going back to the old style that the Liberals would like to do which would see constituents such as the one mentioned by the honourable member far worse off than they are at present.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

WESTERN SUBURBS YOUTH STRATEGY

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education provide the House with details of Government strategies to assist disadvantaged young people in the western suburbs of Adelaide?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I certainly thank the honourable member for his continued interest in this issue. A number of excellent programs are currently being run in the western region. However, the one I would like to specifically refer to today is 'Chain Reaction', a youth strategy. It is a joint Commonwealth-State Government initiative presented by the Western Youth Strategy of State Youth Affairs and the Adelaide West Region of the Department of Employment, Education and Training. Ms Helen Swift, the State Director of DEET, and I officially launched the Chain Reaction campaign last year. Since then the program has provided opportunities for a considerable number of young people in that area. Chain Reaction is made up of a series of smaller projects—small but, I think, important, particularly for the individuals involved, who are specifically disadvantaged individuals.

To give an idea of the flavour of the scheme, recently a joint initiative between the Adelaide Toast Masters Club and the Western Youth Strategy provided an opportunity for 12 young women from Seaton High School to be involved in a youth leadership program. All of the young women involved in the course were presented with certificates on 11 February 1992. The program obviously increased the confidence and skills of the young women and demonstrated to me the community's desire to work positively with young people in the area. Another successful program run under Chain Reaction saw 10 young Aboriginal people successfully gain their driver's licence. The Aboriginal young people, supported by community elders and agency project officers, experienced an enormous boost to their pride and self-esteem as a result of this project. The acquisition of their driver's licence has also removed a very real barrier to their seeking employment in the future.

The Adelaide West Region of DEET has been successful in securing funds to develop and implement a national business and education pilot project in the western suburbs. The program's central aim is to bring business and education sectors together to assist youth. The project will operate on several levels and will have a number of components. For example, the training and development opportunities for teachers, which will include work placements in industry in order to increase the relevance of schooling to the work ethic and to increase the knowledge of students about the world of work; seminars for the business community to raise awareness of the education sector and to explore potential partnership projects; workshops for young people focusing on the development of competencies and attitudes required and valued by industry and society as we move towards the twenty-first century; and numerous regional

projects which will be exemplars of how the education and business sectors can work together to provide exciting educational opportunities for young people. Members will no doubt agree that this is just another of the many exciting initiatives aimed at young people in the western region. I certainly encourage all members to support this excellent youth initiative.

PUBLIC HOSPITAL SYSTEM

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): How can the Premier justify his system of financial constraints to our public hospitals which prevents a woman constituent of mine from receiving a prompt and urgently needed biopsy to determine the appropriate surgery to treat suspected breast cancer? My constituent, who came to see me today, learned of possible breast cancer from a mammogram on 21 March. The earliest appointment she could get at Flinders Medical Centre was yesterday but, on attending the hospital, she was told that, because of financial constraints, the necessary facilities were not then available to obtain the mammary tissue needed for assessment. She is very distressed, as is her husband, who told me that they were advised that the next earliest appointment to determine the presence of cancer and the remedial action to be taken was two weeks. That is six weeks after the original diagnosis of this condition in which, from personal experience I can say, every day counts.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Neither I nor anyone else should make an attempt to justify that situation if it is as described by the honourable member. If it is deemed by the medical advisers that urgent treatment is necessary, then urgent treatment must be and will be provided. I invite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is a fact.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If there is an urgency or if it is an emergency, it will be and must be dealt with. That is not to say that, in some instances with the thousands and thousands of patients, situations do not arise where that is not happening. I will refer that matter to my colleague as a matter of urgency on behalf of the honourable member because that situation should not arise, funding constraints or not. Medical judgments have to be made in these cases, these judgments are given effect to and the hospitals are funded to ensure that that happens.

ARTS FUNDING

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I direct my question to the Minister for Environment and Planning, representing the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage in another place. What is the Minister's intention regarding future funding to the arts industry in South Australia? Today I accepted a petition for presentation to Parliament containing approximately 4 300 signatures protesting any future funding cuts to the arts industry in South Australia. There is a belief that future funding for the arts will be cut by between 10 and 15 per cent to a level which would be a major blow, not only to the arts but to tourism and employment in this State.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: In response to the honourable member's question, it is important to put on the public record that the allocation of money to the Department for

the Arts and Cultural Heritage will be dealt with in exactly the same way as the allocation to all other departments, that is, in the budgetary discussions carried out around the Cabinet table. However, as this is not my area of responsibility, I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place for her response.

WORKCOVER

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): In the light of today's Full Court decision, will the Minister of Labour as a matter of urgency now support Opposition amendments on the second year review process to the WorkCover Bill before Parliament, which, unless redressed, will cost WorkCover \$120 million in past liabilities and a further \$50 million a year from now on, thus making the WorkCover scheme unviable? With your concurrence, Mr Speaker, and that of the House, I seek leave to explain.

Mr Hamilton: Question!

The SPEAKER: Order! Question has been put. I call the Minister of Labour.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park is out of order. The Minister of Labour.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I am aware that at 9.45 this morning three judges appeared in the Supreme Court and indicated that they dismissed the appeal of the WorkCover organisation against the decision by Justice Mullighan in an earlier hearing on 12 November when he dismissed an appeal by WorkCover against the decision of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Tribunal.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The bosses' lackey from Mount Gambier who wants to see workers deprived of everything and is fond of slinging insults across the Chamber ought to listen and so should the member for Bragg in this matter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair cannot hear the response. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

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

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Mr Speaker, they are demonstrating their ignorance and their lack of understanding. The reasons for the decision are quite complex, and have been and are still being studied to ascertain their effect. My advice is that the nodding member for Bragg ought to understand that the proposals that he has been trumpeting at the moment are themselves cast in doubt by the decision.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

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

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Bragg wants to jump in before he knows what he is talking about. He has demonstrated that amply today and frequently in the past. As I said, we need to wait and find out what the decision is about. It has been studied and, when the full ramifications of the decision are understood, we will be taking appropriate action.

LOCUSTS

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Can the Minister of Agriculture outline to the House the latest situation in regard to the increasing number of locusts sighted in the

State's agricultural areas and indicate what action is being taken by the Department of Agriculture to combat this problem? With your leave, Sir, and that of the House, I will briefly—

An honourable member: Question!

The SPEAKER: Order! 'Question' has been called. The honourable Minister of Agriculture.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I thank the member for Napier for his question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Albert Park.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I appreciate the concern of the member for Napier, who is concerned about what might be a threat of further locust infestation not only in rural areas: there will always be the possibility of locusts coming down into the metropolitan area, although I know that that has not happened for many years, the last occasion having been in 1950 or shortly before that. However, the situation as of this morning, following earlier reports this month about locusts being sighted over the border from Queensland, is that there have been sightings of a small swarm near the Hawker airstrip, dispersed over an area of 80 square kilometres, at Quorn in the Richmond Valley—

An honourable member: A small swarm?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The notes that I have say it is a small swarm, but I have to say that an 80 square kilometre swarm does not seem that small.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Murray-Mallee will not interject, and the Minister will direct his remarks through the Chair.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: My apologies, Mr Speaker. It does say that it was dispersed over that area, rather than being one entity, I suppose. Near the Richmond Valley, near Quorn, another small swarm was laying eggs over an area of approximately eight square kilometres, and currently under investigation are reported swarms at Parachilna, Hollowillena, Nectar Brook and Ucolta. In other parts we are currently investigating landowner reports in the Minnipa and Streaky Bay areas. Small swarms have been reported at Hamley and Crystal Brook. Also, it has been reported that dispersed adults passed through Yamba yesterday, heading south.

The concern at this stage is not so much with the actual sightings that have taken place, because they themselves can be controlled, but that they will lay eggs, which will then hatch and develop into adults in the spring, resulting in the spectre of an invasion in the central areas of the Lower North, Yorke Peninsula and Eyre Peninsula regions. That will be highly dependent upon weather conditions and the amount of green feed available in the spring. But it is important that we know as soon as possible where sightings are being made so that the department can work with farmers to have reactive measures organised—particularly spraying measures—to prevent further migrations of new generations of locusts in the spring. Forecasts from the Australian Plague Locusts Commission are that further migrating locusts from south-west Queensland may arrive in the Flinders Ranges in mid-May.

In terms of countering the spectre of a locust plague, we are very dependent upon sighting reports from landowners or anyone else who happens to see a locust swarm. I strongly recommend that all members who have an interest in this matter advise producers in their area to report swarms as soon as possible, because that helps us to know where locusts may be hatching their eggs and where we can most effectively target our spraying programs to prevent any further outbreak of locusts in the area. At this stage, there

have been no reports of crop damage, as there are no crops in the relevant areas—they are still in the seeding stage—but we are seeing some damage to native pastures in the areas where locusts are presently reported.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Will the Treasurer admit that any increase in the \$36 million payment to SGIC to make up for illegal interfund loans will be used to cover up for continuing losses on investments such as 333 Collins Street; and, instead of supplying taxpayers' capital, despite SGIC's Government guarantee, why will the Treasurer not sack Mr Kean and Mr Gerschwitz, who are responsible for the commission's losses of around \$100 million?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Last August, I think, I made a statement about the capitalisation of SGIC. I pointed out that, despite what Opposition members have been saying in their criticism of SGIC over many years, it was not using taxpayers' money and had not a cent of taxpayers' money in it. The money that was used to establish SGIC was repaid. Apparently, now that that has been pointed out, it is of no interest or moment any more. The Opposition is saying, 'Sorry about that; we were wrong. We thought it was. Now let's resume our attack on SGIC.' SGIC has been an extremely important institution for this State. It has delivered results both in terms of keeping the—

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Bad ones, says the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

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

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would have thought he would have some concern for the motorists of South Australia and the premiums they have paid over many years. In relation to the need or request for capital, the Government has the matter under consideration following the investigation by the Government Management Board. It has been fully canvassed and we have had a select committee—we have been through all of that.

In respect of the \$36 million figure, the honourable member does not remind us, as I thought she would in the interests of justice, that the Opposition was using a figure of \$100 million or more. Did she acknowledge that? Not a bit of it. Dishonestly, she says 'in addition to the \$36 million'. We can forget about yesterday's story of the \$100 million, which is actually \$36 million. So, there is that little aspect. Last night, in reference to the select committee report, I canvassed the whole question of capitalisation. So, I do not believe that we should be wasting the time of the Parliament now.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In relation to the second part of the question, this is part of a campaign that the honourable member has waged against two particular individuals in SGIC. Notice has been given of a motion that will allow that question to be fully debated. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition wants to use it also. All I can say is that the select committee did not discover or reveal anything—nor the Government Management Board, whose overall conclusion was that SGIC had been well and efficiently managed—that to my mind suggested that either of those individuals

that the honourable member has targeted should be dismissed, sacked or disgraced in the way in which she is suggesting.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Mr Kean has a term of office as the Chairman of SGIC, and he is entitled to serve out that term. That was passed by this House last night under the Bill that has gone to another place. If he chooses to relinquish his responsibility at some time, he will say so. I am sure that he will act ethically and honestly, because that is Mr Kean's reputation—an ethical and honest man.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Coles.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member says that is not a public perception. That is because people like the honourable member are trying to spread the perception that he is some sort of a crook or a person who is not looking after the interests of the community. I repeat that Mr Kean has a high reputation. He is a very active Catholic layman, as I understand it, and has been involved in charitable and other enterprises in this city. So, if the honourable member wants to smear or traduce him, all I can say is that those matters have been covered in the Government Management Board report, and she should confine herself to that. The situation in relation to Mr Gerschwitz is similar. He will retire; that has been announced and a successor is being sought. The honourable member is not content with that; she—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —wants a head on the salver now. That is what she wants. Perhaps it is appropriate that that is the line she wishes to take, but I do not see in what way she is assisting the State, its finances, the health of SGIC or the community by asking questions such as that.

ADELAIDE FLOWER MARKET

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Can the Minister of Agriculture report on the progress of the Adelaide Flower Market project and indicate whether the Government is supporting the development of a horticultural industry in South Australia? The Adelaide Flower Market commenced operations in April 1991, as a direct result of the number of leading growers who were concerned about the future of their industry. The lack of a wholesale flower market in Adelaide was seen to be holding back the development of the industry in South Australia, resulting in poor flower distribution and high distribution costs and holding back the growth of flower consumption.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question, which is very pertinent, because today is the first anniversary of the Adelaide Flower Market. I was pleased to be at the celebrations there this morning, because indeed the growers are very happy with the progress that has been made. I know the member for Victoria—the Leader of the Opposition—was there last year on the occasion of the market's official opening.

What we have seen happen is a group of flower growers in South Australia realising that there was potential for this industry but that it was largely untapped potential, because there were problems in the mechanism for efficiently getting flowers from growers to resellers. A lot of money was being wasted and, as a result of that, maximum prices were not being received by growers, nor were resellers for their part

getting access to as good a range of floriculture products as possible. So, they established this Adelaide Flower Market and I may say that credit should go to the Minister of Transport and the Department of Road Transport, who enabled the people concerned to access some facilities at Mile End which they rent. They did have some assistance for the first few months, as any start-up business might seek, and it is now working very well. As with all such enterprises, one would expect the first year to be cash flow negative, and I understand that is the case, but they are looking forward to a much better situation in 1992 with respect to—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: It will blossom.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, it will blossom, in the words of the Minister of Transport. This gives us an opportunity for enhancing the floriculture industry in South Australia. It is worth noting that 40 per cent of the flowers sold in South Australia come from interstate and a reasonable percentage of the production of South Australian flower growers goes interstate. A large proportion of those interstate imports and exports are being dealt with through the Adelaide Flower Market. Indeed, even some of the export overseas is being dealt with through the Adelaide Flower Market. We still have a long way to go on that; we export only 2 or 3 per cent of our flower production and we could do a lot more. Dutch authorities—the world flower trading authorities—speculate that by the year 2000 the volume of flower trade will grow 50 per cent on the present figures and the value will double on the present figures, so we need to be a part of that market, and we cannot be until the industry feels that it is efficiently structuring itself. The Adelaide Flower Market is an important part of that process.

The Department of Agriculture and the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology are both offering support for further development. We are offering to help organise a trade mission to Europe later this year to visit the Floriade flower exhibition—the pre-eminent flower show in Europe—and to organise contacts with other merchants in Europe. We are presently ascertaining grower interest in participating in such a trade mission. We are looking at extension services to flower growers and the like. I congratulate the Adelaide Flower Market, Trevor Kean (its Chairman), the board of directors and the growers—who take up some 90 per cent of the space at the flower market—and the reselling industry that has so quickly taken that market to its heart and is using it very successfully to the benefit of both growers and resellers.

UNLEY SHOPPING CENTRE

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): My question is directed to the Minister of Housing and Construction. In view of his statement to this House on 2 April that he accepts the processes followed to obtain planning approval for the Unley Shopping Centre redevelopment and that he will 'respect them as a responsible citizen and a member of Parliament', why is he still attempting to stop this project? I have in my possession a copy of the agenda of the annual meeting of the Unley sub-branch of the Labor Party to be held on 27 April. It has been provided by a member of the Labor Party who has told the Opposition that he is seriously concerned that the Minister is still determined to have public housing built on this site.

I have been informed that, by lawful decision of the Unley council, upheld by the Planning Commission, this project has received all necessary approvals and the Minister has told the House he respects the approval processes. How-

ever, this agenda now reveals that the Minister intends to co-opt the Labor Party in a campaign to have the council withdraw from the redevelopment.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Newland for her question as it gives me a great opportunity to highlight again her inadequacy as a member. If she sticks around for a while, I will have another go. It is pathetic. If the honourable member had read the resolution as proposed, she would know that it refers to the public meeting at which residents and ratepayers of Unley, tenants and shopkeepers called upon the Unley council to withdraw its support and review the shopping centre development for an appropriate shopping centre development to be placed there. Obviously the honourable member does not understand when she has lost. She should have given up weeks ago, but she bobs up again.

The residents of Unley have called on the Unley council, as they have a full and proper right to do, and have asked me and Mr Taeho Paik to convey to the Unley council, as we have done, the request that it reconsider the awful Z grade development that will be placed on prime land in the heart of Unley. The honourable member would be astonished if she were in my office and witnessed the number of letters, telephone calls and inquiries, or witnessed the number of people stopping me in the streets of Unley and saying, 'Good on you, Mayesy! Get out of there and stop this awful development which is destroying our area.' If she knew about that, she would not bob up today to get another belting, but she will get it and, if she stays around, I have another one coming for her.

EDUCATION ATTAINMENT LEVELS

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Education tell the House what the Education Department's new scheme attainment levels will achieve for students and parents? I am aware that a new education system was trialled at a number of schools, including a school in my electorate last year, and that other schools are looking at this system this year.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for her question and her interest in this aspect of education. Some 95 schools were involved last year in the trialling and acting as reference schools for this new assessment system. I am pleased that one of the primary schools in Port Pirie was involved in this project. I understand that the trials proved valuable and ensured that classroom teachers could put their own practical experience and expertise into developing this system for the benefit of students, teachers and parents throughout South Australia. The system of attainment levels will be further tested this year.

It is aimed at reporting to parents and the community what children know and can do at different stages of their schooling. The new 'attainment levels' project will complement traditional school reports to parents and provide a clearer picture of educational achievements in schools at a State-wide level. This year, teachers, particularly those in primary schools, will become familiar with the attainment levels project. Next year, secondary school teachers will become more familiar with the system. The attainment levels will be fully implemented in all primary and secondary schools for students from reception to year 10 from 1994.

When fully implemented, it will mean parents, teachers and students and the community as a whole will know at what level children are achieving in key study areas. There is a growing demand in South Australia, nationally and

internationally, from parents, industry and educators themselves, for schools to show what students know, understand and can do during their school years. The introduction of attainment levels for students from reception to year 10 over the next two years will mean:

- Students will be set clear goals for learning in the key study areas.
- Teachers each year from reception to year 10 will report student attainment in one of six levels for each of the study areas.
- Teachers using the program will know how students are progressing and take educational action to ensure students can always aspire to do their personal best.
- Parents will continue to receive traditional school reports, while also being able to rate their child's progress in school against State-wide standards of what students can be expected to know, understand and can do at different stages in their schooling.
- Schools across South Australia will gain a clearer picture of student educational achievements so that the education system as a whole can better target where curriculum in particular areas can be strengthened or particular groups of disadvantaged students can be better assisted.

PUBLIC HOUSING ACCOMMODATION

Mr SUCH (Fisher): Contrary to popular rumour, I am still in the House!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will ask his question.

Mr SUCH: Does the Minister of Housing and Construction agree that there is a crisis in public housing accommodation in South Australia, and does he concede the need for radical change in public housing policy in view of the fact that 44 000 households are now waiting for Housing Trust accommodation? South Australian Housing Trust figures reveal that, in 1989-90, 1 417 houses or units were built for rental and 437 for purchase, but this financial year the figures are 995 for rental and only 55 for purchase.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: What an extraordinary question from a member of the Opposition. He may have wished he was not in the House and did not ask the question after he has heard the answer. If the Federal Liberal Party attains Government, its policy will annihilate public housing. There will be \$425 million taken directly off the housing budget of \$1 billion. In addition, to compensate for the GST when it is introduced, the miserable \$2 000 that will be offered to families with an income of \$40 000 or less will mean a further \$175 million will come off. Sixty per cent of the funds provided by a Federal Liberal Government under its policy will be sliced off public housing.

The Federal Opposition spokesman on housing, following a question directed to me in this House as to what it would mean for public housing in this country if the Federal Opposition won Government, agreed in the *Australian* and in the House of Representatives that he would have to encourage State authorities to sell off public housing in order to maintain just the quality of standard maintenance on existing rentals. For South Australia, that means about 1 000 houses per year. That would mean our stock would reduce progressively by 1 000 per year just to provide the funds to service and maintain the remaining stock as it gradually dwindled. We would see a massive explosion of people on the public housing list. Moreover, we would see an explosion which would add extraordinarily to that list. We would have a situation similar to that which has applied

under the policies of Thatcher and Major, with people in the street.

That is the policy that this Opposition is tied to and supports: I have not heard one member of the Opposition say that Dr Hewson's policies are wrong. It is an absolute cheek for the honourable member to get up here today and criticise this Government, which has done more for public housing in its 10 years in office than has any other Government.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MINISTER'S REMARKS

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr MATTHEW: I was offended by allegations made by the Minister for Environment and Planning in a statement to Parliament today on the subject of the Port Stanvac Oil Refinery. The Minister misrepresented me by stating:

Unfortunately, the anger and concern [expressed by me] was not based on fact. The facts are indeed quite different from those presented by the member for Bright who, on two occasions, told the Parliament that the buffer distance between the refinery and the northern residential zone is 350 metres.

The facts are these. The Minister quoted from the *Hansard* proof, which is clearly marked 'Confidential and Subject to Revision'. A few minutes ago I spoke to the Leader of *Hansard* who is holding the tape of statements I made in Parliament yesterday. That tape shows clearly that I said 'within 350 metres of the Port Stanvac Oil Refinery land'—not the oil refinery. That tape is being held for the Minister, should she so desire to listen to what was said. I remind the Minister that the *Hansard* proof is marked 'Confidential and Subject to Revision'.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bright is beginning to debate the issue.

Mr MATTHEW: Thank you, Mr Speaker. In her statement, the Minister also said:

The member for Bright has embarked on a campaign of misinformation and created unnecessary concern among local residents.

Mr FERGUSON: I rise on a point of order, Sir. I submit to you, Sir, that this is not a personal explanation. The honourable member is attempting to debate as he would in a second reading speech.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has already brought the attention of the member for Bright to the need to comply with Standing Orders with regard to personal explanations. I again remind him of the need to be specific and not to debate the issue. His comments must be pertinent.

Mr MATTHEW: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The Minister finished by accusing me of causing unnecessary concern to residents. Again, I was offended by these statements.

Mr FERGUSON: I rise on another point of order. The honourable member is disregarding the suggestion that you put to him, Sir, and is continuing with debate.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will make that decision. Once again, I draw the member for Bright's attention to the need to be pertinent with his remarks.

Mr MATTHEW: I was about to say, Sir, that the Minister again misrepresented my comments to Parliament. I said:

Senior management at the refinery have told me that they can live with the buffer but the people who move to the land in that location will be aware of the refinery's presence. They have told me, 'The residents will hear us and smell us, and we would rather they were further away.'

I stand by my comments.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: Order! The question before the Chair is that the House note grievances.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): The first question today to the Premier concerned Moody's downgrading. It has become known in this State as the Moody's downgrade because it is the second time since May that South Australia has been downgraded. The Premier has been Treasurer of this State for 10 years and in that time the rating has dropped from AAA to AA1 and now AA2. What a record! I asked the Premier whether he thought it was his responsibility that Moody's had downgraded South Australia's credit rating. That question was asked specifically because Moody's criticised the policy direction of this Government; yet, the Premier walked away from any responsibility. However, let me quote from *Hansard* of Remembrance Day (11 November) 1987.

It was a Dorothy Dix question by the then Mr Klunder, now the honourable Minister, and of course it was a question from one person who is financially irresponsible to another of the same ilk. This is the Minister who lost \$60 million of taxpayers' money under his ministership and then blamed management. How arrogant can one be? Mr Speaker, this is the Dorothy Dix question the member asked:

Can the Premier give the House details of the credit rating of South Australia, and particularly that of the State Bank of South Australia? I am aware that Moody's Investor Service of New York recently visited South Australia to assess the State Bank operations and to examine our credit rating for the purposes of raising money on the international market. As a credit rating from Moody's is a reflection of the condition . . . of the State's economy and particularly the strength of the State's finances . . .

That was an open chequebook for the Treasurer who got up and waffled on for about the first five minutes and then said:

Therefore, what is said about an institution like the State Bank relates directly, of course, in the creditworthiness of the Government of South Australia and its other instrumentalities, such as SAFA . . .

There we have it. Moody's reflects directly onto the Government of South Australia and its creditworthiness. The Premier went on for a few more minutes and then said:

Naturally, in the course of that assessment it had some very favourable things to say about the State Bank and, by implication, the Government, which acts as the bank's guarantors.

The Premier then finished up, with his normal reply to Dorothy Dixers on Remembrance Day 1987, as follows:

I would have thought that members opposite would join me in congratulating the State Bank on that achievement and start pulling back from some of the carping, undermining criticisms that they wish to make.

That is the Treasurer of South Australia on Remembrance Day 1987. More interestingly, Mr A.R. (Bert) Prowse, Chairman, SAFA, said on 25 August 1988, in the Chairman's statement:

It was another highlight of our year, although not unexpected, that the international rating agency Moody's Investor Service awarded SAFA the highest long-term rating of AAA, for its offshore \$A bond issue . . .

These are the people who are now trying to walk away from responsibility. It was very easy to take it then and say how good things were going, but already we were asking questions and the Treasurer was saying that we were undermining and carping.

It was the Treasurer's financial mismanagement and that of his Government that put this State into the financial position it is in—and no-one else. Moody's has reviewed that and, for the second time in 12 months, it has down-

graded South Australia. The taxpayers of South Australia will have to pay \$46.8 million for that downgrading and it will impact on hospitals and waiting lists, as we heard today from the member for Murray-Mallee; it will impact on all the schools of South Australia and on the number of teachers we can employ in this State; and it will impact on law and order and on the children in this State because it will impact on the number of police we can employ. This Treasurer has bankrupted South Australia and is now expecting us to believe that it is not his fault. This Government is incompetent and, until it is thrown out of office, South Australians will suffer.

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The members for Custance and Walsh are out of order.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): In the 13 years that I have been in this Parliament—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON:—today was the first time that I have ever called 'question' on a member in this House.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Why was that?

Mr HAMILTON: I did it because of the manner in which I was treated last night in a debate in this House. In eight minutes, seven points of order were called by the member for Bragg and the member for Bright. On each occasion you, Sir, quite properly pointed out that there was no point of order. That took up a considerable amount of my time. As I indicated during my contribution to the House last night, I will be distributing copies of the *Hansard* relating to this matter throughout my electorate to show that this is an Opposition that purports to believe in the democratic system. From those contributions last night, it obviously does not.

Members opposite attempted to frustrate me on a very important matter, about which they profess to be concerned—vandalism and graffiti. I know that I cannot canvass those issues because the Bill is before the House, but the fact of the matter is that those members frustrated me either deliberately or knowingly. If it was knowingly, it is even worse. I was attempting to lay before the Parliament, the people of South Australia and, in particular, my constituents a matter to which I have had a commitment ever since I came into this place. I note that you are nodding in agreement, Sir.

Those seven points of order have denied me the opportunity to put to this House what I believe is my entitlement as the properly elected member for the district of Albert Park. On one occasion, one honourable member opposite, who, like the proverbial Paddy's dog, can dish it out but cannot take it and who is the brunt of many jokes on this side of the House about his sensitivity, raised a point of order. In doing so, he said:

I again draw your attention to Standing Order 127. While the member for Albert Park did not say which member he was calling stupid or which member was sitting with a sickly grin on his face, it was certainly a reflection on someone on this side of the Chamber, and I take exception to it.

Well, if the cap fits, he can wear it, and obviously he was prepared to wear it.

Let us return to more serious matters. In all the time I have been in this Parliament, the Opposition—and members opposite can check the record—would know full well that it is a rare occasion on which I take a point of order. However, if that is the path down which members of the Opposition want to go, so be it. It is not something that I

agree with, but I know that other members on the other side disagree strongly with the tactics that were employed last night by the two aforementioned members. I believe that they stand condemned in the eyes of this Parliament.

In my view, they have debased the privilege that I have as a duly elected member of this place for some 13 years. Never once have I called 'Question'. I give notice that, if those members continue down that path, they will leave me no alternative but to express my anger on behalf of my constituents in the only way I can democratically do so, and that is in the manner in which I did so today. Quite properly, Sir, you warned me about my interjection. It occurred because of my frustration, and I apologise for it. However, the facts of the matter are that people's limits can be tested to a certain extent. They were tested last night. I do not like taking on members.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: That stupid noise coming from that person opposite is a reflection on his inability to allow someone else to express their point of view in this Parliament. As I have indicated, my constituents will be made well aware of the attempts to deny me, as their local representative, the opportunity to express my point of view in this Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morphett.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morphett.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before the member for Morphett commences, I will say that the next member who interjects across the Chamber will be dealt with. The member for Morphett.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): This afternoon, I would like to respond to a ministerial statement made yesterday by the Minister of Recreation and Sport on the South Australian Sports Institute. The questions that have been raised in the past two weeks have their origins over the past three years. If the Minister were not in a state of panic and could distance himself from his siege mentality, he would admit that all the Opposition's questions regarding the Sports Institute have a historical base and do not contain any criticism of the current administration of the Sports Institute.

Indeed, I am on the public record twice over the past couple of weeks as giving my full support to the Acting Director of the Sports Institute. They are dedicated and professional people. The fundamental fact is that, following warnings from the Opposition since 1989 and particularly during the budget Estimates Committees last year that all was not well with the financial management of the institute, the Minister has continued to cover up what has been happening. It was the revelations in the institute's financial procedures audit that flushed out the problems into the public arena and lifted the lid on two years of cover up.

Whilst it is true that I received a copy of the audit report after the January break, the difference between my copy and the copy that the Minister tabled in the House were the damning written notes by the Acting CEO of the department, Peter Young, who also expressed his concern at the inadequate procedures (and in some cases unacceptable procedures) outlined in that report. Whether the Minister likes it or not, Mr Young vindicates the Opposition's questions since 1989. In 1989 the Minister assured the House, as follows:

... the CEO (of the department) will ensure that the business of the Sports Institute is conducted properly.

That clearly did not happen and, during that time, the Minister has failed to confront the issues of management and accountability. Whenever questioned, he turned the answer into bluster and abuse. The management style in the institute, which style has been tolerated in the past, has been difficult to comprehend. During that era we have seen open conflict between its Director, Mr Nunan, and Mr George Beltchev, the CEO. There has also been open conflict between Mr Nunan and the new Acting CEO, Peter Young. In addition, Mr Nunan has felt it necessary to go over the head of the Minister and of the CEO and appeal to his personal friend, the Premier, to get his own way. We have also had the spectacle of the Director of the institute urging sporting associations to write seeking the sacking of the Acting CEO, Mr Peter Young.

We then had the resignation of the highly respected Chairman, Mr Peter Bowen-Pain, followed by most of the members of the board complaining that they could not work for the Minister because of the bureaucracy. In return, he gave the board a tirade of abuse as a parting vote of thanks. On top of all of this, we now have the audit report, which the Minister tabled in the House. Last week, the Minister advised Parliament that he was keeping Mr Nunan's position open. Mr Nunan is currently on long service leave.

On the strength of that, sporting administrators would like to know the future of Neil McGachey and the new board members. The Sports Institute was set up by a Liberal Government and its future is assured under a Liberal Government. There is absolutely no reason why there should be any drop in morale amongst the staff. However, when the Opposition detects financial and administrative cover-ups on the part of Ministers, we will continue to ask legitimate questions, despite the abuse that is thrown back by those Ministers, designed to try to silence the Opposition.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Housing and Construction): I am pleased to have these few minutes to address the House and to place on record an important point made by a constituent of mine who has felt very aggrieved and disadvantaged by the attacks upon his person and his reputation by the member for Newland. Sadly, the honourable member is not here to hear these comments, but it is appropriate and important that they be recorded. The honourable member still has a very strong obligation to apologise publicly to Mr Paik for the outrageous, ill-informed and ill-researched information which she used against him. I have received a letter from Mr Paik: he feels so badly treated by the member for Newland that he has found it necessary to write to me to set the record straight. The member for Newland bobs up again today in an attempt to cover her path by coming up with a fatuous and absolutely pathetic question to me with regard to whether or not I accept the umpire's decision, using a resolution that has been proposed for the Unley sub-branch as some sort of foundation of fact to support her argument.

The Hon. J.P. Trainer: She hasn't got a leg to stand on.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Indeed, as quick as the member for Walsh is with his use of the Queen's English, she has not a leg to stand on. She should have taken on board the belting she got a couple of weeks ago when in this place she made a complete and utter fool of herself, attacking individuals without any information or research. She has since then endeavoured to brush it aside, and it is an extraordinary performance for a member and reflects the sort of people attracted to the Liberal Party, as also evidenced by those currently in this place. Sadly the older

members who showed some appropriate spirit in this place have gone. Mr Paik's letter states:

Dear Kym, I am writing to confirm to you my personal background, which, absurdly, seems recently to have become a matter of some interest to a particular Opposition Parliamentarian. I was born in Seoul, Korea, on 19 October 1957. I arrived in Australia in 1971 to attend Westminster School. After graduation from Adelaide University in 1982, I went to work in Asia for three years. I returned to Australia as a migrant in 1985. I was naturalised as an Australian citizen in 1988.

The Opposition constantly attacked Mr Paik's right to call a meeting of Unley residents. It was the old style Liberal Party philosophy coming out where one must have property ownership equating with a right to vote to give anyone a standing within the community. One cannot simply be a resident but must be a property owner: it is an extraordinarily archaic view expressed by the Opposition. I thought that we did away with that in our democracy many years ago, courtesy of a Labor Government, I would have thought.

Mr Quirke interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Playford reminds us that it was a huge fight. Irrespective of that, the old ugly attitude raises its head, like a phoenix. Mr Paik outlines that he has an absolute right because he is an Australian citizen. His letter continues:

I now live with my spouse, who is the owner of a house at 12 Hart Avenue, Unley.

I hope that the member for Newland is listening in her place because it is clear that the innuendo and accusations against Mr Paik were that he did not have a right to speak in Unley. I challenge that at any time. Anyone who resides in Unley or even drives through the streets has a right to be heard in our democracy. Members on this side will always defend that concept. Mr Paik further states:

We have a 12-week-old child. If any of your parliamentary colleagues would like to know more about me, they are welcome to contact me at their leisure and you have my permission to make available to them my contact number. As for conflict of interest, I believe this is an accusation that cannot be adequately defended without my being able to speak for myself. If the interested Parliamentarian wants to discuss it, I think I will be quite happy to talk to her.

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

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I rise to call on the Minister of Labour to recognise the very serious and urgent problem we have with the WorkCover scheme. Today three prominent justices in our State brought down a decision which, in the eyes of the General Manager of the WorkCover Corporation, will totally destroy the WorkCover scheme if the Act is not amended shortly. I will quote from evidence taken by the select committee to support my argument, as follows:

In the first 24 months of incapacity, the 'partial deemed total' provision means that a worker able to do some work, such as light or alternative duties, but where WorkCover cannot provide such work, is entitled to the full 100 per cent or 80 per cent benefit level as the case may be. Beyond 24 months of incapacity, however, the WorkCover system reduces benefits to partially incapacitated workers in accordance with their capacity to do any work, even if such work is not immediately available.

This critical aspect of the South Australian legislation is currently being challenged in review, and ultimately... Supreme Court and it has considerable, indeed I would say single, significance to the viability of the WorkCover scheme. If that provision is lost, the WorkCover scheme cannot be financially viable with its present level of funding. If it is maintained and upheld in the courts, I believe that the viability of the scheme is able to be achieved.

No more positive statement could come from anyone, including the General Manager of WorkCover, who has been involved directly with, first, the appeal to Mr Justice

Mullighan and now the second appeal to the Supreme Court. The result of the decision today means that \$120 million past liability will now have to be picked up by the scheme. That matter was put to the Minister of Labour by the Opposition approximately 18 months ago, when the select committee looked at the private member's Bill which I introduced in this House, and it is a position which has been put to the Minister of Labour I believe every week for the past 18 months but which has been ignored.

It was the view of many people in the legal profession that WorkCover wasted its money in going to appeal in the first case, and almost certainly has wasted huge amounts of money in going to appeal to the Supreme Court. Hardly anyone in the legal profession believed that the WorkCover Corporation had any chance of winning the review. We need to go back to 1986, when this amendment came before the House. Queens Counsel's advice to me suggested that this particular area was open for abuse and could cause long-term problems. When questioned, Minister Blevins, who was the Minister responsible at the time, told the Parliament that, if this was correct, we would need to change it immediately because otherwise it would have long-term ramifications on the scheme.

But still the Government will not recognise that, if this simple area is not fixed up, the whole workers compensation scheme in this State will fall over on a funding basis—not on an idealistic basis or an argument whether rehabilitation should be part of the scheme or benefits are too high, but purely and simply on this understanding of second year review. It is obvious to almost everyone, except an incompetent Minister who cannot understand, that this scheme is about to fall over. All I ask of the Minister is that, in a week's time in the other place, when this legislation is debated, he not only look at this legislation—

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: On a point of order, Sir, I believe that the honourable member is in breach of Standing Orders 118, 119 and, in particular, 120.

The SPEAKER: In what regard?

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: By referring to a debate in another place.

The SPEAKER: Reference to debate in another place is not permitted under Standing Orders.

Mr INGERSON: I will refrain from mentioning that, but I ask that the Minister consider amendments to be made to this Bill, and that—

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

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I refer to the decision by Australia Post to phase out the registered publication service by which printed matter is carried at a discount. This was the subject of an article by our Parliamentary Librarian, Howard Coxon, in the Higher Education supplement in the *Australian* on 8 April. Mr Coxon pointed out that this decision by Australia Post was announced just before Christmas when there was minimum opportunity to discuss the issue broadly through the community and to have media exposure of the matter. It is important that we should consider the implications of this decision by Australia Post because it does have severe implications for libraries and also the publishers of many journals. I also point out that this decision by Australia Post to phase out the discount, which will greatly add to the cost of sending publications through the post, comes on top of the decisions of the Commonwealth and other State Governments to restrict their free list—that is, Government publications sent without charge to libraries. Another factor which will harm the free flow of journals, newspapers and other information

sent through this category of post is changes in the value of the dollar which will increase the cost of overseas publications.

In the past I have had cause to criticise Australia Post for its attitude towards its community service obligations, particularly as they relate to the closure of post offices and post boxes in my electorate. There is no doubt that Australia Post has made a number of decisions in recent years which have seen it cut back very heavily on the traditional services that it has supplied to members of the public. The Commonwealth has charged Australia Post with community service obligations. However, it has also required Australia Post to operate on a commercial basis. We can ask: just how serious is Australia Post about its social obligations? Are those social obligations just tokenism within the Australia Post charter or is it really serious about providing a basic service to the community? One suspects that its commercial obligations have won out over its social obligations.

In the article by Mr Coxon, he states:

Certainly the Government has not indicated the changing circumstances to justify why the educational and social reasons that were originally so compelling in the introduction of the printed paper rate no longer apply.

Mr Coxon also makes the further point:

The truth is that the registered publications service still serves the same, supposedly important, function in the 'clever' country of increasing the availability of knowledge and information and helping to draw together a dispersed community into a cultural whole.

Different postal rates for different distances, which is part of the structure of the new print-post, is likely to only reinforce the tendencies towards State parochialism. No dollar value can be placed on such an important social goal.

I am sure that all members of the House would be aware of the importance to members of Parliament having access to adequate information. So should the rest of the community through their public libraries have access to as wide a range of information as possible. There is no doubt in my mind that access to overseas newspapers and journals is a very cost-effective way by which members can keep themselves informed on events throughout the world.

The cuts by Australia Post can only lead to a reduction in the number of journals and newspapers that are available, and also must lead to a reduction in the quality of information available to members of Parliament. I congratulate Mr Coxon for drawing attention to this important matter. I would hope that the Commonwealth would look very carefully at Australia Post's social obligations. One would have to say there must be a fundamental problem when an organisation such as Australia Post, charged with operating commercially, is also charged with considering social obligations. Those two objectives do not appear to sit easily together, particularly for Australia Post, when it is that organisation that has to choose between the two objectives. I certainly hope that Australia Post will reconsider its attitude towards this matter.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Emergency Services): I move:

That the House, at its rising, adjourn until Tuesday 28 April at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

POLICE (POLICE AIDES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Emergency Services) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Police Act 1952. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In so moving, I indicate that there is no expectation that this Bill will go through the remaining stages in this House in the time available, let alone in another place. Therefore, I seek leave to insert the second reading explanation in *Hansard* without my reading it, to enable it to lie on the table during the parliamentary recess and to give an indication of the Government's intention in this matter.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Police Department has employed Aboriginal people as police aides for several years. Initially, several police aides were employed on an experimental basis in Aboriginal traditional areas. Both the Police Department and the Aboriginal communities concerned have been pleased with the overall success of the scheme.

Police aides are not recognised as such in the Police Act 1952 or the Police Regulations 1982. As an expediency they have been appointed as Special Constables under the Police Act, thereby acquiring limited police powers and immunities, and are employed on weekly contracts.

Police aides are now an established feature of policing in this State. Depending on funding, by the end of the 1992-93 financial year, it is proposed that there will be 32 police aides employed in traditional, country and urban locations. The advantages police aides have over white police officers is their acceptance by and ability to liaise more effectively with the Aboriginal community. Furthermore, it is hoped that some Aboriginal people will progress from being police aides to police officers, a desirable way of increasing representation within the police force of Aboriginal people.

I believe now is the time to give the scheme formal recognition in the Police Act. This is the wish of the Aboriginal people presently employed.

At present, police aides are not represented industrially by the Police Association because the rules of the Police Association prohibit membership by Special Constables.

The Association supports the move to amend the Police Act as it would allow them to represent Police Aides without alteration to their constitution.

It is considered desirable to recognise police aides in the Police Act because—

police aides are respected members of their communities and their existence and special functions should be formally recognised.

with the ongoing development of the police aides program, the number of police aides is becoming numerically significant.

it will permit the Police Association of South Australia to represent them industrially.

The proposals will not alter their conditions of employment in the short term (except bringing them within the Police Superannuation Scheme) but will pave the way for proper industrial representation which may lead to their current and/or improved conditions of employment being incorporated into an award.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for commencement on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 inserts a new Part, Part IIA, into the principal Act. The new Part deals with the appointment, employment and powers of police aides. New section 20a empowers the Commissioner of Police to appoint police aides by written minute. They can be appointed for the whole of the State or any part of the State specified in the appointment. The area for which an aide is appointed can be varied by the Commissioner. New section 20b require a police aide to take an oath or affirmation.

New section 20c gives police aides the same powers, responsibilities and immunities as a member of the police force subject to any limitations specified by the Commissioner in the minute of appointment of subsequently imposed (by notice in writing) by the Commissioner. Any limitations can be varied or revoked by the Commissioner. New section 20d empowers the Commissioner (at his or her discretion) to suspend or determine the appointment of a police aide. The Commissioner can remove a police aide from office for misconduct, neglect of duty or inability

to perform duty. This power is subject to the requirements in section 19a of the principal Act as to the procedures to be followed in the case of termination for disability or illness. New section 20e empowers the Commissioner, with the approval of the Minister, to determine the conditions of employment of police aides. A determination must provide for payment in accordance with a specified scale and may be general or specific in its application.

New section 20f provides that, subject to that section and to the regulations, a reference in an Act (including the principal Act) or an instrument (whether of a legislative character or not) to a member of the police force extends to a police aide. However, such a reference does not extend to a police aide if it concerns powers or responsibilities that lie beyond any limitations imposed on a police aide under new Part IIA. Those sections of the principal Act that are not applicable to police aides are specified.

Clause 4 amends section 22 of the principal Act by inserting new paragraph (na), which empowers the Governor to make regulations concerning the training of police aides. Schedule 1 contains a transitional provision. It provides that where a person is, immediately before the commencement of the amending Act, a special constable employed as an Aboriginal police aide, that person is to be taken to have been appointed as a police aide under new Part IIA on the commencement of the amending Act. Schedule 2 makes a number of consequential amendments to other Acts.

The Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act 1979 is amended by removing two references, in sections 26 (2) (ab) and 27 (b) of that Act, to special constables employed as Aboriginal police aides. The Police (Complaints and Disciplinary Proceedings) Act 1985 is amended by altering the definition of 'prescribed officer or employee' in section 3 to ensure that the provisions of that Act that are applicable to special constables are also applicable to police aides. The Police Superannuation Act 1990 is amended by inserting a definition of 'member of the police force' in section 4 to make it clear that a police aide is a member of the police force for the purposes of that Act.

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

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN OFFICE OF FINANCIAL SUPERVISION BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Emergency Services): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this Bill is to establish the South Australian Office of Financial Supervision to regulate building societies and credit unions in South Australia.

This is a matter which needs to be resolved as part of South Australia's endorsement of the Financial Institutions Agreement which provides for a new uniform scheme for prudential supervision of permanent building societies and credit unions throughout Australia.

There are three permanent building societies registered under the Building Societies Act 1975, with total group assets in the order of \$2.1 billion. There are 15 credit unions registered under the Credit Unions Act 1989 with total group assets of approximately \$900 million, giving an aggregate for those industry assets of approximately \$3 billion.

Credit unions are currently supervised by the Credit Union Deposit Insurance Board, which is a statutory authority with a board of five members, established under the Credit Unions Act.

The Corporate Affairs Commission administers both the Credit Unions Act and the Building Societies Act, and these functions are performed by the State Business and Corporate Affairs Office.

I will shortly be introducing the complementary application of laws legislation as contemplated under the Financial Institutions Agreement, which will apply the Australian Financial Institutions Code and the Financial Institutions Code as law in South Australia. That legislation will also repeal the Credit Unions Act and the Building Societies Act in so far as it relates to permanent building societies, on the effective operation of the cooperative scheme. The scheme is proposed to commence on 1 July 1992.

As a result the Credit Union Deposit Insurance Board will cease to operate.

The Bill provides for the State Supervisor to have the powers as set out in the proposed financial institutions legislation. These powers will therefore be common with the State Supervisors in other participating States and will include powers to effectively supervise building societies and credit unions and to carry out registration and investigation functions currently performed by the State Business Office.

The structure, powers and mechanisms set out in the Bill will allow the State Supervisor to be co-located with the State Business Office and will allow the State Supervisor, to the maximum extent possible, to make use of the skilled resources of the existing regulators of building societies and credit unions.

The State Supervisor will be an independent authority established as a board with a maximum of five members and will have the freedom to make prudential decisions in a similar manner as the Credit Union Deposit Insurance Board does now in relation to credit unions.

The Supervisor will be required to effectively supervise the institutions in accordance with the uniform standards and practices which will be set by the Australian Financial Institutions Commission. It will need to be adequately resourced to perform this function, to ensure the continuation of a strong and viable non-bank sector in South Australia and its activities will be monitored by the national authority.

The scheme contemplates that the ongoing costs of supervision should primarily be borne by financial institutions and not Governments. The State Supervisor will determine the supervision levy which is to be paid by building societies and credit unions in this State. Credit unions already pay for supervision to the Credit Union Deposit Insurance Board, the supervision levy will be a new cost for building societies, who have up to now paid minimal registration fees. This levy will need to be determined in consultation with industry.

The Bill permits arrangements to be made between Governments, for the South Australian Supervisor to act as a delegate to the Supervisor of another State, to carry out some of its functions. It is expected that the Northern Territory Government will seek to enter into such arrangements in relation to the one building society and one credit union in the Northern Territory.

The working group reporting to Premiers is continuing consultations with the friendly society industry, with a view to finalising a report on uniform regulation of that industry throughout Australia. The Bill does not preclude proposals from that industry sector at a later date, for a board nomination on the South Australian Supervisor, if Premiers agree that the friendly society industry is to become part of the supervisory scheme.

The Bill is not inconsistent with proposed legislation establishing the State Supervisors in other participating States and will facilitate the adoption of a uniform supervisory framework.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clauses 3 and 4 deal with the interpretation of words and expressions used in the Bill.

Clause 5 establishes SAOFS and provides that it is a body corporate.

Clauses 6 and 7 set out the functions and powers of SAOFS.

Clause 8 provides that, subject to statutory exceptions, SAOFS is not subject to Ministerial direction.

Clause 9 requires SAOFS to comply with the financial institutions agreement and to strive to attain the principal objects of the co-operative scheme.

Clause 10 provides that SAOFS does not represent the Crown. Clause 11 provides that SAOFS is an exempt public authority for the purposes of the Corporations law.

Clauses 12 to 22 deal with appointments to the Board of SAOFS and the conditions on which its members hold office.

Clauses 23 to 28 deal with procedure at meetings of the Board. Clause 29 requires disclosure by Board members of possible conflicts of interests.

Clauses 30 to 32 deal with the staff of SAOFS.

Clause 33 prevents persons with a substantial interest in a financial institution from being involved with SAOFS as a member or employee.

Clause 34 requires members and employees of SAOFS to act honestly and impartially in the performance of their functions.

Clauses 35 and 36 confer some protection on members and employees of SAOFS who act honestly in the performance or purported performance of official functions.

Clause 37 deals with the keeping of the seal of SAOFS.

Clause 38 provides that judicial notice is to be taken of the signature of a member of the Board, or the chief executive officer, of SAOFS.

Clause 39 empowers SAOFS to delegate powers.

Clause 40 empowers SAOFS to accept, with the Minister's approval, a delegation of power by the State Supervisory Authority of another State.

Clause 41 requires SAOFS to keep proper accounts and provides for audit by the Auditor-General.

Clause 42 provides for an annual report.

Clause 43 is a regulation making power.

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

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS (APPLICATION OF LAWS) BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Emergency Services: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this Bill is to apply the Australian Financial Institutions Commission Code and the Financial Institutions Code, which has been introduced into the Queensland Parliament (and passed), as a law of South Australia; and to repeal the Credit Unions Act 1989 and the Building Societies Act 1975 except in its application to Starr-Bowkett societies. The current Building Society Act will be amended by changing its short title to Starr-Bowkett Societies Act 1975. The Bill also makes provisions of a savings or transitional nature consequent on the enactment of the Act.

The crisis in NBFIs particularly in Victoria highlighted the need for more stringent and uniform prudential standards governing the operations of building societies and credit unions throughout Australia.

In December last year, Premiers signed a formal agreement committing the States to a uniform process which culminates in consideration of cooperative scheme legislation, and if all States secure its passage, a new scheme for State-based prudential supervision of permanent building societies and credit unions throughout Australia.

This scheme involves national coordination of high uniform standards and practices and will enhance the prudential standing of the industry. It will also provide a framework for a stronger and more competitive industry to develop in the future.

The Premiers communique from the Adelaide Conference of Premiers stated that 'The formal agreement represents a notable example of the States and Territories working together to effect reform in an area of important concern to all jurisdictions. It also reflects a constructive spirit of cooperation between Governments and industry.'

The cooperative scheme legislation has been drafted in such a manner so as to neutralise any State references and in so doing may be known as the Australian Financial Institutions Commission Code and the Financial Institutions Code.

The elements of the supervisory arrangements which are underpinned by the legislation before the House are:

- First, an independent national body, with the working title Australian Financial Institutions Commission (AFIC) to be established in Brisbane under the AFIC Code, to develop prudential standards and practices and to coordinate the application of those standards by Supervisors in each State;
- The State Supervisors are to be established as independent authorities in each State and are to undertake day-to-day prudential supervision of building societies and credit unions registered in their State, with the objective of protecting the interest of depositors in accordance with the uniform rules set by AFIC;
- AFIC will coordinate uniformity, ensure that intermediaries providing banking services to industry are appropriately supervised and will oversee and coordinate emergency liquidity schemes for institutions experiencing temporary liquidity stress; and
- The costs associated with supervision are to be borne primarily by industry.

If the State Supervisors' performance is, in the opinion of AFIC, lax, there are mechanisms built into the legislation for reporting the matter to the Minister, Ministerial Council and the Premier.

The prudential standards which are no longer prescribed in the legislation are to be set by AFIC in consultation with industry. The working group reporting to Premiers has established a steering committee to commence preparation of draft standards for consideration by the working group and exposure to industry. These standards, which will effectively be subordinate legislation, will be published in the *Queensland Government Gazette* and in book form in a similar manner as the Reserve Bank publishes bank prudential standards.

At the core of those standards will be a risk-based approach to maintaining capital, which acts as a break on high risk ventures, whilst not obtruding into legitimate management decisions and provides protection for depositors.

Additionally, the standards will address in detail prudent practices relating to liquidity, large exposures, ownership structures, risk management systems, relationship with subsidiaries and accounting standards, etc.

It is expected that AFIC will set standards and practices which will be equal to those applying to banks and in some instances could be greater. State Supervisors will be required to regularly inspect the institutions to ensure compliance.

The responsibility for prudent management of building societies and credit unions rests with their boards and management, not with Governments, Supervisors or regulators, and supervision should focus on the prevention of problems. It is the role of Governments to provide the right legislative environment in which this can occur. The package of supervision and the underpinning cooperative scheme legislation provides this environment.

To maintain industry identity and enhance public perceptions, the legislation provides that building societies and credit unions should maintain their traditional focus by meeting certain character criteria.

The Financial Institutions Code provides character criteria for building societies to reflect their ongoing commitment to provide residential finance to Australians and has regard to the evolving role of societies specialising in servicing the changing financial needs of the community. The Financial Institutions Code provides for a prime purpose test where a minimum of 50 per cent of a society's group assets must be held in the form of residential finance either owner occupied or tenanted.

Credit unions are required by the Federal Institutions Code to maintain 60 per cent of their assets in financial accommodation to members and no more than 10 per cent of such financial accommodation may be for commercial purposes.

Because all the institutions will not comply with the standards on commencement of the scheme, for example the capital adequacy requirements, AFIC will, in the published standards, provide for transitional periods for compliance.

Apart from the prudential standards not being prescribed in the legislation, and the State Supervisor being given power to determine the supervision levy to be paid by the institutions, the Financial Institutions Code provides for a system of governance for building societies and credit unions not dissimilar to that provided for in current building societies and credit unions legislation.

The accounts and audit provisions in the Financial Institutions Code have been drafted to incorporate the recent amendments to Corporations Law, which apply the economic entity concept to consolidated accounts.

Interstate societies will be required to be registered as foreign societies under the Financial Institutions Code if they trade in South Australia. To be eligible for such registration, they must comply with the prudential standards published by AFIC. Societies already trading interstate, which do not meet the prudential standards on commencement, will be subject to the same transitional timetable for compliance as applies to activities in their home State.

The regulations under the initial Financial Institutions Code have been approved by the Premier. Future regulations are to be approved by the Ministerial Council for financial institutions established by the Financial Institutions Agreement.

To ensure that the scheme complies with the obligations of the States under the Heads of Agreement on future corporations regulation agreed between all States, the Northern Territory and the Commonwealth in 1990—the regulations will provide that the Corporations Law will apply, according to its tenor, to the out of home State activities of the institutions, in the same manners as it applied immediately before the commencement of the scheme.

The future application of Corporations Law to the institutions which are referred to as 1.3 bodies in the Heads of Agreement, is the subject of current negotiations between the Commonwealth and the States.

Building societies and credit unions have a significant and important position in the South Australian market as repositories for domestic savings, as major sources of housing and consumer

finance and they are for many South Australians the secure, efficient and preferred alternative to the banking sector. Building societies remain committed to providing housing finance for as wide a spectrum as possible of prospective home buyers and credit unions are committed to providing consumer lending to their members.

The South Australian Government is supportive of the aims of maintaining a strong and viable building society and credit union industry in South Australia. The proposals contained in the Bill have been discussed with the building society and credit union industry and they are fully supportive of the Bill proceeding. The Opposition has been alerted to the proposals.

The Bill is consistent with proposed legislation to apply the Queensland Bills as law of all other States and the Territories, and in so doing will facilitate the adoption of a uniform supervisory scheme.

The Government supports the early establishment and implementation of a cooperative scheme incorporating high prudential standards and adequate depositor protection to achieve a stable environment for building societies and credit unions.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 sets out definitions that are required for the purposes of the Bill.

Clause 4 provides that references to a Queensland Act extend to the Act as in force from time to time or as substituted by some subsequent Act.

Clauses 5 and 6 apply to the AFIC Code and the regulations as laws of South Australia.

Clause 7 provides that certain expressions used in the AFIC Code and regulations, as applying in the State, are to have appropriate local connotations.

Clauses 8, 9 and 10 are corresponding provisions with reference to the Financial Institutions Code.

Clauses 11, 12 and 13 provide, out of an abundance of caution, for the conferral of powers, and jurisdiction, in accordance with the scheme legislation, on AFIC, the AFIC Appeals Tribunal, and the Queensland Supreme Court.

Clause 14 provides that the South Australian Office of Financial Supervision is to be the State Supervisory Authority for the purposes of the legislation as applying in this State.

Clause 15 provides that the Crown is to be bound by the legislation.

Clauses 16 and 17 impose the fees and levies for which provision is made in the legislation.

Clause 18 provides for Parliament to be informed of failures by the State Supervisory Authority properly to enforce the legislation in this State.

Clause 19 requires the Premier to lay AFIC's annual report and financial statements before the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council.

Clause 20 provides that local adaptations may, if necessary, be made to Queensland laws in order to ensure that they operate effectively in the State.

Clause 21 provides for the payment of fees and penalties, in the absence of any contrary provision, to the State.

Clause 22 provides that South Australian law rather than the provisions contained in section 59 of the Financial Institutions Code is to be applied for the purpose of differentiating between summary and indictable offences.

Clause 23 is an interpretation provision.

Clause 24 provides for the repeal of the State's existing legislation dealing with credit unions and building societies. However, Starr-Bowkett societies will continue to be regulated under the Building Societies Act (which will become the 'Starr-Bowkett Societies Act').

Clauses 25 to 32 deal with various transitional matters.

Clause 33 provides for the making of regulations of a savings or transitional nature.

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

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS (LITIGATION ASSISTANCE FUND) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Emergency Services): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill seeks to make a couple of amendments to the Legal Practitioners Act 1981 ('the Act').

The first amendment concerns the Litigation Assistance Fund ('the Fund') which is to be administered by the Law Society of South Australia by way of a trust constituted by a deed of trust dated 2 April 1992.

In 1990 the Legal Practitioners Guarantee Fund showed a surplus of just under \$2 million. During discussions between the Law Society and the Attorney-General, it was agreed to allocate various sums from this surplus to a number of different areas including the Legal Services Commission, community legal services and a proposed legal insurance scheme.

At that time Western Australia had under consideration a scheme for funding certain legal matters.

The Law Society of Western Australia launched its Litigation Assistance Fund on 5 June 1991. To date it has received 105 applications and assistance has been granted in 21 matters.

The Government believes that a contingency legal aid scheme will open up the legal system to certain litigants. As the Government has a continuing commitment to increasing access to justice it was decided to allocate \$1 million in seed funding to a Litigation Assistance Fund in South Australia.

The fund is available to any person who believes he or she is likely to achieve a remunerative result, including a defendant who may have a cross-claim.

In each instance the applicant will have his or her means to pay and the merits of the case carefully considered. Applications will be received from legal practitioners and will be examined first by an assessment panel, comprised of one member of the advisory board and two experienced legal practitioners. This decision will then be taken to the Manager of the fund. A final review may be undertaken by the advisory board. Where a case is considered to have merit, and strong chances of success, and where the applicant for assistance satisfies a means test, assistance will be granted.

Where an action is successful, a percentage of the judgment sum will be contributed to the fund, together with any costs recovered from the unsuccessful party. Western Australia has fixed the required percentage at 15 per cent and it is likely that our fund will follow this lead. Western Australia has also set a scale of fees which has been approved as the basis upon which fees will be paid by the fund to the solicitor. As yet, the advisory board here is yet to examine this matter. When it does a decision will be made by the Law Society, upon recommendation from the advisory board.

It is expected that there will be a dip in funds for the first few years of operation but the expectation is that, before long, the fund will be self-funding.

The second amendment concerns the Legal Practitioners Complaints Committee ('the committee'). A complaint has recently been received by the committee which resulted in three of the four legal practitioners and one lay member having to disqualify themselves, for legitimate reasons, from consideration of the complaint. As a result, the committee cannot raise a quorum to give this matter due consideration.

The Act confers powers of delegation on the committee pursuant to section 75 but the power to admonish and lay charges cannot be delegated. Accordingly, an amendment has been made to the Act which will allow the Governor to appoint a person to be the deputy of a member of the committee.

Therefore, if a member of the committee is absent or unable, for any reason, to consider a matter, the deputy may act in his or her place.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal.

Clause 4 provides for the administration of the Litigation Assistance Fund in accordance with the trust deed and enables the society to charge assisted persons on a contingency fee basis.

Clause 5 provides for the appointment of deputies of members of the Legal Practitioners Complaints Committee. The deputies may act when members are unable to act because of conflict of interest or for any other reason.

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

SUMMARY OFFENCES (PREVENTION OF GRAFFITI VANDALISM) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 14 April. Page 4295.)

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): In continuing my remarks, I would just like to lay to rest the perception that Government members gained from some of the statements made by the member for Bright that the Government has done nothing about this matter over the past decade. Anyone with a pragmatic view of this issue would be well aware that that is not the case. In my own electorate, I am well aware of the number of occasions on which I have drawn attention to the problems at the Seaton Park and Albert Park railway stations and the problems on the trains themselves. This morning a perusal of the files in my electorate office revealed the wealth of information I have gained and the number of occasions on which I have raised this issue.

However, that is not to say that I am the only one in Parliament who has expressed a view on this issue. I believe that every member in this place is concerned about the enormous cost to the community through graffiti vandalism to public transport, private property or motor vehicles. At some time or another I believe that every member of Parliament has made a contribution in this place on this matter. As I said last night, a number of measures in this Bill have been upgraded as a result of a great deal of research and a number of visits in the metropolitan area and interstate. Research has also been carried out through the Parliamentary Library. I have mentioned press cuttings, and I go back to about 1983 when I raised this matter with one of the high schools in my electorate, suggesting a project similar to the Adopt-a-Station program for which the member for Bright wants to claim credit. The fact is that, long before he came into this place, I was addressing this issue.

The group that I understood him to impugn in this place last night, Seaton Graphics, has done a sterling job, ably supported by the local mayor (His Worship John Dyer) and by the local council and many others in the area. It does not matter what side of the political spectrum one comes from or what one's position in life is, no-one is prepared to accept abuse of their property. To that extent, over a period of years in the local Messenger press and in the *News* I have raised this issue. For example, in the *News* of 10 June 1988 an article headed 'STA acts to scrub graffiti' mentioned the New South Wales reparation scheme, about which I had written to the then Minister suggesting that a similar scheme be introduced in this State. In its editorial of Monday 13 June 1988, the *News* stated:

A round of applause today for the State Transport Authority and a Labor backbencher, Mr Hamilton. By no means have all the STA's initiatives won favour with the public. But it is doing exactly the right thing in taking up the proposal of Mr Hamilton—among others—and pushing for vandals to be required to clean up their messes.

The editorial went on to talk about the cost of this problem. In the Messenger press of 5 March 1986, mention was made about my involvement with vandalism and graffiti problems, particularly in my electorate. Similar reports appeared in 1987, and so it goes on. At one point an editorial was published which heaped a lot of praise on me and which included a quotation that I will never forget: 'Kevin Hamilton is one MP who earns his pay and perks.' Needless to say, many people in my constituency have been reminded of that fact.

In addition, I put out a regular newsletter, which I think every local member should do. I know that my newsletters are viewed by Opposition members for their content, and

I know that you, Sir, are concerned about this question. In every edition I mention the law and order problems in my electorate. The April 1991 newsletter mentioned tough new penalties for young offenders and parents' liability for crime committed by their children, but that is a matter about which the Opposition does not like to be reminded. In that article, comments were made that legislation is being prepared under which parents will become liable for the acts of their children aged between 10 and 15 years. That measure was rejected by the Opposition because it said that it would bankrupt parents, but they ignored the content of the legislation.

Last night, the Minister attempted to educate the member for Bright about a comment from the Australian Democrats. When he interjected, the Minister criticised the Australian Democrats, not the Opposition, but the honourable member opposite chose to ignore that. One can only suspect that he did that because it will mean better reading in his electorate. Another matter of interest to me, as my colleagues are aware, is my involvement with the city of Gosnells in Western Australia. Des Ryan, the Editor of the Messenger press, was interviewed on 5AN on 9 May 1991. The transcript of that interview reads:

Good morning. I have been attracted to this story about truant officers helping to curb graffiti and crime.

In response Des Ryan says:

... as an extension of that—

he is talking about the problem of painting graffiti on railway shelters—

the local MP for Albert Park... and he covers West Lakes and either side of that—is now calling on the Education Department to implement a stepped up policy of truant officers who would go around to check on absent students. He is using as the basis for his call a program in Western Australia—a place called Gosnells where they implemented daylight truant patrols which reduced break-ins [and vandalism] by 70 per cent.

This is a matter in which I have been involved. Many of my colleagues jokingly talk about my visits to Western Australia, but they have been visits with the Assistant Police Commissioner and Detective Inspector Bob Kuchera who has a wealth of knowledge and who has been involved in select committees in the Western Australian Parliament. Inspector Kuchera has a wealth of knowledge in this area.

I have made available taped interviews with the Gosnells City Council and Detective Inspector Bob Kuchera to the Attorney-General's Office and the Juvenile Justice office, and they are readily sought by people working in this field. Only recently when I was involved in a boxing group in my area, I was asked by a member of that organisation who works in this field to lend him those tapes because he had heard about them. He has taken them away and listened to them with great interest.

I raise these issues, because I believe that no one member in this place can claim that he or his Party is responsible for what is before us today. I believe it is the result of a combination of a whole range of things. At the same time I give credit to the Minister because, after the members for Stuart, Henley Beach, the Hon. Ron Roberts and I visited Western Australia, we came back most enthusiastic about what was happening in that State. As a token of the appreciation of the Gosnells council, I received plaques, etc., from it commending me for what was done.

I recall the member for Henley Beach suggesting that I should be the council's public relations officer because of the way that I promoted the sorts of programs on national television in Australia in regard to what was happening in that State. Indeed, the Minister subsequently visited Western Australia at my request and, in a similar request, invited Gosnell's Mayor Pat Morris to visit South Australia and

address two conferences: the Australian Institute of Criminology conference and another conference at TAFE.

Mayor Morris subsequently was sent overseas by the Western Australian Government, and she has accepted invitations to visit Victoria. Pat Morris claims that she is just a housewife, but she is a brilliant person. It speaks volumes for the Minister and the Government that they have tried to get a coherent and positive policy that not only addresses the penal provisions but also and most importantly in my view addresses the social problems that we are confronting in respect of vandalism and graffiti here in South Australia.

Mr SUCH (Fisher): Along with other members of the Opposition I welcome this Bill and I look forward to its speedy passage through Parliament so that its provisions can become law. As members would know, I have had a long-standing interest in this area, supporting both punitive and preventive measures. I believe it is important that we not only focus on punishment, which is the essence of the Bill, but we also try to address the basic causes that give rise to what is negative behaviour. As I indicated earlier, I support the measure, which is long overdue. The Government has taken a long time to get moving on this issue, but I acknowledge that certain members opposite have been calling for action for a while as well. On our side virtually all members have been supportive and have been seeking action—and at long last, belated as it may be, we now see something before the Parliament.

I am concerned that there is no indication of when the Bill will be proclaimed. I hope that we do not see unnecessary delays in having the Bill proclaimed once it has been through both Houses. Over the past several years I have attended conferences, issued many press releases and have written to retail traders seeking their support in tackling this issue. I must say that I had positive responses from retailers in the hardware and general retail areas supporting calls for the securing of materials that could be used by would-be vandals in terms of graffiti. I do not intend to read out the letters, but I did write 18 months ago to the management of all large retail establishments throughout South Australia and, as I indicated, I received a very positive response.

I believe that graffiti may have peaked and is now on the wane, but it is unfortunate that the Government did not take action five or six years ago and nip this problem in the bud. Having said that, I believe that graffiti is on the wane. It is being realised more and more by young people that it is a fruitless and pointless exercise that costs them money, and that highlights one of the important aspects of dealing with graffiti vandalism, that is, to get across to young people in particular that Governmental property is their property.

I am consistently surprised, even by my own children, to hear the view that somehow Government property and that of the STA and similar organisations is not in any way connected to them. This is an important educational role that has to be taken up: young people have to see and understand that STA and other community property actually belongs to them. They have to see that it is paid for in the long or short term out of their taxes. That is a message that needs to be got across—this idea of ownership, that they own railway stations, bus stops, buses and schools and that the Government in that context is not some distant foreign body.

Over time I have put forward several proposals relating to this matter, proposals that go beyond simply the contents of this Bill. For example, I have suggested lowering the age at which a person is treated as an adult in respect of criminal

matters to 17 years. As many members would know, that already applies in Victoria. There are many people working in this way in the community, and I acknowledge the work of people like Sandra Turale who has collected at last count 18 000 signatures calling for the age to be lowered to 16 years.

At least in the interim we can look at lowering the age to 17, because I know from talking to young people that, once they reach the age where they are dealt with by the courts as an adult, in the main they suddenly cease to engage in graffiti. They realise that it is not worth the risk and the adult penalties and they put away their textas, felt tipped pens and spray cans literally overnight. I believe that is something worth looking at. Clearly, it is not in the Bill, but it is something that has happened in Victoria and we should look at it.

Another aspect that should be considered is giving the police authority to issue on-the-spot clean-up and repair orders so that juvenile offenders are required to clean off their graffiti and organise repairs to vandalised property within 15 or 21 days or else face court action. In that way we get the punishment close to the time of the criminal act and avoid some of the lengthy delays that currently exist in our courts system. I believe that that suggestion is worth considering, and I believe that, with appropriate safeguards, it could be useful in reducing the amount of graffiti and vandalism in the community.

In the past, I have also called for marking and aiding and abetting of graffiti to be made specific offences, and I welcome the fact that that matter is addressed by this Bill. I believe we should look at prohibiting the sale of permanent marker pens and allow the sale only of those pens that can be easily removed by water or with readily available solvents. I do not see the necessity to have marker pens that will remain imprinted on a carton for 50 years. If pens were water soluble or could be removed with readily available solvents, the cleaning up and removal of graffiti would be a lot easier.

I think we should be more proactive in seeking the support of retailers and wholesalers to secure spray cans and large felt pens, in particular. In response to letters from the Minister and me, retailers and wholesalers have indicated that they are sympathetic with that idea. I commend those who have not only indicated their support but have actually done something about it. For example, many retailers display empty rather than full spray cans, and that has reduced the likelihood of theft. If members reflect, they will realise that spray cans are quite expensive, particularly some of the fancier ones, and one does not have to be terribly bright to realise that a lot of theft occurs in relation to those items. So, anything that improves security and minimises the risk of theft is to be supported.

Other suggestions that I have put forward include making it illegal for juveniles to possess spray cans and large felt pens in public places during non-daylight hours and giving the police and other authorised officers—for example, council inspectors—power to search bags and confiscate those items that are reasonably suspected of illegal graffiti use. Those are some of the suggestions that I have put forward for several years, and I have forwarded them to the Select Committee on Juvenile Justice and the crime prevention strategy group.

It is not enough simply to have punishment, although I believe that punishment is necessary and it should fit the crime. I think we need to look at some of the causes of people engaging in graffiti. I note that almost exclusively graffiti vandals are young teenage males who—as has been said before by me and other members in this place—tend

to be under-achievers or non-achievers who lack success in school and elsewhere. So, we need to look at ways in which they can find success so that they will come to value not only other people and their property but, most importantly, themselves. I believe that their behaviour in essence reflects a negative view of their own worth. They tend to be low in self-esteem and have a fairly negative outlook towards the world and authority. They take out their frustration and anger against what they perceive as symbols of authority.

I think it is unfortunate that we have such names as the State Transport Authority because by its very name it suggests something against which these people will rebel. I urge the Minister of Transport to look at possible alternatives, such as Metro System or something that does not have the connotation of being an authority or heavy-handed. I realise that that is not what is meant, but I think that the message is often picked up by young people. They see the State Transport Authority and say, 'Let's take them on.'

I do not think that anyone could pretend that this Bill is the total answer, because it certainly is not, but what it can and I hope will do is signal a warning that the community has had enough of this sort of activity and that it will not be tolerated. The main significance of this legislation is that it will provide a signal to people that damaging property is not cost free: it does hurt people; it hurts their pockets; it creates uncertainty particularly amongst the elderly, and it creates an environment that people do not like. So, if it does nothing else but signal that message, it is worthwhile, and I believe that it will do that although, as I have said, it has taken a long time to reach the Parliament.

I accept that there is such a thing as graffiti art, but I believe that it represents a very small percentage of graffiti activity and that the overwhelming percentage of it is vandalism. There are people skilled in art, and I think they should be encouraged, but I think it is important that we distinguish between graffiti vandalism and graffiti art—and I am sure that the community does that. Many young people take the view that the law cannot touch them. That is a misapprehension, because the law as it stands can touch them. There seems to be this folklore amongst young people that somehow they are exempt from the law, that they can do what they like and that nothing will happen. In the total picture of things, I think this legislation will, in due course, send a message saying that action will follow if you engage in these sorts of activities.

In terms of positive alternatives, I commend some of the initiatives of community groups, including the Police Force, who have involved themselves with young people at risk by taking them on adventure camps, abseiling and on canoeing trips to give some of these young people a challenge and the opportunity to partake in activities in which they can test their courage. I publicly commend not only the police but other groups which have done these sorts of things, because that is one way in which we can help to minimise the likelihood of vandalism occurring in the first place.

It is also important that the community support parenting courses. Where the local council has held such courses in my electorate they have proved popular. As a parent of teenagers, I understand the problems of parents. It is very difficult to raise teenagers in this day and age, so any support the community can offer by way of skills programs, seminars and so on is worthwhile. I encourage that sort of initiative on which some councils are embarking and I hope that that will extend throughout the community. Once again, it is not a complete answer but it will contribute towards reducing the likelihood of the sort of negative behaviour that results in graffiti vandalism.

Another suggestion that I have put forward is that organisations such as Neighbourhood Watch, rather than being simply passive—and I do not mean that in an unkind sense—or simply a watching organisation, should be proactive and say, 'The teenagers of the 300 or so homes in this area belong to all of us; they are not foreigners or from another planet' and actually try to organise activities with them. I have found from personal experience in my electorate that some of the older people in, for instance, the Reynella area, who have had problems with teenagers, rather than engaging in combat have invited them into their homes to share a drink and do things that they relate to, and that has made a big difference.

Part of the problem at the moment is the polarisation that has occurred between generations that reinforces this anti-authority outlook of young people. Anything that Neighbourhood Watch can do to help break down that gap is desirable and worthwhile. Nowadays, we expect councils and Governments to solve all our problems. We have to get back to the old village idea. I think that the Neighbourhood Watch structure lends itself to a village type approach so that a small group of several hundred homes in a few streets can claim these teenagers as their own and do something with them because, if they do not, they will reap the consequences partly in the form of graffiti and vandalism.

The Neighbourhood Watch groups in my electorate that I have contacted have said that they like that idea but that they would like some assistance in organising positive activities involving young people—night time activities, weekend activities and so on. So, the potential is there, and it comes back to doing positive things as well as punishing people.

I have focused most of my comments on young people, and I believe that that is where the bulk of the problem lies in respect of graffiti and vandalism, but it would be unfair and unfortunate to give the impression that all our young people are bad, because that is not the case. In fact, I am constantly reassured by, and pleased with, my contact with young people in my electorate and elsewhere, because the overwhelming majority of them are fine people; I believe they will make a great contribution to this country and are making a contribution even in their early years. So, I think we should avoid any sort of witch-hunt against or focus on young people as if they are the centre of all evil, because that is not the case. Indeed, I would request State and local government authorities to ask themselves whether they give teenagers a fair go in terms of the allocation of resources they receive. It is a theme I have raised previously, having been involved in local government and having initiated a survey and interaction with young people to find out what they want from local government.

If we look at the spending patterns of local government, or even those at State Government level, we find that resources tend not to be directed heavily to teenage activity. Many people throw up their hands and ask why the teenagers are misbehaving, when the activities and recreational facilities have not been provided for them. I think we should be mindful that these young people do not have a vote and are, therefore, not actively courted and solicited by people seeking votes, whether at local government or State Government level. As a result, they tend to miss out on resources. In all fairness we should look at that and ensure that young people do get a fair slice of the cake and that they are not being criticised for not participating when the opportunities for participating are not readily available to them. That comes down to the availability of such services as public transport because, if one is of a junior age, one is heavily dependent on either parents or public transport. Once again, if teenagers are bored, they cannot go to venues for recre-

ation and other pleasures: they will get up to mischief, and part of that will be graffiti and vandalism.

It is often said that graffiti vandalism is mindless. I do not think that is quite true. I think it indicates a state of mind that has a deep malaise within it that needs addressing. So, it is not mindless: it is the wrong sort of statement from the mind that needs to be addressed. In conclusion, I would like to say that this Bill is welcome. It will not solve all the issues and problems relating to graffiti vandalism, but it is a step in the right direction. I trust that, once this Bill is passed (and I hope it will be), the Minister will ensure that it is proclaimed with due speed so a message is sent to would-be graffiti vandals that their time is up and that, literally, the writing is on the wall for them.

MFP DEVELOPMENT BILL

The Legislative Council requested a conference, at which it would be represented by five managers, on a suggested amendment and the House of Assembly's amendments, to which it had disagreed.

The House of Assembly agreed to a conference, to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 9.30 a.m. on Wednesday, 22 April, at which it would be represented by Messrs Armitage, Bannon, De Laine, Groom and Ingerson.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (PREVENTION OF GRAFFITI VANDALISM) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading debate resumed.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I congratulate the member for Fisher on the speech he has just made, because for at least 50 per cent of his contribution he indicated that positive measures as well as punitive measures need to be undertaken regarding the problem of graffiti. I believe that that is a correct assumption, that the problem needs to be looked at and that more Government money should be invested in this problem. By contrast, I was dismayed by the remarks of the lead speaker of the Liberal Party in this debate, particularly when one realises that he had unlimited time. That is a concession that ought not to be taken lightly: I think he should have produced a more statesmanlike effort. This matter needs to be tackled in a bipartisan way without political point scoring.

I was most alarmed by the tone of the comments of the member for Bright on this occasion. It was only in the third paragraph of his contribution that he started to enter into what I call the political field, and he said that the politicking that has occurred over this Bill has been nothing short of disgraceful. He also referred to a deliberate attempt to mislead the community and members of local government and local government bodies in a letter to local government. The honourable member knew that the Minister was referring not to members of the Liberal Party in that instance but to the Democrats in another place, but he deliberately made attacks which, one might say if one were uncharitable, were misleading. He attempted to pin on the Minister and on members on this side a point of view that we have never established in the first place. Then, having set up that scenario, the honourable member continued to debate along those lines.

One would be forgiven for saying that the impression given by the member for Bright on this occasion was that he was a right wing Rambo, because the honourable member

emphasised to this forum that he and his Party were the first to suggest punitive measures; as far as he was concerned, the more punitive the measure and the quicker it came into operation, the better able it was to solve this problem. Nothing could be further from the truth. I again commend the member for Fisher on the arguments he has put to this Chamber, because I believe he can give guidance to the member for Bright in the way this issue ought to be tackled. To castigate members on this side because they refused to vote for an extremely punitive measure that was first suggested by the member for Hanson, and to criticise members on this side for not being prepared to support that proposition in those very early stages is despicable.

We on this side of the House are more prepared to show more concern and compassion to those youngsters in necessitous circumstances than are members of the Opposition. The only solution we have heard, particularly from the member for Bright, is the introduction of stronger, harsher and more difficult penalties. This is the sort of mentality that transported our original settlers to this land for seven years or more for doing nothing more than stealing a handkerchief or a loaf of bread. The mentality of the English gentry, which certain members, but not all members, of the Opposition want to copy, has been proved in the past not to work, and it will not work this time. We are introducing more punitive measures under this Bill, and that has been forced on us by public opinion—and I certainly support the Bill. However, I cannot understand the absolute enthusiasm with which certain members of the Opposition have grasped this opportunity to say, 'Me, too; we suggested these very severe punitive measures earlier than anybody else, and everyone else should have jumped on the band wagon.' I find that difficult to understand.

I also noted in the comments of the member for Bright the lack of any positive suggestion to help youngsters who are in an underprivileged position and who are definitely in need of assistance in many ways. I take exception to the fact that he cast reflections on the Adelaide Children's Court and the children's aid panels for not convicting the majority of children who come before those institutions. Something like 75 per cent of those youngsters who appear before a children's aid panel—although some of them graduate to the Children's Court—never offend again. The system in South Australia is outstanding. The member for Bright has suggested in his buccaneering way that every child who is taken before one of these panels should be punished severely; he said:

... Young people thumb their nose at the juvenile justice system, regarding it as nothing short of a joke and as an issue of ridicule providing absolutely no deterrent at all.

We know that that is absolute rubbish.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will link his remarks to the Bill.

Mr FERGUSON: Yes, Sir. I am linking my remarks to the Bill in a sense, because they are the words that the member for Bright used in support of the original Bill. I am merely rebutting that argument. I would agree with you, Sir, if you were to say that those arguments were hardly worth rebutting, as they are not. There is little value in them at all, but we should not be led by somebody who would probably happily be received into the Ku Klux Klan. We must rebut those propositions. I know that, to impress some of his peers, the member for Bright must take an exceptionally heavy line. He has done that, given his suggestions, with little thought at all about the way to provide positive measures to solve the problem of graffiti.

I implore the member for Bright to read in *Hansard* the speech made by his colleague the member for Fisher and to pick up some of his ideas in terms of the positive

measures that ought to be taken regarding graffiti incidents. I had the pleasure of going to Gosnells in Western Australia to see how that the local government area is combatting the graffiti problem. Its methods have been most successful. Members of that council have never suggested to me that heavier or more punitive measures should be used to overcome what has become known as the graffiti problem. I am very surprised that the member for Bright has not been prepared to look at these measures. He is too busy politicking, suggesting that he and other members of his Party were the first to suggest penalties. In Gosnells in Western Australia, a resident artist has been provided to advise those youngsters who are interested in graffiti. An outdoor space has been provided where youngsters can ply their craft. In that local government area, rebellious and unruly youngsters have been taken in hand, finishing up in the Western Australian Arts Department: they have been taught, and have produced some amazing art work.

I had the opportunity, together with the member for Albert Park, to view one of the exhibitions in Fremantle. I can only say that our young people have an amazing amount of talent and, as a community, we should be encouraging the artistic ability of those youngsters rather than repressing them. The member for Bright suggested that we should bring down strong penal measures on those youngsters instead of encouraging the artist in them. I find that reprehensible. I hope that the member for Bright does not gallop in with the idea of again making political points and that he takes the opportunity to look at the problem properly and come forward with useful suggestions.

The member for Bright said some unkind things about these people providing legal sites for these youngsters. I have had great pleasure in being associated with Spray Graphics, an organisation supported by the Woodville Council which has been provided with money by the State Government and which has taken these young people and assisted them with their artistic abilities. This organisation has done a wonderful job. We should be looking at the more positive side of trying to assist these youngsters.

I agree with the member for Fisher that graffiti vandalism is mainly the result of a poor family situation. However, that is not always the case. Whilst I was in Gosnells, I spoke with a physician's son who was involved in the graffiti scene there mainly for the kicks. However, generally speaking, these rebellious youngsters do come from families that have an unfortunate history.

If the member for Bright, or any other member opposite, were to introduce a private member's Bill suggesting that this State ought to be providing assistance to families and doing something about those dysfunctional families in our community, providing workers to assist and providing early intervention in our schools where people in the Education Department are able to pick up at a very early stage some of the problem children, and if he were to suggest that the State ought to be putting aside more money to assist these youngsters (and that can only help with this problem), I am sure he would find support on this side of the House.

The crime and punishment syndrome that is often the stamp of the right wing, both in this State and in Australia, is a philosophy that has not worked in the past and is unlikely to work in the future. Together with some of my colleagues, I took the opportunity to interview some youngsters who were in institutions in South Australia. I sought their views on being incarcerated, and asked them whether it would affect their future so far as crime is concerned. I interviewed both males and females, and nearly every one of them stated there was no way that incarceration would

assist the situation and that their stay in those institutions would probably lead to more crime.

So, we have to do some lateral thinking about this matter. I certainly hope that those Rambos opposite who seek retribution in this matter involving unfortunate children will think about what they are saying and remember how many lives they will be destroying if they come down with some of the propositions that I have heard suggested both in this Parliament and previously. I support the proposal of providing more money to assist youngsters in this regard.

Mr Speaker, this is a difficult area and you would know that on the Lefevre Peninsula and on the western side of this city youngsters are getting themselves into trouble. When they are quizzed about the reasons why, they say that they are bored. We have to be prepared as a community to invest more money to assist these youngsters than we have been prepared to invest so far. I hope that the debate from now on takes a positive turn. I hope we do not get any more negativism from the other side. Certainly, members on this side will support the measure, and I hope we will see this proposal made law very quickly.

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I am very pleased to address this legislation because, as the member for Adelaide, I have in my district my fair share of graffiti, if not more than most other members of Parliament have in theirs, since the electorate of Adelaide is the hub of large numbers of people. As my constituents and I travel around our electorate, we notice on buildings and fences and, indeed, on moving targets such as buses, large amounts of graffiti or tags as they are unfortunately called. By giving them such a name, I think we glorify them, and that is a mistake. However, if I call them 'tags', everyone knows what I am talking about. There are many theories about how these ought to be removed. There have been many conferences on methodologies for stopping these acts of vandalism. Unfortunately, despite all the good ideas, no-one has actually come up with anything effective. I doubt whether this in itself will be completely effective as a measure of preventing vandalism. However, I believe that it is a step in the right direction.

I am sure that most members of Parliament would believe, as I do, that it is a problem that must be addressed. At a number of conferences which other members have attended, and in the literature which I have read about graffiti, it appears that quick removal is a good idea. The difficulty with this is that it is perhaps too difficult to keep up with the supply of graffiti which has to be removed. Certainly it is an expensive business, given the profusion of it. Previously I mentioned buses, and certainly the STA is a great target for graffiti vandals.

I will briefly relate the feeling of a person I know who recently travelled on a bus. She does not use public transport very often: she mainly walks to work, but on this occasion she was unfortunate enough to be on a bus which had recently been the subject of quite a serious attack. She reported to me that she actually felt quite threatened, even though there was no direct threat, because it was such a vicious gesture against society to see the amount of graffiti on the bus. She felt that not only the bus but she also had been vandalised. I wonder whether it is not counterproductive to give the vast amounts of publicity that is given, particularly to severe attacks of graffiti vandalism on STA property, not only because it glorifies the perpetrators within their local groups and communities but also because it has a detrimental effect on people wanting to use the transport themselves. They feel fearful of it and do not like it, and that is quite understandable.

A previous speaker in this debate has mentioned Neighbourhood Watch as a potential source of helping with this problem, and that is a good idea. I was involved in Neighbourhood Pride Day, helping to clean up some of the graffiti in the area in which I am zone leader. We were quite lucky: there was only one area that had been vandalised with graffiti. It was a very prominent wall, but I have to report that, despite our efforts, the graffiti has returned. However, we are still working on it. When I was in Paris, looking at various therapies and treatment for AIDS, and at the management of the French health system, I spoke with a large number of people from different areas. One of the matters reported to me was that one of the new Ministers of Youth Affairs (or the equivalent thereof) in France had indicated that he was asked at one of the early media conferences what he would do to stop youth problems and, in particular, graffiti.

I commented that there was very little graffiti in the area of Paris that I visited. The Minister made what I thought was a particularly interesting comment, given that large numbers of people who were his direct responsibility lived in ghastly tenements of 30 or 40 storeys with no gardens, and so on. He said that the first thing he intended to do to help stop the problem was to make sure that the lifts in the buildings worked and then he would paint the buildings and put carpets in the lift foyers. He was laughed at but I do not think that we can expect people who have no pride in their own home and their own surroundings to respect public property.

I am following this matter up on a progressive basis, but I understand that this solution has been quite efficacious and the graffiti problem has decreased quite dramatically because people feel more comfortable in and warm towards their surroundings and do not take their frustration out on public property. Because the Government has control of legislation and matters that are debated in Parliament, I urge it to look at the wider picture for youth so they are more comfortable and happier in their surroundings.

The most burning issue among young people is that of unemployment. When I speak with teenagers who are in the latter years of their schooling and they tell me that they feel they have a bleak future with respect to the employment scenario, I detect in their comments an anger and I do not think it is at all surprising that they perceive that the way to protest against adult values is to vandalise adult property. One of the things that distinguishes large numbers of adults from large numbers of younger people is that many adults own or control houses, property and cars, so they are a ready target for people who wish to express their anger.

In order to underpin measures such as those contained in this legislation, we should look at general support for family values. I am saddened to say that some family values have disintegrated. I am sure that all members of Parliament have had constituents call on them in their office to indicate that, although the fabric of society has not completely disintegrated, it is not the same warm, caring, loving, nurturing society that was extant perhaps 30 years ago. What can we as adults expect but that youth will lash out when we present them with a fairly bleak future?

I am not an interventionist but I believe that, in this case, there is great need to intervene, particularly in the family. The member for Fisher mentioned parenting courses and I think they are very important to solve many problems of which graffiti vandalism is but one. However, I think there is a reason for intervening in families and in schools, which are most readily controlled in society. In addressing the problem of graffiti vandalism, I acknowledge the worth of schemes such as Adopt-a-Station. Indeed, I applaud the

volunteers who care enough about their society to want to clean up graffiti, given the theory that the sooner such vandalism is removed, the less likely it is to be repeated.

Coincidentally, I must say that I am disappointed that the Minister of Transport indicated in response to a number of questions about this matter that he is not in favour of volunteers working on these programs because they take away jobs from the unions. I understand the political *milieu* within which the Minister of Transport says that, but I noted in an answer of another day that the Minister said that the STA unions cannot keep up with the amount of graffiti that needs to be cleaned up. I urge that common-sense prevails and that, if volunteers want to be involved in a local community project, they be allowed to do so. A lack of care for one's community, to which I alluded earlier, reflects part of the general disintegration of values.

The Bill contains a clause relating to Bills, posters and placards. As the member for Adelaide, I believe that my electorate, which is the most populous during the day, is the easiest target for promoters attempting to generate interest in various events.

Mr Quirke: And politicians!

Dr ARMITAGE: I did not quite hear that interjection, otherwise I would have reacted to it. However, I believe there is a methodology and a reason for trying to stop it, Mr Speaker, hence I will move an amendment at the appropriate time.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Hutchison): Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that there has been a change in the Chair.

Dr ARMITAGE: I apologise, Madam Acting Speaker. I feel this particularly, because I get so many complaints about this matter. In addition, my office is close to the former Le Cornu site on O'Connell Street and members might recall that that building has a long window that is billed as the longest non-reflecting glass window in the world. I am confident that, since Le Cornu's moved on, it has become the longest non-reflecting billboard in the world because it is a source of posters advertising different events. It is just as offensive to a community to see such posters, which perhaps are commercially sanctioned, as it is to see tags or whatever.

I pick up the point that the member for Fisher made that it is not only a problem of youth, although he addressed the subject of youth in his speech. The problem is more widespread and I target particularly the irresponsible posting of placards and so on around my electorate. In Victoria, the Summary Offences Act contains a section that prevents people authorising publications of bills, but there is a large element of the reverse onus of proof in that. The Western Australian Legislature has addressed this through the Local Government Act, but I am not in favour of doing that. If we as parliamentarians think it is a problem, we should address it ourselves rather than expect another level of government to do so.

The New South Wales legislation is similar to ours; in other words, it says that people who deface walls or put up placards commit an offence, but it does not address the problem of people who instigate the posters, placards or whatever in the first case. That is what my amendment will attempt to address. In my view there is not enough penalty or opprobrium given to people who use this method to advertise their commercial event.

In Adelaide, if one wants to have thousands of posters put up, one rings a series of revolving numbers on mobile phones and one speaks to 'Poster George'. One then supplies the required number of posters and a bucket of glue, and that is the last one needs to have any consideration of the

matter other than when one drives to work and sees 10 000 posters defacing walls around Adelaide. It is appropriate that we try to stop that, just as we are trying to stop more standard graffiti vandalism.

In summary, I would say that this Bill is a good attempt and goes some of the way, despite just changing the names of various things, but at least it concentrates the mind on graffiti as such. I believe more widespread solutions are necessary, some of which I have alluded to and some of which have already been alluded to by other members. The issue of graffiti vandalism is almost, dare I say it, a political issue because we are all continually confronted by constituents who are angry that their own property has been defaced or that public property in their vicinity has been defaced and that they have to look at it day after day. I commend to the House the thought behind the Bill and I hope that the amendment that I will move later will be supported.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I support the legislation and later I will have some comments to make about some of the contributions from the other side, because it is pretty fair to say that people from the conservative side of politics, whether in this State, in this country or in western world democracies as we know them, actually want graffiti, vandalism and crime because it gives them something to attack in the case of Governments or Parties of the political persuasion to which I belong.

We hear all those hollow words about what we should be doing and, in the case of this legislation, we have the 'me too', or 'I thought about it first' reaction and, if perchance it is popular with the general community, members on that side of politics can gain some degree of benefit. When one looks at legislation around Australia (or in other parts of the world, and I have had the opportunity of reading what has been done elsewhere), one sees that this is the toughest legislation of its type in this country. When we look at some other aspects of the Bill compared with what has been enacted in Europe and North America, I would say that it is the toughest legislation in the world.

Yet it has been attacked editorially in the media; it has been attacked by the Hon. Mr Gilfillan in another place; and they have all said it is too tough. One cannot have it both ways. If members demand that kids have their hands cut off at the wrists to stop them using a spray can and, if this Minister on behalf of the Government brings in a package which hopefully will be able to deal with the situation, then members cannot say the Bill is too tough.

I congratulate the Minister because, despite the barrage of criticism, he has not once flinched from his responsibilities and, in fact, I would say that he is the Captain Courageous in this area and deserves full credit. Once the Bill has gone through both Houses and has been proclaimed, I hope the Minister will pick up the points of view that have been expressed in this debate and tell those mindless people out there that their days are numbered, because that is the case. Not one of us has any argument with the fact that where people engage in mindless vandalism they need to be dealt with promptly. Indeed, I applaud the member for Fisher for his responsible attitude to the whole question of graffiti vandalism.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: A mature attitude.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Indeed. I have already gone on record as saying that the member for Fisher has matured considerably over the past two or three months and I give him due credit for that. Let me look at some of the things that the member for Bright said because, in effect, he carried out quite a scurrilous attack on this Government and on the member for Albert Park, whose record in trying

to combat graffiti vandalism is unique and without peer. Time and time again the member for Albert Park brought up in the House and in Caucus the matter of what the Government should be doing, but one does not suddenly pick up a matter and say, 'We will increase the penalty and put them away' etc. One must think it through.

We copped flak from the member for Bright because we did not willy-nilly follow the member for Hanson back in 1987 who, dare I say it, introduced a hastily prepared piece of legislation which did not really tie all the ends together and, because we opposed it, the member for Bright suggests that we are not concerned. That is why the member for Albert Park became so outraged about this last night and it resulted in my not being able to give an explanation to an important question that I was asking the Minister of Agriculture earlier today. I suffered because of the scurrilous behaviour of members opposite—in particular, the behaviour of the member for Bright and the member for Bragg. However, I am digressing and I should not be.

Let me look at what is already in place, despite what we have before us in the Bill. Already in the statutes are a sufficient number of measures that can deal with people who deface property in South Australia. Section 48 of the Summary Offences Act 1953 deals with writing on walls and defacing, and the penalty is \$1 000 or three months imprisonment. That is not exactly a whimperish Government reaction to this problem. The courts may also order compensation payments to the owner or occupier of a property and, as the House well knows, the Government proposes to increase that penalty.

The Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935, in sections 84 and 85, deals with property damage, and the penalty involves imprisonment ranging from three years to 10 years (depending on the amount of damage) for a completed offence and imprisonment from two to six years for attempted damage. Of course, section 86 deals with possession of an object with the intention to damage property. The penalty is imprisonment for three years—again not a luke-warm attitude to this kind of problem. Section 25 of the State Transport Authority Act deals with defacing authority property, with a penalty of a \$500 fine, and compensation can also be ordered. Under the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act a wide range of penalties apply. Parental responsibility must make members opposite squirm, because when they were given the chance to support Government amendments under the Wrongs Act, what did they do? They ran for cover and started to say—

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I rise on a point of order. Standing Orders require relevancy in debate, and we do not appear to be getting that at the moment.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Hutchison): I ask the honourable member to relate his comments to the Bill.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I certainly will, Madam Acting Speaker. I think it goes to prove that I have touched on a raw nerve because the member for Bright's speech had no relevance to the Bill—he referred to a private member's motion that was moved in 1987—but the member for Light did not stand up and squeal about no relevance; as he is one of theirs, he was quite content. One of the most important aspects of the Bill concerns the definition of an offence of carrying a graffiti implement without lawful excuse. I accept that this has not been defined under the regulations at this stage, as the Minister has said, but I accept his word that it will include only the most common items such as spray cans and wide felt-tipped pens. I hope that shoe polish dispensers with a felt tip will be included: the member for Bright in his contribution referred to Nugget shoe polish as

being quite damaging to certain materials used in STA buses and trains.

The real problem in the past has been with actually catching the person while he or she was committing the offence. The member for Bright as a wayward teenager of 15 could have been walking around with a satchel full of spray cans, but as long as he did not use them the police or the transit authorities could do nothing about it. That is an important part of the Bill, and I hope the member for Light knows that I am on about relevance.

There has been wide consultation about this Bill with local government. The member for Bright took offence at that. He jumped up and down and said that, because the Minister had the decency to consult with local government, that somehow implied that the Minister was saying that the Opposition was opposed to it. He then gave us this rather fanciful story about local government queueing up outside his door wanting to know why the member for Bright did not support the legislation. The Minister does not operate in that way: he consults down the line. In fact, he consulted with my own local government authority and was very well received. I think the Mayor of Munno Para put out a press release congratulating the Minister for his vision in actually introducing this legislation.

Let me look at what local government has done. I congratulate the member for Bright for organising groups in his own area to implement anti-graffiti measures. That is not to say that because the member for Bright became involved, he should pour scorn and ridicule on Government members and, in particular, on my friend the member for Albert Park who ultimately denied me the chance to explain my question. At Glenelg, a classic area that has a lot of trouble with young people, this problem has been addressed in various ways. They have a residents' watch patrol, which is an extension of Neighbourhood Watch. They are not vigilantes but they want to do something about stopping their property from being defaced.

I refer to the Elizabeth council's Aquadome and the Munno Para youth project shopfront, which was funded by the council and which looked at legal sites. The Minister of Youth Affairs organised a grant for the Smithfield Plains High School which conducted five classic examples of what can be done with legal graffiti. Most of the people involved were kids from pretty deprived backgrounds. After that experience, under the guidance of a professional artist, I would say that their attitude to mindless graffiti changed completely. The West Torrens City Council became involved in a more punitive way by identifying culprits and making sure they cleaned up their vandalism. One could say that that is not exactly the way in which other councils operate, but at least it is a step in the right direction. That council also provides a reward for information on offenders—again, a step in the right direction.

One would have thought that in the blue-rinse set in the Burnside council area there would not be any graffiti, but it seems that even in Burnside they have the same problem as in the northern, southern and western suburbs. The Woodville council has been a leader in attempting to involve local youth in positive preventative programs. I understand that a legal art competition is being encouraged in that area where youth are actually painting 44-gallon drums to be used as litter bins.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The member for Albert Park interjects very quietly to say that that initiative was promoted from his electorate office—

Mr Hamilton: No; with the Mayor of Woodville.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:—together with the Mayor of Woodville. The Tea Tree Gully council stands out as a beacon. Already it has committed \$70 000 to an integrated program to combat graffiti, including a rapid clean-up role for Neighbourhood Watch groups. I think that may have been referred to by the member for Bright when he said that other areas had picked up the lead of the Noarlunga group. 'Adopt a Stop' is current in most areas. I wish someone would adopt the bus stop outside my house because it sometimes suffers from graffiti. Perhaps the Minister would consider giving me a grant. Other projects under the Tea Tree Gully program include the preparation of a brochure for point of sale of graffiti implements in schools; support for a youth project entitled ART FXU; and the setting up of an urban art park where young people can do legal art activities.

Although this legislation is long overdue, there is a positive move in the community to say 'We have all had enough'. This problem has been going on for generations. I am sure Madam Acting Speaker that at times you used to scribble on the wall with chalk when you were a young girl—I know that I did. Despite the punitive aspects of this problem, we have to encourage those people to use their talents legally and, by way of example, not to get involved in graffiti vandalism. The member for Fisher made the point that, if a lot of these young kids had been treated differently at an early age, they might not have gone down this path. That is something the member for Bright either does not understand or has deliberately excluded from his contributions on this subject. I know that this Bill will get a rapid passage through the House.

I understand an amendment is on file and I will have to consider it and decide whether or not I support it, but I do think that at long last we have something that we can hang our hat on. Despite the barrage of criticism the Minister has received from some of the more pious members of our society, I encourage the Minister to stick to his guns and at the same time tell the member for Bright that the fact that it was introduced in February and is being debated in April is not a sign of Government weakness; it is a sign that we have a program to follow. My advice to the member for Bright and members opposite is that, if they did not go on so much on other pieces of legislation in a repetitive and nauseous way, we would have dealt with this Bill in the middle of March.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): The Government has lost the plot part of the way in relation to this legislation, and it is very interesting to note some of the speeches and some of the comments made by Government members. The whole idea of the legislation is to deal with the problem of graffiti and those who create graffiti and damage public property. No matter what legislation we introduce into this House and what we enact, the problem is that we must first catch the offender, prove that that person was the person responsible, and then deal out a suitable penalty.

I have lost count, but it must be at least 15 or 16 years ago when I first brought this matter to the attention of my local government authority—West Torrens council—and suggested to it and the Glenelg council that perhaps, to combat the tremendous amount of damage that was being done to our bus shelters, we put up a warning sign and offer a reward of \$200. That was seen as quite draconian but it was effective and, through our council areas and by constantly paying attention to any damage that was done to those bus shelters (as soon as it was done it was immediately painted over or cleaned up), we were able to some degree to combat the incidence of graffiti.

In the past few years West Torrens council in particular and Glenelg council have stepped up their program to combat graffiti. West Torrens council reiterated to the public that there is a reward of \$200, and it has been quite effective. One resident reported a young student who was writing graffiti on a bus shelter, and that student was suspended from school (Immanuel College). Glenelg council offers a reward of \$500, so that is how serious it is, and it is costing councils thousands of dollars a year to combat or clean up graffiti in the area.

I would like to think that the action I took back in September 1986 (page 991 of *Hansard*) when I moved amendments to the Summary Offences Act could have put in train certain penalties and certain actions that, given the right amount of publicity and support by the Government at the time, could have curbed the activities of people who wanted to write graffiti all over public and private buildings. That is why I was particularly disappointed that, when I introduced the legislation back in 1986, the then member for Adelaide responded on behalf of the Government and, in quite a negative way, as we note on page 2985 of *Hansard* of 19 February 1987, said that some of the amendments I proposed were similar to those moved to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. In fact, he said they were the same as the general range of offences. The maximum penalty for the offence at present is a \$1 000 fine or three months imprisonment. The penalty was increased from a \$50 fine in 1985 as part of a general rationalisation of what was then the Police Offences Act.

He went on further, saying that he believed that further increases so soon after the last were not justified. The point is that nobody was prepared to admit that a \$50 fine was absolutely ridiculous at the time; that \$1 000 was reasonable but \$2 000 was even better, because discussions held with the other States suggested that a \$10 000 fine might have been more realistic. We realised we were dealing with young people, so we set the fine at \$2 000. That is where the members of the Government lost the plot, because the Summary Offences Act was the right Act to deal with it, and the Government did not realise it, or, if it did, it was not prepared to say so. In that speech, the member for Adelaide proved that he was out of touch or had been given instructions from the then Attorney-General and the Government on the action to take; namely, that to justify the Government's stand against my proposal he was to relate to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. He was a oncer, and that is exactly what happened to him, because he certainly did not enhance his prospects of being re-elected to the seat of Adelaide.

The member for Bright is already on record as saying that the proposal was defeated 25 votes to 16 following a division, so the Government could not hold its head high from 1987 onwards. That damage amounting to countless hundreds of thousands of dollars, occurred following the proposal is clearly on the head of every remaining Labor member who voted against that legislation. In no way can anybody duck the responsibility. The opportunity was there to bring in reasonably tough penalties, as we heard when the member for Napier said that these are pretty tough penalties now. That does not bother me. The fact is that the opportunity was there and the Government ducked away from it.

Then, I gave the Government another opportunity on 13 December 1990, when again I moved amendments to the Summary Offences Act, similar to 1986, incorporating the penalties that we are now considering. Again, we had to hear a lead speaker from the Government oppose that proposition. It is probably one of the most disgraceful speeches

that has been recorded in *Hansard* for a long time, because it was a very cowardly attack, and a cowardly response on behalf of the Government. On page 3639 of *Hansard* of 14 March 1991 (quite some months after I moved those amendments), the member for Albert Park responded, referring to me:

It is unfortunate that he is not here so that I could take him to task . . .

Further on, he says:

. . . this . . . has been a political stunt because, quite frankly, within the Act there are those penalties available.

If it was a political stunt, why was I not reminded of that in 1986; why was I not reminded of that 15 years earlier when I asked local government to bring in a penalty or reward system to do something about it? All the way through the contribution by the member for Albert Park he says such things as:

It is just a clown act, that is all it is. It is beat-up publicity to try to suggest that the Government is not doing enough.

We were trying to give the Government some teeth—some testicles, if we want to put it crudely—to do something about the problem that was annoying the people in the community. Then, we get the usual little swipe about the 'silvertails opposite'. That is the continual threat all the way through the speech of the member for Albert Park. It does nothing to enhance the status of Parliament and does nothing to help any Government or Parliament trying to do something in relation to law and order. So, it was disappointing that in that debate he was the only speaker on behalf of the Government. There was really little substance whatsoever in the whole speech; it did not really refer to the Bill that I had proposed. It was generally airy-fairy waffle and did not address the whole issue.

Again, the honourable member, like the Government, missed the whole issue, because the principle here is whether the Criminal Law Consolidation Act is satisfactory legislation for this measure or whether it is better to amend the Summary Offences Act. I contend, as I have always contended and contended back in 1986, that it should be in the Summary Offences Act. The legislation that we are now considering was the way to go then. It was a tragedy that it was not approved because, under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act (one has to find the respective clauses), if somebody is convicted of an offence under that Act they are tried in either the District Court or the Supreme Court. It is an indictable offence upon information and there is a preliminary hearing before a justice of the peace or a magistrate before it proceeds further.

In those days, that was a tough penalty. If we are talking about being tough, the Government had reasonably tough legislation then, but it was too strong, as offenders were going before the District or Supreme Courts. That is not what the Parliament really wanted, as most of these people were juvenile offenders or, if they were not, they were just over the age limit. Under the Summary Offences Act, an offender is summoned to appear before a justice or magistrate and the matter can be dealt with in a court of summary jurisdiction. It was a much simpler process. That is what we are doing now. We are doing the right thing by the law and the courts system through this Bill. At long last we are on the right track so far as the law and order program is concerned. I will not go over all the issues, the programs or the hoo-ha that has been going on for umpteen years and recorded in *Hansard* since 1986. We all have huge files on graffiti, on the pros and cons of what should be done according to psychologists, on how it should be treated and on whether parents should be liable.

In today's society, young people have less respect for parents than they had in my day. We have a real problem, and certainly the education system falls down—it fails badly. I get very annoyed when I hear some of the arguments in rebuttal to the comments made by the member for Bright, the lead speaker for the Opposition and shadow Minister in this area, but we are still missing the point that we have to get through to young people that, when they ride on public transport, they must not pull out a pen or a spray can and write all over property. I recently rode home on a bus that was absolutely disgraceful. I would not have believed it was possible: there was not a square inch that had not been written upon. The bus was an absolute mess. I sat at the back of the bus and, as each school child got on, I kept a close watch on them. They took one look at me and were not game to do anything, which is just as well. My family uses public transport a lot and, as my wife said, the bus drivers are intimidated by the groups of school children. They are not always children from Government schools: some of them wear college clothes and are from some of the better recognised schools in the State.

We need to take the arguments to the principals of these schools and the parents of these school children; we should tell them that we will not tolerate this anti-social behaviour—we will not have a bar of it. The art teachers and others who have been teaching some of these little horrors these skills must also be made accountable to the community. The Minister knows that I have also looked at the possibility of our banning spray cans. They are a curse, but they are useful for the handyman in touching up paint jobs at home. I am loath to introduce a ban on spray cans. Even if we did, as with the Licensing Act, we would always find that somebody would buy something and pass it on. A price will be paid, and that is the tragedy of our society today.

Let us not be so concerned about what has gone on in the past: let us look at the future and at how the legislation will impact on the community, how it will make parents accountable and how it will provide teeth for the courts and give the police the opportunity to do something satisfactory, as required by the community. Until we embark on a solid education program, until we use the education system and until we use the media to advise these young people that this sort of anti-social behaviour is not acceptable, we will get nowhere. It is no good having all the laws in the world unless we can catch them. There is no point having laws unless we can advise and strenuously inform these people that this sort of behaviour is not on. We have to reorganise our thinking and look at a stronger education program whilst putting a little more responsibility on young people themselves. We can say to them, 'Listen here; the challenge tonight is that you will ride home on a school bus without doing any damage to that bus. That is the real challenge.' The little horrors cannot do it. They have to be fiddling and fidgiting and doing something destructive.

I appeal to the Government: we should follow through after we have paid the price of tens of millions of dollars. In 1987 the State Transport Authority caught about 100 young people defacing public transport facilities. The STA knew even in those days that it had an immense problem, but it did not really come down hard enough to do something about it. We need a strong, solid education program through every available avenue so that we can reinforce to young people that they have a place in society and are welcome. If they are skilful and if art is their way, they can learn to do it on a piece of paper but not on public walls, transport or buildings.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I commend the Government on taking this initiative. We must use a number of different

strategies to deal with the problem. There is not a simple answer. Graffiti has been a problem for many years. It can rightly be argued that in the past few years it has become a much more serious problem, but effectively it has been around since painting and other writing instruments were invented. The road of increased penalty as the only solution has been tried before. The Romans had a problem in a number of their possessions and, under Roman law, crucifixion and not a division 7 fine or whatever was prescribed for a first offence. The problem did not go away. The Romans still had the problem in a whole range of areas. They built many nice artefacts, but graffiti artists painted and chipped away at them, leaving all sorts of marks on them, which today are sought by archaeologists.

The decorations that we see in the train stations, bus depots and other places are hardly likely to be sought as archaeological finds in the future. Most of it is of nuisance value, and in many instances many examples of graffiti vandalism, particularly on STA facilities, not only is expensive to remove but represents open disregard of community standards. The public demands to travel on buses which do not have wet paint all over them, destroying clothes and property.

Some of the clauses are absolutely necessary. The law regarding the carriage of graffiti items must be made clearer. When it comes to regulating this legislation, we will have to look regularly at what are graffiti implements. I have no problem whatsoever with the Transit Squad picking up any young hooligan—or for that matter, an older one—who has a bag full of textas or paint cans, for instance, considering them to be graffiti instruments and reacting accordingly. However, it is necessary to say that there are a number of horizontal as well as vertical solutions to this problem. There is no doubt that there is a greater role for education in this matter. And there is a role for Government at all levels.

There is also a strongly held view in the community that graffiti vandalism is something that ought to be stopped. I put to the House that the community could do more to stop some of the examples of vandalism in our midst. There is no doubt that many parents are aware that their children are involved in these activities. They too can play their part in this exercise. There is no doubt that, where examples of graffiti vandalism are detected, people generally tend to look the other way. This legislation recognises that it is a much bigger problem than has been the case in the past. We will always have problems in the future but, in essence, we are tackling some of the problems that are now before us. I support the Bill.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I support the Bill, but I would like to see it amended. We will consider an amendment to be moved later by the member for Adelaide. The graffiti vandalism that goes on in our community is a concern, but this law will not stop any of it to any great degree. It may in the long term, because those intending to offend will have the opportunity to think it through. One problem in our society is that we tackle things from the wrong end. Governments give very little support to the family unit. Little publicity or promotion is given to the concept that the family unit is important. By that, I do not mean that we can stop marriages from breaking up or problems in that area where personalities clash or circumstances change so that people do not get on: I am just saying that the family unit has become a secondary consideration, even to some of our departments.

The Department for Family and Community Services sometimes tends to be more interested in encouraging young

people to leave their home instead of trying to sort out the problem at the home or with those associated with the home. That is not the fault of only the State Government: it is the fault of the type of society that we have allowed to develop. In the main, the cause of that is what we are given to view—on television or in the theatre. It is not imposed upon people at the theatre, if they wish to have some control over their children, or even attempt to have that control. However, it is imposed on family units by television, if not in the home where the parents are present then at a neighbour's home.

There is no doubt that violence is associated with vandalism. It is only one step further. I challenge any honourable member to sit down for one evening—of those few that we have at home—and take note of how often aggression, damage to property or the stealing of motor vehicles—all the things that concern us—are depicted in some way on the television screen. It is not easy to attack the problem because, if we attempt to legislate to try to restrict that in some way, it is said that we are interfering with people's freedom of speech and freedom to view what they like. Tied up with that is our attitude that many people go out to dine, and there is a tendency to spend more time away from home, leaving a babysitter to look after the children or for children eight, nine or 10 years of age to look after themselves until Mum and Dad, who dine out either together or separately, come home. All those things add up, to some degree, with many others that I will mention in a moment, so that the children grow up and wonder what is the right direction.

Since I have been in this place—going on for 25 years—I have seen the law change with respect to licensed premises and the consumption of alcohol. We now have the con-founded places open all night, right through until 5 a.m. One set of parents will say to their 14 or 15 years olds, 'I do not want you to go out; I want you to stay home and study.' They say, 'But our mates are going out. Mr and Mrs Smith, Aunty Nell and Uncle Bill let their children go; why can't we?' So, there are pressures on the family because young people see from the television, the theatre or magazines that certain things are the right things to do. In the end, the vast majority of parents buckle.

Some of them have excellent arrangements with their children. They ask, 'What time will you be home?' The reply is, '11 o'clock', and the parents say, 'If you are not going to be home at 11, ring us and tell us where you are.' Where that sort of faith and trust has developed, very seldom do we see trouble from those young people. But how do we as a Parliament attack it? I do not know the answer, except to say that these licensed places should close at midnight or earlier except perhaps on Friday and Saturday nights. Maybe they could close at 2 a.m. or 3 a.m. on Saturdays and 1 a.m. on Sundays.

There is no doubt that many young people have come to accept that alcohol is the norm. We all know that, if the young people of our own movements have a show, it is not a show unless stabbies or other alcohol is provided. It is becoming the Australian custom with young people that alcohol must be the basis of a party. If some are too young to purchase it, somebody purchases it on their behalf. Even though the law has been changed, they will drink in the parks. We talk about having dry areas. Either we do not have enough police or the police are not prepared to take the punt and book young people when they drink in public places. We have that trouble in Blackwood. The Coroner still cannot tell me what caused the death of a young man of 19 years. He was burnt to death—not burnt just a little but cooked—in a local park. If it was done deliberately, it

is murder. If it was done as a result of a silly prank, with people skylarking but making an error, perhaps with flammable material stolen from a shop, that is a form of vandalism. If the young man took his own life, it is sad. In the parks, young people climb poles and smash lights, but we can always find empty alcohol containers nearby. There is not much good punishing them if we have no way of policing what we accept to be the norm in our society.

At one stage I formed a youth club in a Hills' town with the help of the police, the churches and community workers. We provided the young people with pool tables, a music room for those who wanted music and a room where they could meditate or be quiet. We had some rules and the young people came to us and said that they did not like our rules. We said that in that case we would have no rules. A few weeks later, a group of young people came to us and said that when they were trying to be quiet there was too much noise coming from the music room and that when they wanted to play pool someone messed around with the cues and caused trouble. We told them to make some rules, which they did. In the end, the young people who conducted themselves better left the club because a few ratbags dominated the scene and dragged a few others with them.

Vandalism and graffiti are only part of that scene. We have adopted an international convention that says that we cannot get too angry with children or hit them. I hit my daughter when she was 15 and broke my wrist. She did not cry because I hit her, but about half an hour later she cried because I had broken the scaphoid bone in my wrist, which had become swollen, and she was sorry that I was hurt. We are still the best of mates and always have been but, if I did that today, I would be up before some confounded court. She knows why it was and so do I.

While still at primary school, children of very young age are told that, as far as behaviour is concerned, they do not have to take notice of their parents. I am not saying that they are told that they should not listen to their parents but they are told that they do not have to take any notice. If any of us were given direction from four or five years of age about options we might take—I am not saying should take—many of us would fall by the wayside, carry out vandalism or graffiti, damage other people's property or turn to drugs and alcohol. We are told that some of the old-fashioned ideas are no good. I make a prediction that not too far in the future this Parliament and others throughout the world will try to bring back some of those old customs and practices.

The member for Fisher said that we have to start helping young people with their entertainment or their spare time. That sounds great but that can only occur if we give responsible young people a fair bit of control over how the particular exercise is conducted so that they can say to those who want to lead others astray and cause trouble, 'Toe the line or else.' Our lesson was learnt badly and it cost quite a few people a lot of money. It failed because we let those who had difficulty in coping with life take over from those who wanted to be responsible.

Another thing that must be realised is that the vast majority of young people in our community are home studying, trying to get part-time work and acting responsibly. If they did not, there would be hundreds more incidents of graffiti and vandalism in our community. The percentage of young people in this category is not large and that is something of which the community and young people should be proud. We need to recognise that. We should get newspapers and the television news services to forget about the bad things that occur and promote the good things, where young people help the elderly, plant trees, clean up a street or do some-

thing to help others, even people of their own age group. If that were promoted, it would become accepted as the in thing and there would be more of it. The trouble is that that is not the way it is and people in the media tell us that all the public wants to know is about the things in society that have a bit of a taint to them. If we promoted good, I believe good would come about. How does Parliament achieve that? It cannot, because Parliament does not control the media.

Although I might get into trouble a little later, I feel that I must make some comments about the performing arts. People involved in the performing arts tell us that they follow society. They do not. They set the scene for society with the type of plays that are written and produced, even in the schools. I have seen those plays in schools. People complain to me about some of the nomadic performers, as I call them, who travel through the State. They did not come to school in my time. Some of us got into trouble, but not as badly as kids do today. If they do not do any harm, why are we seeing a lot more of it? That is part of the problem. Certain people want to take society a step further down the path of what I call experimentation, and that is a problem.

The cost of vandalism and graffiti is high not just to Government instrumentalities or local councils but to individuals. For example, a gentleman in Blackwood has an older style home, the front wall of which is right on the footpath. Posters advertising high-class entertainment centres in the city are stuck on his window. He cannot catch up with the offenders because they do it in the early hours of the morning. It is his home. The promoters of such commercial ventures would not like it if such posters were plastered on their home.

This issue goes deeper than the penalties. Unless Parliament has the courage to help families get together, to help young people understand that the family unit is important and to promote a return to those standards—and we cannot go right back—I do not believe that we will reduce the cost very much. All that will happen is that another form of antisocial act will develop. The idea of telling shopkeepers to keep spray paint cans in cages has been of little use because in my area all offenders have done is break in after hours, smash up the shop, smash up the cage and pinch the containers. Shopkeepers were better off when the cans were displayed openly and only one or two were pinched every week. I support the Bill.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): In my contribution I will make a number of observations about the circumstances leading to the current graffiti problems and the matters referred to in the Bill. At this stage, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ILLEGAL USE OF MOTOR VEHICLES) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 26 (clause 3)—Leave out 'division 5 imprisonment' and insert 'imprisonment for 2 years'.

No. 2. Page 1, lines 27 and 28 (clause 3)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert 'for a subsequent offence—imprisonment for not less than 3 months and not more than 4 years.'

No. 3. Page 2, lines 20 to 23 (clause 3)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 4. Page 2, lines 24 to 32 (clause 4)—Leave out the clause.

Consideration in Committee.

Amendments Nos 1 and 2:

Mr BRINDAL: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 1 and 2 be agreed to.

These technical amendments keep the spirit of the Bill as it left this House. I believe that the other parts of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act do not contain the division penalties, and that will be progressively updated. 'Division 5 imprisonment', which was the wording as it left this place is now 'imprisonment for two years', which is what another place seeks to insert. The second amendment is of the same order. Another place has made a technical change which suits the Bill in which it will reside.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 3:

Mr BRINDAL: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 3 be disagreed to but that the following alternative amendment be made in lieu thereof:

Clause 3, page 2—Line 21—After 'premises' insert 'unlawfully and'. Line 23—Leave out 'Division 3 imprisonment' and insert 'imprisonment for 2 years'.

Another place sought to leave out the provision of a penalty for being on premises with the intent to use a motor vehicle. There are many precedents in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act which establish the crime of intent, and section 172 of that Act provides:

Any person who is found by night—

(a) armed with any dangerous or offensive weapon or instrument with intent to break, or enter, into any building and to commit any felony therein; . . . shall be guilty of a [felony] and liable—

to imprisonment for a term not exceeding seven years. I believe it was the intent of those who passed this Bill that it should be an offence if someone comes onto property and attempts to use one's motor vehicle illegally. That was the intention behind the clause as it left this place. That intention is not the same. It is a mirror of similar intents in regard to burglary and other crimes found in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

This amendment makes it more clear that a person must be on the premises unlawfully and that it must be with intent. Similarly, the second part of the amendment, in seeking imprisonment for two years, acknowledges it as a much lesser penalty than was previously proposed and, therefore, I commend the amendment which I propose to the Committee.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 4:

Mr BRINDAL: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 4 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (PREVENTION OF GRAFFITI VANDALISM) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).
(Continued from page 4374.)

The SPEAKER: Before calling the member for Light, I draw the attention of all members to the total debacle that private members' time has become every Wednesday evening, and I call upon the Leaders and the Whips to ensure that business is programmed correctly so that we can deal with matters more expeditiously. The honourable member for Light.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): It has been interesting to listen to the various approaches to this matter in order to get an indication of who did what when and who did not do what they should have done when they should have done it, etc. At least this Bill is before the House, and one hopes that some tangible effort will be made to come to grips with this issue.

This matter has grown through the years and is actually a follow-on of what has occurred overseas. When the Hon. Gavin Keneally was Minister of Local Government some years ago, I presented to him a monthly publication from America. It was a very glossy and well presented document devoted entirely to graffiti and how to proceed with it. On the American scene it drew attention to the fact that the community and youth were working together. A great number of trains and other public utilities gained the benefit of repainting in a particular design structure that could be regarded as graffiti but, because it was being done officially with consultation between the various authorities and persons concerned who wanted to undertake the activity, there was a measure of balance. It was gaudy and psychedelic but it provided an entirely new approach to action taken by public utilities and youth.

That was the forerunner to what was to happen inevitably in Australia if no positive action was taken to seek to control or manage graffiti activities. It came to my knowledge that a group of young people in the north were seeking the permission of the Department of Transport to paint murals or structured graffiti on the inside of railway bridges that pass over the metropolitan line between Adelaide and Gawler. There had been an attempt to put a few tags and scrawls on the pillars and walls of these bridges, but these young people wanted to submit a design to the department and then to make use of available blank concrete walls as a feature all the way along the line.

The then Minister thought very seriously about this and suggested to Cabinet that consideration ought to be given to acceding to the request, but in the long term he had to say, 'We are not going to enter into this particular field.' The thrust of the argument was taken up very successfully by the Port Lincoln council. On the foreshore near a jetty close to the civic centre there was a large ablutions block, which was a very ugly structure. It had often been graffitied by young people, and the Port Lincoln council suggested that it be used for a mural. From the time that the Port Lincoln council made that building available to young people to paint a mural I have never seen it despoiled. The member for Flinders might be able to advise us whether it has been despoiled, but I do not believe that it has been. What the young created they revered. No doubt after counselling took place on the sort of graffiti that would look good on that ablutions block, the building has looked much more attractive to the passing public. It has been repainted from time to time but has never been damaged by graffiti.

Similar action has taken place on a number of buildings around Adelaide. One which comes graphically to mind is the solid construction fencing that was erected around the Festival Theatre site. School children were invited to paint certain panels. It was graffiti of a different type, but it was pleasing to the eye on what would have otherwise been a bland fence. The young people got a great deal of delight out of doing something that was actually an expression of their art, in which they were assisted by their teachers. They had the sanction of the builder, the Government and the City Council and, to my recollection, it was never despoiled. Again, it was created by young people who took pride in it, and it was not despoiled.

We are having a degree of trouble with graffiti at this time, but when given the opportunity to work in harmony with young people and to make use of appropriate places to express their skills, we failed. We gave no consideration to the opportunity that existed alongside railway lines and under bridges, and as a result they became more and more graffitied. When these young people ran out of wall space, because there was no real art or pride of ownership involved in what they did, they turned to back fences and signal boxes, etc.

More recently, some of our schools have undertaken to be responsible for a railway station, paint it, tidy it up and look after it. I have been heartened by the fact that where a school has shown a proprietary interest in a station there has been a reduction in the amount of despoiling by itinerant travellers. I am not suggesting that a tag has never appeared on some of these stations, but I refer to the Evanston railway station, which was always badly graffitied. It was taken over by the Evanston Primary School and is a sight to behold. It looks sparkling new. There is an attitude of 'This is ours; we are going to protect it', and protect it they do. I know that there are other places throughout the State where that has taken place.

I am really saying that, whilst we are putting through a piece of legislation that seeks to reduce the effects of graffiti, I would suggest to the House that it might be only the tip of the iceberg and that in actual fact we ought to be looking at other aspects of the whole issue, where the community works with youth and perhaps develops a greater degree of pride than currently exists. I am not taking away the type of problems from across the State constantly put before the Select Committee on Juvenile Justice but, there again, one word which comes through frequently and commonly is the word 'boredom'. The alternative action that I have spoken of is to take away some of that boredom by giving people the opportunity to participate in a project. I certainly give my support to the Bill before the House, but would draw attention to the fact that it will not be the be all and end all and that we have to use our initiative. In fact, the community will have to use its initiative to make sure that there is a more structured approach to the problem of graffiti in the community.

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I would like to say a few words about this Bill and to congratulate the Minister of Youth Affairs on the work that he has done to address the problem of graffiti. Graffiti is a particularly costly problem within our community. I believe that the cost for the STA alone is something approaching \$1.5 million a year, and I am sure the cost to councils and other public bodies as well as to individuals is much higher than that. I guess that one of the main problems with graffiti as a crime is that it is particularly intimidating. Not only does it make many areas very ugly but also I am sure it has an effect in discouraging many people, particularly the elderly, from travelling on public transport because it makes people feel rather frightened when they see all the graffiti around.

There is no doubt that graffiti is a problem of the young and that it really is a cult that has been adopted in its present form from the United States. I am sure that anyone who has seen pictures of the transit systems within the large cities of the United States such as New York would be well aware of the incredible amount of graffiti in those systems. The type of graffiti we now have—the rather distinctive figures and murals—follow worldwide trends. We need to address the problem of graffiti with a balanced approach, including both the carrot and stick. What we see in this Bill is the stick side of it; we see some very necessary increases

in penalties and, more particularly, we see the definition of a new offence of carrying a graffiti implement, which is a very necessary part of effectively being able to police the problem of graffiti. I warmly welcome this, but we must realise that we need a carrot as well; we need to encourage our young people to be involved in more productive activities within the community.

Again, I would like to congratulate the Minister of Youth Affairs on some of the initiatives that his department has developed to encourage young people, particularly those with some talent as artists to develop their talents in a more productive way. I am also aware that, through TAFE, the Minister has taken initiatives to encourage young people to develop their genuine artistic talents. I would also like to congratulate the Minister on the conference on graffiti that he held last year, and anyone who attended would have been very impressed indeed by the information that was gathered at that conference.

I know that many people came to that conference from local government, and I am sure that, as a result of that and other initiatives that the Government has taken, we have seen a lessening of graffiti in the community. Certainly, I can say that my area, particularly along the main railway line, which was particularly badly affected by graffiti in the past, is now a very clean area, and I know that is greatly appreciated by my electors and, I am sure, by those who pass by it each day on their trip to the city.

I would like to address some of the furphies that I heard before the dinner adjournment from the member for Davenport, who spoke about parental responsibilities in relation to juvenile crime. The member for Davenport repeated the old saying that children can ignore their parents. I would like to draw his attention to the statement made by the Attorney-General several weeks ago which clearly set out parental rights in relation to disciplining children.

I think there is no doubt that much misinformation relates to the program that has been developed through our schools to make young children aware of the problem of child abuse and to encourage them to speak out against abuse, because we know, unfortunately, that many cases of child abuse are associated with the family and with friends and relatives. Of course it is a very necessary part of our education system that we should be encouraging young children to speak out or to feel free to speak out about such abuse. Because of that, it has been interpreted by some parents as a weakening of their authority, and there is certainly some confusion in the community about parental rights. Perhaps that is a matter that we need to address, but it is certainly quite wrong to suggest, as did the member for Davenport, that parents are unable effectively to discipline their children.

I do not think I need to say much more; this has been a fairly lengthy debate and most of the background to this problem has been covered. I would like to conclude by offering my congratulations to the Minister (and the Government generally) on the initiative that has been taken. I believe that as a result of this Bill we will be able to deal effectively with the problem of graffiti and will be able to continue to reduce the problem in the community, as I think we have proved successful in doing over the past 12 months. As I said earlier, there has been a noticeable reduction in the amount of graffiti within my electorate, and I feel sure that, with the passage of this Bill and the other initiatives the Government is taking, we will be able to reduce the problem further within our community. I warmly welcome the passage of this legislation.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): Similarly, I commend the Minister on introducing, if belatedly, this Bill to the House.

I know it has long been a concern of the Minister, because he has told this House repeatedly that it has long been a concern of his. It seems a pity that it has taken so long for the Government to come up with such a simple solution as it appears to have found in this Bill. I say that I regret that it has taken so long, because I believe that much of the problem has gone away, and I commend other sections of the Government—other Ministers—for the initiatives they have taken. Like the member for Mitchell, central to my electorate is the Noarlunga railway line, and I must record in this House the difference in the past six to nine months in all the STA property and STA vehicles moving around the city.

It appears that, having decided that it has the will to do something about graffiti, the Government has acted, and it has acted well, to its credit. I rode the trains in twice last week and was amazed at the difference between the train line, the vehicles, the stations and all STA property now as opposed to those very same pieces of property last year. Last year, they were an utter disgrace, and I believe that, because of fear more than anything else and the appearance of degradation and the general run down look that the properties had, elderly people were fearful for their safety and were keeping away from STA properties.

Now they are painted, they are clean and have little or no evidence of graffiti, and the problem seems to have been tackled or got on top of. I commend the STA and the Minister of Transport for that. It is a barbed commendation because I regret that the Government did not choose to do something about it before now. If the Minister thinks that I am being ungracious, perhaps I am. If the Minister or the STA had come up with this initiative 18 months ago, they would deserve more commendation than they are currently receiving. I cannot help but note that perhaps one of the reasons for the decline in graffiti around our city is due to the will of the Government to address this matter and to do something about it, and it must be commended for that.

The other major factor is the abolition of free public transport for students. I understand that in the heat of an election it is attractive for a Government to offer incentives to the voters, and at the last election the Government came up with a very attractive incentive for voters with young families, namely, free public transport for children. It was a very popular incentive with electors and no more popular than amongst the children. The STA transit police and the STA itself will attest to the fact that, once free public transport for children came in, graffiti ballooned and blossomed as never before. There are archetypal stories—which may or may not be true—of bands of youths who would roam the length and breadth of metropolitan Adelaide placing their tags on whatever was not moving. It was an attractive proposition for students because it involved no cost. When free public transport was cut out, almost overnight the incidence of graffiti in many areas of the city was diminished and rendered controllable. The Government is part of the cause and the cure of the problem. Time will more than amply demonstrate that.

The member for Mitchell interjected some time back that the transit police helped also. I acknowledge that and believe that the transit police are a necessary factor on our current rail system. I would hope that the time will come not long hence when we do not need special transit officers on trains in suburban Adelaide whose job it is basically to enforce good manners, peace and proper activity from our citizens. No member in this House would be pleased that it is necessary to have a type of security person on our trains to protect our citizens. Every member in this place would rather live in the type of society which I and I am sure the

member for Light and other members on this side of the House grew up in—a society in which our parents could let us catch a train into the city without fear for our safety or fear of anything going wrong.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Spence wrongly interjects. He asked when I was last on a train. If he had bothered to listen, he would have heard me say a moment ago that I caught the train on three occasions last week. I regularly catch the train from my electorate.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: The Indian Pacific?

Mr BRINDAL: The Minister thinks that I caught the Indian Pacific: I am not living in Cook—I am currently living in Hayward. I caught the train from Oaklands Park to Adelaide—a fairly simple matter and a trip on which I commend the Minister of Transport.

The SPEAKER: Order! Although the Chair finds the honourable member's tale of his rail travels very entertaining, they bear no resemblance at all to any clause in the Bill. I ask him to link up his remarks with the Bill.

Mr BRINDAL: I certainly will, Sir. I was giving a travelogue only because of the graffiti that used to be on the train that I used to catch. All members on both sides of the House seriously deplore the fact that we need transit police. They do a good job: no-one denies that or the fact that they are necessary at present. I and other members hope that we can reach the stage where our transport system can be safe and trusted by children and all people without the necessity of a special security-type force to protect the common citizen. That may not happen, but I hope that it will and I am sure that you do also, Sir, as do other members of this House. Much has been made of graffiti, how bad it is and the problems associated with it. Members opposite have been unfair. They have said that all the Opposition wants to do is belt everyone over the head with a hammer, lock them up for 10 years and put them in Stalags.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I really do wonder. The member for Spence comes in and out of a trance. He interjects and asks questions but does not listen to the answer and then makes some other innane interjection. If he would listen I would not mind talking to him.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

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

Mr BRINDAL: Perhaps off the rails, Sir. I do not think it fair for members on the Government benches to lambast us and say that we are draconian or that we seek unjust measures in the matter of graffiti. The member for Albert Park stood up with his hairshirt on and said that he had been on about graffiti since 1983. If he has (and I accept his word), I commend him for being on about graffiti since 1983. I am sure that many members on this side of the House have also been talking about graffiti and the need to do something about it since 1983.

However, it is unfair of him to criticise the members for Spence, Mitchell and Bright who have not had the privilege of being here since 1983 and who indeed came into this place in 1989 and who have consistently raised the matter since coming in here. After all, we can raise these matters only when it is our privilege to be here. The member for

Albert Park seems to miss that point. He thinks that, because he was here before us and has enjoyed the privilege longer than us, he is somehow special. It is a matter of consistency in one's time here and not a matter of whether you started before I started and is not that good? I may be doing the member for Albert Park an injustice, but that was the gist of his speech.

I come back to the main issue, namely, the Opposition's attitude to graffiti. We are not draconian or unreasonable about it. We have said consistently during questions and in grievance debates in this House (and you, Sir, have been here longer than most of us and would appreciate what has been said about this matter in the past few years) that something should be done about it and have called on the Government to do it. Will it be commended for it? It is not to say that we are unreasonable or do not understand the problem. While I commend the Government for finally doing something, the Bill is a belated effort and is too little too late. It does not address the serious problems. I see graffiti as a symptom of the problems that lie at the cause. We have seen no amendments to the Education Act and no measures which strengthen the family or look seriously at social welfare in the past two years. Members on the Government benches stand up and say, 'Look at this Opposition—they are a mob of draconian fascists (I believe I have heard that word used) who want to bash, lock up and do all these things.' That is not true. We want to show concern for people about whom we should show concern.

Among those people for whom members on this side feel most concern are our youth, especially our unemployed youth. We can make much of graffiti, which is a symptom of a problem, but the problem I believe lies in our schools, our homes and the employment structure that we have in this State. Frankly, no member on either side of the House would commend or support anyone for an act of wanton vandalism. I disagree with my colleague the member for Fisher, who acknowledges one form of graffiti vandalism as graffiti art. I accept that as a point of view but, whether it is graffiti art, it is still graffiti, and it is still an act of vandalism. It is placing something on somebody else's property which they do not seek to have there and which everyone does not put in the same class as a Picasso painting.

I cannot support graffiti, but I can understand the frustration of our young people who do not seem to be adequately serviced in our schools or who do not seem to be adequately supported by any part of society when they go looking for a job that does not exist, when they have to exist on the dole and their whole reason for being is questioned. I understand it when we have structures in this society which do not seem conducive to the support of the family and family life.

I would commend the Minister of Youth Affairs were he to bring before the House Bills that positively addressed matters related to his portfolio—matters of youth affairs, matters relating to the profitable employment of our youth, matters relating to families (and that comes under another Minister's portfolio) and matters relating to the education of our youth (and that comes under a third Minister's portfolio). Then we might be not here discussing a Bill that addresses the problem of graffiti but rather discussing the root causes. Graffiti might then not exist.

We can introduce draconian measures in relation to graffiti. We can do what we like and that might solve this problem but, unless we serve the long-term problems of our youth, all we will do is shift the problem. We might make it unprofitable for our youth to paint on walls, bus shelters, in shopping centres and on buses or trams, and they might think it is no longer worth it. If they are bored, frustrated

and no longer feel fulfilled, they will find something else to do, as youth have done since the beginning of time. Whatever else they find to do, I bet it will be to the annoyance and chagrin of the adult members of society, and something that members in this place will deplore. We will pass yet another law aimed at our youth. However, all the time the problem will not go away. The problem is not just of our youth but of this Parliament. There are problems of education, the family and unemployment. Until we address those problems, I put it to the House that Bills such as this will be little more than window dressing and ineffective.

Having said all that, I do commend the Minister, although I said it was too little too late. At least he is prepared to do something. At least he is prepared to stand up and be counted when it comes to these things. I do not know whether it will finally solve the problem, but any attempt is better than no attempt at all, and this is just that: an attempt. I commend the Minister for making the attempt—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Courage!

Mr BRINDAL: The Minister wants me to say he has courage. If the Minister needs members of the Opposition to praise him—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: I was talking about your courage in praising me.

Mr BRINDAL: It takes no courage to praise the Minister. It is a very little thing, to praise a Minister. The Minister has courage in introducing this Bill, standing up against the weak-kneed people in his Government who do not want to take any stern measures against those who break the law—the people who stand up in this place and stick up for the house breaker and the car thief and say—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: If the member for Spence actually sat in this Chamber and listened to the debate instead of reading or nodding off to sleep, and coming to life sometimes, he would know which very prominent member in this House accused me of belting the poor down and out, and he was referring to car thieves. Sir, I bet that you remember—

The SPEAKER: Order! Car thieves legislation has nothing to do with graffiti. I draw the honourable member back to the Bill before the House.

Mr BRINDAL: Yes, and the Bill before the House relates to graffiti vandalism. I was relating that to car theft, because car thieves are vandals and sometimes graffiti the cars they steal. As I said, we have a problem, and we have an attempt to find the solution. I do not think it goes far enough. It is too little too late. However, it is an attempt, and we must accept it as such. I would hope that, before the spring session, the Minister might come back here, in concert with his Cabinet colleagues (they must have little to do over the break), sit down and work out a coherent strategy to address not only this aspect of the problem but other aspects as well.

Sir, you have been here for long enough to know that your time is precious, and we have better things to do than continually to pass pieces of bandaid legislation that patch things up. I am quite sure that all members of this House would rather spend their time considering pieces of legislation which might address the causes of the problem so that we could be out in our electorates attending to the problems of our electors. With those words, I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Members will appreciate that we have a very difficult situation. I believe that within 10 years there will not be a continuation of the vandalism that we have seen of public property and so on. The first time I saw graffiti of the type

we now have with us was in Copenhagen of all places, some six years ago. It was over all the historic buildings. I was shocked and hoped at the time that it would not come to South Australia. Well, it has, and it has come in a very vicious form. It is a product of a whole range of influences.

For those who paint murals, there is an opportunity to express their art. For those who cannot paint very well, they put tags on things. What we have is the destruction of our built environment by young people who should know better. Perhaps time will erode their enthusiasm for that form of activity. However, there is a need for legislation to demonstrate quite clearly to the community at large that it is not to be tolerated. It is pleasing that not only is the Government bringing forward legislation but, in the meantime, we have had tremendous response from community groups. The Mitcham railway station is now graffiti free due to the good services of Mitcham Lions. We have a number of other people looking after passenger stop-offs on bus routes. The community has reacted very positively to the challenge ahead.

Whilst there was a feeling abroad at one stage that murals were a very positive response by young people wishing to express their art in the open, the evidence suggests that that brings out a form of expression that we would not wish to have—that is, tags that we see over everything. I see them in the toilets of my office and on the outside walls. We take them off and they put them on again. If we do it more rapidly, I think they will probably get tired of it. A lot of things are happening; the legislation is important. I note the amendment relating to posters foreshadowed by the member for Adelaide. I support the legislation before the House. It is a pity it has taken so long to get here, but we should be pleased that at last we have something before us.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Youth Affairs): I thank members for their contributions. All of us agree that graffiti is a mindless and destructive act and the damage caused by graffiti vandalism at State or Federal Government level, local government level or private property level amounts to millions of dollars each year. There are also significant social costs, not the least of which is the impact on the community in terms of self-perception and image. There is one piece of ugly and senseless graffiti around the corner from where I live. The people who live in that house constantly paint it out and the same meatheads paint it back again. This has been going on for years and it has a debilitating effect on the community. It sends a negative message about the society in which we live.

As has been acknowledged by the members for Mitchell, Henley Beach and Hayward, this is a very complex issue. We are dealing with something that has no easy solutions. We have to look at a range of approaches which includes prevention and the hard line and the soft line. A number of groups have played very strong and supportive roles. For example, the Retail Traders Association, with which I met late last year, has developed a draft code of practice aimed at limiting potential graffiti implements on sale. One hardware chain, which has about 100 outlets in South Australia, has done the same as record shops. It displays empty colour-coded cans and people have to take the desired coloured can up to the counter in order to get one with paint in it. That voluntary action by retail traders is having a significant effect because a lot of these kids do not buy spray cans; they steal them.

Increased security is another option. Other stores are looking at highlighting spray cans and so on to ensure that they are on display and visible to the people at the check-

out in the same way as in supermarkets chocolates are up front to ensure that kids do not pinch them.

What we must try to do is look at the causes of graffiti. A number of members mentioned unemployment, but that is somewhat illusory. All the statistics that we can find internationally, interstate and in South Australia show that graffiti vandalism cuts across a section of society. The Gosnells approach shows that children of very affluent families and children from lower socioeconomic groups are involved. One cannot stereotype who is involved in graffiti vandalism except to say that they are mainly male and, in South Australia, many hundreds of young people are involved in gangs and these children are very young, often only 14 or 15 years old, if not younger. We are not generally talking about people in their twenties although some of the ringleaders of these gangs are in their twenties. A cross-section of people are involved in that. That is why it is very important for us to embark on a range of strategies.

Following a request by the member for Albert Park, who, along with the member for Hanson has been a leader in this area, I went to Gosnells. The member for Albert Park told me to go there and meet Mayor Pat Morris to see what that council does. It is extraordinarily innovative. The mayor had the guts to speak to the kids and say, 'Enough is enough. If you are bored, what can we do to encourage your skills? What can we do to harness your enthusiasm into something positive and legal?' The mayor organised legal murals to be painted on council property, but the contract with the young people was that, in return, there had to be a reduction in the amount of graffiti in the area. After three years, there was a 50 per cent reduction in graffiti, saving many tens of thousands of dollars for that council, which had the guts to adopt a preventive approach.

Last year, we invited Mayor Pat Morris and people from Victoria and other States to a conference here to talk to local government and Neighbourhood Watch groups so that people attending the conference could hear first-hand about which strategies had and had not worked, and about different strategies or ways of approaching the issue.

I spent a great deal of time talking to police, retail traders, youth workers, social workers, people from Family and Community Services, people in local government and the kids themselves and it seemed to me that we needed a two-pronged attack: preventive measures and stiffer penalties. What we are doing is the way to go. In the United States, those States that have been the most effective in reducing but not eliminating graffiti have adopted a two-pronged attack. I pay tribute to a number of people, including my personal staff, retail traders, people in TAFE and people in local government who were very keen to assist.

In addition, I pay a special tribute to the Community Pride organisation, which showed a great deal of local initiative, along with some Neighbourhood Watch groups and some councils, to try some bold and innovative steps. I heard initially from Community Pride about its plan for a State-wide clean-up day. We were able to provide some assistance and support to that group. There is a bit of confusion about this. Community Pride was highly recommended to my officers as a community group with drive, initiative and a very good idea for an assault on illegal graffiti. Therefore, I was confused by the member for Bright's comments that there had been some dysfunctional relationship between us and Community Pride.

We have always recognised that Governments alone cannot solve the problems, that community groups must be encouraged to assist where they can and to be innovative where they can. My liaison officer contacted Mr Byass of Community Pride and suggested that he might like to meet

with officers of State Youth Affairs who were undertaking preliminary work on the graffiti action strategy. Mr Byass attended that meeting and fully detailed his organisation's proposed community clean-up day. I was advised by officers that Mr Byass expressed considerable concern about the lack of word processing equipment available to him and his urgent need for clerical support to ensure the success of the clean-up day because of the organisational factors involved.

I suggested that State Youth Affairs might be able to assist through the offer of a small grant. That offer was conveyed to Mr Byass who was then requested to make a formal written request for assistance through State Youth Affairs. He did so and was successful in gaining a grant. I have letters from Mr Byass and I will give copies of them to the member for Bright because there seems to be some confusion. I do not know how one can request assistance and then say that it is not wanted.

Because of some delays in processing the funding within the department—delays which should not have happened and for which an apology was made—Mr Byass telephoned my officer on a number of occasions to ensure the money was still coming. That is how keen he was to see it. Mr Byass contacted my office for help with publicity. There has been criticism of the media treatment of Community Pride. Any media release put out on my behalf that mentioned that group were sent to Mr Byass before release for his feedback. He never indicated that he was unhappy about any release. We also included in the graffiti action kit a leaflet about Community Pride Day, approved personally by Kym Byass.

My officers have also advised me that he rang them to request a letter of support from me to assist him with his approaches to other organisations. Because of time restrictions, they offered him a copy of the media release praising Community Pride. He indicated that was acceptable and it was sent out by his organisation. Community Pride is outstanding and I hope that the member for Bright was not reflecting on that organisation. I hope that he was trying to reflect on me because I think that Community Pride needs his support just as it has secured my support. They will continue to have my support as long as they come up with good and innovative ideas about tackling this problem.

I have mentioned Gosnells. A range of programs was also undertaken in South Australia to find outlets for people to construct murals. There was something very odd because, in a series of press releases, the member for Bright—and he has his back to both the Chair and me—opposed these community murals and opposed these legitimate legal outlets; he said they encouraged illegal graffiti.

That is odd, because in the Liberal Party policy quoted in the *Advertiser* of 13 November 1990, when the honourable member accompanied Mr Dale Baker, one of the key items was to support and find legitimate locations for murals where graffiti could become art. It seems that the honourable member has been doing cartwheels and is perhaps confused because of his newness to the shadow portfolio. I judge these programs on their outcomes; if they work, as Gosnells did, they deserve support. I am not interested in programs that do not work. If they do work, then rather than sounding good, let us look at programs that work. I am pleased that, since we conducted that conference, many councils, as was detailed earlier today, have actually become involved in some innovative programs. For example, I understand that at Maslin Beach there has been a massive reduction in illegal graffiti because of a program similar to the Gosnells approach.

I was interested that hear the member for Bright say last night that he supported murals on walls and stobie poles

but objected to the provision of health and safety information about people doing legal artwork, using spray cans. This seems to be a rather confusing stance, but perhaps we can discuss that at another stage.

We cannot ignore the fact that people engaging in illegal graffiti must be punished, and that is why we have drawn a line and said that enough is enough. We want to introduce the toughest measures in Australia to tackle this and, therefore, I was again confounded by some of the claims about this being a Liberal initiative. I would like to ask the member for Bright, perhaps rhetorically, where in previous Liberal legislation was graffiti ever defined? It was not—never. Where in previous Liberal legislation was the definition of 'property' broadened to include property such as motor vehicles? Never. Where in any previous Liberal legislation was there reference to offences relating to the carrying of graffiti implements, as in those two extra councils? It was never included.

Apart from the relatively simple matter of the increase in penalties, rather than assisting the police and allowing the police to operate without having one arm tied behind their backs, as occurred under the Tonkin Government, when the criminals and murderers spent seven years in gaol rather than the 14 years that they spend in gaol now, on average, because they were soft on law and—

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. You might have been distracted, but the Minister is referring to people having arms tied behind their backs and police activities during the time of the Tonkin Government, and I ask you to rule on relevance.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has no point of view in regard to relevance. I do not believe there is a point of order. I call on the Minister.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Let us get on with the task. What I would really have liked to see last night was the member for Bright, the shadow Minister, showing maturity and saying in here, as the member for Bragg and the member for Coles have said about previous legislation, 'This is a good thing, and it deserves bipartisan support.' Let me give some advice to the young shadow Minister opposite: the public is sick and tired of political bickering; it is sick and tired of people who oppose for the sake of opposing, and I would like to see the honourable member stand up and say, 'We support this, because it is a good thing to do.' That is important but, unfortunately, he has not yet learned that there are times for politics and there are times for bipartisanship. There are times to put the community interest before Party interest—

Mr MATTHEW: Mr Speaker, I rise—

The Hon. M.D. RANN:—and I intend to write to his constituents about this matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The member for Bright has a point of order.

Mr MATTHEW: I draw your attention to Standing Order 127, which relates to personal reflections on a member. The Minister has continually reflected upon my integrity and attempted to interpret incorrectly the debate in this House. I have constantly said that the Opposition supported the Bill, as the Minister well knows. He clearly did not listen to my speech—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now debating. Unfortunately, I was once again talking to a member—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair's attention was diverted. I did not pick any of the points that the honourable member is making, but I would ask the Minister to pay due heed to

Standing Order 127 under which it is clear that a member may not digress or reflect. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. Just to wrap up this part, I want to stress again that we are coming at this from three ways. The first is to double the penalties—six months imprisonment under clause 7. We are also looking at the intent of people. That is because I am continually told stories about the head of the local football club finding a couple of thugs at the side of the football club at 3 o'clock in the morning; they had a bag full of spray cans and the walls were wet but, because the thugs were not seen in the act they could not be apprehended. We are saying that the onus is now on them to prove that they are art students legitimately on the property, and they will not be able to do that. Basically, we are saying that, if they are to go to schools in the middle of the night with a bag full of spray cans, so far as the police are concerned, they are in absolutely deep trouble. That is the way it has to be from now on.

That is why I want the support of the Democrats, the Liberals and other members in this House for this important piece of legislation. That is why, too, we will have under regulation a prescribed class of graffiti implements. We will be able to ask people, 'Why are you carrying that implement in this way?' We are trying to assist the police in terms of apprehending people involved in this insidious and costly assault on our community property. I met with the head of the Transit Squad last week, and he was certainly keen to see this type of legislation.

A couple of other matters deserve mention. The question was asked whether local government is supportive of this action. I took the trouble of actually writing to and consulting with local government, and I have been criticised for doing so. But let me cite the responses. The first one is from the office of Mayor of the City of Munno Para, and states:

Dear Mike,

Your proposal to endeavour to curb vandalism and graffiti were put to Munno Para council at its meeting last night. A motion was passed unanimously that council supports your proposals.

Here is another one from the Lord Mayor's Room, Town Hall, Adelaide, South Australia. Let me read it, in part, as follows:

Late last year council adopted a strategy for the control of graffiti and bill posters which is complementary to the State plan. Accordingly, the proposed legislation would have the full support of council.

(signed) Steve Condous,
Lord Mayor

That is signed by the soon to be Liberal candidate for somewhere or other, so we have heard. Here is one from the City of Mitcham, as follows:

The Mayor supports the legislation in endeavouring to minimise graffiti and is pleased this legislation is proposed.

That letter is signed by the Town Clerk. A letter from the Corporation of the Town of Hindmarsh states:

This proposed legislation appears to be a good signal that such mindless attacks on private and public property will not be condoned and will help all authorities deal with the problem. We wish you every success in your efforts to get this legislation enacted and, from our dealings with the general public, your stand on this issue will be supported.

(signed) Flo Pens,
Mayor of Hindmarsh

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Last night members opposite were saying that somehow local government was out of step with me on this. The City of Prospect states:

Dear Minister,

This council supports the provisions of the prevention of graffiti vandalism Bill that the Government proposes to introduce into State Parliament.

A letter from the City of Happy Valley, signed by the Mayor (Trevor Starr), states:

The measure you propose is compatible with council's objectives of seeking a concerted Government and community effort to combat the problem. Council formally gave, in principle, support to a Bill on 28 January 1992. Accordingly, we wish you success with the proposed legislation.

Let us go to historic Glenelg. The Glenelg council states:

As you have noted in your correspondence, the Glenelg council is extremely concerned about the graffiti problem and wholeheartedly supports the principles contained in this Bill. The Mayor would also be pleased to provide any personal support which you may consider appropriate.

A letter from the Deputy Town Clerk of the City of Campbelltown states:

I wish to advise that council wholeheartedly supports this legislation.

The Corporation of the City of Enfield states:

The council resolved to support the proposed Bill because it has been concerned at the detrimental effect of graffiti vandalism throughout Enfield.

The City of Marion states:

The council considered the proposal at its meeting on 28 January 1992 and indicated that it would support the measure as described in the new Bill.

The City of Elizabeth states, in part:

We strongly endorse any attempt to curb graffiti vandals from carrying out their most unacceptable activities and applaud the Government's attempts to do so.

The town of Thebarton says:

I am pleased to inform you that the council at its meeting held on 18 February resolved to fully support the anti-graffiti legislation to be debated in State Parliament in February—

and, because they were not as stupid as the contact of the member opposite, recommended—

that a copy of the support letter be sent to the relevant Opposition spokesman and the Leader of the Democrats—

who was actually the member who came out and opposed this issue. I think he is far too sensitive—perhaps, again, portraying his age. I refer finally to the City of Noarlunga, which states:

I am writing to advise that council at its meeting on Monday 17 February resolved to support the endeavours in support of the proposed anti-graffiti legislation as outlined in your correspondence. Council further resolved to bring the matter of council support of this matter to the attention of our local members of Parliament on both sides of the House.

So, let us not hear any nonsense about my being offside with local government or somehow offending councils in the letter that I sent.

Mr Matthew interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I conclude that this legislation is vitally important. We are covering a range of new areas. I believe that by the definition of 'property', we are defining—

Mr MATTHEW: I take a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Minister will resume his seat. The member for Bright will resume his seat. The member for Bright has raised several points of order tonight, none of which has been upheld. I caution the honourable member that frivolous points of order may incur some degree of resistance from the Chair. The member for Bright.

Mr MATTHEW: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to Standing Order 127, which covers personal reflections on members.

The SPEAKER: I assume that the honourable member intends to refer to the Minister's reading of letters and

saying, 'Let's not carry on in this way.' The letters referred to were from councils. I assume that the honourable member is taking offence to their being read out. What is the point of order?

Mr MATTHEW: The point of order is that before and after reading those letters the Minister claimed that members or a member on this side of the House had said that the Government was out of step with councils. I did not say that and neither did any of my colleagues.

The SPEAKER: A general point of order was raised. The Chair is not Solomon. If a member is not named in a remark it is impossible for the Chair to make a ruling. The member for Adelaide.

Dr ARMITAGE: On a point of clarification, Mr Speaker, you mentioned a frivolous point of order. In order for members to obey your guidelines and for order to be maintained in the House, could you please define a frivolous point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! The definition is purely in the eye of the beholder or the interpreter, which is the Chair. If any member disagrees with the ruling of the Chair there are set procedures to take that dissent further. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: In conclusion, I want to give a brief overview of what we are really doing. We are defining graffiti for the first time. We are also extending the definition in terms of marking property to cover vehicles and personal property. The amendments propose a doubling of penalties in section 48 from a division 8 penalty to a division 7 penalty of up to \$2 000 or six months imprisonment.

The Bill creates new offences of carrying a graffiti implement with the intention of using it to mark graffiti, or carrying a graffiti implement of a prescribed class without lawful excuse in a public place or a place on which the person is trespassing or has entered without invitation. Again, a division 7 penalty of up to \$2 000 or six months imprisonment may be applied. We believe that we are moving ahead to tackle this problem comprehensively, and the Bill deserves the unqualified bipartisan support of every member of both Houses.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Posting bills and marking graffiti.'

Dr ARMITAGE: I move:

After line 23—Insert subclause as follows:

(1a) Where a bill, poster or placard is affixed to property without lawful authority, a person who distributed, or organised or was concerned in the organisation of the distribution of such bills, posters or placards is guilty of an offence unless the person proves that he or she took reasonable precautions to ensure that the bills, posters or placards were not affixed to property without lawful authority.

Penalty: Division 7 fine or division 7 imprisonment.

Line 24—After 'subsection (1)' insert 'or (1a)'.

I want to reiterate briefly a number of matters that I mentioned in my second reading speech earlier today, not the least of which is the fact that this amendment is intended to fire a torpedo across the bows of people who indiscriminately distribute posters advertising events in South Australia and, more particularly, in the electorate of Adelaide.

As I mentioned, because of the concentration of people within the electorate of Adelaide, and in particular within the central business district of Adelaide during the day, there is a ready market for people to abuse large areas such as walls, fences or building sites that are prominent within my electorate. I believe that there is no undue onus on the people concerned. If the people who distribute, organise or are concerned in the organisation of the distribution of such

bills are able to prove that they took reasonable precautions to make sure the bills were not affixed unlawfully, they would not be guilty of an offence and, as such, I believe this measure is completely appropriate. It has been called for quite frequently by council members within my electorate and I am certain within electorates of other members, and I hope that the passage of this amendment and of the Bill will be yet another step towards cleaning up what is an eyesore in all electorates.

Mr FERGUSON: I oppose the amendment.

An honourable member: You're not dinkum.

Mr FERGUSON: I am dinkum. This amendment has such breadth and depth that it could include all political posters distributed at election time by various candidates, including the member for Adelaide. I have seen the member for Adelaide's posters attached to posts in the Adelaide parklands. I doubt very much that he would have had the authority to do that. Some councils, such as the Henley and Grange council, take the view that political posters can be distributed anywhere provided they do not create a traffic hazard or a nuisance. This proposition could include all political posters unless the words 'without lawful authority' could be interpreted widely enough. If the honourable member is suggesting that the imprint on political posters provides lawful authority, my objection to this amendment would go a long way towards being placated. However, I see that as being a problem to political Parties and political candidates as to where they put their posters.

Dr ARMITAGE: I am amazed, quite frankly, because the logical extension of what the member for Henley Beach is saying is that he believes it is appropriate for political posters to be put up willy-nilly and without lawful authority. I take exception to the implications made previously by the member for Henley Beach. I certainly had a lot of posters put up but I had worked very hard to get permission from people, and from the STA on the railways and various places like that, for which we paid \$10 per poster site. So, I think it is quite possible for political candidates to fulfil all the legal obligations and still have a political presence. Of course, all posters must be authorised, so it is quite clear as to who would be to blame or responsible for this. I can vouch for the fact that the secretary of the Liberal Party, and I would guess that his equivalent in the Australian Labor Party, would not be at all happy if the 10 000 posters that were distributed around Adelaide and the surrounding areas were in unlawful positions if this was passed. The passage of this Bill will ensure that political placards and posters are treated no differently from any other poster—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Nor should they be.

Dr ARMITAGE:—and nor should they be, as the member for Coles says. All this amendment will ensure is that, if the member for Henley Beach (although in the next election he will not be seeking the same political profile) or any political candidate wishes to build up a profile, it is a matter of getting lawful permission from owners of buildings, building sites, private homes or whatever so that all the obligations of this amendment are fulfilled. As I said, the logical extension to saying that this is a concern for political candidates is to say that it is quite okay for political candidates to be going around fixing placards to properties without lawful authority.

Mr FERGUSON: I cannot let this go unchallenged, because what this does is support the major Parties. The honourable member may well be right in saying that the secretary of the Liberal Party and the secretary of the Labor Party have gone around and made sure that they have permission, but what about the poor old Independents?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FERGUSON: I need your protection, Sir. It is all right for the major Parties to defend themselves, but what about the people other than those in the major Parties—people who do not have the same sort of political backing? This is nothing more than a move to exclude them. Now we have a situation where television advertising has been disallowed by the Federal Parliament. I might say that I am not happy with that decision; I do not think it is a very good decision, but all Parties will now be relying on the old style of political campaigning, that is, letters in the letterbox, posters (whether or not it is possible to put up posters), pinning material to shopfront windows and so forth. If an enthusiastic member of an Independent's campaign committee happens to put up a poster in a spot where the candidate has not had time to go and get lawful authority, under this provision he or she is committing an offence. I see that as nothing more than a reason for banning political advertising other than that of the major Parties, and I am afraid I cannot accept it.

Mr BECKER: I think it is time the member for Henley Beach retired. I do not think he has seen enough elections to find out what really goes on. He disappoints me, because the honourable member knows as well as I that during an election campaign any candidate worth his or her salt first gains approval to place posters wherever they can. The member for Henley Beach can thank me for establishing over the years with the Henley and Grange, Woodville, West Torrens and Glenelg councils the opportunity for political candidates to place posters in authorised locations, provided they are removed within 48 hours of the closing of polling booths, and the honourable member has used that opportunity quite successfully over the years.

I would not be worried about an Independent candidate or a candidate from the Democrats or anywhere else, because they do not care where they put their posters; they never have and they never will. So, it is not a matter of big political Parties versus the little guys or whatever; it does not mean a thing, it has nothing to do with it and it should not be considered as far as the amendment is concerned. The member for Adelaide's amendment is worthy and well thought out, and I can assure the Committee that a considerable amount of discussion took place before the wording of this amendment was adopted. The key words are 'without lawful authority'.

We received a letter recently from the Electricity Trust of South Australia which stated that in future, political candidates would be allowed to fix to Stobie poles election posters provided they are taken down after the election. The Highways Department gave me its approval and has always given me its approval to put up posters on their bridges. We do that down our way, and the member for Henley Beach knows that; we put posters up anywhere under the control of the Highways Department because they are not there long enough to cause a great problem and, by the time anyone could go around to cause any problem, they would have come down anyway. The State Transport Authority has given us approval to put up posters along the tramline as long as we advise the State Transport Authority where they are located, and we pay a small fee for this opportunity.

The thing that annoys me is that every time I put my posters up along the tramline the Labor Party comes along and knocks them down, so it is a continual job during an election campaign to keep one step in front of the Labor Party. I enjoy doing that at about 4 a.m., so it does not worry me. The West Beach Trust has finally agreed to allow us to put posters up on its property. For years it objected

to this, but, after the West Beach Branch of the Labor Party, (which now runs the West Beach Trust) put up its posters, it agreed that perhaps Becker should be allowed to have one or two. The Kooyonga golf course has never objected, and that was established many years ago. The Adelaide Airport, of course, is a different kettle of fish; no-one at all is allowed to put up unauthorised posters there.

So, on our side of the city this amendment presents no problems whatsoever as far as political posters are concerned, but the local council authorities are concerned. We are tired of the huge posters advertising rock bands and so on at the various hotels. These posters are being plastered all over the bus shelters, disused service stations, disused shops and hoarding sites. That is the problem—that type of visual pollution that is put out there by the sneaky little characters in the middle of the night who slap these things all over the place, and anything that is standing still gets a poster. They are the people we want to get. Let me remind the member for Henley Beach of the *News* article dated 25 August 1986. This is significant, because we could have stopped all this in 1987 when I introduced my legislation.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BECKER: I do not know where you were at the time; you were probably still at school, although it probably was not a candidate school. Two people were fined \$40 after admitting that they had in their vehicle a pile of posters, a bucket of glue and a roller. They admitted that, on a building site in Norwood, they had put up these posters advertising a function in the city. It has been a problem as far back as 1986, Councillor Roger Rowse (and you will not get a better Adelaide City Councillor who is most concerned about the environment within the city) stated in the *News* of 28 November 1990:

Advertising posters plastered on vacant buildings are 'polluting' the city and North Adelaide and should be banned, says Adelaide City councillor Roger Rowse. Cr Rowse last week renewed pressure on the State Government to give the council powers to stop use of the posters. He said bands, singers, venue operators and promoters should be fined for putting them up. 'They are a form of visual pollution which destroys our environment,' Cr Rowse said.

'They (advertisers) just don't care about what damage they do. There are plenty of other places to advertise, such as billboards, newspapers, TV and the backs of buses'. He said posters stuck on empty buildings were left there to peel off and look untidy. 'I'm not against advertising as long as it's done legally and orderly,' he said. He said posters glued to buildings on a corner of Angas and Pulteney streets and Melbourne Street, near The Old Lion Hotel were among the worst cases of visual pollution. Earlier this year Cr Rowse called on the Government to amend the Local Government Act to give councils power to ban advertising posters being plastered on empty buildings. He said the Government ignored the problem because it feared the change would restrict the placement of election campaign posters. 'I've got no beef with political parties', he said. 'They put them up in an orderly fashion and take them down straight away.'

We either believe Councillor Rowse or we do not. I commend my colleague's amendment to the Committee because it makes sense and achieves what we have been wanting to do for many years. If we can get rid of this unsightly visual pollution under this legislation, we will be making considerable progress. The only other way is to do what we tried down our way: we put 'cancelled' signs over the posters. That soon stops them!

Mr MATTHEW: My colleague's amendment is indeed a worthy one. I have pointed out time and again in this debate that members of the Government, in particular the Minister, have called for bipartisan support for this Bill, which has been and will be given willingly and strongly. We now call for the same sort of bipartisan support. Just as the public are fed up with the scourge of graffiti that covers our buildings and property throughout our city, so they are also fed up with the billboards and posters that cover our city.

The members for Adelaide and Hanson have told the Parliament of specific examples of the proliferation of this sort of menace in their electorates, and my electorate suffers the same problem. Being a seaside electorate and one to which a large proportion of the metropolitan area travels on weekends to enjoy the sea, regrettably Brighton Road in particular has become a haven for posters advertising one event or another. Every stobie pole or building seems to be covered by a billboard. This amendment, as put forward by my colleague the member for Adelaide, provides an opportunity for us to rid our city of this menace. I therefore call on the Government and the Minister to show some bipartisan support for this very worthwhile amendment.

The member for Hanson is probably one of the most experienced and seasoned campaigners in this Parliament. He certainly has a considerable amount of expertise that he can pass on to those members who have jelly knees over the people to contact for permission to put up billboards and posters. I had the privilege, while a student at university, to work on the campaign team of the member for Hanson and was able to be schooled in how to go about obtaining permission to put up billboards and posters. I am well aware that the member for Hanson has always been meticulous in his attention to that sort of detail and in seeking such permission.

I was concerned to hear the member for Henley Beach stand up tonight and talk about the problems in respect of political advertising. I note that my colleague the member for Hanson pointed out that perhaps the member for Henley Beach should thank him because he seems to have gained the necessary permission from the councils in the honourable member's electorate. I hope that the member for Henley Beach is not suggesting that there should be one rule for politicians and one rule for everyone else because we all know how the public would react to that sort of situation. I would hope that nobody in this Parliament would suggest that there should be one rule for politicians with regard to billboards and posters and one rule for the rest of the public. I hope that no member of this Parliament, particularly the member for Spence, would not suggest such a thing.

I was concerned that the member for Henley Beach expressed a particular worry for Independents as though they were a group of political candidates who were devoid of the intelligence that the mainstream Parties have. I am sure that the member for Henley Beach would not insinuate that, as I know of a number of Independent candidates and successful Independent members of this Parliament who are quite well able to contact people and ensure that they obtain the necessary permission to put up their political posters. I would be very surprised if the present Independents of this Parliament have not done so or do not do so as a matter of course. I will be supporting my colleague's amendment. I look forward to the Minister's response and hope that he and his colleagues support the amendment so that it gets the bipartisan support needed to help rid our city of this scourge—the billboard and poster.

Mr FERGUSON: I am under pressure to complete the debate, so I will be brief. If members of the Liberal Party—the members for Hanson and Bright—were fair dinkum, they would ban completely political posters and I would support them. They would then get the bipartisan support of this side of the Committee. The argument is that these posters are visual pollution. The member for Hanson referred to my campaigning, but I remind the Committee that I took the seat of Henley Beach from the Liberal Party and have held that seat ever since. This is my tenth year in this place.

I do not need any advice from the members opposite as I have been able to defeat the Liberal Party for a decade. I have no problems in that regard. I hold no fear of Liberal opponents or of taking on the member for Hanson. Like all Liberal propositions in this place, the amendment supports the establishment. The present Lord Mayor of Adelaide would have no problems at all gaining permission to distribute bills and posters all over the place, but other candidates would have some difficulty as they do not know the ropes. Therefore, somebody taking on the Lord Mayor would be at a disadvantage. In all political contests everyone should be equal. The amendment is a typical Liberal proposition in that it supports the establishment. It does not deserve the support of the Committee.

Dr ARMITAGE: I had a number of points to rebut the contribution by the member for Henley Beach, but his last flight of fancy was so illogical that I shall not bother. To talk about political photographs, posters and bills in relation to this amendment is highjacking the debate, because the amendment is aimed at stopping the regular and recurrent posting of bills on a daily basis and not for a short period which, as the member for Hanson said, can be readily removed. In fact, statutory authorities give permission on the basis that they are removed quickly.

The amendment is designed to stop the proliferation of posters which are put up without lawful authority and which are often difficult to remove. I will cite an example. I discussed this matter previously with my colleagues, one of whom has an electorate in the Hills and has his house near a main road. He has placards, posters or bills—whatever one wishes to call them—plastered on his front window on a regular basis. That is appalling, and the person who organises those posters to be put up ought to be called to order. I believe that this amendment does that.

This amendment is not designed to stop political advertising because anyone who gets lawful authority, anyone who approaches the owner of a house, the STA, the Highways Department or whatever will obtain permission. If they do not obtain permission, they cannot put them up. Under the amendment they can still apply to do it. There is no intention to stop it. There is merely an attempt to stop the indiscriminate posting of these bills which remove people's basic right to have their homes or buildings as they wish. This amendment is designed to stop the proliferation of posters for things such as outdoor entertainment events, circuses in the parklands, political rallies and expressions of political interest often by minority groups with views with which I am sure there would be no accord from members of this place.

The amendment is also designed to stop the indiscriminate advertising of smaller events which do not have general support. Major events, such as Carols by Candlelight, are often sponsored by and held in agreement with local councils, and they would clearly have no trouble getting lawful authority from the council to put up posters where they wanted. Despite the attempt by the member for Henley Beach to hijack this amendment, it is clearly designed to stop indiscriminate poster usage and the pollution of sites around the city. It is appalling that we might even contemplate voting against something or other that occurs on a daily basis merely because of the self-interest of some politicians who, according to the member for Henley Beach, do not have the gumption, the knowledge or the get up and go to telephone someone and say, 'I am standing as a political candidate in this election. Is it all right if I put up one of my posters on your front fence?'

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: If you can't do that, you shouldn't be in Parliament.

Dr ARMITAGE: I was just going to say that, but the member for Coles has said it. If you do not have the get up and go to do that, you ought not be in Parliament. Perhaps it is very appropriate that the honourable member making such an objection will not need to put up posters for the next election.

Mr BRINDAL: I support the amendment moved by my colleague. It is a serious and important amendment. In doing so, I would like to gently admonish the members for Bright and Adelaide for being too cruel by half to the member for Henley Beach. We must remember that, as he flees this place to don the ermine, all he is doing is sticking up for his mates. I believe I heard the member for Napier say, 'If you attack my mate, you attack me.' We on this side have to commend that sort of attitude. We would not do that because, after all, we are never sure which member for Napier we are currently attacking!

The amendment is a serious one. It has been put forward seriously by the member for Adelaide, and I believe it does address the substance of the Bill. After all, the Bill is about graffiti, about the wanton interference with public property and the defacing of public property. Bills and posters deface public property as much as the more traditional forms of graffiti to which the Bill is addressed. It is a serious amendment, which addresses a serious problem. As the member for Adelaide said, it is a much needed provision and one that perhaps was needed before our attention was drawn to graffiti. It disappoints me—and the Minister spoke about a bipartisan approach—that we do not have a bipartisan approach on this serious matter. It should be canvassed seriously. The member for Adelaide, who is known on this side for both his intelligence and political acumen, is being denigrated by people who are jealous of this very clever and important amendment. We should expect in this season no more than a prophet be not acknowledged in his own land.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I was not going to enter into this debate until I heard the member for Adelaide and the member for Hayward try to advance their arguments for this amendment—and I do admit that it has a certain degree of merit, but I have some problems with the actual policing of it—by attacking the member for Henley Beach. If they get personal satisfaction from attacking the member for Henley Beach, that is okay—I suppose they have no problem with their own consciences, and they can face their shaving mirror in the morning. However, to add insult to injury, just because I am sitting alongside my colleague, in the place designated for me in this Chamber, I then get attacked.

Sir, I know you are one of the finest and fairest Chairmen that this Chamber has ever had, but it did cross my mind that you must have been slightly lax to have allowed that personal attack against me. However, I did notice that you raised your eyebrows and they ceased the attack. My question to the Minister, who might be amenable to this amendment or perhaps does not oppose it as strongly as I think he should, is: how will this amendment be policed? One can say that it will come within the Summary Offences Act, but I take members back to the last election.

I will not say anything about this amendment being part of an election process, but in the electorate that the member for Bright managed to win, every post, lamp post and vacant wall that I saw when electioneering down there had the slogan, 'No Jap cities.' All marginal seats that the Labor Party lost in that area displayed the sign, 'No Jap cities.' One could argue that that racist poster, 'No Jap cities' played a significant part in ensuring the defeat of the Labor Party candidate and the success of the Liberal Party candidate. I

am not suggesting for one minute that the member for Bright, or any other successful Liberal Party member down there, had anything whatsoever to do with that obnoxious sign 'No Jap cities.'

Let us suppose that this amendment is carried. The amendment is silent in how it will be policed. I understand that it will be policed through the Summary Offences Act. Will the Liberal Party then say that we will have to have another 40 or 50 police officers around our cities to track down those people who are putting up those posters, or are we in effect paying lip service to it and saying that the only time there will be a prosecution is if someone is seen with a glue pot, brush and poster in their hand, and we will do nothing else?

When those posters are put up, they are usually put up in the dead of night. Everyone knows that. Are we really serious? I think that the member for Adelaide is serious with his amendment, but it should say exactly how we are to deal with it. If there is ever a weakness in this Bill, and I think that the Minister has recognised it, it is that you have to be caught, as in the old days, or you have to be in possession of graffiti implements. However, it does not guarantee that we will not have graffiti on our walls or anywhere else. I was prepared to live with that part of the Bill, but the amendment poses a very important question that, if racist people go around putting up 'No Jap Cities' posters in marginal Labor electorates, trying to incite racial hatred so we lose out, there must be some mechanism to ensure that there is adequate policing of that. This amendment tells me nothing and I would like some clarification.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The member for Napier is quite wrong in saying that I will oppose this weakly. I intend to oppose this amendment with vigour. The member for Adelaide's amendment provides that a person is guilty of an offence unless that person proves that he or she took 'reasonable precautions'. What the dickens does that mean? Is telling people enough or does it have to be in writing? It seems to me that this is quite vague and very difficult to interpret by the police or anyone else. How will a person be able to prove that he or she took reasonable precautions? The reverse onus of proof can be justified in cases where there is a rational connection between the fact proved and the assumption on which it is based. For example, it is rational to assume that a person who drives a car while over .05 is guilty of drunk driving. Such a rational assumption cannot be made in the case of this amendment.

As has been mentioned, during an election campaign a member's political opponent could plaster his or her electorate with posters that appeared to be the member's posters and, under this amendment, the member could be at risk of ending up in court, having to prove that he or she had nothing to do with the proliferation of posters. Equally, a person who has taken pains to ensure that election posters were displayed properly could end up in court if an enthusiastic campaign worker got carried away and affixed posters somewhere without lawful authority. This is a personal attack on me because people are well aware of a community uprising about the proliferation of 'I like Mike' stickers in my electorate.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: This amendment is very vague, sloppily worded and should be opposed. Nobody should be put to the cost or inconvenience of defending charges which are unfounded and which, ultimately, can be shown to be unfounded only by defending them. However, I am prepared to release copies of these stickers to the member for Adelaide and, if he wants to distribute them around his electorate, I am happy for him to do so.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Youth Affairs): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

I thank all members for their efforts. I pay particular tribute again to the member for Albert Park whose national leadership in setting up Neighbourhood Watch and tackling graffiti, which is now being taken up in New Zealand, deserves to be applauded in a bipartisan way. Indeed, there has been a bipartisan approach to this legislation. The Walkerville council opposed the legislation and said that it was too reactive. I received a letter from the Human Services Manager at Elizabeth who said that he thought an increase in penalties would not be particularly effective. They have genuine ideas and I think that we should endorse people feeding ideas into the system. We are looking at this from different ways.

The member for Hanson was a pioneer but, in my view, his legislation did not go far enough. I am pleased that we have introduced the toughest legislation that we could find anywhere in the world, although it has not been done in some kind of Islamic-law way, and that it has the support of all members of this House. I commend the third reading.

Bill read a third time and passed.

FIREARMS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 March. Page 3433.)

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): In the spirit of bipartisan support, I am pleased to be able to indicate the Opposition's support for this Bill. It is part of an ongoing debate about the control of firearms in Australia. It is acknowledged in the second reading explanation that it is a reaction to the 1987 Queen Street and 1991 Strathfield massacres. The Bill follows the Police Ministers Council and the Premiers Conference. The explanation acknowledges that it is not claimed that the Bill is a panacea but that it states that it is imperative that suitable controls exist within firearms legislation. The Government seeks to assure the community that this Bill and the changes therein are neither emotional nor knee-jerk reactions to the multiple murders that occurred last year. The objective is to prevent as far as possible death and injury as a result of firearms misuse.

This Bill is an amendment to the 1988 amendment Act which had a controversial and eventful passage through Parliament. I believe that the 1988 Bill was introduced into this place several times and, on its third appearance, after many amendments it was passed by both Houses of Parliament. I am aware that many members want to make major contributions to this debate. Because the Committee stage of the Bill will elicit many questions relative to the answers required to support this Bill, it is my intention to outline certain concerns which I have and which have been brought to me by members of the community representing the tens of thousands of people who will be affected by this legislation.

In attempting to interpret the intentions of this Bill, the Opposition and those sections of the community that have an interest in it have been hampered by the fact that the 1988 Bill has not been proclaimed. Therefore, we are dealing with amendments without the benefit of the consolidation of the 1988 Act into the principal Act of 1977.

I would also point out that, without the benefit of viewing the regulations which will deal with this legislation, the true picture of the intent of the legislation is somewhat blurred. I trust that open and frank answers in Committee will provide members with a clearer picture of the expected outcomes and the administrative procedures and their effect on firearms owners and prospective owners in this State.

One of the areas about which I am concerned is the clause providing that the Crown is not bound by the Act. I understand that this provision came about through a decision of the High Court, which raised doubt as to when the Crown is bound by an Act. This exemption under the firearms legislation tends to raise questions about access to firearms and use by on-duty police, correctional services officers and National Parks and Wildlife officers if the licences of those people have been revoked by the Registrar. I will pursue that aspect in Committee.

Another inclusion imposes a new obligation on medical practitioners. The Opposition has no great objection to the principle of that new obligation, but I foreshadow a minor amendment, which I hope will be accorded due respect by the Government and accepted. Another clause inserts new sections relating to paintball operations, having supporting definitions and machinery provisions. This relates to war games, where a projectile containing paint dye or other marking substance is fired by means of compressed air or other compressed gas. As a projectile is fired from what is technically a firearm, this provision allows the operation to proceed with safeguards. We have no objection to the inclusion of this clause.

Other areas that will be canvassed relate to the power of the Minister or the Registrar, and that leads me to question whether the Minister or the Registrar will be the sole arbiter on many matters, without there being right of appeal to any other party or body. We must all agree that it is right and proper that a party aggrieved by a decision on any matter under the legislation should have an avenue of appeal, at least to a magistrate in chambers, as is provided elsewhere under this legislation. I am aware that there is provision for a consultative committee. I am not fully cognisant of the fact that in the legislation all types of appeals may be referred to that consultative committee and that, in itself, will raise many questions which I am sure the Minister will be pleased to answer.

One of the other areas of great concern to me is training. A recent press statement by the Minister of Emergency Services advised that adequate training through TAFE colleges would be compulsory before a new licence was granted. This appears not to have been included in these new proposals and, as there is a provision for the Registrar to determine the qualifications or experience in relation to the safe handling of firearms that an applicant must have, it would appear to be an anomaly that legislative provision has not been considered.

Many other matters can be canvassed, including ammunition; several clauses provide for the Registrar to determine the requirements for safe custody. I am not sure at this stage whether it is intended that ammunition must be under lock and key and kept separate from firearms and how this will affect dealerships and collectors. Another area of concern relates to the permit to purchase, which is covered under clause 15 in respect of applying for and obtaining permits.

I believe that official figures of the Firearms Branch included in the Police Commissioner's report to Parliament do not divulge the number of approval to purchase applications processed annually. As these cover hand guns only, it would be informative to ascertain the increase in the

workload of the branch, local police stations, firearms dealers, purchasers and sellers. At this stage, based on the 1989-90 figures, it would appear that there is an increase in this area of 1 445 per cent.

There is concern in the community, particularly within professional shooters groups, about the provision which reduces magazine rounds to five for self-loading rifles or shotguns and which requires the written approval of the Minister. I am informed by the Firearms Traders Council that there are more than 15 000 such magazines in South Australia, so it is difficult to understand how the recording of these items will be achieved and how the administrative side of this part of the legislation can be cost effective or processed in an efficient manner. Further, many areas involving registration must be canvassed. I am well aware of the lateness of the hour—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mrs KOTZ: Thank you. There are several other areas of great concern that I will record at this stage for further debate later. First, the Bill makes no provision for genuine *bona fide* collectors of firearms and associated items, including ammunition. I believe collecting should be identified, and I will be discussing that later. Because there is insufficient time to complete the debate, and having given only a brief outline, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will we or won't we?—I think that is the question in relation to the Commonwealth Games and the decision to be brought down in Barcelona. Every loyal South Australian will be interested in that decision; it will determine whether or not we have been successful. July this year will be a crucial month for all South Australians, for a whole host of reasons. If South Australia achieved the 1998 Commonwealth Games, it would be a credit not only to the Government but also to the Opposition.

There has been a bipartisan approach in this State to push for what I believe is an initiative that will not only benefit South Australians and the business community but also create a tremendous amount of employment during the period of the games and for many years to come. It has been demonstrated in the past that events such as the Grand Prix and similar events in other States have contributed enormously to the recognition of the potential of Australia to host the games. It is recognised overseas that Australians are a very warm and hospitable race. The overwhelming majority of South Australians are keen to show visitors from interstate and overseas what South Australia has to offer, whether it be in my area, the western suburbs of Adelaide, or elsewhere. We can show visitors the magnificent development of the West Lakes area, the restoration of Fort Glanville, the history of Port Adelaide, the foundation of South Australia at Glenelg, the South-East of South Australia, where I was born, or the Flinders Ranges to the north. I believe that we are and should be ambassadors not only for this State but for Australia.

The facilities that we have to offer for the Commonwealth Games have already been recognised by visiting overseas dignitaries. Last month, an inspection group visited South Australia and, as I understand it, the Vice-Chairman of the Commonwealth Games Federation was very impressed with

what South Australia had to offer *vis-a-vis* that which has been offered by Malaysia—and, as I understand it, is yet to be completed.

Like the Minister and the member for Hanson, I believe that, if the decision to host the Games is based on the facilities, South Australia will win hands down. There are things that politicians should not say, but suffice to say that, based on a pragmatic assessment of what is offered by the two countries, South Australia would win by a mile. We all know to what I am alluding, and for obvious reasons I will not sensationalise those aspects.

Let us look at what we have to offer in South Australia. Our sporting venues are within a 20 minute radius of the heart of the city. It is proposed that the opening and closing ceremonies will be held at Football Park, which I am proud to say is the base for the South Australian National Football League and the home of the Crows. The stadium will hold 50 000 spectators, and there will be a warm-up track at that facility.

The West Lakes Community Club, of which I am a foundation member and which is situated in my electorate of Albert Park, will be the venue for the bowling competition. I take great pride in talking about that establishment. The iron man competition, which I think is very important for all South Australians, will be held at Semaphore Park. Nearby in the electorate of Spence, the Bass Australia badminton competition will be held and that venue will house some 3 000 spectators. The Adelaide Convention Centre, which houses a similar number of people, will be the venue for the boxing event. The cycling events will be held at Sports Park, which accommodates 3 000 people. My colleague the member for Price, who is recognised by many as a State champion in cycling, is not only a wonderful person but a very close friend, and I know of his great input into cycling; he will be a keen and very interested participant in relation to the cycling events.

The gymnastics competition will be staged at the Entertainment Centre, which can accommodate 9 000 visitors. I have already said that the lawn bowls competition will be held at the West Lakes Bowling Club, which can accommodate 7 000 people. I mentioned in the House last week that that site will be the venue for the amputee games to be held next year. We should all recognise the wonderful involvement of those people who are, if you like, not as advantaged as we are.

The Jubilee Pavilion, which houses some 6 000 people, will be the venue for the netball competition. The shooting competition will be held at the State Shooting Park, which can accommodate 1 500 people; swimming at the Adelaide Aquatic Centre, which houses 3 000 people; weightlifting at the Adelaide Festival Centre, which houses 2 000 people; and wrestling at the Exhibition Centre, which also houses 2 000 people.

Many years ago, I remember the member for Coles citing information on an A4 sized piece of paper on the benefits of tourism that I understand she obtained from Tasmania. I also saw that same piece of paper in the timber country—in the south-eastern area of Western Australia. The point I want to make is that there is not one business that does not benefit from tourism.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: That may be, but I suggest that, unfortunately, we need security to look after our visitors because of political problems overseas. I believe there is common agreement in this Parliament on the benefits that would accrue to South Australia, irrespective of which Party is in government. I believe that everyone in this Parliament sin-

cerely hopes that South Australia will be the beneficiary of the decision to be taken in July this year at Barcelona.

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

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): It is appropriate that I should follow the member for Albert Park, who has been promoting South Australia as a venue for the Commonwealth Games, because I want to promote South Australia as the venue for the Centenary of the Celebration of Women's Suffrage in 1994. I hope that the Premier will remain in the Chamber long enough to hear me point out to him that a number of influential women in South Australia are absolutely fed up with his failure to act upon a request that I made almost a year ago and an undertaking that he gave seven months ago to establish a steering committee to commence planning for the Centenary of Women's Suffrage. It is simply not good enough to sit around without acting when action is called for.

That has been one of the Premier's failings and it could not be better illustrated than in the correspondence that I sent to him on 27 June last year seeking his support for the establishment of a committee to plan and coordinate the process of the celebration of the Centenary of Women's Suffrage, which occurred through amendments to the Constitution Act passed in December 1894.

My letter was dated 27 June 1991. I set out the political, cultural and economic benefits of commencing planning early so that we could attract significant numbers of women's conventions, particularly from North America but also from Europe, possibly from South America and certainly from South-East Asia. On 9 September 1991—three months later—the Premier responded to my letter, thanking me for it and indicating that the Government would be pleased to participate and to coordinate these activities and to establish a committee to plan for the year's celebration. Seven months after that, absolutely nothing has happened; 10 months has passed since the original letter and it is seven months since the Premier's reply, and nothing has happened. Women have been asking me month after month, 'When is the committee going to be set up?' I have been replying, 'The Premier has said he would do it; surely he will not take much longer.'

Influential women in this State are getting fed up to the point where they are about to take action and set up their own committees, and the reason is that they are already receiving requests from women, particularly academics, interstate and overseas, asking when the conference will be held and when a start will be made on calling for papers to be delivered at such a conference. The Premier would certainly know, and I believe all other members would know that planning for conferences that attract international attention must commence at a minimum of three years prior to the event. In respect of celebrations for the centenary of women's suffrage, one must take into account that most of the visitors who will want to join in that celebration are women. Women have to plan ahead; they have to arrange for leave, they have to arrange for someone to care for their families and they have to save up to travel halfway around the world or at least a significant distance to visit South Australia. If they want to participate in the activities, as many do through the presentation of papers, time is required for research to present those papers.

We have now lost 10 months of a critical three year period that is required for the planning of those centenary celebrations and what we risk as a result of that delay is that we will lose the initiative and the women who want to celebrate this important and pioneering event will go instead

to New Zealand which in fact enfranchised women a year ahead, in September 1893. I put to the House that women from North America, Europe, South America and South-East Asia will not come to this part of the world twice in 12 months. They will come once if they are invited in good time, if the planning is satisfactory and if the events are such as to warrant the interest of women who are seeking to take part in a worthwhile event. They will not come twice and, if they go first to New Zealand (and as far as I know nothing is yet planned in New Zealand but it may well be), they will not come to South Australia. I venture to say that we are passing up the opportunity for millions of tourism dollars which could come to this State if we acted fast and sensibly.

One is tempted to think that the Premier realises that he will not be in office and that therefore there is no point in planning anything, because he will not be part of the celebrations. That may be an uncharitable attitude (undoubtedly it is an uncharitable attitude), nevertheless, one can draw no other conclusion from the lack of action over the past 10 months. When thinking about the planning for this conference I was reminded of the extraordinarily successful Women and Politics Conference held in Canberra in 1975 to mark International Women's Year.

Mr Atkinson: By what measure?

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I am about to indicate by what measure. I happened to have been there with my daughters, who were then young, and I judged it to be a success in terms of the intellectual stimulation and inspiration that it gave to women who were meeting together from all around Australia and the world. One of the speakers at that conference was the eminent feminist Irene Greenwood, and I quote from her remarks entitled 'A lifetime of political activity', which was reported in Volume I of the proceedings of the conference, as follows:

I just want to say that the more the women hidden in history are dug out and made to live and to glow, with the aura which they possessed, but which they were prevented by whatever reason you had better determine (I have got my own theories), I think that that must be done, so that we make this ongoing chain for the younger women today so that they can know and revere the women of Australia.

If we are to ensure that the women of South Australia who worked in such a sustained fashion to achieve the enfranchisement of women—

Mr Atkinson: Catherine Helen Spence.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:—such as Catherine Helen Spence, and Mary Lee—I am happy to nominate an eminent woman trade unionist. If we are to ensure the enfranchisement of women, we had better start planning now. I repeat that the economic advantage as well as the social cultural and political advantage we will gain from a well planned celebration is important. I repeat also that any tourist organisations will tell us that an international event takes at least three years to plan.

I might say that it is just typical—absolutely typical—of the double standards practised in this Parliament and in this community that we should be pouring endless effort, considerable money and the resources of the State into planning for the Commonwealth Games and putting such value on sport, as indeed we should while letting go, like Cinderella—like a lost cause—the enormously important event of the celebrations for the centenary of women's suffrage. It is just indicative of the way the men in this Government see women's issues, women's interests, women's history and the rights of children. I think it is appalling and I call upon the Premier to get his act together and to start by nominating a chairman and by ensuring secretarial support and by inviting the relevant people to send their

nominees. We cannot delay any longer; we have let the better part of a year go by and if we do not act soon we will lose the opportunity for a well planned international event.

Motion carried.

At 9.58 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 28 April at 2 p.m.