HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 28 August 1991

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

PETITION: FISHERIES ACT

A petition signed by 23 residents of South Australia requesting that the House reject the proposed amendment to section 37 of the Fisheries Act was presented by the Hon. Lynn Arnold.

Petition received.

PETITION: JUNIOR SPORTS POLICY

A petition signed by 187 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to amend the junior sports policy to allow children greater access to competitive sport was presented by Mr Brindal.

Petition received.

PETITION: PROSTITUTION

A petition signed by 13 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to decriminalise prostitution was presented by Mr Venning.

Petition received.

PETITION: WATER RATING SYSTEM

A petition signed by 97 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to revert to the previous water rating system was presented by the Hon. D.C. Wotton.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: COMMERCIAL SNAPPER FISHERY

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Fisheries): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I wish to inform the House about the state of the commercial snapper fishery. It was stated in the House by the member for Goyder yesterday that there is a fiasco in this fishery as the total catch quota for the year was taken in 36 hours. Once again the honourable member is confused or has tried to mislead the House. Here are the facts. The average snapper catch per annum is of the order of 400 to 450 tonnes. This catch is taken by suitably endorsed marine scalefish, restricted marine scalefish, lakes and Coorong, rock lobster and miscellaneous licence holders using a variety of gear, including nets, lines and longlines.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: If you would like to listen, you might get some information. Following review of the commercial snapper fishery in 1987 a global 20 tonne quota was placed on the commercial net sector; this is not relevant to the other sectors fishing for snapper. This was first implemented in 1988 and has remained at this level ever since. The marine scalefish fishery licensing year commences on 1 July. As the commercial net sector quota is globally rather than individually allocated, the department monitors catches from 1 July and formally closes the fishery, through notice, on industry catching the 20 tonne level.

I remind the House that that has applied since 1987. It is interesting to note when this closure took place in each of the years: 30 September 1988, 3 October 1989, 21 August 1990 and 2 July 1991. I stress that this refers to the net sector only. The remainder of the commercial snapper catch is taken throughout the year by the other methods available. All licence holders have access to the other methods.

The allocation of a set quota to the net sector reflects the community's (recreational, commercial and other interest groups) views regarding what is considered an equitable allocation of the State's finite fish resources between the competing sectors. The need to close the net quota sector fishery earlier each year reflects the change in fishing effort that has occurred in the marine scalefish fishery. These trends are addressed in the July 1991 supplementary green paper on the marine scalefish review, which has recently been released for public comment. It does not reflect a reduction in the snapper net quota over the period 1988 to 1991, as was implied in the member for Goyder's question.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: VARIETY CLUB BUSH BASH

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Emergency Services): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: In my absence through illness last Thursday the Deputy Premier, in response to a question from the member for Stuart, undertook to find out whether a report had been made to police about an incident which allegedly occurred at the Quorn Oval on Saturday 17 August. Yesterday, I received the following report from the Commissioner of Police, which I would like to read to the House in its entirety:

On Saturday 17 August 1991, police attended at the Quorn Oval to conduct investigations into an incident involving flares at Glenelg, at the commencement of the Variety Club Bush Bash. This incident had resulted in the hospitalisation of a police officer due to a fire which had started at the Magic Mountain complex. Whilst the investigation was being conducted at the Quorn Oval Mr Dale Baker, MP, Leader of the Opposition, approached police. He inquired as to what was happening and the length of time that the vehicles would be expected to remain at the oval. Police advised Mr Baker of the incident at Glenelg that they were investigating, and that the vehicles were expected to remain at the oval for as long as the investigation may take. Mr Baker was then asked whether he had activated a flare at Glenelg, to which he replied that he had not.

Mr Baker then walked over to a group of people near car No. 18, 'The Green Machine', and spoke with them. Another person from that group got into the car and pig noises were subsequently heard emanating from the vehicle's public announcement system. It is my understanding that Mr Baker was a passenger in 'The Green Machine'. There is no evidence to suggest that he was in control of the vehicle, other than at those times when he was driving it, and therefore there is no evidence to suggest that he was in a position to prevent the person in the vehicle from playing the tape. I have sought statements from both of the police officers with whom Mr Baker spoke at the Quorn Oval. There is no evidence that Mr Baker obstructed the police investigation or committed any offence. He was informed, at the stage that he spoke with police, that they wished to keep their inquiries low key and there is no evidence that he failed to cooperate with police in this.

A high level of cooperation was also extended to police by the bash's chief organiser, Mr Doug Kennedy, so that the police investigation could be conducted. One of the police officers with

whom Mr Baker spoke did draw adverse inferences about Mr Baker's behaviour, which he communicated to the Police Association. Those inferences are highly perceptual and, in view of my responsibility for political impartiality and the absence of my presence at the event, it would be both improper and unfair for me to comment.

The report is signed by David Hunt as Commissioner of Police and is dated 26 August.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: POLICY AND PLANNING DIRECTOR

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I was asked yesterday by the member for Heysen why normal Public Service selection procedures were bypassed in the appointment of Mr M. Duigan to the position of Director, Policy and Planning, the Attorney-General's Department. Normal selection procedures were not bypassed in respect of this appointment. The appointment was made on the basis of extensive advertisement, and the instructions contained in the Commissioner for Public Employment's circular 53 on senior officer selection were rigorously followed. It is an appointment which has been made on merit.

The duties of the position of Director, Policy and Planning, include management of the division, provision and coordination of high level advice on the legislative program of Government and a variety of other issues, including crime prevention. The Director is also responsible for providing a policy coordination and consultation service with a number of other agencies. The position was advertised in the internal notice of vacancies on 26 June 1991, and throughout the State and the country in the *Advertiser* and the *Weekend Australian* on Saturday 22 June 1991.

The Commissioner approved a selection panel comprising: Mr Kym Kelly, Chief Executive Officer, Attorney-General's Department; Mr Tony Lawson, Director, Corporate Services, Attorney-General's Department; Ms Sue Millbank, Manager, Crime Prevention Unit, Attorney-General's Department; and Ms Karen Morley, Manager, Personnel Management Improvement, Department of Labour (representing the Commissioner on the panel). Criteria used for selection included: management and leadership skills; high levels of report writing and oral presentation skills; proven experience in the development of policies and programs; sound knowledge of the workings of Government; sound knowledge of the operation of the South Australian legal system; and thorough understanding of issues relating to crime and crime prevention, law reform and legal policy.

The position called for suitable tertiary qualifications in areas such as social sciences, law, humanities and public or business administration. A law degree was not a prerequisite. There were 16 applications received from applicants within South Australia and interstate and, after a short-listing process, seven candidates were selected and interviewed. The selection process involved an examination of work reports and references, an interview, and a written exercise for the seven short-listed candidates.

The written exercise involved candidates interpreting information about a legal policy area, analysing a series of options in respect of the area and formulating a proposal for action to the Attorney-General.

The panel was unanimous in its recommendation of Mr Duigan as the candidate who best met all the requirements to successfully perform the duties of the position. The recommendation was considered and approved by the Commissioner for Public Employment, who wrote to Mr Duigan informing him of his successful application. A letter of response was received from Mr Duigan, who was subsequently appointed to the position.

Mr Speaker, for the record Mr Duigan has the following formal qualifications: a Bachelor of Arts (Honours) degree from the University of Adelaide; a Local Government Management Certificate from the Canberra College of Advanced Education; and a Diploma of Social Administration from Flinders University. Mr Duigan was clearly appointed to this position on merit, after an extensive selection process.

Was the member for Heysen suggesting by his question that a former member of Parliament could not win a senior Public Service job on merit—and looking at the members of his Party, that is probably a reasonable view—or was he suggesting that, because a person has been an MP, that person should be forbidden from winning a Public Service job, despite their ability? That is a ridiculous view.

The fact is that this Parliament has seen many very able people take their seats as members for periods of time. Some of them have later gone on to senior positions in other areas. Mr Duigan is among them.

QUESTION TIME

STATE BANK

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Treasurer. On 19 February, when he told the House that the State Bank's projection of non-accruals of $2.5 billion (or $2 500 million) as at 30 June 1991 was still valid, was he aware of a higher State Bank Group estimate of non-productive accounts?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Tomorrow, when the budget is delivered, the annual report of the State Bank of South Australia will be presented. This will be the first occasion on which we have a full and complete assessment of the State Bank's figures, its exposures and its results, which have been signed off by the board and, of course, appropriately audited. In the course of the budget speech, as I have indicated now for some weeks, I will be not only tabling those reports to provide that full picture of the State's finances but also dealing at some length with the position of the State Bank. I suggest that until that time such questions as the Leader of the Opposition has asked should be held and they will be fully addressed in due course.

CITY HERITAGE

Mr De LAINE (Price): Can the Minister for Environment and Planning indicate to the House the steps taken to clarify the management of heritage items in the City of Adelaide to avoid conflicts in future similar to those which occurred in relation to St Pauls and the House of Chow?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am delighted to inform the honourable member that I can outline some of the actions that I have taken as Minister with responsibility for built heritage in this State to provide greater certainty for developers. I believe it is important not only to provide greater certainty but to meet the other primary requirement of the Minister responsible for heritage, and that is to protect heritage. The Heritage Act has been reviewed and subject to wide community consultation, and after consid-

eration by the State Heritage Advisory Committee I expect to receive proposals to improve the existing legislative framework in the very near future. These proposals will then be referred to the planning review to ensure that they accord with its recommendations.

I need not point out to the House the obvious need to ensure that any recommendations affecting heritage must also be in line with or complement those recommendations that would be made as a result of the planning review. At the same time, I have had separate meetings with the Lord Mayor, with representatives of the development industry and with conservation groups to progress the identification and protection of heritage buildings and townscapes.

In my view, a planned approach is the best way to preserve properly the character and heritage of our city. This will provide protection for individual buildings and will, certainly, delineate townscape areas. Together, they would give clear direction on development and protection guidelines applying to such things as buildings of heritage significance in their own right; buildings with character value rather than heritage value; and sections of streets and clusters of buildings which, together, give a picture of an era of Adelaide's past, which should be preserved.

It is appropriate that the State Government be concerned about avoiding future situations similar to those involving the House of Chow and St Paul's. We want to avoid conflict and uncertainty in the community. I believe that this view is shared not only by the development industry but also by the conservation industry.

STATE BANK

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): In February, was the Treasurer aware that problem exposures of up to $1 billion mainly relating to Adsteam and Remm were not included in the $2.5 billion non-productive loan forecast or the $970 million indemnity figure that he provided to this House?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I can only refer members to the statement that I made at that time as to the basis on which the assessment of the liabilities of the State Bank was made. In that, I made clear that much of the final figuring had not been completed. As I have just said to the Leader of the Opposition, now that that has been done in the preparation of the annual report, now that it has been fully assessed and audited, the appropriate figures can and will be put on the record tomorrow. I suggest that, instead of trying to stir up agitation around this issue, the honourable member should just control himself, have a little patience and, perhaps, try to do something productive in this area. I have heard comments—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Well, the interjections start now, Mr Speaker. I know from statements that the Leader of the Opposition has been making that he is attempting to prepare certain ground work and make certain allegations. Again, I suggest that that is totally unproductive in the circumstances. If the honourable member, the Leader or any other member opposite has some constructive point to make or some proposal to put forward, I am sure—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —that people would be delighted to hear. Instead, they wish to wallow in the mire. They wish to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —create a crisis of confidence; they wish to create an atmosphere of total unease. As the honourable Leader, admittedly shamed into it by his colleague the member for Coles, has revealed, the whole purpose of what he is saying and doing is to try to get across to these benches as quickly as he can. That is not what it is about: there are certain responsibilities to be discharged, and they will be discharged. Within about 24 hours—and I know that that is a pretty long attention span for them—members opposite will have the whole situation laid out before them, and they will be able to make their comments and questions and make allegations. No doubt, they will all be prepared, anyway. I do not think that anything productive is to be gained by this sort of exercise today.

Members interjecting:

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

RAIL STANDARDISATION

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Transport advise the House of the principal benefits South Australia would receive from the Adelaide to Melbourne rail standardisation proposal? A number of my ex-workmates and railway workers have approached me expressing interest in this proposal, its cost and the number of jobs it will create.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Adelaide-Melbourne rail standardisation and upgrading is a very important project for South Australia. The new National Rail Corporation as a high priority has to make a decision on whether this upgrading and standardisation takes place. A consultant's report is being prepared already, and this is prior to the corporation's actually being formed, so that indicates the urgency with which the Federal Government and the South Australian Government consider this project. There is no doubt that the standardisation, of itself, will do very little to shorten the time between Melbourne and Adelaide, but the upgrading that we assume will take place at the same time will make a very considerable difference indeed. It has—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Via Angaston!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I cannot guarantee to the member for Light that it will be via Angaston; we have not got down to that detail just yet. Various costings of this project have been done over the years but the most favoured option prior to the National Rail Corporation's investigation was for a $300 million project, so it is very significant indeed.

The principal benefits, as requested by the member for Albert Park, can be summarised this way. There will be a significant reduction in transit time to as little as 10 hours for South Australian exports; an injection of about $411 million from construction activity into the State's economy; and the provision of 470 jobs. There will be substantial operating cost savings and increased revenue for Australian National and therefore increased rail employment; an increase in rail share of forwarder into local markets from the present 25 to 60 per cent—that is, 500 000 tonnes per year—and this change will take place mainly from road transport; and a reduction in truck movements by 30 per cent, or 120 vehicles a day and, therefore, a resource cost saving from reduced road wear, accidents, etc.,—something that I am sure everyone in this House would welcome. It would also reinforce the State's role in servicing the Northern Territory. That would be at the expense of the Queens-

land trucking industry; nevertheless, we believe that rail can do it better after this standardisation and upgrading takes place.

Also, we believe that it will add significantly to the State's Government's push for the transport hub concept for South Australia. We believe that, geographically and in other ways, South Australia is very well placed to become the transport and distributive centre for very many goods in Australia. We believe that the energy we are putting into that, coupled with the new National Rail Corporation and the upgrading and standardisation of the Adelaide-Melbourne line, will bring very many benefits to South Australia and give us an edge on transportation costs, bearing in mind that being so far away from our principal markets is obviously a real liability at the moment. So, the standardisation is a very important project for South Australia, particularly if there is an upgrading of the line and not merely standardisation, and it is something for which this Government has fought very strongly indeed and will continue to do so—and, we believe, with a great deal of success.

STATE BANK

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): Since February, has the Treasurer been receiving a weekly report on key events in the State Bank group and was he formally advised in April that non-productive loans of the group as at 30 June 1991 were estimated at $4 300 million?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I again suggest that the Leader display a little patience, because the position will be fully explained tomorrow. In the period during which the bank has been preparing its annual report there has been constant and unremitting assessment of its position and its exposures. Naturally I have received regular reports. I have had meetings on occasions with Mr Nobby Clark, the Chairman of the bank board, who has provided me with an updated and on-going report. The information showing the position as at the end of the financial year will be presented tomorrow.

RECYCLING DEPOTS

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning advise whether the Government has been working towards the establishment of one or more recycling depots as part of a comprehensive recycling scheme? On 29 May 1991 the *Advertiser* published an article announcing the release of the Liberal Party's direction paper on the environment. In that paper released by the Leader of the Opposition was a proposal to build recycling depots north and south of Adelaide, and my understanding is that this approach is already included as part of the Government's recycling strategy.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! When the Speaker cannot be heard to call on the Minister, things are getting out of hand. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question, which again illustrates that the environmental directions paper issued by the Opposition is nothing more than a fake. The Opposition promises an environmental protection agency. The Government has already announced the establishment of such a body.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It certainly was not after but very much before the event. The Opposition promises recycling depots: again the Government is already understanding this. Metropolitan recyling facilities form an integral part of a scheme which starts with kerbside collection, with materials being collected and then delivered to a recycling facility for sorting, baling and sale. Indeed, I am sure that it will be of great interest and information to the Opposition to learn that the South Australian Waste Management Commission has already been negotiating with regional local council organisations for quite some time—long before the Opposition cobbled together this most amazing document, which certainly could not be described in any language as an environmental policy. It is a cobbling together of Government initiatives already being undertaken and yet the Opposition comes out saying that it has an environmental policy.

Let me expose this environmental policy so that we can see what I am saying. I am amazed that the environmental directions paper released has mirrored our plans on a number of issues. I will highlight to the House where the paper is silent: it is silent on a whole range of vitally important environmental issues such as the greenhouse. Where is the Opposition's position on the greenhouse? It is amazingly silent. I also refer to coastal protection.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, I do not recall the question being in any way related to the greenhouse.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The honourable member will resume his seat.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: For the honourable member's edification, I assure him that the greenhouse effects are occurring right at this moment, yet the Opposition in its paper has been totally silent on this very important aspect. In relation to coastal protection, we have seen newspaper articles over the past couple of days, but the Opposition is very silent about its position. There are also the areas of sustainable development, environmental choice and so on. I could delineate quite a list of areas where, strangely, the Opposition is quite silent in its environmental statement. I can only assume that the Opposition does not have policies on these vital and important issues.

STATE BANK

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Treasurer confirm that the State Bank group now has audited figures showing non-productive loans of $4.5 billion, out of which it is estimated between $2.2 billion and $2.4 billion will be lost, and that, to meet the Reserve Bank's requirement, a State Government indemnity totalling as much as $2.3 billion of taxpayers' money will be needed?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As the Leader of the Opposition well knows, I will not confirm, deny or in any way comment on figures until the budget is presented tomorrow. While it might be great for the Leader of the Opposition to think that he will show us how smart he is or to join the realm of speculation, or whatever, that is fine for people who want to play games. In fact, the Chairman of the bank did the Leader the courtesy of talking to him about the timing of the release of the report and outlined some of the matters contained in it—he was given that courtesy on the basis that he would behave responsibly, as he has claimed he has. I do not wish to make an issue of that. I will give the response that the Leader of the Opposition knows is appropriate in those circumstances. A full statement will be made tomorrow. I regret that he wishes to use the forms of the House in this way, but I guess that that is par for the course.

HOUSING TRUST

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction advise the House of the current situation in regard to the restructuring of the South Australian Housing Trust and, in particular, assure the House that the restructuring will provide a more convenient, one-stop service to trust tenants and prospective tenants?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Mitchell for his question. He is one member who is vitally interested in this issue because, of course, he has a number of constituents who are trust tenants. The review of the Housing Trust administration has been couched with two directions in mind. The first is the very point the member has raised; that is, providing an improved service to the community. That involved an assessment, which was carried out in the regionalisation that was adopted 10 years ago. It was felt within the trust that, when tenants or prospective tenants came in requiring information, often they had to be passed from one office to another or from one agency to another. It was felt that a much more efficient system was needed, not only for the clients but also for the trust as a whole.

The second direction was, of course, to look at the efficiency in the organisation of the Housing Trust. The overall exercise is now complete and regional managers will be established in each area. They will have overall responsibility to conduct their particular region, and they will have far greater delegation responsibility than previously, The new process will operate from 30 September this year. For tenants and prospective tenants it will mean that they can go to the front desk and obtain all the information they require on any aspect of public housing. That will be a significant advantage to those tenants and prospective tenants.

In addition, we have moved the process of rent payment from trust offices to Australia Post. On Friday we have the opportunity, again, at the Housing Minister's meeting to advocate procuration orders, on social security payments. We believe that will assist a lot of people. It will help to keep the trust's rent arrears to a minimum. The automatic deductions will assist the individual who may be immobile or who is unable or who may find it inconvenient to get to a post office. I hope that the Federal Government introduces that process in the very near future. I believe the overall reorganisation will offer improved service to the trust's clients as well as greater efficiency within the Housing Trust itself.

STATE BANK

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Has the Treasurer made any plans to make a decision by the end of September on the sale of all or most of the State Bank Group and, if so, what are they?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have made no such decision; in fact, it would not be appropriate for me to make such a decision. The position of the State Bank, its financing and its position in the marketplace, despite the efforts of the Opposition to destabilise it as much as it can, is I believe very secure, and I will explain in great detail tomorrow exactly what that position is on the basis of audited accounts provided by the bank and its annual report.

DRUG EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I ask the Minister of Health: what funds are provided in the Federal budget for drug education programs, and will the Minister describe the direction of policy under the National Campaign Against Drug Abuse (NCADA)?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The amount funded to South Australia is $1.948 million, which is about a 6.7 per cent increase on what we received last year. Of course, most of this money is spent through the Drug and Alcohol Service Council. The National Campaign Against Drug Abuse is a program which was initiated some years ago by both the Commonwealth and the States, and we have had some opportunity to discern its outlines and to gauge the effectiveness of its programs.

When this program was first set up, a lot of people felt that the aim would be to look at the problems posed to our community by illicit drugs but, of course, those people in the know would be aware that, for the most part, the problems that we have with drugs are due overwhelmingly to the abuse of listed and, indeed, prescription drugs. The prescription drugs area is one to which we will have to pay rather more attention than we have in the past. For example, the Marion-Brighton Council for Health and Community Welfare recently sponsored a review, program, investigation or survey into concerns about prescription drugs—and they continue.

This matter needs to be addressed in a number of ways. First, for the most part, general practitioners are pretty well informed as to possible side effects and can gauge problems that occur when people come to see them with an obvious degree of drug dependency. The problem is, of course, that people shop around. Therefore, often a prescription is given in the absence of any knowledge by that general practitioner of the person's problem. As the member for Adelaide would well know, in a situation of dependency, price is not a disincentive: these people will often pay anything to get what they want. So, a good deal more work has to happen in the area of prescription drugs.

There is a problem for the Federal authorities because, on the one hand, we have a very conservative regime in this country in relation to the release of drugs for whatever purpose, and that is sometimes criticised by people. On the other hand, one of the ways in which to better control some of these practices is to be even more conservative. So, I imagine that, at the next meeting of NCADA, there will be considerable and lively discussions about this matter, and I assure the honourable member that a good deal of work is being done on it.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): Will the Minister of Transport confirm that he has rejected proposals from private insurers to provide compulsory third party motor vehicle insurance in South Australia at reduced premiums because of the deficit in SGIC's third party fund?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: There is a Bill before another place at the moment and, on behalf of the Government, the Hon. Trevor Crothers has already very clearly and firmly rejected, as only he can, the Bill that was introduced by the Hon. Diana Laidlaw to open up the compulsory third party system to private insurers. Members can read *Hansard*, but I will fill them in. The Government makes no bones about it. Irrespective of the state of the compulsory third party fund, we do not believe that there is any longer a role for private insurers in this area. Since the private insurers pulled out—nobody kicked them out; they pulled out because it was seen to be unprofitable by them—and left South Australian motorists in the lurch and the SGIC holding the baby—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is what they did. Now they feel that it may be profitable, so they want to come back in. On behalf of South Australian motorists, I can assure the private insurers that, as far as this Government is concerned, they will not be coming back into the field. If we make any comparison between the SGIC's premiums and benefits and any interstate private insurers' benefits and premiums, we see that the motorists in South Australia are far better off, because they have lower premiums and better benefits.

From time to time there may well be a small window of opportunity for the private insurance companies to come in, skim off a bit of cream and disappear, because that is their history. If they had a history in this State of consistently supporting South Australian motorists, they would have no problem with me, because I have no ideological view in this area whatsoever, and neither has the RAA.

The RAA represents motorists and the RAA has not come out and said that there should be private insurers in the field, because the insurance company with which the RAA is associated did the same thing—it pulled out in the 1970s. It said, 'It is no longer profitable. Never mind about the motorists in South Australia; you can keep your compulsory third party. We are a free enterprise organisation operating in a free enterprise system, and it is our right to dump South Australian motorists.' That is fair enough; those are the rules. However, 15 years later, or whatever it is, they feel that they can come in, skim off a bit of cream and, when they do not like it, move out. I can assure members, on behalf of South Australian motorists—

Dr Armitage interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: And I can assure the member for Adelaide that I can shout louder than he can. I am in order and he is not. It does not bother me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I can still shout louder than you can. And my microphone is switched on but yours is not. If I were you—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to address the Chair.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Speaker, I am about to wind up. There is no question but that the private insurers in this area badly let down South Australian motorists. Our system is the best and the cheapest, and it supplies the best benefits in Australia. When you are on a good thing, stick to it.

ONE-STOP LICENCE SHOPS

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, representing the Minister of Small Business, give an assurance that, when the one-stop licence shops for small business are set up, a 008 number will be provided for the assistance of country callers?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yesterday, the honourable member asked a question on a similar matter and I undertook to refer it to my colleague the Minister of Small Business in another place, and I will do so with this one as well. I believe I can say with a degree of assurance that it would almost certainly be the case that a 008 number would apply, because that is the trend line for the provision of Government information services in a number of Government agencies and related agencies. I know that the Department of Agriculture, which comes under my portfolio, has in the past few months introduced a number of services to the 008 telephone line system. I will bring back a formal reply on this matter from the Hon. Barbara Wiese as soon as possible.

LATE PAYMENT OF ACCOUNTS

Mr SUCH (Fisher): Will the Treasurer take immediate action to stop the SGIC and WorkCover abusing their monopoly status by delaying payment of medical fees for as long as four years, in some cases? Two medical practices have provided me with documents that show long delays in payments by the SGIC and WorkCover. A practice in the Morphett Vale area currently has on its books the following third party accounts that have not been paid by SGIC, even though, I understand, the accounts are not in dispute: from 1987, accounts totalling $314; 1988, $2 126.70; 1989, $2 914.50; and 1990, $2 097. In total, this practice has $8 387.70 in accounts to SGIC that have been outstanding for at least 90 days. A practice in the Reynella area has reported to me third party accounts totalling $17 000 outstanding for at least 150 days.

This same practice has WorkCover accounts totalling $11 000, which have been outstanding for at least 150 days. I have been informed that another eight medical practices in the southern suburbs have similar concerns regarding late payment by SGIC and WorkCover. Principals in these practices remember public statements by the Premier that Government agencies would pay their bills within 30 days.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In consequence of those statements, I think that there has been a very considerable improvement in the payment of bills by Government agencies, as has been testified to me by a number of—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —those in industry. The honourable member says that he has been made aware of certain accounts and matters, which he has put before us. If he could provide those to me, in turn, I will ensure that they are referred to the respective agencies and some report obtained.

BARLEY BOARD

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Does the Minister of Agriculture intend that the Barley Board should in future be appointed by selection rather than election by barley growers? Like many other members of this House, I have received correspondence from a Mr Anthony Honner expressing concern about proposed legislation on this matter, hence my question to the Minister.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The honourable member raises an issue that has been raised by a number of members in this place. Indeed, I know that you, Sir, yourself have spoken to me about the matter, as have a number of other members on both sides of the Parliament. The reason why it is coming up as an issue is that there has been a review of the barley marketing Acts. I remind members that that situation covers two State legislatures, the South Australian and the Victorian Parliaments. The legislation must be passed in both those Parliaments to provide for the new arrangements for barley growers in South Australia and Victoria.

The review that was undertaken into the barley marketing arrangements and what changes, if any, there should be proposed a number of changes that were put to me and to the Victorian Minister of Agriculture. Amongst those rec-

ommended changes is the question of the composition of the board.

At the moment, the members of the board are elected and it is proposed that the new board members should be selected instead. It is that which has caused much concern among some barley growers. However, it needs to be noted that there is a diversity of opinion amongst the barley growers of South Australia. Many growers, through their organisation (the UF&S), believe that it should be by selection, but others believe that it should be by election. Mr Anthony Honner has spoken to me about this matter on a number of occasions as, from the counter point of view, has the UF&S.

The argument in favour of a selection method is that it enables the selection of the best group of people to work together to administer the new arrangements under the Barley Act. There are very many situations where that is the most appropriate way to appoint the governing board or committee, because we can bring together a team approach, whereby we try to fit in the strengths of a number of people and see how they mesh together to make a good operating group. Sometimes that is not achieved by the election method, because that method simply identifies individual members regardless of how they would fit into a team of people possibly being elected to the board.

The view of the review committee was that that would not be an effective method for the Barley Board and, indeed, on other occasions with other commodities, that view has been adhered to in this Parliament. With respect to the citrus industry, this Parliament has accepted that situation, namely, that the new Citrus Board of South Australia should not be appointed by an election mode because, while the board had done an excellent job in the past, it had not been helped by that mode of appointment. So, I have been favouring the selection mode for that reason. I am in the process of hearing submissions from both sides of the debate. I had discussions with my colleague the Hon. Ian Baker, Minister of Agriculture in Victoria, who tells me that Victorian barley growers believe very strongly that appointments should be by selection and that no group in Victoria supports appointment by election.

That then raises the nub of another problem. If the legislation that comes out of this Parliament is different from the legislation that comes out of the Victorian Parliament, we could well end up with no Barley Board, and that could be *de facto* deregulation. Those who have views on this matter should think very carefully where they want the barley industry to end up. If they want a situation where there is a contradiction between the two Parliaments and we effectively end up with no Barley Board, what they have given to the barley growers of South Australia is a deregulated environment, and I suggest they go and be honest with the barley growers in their own electorates about what are their views.

I have to say that there seems to be a range of views or non-views, in other words, the failure to express views in this matter in public by a number of members who have a key relevance to this issue. I look forward to hearing in Parliament what are their views, including those of the member for Goyder on this very matter, and to hear how he answers this issue of the possibility—the spectre, even—of *de facto* deregulation because of the failure of two Parliaments to agree on the same legislation.

GOVERNMENT FLEET

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): My question is directed to the Premier. Does the Government intend to lease a greater proportion of its vehicle fleet in order to gain an up-front cash injection from the sale of its existing fleet, to help reduce the budget deficit?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not aware of any such proposal being pursued in the current circumstance, but I will refer that question to my colleague the Minister in another place who is in charge of the Government fleet. At all times we are looking at any opportunity to operate as effectively and efficiently as we can and, if those matters are worthy of pursuit, I am sure they are under examination.

NEW ZEALAND ECONOMIC AGREEMENT

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Is the Minister of Agriculture concerned that the Closer Economic Relations agreement with New Zealand is not benefiting Australian export industries as originally planned? The Minister would have noted recent reports that New Zealand has purchased Saudi Arabian wheat.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I may say at the outset that I have been a very strong supporter of the CER arrangements between Australia and New Zealand, because I think it is economic good sense for Australia and New Zealand to recognise that we both live in the same broad trading world and that, if we can establish closer economic relations between us, that is the correct way to go. I was very pleased to see the arrangements that have been made with this Federal Government by the former New Zealand Government. I believe progress was being made although, of course, as with all agreements, sometimes there are hiccups that need to be sorted out. I have to say that the arguments being followed at the moment by the present New Zealand Government do give considerable cause for concern in a number of areas. One of those areas is precisely in this accepting of subsidised wheat from Saudi Arabia.

I am certain that all members of this place would understand the grave problem that that poses to our own wheat producers in South Australia, with even the market of New Zealand now accepting subsidised wheat.

Mr Meier interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I hope that the member for Goyder is concerned about this situation as it should concern all of us. I intend to raise it with Simon Crean, the Federal Minister for Primary Industries and Energy, and with Senator John Button, the Minister for Industry, Technology and Commerce, to determine what kind of monitoring will take place with respect to CER to ensure that the spirit of the agreement entered into by the New Zealand and Australian Governments is in fact achieved and that it does not involve any method that might see, through CER, products coming into Australia through the back door which will unfairly disadvantage our producers, be they manufacturers or primary producers. A similar situation applies with certain tariff regimes.

One of the things that should come out of CER as soon as possible is a matching up of tariff regimes that apply to products that might be able to enter one of those countries and then be transshipped to the other. Where an industry in this country faces certain tariff regimes for imported products and in New Zealand it is a lower tariff regime, those goods could come into New Zealand and from there into Australia, thereby posing an unreasonable threat to industry here, without having benefited industry in New Zealand. I do not want for one minute to create a situation where we are trying to take away from the natural rights of the New Zealand economy to develop itself for its own citizens, but it does not help them if goods are simply using

New Zealand as a staging post on their way to Australia. I intend to pursue the matter further with Simon Crean and John Button so that the spirit of that agreement can be achieved, rather than what seems to be worrying signals that are presently taking place.

ELECTRICITY TRUST

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Will the Minister of Mines and Energy advise what was the Electricity Trust's total contribution to the State Government, including SAFA, in the 1990-91 year?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I try not to carry figures like that around in my head, but I will make them available for the honourable member.

OUTPATIENT EMERGENCY SECTIONS

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister of Health advise whether public hospitals such as the Adelaide Children's Hospital have been issued with new guidelines to deter members of the public from using casualty facilities for non-urgent medical matters? A constituent of mine complained that she had to wait for more than three hours for her baby to receive medical treatment last night at the Adelaide Children's Hospital. Although not life threatening, the child was suffering from a viral infection and all normal medical services in my electorate had long closed for the day.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: No such instruction has been given. Obviously, it depends entirely on the traffic through the accident emergency department at any time. Yesterday afternoon I was talking to a group of young people who had done a useful survey for the Government, mainly through CAFHS, on youth health. Young people face this problem, but for the most part in their case we are dealing with sports related injury, and we all know when sport is played. We tend to see injuries at the same time and, therefore, Saturday afternoon is a rush period at the accident emergency departments. I will check to ascertain whether there was anything in particular operating at that time.

FREE STUDENT PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Will the Minister of Youth Affairs advise whether he is opposing any further restrictions on free student public transport following the view he has expressed personally and publicly as the Minister of Youth Affairs that 'it has been a major plus in helping families with the cost of getting their children to school and to weekend events'?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: My position on this matter has been made patently clear.

TREE PLANTING

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning report to the House the progress of the Government's one billion trees program?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I cannot give the honourable member a detailed report, but I would be very pleased to provide a report to him subsequently. I believe that so far we we have planted almost 20 million trees of the targeted one billion. In giving a report to the Parliament it is important that we recognise the enormous contribution of a whole range of sections of our community, not only the rural community and the conservation movement but also ordinary South Australians and, in particular, numbers of schools and school children who have been involved in this whole, if you like, greening of South Australia movement. It is a great credit to the community of South Australia that it has picked up this initiative and that it is prepared to run with it. As a Government, indeed I am sure as an Opposition and, I guess, as a Parliament, we are very much behind this whole program of planting a billion trees and, as I said, I understand that about 20 million trees have already been planted.

TAFE COLLEGE CLOSURES

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): What assurance can the Minister of Employment and Further Education give that there will be no closures of South Australian TAFE colleges this financial year?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Members opposite are very much like turkeys praying for an early Christmas. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition recently misled this Parliament by saying that I had sold the Kensington Park TAFE in Lossie Street for millions of dollars less than it was worth. However, I point out that it has not yet been put to sale.

TAXI INDUSTRY TRAINING ADVISORY PANEL

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Transport advise the House of the outcome of the Taxi Industry Training Advisory Panel's recommendations?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes, there has been a great deal of concern for some time that there is a very large turnover of taxi drivers in metropolitan Adelaide. Taxi drivers vary in their abilities and their presentation to customers. Some are a very real asset to the industry and others need a little bit of work.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am talking about taxi drivers, not taxi owners. It is different.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmmore interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Coles is out of order, and the Minister should direct his response through the Chair.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I apologise, Sir. I was merely trying to help the member for Coles get her terminology correct. As I said, many of the new drivers who come into the industry are an asset, but others need a little bit of work before they develop their full potential. The Metropolitan Taxi Cab Board has decided that it will no longer issue permits to people who have not successfully completed an accredited training course. That is an important decision on the part of the board and one with which I fully concur. It is not good enough, particularly for our tourism industry, to have taxi drivers who come into the industry for only a few months—perhaps they are between jobs, or whatever. If they are not properly trained in how to carry out their duties efficiently and well, they can do a significant amount of damage to the image of Adelaide, which is something that none of us would want.

Mr Ferguson: And the tourism industry?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Indeed. The Metropolitan Taxi Cab Board is putting significant resources into training, and I expect the industry to do likewise, because over the

years it has not had a lot of structure other than one that maintains the monopoly of those people already in the industry. It has been reported to me by taxi owners that it is extremely difficult to get quality drivers. However, I believe that a training program conducted prior to the issuing of a permit will ensure that those drivers who are available have made some initial commitment to the industry by going through a training course. I am sure that this training will lift the image of the taxi industry considerably, thereby contributing to the well-being of the whole of the industry. I congratulate the Metropolitan Taxi Cab Board for taking this initiative.

FINNISS SPRINGS PASTORAL LEASE

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Is the Minister of Lands aware that she has acted illegally in resuming the Finniss Springs pastoral lease, and how does she propose now to legally achieve resumption and to compensate the present leaseholders? The Minister has acted illegally by attempting to serve a notice of resumption on the leaseholder late and by fax and not by post, which is in contravention of the definition of 'postage' in section 33 of the Acts Interpretation Act. Further, in contravention of section 40 of the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989 she has failed to serve on the mortgagee (Elders Pastoral) the required notice of her intention to resume the lease 14 days prior to the commencement of the process of notifying the lessee.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am amazed at the lengths to which the honourable member is prepared to go to try to thwart what I believe the community in general in South Australia, but particularly the Aboriginal community, has welcomed. It is interesting to note that with respect—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I will get on to the actual specifics in a moment, Mr Speaker, but it is interesting to note that in the question asked by the honourable member last week he said that a group of Aboriginal people was, I think he said, extinct. I will quote the exact words of the honourable member. He actually suggested that a group of Aboriginal people was no longer in existence. I have a letter in front of me from the Secretary of the Kuyani Association Incorporated, posted from Port Augusta. I will quote from the letter, because I think it relates very much to the question that was asked.

Mr LEWIS: A point of order, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume her seat. There is a point of order before the Chair.

Mr LEWIS: What relevance does this have to the question I just asked?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will resume his seat. This is a very serious question. It alleges that a Minister has acted illegally and improperly, and the Chair believes that a full explanation should be allowed. If the Minister answering the question believes it is valid, I think a full and complete explanation is allowable, considering the seriousness of the allegations.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. In a very detailed answer to the House with respect to the member for Hayward's question last week, I clearly delineated the Acts of Parliament and the sections under which I had made my decision. Indeed, I referred to the Aboriginal Heritage Act in terms of the rationale behind that decision. In that same Question Time, the honourable member made some allegations about the way in which I had arrived at that decision. Therefore, my answer, as you so rightly point out, Mr Speaker, is in fact an extension of the accusation which the honourable member has levelled at me as Minister of Lands and Minister for Environment and Planning. The letter, dated 20 July this year, states in part:

> At a meeting in Port Augusta last night we were asked to approach you and the Ministers for Aboriginal Affairs at both State and Federal level to intervene in seeking a postponement of the auction to allow us time to conduct negotiations amongst Aboriginal people, with ATSIC and the National Parks and Wildlife Service, in order to arrange a settlement of the situation that will suit everybody including the present Finniss Springs Station lease owners.
>
> The Kuyani Association Inc. on behalf of its 200 registered members—

and I remind the House that, according to the honourable member, they have all been dead for hundreds of years—

> is currently involved in a series of initiatives designed to create employment opportunities for our people. These initiatives will embrace any Aboriginal people from whatever group and include development of the region's tourism potential and environmental rehabilitation programs. ATSIC and the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement were represented at last night's meeting and the indications were that the joint Arrabunna/Kuyani proposal was welcome but needed time to be put together properly.

It goes on to say that I will be able to assist, and so on, and the letter is signed by Vonnie Davies, the secretary of the Kuyani Association Inc.

I had not intended to raise this matter further in this Parliament because of the way in which I believe there has been a deliberate attempt by the member for Murray-Mallee to denigrate Aboriginal people and, in particular, those people who have been involved in the proper and correct negotiations with my department in making representations to me as Minister responsible for the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act and the Aboriginal Heritage Act. I will have the honourable member's pedantic points carefully checked, but I am disappointed in him because the fact that he has deliberately tried to undermine an initiative which has been welcomed by members on both sides of this Parliament is very destructive to the good working relationships that we have developed as a community with our Aboriginal community brethren. I will not have that relationship undermined.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: STATE BANK

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr D.S. BAKER: In answer to a question earlier today the Treasurer suggested that I was told by Nobby Clark what would be contained in the State Bank's annual report. I visited Mr Nobby Clark on 2 August—some four weeks ago—and that meeting was at the request of the bank. The discussions were about what questioning with regard to the bank would take place when Parliament resumed. I assured Nobby Clark that we would not be questioning any events which happened prior to 10 February as they would probably be ruled out of order by the Speaker as being *sub judice*. At no stage was I given any information about any matters contained in the bank's annual report.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: FINNISS SPRINGS PASTORAL LEASE

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

Leave granted.

Mr LEWIS: In answer to me and to the House just now the Minister for Environment and Planning misrepresented what I asked in my question last week. She has also misrepresented my position and that of members of the Opposition. In the first instance, she said that I had said there were no members of the Kuyani Association Incorporated. I did not. The Minister, in answer to me last week, said that there were traditional owners of the Kuyani whom she had consulted. I had told her in a subsequent question that there were no traditional owners of the Kuyani tribe who had been on that land and who were still alive. That is a fact. The members of the Kuyani Association Inc. may be some descendants; they are not the elders of the tribe which occupied the land prior to Mr Frank Warren and his wife, who was an Arrabunna. In addition, the Minister said that I had deliberately set out to denigrate Aboriginal people. I did not at any time. Neither in this place nor anywhere else have I attempted to do that. I have had good and complete consultation with all the people, Aboriginal or otherwise, who have been involved in this matter, and none of them has made any such allegation to me. Most of them have had no contact with the Minister.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: BUSH BASH

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr D.S. BAKER: In response to a ministerial statement made today by the Minister of Emergency Services, I should like to make several points. First, to all those members opposite who approached me or who rang my office after last Thursday's question by the member for Stuart, I thank them very much. The abhorrence and disgust expressed by members on that side of the House at the way in which this Parliament was being used as a forum for the making of unfounded allegations against another honourable member was quite moving.

I have obtained two statutory declarations which were sent to me this week and which I will read to the House. The first is from Richard Charles Nitschke, and is as follows:

I, Richard Charles Nitschke

do solemnly and sincerely declare that the members of the crew of car 18 in the Variety Club Bush Bash have had their attention drawn to certain allegations made in the House of Assembly on 22 August by the member for Stuart, Mrs Colleen Hutchison. We refer in particular to the following:

> I am informed by observers that the Leader joined in with the rest of his crew in laughing and joking while the offensive tape-recording was being played. I am also told that at no stage did the Leader attempt to stop the crew's behaviour, and in fact observers say that he actively joined in and condoned it. Many residents of Quorn and my own constituents were present on the oval to witness this appalling attempt to humiliate the police.

The reference to the leader means the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Dale Baker M.P. I believe Mr Baker had been invited to participate in the event for the first two days by travelling in an official car. At the last minute, a member of our crew was unable to participate, and Mr Baker accepted the invitation to join car 18.

We believe that most if not all cars participating in the event are fitted with loudspeakers and sirens to enable a large range of noises to be played, which contribute to the atmosphere of the event. During the journey between Adelaide and Quorn on 17 August we participated in a number of 'stunts' with the active support of the police, during which each car would have used their sound systems. No police officer objected to the use of such equipment. We did not become aware, until the cars had been delayed at the Quorn Oval for some time on the afternoon of 17 August that a police officer had been injured during the start of the event at Glenelg. Car 18 has never carried flares during the past bashes or at any time during the 1991 bash.

At no time did any members of the crew of car 18 behave in a manner intended to humiliate the police. We also categorically and completely deny any allegations of inappropriate or improper behaviour made against Mr Baker. Mr Baker got out of car 18 shortly after its arrival at the Quorn Oval, which was a lunch stop, and did not return to our car until it was able to leave the oval later in the afternoon. Many participants in the event, including some police officers, have expressed concern and anger to us that untrue allegations have been made in the House of Assembly which have overshadowed what was an extremely successful and worthwhile event for charity.

The second statutory declaration came from Geoffrey Paul Gauvin and reads as follows:

I am the Chairman of the Variety Club Bush Bash Committee. I invited the Leader of the Opposition. Mr Dale Baker, to participate in the event for the first two days,17 and 18 August. It had been planned that Mr Baker would travel in the official car. However, when a vacancy became available in car 18, Mr Baker accepted the invitation to become a member of its crew.

I was present at Quorn Oval during the afternoon of 17 August when the Bush Bash cars were delayed. I have read a *Hansard* transcript of a question asked in the House of Assembly on 22 August by the member for Stuart, Mrs Colleen Hutchison, during which allegations of inappropriate and improper behaviour were made against Mr Baker.

At no time while on the Quorn Oval on 17 August did Mr Baker behave, as alleged by the member for Stuart, in a manner intended to humiliate the police. Many participants in the event, having heard of allegations against Mr Baker, have expressed concern to me that such allegations are both untrue and reflect unnecessarily on an important charity event in South Australia.

I had a very interesting phone call last Tuesday morning from Mr Jeff Phillips, a member of the ABC Radio car called 'The Barge'. Mr Phillips, whom I met on the bash and with whom I had quite a lengthy conversation, told me that he is the Secretary of the Bragg branch of the Labor Party and that he was 'slagged' during the Labor Party Convention on the weekend for having had the temerity to stand up and say that at no stage was I involved in any of the allegations made and he thought it was very poor form for anyone to carry on in that way. Mr Phillips also said that he delivers the Premier's papers and calls him 'the boss'. He said that he delivers 'the boss's' papers each evening, and he intimated to me that he was going to express his concern to 'the boss' for the way in which he had allowed Parliament to be demeaned.

In closing, the most worrying thing about this whole matter is that the Premier has not had the guts to make the allegations himself but had to have the member for Stuart make them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (ABOLITION OF YEAR-AND-A-DAY) RULE AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): 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 abolish the rule at common law known as the 'year-and-a-day rule'. That rule states that, where one person causes injury to another, or inflicts injury on another, he or she cannot, as a matter of law, be taken to have caused the death of the victim if the victim dies more than a year and a day after after the infliction of

the injury which is, in fact, the cause of the death. Some say that the rule reflects nineteenth century medical knowledge and represents a judgment that, in 1800, for example, it was not possible to prove the causal link between an injury and death where the death does not occur until a year and a day later. Others see its origin in the thirteenth century procedure of appeal of felony for death.

Whatever its origin, it retains no present rationale. Further, it may cause an injustice where an offender injures a victim who lies in a coma for a long period, or where the offender, for example, infects the victim with a disease such as AIDS, which involves a long, slow death. The result of repealing this rule will be that the causation of death will now be assessed on the same basis as in any other criminal case. It is true that on the abolition of the rule an offender may be convicted of a lesser offence and then later be charged with murder or manslaughter. However, if he or she did cause the death of the victim, it cannot be denied that the later charge is appropriate. Repeal of the rule was recommended by the Mitchell committee.

Clause 2 of this Bill was included as a section in the Statutes Amendment (Attorney-General's Portfolio) Bill in the last session of Parliament but was struck out during the passage of the Bill because of concerns expressed by the Law Society. Since that time, the Law Society has indicated that it supports the measure. In addition, abolition of the rule has become law in New South Wales and was agreed to by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General. The reform is clearly warranted and is justified.

I commend the Bill to members.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 inserts a new section after section 17 of the principal Act in the part dealing with homicide. The new section 18 abolishes the common law 'year-and-a-day' rule by providing that an act or omission that in fact causes death will be regarded in law as the cause of death even though the death occurs more than year and a day after the act or omission.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 27 August. Page 498.)

Clauses 6 and 7 passed.

Clause 8—'Membership of committee.'

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The amendment that I have on file relates to the reassertion, as under the Public Accounts Committee legislation, of the political balance. Since this provision has been denied under clause 5, I assume that it will be denied in this case, and that that would also apply to the amendments to clauses 11 and 14, which also deal with the memberships of a committee. I will not proceed with those amendments to clauses 8, 11 and 14. with the proviso that, when the matter is before the Upper House, I assume that these issues will again be debated. I draw the attention of the Committee in its denial of this provision and the preceding amendment that I moved yesterday to the fact that included under the schedule that is part of the Bill is a provision for political equity within the Industries Development Committee.

The principle is established within one of the committees, which is to be a subcommittee of the Economic and Finance Committee, but it is being denied in relation to the four standing committees proposed under this legislation. I suggest that there is some inconsistency in the manner in which this matter has been approached, at least, by the Government and by the proponent of the Bill.

Clause passed.

Clauses 9 to 25 passed.

Clause 26—'Admission of public.'

Mr BECKER: Do I take it that all committee meetings where evidence is taken from witnesses must be held in public?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The clause provides 'except where the committee otherwise determines', so it is really a matter to be determined by each committee in the appropriate circumstances. I understand that that is what occurs now.

Mr BECKER: But there must be a special resolution on each occasion.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Yes; as I understand it, a decision must be taken by each committee with respect to whether all or part of it, and which part of it, shall be open to the public. Of course, a prohibition is provided with respect to the public attending while the committee is actually deliberating. That is a well understood and established practice. But, certainly, the presence of members of the public at meetings of the committee while it is examining witnesses remains a matter to be determined by the committee.

Mr BECKER: I would like to place on record my view that it should be the intention of this committee and Parliament that, if this legislation is passed and enacted, all future meetings of all these committees should be held in public. I believe that one of the strengths of the parliamentary committee system is the holding of public meetings; the public can see Parliament at work and that the bureaucracy is being challenged—quite properly and quite legally—on the workings of Government. Unless we have open hearings of all inquiries (but I do not refer to the normal business side of committee meetings), I believe that we do not have the ultimate in accountability. After all, this legislation is all about accountability of Government and, if we want that to be upheld, there should be a very clear instruction that it is the intention of this House that all committee meetings be held in public.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Whilst the general comment that the honourable member makes is laudable, I think that we should always consider the circumstances of each committee's operations. Obviously, there have been many instances in the past where it has been seen by a committee as appropriate to take evidence in camera, and the reason for that may range from commercial confidentiality to the protection of the life and wellbeing of an individual who appears before a committee. So, I think that an absolute statement that every committee should be open to the public when witnesses are being examined may not serve the interests of the Parliament or the people of the State to the extent that the honourable member would like. Whilst the general thrust of having meetings open to the public is no doubt good, one must always reserve the right to provide those protections that I think the community would expect of us in particular circumstances.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I acknowledge the remarks made by my colleague the member for Hanson and the Minister's response. I would just counsel all members that, as far as the IDC is concerned, where commercial confidentiality and many aspects of new products are a feature of the discussions that take place, and in so far as one of the committees is destined to take over that role, I believe there can be only one answer, and that is that it will remain a completely closed session with not even the evidence being

made available, except subsequently being made available by the organisation itself. That is rare.

On the one or two occasions when information from the IDC has been used in debate in this place, it has invariably been found that it came from the organisation that had been the subject of the inquiry and not from the members of the committee, which has a major responsibility to look in closed session at matters which are very sensitive and which will create benefit for this State through employment and new technology. I believe that that would not have been the area in which my colleague was suggesting open meetings should be undertaken, but it was not clear, with all due respect, and I believe that that other aspect of the whole matter must be put on the record. In so far as the IDC activity will be taken over by one of the newly created committees, that action will be entirely in camera.

Mr BECKER: I thank the member for Light for reminding me of that function of the Economic and Finance Committee. It is certainly not my intention that anything to do with the Industries Development Committee or an investigation into the financial support provided by the State to any company or organisation be held in public. I was purely referring to the work of the Public Accounts Committee, as we would know it now, and the Public Works Committee in particular, because I believe that those two functions are most important as far as accountability is concerned. The industries development side and the Economic and Finance Committee would be a subcommittee function and would be considered in an entirely different light.

Clause passed.

Clause 27 passed.

Clause 28—'Powers of committee.'

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I move:

Page 8, line 35—Leave out ', 16b (1) and (2)'.

I move this amendment on the basis that this section of the Royal Commissions Act is not relevant.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The Government has taken some advice on this matter, and I believe it is not in the interests of the operation of the committees to provide for protection and immunities for members of Parliament in relation to their duties or functions and for witnesses and counsel appearing before committees in this form. As I understand it, it may provide a negative outcome that is not envisaged by the honourable member, so I think that, whilst the intention is obviously laudable, the outcome may not be so desirable. In that case, I think we should revert to the provisions that we have in this Parliament with respect to the traditional protections that are provided for the Parliament itself and, through the Parliament, vested in its committees and organisations. So, for those reasons, I would suggest that this amendment not be supported.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I move:

Page 15, lines 38 and 39—Leave out subclause (2) and insert subclauses as follows:

(2) The same protection and immunities as attach to members of Parliament in relation to their duties or functions in Parliament attach to the members of a Committee, witnesses and counsel appearing before a Committee and the members of the staff of a Committee and other persons engaged in the business of a Committee.

(3) The provisions of this section do not limit in any way the powers, privileges and immunities that attach to or in relation to a Committee as a committee of Parliament.

You and I, Mr Chairman, have had some discussion as to the propriety of having such subclauses inserted. I have given it some thought and the subclauses I move were intended to ensure adequate provision and protection not only for members of the committee but also for the staff. As you, Sir, in our discussions pointed out that you believed this committee is established as a committee of the Parliament and as we have included the provisions now remaining in clause 28 of the Royal Commissions Act as well as the provisions which can be referred to at law under article 9 of the Bill of Rights, I am prepared to concede that there may be a better protection for the staff of parliamentary committees were we not to include that matter by definition in any specific Act of Parliament. I had intended to move this amendment. I have certainly spoken briefly to it and wonder whether the Minister in charge of the Committee has anything further to add before accepting or rejecting the recommendation.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I think I have explained as fully as I can why the Government is reluctant to accede to this amendment.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 29 to 31 passed.

Clause 32—'Coordination of committees.'

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I move:

Page 9, lines 18 and 19—Leave out subclause (2) and insert subclause as follows:

(2) In discharging their responsibilities under subsection (1), the Presiding Officers of both Houses must—

(a) consult with the Presiding Officers of the Committees; and

(b) so far as is practicable, give effect to any recommendations of the Presiding Officer of a Committee as to the staffing of that Committee.

As I said during the second reading debate, this amendment is not an expression of no confidence in the Speaker of this place or the President of the other place but, rather, it signifies a desire to provide the legislation for the situation currently pertaining in the Public Accounts Committee where, when we are interviewing the staff members, one member of each political Party is selected as an interviewer.

Mr Hamilton: It works very well, too.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Yes, as the Chairman of the committee has just interjected, the system works well. Interviews have been undertaken in the presence of a senior clerk of the House and occasionally in the presence of the Speaker of the House, but almost without exception, for as long as I have been associated with the committee, the recommendations of the Chairman of the committee itself have prevailed and the Speaker has subsequently appointed the recommended applicant and has been their employer.

As the legislation currently stands, there must be some inference that the Presiding Officer of the House (whichever House it may be) could well listen to the committees but disregard any recommendations made. I put this recommendation to the Committee simply to clear up that position, but without the amendment carrying any inference that a committee should be able to go to the Presiding Officers of either House and stake a claim for excessive staff allocations. We are not looking for unfair play but simply saying that the staff to which a committee may be entitled should also be subject to nomination by that committee with acceptance wherever practical by the Presiding Officer.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I can certainly understand the purport of what the honourable member is trying to achieve by way of his amendment, but it is the Government's view that it is not necessary to embody current practice in legislation as it is really taking the issue somewhat too far. However, as the honourable member has explained, a practice has been well established with respect to appointments.

Mr BECKER: I support the amendment. It is an important section of the proposed Bill. Subclause (1) *(b)* provides:

(1) The Presiding Officers of both Houses are responsible for—

(b) arranging for each Committee adequate staff and facilities for the performance of its functions:.

That means that the Presiding Officers of the House will have control over the committees. I have been involved in this argument since 1979 as I believe committees must be masters of their own destiny and should select and appoint staff. They should seek out the type of staff they require to assist them with their work. After all, members of the committee in question are elected to Parliament to represent the people who seek the accountability of the Government and, therefore, they have a precise duty to perform. In my period of involvement with the Industries Development Committee and, more importantly, the Public Accounts Committee, we have undertaken many investigations and inquiries in the process of interviewing persons for staff positions. It was set up when I was Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, because the then Tonkin Government allocated an additional staff member to the committee. We were able to arrange with the Auditor-General the secondment of somebody from his office on a short-term basis.

It was always the wish and desire of the committee that the research officers be engaged for a period of not more than 12 months. In some cases it was three or six months, depending on the inquiry. That process worked extremely well. There was one case where we selected a person who proved to be unsatisfactory for the task. In all other cases we were more than pleased with the quality of the staff found for us by the Public Service and/or the staff that came from the Auditor-General's Department. All of these people have progressed quite satisfactorily within Public Service ranks. Some of them will achieve quite significant appointments in the years to come.

However, it proved the point that the committees of the Parliament and the members of these committees knew what they were looking for. No-one will convince me now that the system will be maintained. I do not believe that it will. I was recently at Westminster and I wanted to see the secretary or the research officer of the Public Accounts Committee. That could not be arranged at short notice because the Parliament had resumed after the Easter break. I fear that the same situation could well occur if we have staff seconded from other Houses of Parliament or the staff of the Parliament working for these committees. I believe that the staff of these committees should be totally autonomous from the Parliament itself; they are members of the parliamentary staff from the employment point of view, but as far as the committees are concerned they belong to the committees.

It would be very difficult to operate these committees as the committees operate at Westminster at present. It is not satisfactory at all. I think that we have the best arrangement. When the member for Light was the Speaker we ensured that everything was documented. We virtually had to start up a whole new filing system, because there was not much on the files in relation to the appointment of staff. I urge the Government to reconsider this amendment, because it is most important to give the committee that power and to trust the members of the committee to select their own staff.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his contribution. Indeed, the whole Parliament should recognise the enormous contribution that the honourable member has made to the life and work of the committees during his long parliamentary service. He obviously speaks with some authority in this area, and the comments he has made obviously need to be well considered when this Bill goes to another place.

However, I should also sound a note of caution about committees taking on a life and a structure of their own beyond that which is envisaged in this legislation. Indeed, as has traditionally been the case, they are creatures of the Parliament and the resources available to the committees must be able to be used in a flexible way. The great strength of the Bill before us is that there can be a good deal of interrelationship between the work of the committees. Perhaps in the past they have been somewhat too discrete as structures. For example, as I outlined in my second reading explanation and in the debate last evening, there are flexible ways in which staff can be provided, not only from within the resources of the Government but also by way of consultancies. In that way they can serve not only the committees but also the Parliament as a whole. So, some note of caution needs to be sounded about committees acquiring their own staff and, indeed, taking on a life and an employing function somewhat apart from the life of other committees and from the best interests of the Parliament as a whole.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I move:

Page 9, lines 20 to 23—Leave out subclause (3).

This amendment relates to the authority of the presiding officers of the committees to release to the Presiding Officers of the Houses any evidence, proceedings or reports of committees, even though reports may not at that stage have been tabled in Parliament. Members of the Opposition who have served on the Public Accounts Committee, the Public Works Committee or the Industries Development Committee have expressed their concern that a breach of confidentiality, however minor and to however important a member of Parliament those disclosures may be made, is not appropriate. Members of the Industries Development Committee, in particular, and the Public Accounts Committee, who deal confidentially with the Auditor-General at a personal level, are quite firmly convinced that to include a clause permitting disclosure by the presiding officer of the committee, even though it be a discretionary clause, is not correct.

The confidentiality of the work conducted by these committees is actually a matter of extreme importance, especially when the Industries Development Committee is dealing with applicants for assistance—very often substantial financial assistance. There may well be questions of competition between one industry and another to be considered and the committee members feel that it is more appropriate that confidential matters be kept within the confines of the individual committees rather than having any documents floating out of those committees for exchange between the President of the Upper House or the Speaker of the Lower House. That is no reflection at all upon those very senior and responsible people. However, it is, I suppose, an admission that documents can be mislaid; they may remain on a desk unattended for whatever reason. The more confidential the matters are kept the better for the operations of the committee. I suggest that the Government should consider alternative means of determining whether there is any duplication in the handling of the matters between one committee and another, but without the disclosure of confidential documentation.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The Government opposes this measure. However, I undertake to have it further considered before it is debated in another place. I understand that the Presiding Officers currently have those powers and to take those powers away from those officers needs to be considered very seriously before one would move to do that. It almost has shades of the historical role of the Speaker who was appointed by the monarch of the day not being trusted by the House and, hence, we have the position of Chairman of Committees, the positioning of the mace and so on. I think that one needs to reflect very carefully upon trying to

restrict or limit the role and function of the Presiding Officer of a House under the Westminster system in this way. It is for those cautious reasons that the Government opposes the amendment.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I wish to correct any possible inference that I am reflecting upon the integrity and the calibre of the Speaker of the Lower House or the President of the Upper House. I made quite clear in my previous brief comments that there was no such intention. However, I think that every member of this House would be well aware that documents can go astray and that, if extremely confidential documents were kept within the confines of a committee, that would be appropriate. They can be lost in transit without the senior officer of either House ever having received them. I suppose that that is one of the facts of life: leaks occur. The less chance there is of a document getting out of a committee and being leaked along the corridors or whatever, the better the committees would feel. No reflection whatsoever is intended upon the integrity of the senior officers of the Parliament.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise to support my colleague the member for Mount Gambier. Like him, I obviously intend no reflection on the authority or the dignity of the office of Speaker. My understanding of the procedures of this place are much more limited than that of the Minister at the table. I truly do not believe that this provision currently exists. I believe it is an important matter for us to consider, because we are really considering to whom the information or the business of this House rightfully belongs and where it should, if one likes, go first. Whilst the Speaker is the Presiding Officer of the House and the person who gives the House its dignity and decorum with respect to the dealings of the business of the House, the actual business and the information provided to the House is irrevocably the business of all the assembled members of Parliament and not of any officer of the Parliament, no matter now exalted or how chosen from the members.

It is an important principle that any committee of this Parliament should report its information first and foremost to this fully assembled Parliament, and that that information should not for any reason be given to anyone before it is given to the Parliament. My limited understanding of select committees is that people who give evidence before select committees and members of those committees are duty bound not to disclose or discuss that evidence until it is presented to Parliament. In that spirit, I beg to differ with the Minister. While casting no reflection at all on those who are elected to preside over us, I urge the Minister to consider this matter as one that is truly related to the right of this House to consider, and to have supremacy in dealing with, its own business. This clause could take away from the House its right to know its business before any individual member.

Mr FERGUSON: I do not want to make a fight out of this, but I have to take issue with what has just been said. In a sense, I agree with the honourable member when he says that the matters put before a committee are the property of the House. It may be that Parliament may wish to investigate matters that have not been put before the House. The appropriate way to do that would be to empower the Speaker, at his discretion, to provide to the House such information as he deems necessary. However, I feel that we must allow the Speaker to have the opportunity to investigate and to gain whatever knowledge is necessary from the committees. To take away that power, which the Speaker currently has, would be a retrograde step; so, I oppose the amendment.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 33—'Other assistance and facilities.'

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:

Page 9, line 25—After 'with' insert 'the prior authorisation of the Presiding Officer or Presiding Officers of the committee's appointing House or Houses, with'

This amendment seeks to insert the function of the Presiding Officer or Presiding Officers of the committee's appointing House or Houses in the function that is provided in clause 33. This matter was touched on a moment ago during the debate, and it is appropriate that Presiding Officers should play this role.

Amendment carried: clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (34 and 35) passed.

Schedule.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Mount Gambier may speak to the schedule, but it is not possible to move an amendment that has no place in the Bill as it stands. I ask the member for Mount Gambier to address the schedule if he wishes.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I do not wish to move a consequential amendment as the major amendment with respect to the establishment of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee has already failed. Government backbenchers have asked about the impact that the establishment of a new committee, coupled with a reduction in remuneration of members, including Chairpersons of present committees, might have on the value of that remuneration. The answer is pretty simple and staightforward. On a calculation of the remuneration currently awarded and applicable to the legislation as it stands with all clauses having passed and using a base salary (that is approximate but very accurate) of $65 000 per annum, with respect to the salaries of Chairpersons and all members the current gross figure is $176 800. Therefore, a reduction of exactly 25 per cent would result in a net figure of $175 500. In other words, the cost to committees of salaries would be $1 300 less than currently pertains; so, I have erred on the lower side.

Therefore, when the legislation is before the other place the salary in respect of the Chairperson of the Economic and Finance Committee and the Environment and Resources Committee, will be reduced from 17 per cent to 12.75 per cent. The salary of the Chairperson of the other two committees plus the Statutory Authorities Review Committee will be reduced from 14 per cent to 10.5 per cent. Members' remuneration with respect to the first two committees that I mentioned will be reduced from 12 per cent to 9 per cent, and with respect to the last three committees from 10 per cent to 7.5 per cent.

Those figures are approximate, but if members choose to check they will find that they are very precise. If members wished to share a small proportion of the remuneration (25 per cent) with members of another committee, the burden would not be unduly great. I add to that the simple matters of taxation and superannuation, which are relevant to any emolument received by members of a committee. Assuming that the figure for taxation is about 47.5 per cent and about 12 per cent for superannuation, about 60 per cent of any remuneration would automatically be lost to a member, so that only the remaining 40 per cent of any emolument for committee work would be pocketable.

So, members are not simply looking at a flat loss of 25 per cent of remuneration for committee work, but at two-fifths or 40 per cent of that 25 per cent. It is not nearly as large a burden as members may have imagined when I floated this matter yesterday, having already had the unanimous and unquestioned acceptance of members of committees and of members of the Opposition Party during the discussions in our committee room.

Mr HAMILTON: I may have missed the member for Mount Gambier's earlier contribution, but I have not heard him mention anything about the cost of running a committee, and I think that is a very important aspect of the proposal he has put forward. If a committee is to serve Parliament properly, I believe adequate space should be provided with the appropriate tools of trade such as computer equipment and staff facilities and, I imagine, that at least three staff, if not more, would be needed.

I believe that we would be looking at all those costs and the recurrent costs associated with setting up another committee. I do not know whether the member for Mount Gambier has addressed those costs. If he is fair dinkum about this issue, he should bring before the Parliament a proposition incorporating the matters that I have raised, and I suggest there would be many others of which I have not thought in my quick response to this proposition. There is no doubt that the proposition is an attempt to placate a colleague in another place.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: The member for Murray-Mallee can have his say in a moment, but I intend to have mine. Those of us who have been involved in the Public Accounts Committee over some years have known of the involvement and views of the Hon. Mr Lucas on statutory authorities. I am not here to reflect on a member in another place. It would be unwise for me to do so and you, Mr Chairman, would not allow it. However, the proposition, where it is properly researched and read, is, to put it bluntly, half baked. I see this as an attempt by the Opposition to set up another committee which is not warranted.

I do not accept the proposition put forward by the member for Heysen. I respect his views, particularly as a colleague on the Public Accounts Committee because he has a good input, but I do not believe that it would take about 40 years to address the problems of all those statutory authorities that I understand this committee wants to address. I hope that the committee, of which I hope to be a part, will be adequately staffed. I believe that you, Mr Chairman, will almost certainly be a member of that committee and, with your strong support, we would ensure that the committee is appropriately staffed.

Last night the member for Mount Gambier presented the Committee with a proposition that was not fully costed. I was complimentary to the member for Mount Gambier last night. I have been a member since 1979 and I have found that on most occasions he does his homework. I may not always agree with him, but he does his homework. However, last night he did not have that costing information. I suggest, with respect to the member for Mount Gambier, that again he has not thought this through. To put it fairly and bluntly, he is defending a proposition put forward in his Party room that he has to support in this place. I can understand his loyalty on behalf of his colleagues, but this is a half-baked proposition which has not been thought through and researched properly. Therefore, I oppose the proposition.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I rise with some amazement, having listened to my honoured and respected Chairman. I remind members that the amendments that I have moved have largely been to protect the interests of the committee over which the member for Albert Park presides. Yet, the only comments that I have heard from my honoured Chairman have been more derogatory than praiseworthy. Yesterday he acknowledged that I was intelligent, that I usually did my homework and that I was perceptive.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: A mutual admiration society!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Not if you had heard the whole debate, Minister. To hear the honourable member suggesting several things, one of which is that I am moving these amendments to appease a colleague in another place, is to deny the fact—and I am sure that Government members other than my Chairman will appreciate this—that the Government would be the chief beneficiary. There would be a Chairman on the Government benches and the perquisites that go with it, and it would have two additional members of the five. There is no guarantee that the Opposition in another place would score more than one member on a proposed committee of five. There is no guarantee—in fact, I would say that it is unlikely—that the person whom the member suggests I am trying to placate would be one of the members of the committee when he is already the Leader of the Opposition in another place. I find the implications behind those remarks inaccurate and distasteful.

Even more than that, I have read the second reading speeches and I have had discussions with responsible members of the staff of this place. I believe that I have understood the recommendations that have been made to me, both in public and in private, and included within the recommendations behind the setting up of this legislation is the fact that there may be substantial rent savings in the longer term. If we can save rents of anywhere between $150 000 and $300 000 a year—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Those statements have been made not by me, but by the proponents of the Bill. I understand that there is a possibility that we can save a considerable amount on rents. I suggest that the statutory authority which I propose to set up in another place could be set up somewhere on the Legislative Council side of the building. Assurances have been given to me that, during Parliament's busy season, parliamentary staff have a great deal of work to do, but during the quiet season, when the two Chambers are not in session, members of the parliamentary staff may share in the work of the committees, may be senior officers of the committees and may take a responsible role at no additional cost to Parliament. The honourable member has accused me of not having done any homework. I could have produced sets of figures.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I draw the attention of the member for Mount Gambier and the Committee to the fact that we have the schedule before us, not the amendment.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Yes, Mr Chairman. I suppose I am addressing the adverse and inaccurate comments made by the member for Albert Park who has obviously not entered into the same depth of discussion as I have. I suggest that if members wish to examine the proposal more thoroughly they may find that it would be possible to conduct another committee at minimal additional cost, including not only the membership but the operations of the committee. I am prepared to go into those further details when the Bill goes before another place.

Mr LEWIS: With respect to the schedule, the things that it contains and some of the things that it does not contain, and in direct response to the remarks made by the member for Albert Park, to which the member for Mount Gambier was referring, I draw the attention of the member for Albert Park to Standing Order 127, paragraph 3, in relation to his remarks to us in general and to the member for Mount Gambier in particular. I know that other members opposite joined him in his accusation that we had done a deal and were trying to do something for someone in the Legislative Council. Let me reassure the honourable member that that is not the case.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr LEWIS: If the member for Albert Park has been told that sort of thing, it must have been by someone on his side of the Chamber, because it certainly would not have been anyone on this side. I was a member of a small group of people who looked in some detail at this legislation, and at no time was any attempt made by any member of the Legislative Council, a part of or not a part of that group, to get those of us from the House of Assembly to agree to any such proposal, because no such proposal was made by them: it was made by me. For the member for Albert Park and other members opposite to accuse us of—

Mr Ferguson: It must be getting close to the full moon.

Mr LEWIS: I take exception to that remark from the member for Henley Beach. That is inane, and is the kind of thing that we just do not need. The member for Albert Park should not impute improper motives to any honourable member, and to suggest that we were involved in any such thing is quite improper. It implies that we had some ulterior motive, but that did not exist.

My genuine concern and that of all my colleagues has been to ensure an adequate review of the activities of statutory authorities that currently are not subject to the review of Ministers or of any organ of this Parliament. It is ridiculous for that state of affairs to continue, as recent events surrounding and relating to most of those statutory authorities indicate.

Schedule passed.

Title passed.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I want to speak to the Bill as it comes out of Committee. I will not detain this House, but I would like to make two brief comments. I am disappointed that the Government has not sought to amend this Bill to provide for tenure for the presiding officers and the officers appointed by the committee.

Another thing that greatly disturbs me as this Bill comes before us for the third reading is the obvious misunderstanding that Ministers and members opposite have of the Standing Orders of this Parliament. I refer members opposite to Standing Order 339, and to the fact that statements made by the member for Henley Beach concerning the powers of the Speaker and the provisions of disclosure by the presiding officers of current committees of this Parliament and of select committees of this Parliament to the Speaker are plainly wrong, and invite him to correct his remarks at some future time.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, in the third reading stage members cannot refer back to the second reading or Committee debates, and that is what the member for Hayward is doing.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member referred to the Bill as it came out of the second reading stage, and that is in order.

Bill read a third time and passed.

GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 August. Page 84.)

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): The Opposition does not support this measure. The legislation proposes to abolish the Geographical Names Board and to establish a Geographical Names Advisory Committee. At the outset, let us make plain that there is no excuse or argument that this is a measure of deregulation. That is piffle. It is nonsense to suggest that it is. The costs of running the advisory committee will be identical to and probably greater than the costs currently incurred in running the board. There will be no deregulation whatever.

The legislation also provides that the Minister will have absolute power to decide place names, whereas at present the board does this while the Minister has the power to veto any proposal of the board. She does not have the power, nor will any subsequent Minister, in the event that this legislation failed and the existing law or any proposed amendments I might choose to make would enable the subsequent Minister to veto the board's decision rather than to propose an alternative. At this point, the Minister may only veto.

The current Act has not been altered since it was proclaimed in 1970, and only one significant problem has been identified since then. The Minister was quite correct in identifying that: it is a very serious problem. Australia Post and emergency service organisations are confused by the uncontrolled and uncontrollable use of estate names given to subdivisions by developers and land agents for their advertising and for land sale purposes, not the least amongst these being the very quango the like of which we were speaking of in this Chamber a few minutes ago, that is, the Urban Land Trust.

Of course, it is not subject to the current legislation, and it needs to be in future. The Minister said in her second reading explanation that there are other problems, for example, that the present Act does not allow dual names to be given to places said to have both Aboriginal and European significance. Frankly, any proposal to allow or to encourage this is in conflict with the above.

If we seek to eliminate the confusion that occurs when an ambulance is called to a place which is not a suburb and which the ambulance cannot find, or if a fire unit (whether MFS or CFS) is called out to a place which does not exist and which it cannot find, or if the police are called similarly to such a place that is named improperly or inappropriately by the person making the emergency call, confusion reigns and life and limb, as well as property, is put at risk.

The Minister seems not to care about that. On the one hand, she acknowledges the stupidity of a situation in which there are dual place names yet, in the very next breath, proposes to create the same stupidity over again by allowing—indeed, encouraging—places to be known not only by the names they have been given since the written word was the means by which human beings in this State communicated with each other but by the Aboriginal names as well. To my mind, that is really stupid. One wonders whether the Minister's adviser advocates the abolition of the board and the establishment of the advisory committee.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: It's deregulation.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Yes.

Mr LEWIS: I am very pleased for both the Minister and the member for Napier to come in on that point: they did not listen to my second sentence, that is, it is not a deregulation measure, is it? It will create the Geographical Names Advisory Committee, which will cost at least as much as, if not more than, the operation of the Geographical Names Board. For the benefit of the member for Napier, the Minister said in her second reading explanation that she would consult that committee's opinion on all matters. That is okay for this Minister, but there is nothing in the legislation that requires any Minister of Lands to do so, including this one.

If the Minister is true to her word—and often she is not—we would expect that it will cost just as much to pay

the members of the advisory committee as to pay the members of the board; it will cost just as much to keep the minutes of the advisory committee meetings as to keep the minutes of the board; and it will cost just as much to pay the rent for the facilities used by the advisory committee as to provide the current facilities for the board. So, it is not deregulation; patently, it is not. Any suggestion that it is deregulation is absurd. It befits the mind frame of the member for Napier to behave in such ways at times, I know.

The Minister states in her second reading explanation that the current law should be repealed so that 'the new Act can provide an orderly means of determining and assigning geographical names to places in South Australia'. Given that what I have said is an accurate summary of what the Minister intends, such a statement in the second reading explanation is a nonsense. It cannot and will not provide for any orderly means of determining and assigning geographical names if the Minister can change the name of a place at her whim and, in addition to that and worse still, allow it to be known by two names. That will confuse Australia Post; it will confuse the police; and it will confuse the ambulances and fire brigades and anybody else. It will not make the thing orderly: it will make it very disorderly indeed.

I guess the other aspect of it that the Opposition finds quite repugnant is that the Minister, by her action in this instance in abolishing the board and giving herself more powers, arrogantly (quite arrogantly, as acknowledged by the member for Albert Park who is out of his place and out of order in responding to my remark, leaving the Chamber as he is) ensures that, for political purposes alone, she and any future Minister will be able to change at whim the name of a place somewhere in South Australia. This may occur particularly in the suburbs of a marginal seat where it suits a candidate of the Minister's political persuasion to have the name changed so that that candidate will be able to boast during an election campaign that, every time constituents get their upmarket place name on an envelope, they will know that the candidate's representation to the Minister made it possible. In addition to that, there will be further confusion.

I do not think that it behoves us to pretend that it is possible for a place to be known by two names in law if we have sufficient respect for a place name given by the traditional owners who were here before European settlement, that is, the people who were here before our predecessors arrived. If it behoves us to have sufficient regard and respect for what they believe, most certainly we should name the place accordingly and leave it with just one name. That causes me no offence whatever. I suggest that that is easily the most sensible way for us to proceed from this point.

Accordingly, the Opposition proposes that the board be retained and comprised of members who are expert in various disciplines relevant to the determination of the place names. These may include someone who has extensive knowledge and experience in town planning; another person who has extensive knowledge of South Australian history; someone who has an understanding of local government, believing that it is important that local government be included in the process of determining place names; another person, selected by the Minister, who is an expert in the culture and history of the Aboriginal peoples who inhabited South Australia; and yet another with extensive knowledge of physical geography. They are the kinds of people who ought to be included in a panel appointed for the purpose, in an apolitical atmosphere of determining the names of places in this State. Any other process is open to abuse and, to my certain knowledge, that is not past the current Minister.

We also believe that the Act must bind the Crown, but the present legislation before the Chamber does not do that. We believe that it should prevent problems caused by double naming, which the current proposal before us will allow. We also believe that such changes as will enable the board to recover its costs when it is constituted in the form that we suggest should be included in the legislation. So, altogether if members opposite will take a serious and sincere look at the Bill, they will find that the points I have made are valid, real and relevant, and that the legislation in its present form ought not to proceed.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I am always amazed that, when a Government introduces a measure for deregulation and when we have an Opposition that believes in total free enterprise and is against regulation, the Opposition oppose the measure—without fail. I well remember that, when the Government introduced deregulation proposals relating to shopping hours, hot bread, the Egg Board, the Potato Board and other areas, the Opposition, which believes in total and absolute free enterprise, gave the guaranteed response. And it has not let us down on this occasion. This is the ideal opportunity to deregulate a part of industry, and what happens? We have a proposition to provide for more regulation than previously.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Nonsense!

Mr FERGUSON: I can understand the member for Coles saying it is nonsense; she probably has not had time to read the amendments, which were produced in this House only five minutes before this debate. That is absolutely disgraceful. If we read the amendments, we find that what I am saying is indeed true. If these amendments are carried, if the wishes of the Opposition are agreed to, we will finish up with more regulation than we had when we first started. I understand the confusion of the member for Coles if she does not have the amendments. It is disgraceful that members of Parliament should be given such a limited amount of time in which to study such important matters upon which they are expected to pass judgment.

The matter of amendments needs examining in this place. The Geographical Names Bill is more significant than the House would think. Geographical name changes are of a great deal of importance to certain organisations and householders. The old question of 'What's in a name?' is very important because a change in name can add thousands of dollars to real estate valuations. For example, in my electorate a piece of land abutting West Lakes on the Henley Beach side of Trimmer Parade is called Seaton. However, the residents have made application to the Geographical Names Board to have that section renamed either Grange or West Lakes. This change is alleged to add several thousands of dollars to the valuation of those properties.

My information from the Lands Department is that there is a dispute at Hallett Cove where a real estate agent has named part of Hallett Cove as Karrara. The Geographical Names Board has canvassed the area and unfortunately 50 per cent of the householders would like their estate name to be Hallett Cove and 50 per cent would like Karrara. I do not know how you resolve a dispute like that unless, like members opposite, you are prepared to have a bob each way. It is interesting to note that the name of Kirkaldy was referred to by people in my area to represent the households that were in and around the old Kirkaldy railway station, but there never has been a postal area named Kirkaldy. This has caused much confusion to Australia Post, ambulance services, taxi drivers, and so on.

I can understand the imposition of a fee to those people who seek to change a geographical name, because I understand that three people in the Lands Department are dealing with proposed changes on a full-time basis and if a developer or any group of people require a geographical name change then the 'user pays' example should apply. I am extremely pleased to see that the new Act will take into consideration both Aboriginal and European place names. This will maintain the heritage of both groups. This course of action is being taken in other areas of the world in order to maintain indigenous place names—Canada is a classic example. I understand that this exercise will be carefully managed so that no additional costs will occur; for example, printing of maps will incorporate both names, but reprints will take place only when they are necessary.

I have had as little time as the member for Coles to examine the proposed amendments. Whilst one should not refer to amendments at the second reading stage, the honourable member concerned referred to his proposals. I take this opportunity to refute some of the measures he has suggested he will put before us. I find it incredible that the member for Murray-Mallee, a shadow Minister in the area involving this Bill, only yesterday in this House asked questions about the Government involving itself in recovering costs, yet he is prepared to introduce into this Bill a cast of thousands. He is suggesting a board equal to or bigger than any board existing under any other legislation. The honourable member is on about saving costs. I refer to the Minister's second reading explanation, as follows:

> The administration of geographical names activities costs the State approximately $100 000 per annum. Much of this is spent in investigating naming applications necessary for the development of the State. Applications are, from time to time, lodged by individuals or organisations requesting that suburb boundaries be altered for various reasons.

The proposal is that this exercise will be given to the Surveyor-General as a matter incidental to the work he is now doing. The reason is to reduce costs. The proposal put by the member for Murray-Mallee with respect to this legislation is that we have a Geographical Names Board consisting of six members appointed by the Governor. He has also introduced the concept that members of the board be paid.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member himself covered the point about referring to amendments. There should be no specific reference to amendments until we get into Committee.

Mr FERGUSON: Yes, Sir, it is a point that I made many times when in the Chair and I accept without reservation the point you are now making. The only reason that I went down that track—and I accept that it is quite wrong—is that I wanted to point out to the Parliament that the proposition put by the member for Murray-Mallee will be extremely costly. If time permits I will develop that argument at a later date.

The other criticism that I understood the member for Murray-Mallee to be making was that the Minister will now be taking over certain powers that were previously the province of the old board. The Government is simply taking the advice of the Leader of the Opposition. In recent days the Leader has stated that, so far as any decisions that are made, there should be ministerial responsibility. All we are doing in this exercise is restoring responsibility to the Minister for any mistakes made. We are merely following the advice of the Leader in that respect.

If the proposal before the House is tested elsewhere and found to be wanting, we will then have cause for a second look at this matter. But what do we find? The very proposals the Government has put before the Parliament are working well interstate. We are simply reducing the bureaucracy in order to provide for a more efficient effort. The Surveyor-General will now have the ability to speed up the approval of new names in some cases, especially in regard to schools and conservation parks. I thought that that would be welcomed by the Opposition. I suppose that the Opposition believes its duty is to oppose, no matter how good the proposal. When one examines the Bill, one sees that there could not be a more sensible proposition. I take this opportunity to ask members of the House to support this legislation and pass it without delay.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles):

> To understand the meaning of our place names is central to an understanding of our history. Far from being a dry pursuit, place name history often reveals the folly and vanity of our pioneers and public figures, as well as their dedication, vision and courage.

The House may be interested to know the author of those words: it is the Premier of South Australia, John Bannon. Those words form part of a foreword that he wrote in 1984 for a book by Rodney Cockburn, entitled *What's in a Name? Nomenclature of South Australia: Authoritative derivations of some 4 000 historically significant place names.*

By way of interjection, the Minister asks, 'What has that got to do with this?' It has quite a bit to do with this Bill and I shall seek to demonstrate why to the Minister in a moment. I should perhaps declare my interest in that my husband, Stewart Cockburn, republished his father's work in 1984, the original work having been printed in 1908. I commend to all members who have an interest in nomenclature the preface and the book itself, because it is and has always been recognised as the authoritative work on nomenclature in South Australia.

In the preface to that book the point is made by the publisher, Stewart Cockburn, that there is an unceasing public interest in the origin of place names. At that time Mr Cockburn appealed to the State Government to provide even more support and encouragement for the work of the Georgraphical Names Board than it had been able to give in the past. At that time the Premier was presumably very sympathetic to that plea, which is why he agreed to write the foreword to the book. What we see now is the Minister, instead of supporting the Geographical Names Board, proposing to abolish it and to replace it with an advisory committee—

Mr Lewis: With herself.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: —with an advisory committee to herself—the advisory committee having no statutory requirement whatsoever to have any of the specialist skills that need to be brought to bear on this important subject. The former Secretary of the board, Mr Medwell, and his colleagues were very conscientious indeed in their researching and compiling of place name derivations in South Australia. They brought consistency and imagination to bear on the task of fixing new names on the map. In that respect, they followed a very honourable tradition. Members may not be aware that the study of place name history is now regarded as a scholarly discipline applied to mapping which, in itself, draws on related disciplines, including history, geography and linguistics. The name given to the discipline is 'toponymy', which is the study of regional place names. The word combines two classical Greek roots: *topos*, a place, and *onoma*, a name.

The member for Henley Beach, who seems to be the fall guy called upon to defend the Government when newer backbenchers are content to sit silent in their places, has attempted to suggest that, in proposing this legislation, the Minister is simply attempting to fulfil the Opposition's policies in relation to deregulation. There is a very big difference between deregulation and ministerial responsi-

bility, and the arm's length fulfilling of public duties and obligations, which should not be placed directly in the hands of a Minister.

In abolishing the board, this Bill—under Division 1, clause 6—gives the Minister the power to assign names to places, to approve a recorded name of a place as a geographical name, to alter a geographical name, to determine whether the use of a recorded name or a geographical name is to be discontinued. That is an enormous power to put in the hands of a politician and that is precisely what this Bill does. There is no arm's length detachment on a subject about which there should be an arm's length detachment.

The Minister has the power to delegate, true, to the Surveyor-General and to the Geographical Names Advisory Committee. The delegation is revocable at will by the Minister. In other words, one elected person has the total power of control and veto over the naming of places, schools, railway stations, sidings and hospitals in this State. I, for one, believe that that is a power that is more properly exercised by a board that has some degree of detachment and also a high degree of professional skill. The Bill that the Minister is asking us to support does not fulfil those conditions as far as I am concerned.

Clause 13 of the Bill creates offences, which means that a person must not produce or cause to be produced or display or cause to be displayed a document or advertisement in which another name other than the assigned geographical name is represented. I do not know what the Real Estate Institute thinks about that or, indeed, whether it has been consulted by the Minister on this matter. However, I know that it is not unreasonable for those who develop land to select names that they believe will assist in marketing that land, nor is it unreasonable for people who choose to live in those developments to become attached to the name that has been selected.

The member for Henley Beach made a very good point when he said that a monetary value attaches to a place name. He mentioned Seaton, Grange and Henley Beach. Another location that comes readily to mind is Delamere Avenue in the southern suburbs. On the southern side of Delamere Avenue is the suburb of Springfield, on the northern side is the suburb of Netherby. Of course, the value attaching to land in the suburb of Springfield is considerably greater than that which attaches to land in the suburb of Netherby. So, for a Minister to be able to make these determinations in what could be an arbitrary fashion is, to my mind, quite inappropriate. In matters of this kind we look to some detachment and this proposed Act does not give us that satisfaction.

I refer again to the author's preface to *What's in a name?*, because of its reference to Aboriginal names. In fact, Rodney Cockburn was a great champion of the use of Aboriginal names in South Australia. A glance at his book will indicate the meanings of vast numbers of Aboriginal names from Abminga, which means a snake track, to Alawoona, Aldinga, Andamooka, Aroona and Arkaba; and names like Beetaloo, which means a spring and creek; Goolwa, which means the elbow; Lameroo, which has an objectionable meaning: Nelshaby, which means boiling springs; Wilpena, which means bent finger; Curdimurka, which means monsters; Monarto, which is taken from the name of a lubra—Monarta; Nangkita, which means place of little frogs; Nuriootpa, which means marketplace; and Willunga, meaning green trees or black duck—and so the list goes on.

Aboriginal place names are an integral and important part of the sacred, legal and social practices of Aborigines, and I think that most South Australians have come to know and love those names and would certainly welcome their continued and expanded use in the new nomenclature of this State. It may be a matter of interest to members to know that Rodney Cockburn was at one stage a reporter and later Chief Sub-Editor with the *Advertiser*. In 1914, he left journalism to become the Assistant Leader of the newly-established *Hansard* reporting staff of this Parliament, and he was co-founder of the Australian Journalists Association (South Australian branch).

So much for that background, but it is relevant to this Bill because it demonstrates that throughout the history of this State the determination of placenames has been put in the hands of those who have a statutory responsibility and authority to determine names. I believe it is a retrograde step to hand back that responsibility to what in the hands of a Minister is a purely political and arbitrary decision-making process. I cannot see it as deregulation; I see it as the assumption of a political power that is entirely inappropriate in this instance.

What is more, I do not believe that the Minister in her second reading explanation has given any satisfactory reasons for this move. There is nothing in the Minister's second reading explanation that justifies this transfer. The only reason I can see that could justify it is the one proposed by the member for Murray-Mallee: simply to give the Minister greater political power to influence events in a way that I think is undesirable. I firmly believe that the Geographical Names Board should be maintained, and I certainly agree with the proposed amendment that requires the board to include a person with extensive knowledge of and experience in town planning, a person with extensive knowledge of South Australian history, and a person nominated from a panel of three by the Local Government Association of South Australia, with extensive—

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the attention of the member for Coles, as I did the member for Henley Beach, to the fact that reference to the amendments at this stage of the debate is not in order.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Mr Speaker, I overlooked for one moment the requirement of the Standing Orders. I simply emphasise what I said earlier that not only detachment but professional skills of a multi-disciplinary kind are required if the board is to continue in future to fulfil the functions that it has fulfilled in the past. As I mentioned with reference to the work of the previous Secretary, Mr Medwell, and his colleagues, this task of toponymy is actually regarded now as a scholarly discipline in itself and one that requires multi-disciplinary skills of the kind referred to by the member for Murray-Mallee in his second reading contribution. I urge the House to view this Bill—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: —objectively. If the House does view it objectively, I believe it will be seen as a piece of legislation which is not in the best interests of the State, and which is not necessary in terms of its goals. If we are to alter the present Act, we should simply do so in a way that strengthens the function of the existing board, as proposed by the member for Murray-Mallee. I hope that this is not regarded as one of those lightweight pieces of legislation that can just be dismissed as a matter of no profound consequence. I believe that it does deal with matters of profound consequence and that the Bill in its present form should be rejected by the House.

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): The Geographical Names Act 1969 is an example of the post-war legislative explosion from which we still suffer. I believe that people should be

allowed to call the places where they live whatever they please. Nomenclature develops by custom and should not need Government regulation. Sometimes a Government will want to change a name for symbolic purposes, as in the wartime change of Klemzig to Gaza, but, in general, nomenclature should be left to common usage. Intellectuals and bureaucrats have a horror of the common usage of people and a love of order, so they say we must have geographical names legislation. Now we are stuck with it, we may as well make the best of it.

I believe that the best system of regulation is to put the power of naming localities into the hands of a Minister responsible to Parliament instead of a board with its spuriously rational and objective reasoning. The Geographical Names Act 1969, together with parliamentary plan—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: You are an extremely arrogant and offensive young man.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence has the call.

Mr ATKINSON: —No. 336 of 30 August 1968, proscribed many names that had been a familiar part of life in Adelaide. Let me give the House some examples in respect of public transport. The first was the old Kircaldy bus to Henley Beach. Another was the bus to Oldfield and a third was the bus to Graymore. Those suburb names were expunged by the operation of that parliamentary plan together with the Geographical Names Act. Alas, after some fluxion of time those bus destination names were removed from buses in the early 1980s when all bus destination names were removed—a tragic decision.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Hear, hear! I do agree with that.

Mr ATKINSON: I must be a humble young man on that one. We have railway stations, such as Woodlands Park, Draper and Midlunga, which have lost their suburbs. I understand that the Act is intended to prevent the use of pretentious estate names that appeal to snobbery or try to hide the true location of real estate. Examples of this are the Quinton Hill Estate at Pasadena and the Huntingdale Estate at Hackham. Adelaide has long had a peculiar snobbery that requires the suffixes 'park' or 'gardens' to be appended to names that could stand alone.

We would be better off if euphemisms, snobbery and salesmanship had been cast aside and we had suburbs called Brooklyn, Trinity and Clovelly. Tastes and names change, so that names with snob value today will assume their true denotation in time. It is a tragedy that we have lost some fine suburb names over the years. I do not know how many were victims of the procrustean Geographical Names Act. Few members would know the contemporary names of these suburbs: Roseville, which is now Gillman. Perhaps we will change that name back when the MFP gets going.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ATKINSON: Beverley Hills is now Seaview Downs.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: I bet you don't know how St Morris got its name.

Mr ATKINSON: No, I don't. Hollywood is now Clarence Park, Chicago is now Kilburn and Panchito Park is now Torrens Park. As a Labor member from the western suburbs, I have long aimed to become the Minister responsible for this Act and to abolish Burnside and return that district to its original names of Slape's Gully and Traver's Brook. A number of names in the Spence electorate have been lost as a result of the Geographical Names Act. One is Challa Gardens which, in Aboriginal, means good soil. Challa Gardens is still commemorated—

Mr Brindal: What dialect is that?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hayward is interjecting and is out of his seat.

Mr ATKINSON: Challa Gardens is still commemorated by a primary school and a pub where the then Premier of South Australia had the first drink after the abolition of 6 o'clock closing. Gelland is still commemorated by a Uniting Church on Torrens Road and by the Soldiers Memorial of the same name. It was named after Harry D. Gell, the Chairman of Trustees of the State Bank and of the Adelaide Cooperative Society. Islington is commemorated only by a railway station. Islington is a London suburb. I have read that most of the allotments in Adelaide's Islington were sold cheaply at night auctions in Hindley Street for as little as 12 shillings.

Other names in Spence have been lost by the operation of this Act: the suburb of York, which covered parts of West Croydon and Beverley; the suburb of Caversham, which covered parts of Beverley; Croydonville, which is now Croydon Park; and Tenterden, which is Woodville South. Tenterden was the residence of a mariner well-known in Port Adelaide. The mariner had owned a steamer by the name *Tenterden* that had been wrecked off Port Macdonnell.

I should like to go through some of the names in the Spence electorate. The name Bowden has been put down by the snobs of Adelaide. It was a village in Northamptonshire which was home to Sir James Hurtle Fisher, the first Lord Mayor of Adelaide. Bowden quickly got a bad reputation, and in 1917 a Hindmarsh councillor moved unsuccessfully that Bowden and Bowden-on-the-Hill be rechristened St Albyns and Strathfield respectively. He justified his proposal by the remark that too much ridicule had been cast against Bowden and that music hall performers grabbed the opportunity to reintroduce stale and worn-out jokes against the town.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that, interesting as his contribution is, he should link it to the clauses of the Bill that we are debating.

Mr ATKINSON: If the Geographical Names Act met the fate that I would like it to meet, perhaps some of these names would return. The point I am trying to make about Bowden is that names get changed for reasons of snobbery and to increase the land value of real estate in a suburb. I am taking members through the history of Bowden to show how certain people in Bowden have tried to avoid the name. That was 1917.

In 1929 the Hindmarsh council asked that Bowden-on-the-Hill become known as Hillside. That was defeated by the postal authorities. Common usage now has Bowden-on-the-Hill referred to as Ovingham, which must help the vendors in real estate transactions. I believe that the Bodyworks gym in Bowden refers to itself as being in lower North Adelaide. Croydon, the suburb in which I live, is named after the town of Croydon in Surrey. Croydon in Surrey is where the chalk down comes nearest to London. Cockburn's book, which was referred to by the member for Coles, tells us that 'black as a Croydon collier' was a common saying in London. It denoted someone who was a lot darker than a chimney sweep.

Kilkenny is an Irish name, but the suburb of Kilkenny was once referred to as the Sheffield of South Australia. I will not continue down the railway line, Mr Speaker, but I would like to refer to Woodville. Alfred Day's *Names of South Australian Railway Stations* says that Woodville is a descriptive name referring to the well-timbered land in that vicinity. I am sceptical of that explanation. Four hundred years before the district was named, Elizabeth Woodville

was Edward IV's queen and the mother-in-law of Henry Tudor. I mention that for the edification of *Black Adder* fans. In conclusion, the people of the Russian city of Leningrad recently voted to return the name of their city to its pre-1915 name of St Petersburg. If names must be decided by politics and Government, that is the best way to do it. I believe it is better to have a Minister responsible to an elected Parliament deciding nomenclature than a statutory authority with its spurious rationality.

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I support some aspects of this Bill but oppose the abolition of the Geographical Names Board. I know that the member for Henley Beach cannot contain himself and wants to start already, and he might regard it as unusual for a Liberal member of Parliament to oppose the abolition of a board. He will know that my colleagues and I have on many occasions proposed the abolition of a board, but this one is a bit different because this board is needed to ensure that the Minister, or her delegate, is prevented from making decisions on suburb name changes to their own political advantage. That is the most important part of the need for the existence of this board.

The Government wants this legislation to go through for its own political advantage. One need only look at the history of some applications for geographic name change to see why the Government wants that to occur. Only recently the name of part of the suburb of Edwardstown was changed to Melrose Park. Initially, the Geographical Names Board rejected that change. However, I have it on very good authority that the Minister called in representatives of that board and threatened them. She told them that if they did not recommend that name change she would abolish their board. That is the axe that she wielded over their necks at that time.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: The Minister can sit there and deny it, but she knows damn well that it is true. She threatened them with abolition and muscled that through.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I believe that the honourable member is reflecting upon my character and also using unparliamentary language.

The SPEAKER: Is the Minister asking for a withdrawal?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I do not believe that the language used is parliamentary, but I will be guided by your ruling, Sir.

The SPEAKER: I must say that the Chair did not hear anything that could be regarded as unparliamentary. I inform the honourable member that I shall be listening very closely.

Mr MATTHEW: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Melrose Park is but one example of many. The member for Henley Beach mentioned the application to change part of Hallett Cove to Karrara. The drama that has surrounded that application has been absolutely amazing. Once again the Geographical Names Board was told, after having rejected that suburb name change, that it had to go ahead. The timing of that order is very interesting. On Thursday 19 October 1989, just before the announcement of the last State election, the Geographical Names Board placed a notice of intent in the *Advertiser* to change part of the suburb of Hallett Cove to Karrara. I have it on very good authority from staff involved with that board that they were told they had to do it. They did it because, once again, the axe was put above their heads. They were told, just before the State election was called, that, if they did not go ahead and advertise it, their board would be abolished; they were finished.

So, they placed the advert in the paper, but the Minister and the previous member for Bright goofed—they got the boundary very wrong, and the objections started. By the time the period for objections had closed, they had received 620 objections to that application. The previous member for Bright was running around knocking on doors, floating letters all over the place saying, 'No, that is not the way I intended it: a mistake has been made but, don't worry, we'll fix it.'

On previous occasions, they had tried to get their act together and find out what people wanted. Indeed, they had undertaken a survey of the whole area of Hallett Cove, and the survey, which was sent out to some 1 800 homes, elicited about a 50 per cent response. As the member for Henley Beach alluded to earlier, that response showed that the people who lived in Hallett Cove were divided 50-50 on what they wanted to occur. But the previous member for Bright assured the Minister that that was wrong and that they should plunge ahead with it anyway. That is what finally led to the notice of intent being placed in the *Advertiser.*

The response resulted in a bit of a surprise for the Government, and it thought that it would let the matter lie for a while. I made a number of commitments to residents of Hallett Cove that I would pursue this matter and have it resolved. Because of the way the previous member for Bright and the Minister had handled this situation, resident was fighting resident over the often fairly emotional issue of suburb name change. I thought it only appropriate that I should ask a question in the House and then write to the Minister seeking an answer.

I wrote to the Minister on 13 March 1990. To assist her, in my letter I gave a run-down of the history of the application for the name change and explained how long the problem had been going on. I even gave her a proposed solution. I said that, because so much public money and time had been expended on the Government's inability to come up with a proper alternative, the Government should define a boundary—and I suggested a boundary—and hold an impartial poll of all residents, and that the result of that poll should be the decision.

That answers the query of the member for Henley Beach: how do we decide such a tied issue. I felt that that was the only proper way in which to do it. The Minister often finds it hard to make a decision, as is evidenced by my letter dated 13 March 1990, to which I received a reply on 7 January 1991. To her credit, even though it was many months later, the Minister was polite in her response, and her opening sentence was:

> I apologise for the delay in replying to your letter.

I thought that that was only fair, despite the fact that a number of reminders had been sent to her and that almost 10 months had passed since my original letter. But the Minister felt that things should be left just as they were because it was too hard to make a decision, and that we should just keep everyone at each other's throats and wash our hands of it. This is the same Minister who wants the power to make a decision. This is the same Minister who thinks that she should have ultimate authority. She still cannot get her act together on this issue.

It has been going on for years, and she has ignored it; she has ducked, weaved and avoided the issue. She will not make a decision. She has been given the opportunity time after time, and she will not make a decision. At the end of the day, the only reason why she wants this piece of legislation to go through is so that she can use it to her political advantage just before an election.

Mr FERGUSON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I refer to Standing Order 123, which provides:

Members refer to other members by the name of their electoral district or their parliamentary title, and not otherwise.

The SPEAKER: I must say that it crossed my mind at the time that the term 'she' was being used excessively; I ask the honourable member to refer to the Minister by her office in the Parliament or by the electorate that she represents.

Mr MATTHEW: I apologise for overlooking that important part of our Standing Orders. I am pleased to note that the member for Henley Beach is paying attention to what is being said here today.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Apparently, the member for Murray-Mallee has some problem with the ruling I just gave. However, I refer him to Standing Order 144, which endows the Chair with powers to maintain the dignity and decorum of the House. The Chair will impose that ruling whenever it feels that the dignity and decorum are being affected. The honourable member for Bright.

Mr MATTHEW: We are left with a situation in which this legislation could be used at an opportune time, such as on the eve of an election, to change the name of a suburb for precisely the same reasons as were alluded to earlier by the member for Spence. Many people may want to change the name of their suburb simply because it has greater elitist appeal to them. In many respects, that is not surprising. Many of these applications come from residents of new and growing suburbs who, particularly in the north and the south of Adelaide, are very proud of their little patch of dirt.

They have worked hard and are still working hard to buy their homes, pay their mortgages, establish their gardens, and they feel part of their neighbourhood, and think that their particular place of residence is pretty special. It is quite understandable that some of them feel particularly strongly about adopting an estate name, for example, for the area in which they live. It is also fair to say that, because they feel so strongly, they would feel quite good towards a Government or a Minister who would make that change happen for them.

When the power to look at things in a completely non-political way and to look at these points on their merit is taken away from the board, that is fine, but if we hand that power to the Minister, the Minister will then have the opportunity to make those changes, even for small groups of people, simply to extract political gain from the situation. That is something I oppose quite strongly. It is interesting to note that in her second reading explanation the Minister said:

The object of this Bill is to repeal the Geographical Names Act 1969 and to provide new legislation for assigning geographical names to places. The purpose of the new Act is to provide an orderly means of determining and assigning geographical names to places in South Australia.

That orderly means already exists and has existed since 1969. There is nothing disorderly about the present methods by which geographical names are changed. The whole point is that the Minister does not have ultimate power and wishes to have that power. That is something that should be resisted very strongly. In her second reading explanation the Minister also stated:

A matter which has been of concern in the past has been the uncontrolled use of estate names in urban land developments. Although the current legislation provides that it is an offence to display any name other than the assigned geographical name in advertisements, etc., the Crown Solicitor has advised that the wording is ambiguous and prosecutions would most likely be unsuccessful.

I think that we all acknowledge that the present way in which estate names are being used has been fairly uncontrolled and needs some controlling, but that is no reason to abandon the Geographical Names Board: it is a reason to amend the existing legislation so that the wording is not ambiguous, so that developers cannot use estate names in a manner in which they should not, and so that, should they do so, prosecutions would be successful. I should have thought that that was all that was needed to fix the problem once and for all.

Also in her second reading explanation the Minister makes a statement that I think is worthy of support. She states that administration of geographical names activities costs the State approximately $100 000 per annum, and she proposes in the new legislation to allow the Surveyor-General to levy charges on applications of this type. I have no problem with that, and I think that it is something that could be incorporated in the present Act. It is important that the Government recover this sort of charge, but I draw members' attention to the fact that one of the reasons why administration of geographical names activities has cost so much is the sort of situation that surrounded the Karrara name change fiasco.

That could have been prevented many years ago from getting to the stage it has and, with all due respect to the current Minister, probably the previous Minister for Environment and Planning should have fixed the problem and the Minister should not have been facing it today. I have some sympathy for the predicament in which she found herself initially, but she, too, has failed to act appropriately. Having said that, I point out that, as long as the Bill contains provisions to abolish the Geographical Names Board, it should be opposed, but if that provision is deleted and some other changes are adopted, in line with the comments made by my colleagues who have spoken before me, it may well be that we finish up with an improved version of the 1969 Bill.

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I support the Bill, and I am delighted to see that the Geographical Names Board is to be abolished. I would be happy to dance on its grave. I refer first to the speech made by the member for Bright. He has told us that we should just cop it sweet when decisions are made by the independent statutory boards. I would like to remind members opposite about a little episode that faced us a few years ago over the Mitcham boundaries, where the Local Government Advisory Committee recommended that we accept the boundaries. I did not see members on that side copping it sweet on that occasion. No; there we had a case where the Minister did not have any powers.

Members interjecting:

Mr HOLLOWAY: It is entirely relevant to the arguments put forward by the member for Bright. I now turn to the case of Melrose Park, because the member for Bright brought up that matter earlier, and I am delighted that he did. I would like to tell the House the story of what happened in relation to Melrose Park. Melrose Park was originally a section of Edwardstown on the eastern side of South Road bounded by Edward Street, Winston Avenue and Daws Road, and Edwardstown was one of the largest suburbs in the Adelaide metropolitan area. Mainly through Neighbourhood Watch, the residents of that area decided that they wished to change the name of the suburb. That decision was motivated largely by the fact that, if emergency services needed to go into the area, they were never sure which side of South Road to go to—the eastern or western side. So,

Neighbourhood Watch took up a petition which was signed by 90 per cent of the residents of the area.

When the proposal went before the Geographical Names Board, it was turned down. Subsequently, a public meeting held in the area attracted about 350 people. I attended that meeting, so I know that, at the end, a vote was taken on what should be the name of the suburb—whether it should be Melrose Park or Edwardstown East. Two people voted against Melrose Park as the name of the suburb. Of those two, only one actually lived in the area, and the other person was an historian who wanted some name that no-one else had ever heard of anyway.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HOLLOWAY: It was Chellaston, actually, which is the name of an old house in the area. The vast majority of people wanted the name of Melrose Park, in honour of Jimmy Melrose, the famous aviator who had had an airstrip in the area.

Mr Ferguson: What was Edwardstown named in honour of?

Mr HOLLOWAY: Edwardstown was named after Mr Edwards, who was one of the original residents on the other side of South Road. There was strong public support for the name of Melrose Park because part of the area had originally been called Melrose Park as an estate name—and I will come to the question of estate names in a moment.

It had a tie because of Jimmy Melrose's connection with the area and that name was unanimously supported, but that was not good enough for the Geographical Names Board. Mitcham council also strongly supported the name change. The Minister exercised her power of veto over the board. Under the Act, the Minister had power of veto over any name, but she could not direct the board. Ultimately, the board backed down and accepted the name which 90 per cent of residents had wanted and which the public meeting had decided upon. So, let us not allow the member for Bright to talk this nonsense about political favouritism. It was quite clear what the majority of residents in those areas wanted.

I would like to turn to another important part of this Bill, namely, the control over the use of estate names. The member for Spence said that in my electorate there is an area in Pasadena called Quinton Hill Estate, obviously a name used to promote that area. We could easily see a situation where if people move into an area and like the estate name, say Quinton Hill, they can become confused as to what is their actual postal address, and that is exactly what happened in the case of Melrose Park. That was an estate name and it even appeared on titles for land held in the area, as did the name Cudmore Park in relation to other parts of that area. It was the estate name that actually appeared on the title and, indeed, the residents of that area were quite convinced at the meeting with the Geographical Names Board to which I referred earlier that the suburb had actually existed: it was only when they checked the record that they discovered that, in fact, even though the name had been on the title, it had never been established. So, there is a real need to tidy up and to make clear to people that, even though land agents can use estate names to promote an area, the proper postal name of the suburb should be quite clear. This measure is long overdue.

The main reason why we should support this Bill is its democratic nature. The member for Spence said earlier that the name of Leningrad in the Soviet Union is to revert to St Petersburg. Just imagine if that case came before the South Australian Geographical Names Board. The Soviet postal officials would say, 'Well look, really, there is another St Petersburg over on the other side of the country, and we couldn't really call it that, because the mail might go to the wrong area.' Then the historians would stand up and say, 'Well, St Peter never actually came to St Petersburg, but Lenin did, so we should keep the name Leningrad.' We would end up with a situation where the officials would say, 'No, we think it should stay as Leningrad.'

What would the good citizens of the Soviet Union make of the new-found democracy they have fought so hard to win if some non-elected bureaucratic board decided what should be the name of their suburb? Surely, the name of a suburb is an issue that should come before the Minister of the House. If the matter comes before this Parliament and the Minister has responsibility, she is answerable to this House, and if the people want to raise a matter or if there is disagreement, they can bring it before us and we can debate it. I would like to conclude by saying that there are four good reasons why we should support this Bill. It covers Aboriginal place names, which is a very useful initiative. It will save taxpayers' money, it will control the use of estate names and, above all, it is democratic. It will mean that place names will be decided by a Minister who is responsible to this House. I support the Bill and I support the abolition of the Geographical Names Board.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I support the remarks of the member for Murray-Mallee. I thought he put the argument extremely well. I do not see why the Geographical Names Board should be abolished at all. Having had to listen painfully to the remarks made by the member for Henley Beach, I remind him that clause 10 provides for the establishment of a committee consisting of six people. What is the difference? We have a board now; there is nothing wrong with it. Let us keep it. There are six members of that board, so it is cost neutral, if we are worrying about cost. The new committee will consist of the Surveyor-General—the presiding member—and five other persons appointed by the Minister after taking into account the recommendations of the Surveyor-General.

The member for Henley Beach was way off track. This legislation, as proposed, is extremely dangerous. It gives the Minister absolute power. Under clause 7 she can delegate that power and, under clause 7 *(c)*, the Minister can appoint a person for the time being occupying a particular office or position. It does not state what office or position. No doubt, it is designed for Derek Robertson; they have to give him a job anyway. The poor bloke has nothing to do. After all, he has been the main architect.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BECKER: Well, he does not do much; he never has. If he was any good, he would still be here. So, there we are; let us leave it at that. What I do not like about the legislation is the fact that there is no right of appeal over the Minister's decisions. This is total dictatorial power by the Minister.

Mr Holloway interjecting:

Mr BECKER: Are you not well or something? I cannot support this type of legislation where the Minister has the widest powers and yet, if one wants to object to the Minister's decision, one has no right of appeal. It is unreal! We have already experienced this problem in Glenelg, as the Minister would know. We have had a problem for many years with the suburbs of Glenelg, Glenelg North, South and East, all with the same postcode. Recently the Glenelg council tried to rename part of Glenelg North as Glenelg North Shore.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

Mr BECKER: Now the Minister has given away her birthplace—it is New South Wales. Derek Robinson is also from there. I am glad that I am South Australian and that

we at least appreciate the history of the State. Let us look at the example of the Glenelg council where one member, who supports the Democrats, put up a resolution to rename the area between the Patawalonga and the foreshore Glenelg North Shore. The Glenelg council sent a submission to the Geographical Names Board in November 1990 and the board wrote back stating that the issue would be considered at its meeting on 21 January 1991.

It further wrote on 24 January, following the meeting on 21 January, stating that it had considered the area to be too small to have a name in its own right. The council wrote to the Geographical Names Board advising that it would not pursue the matter at the time but that it would resubmit a proposal at a later time following the upgrading of Tapleys Hill Road and further development of the Glenelg foreshore and the environs. I concede that it is a small area and that the name Glenelg North Shore would be exclusive and its use quite elitist. The Geographical Names Board acted quite properly, in my opinion. The board is serving its purpose, so why abolish it?

If we had a Government which felt quite differently and wanted to play politics, the Minister could override the committee. On the one hand we are saying that we will do this or that, and on the other hand the Minister can override all decisions and no-one has any right of appeal. Let us deal with the background, as it is fascinating. In *the Place Names of South Australia*, written by R. Praite and J.C. Tolley, the introduction states:

There is a fascination in the meaning and derivation of place names. There are the softly flowing Aboriginal names; the nostalgic pioneers' birthplaces overseas, given to new settlements in the colony; names which perpetuate those of prominent people; and the descriptive names given to towns and features. Sometimes these are too complimentary. There are many names with obscure derivations, adding speculation to the interest in nomenclature.

Here again the Government of the day could, if it wished, load the whole of South Australia with names perpetuating the people of their political persuasion.

An honourable member: What a good idea.

Mr BECKER: It is not a good idea—get rid of the nonsense. If the Liberals were in power we could name everything 'Playford'.

Mr S.J. Baker: Or Baker.

Mr BECKER: Yes, or 'Baker', which would be worse. If the Labor Party desired, everything could be named 'Walsh'. No-one has ever recognised dear old Frank Walsh. He was very kind to me when I was President of our union. We can understand the concern of the community in relation to this very serious subject. The introduction continues:

This absorbing interest prompted the compilers to prepare this work. Reference was made to existing publications, but wider research revealed new sources from which many new derivations were discovered. No work of this type would be complete without homage being paid to the late Rodney Cockburn, who was the most notable of the pioneer nomenclators in this State. His book, *The Nomenclature of South Australia*, was the standard work of his day, and is now much sought after by collectors.

The member for Coles rightly paid tribute to the late Rodney Cockburn. The introduction continues:

He served on many committees dealing with nomenclature, including one appointed by the Government of the day to advise on the charge of names derived from enemy countries during the First World War.

That is a blight on history. It continues:

This committee presented a report (Parliamentary Report No. 66, 7 November 1916) in which it gave suggestions for changing sixty-seven enemy place names in South Australia. These were to be replaced by names which were mainly derived from the Australian Aboriginal.

A glance at this report will show that, although the committee entered willingly upon their task, it was not without some hesitation. Some of the names commemorated well-known people of Germanic origin, who had served South Australia well in the early days of the colony. One of these was Ferdinand Bauer; not a German, but an Austrian natural history painter who was with Matthew Flinders on board the *Investigator*. Another was Dr Richard Von Schomburgk, a former Director of the Botanic Garden, Adelaide.

The following paragraph from the report shows clearly the sentiments of the committee members:

Far-reaching consequences must follow the adoption of the resolution arrived at by the House of Assembly. However commendable may be the sentiment that prompted the decision—which clearly has the weight of public opinion behind it—we feel it our duty to point out that the proposed wholesale alteration of the State's nomenclature cannot be undertaken without considerable vexation and temporary confusion in the postal and railway departments, complications in the matter of title deeds, and further trouble from the fact that all maps and plans of South Australia will have to be altered to the extent the new place names are adopted.

Those comments given to the Parliament back in those days are worth remembering even today. If we make these alterations it has a tremendous impact on a large number of authorities and organisations. The introduction continues:

This report, with a few alterations, was eventually accepted and passed by Parliament on 10 January 1918. Although this report was entitled the 'Nomenclature Committee's Report on Enemy Place Names', it either missed or did not take into consideration the name Castambul, a name of Turkish origin. Turkey at that time was also an enemy.

It was not until 1 December 1935 with the centenary of South Australia on the horizon and improved German relations with the Commonwealth, that the Government of the day saw fit to allow three of these names to revert to their originals. These were Gaza (Klemzig); Tweedvale (Lobethal); and Ambleside (Hahndorf).

I recall working in the Bank of Adelaide at Klemzig when it was known as Gaza and it caused confusion when checking on securities and title deeds. We can look at how the various names have changed. Aero Park is now Albert Park and was so called because there was an airstrip in that area. Gaza is now Klemzig. Page 49 of the book refers to Gillentown at Clare named after Peter Paul Gillen, MP, Price Commissioner of Crown Lands. Members of Parliament can be perpetuated, and we have the fascinating history of Gillman (a suburb near Port Adelaide) named after the General Traffic Manager of the South Australian Railways in the 1930s. That name should be retained, even if we have an MFP.

Page 57 of the book highlights my point in relation to Hoffnungsthal, two miles south of Rowlands Flat, a German name meaning valley of hope. It was changed during the First World War to Karawirra a native name meaning red gum. We had a situation where a name was changed to one of a totally different meaning. Many suburbs have disappeared completely. The member for Spence mentioned some in his electorate including White Park, which was well known as a housing development on the edge of Lockleys and now known as Lockleys. We had West Beach Estate and all sorts of other small estates. The Government's Urban Land Trust, which is a developer encouraging joint ventures, is actively involved in those areas.

When an estate is established, initially it has to be called something for that small new area to be identified. Eventually, it will be swallowed up by the much larger suburb. A similar activity occurs in Government. When South Australia was established as a colony, it was the work of the first Governments to establish various services, departments and authorities and it was necessary for the Government of the day to be involved in just about everything. Today—150-odd years later—it is not necessary for the Government to be involved in many of those areas. We should get right back to basics and the Government should probably be involved only in health, welfare and education. The rest of it can be sold off. The same thing happens with place names. Originally small estates have to be identified and when they

are fully developed there is one whole name. I cannot see any need to change the name of the board. I believe its name should be retained, because the members of that board have served the State well.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I support the Bill and I support it enthusiastically. One thing that always surprises me about members opposite is that they just do not like success; they just cannot stand success. Because the Minister at the table is a successful Minister and has taken up the matter of a statutory body and effectively abolished it and streamlined the procedures, bringing it into the twentieth century, members opposite do not like it.

I was surprised at the contributions of the member for Murray-Mallee and the member for Bright. One could see the venom coming from them, not because of the Bill itself, but because this Minister was introducing it. There has been a lot of comment on both sides of the House about name changes. In some certain respects I have a lot of sympathy for some residents who may wish to change the name of their suburb. In fact, there are instances when people have changed their own name. I understand that the member for Hanson changed his name, and it has done his image the world of good. No-one would deny that the member for Hanson had the right to change his name. That is what this is all about. The member for Hanson has gone through all the normal procedures and has changed his name and it has enhanced his image no end. It is a pity that it did not improve his image with the Liberal Party. We appreciate the talents of the member for Hanson.

Mr BECKER: I take a point of order, Mr Speaker. There is no doubt about the member for Napier. He has reflected on me, Sir. I have not changed my name. I am commonly known as 'Heini' Becker, which is a family nickname.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. You can make a personal explanation if you wish. There is no Standing Order relating to names. However, I draw the member for Napier's attention to the fact that this has nothing to do with the Bill and I ask him to link his remarks to the clauses of the Bill.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Thank you, Sir. I take your advice and I look forward to the personal explanation of the member for Hanson at some later date. This Bill is about deregulation. Yesterday we were told by the member for Hanson—and I am not picking on the honourable member—that there were 248 statutory bodies in South Australia and that it would take 42 years to examine all of them if a review committee were set up. Here we are, the Minister has come in here—of her own free will—saying that she will take one of those bodies off the list so that the Opposition will not have to bother about it. What do they do? They scream like stuck pigs and say that there is some sinister motive behind it. One thing that can be said about this Minister is that she always consults. I am sure some people say that she consults too much.

Let us look at the consultation process that occurred before this Bill was introduced into the House. A green paper was prepared following consultation with the Department of Lands, the State Planning Authority, museums and the State Library. That green paper was distributed widely to developers, local government and all interested groups. In all, 200 copies were distributed and 32 responses received. The deregulation adviser supported the green paper. I know about our deregulation adviser; he is a hard nut to crack, but he supported the green paper. Following that, a draft Bill was prepared and copies were forwarded to those who responded to the green paper. The Minister's department received further information on that paper and there was general support for the draft Bill, with some minor wording alterations, which were proposed by some of those people and which were gladly accepted by the Minister and incorporated in the Bill.

I would say, with all due respect to the Minister, that that is consultation gone mad. However, it works; it works in open government. Yet, we now have every speaker on the other side saying that no-one wants it. Members opposite have given us some stupid examples of where the Minister has ridden roughshod over certain residents in their constituencies. One could accuse this Minister of many things, but she never rides roughshod over anyone. I can speak from personal experience. All that members opposite talk about are little, isolated incidents. They say that the Minister is sinister and that she has sinister motives. They say that the Geographical Names Board should be performing the task and that a Geographical Advisory Committee would only be the lapdog of the Minister, who would continually override decisions. Members opposite are in cloud cuckoo land, because that is not the intention of the Bill.

They also talk about not wanting ministerial responsibility. My colleague, the member for Henley Beach, quite adequately covered that point. Day after day, members opposite scream that there should be ministerial responsibility. We have heard lecture after lecture from the member for Hayward who, unfortunately, is still wet behind the ears as far as parliamentary processes are concerned and who continually gets up and lectures us about the rights of Parliament, the Westminster principle and the buck stopping with the Minister. The Minister provides them with that kind of mechanism, but they shout and cry 'Foul'. Obviously, members on this side of the House and the people in the community are not hoodwinked by their thinking, because they fully endorse what the Minister has said. I see that you are nodding, Sir; obviously you agree with what I am saying.

However, I do have sympathy with members opposite in respect of one area, that is, where developers sometimes give a fancy name to a particular suburb because, in effect, they do not want to let people know that that particular area might be 'undesirable'. There are two instances of this in my electorate, and I am sure that the Minister would be well aware of them. One is an area called Blakeview and the other is called The Sanctuary, which is a lovely place, but which is located in Smithfield. Smithfield has a great history. It was there before Elizabeth and Munno Para and it was founded by John Smith, who built up the place almost single-handedly. I am very proud to represent Smithfield but, because some of the northern suburbs have a reputation that they do not deserve, pressure was put on the Geographical Names Board to call these areas Blakeview and The Sanctuary.

The Sanctuary has a fancy brick wall around it with very imposing pillars but, funnily enough, people who live in The Sanctuary still think I am a great fellow and they vote overwhelmingly for me. Despite the name of their area, they know that they still have a good member of Parliament representing them. I have pointed that out to them. Certain processes have to be gone through, and I refer to that part of the Bill that talks about estate developers and where pressure has been put on the Minister, creating havoc for Australia Post because everyone wants their area to have a fancy name. This Bill gives them the right to do that, but prominently on the signpost it must have its correct name. In other words, those people who are encouraged to buy a home in Blakeview or The Sanctuary will have to be told that those areas are in Smithfield. I see nothing wrong with that, and I am sure the member for Murray-Mallee sees

nothing wrong with it, unless he is on the side of the developers and wants to hoodwink young married couples who are trying to buy a home in a marvellous electorate such as Napier. I will not say any more because the Minister wants to get this Bill through. All I can say is that I support the Bill.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I will not delay the House for long. I am delighted that I stayed in the House to listen to this debate, and I express some disappointment for those members who were not able to hear the contributions, which have been most amazing. I learned things about the Minister of which I had no idea. I learned about aspects of her character that I did not know she had. Very simply, I think that names and places evolve by custom and usage—they develop. Therefore, I believe that it is not a good practice for anyone to control those names. I do not even like the idea of a board controlling a name, but I suppose that someone has to. I suspect that the board invariably answers to the Minister and, in turn, the Minister answers to this House. So, I refute the comment of members opposite that, by having a board which is answerable to a Minister who is answerable to this House, we are getting away from that situation. I know that, one day, there may well be a suburb of Ferguson, but I think that that suburb will have to evolve by the common acclamation of the people and not by the creative fiat of a Minister. One day there may even be a suburb of Hemmings but, again, let the people wish for it; do not let the Minister proclaim it.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I do not like to be provoked, but once I have been provoked I think I should stand up. I do not have to defend my Minister, but obviously I have to make a contribution as I do not want to be left out. It is fair to say that the member for Albert Park is pretty mean with a quid, but when I see that, as a consequence of this legislation the taxpayers of South Australia will save a considerable amount of money, I think to myself, 'You beaut, mate, let's get into this.' When I talk to my constituents they will say, 'What have you been talking about lately, Kevin?' I will say, 'I have been talking about the Geographical Names Bill.' Obviously, people in my electorate have inquiring minds, as you would be well aware, Sir. Perhaps one day, Sir, you will want to move into my electorate, and you would be most welcome—it is a very nice area.

However, when it comes to talking to my constituents about saving money, I think that if I can save money in this particular area as a consequence of good legislation brought forward by the Minister, and if I support the Minister—and I do not like saying this openly—I may be able to get to her later and say, 'I have saved a quid here, I would like a proportion of that to help out down my way'—or down our way, Sir, as you would understand.

Seriously, it is very important that we look at this whole question of the amount of money that we can save. Unlike some of my colleagues who are looking to have a suburb or town named after them, I am very fortunate that, in many parts of the world, including Victoria, Canada, Scotland and all over the place, as most of my colleagues know, there are towns named Hamilton.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: And New Zealand.

Mr HAMILTON: And New Zealand, as the Minister properly tells me. There are some jealous people around here who would be most envious of a name such as Hamilton, and I understand that.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Not on this side, I know, but on the other side.

Mr Lewis: They are not jealous of anything common.

Mr HAMILTON: I will ignore the rabbit—I mean the member opposite. Seriously, it is very important that we have in legislation the opportunity for dual names.

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

Mr HAMILTON: Since we adjourned at 6 o'clock I have had time to be educated by a number of my colleagues about this important Bill. I have consulted quite widely on this matter. Prior to the adjournment I was talking about the cost to the community and how the Government could recoup some of its money. I indicated my strong support for the dual naming of Aboriginal and European names. Quite properly, this Government will provide due recognition of the importance of Aboriginal culture. When we have dual recognition for both Aboriginal and European names, people from overseas will start asking about the meaning of the names. It will be an educational program not only for visitors to Australia, and South Australia in particular, but for members of Parliament. Many members, including myself, do not have a great understanding of Aboriginal culture.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: What about the member for Murray-Mallee?

Mr HAMILTON: I want to be serious about this matter. My colleague sometimes makes comments which are perhaps a bit unkind to the member for Murray-Mallee, but he is a good friend of mine. If we teach and give due recognition to the importance of Aboriginal culture in our primary and secondary schools, I suggest that will provide a great fillip to our tourism industry as well. With dual naming, many people in this country, and in South Australia in particular, would express greater interest in those names and in the culture of the Aboriginal people. It would also provide the whole community with a window into Aboriginal culture.

South Australians have taken many things for granted for so long, and I do not exclude myself from that. I love the outdoor life, particularly the sunshine. When one gets into the outback there are many things that we can learn, particularly from the Aboriginal people. With the will of Parliament and, indeed, the people of South Australia, we should cultivate such a program so that not only can we and our children learn, but people from overseas can learn and will be interested in the various names. One can extend that laterally and talk about it for many hours.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: My suburb is named Elizabeth.

Mr HAMILTON: I understand what the honourable member is saying. It takes me back many years when I was in New Zealand talking about Aboriginal culture. I spoke to some people in Christchurch who had a program for overseas people who came to their city. Local people would invite overseas people who approached the visitors centre to come home for a meal in their own homes. As a consequence, they could tell visitors what their community was about and, equally importantly, they could tell them what the Maori culture was about. With the support and authorisation of the Aboriginal people in our community, we could develop such a program. Obviously, we would not show the names of sacred sites unless approved to do so by Aboriginal communities.

Another aspect of the Bill relates to the consultation that has been undertaken by the Government, and I want briefly to refer to that consultation process. I do not want to delay the House, but it is important to have this information included in *Hansard* for people who want to follow the

debate. A green paper, prepared following consultation with the Department of Lands, State Planning, the Museum and the State Library, was widely distributed to developers and local government. With about 200 copies being distributed, it was a very good result that 32 responses were received. Further, those involved with deregulation supported the green paper and a draft Bill was prepared with copies being forwarded to those who responded to the green paper. There was general support for the draft Bill, with some minor wording alterations being proposed and accepted.

I do not want to delay the Bill but, as I have indicated, it is important for the people of South Australia to have an opportunity to provide for the dual naming of sites and to protect particularly the reputation of the real estate industry. Whilst it may be said—and I note the response from the Minister—that some people say that politicians are just a cut above real estate people (I do not know whether or not that is true), it is important that we provide better control over the use of estate names in real estate advertising. Many members have seen on television programs and read in the newspapers that people have been snowed by highfalutin and nice sounding names. I therefore support the Bill, which is a positive step, and I congratulate the Minister on bringing it before the Parliament.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Lands): I thank honourable members for their participation in the debate. When I brought this Bill before the House I never imagined in my wildest dreams that it would create so much interest and that we would have such a high level of contribution. We have had everything from high farce to serious and reasoned debate and discussion on the Bill. It is probably a mark of our times that a Geographical Names Bill should elicit such an enormous response from so many members.

Having said that, I thank members for their contributions. Because so many members from both sides of the Parliament have participated in the debate, I will not go through the contribution of each member because I am mindful of the time. However, I would like to pick up a number of the salient and important features of this legislation. First, as members have pointed out, it provides for a dissolution of the board, and it will therefore remove a statutory authority.

No amount of posturing on the part of the Opposition can change that fact. We will be removing one statutory authority from South Australia. I do not believe we will be doing that to the detriment of what has become a very historical and important aspect, that is, using nomenclature to ensure that we have recognition of the wealth of history and culture that has been established in South Australia. Indeed, I put to the House that this Bill goes further: by recognising Aboriginal names in a sensitive way—and perhaps that is the first point I should address—it will extend the whole concept of a quality provision and also make sure that the nomenclature is protected. It is very easy for people to quote from the forewards of particular publications and from those publications but, at the end of the argument, those quotations are irrelevant if they do not in any way affect what we are doing with this legislation.

With respect to dual naming using Aboriginal and European names, I note that the Opposition's major point of concern and dissention is that dual naming may be misapplied to some locations other than places which were named by Aboriginal people. Indeed, it might be a way of trying to change a name when that is not realistic. I will quickly elicit a number of arguments to put that concern to rest completely. The Act specifically provides that the Aboriginal name of a place be the original Aboriginal name of the feature as it was used. Therefore, there is no way that people could mischievously try to use an Aboriginal name where it was not appropriate.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: This is quite amazing! This is what the Act clearly states. As the Minister responsible for this legislation, I am outlining to the House what will happen. The Aboriginal names to be used in this manner will be the names of natural features only and will not be applied to cultural features that have come into being since European colonisation. The Aboriginal people did not have a name for Adelaide or for suburbs. However, they did have names for particular geological features. Therefore, the concerns expressed by the Opposition are not valid, and an impartial and impassionate reading of the Act would indicate that that is the case. The use of both names will aid in the retention of aspects of both cultures. Surely, that is something that we as European Australians—

Mr Ferguson: Should applaud.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: —should not only applaud, as my colleague says, but encourage. It is not just a matter of recognising a culture that has been here for many thousands of years before we arrived; it also involves an extra interpretive feature for tourists whereby the European name is shown and, underneath, the Aboriginal name. I have done my homework on this, and I can assure the House that this is not something unique or different to South Australia only. The use of bicultural naming methods, if you like, happens right around the world. It is not something that has happened in other parts of Australia, but I am told that other States are looking in a very supportive way at what we are introducing here. I believe they will be moving very soon to introduce this pratice. In other places such as Canada and New Zealand—

Mr Atkinson: And Ireland.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Ireland is a wonderful example. I have visited that place, and obviously so has the honourable member—

Mr Atkinson: No.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Well, I hope that he does, because it is certainly worthwhile. Again, that is another culture that uses a dual naming system and does so because it appreciates the value and the contribution of both cultures to the wealth of history and cultural diversity of which the vast majority of people, in our case South Australians, are proud. I hope that the Opposition will join with me in publicly stating that pride.

It is not the intention of any nomenclature authority to be the judge as to which cultural heritage is to be retained and which is to be lost. It would be totally untenable for an authority to say that we will have only one name and that that authority will judge which one should be retained and which should be lost. This Government does not believe that that is the correct and proper role of any authority.

The Aboriginal names will not be used without prior consultation with and authorisation from the relevant Aboriginal community. Again, this is not some kind of paternalistic white person's way of trying to make up for some of the atrocities that have been committed against the Aboriginal culture. What we are saying is that we will not ride roughshod over Aboriginal culture and just use names willy-nilly; there will be proper consultation with and authorisation from the appropriate Aboriginal tribe or grouping. I should have thought that that would be welcomed.

With respect to the point about removing a statutory authority, I want to put very clearly on the record that the proposal to dissolve the board was supported absolutely by seven of the 17 submissions received to the Green Paper,

and I will talk about the other submissions in a moment. I have copies of letters from groups supporting this move. I will not do what many Opposition members do and read every last word of those letters into *Hansard*. I am happy to make copies available to the Opposition, if members opposite want to look at them. However, supportive submissions came from the Housing Industry Association, the Real Estate Institute and the Urban Development Institute of Australia (UDIA). These would have to be seen as the major interests, if you like, in this Bill. They are some of the major organisations involved in South Australia in the housing and development industry.

A further four submissions supported the alteration of the board from a statutory authority to an advisory committee, although I will not pretend that there were no objections. In fact, there were three objections out of a total of 17 submissions, and I do not include the 32 referred to earlier, from people who responded in some way. I am now talking about submissions from three individuals.

It must be recognised, therefore, that with the support of local government, of the UDIA, of the Real Estate Institute and of the Housing Industry Association it seems quite untenable for the Opposition to fly in the face of that enormous amount of community consultation and support. Again, I think it is quite improper to suggest that there has not been adequate consultation or that we have introduced something that does not have almost the total support of the community and of industry.

I will now deal with some other points that were addressed, particularly by Opposition members. Vesting some of the powers of the present board in the Surveyor-General will have the effect of speeding up the approval of new names for, for example, public schools and conservation parks in some areas. I should have thought that the Opposition would welcome that. Are we seriously trying to hold up all these things to ensure that we have so many layers of bureaucracy and consultation that we will never get to the point of making decisions?

The fact that most of the decisions are not contentious but can be facilitated quickly and that we can provide a comprehensive and efficient service to the community, surely, is what good government is all about. There is a terrible, paranoiac fear that the Minister—this horrendous monster who has been described by some speakers—will somehow wield enormous power. One almost asks: 'Is it supposed to be wielded secretly?' Quite obviously, no area would be more public than that of suburban name changes. Any Minister foolish enough to try to turn the whole thing into a political football would have to be quite mad, because at the end of the day, whether the Opposition likes it or not, we actually live in a democracy, and it is important that the democratically elected Minister or Government of the day have responsibility for some of these decisions.

In fact, let me remind members that, under the Act, which was passed 20 years ago or more, the Minister has the power of veto over a board decision, so that already exists. The Minister can veto, which means that the Minister could continually veto if he or she so chose, and no decision could be made. This power has been used only once in the 21 years of the board's existence with respect to the whole question of Colonel Light Gardens, and one situation where the matter was referred back to the board by the Minister—who was myself—with respect to Melrose Park. Of course, earlier this evening, we have had a very positive contribution from the member in whose district Melrose Park is located. Vesting the powers of the board in the Minister will give the elected representative decision-making powers in this area of responsibility, and I will just refer to one little article that appeared in the *Advertiser* on Tuesday of this week (the 27th) entitled 'Baker warns on avoiding blame', where the Leader of the Opposition is quoted as follows:

> Mr Baker told the Public Service Association biennial conference in Adelaide that the Bannon Government appeared to be 'making an art form of avoiding (ministerial) responsibility . . .'

and it goes on to say what it was about. Let me just say that it is important that members of the Opposition have some degree of consistency. They cannot on the one hand publicly posture and talk about the need for ministerial responsibility and, on the other hand, when we bring something into the Parliament that will streamline the process, save money for the people of South Australia, remove a statutory authority and give the responsibility and accountability to the Minister of the day, then say they do not like it. I put to members of the Opposition that they cannot have it both ways, and the community will judge them accordingly.

Interstate experience has shown that the method we are proposing is working very well. Again, I notice that the Opposition did not call on any interstate experience to support its arguments. Only two other States—New South Wales and Tasmania—have a statutory authority. In all the other States, these services are provided by advisory committees or public service officers. In all the other States, with the exception of New South Wales, the Minister has the power to alter recommendations. So, without taking any further time of the House, I have to put to the House that surely in a time of economic recession and in a time when we are all more accountable to the people who elect us—to the people whose money we actually spend—it is important that we should make savings wherever possible. I will not pretend that we are talking about multi thousands of dollars of savings, but I would have thought—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: That is not correct. The honourable member interjects to say that there will not be one cent of saving. He obviously has not done his homework in this, or he would not make such a silly statement. I am not suggesting that many thousands of dollars will be saved, but surely any measure introduced in this Parliament that will make savings, whatever the modest level of those savings, should, I would have thought, be welcomed by sensible and reasonable members of the Opposition, and I am surprised that people like the member for Light—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: —are not prepared to support this very commonsense piece of legislation, which has the complete support of the industry and indeed of many areas of local government and individuals in the community. I therefore commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

Mr LEWIS: I move:

Page 1, line 18—Leave out this line and insert the following:
'the board' means the Geographical Names Board established by this Act:.

Page 2, line 21—Leave out this line and insert the following:
Division I—The Geographical Names Board

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Henley Beach will come to order. The member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: As a former Chairman, the member for Henley Beach ought to know better. The amendment replaces the reference in the Bill to the 'Geographical Names Advisory Committee' with 'the Geographical Names Board'. In

spite of what the Minister says, there is no saving or deregulation. There will be six members of the advisory committee if the Bill goes forward in its current form. If it passes forward in the form in which the Opposition proposes there will still be only six members and they will meet to consider each and every issue in precisely the same fashion. The only difference is that we will have an apolitical body—a statutory authority—making the decision rather than the Minister. The Minister said in a letter on another matter to which I referred earlier today that she would refuse consent for a transaction, and that was a quite threatening and capricious statement in contravention of the very section of the Act from which she quoted in her letter.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair is assuming that this clause is a test case for further amendments and therefore is allowing a broad ranging debate on later amendments. I think that addresses the Minister's concern about relevance.

Mr LEWIS: The structure of the committee referred to in this instance fails to provide for the kind of competence that ought to be contained in such a body. We will get to that. So much for my amendment. I now proceed to the substance of the definitions. It is very important for you, Sir, and all other members to look at the definition of 'place', which states:

> 'place' means any area, region, locality, city, surburb, town, township, or settlement, or any geographical or topographical feature, and includes any railway station, hospital, school and any other place or building that is, or is likely to be, of public or historical interest:

I underline and emphasise that definition of 'place' because it is very relevent when we come to a subsequent clause. The Minister misled us about this word in the context in which it is to be referred in another clause when she used the adjective 'original'. I will drop that into the minds of members at this point and leave it at that. The Opposition strenuously urges all members to support our amendments to this clause.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The Government urges members just as strenuously, if not more so, to reject the amendments moved by the honourable member. I have gone through this a number of times but, for the edification of the honourable member, I will do it again. It is important to note that, in seeking approval in Cabinet to take this Bill forward into the House, I stipulated that the following people would be on the advisory committee, namely, an Aboriginal person (I will be interested to know whether the honourable member supports that), a heritage adviser and an historian.

It is interesting to note that the honourable member talks about the whole concept. He really has not addressed the fact that we are removing a statutory authority. The Opposition has, in the nine years that I have been in this Parliament, continuously raised a whole range of issues, stating how horrendous it is to have all these statutory authorities. Yet, as the member for Henley Beach said in his speech, every time the Government moves to remove a statutory authority, without exception the Opposition has literally gone to the wall to oppose it. I am sorry that the member for Hayward shakes his head. Perhaps he needs to read some of the debates in *Hansard* about the removal—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am not being critical of new members who have come into this place in the past 18 months or two years. But, it seems to me to again be amazingly inconsistent on the part of the Opposition. When the Government actually moves to implement something that the Opposition has been advocating for nine years and says 'We will remove this one,' members opposite stand up in this place and say, 'Oh no, not this one, it is all those others.' It is the most bizarre situation that one could imagine. Maybe we need to get the Opposition to provide a list of the statutory authorities that we could move to abolish. Maybe we have to turn the argument around. Maybe the backbenchers on the Government side should start asking questions about which of the authorities the Opposition would be prepared to have abolished. It just does not make sense.

I reiterate: we are removing a statutory authority; we are providing an advisory committee. The advisory committee must have, if you like, some broad representation. The department will continue to fulfil the role that it has fulfilled in the past. The quality and standard of nomenclature will not change, it will not be diminished, and there has not been a shred of evidence presented in this Parliament to suggest that it would be. Therefore, I cannot accept the amendments moved by the member for Murray-Mallee.

In conclusion, I realise that my colleague interjected and, he was out of order to that extent, but the amendments from the member for Murray-Mallee were not put on file until late this afternoon. While the member for Murray-Mallee might say, 'I had the amendments, I had them drawn up and I gave them to your officers,' I point out that he is one of the greatest sticklers in this Parliament for adherence to Standing Orders. No member calls more points of order and wants us to carry out every last—

Mr Lewis: What's that got to do with the clause?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Well, it has a lot to do with the clause—

The CHAIRMAN: Address the Chair.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Sorry, Mr Chairman. Members did not have an adequate opportunity to study thoroughly the amendments from the member for Murray-Mallee because he put them before the House about a quarter of an hour before the Bill was due to be debated. I put it to you, Mr Chairman, that if I as Minister had done that the member for Murray-Mallee would have been shouting and screaming in this place and criticising me for doing it. All I am asking is for the member for Murray-Mallee to be consistent. Let him apply the same standards and rules to himself that he wants applied to everyone else. It is most unfair to members of the backbench and of the Government not to have paid them the courtesy of providing those amendments. I am sorry, but I cannot accept the amendments from the honourable member.

Mr LEWIS: I am pleased that the Minister, in conclusion, has said what she has said—that means she has finished. Let me make it plain that I gave the amendments to the Clerk of the House much earlier than the Minister claims I did. I put that on the record. Secondly, it is quaint that the Minister—

An honourable member: Quaint?

Mr LEWIS: Yes, quaint, I didn't say queer. I think it quaint that the Minister should even want to contemplate a situation in which she would be amending her own legislation. As the Minister she brings in the legislation. If the honourable lady cannot get her act together in the form of the Bill that she puts before this place then, of course—

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: I am not moving any amendments.

Mr LEWIS: Then why complain? I do not know of any circumstances in which I have complained about a Minister's amendment to a Minister's own legislation. I find it incredible that you took me to task for that. I think it is improper. The Minister makes great play of the fact that

this is an act of deregulation. That is garbage. I will explain to members, as I will explain to the honourable lady again, that what the Minister has done is to abolish a board—a statutory authority—and created a statutory committee, comprised of exactly the same numbers, doing exactly the same work, but without the same measure of responsibility.

The Opposition simply complains that the process will not now be apolitical. The Minister of the day, regardless of whether it is the honourable lady at the bench, or anybody else, will have the prerogative to do as they please when they please, and that includes the delegation of authority to do such things for such other persons—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Of course not; if it is convenient electorally for the moment to do that I would not put that past the honourable lady. She has done the same sort of thing before. I am quite sure and quite satisfied, after my more recent consultations with the organisations, to which the honourable lady addressed herself as approving of these amendments, that she should be told and the whole Committee should be told that they were misled about the consequences of the legislation. Their comments were more related to their particular interests rather than to the broader interests of the wider community.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Tell them that.

Mr LEWIS: I am, right now; it is on the record; they will have this within a week.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Good.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the member for Murray-Mallee and the Minister to address their remarks, when they are respectively speaking, through the Chair and not to each other.

Mr LEWIS: Indeed, thank you, Mr Chairman. These organisations will come to understand that the Minister's correspondence with them bears little resemblance to the consequence of the legislation we are now debating but, rather, was a convenient description of what she wanted them to understand. Notwithstanding that, I say again: all members need to pay particular attention to the definition of the word 'place'.

The CHAIRMAN: Since it has become a matter for debate, I wish to point out that the amendments were circulated by the attendants in the Chamber at 4.10 p.m., having been received at 4 p.m. The member for Henley Beach.

Mr FERGUSON: I was just about to make the same point, Sir. I came in here just before prayers—and you know that I am a regular attender at prayers—and, because I had an interest in speaking to this debate, I checked with the attendants to see whether there were any amendments on file, and there were none. If we need to get a statutory declaration to that effect, that can easily be obtained. The amendments were definitely not made available to the backbench, and they arrived just a few minutes before the legislation was to be debated. I have already had my say about what I think about this matter. I hope it does not happen again.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The member for Murray-Mallee talks about the Minister making decisions at whim. There is, I think, an implication of not being accountable. May I remind the honourable member that the Minister is democratically elected by the people of South Australia and is accountable to them.

Amendments negatived; clause passed.

Clause 4—'Act not to apply to certain places.'

Mr LEWIS: This is an important clause because it satisfies the anxieties of local government in that the names of municipalities, districts or wards constituted or establishing under the Local Government Act are exempt. The Minister stood up and prated piously about how much the Local Government Association approved of what she was doing—but only because this is included here. In other words, the Minister cannot fiddle with them. Neither can the Minister fiddle with an electoral district, division or subdivision established either under the Constitution Act or the Electoral Act. Nor can the Minister fiddle around with the names of roads or streets, whoever the Minister may be, whether it is the honourable lady on the front bench or someone else. That, of course, satisfies the concerns in a particular context of some of the organisations from which the Minister so piously said she had approval.

Clause 4 (2) quite simply means that the Government can do as it jolly well pleases. Under this clause the Governor may, by proclamation, exempt any place or place of a type or kind from the provisions of this Act, and this would be done to suit the Minister herself or any subsequent Minister. That is a very wide power indeed. Of course, if the Government ultimately decides that that is not an appropriate thing to have done, it can turn turtle on it under clause 3 and simply reverse it.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I point out to the honourable member that clause 4 is identical with the previous provision except that the language of 1969 has been modernised. A period of 21 years has elapsed since the original Bill. There have been no amendments to the original Bill in that period, and I am informed that clause 4 provides exactly what is provided in the current Act, but the language has been made a little more modern and possibly a little easier to understand. Therefore, I do not believe that the concerns and criticisms raised by the honourable member are valid. If they are valid, why did the honourable member not seek to amend this particular part of the original legislation during the rather lengthy period that he has been in this House?

Mr LEWIS: So that the honourable lady can understand—

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: A point of order, Mr Chairman. I ask the honourable member to address me in the same way as he addresses my colleagues. The way in which the honourable member addresses my colleagues is to call them the honourable Minister. I am not sure why I have to be given the title of the honourable lady.

The CHAIRMAN: The Standing Orders require members to address other members by the title of their electoral district or their elected office, so I ask members to comply with that Standing Order.

Mr LEWIS: I will not call her an honourable lady; I will happily refer to her as the Minister or, if she prefers, the member for wherever she has been elected.

The CHAIRMAN: The correct title is 'Minister'.

Mr LEWIS: Earlier today the Speaker took a member to task for referring to another member using the third person pronoun. I did not wish to call the honourable Minister 'her' for fear that I might offend. At that time, I thought it might be more appropriate to use the other appellation that I have been using; however, I will desist.

The Minister's comments about clause 4 having been, in effect, included in the original legislation are correct. However, contextually the provisions are quite different in their impact. We now have a Bill under which the Minister has enormous power but where previously that was not so. To provide clause 4 in addition to the other powers that have now been given to the Minister makes for lots of mischief, because within a matter of 24 to 36 hours, in the event, say, that the Opposition or another aggrieved party drew attention to the mischief being perpetrated by a subsequent

Minister exercising powers found elsewhere, the Minister could simply revoke the decision of the Governor by having another meeting of Executive Council.

The Minister knows, as you do, Sir, that Executive Council is comprised of the Governor and three Cabinet Ministers of the Parliament. No notice of such a meeting is required. So, it is very easy to have a meeting of Executive Council with 10 minutes notice if the Government wishes. I simply make it plain that clause 4 in the context of this legislation gives much greater and wider power overall to the Executive Government of the day and to the Minister in particular, than was the case under the previous legislation.

Mr BRINDAL: As it appears that our—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I want to ask the Minister a question if the member for Spence does not mind.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair does mind. The member for Spence is out of order. The member for Hayward.

Mr BRINDAL: I notice that clause 4 does not give the Minister power over streets and roads. Does the Minister think that is a good idea? There are some streets and roads which run through several municipalities and they may cause concern. I also contend that some streets and roads are of State significance—for example, Anzac Highway. If the Minister is to have these powers, I would ask her to consider the fact that there may be certain roads and streets over which the Minister and this Parliament should exercise at least some indirect authority. Has the Minister considered that point?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Generally speaking, most roads are primarily contained within local government areas and it is appropriate that local government should be given responsibility for the naming of those roads. The honourable member referred to principal roads. There is a proposal to have a Principal Roads Act which would deal with the situation he has raised. It is a relevant point, but I do not think we want a larger State bureaucracy naming roads. Local government has that responsibility. Any streets or roads that may cut across a number of local government areas will be dealt with in the proposed new Act.

Clause passed.

Clause 5—'Act binds Crown.'

Mr LEWIS: The Opposition has no difficulty with this clause. We simply wish to place on record that it should and does bind the Crown. The Urban Land Trust has been guilty of mischief in the past, and other statutory authorities which are sacred cows to the Minister and other members of her Party often set out to please themselves. Were it not for clause 5, it would not be possible to call them to heel.

Clause passed.

Clause 6 passed.

Clause 7—'Power of Minister to delegate.'

Mr LEWIS: Taken in conjunction with clause 6, this is the king hit clause. It provides that the Minister may delegate any or all of her powers to the person for the time being occupying a particular office or position. In other words, the Minister can delegate her power under this legislation to anybody at all, and that is incredible. I wonder whom the Minister has in mind. If the Surveyor-General and the Geographical Names Advisory Committee, as contained in paragraphs *(a)* and *(b)*, are not sufficient bodies or individuals to whom authority ought to be delegated, I cannot imagine who else it ought to be. It astonishes me that the Minister, with all the powers she has under this legislation, needs to be able to delegate them to somebody else so that she can do other than what she would have us believe—and that is duck shove. Delegation can happen one hour and be retracted the next so long as a note is written establishing the fact that it was delegated for that time. I am astonished that that measure of flexibility and width of discretion is necessary.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The clause is fairly explicit. It provides that the Minister may delegate—

(a) to the Surveyor-General;
(b) to the Geographical Names Advisory Committee; or
(c) to the person for the time being occupying a particular office or position.

The reason for this clause is to ensure that matters which have been dealt with every day for the past 21 years in a routine way will continue to be dealt with in that way. The honourable member does not understand the way in which this Act has operated in the past. The Minister does not need to approve every routine naming of a particular suburb or place. This ensures that the practice that has been established continues, and that it does so with some commonsense and streamlining to provide a service to the community that is both effective and efficient.

Mr LEWIS: For people with commonsense, goodwill and respect for the opinions of others, that is all very well, but it was laws like this that resulted in the Nuremberg trials.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It is a long bow to draw, but we will not debate that.

Clause passed.

Clause 8—'Assignation of geographical name.'

Mr LEWIS: This clause contains much red tape and is an enormous sham. It strikes me as quaint that we should find ourselves confronted with the kind of nonsense that is contained in part of this clause. I guess I know what some people have been trying to achieve when they set out these ideas, but what is now made possible is something quite different again. However, let me draw attention in particular to subclause (5). Members will recall that I asked them to remember the definition of 'place'. Subclause (5) provides:

The Minister may assign to a place a dual geographical name that is comprised of—
(a) an Aboriginal name—

The word 'original', as claimed by the Minister, is not mentioned. In fact, it does not say anything at all about originality, the former name by which any feature or place was known. It does not require that to be taken into consideration, but it provides:

an Aboriginal name that is the Aboriginal name used for that place.

It does not say that that is necessarily the name used by the tribe of Aborigines who occupied that locality at the time of European settlement. It does not say anything about that. Although the Minister said closing the second reading debate and indeed in the introduction of the legislation that it would be in circumstances only where there was an Aboriginal name for any 'place'—and we know what the definition of that is—we now find that subclause (5) *(b)* provides that a dual geographical name can be assigned. Therefore, Adelaide or Tailem Bend, for example, could be known by another name, and it does not say that it has to be Aboriginal at all.

Mr Atkinson: It could be a European name.

Mr LEWIS: Obviously, that is what is envisaged: it would not be there if that was not so. No matter what the Minister says, that is exactly the effect of the legislation as it is drafted.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Rubbish!

Mr LEWIS: The Minister may assign a dual geographical name to a place—and we know what the definition of 'place'

is. In fact, I can read it for the Minister if she has forgotten it. The Bill defines 'place' as:

> ... any area, region, locality, city, suburb, town, township, or settlement, or any geographical or topographical feature, and includes any railway station, hospital, school and any other place or building...

The clause provides that a place, as defined in the Bill, can have a dual geographical name that is comprised of any name, the one that it already has, and another name—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Exactly. I ask members opposite to remember my second reading contribution when I quoted quite deliberately the second reading explanation of the Minister when she introduced this measure. One of its objects was to remove confusion for emergency services, like ambulance, police and the fire brigade who need to be able to get to a place quickly, and especially in this day and age where we use air ambulances and helicopters. Unless the maps carried in air ambulances and aircraft used for firefighting contain both names, how will they know where to find the place by which it is otherwise known if it is not on the map? The Minister said that she was trying to eliminate confusion by ensuring that this did not happen; yet this provision ensures not only that it probably will but that it certainly will, whenever it takes the whimsical inclination of the Minister to do so, under the powers given to the Minister that we have discussed already.

Mr Atkinson: That is a long bow.

Mr LEWIS: Nonsense; that is true. The power would not be there if it was not intended to be used. The honourable member knows that this Minister will stop at nothing when it suits convenience. We only need look at the way she has dealt with the people at Finniss Springs to understand that, if we study the law that she has screwed up on in that context. I do not understand why, on the one hand, the Minister has said one thing and, on the other, done another. It does not make sense. It is irrational and unreasonable, and will ultimately lead to even greater confusion than we have already.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The honourable member is becoming more emotional as the night wears on. Quite obviously two situations are being accommodated by this clause. One is the whole concept of naming places under the dual system, using the original Aboriginal name—

Mr Lewis: It doesn't say that.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thought I gave the honourable member an opportunity to clearly restate his point on a number of occasions. Clause 8 (5) *(a)* provides:

> an Aboriginal name that is the Aboriginal name used for that place.

That means the name that the Aboriginal people have used for that place. I clearly explained in my response to the second reading debate what that meant, that there would be consultation with Aboriginal communities. I point out to the honourable member, if he is prepared to listen to my explanation, that Aboriginal people did not have names for specific things like hospitals, schools, buildings, etc. Indeed, they did not even have an Aboriginal name for Adelaide. They had names for areas and some geographical or geological features. We are talking about not replacing that name. I thought I made that very clear. How can there be confusion for the people providing emergency services, because the name that exists now will be retained, and an Aboriginal name will be used also?

The further point I make is that emergency services in fact access the computer information of the Department of Lands and would have all that information at their disposal at very short notice. The other reason for incuding clause 8 (5) *(b)*, 'another name', is to deal in a sensitive and commonsense way with the whole issue of estate names. For the benefit of the honourable member, I have in front of me a number of acceptable and unacceptable uses of estate names. One advertisement contains two estate names and there is absolutely no reference to the proper geographical name or the name used by Australia Post or emergency services, etc.

Another advertisement refers to the 'Bird Haven Estate', with 'Parafield Gardens' clearly printed underneath. The whole idea was to try to incorporate the ability of developers and real estate agents when using estate names to identify particularly a new part of a suburb. However, there is now a mandatory requirement under this legislation to ensure that they do not use the estate name separate from the proper geographical name.

I thought that any reasonable person might have been at least gracious enough to acknowledge that we are not trying to ride roughshod over the business community and that we are trying to meet the very real concerns of, on the one hand, the State Emergency Service, Telecom, Australia Post and others and, on the other hand, acknowledging that we live in a society in which people wish to advertise their product. In this case, it is a new estate with new development, so then the new estate name can be used, provided that in very clear, bold lettering the original name or the name by which that area is legally known is retained.

I believe that that is a commonsense way to move forward but, in terms of the nitpicking about the use of Aboriginal names, I wonder whether the honourable member has some other agenda; I do not know. We believe that it is an important recognition and acknowledgement of Aboriginal history and culture and of the fact that many prominent geological features have been known for a long time, through Aboriginal history and culture by a particular name. I should like to stress that we will not remove the Anglicised name.

We are not going to replace that name. We are not about making judgments about which culture will have supremacy with respect to the naming of a particular feature. We are trying to recognise the importance of living in a society whose original culture has been here for many thousands of years. Most reasonable people would welcome and acknowledge that recognition which this Bill now gives.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I did not intend to speak to this Bill, but I want to make one or two points. I remember when particular places were given different names: when Hahndorf was called Ambleside and Lobethal called Tweedvale, because of a war, and I remember for how long afterwards it caused confusion. My family has lived in the same valley since the early 1850s and, in one case, the late 1840s. People who were what some would call the traditional users of that land were still within that area, and many modern ideas of what Aboriginal people called certain areas are not true.

I believe that, suddenly, descendants of a race have decided to come forward, quite often without any real historical record of an area, and concocted names that may not be appropriate to particular areas. People can attack me or do what they like about that. Warri Parri, the name given to the suburb that is now Flagstaff Hill, was the Aboriginal term for a tree-lined stream, but it could have been any stream anywhere in the State—it was not just the Sturt Creek. However, someone used it as a name for that area.

Members may be interested to know that in Coromandel Valley, where there is a public utility, there is actually an Aboriginal burial ground. One lady has complete records of it and, wisely, I think, retains the records without causing embarrassment to the community or to those who use that public facility. Perhaps those who use the public facility may not be using it in the very near future because of a

change of location; that may give an indication of where it is.

However, this burial ground was known to the white community and to the traditional people. Some places that were claimed to be burial grounds were not, in fact, so, because, in most cases, except in rocky areas where they could not dig holes and carried out the service above the ground (if I can call it a service, recognising how important it was to them), the burial grounds in the near city areas were alongside streams on the silt banks, where it was easier to dig. Of course, in those days they did not have front-end loaders, back hoes, shovels and picks.

They chose the easiest spot to dig and bury; that was only commonsense, and they have the wisdom to know that, without a doubt, as anybody else would know—even those of us who came later. I would just say that I have a concern about some of the names that I believe have been 'concocted' today from how an area was termed, when that term could have been used generally for many other spots within the State, depending on where the nomadic tribe was at any particular time.

I have never spoken on the subject before, but our family does have some records of the traditional people in that valley, and it would be the same throughout the State. Many modern 'do-gooders' are not really interested in the truth about the race that inhabited the area but are telling stories in order to get a bit of limelight.

Personally, I strongly object to the two names scenario. Whether it involves a developer who is trying to capitalise on a fancy name to sell a piece of land and convince people it is the 'Golden circle' or the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow, it does not impress me. I know that in Coromandel East people had trouble over postal deliveries and there was an argument whether it was Ironbank or Cherry Gardens, although that may not have been relevant to the Minister's portfolio at the time. Right through the Hills in Upper Sturt and Hawthorndene, two names were used. I refer particularly to Coromandel Valley and Coromandel East, where there was confusion, even with the salespeople selling land. We need one name because, in the end, a group of residents move in and they say that they are Coromandel East; others say, 'No, you are Cherry Gardens' and others say, 'No, you are Ironbank.' This did split the community for nearly five years and it was not worth it.

Mr LEWIS: I guess the Minister's misunderstanding of my point arises from the terms that are used and the literal meaning of those terms. 'Aborigine' is the noun, used to describe original inhabitants and, by the way, it is not a word that comes from the language of any of the original inhabitants of this continent. An 'Aborigine' is a person who is wholly descendent from people who were living here prior to the arrival of Europeans at the time of settlement, whenever that was in the past 150 to 200 years. 'Aboriginal' is a pronoun and it means someone or something that has some relationship to the culture of Aborigines—somebody who may be born of one parent of another race and one parent of Aboriginal extraction.

Indeed, an 'Aborigine' is not properly referred to as an 'Aboriginal'. Something which comes from the culture of Aborigines is possibly referred to as an adjective: 'Aboriginal'. I think it is unfortunate if the Minister meant 'original', as it would have been more appropriate for her to use terms which ensured that it was original. She has not. The legislation does not. Notwithstanding that, given the explanation she has made, I accept that she does mean that it shall be a name given to a feature—an explicit name for that feature—by the original inhabitants of the land upon which that feature stands or is to be found.

Notwithstanding my explanation of the reason for what I think is the difference between my understanding and that of the Minister, I accept in all sincerity the explanation which she gave. I still believe that the problem of confusion that we sought to address by the introduction of this legislation is still going to be there, and emergency services will ultimately get it wrong and it will cost someone their life and/or their property, depending on whether it is a heart attack, a bushfire or something of that nature. I know that the Government is determined to see through the measure in its current form, and I have no further comment on this or any other clause.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I will respond to the comments of the member for Davenport. It was interesting that he made his comments and then left the Chamber: he was not prepared to give me the courtesy of replying, but I trust that he will read *Hansard* tomorrow. He referred to the World War I situation where German names were changed to English names. I guess that he was highlighting the level of paranoia and racism that existed. I put to the Committee that some of the arguments we have heard tonight incorporate the same level of paranoia and racism dressed up in other clothes. I am not being critical of the member for Davenport.

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am saying that the period in which these name changes were made was one in which there was extreme paranoia and racism. I am suggesting that the opposition to dual naming—using Aboriginal and English names—based on the argument that some Aboriginal people will make up these names really has the same kind of flavour about it. I am sad to say that, because it really is sad that we live in a community where we as white people will make value judgments about the Aboriginal people based on an assumption that they might make up names. I cannot understand where someone would come from in making that kind of assertion. Why would Aboriginal people want to make up names for features or areas of historical and traditional significance to them? It defies reason and logic in my view. I do not intend to pursue it.

I place on the public record that it is sad that the debate has gone off on this tangent when the intent and spirit of the legislation as well as its practical implications and implementation will show that it will not mean that every place, hospital, building and everything else (and the member for Murray-Mallee has graciously acknowledged that) will use two names. Probably not a lot of areas within urban Adelaide will be covered by this legislation. However, whilst I am prepared to listen to the discussion and negotiation, I cannot accept the rationale upon which opposition to this clause is based.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (9 to 18) and title passed.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): The Opposition is very disappointed with the Bill as it comes out of Committee. There is still the grave risk of confusion and the opportunity for ministerial fiat and interference in what should otherwise have been an apolitical process in determining a placename for any one place. Accordingly, we can only hope that, because we are fortunate enough to belong to a bicameral Parliament, appropriate understanding and amendment will be achieved in another place.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (21)—Messrs Atkinson, Bannon, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Heron, Holloway and Hopgood, Mrs Hutchison, Mr Klunder, Ms Lenehan (teller), Messrs McKee, Quirke, Rann and Trainer.

Noes (20)—Messrs Allison, Armitage, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, Becker, Blacker and Brindal, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn and Ingerson, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis (teller), Matthew, Oswald, Such and Venning.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs L.M.F. Arnold and Mayes. Noes—Messrs Chapman and Meier.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

CLEAN AIR (OPEN AIR BURNING) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 August. Page 85.)

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): This is a lapsed Bill that has already been dealt with by the House of Assembly, and I therefore do not propose to speak at any length on it beyond acknowledging that the amendments are being sought in response to local council requests, notably, Thebarton, Glenelg, Henley and Grange, and Unley. Most members of the Assembly have received complaints from their constituents and will know that the power of local government to deal with these matters is very much wanted by most residents, not only in city areas but also in country areas.

I have received representations from people in country towns who resent the reluctance of some country councils to come to grips with placing prohibitions on backyard burning. I feel sure that the day is not far distant when country councils will follow the example of metropolitan councils and seek to use these powers. The Opposition is pleased to support the Bill.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Obviously I support this Bill which is an extension of the Clean Air Act. The provisions of this Bill result from a review of the backyard burning legislation that is administered by local councils under the Clean Air Act. Those changes which required amendments to the regulations have already been implemented. Local councils responded to the survey about problems in administering backyard burning controls, and these are clarified by the insertion of definitions of 'open fire' (as distinct from a properly constructed furnace or incinerator) and 'domestic incinerator'.

The main features of the Bill include, first, a definition of 'domestic incinerator' in clause 3. Councils had some difficulties administering aspects of the regulations. The current definition of 'domestic incinerator' refers to a certain size and its use by less than three private households. Thus, councils could not apply the domestic burning rules to blocks of three or more flats, even though they are clearly residential premises and, being in residential areas, were directly affecting single dwellings.

Secondly, the new definition will mean that consistent rules apply to all residential premises with domestic incinerators. This is even more important in view of the prohibition of backyard burning being sought by some councils. Thirdly, where large industrial standard incinerators form part of a block of flats, they will be dealt with by the Department of Environment and Planning officers. Strict emission standards specified by the Act are applied rather than there being just a limitation on the times that burning is allowed.

The disposal of rubbish by a fire in the open on non-domestic premises is prohibited except when a council's written permission has been obtained. This regulation has been retained from before the introduction of domestic burning controls. In some circumstances, a council could allow 'one-off' burns of timber or other waste which would not have significant impact, whilst generally discouraging such uncontrolled burning. Permission is rarely given, but there are still occasions in remote district councils when it may be acceptable.

On some occasions councils have found fires in either open-topped drums or partially enclosed areas which are not acceptable as incinerators but which at present are not clearly 'fires in the open'. This definition is similar to that contained in the New South Wales Clean Air Act. It will allow councils to class fires in 205 litre drums and the like as fires in the open and to take appropriate action to eliminate their regular use on commercial and industrial premises, as the legislation originally intended.

It has been said that this Bill is a rehash, but what I am saying certainly is not. I believe that the consultation process and the financial, environmental and social justice impacts have been discussed with respect to this matter. I do not intend to delay the Bill; however, I believe that this legislation will complement the existing legislation and that this amendment will tidy up an area that has been of concern to many people in the community.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I want to speak briefly to this Bill because this is one of the few measures brought in by the Minister for Environment and Planning that I can support. I want to put on record that this Minister has done very little in recent months which I think is sensible. We have had the water rates fiasco and we have just had the naming of suburbs fiasco, but here is something which I can support. So, I want to put on record that I support the Bill.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): The Bill as it stands is quite acceptable; I have no problem with it. I simply wish to draw the Minister's attention to a couple of practices which I think she could have addressed through this legislation, but which nonetheless may be prohibited by it. In the first instance, I speak on behalf of horticulturists—our market gardeners. The Minister and some members of this place would know that there is only one way to deal with fungal diseases of some horticultural crops, or at least the residual parts of them, once the crop is harvested, and that is to destroy them by burning—there is no other way. It is not sensible or appropriate to attempt to compost them, regardless of whether they are stone fruit prunings, vine prunings or other remains of beans, tomatoes and strawberries which carry verticillium wilt. Whilst members and the Minister may argue that it would be possible to remove those remnant crop plants entirely as waste, that would be prohibitively expensive.

I believe that a provision ought to be made to enable past practices, which have been continuing for decades, to continue. They have been drawn to the Minister's attention since the Clean Air Act was introduced as practices made difficult by the legislation, and they are now outlawed by it. In my opinion, they ought not to have been outlawed; that it is not reasonable or fair.

Another point: based on the same line of reasoning, as given by the Minister in her remarks in the last half an

hour or so, I am surprised that a provision was not included in this amending legislation or, for that matter, in the original legislation, to allow Aborigines to continue to do what they have done for thousands of years. If they choose on any particular or special occasion within the area proclaimed by the Act, to light a campfire as and when it suits them, as long as in doing so they put no-one else's property at immediate risk. Under the terms of this legislation, it is forbidden for Aborigines to attempt to do what they have been able and may seek to do as part of that traditional practice. To my mind, that smacks of double standards, and that is unfortunate.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning): I thank honourable members for their support for this small but quite significant piece of legislation which clarifies a number of areas. I will not take up the time of the House. I thank honourable members for their contributions and support.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I ask this question at the request of the member for Heysen who is unable to be present for the debate. He would be interested to know whether there are any plans to introduce regulations regarding combustion stoves—in other words, pot-bellied stoves—not to cover existing installations but to cover new installations. The Minister will be aware of the complaints that are intensifying, particularly in built-up areas, about the pollution and the toxic fumes that can be emitted from such stoves, particularly when inappropriate material is incinerated. We would be interested to know what proposals, if any, the Government has to deal with that problem.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I know that you, Mr Chairman, also have some concerns about this area, as do other members and myself. It is not a simple matter to address, because there are many complexities in this whole issue. We are looking at having some national standards with respect to the control of combustion stoves or, as the honourable member said, pot-bellied stoves as they are more commonly called, which are used in the winter for heating purposes. Quite a deal of work is presently being done on that matter. There are already recommendations to increase the height of the flues above roof level. I shall be looking to introducing that requirement.

However, what we need is a package of measures which encompasses the whole concept of education. We are also considering regulating specifications for particular types of combustion stoves so that new stoves would have to comply with regulatory standardised requirements, such as the height of the flue being at a certain level above the roof. What we cannot legislate for, unless we have an army of combustion stove inspectors, are the materials that people put into those stoves. Instead of putting in dry wood, they put in green timber, plastic containers, children's disused toys and a whole range of totally unacceptable packaging.

The honourable member referred to toxic fumes coming out of chimneys and flues. When I bring in the regulations, we will need to have an educational campaign as a package. Perhaps all local members might want to be part of it in terms of getting the information out to their constituents and so on. I do not think that it will work unless we can convince people to send certain items off to be recycled rather than put into slow combustion stoves.

I am aware of the issue and I am addressing it. As work is going on at national level in terms of having a national approach to clean air regulations and standards, it is important that we move in concert with other States to ensure that the new appliances meet certain requirements and that the stoves are properly vented and the flues are at certain heights. As I said, I think we need an educational package. I shall be happy to provide further information to honourable members as it comes to hand.

The only other question that might be asked is whether I am proposing to ban them. The answer is that I am not. One would not do that first up. That would be an extreme way of addressing the issue. We have to move forward to educate and to regulate where it is sensible and appropriate. That is the way that I intend to handle this issue.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST (WANILLA)

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. S.M. Lenehan:

That this House resolves to recommend to Her Excellency the Governor that, pursuant to section 16 (1) of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act 1966-1975, sections 160 and 166, hundred of Wanilla be transferred to the Aboriginal Lands Trust and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

(Continued from 14 August. Page 172.)

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): The Opposition is happy to accommodate the Government and, more particularly, the Minister in her desire to have this land at Wanilla transferred to the Aboriginal Lands Trust. In examining the remarks of the Minister in moving the motion, we see what the Government is doing—and the Opposition wants to place this clearly on the record. The responsibility and the odium for this proposition rests squarely and quite fairly in the Government's lap. The Government is setting up the Aboriginal people on Eyre Peninsula, particularly those members of the Port Lincoln Aboriginal Organisation (PLAO) for a fall. In our opinion, that is just not fair.

If one looks at what the Minister said in her remarks, we can see that the Wanilla Forest Reserve has been there for nearly 100 years. There has been no clear felling of any stand of timber that has been planted or that forest reserve for timber purposes in that time. Some of those trees are well over 60 years old; in fact, some are over 70 years old, and some of them still have not reached full size. There is no doubt that the land in question comprises some of the best farming land on Eyre Peninsula, but what is happening is that the Government and the Minister have said that it has become apparent that this forest cannot be sustained as a commercial operation. In other words, it is not viable or appropriate. But then just a little further on in her remarks the Minister states:

The PLAO will then be charged with the management of the Wanilla forest under lease from the Aboriginal Lands Trust. Its management program will provide training and jobs for about 30 Aboriginal people in five years in four major areas:

Forestry operations—

The Opposition wonders why the Government wants to train Aborigines in skills and jobs for an industry that cannot exist viably in that locality. We just think that that is cruel, quite unfair, unjust and unreasonable. The Port Lincoln Aboriginal Organisation has been sold a pup and has been conned. It has as its ultimate aim the benefit of the Aboriginal people of Port Lincoln and districts, so the Minister said in proposing this measure.

It may be an excellent project in her mind, but it is typical of some of the things she has brought into this Chamber, in that it has not been thought through. It is pretty much a matter of 'Do it now and fix it later.' Clearly, there will be Aboriginal people trained in skills for jobs for which they should not be trained because they cannot in all conscience exist in an industry which is not viable and which is not going to be there once the trees in the forest reserve have been felled.

With respect to other commercial enterprises, well and good. That is a matter for appropriate management to determine their success or otherwise. However, I say again on behalf of the Opposition that it is really quite cruel to give those people an expectation that they can run a viable forestry enterprise when the Minister, presumably advised by officers of the department of her colleague the Minister of Forests, has quite clearly and categorically assessed the forestry proposal to be other than commercially viable.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I do not quite take the same line as that of the member for Murray-Mallee, although I understand his concern that members of the Port Lincoln Aboriginal Organisation (PLAO) may have some difficulty in making a viable unit from it. However, the history concerning this matter is that the Wanilla forest was not considered to be a commercial operation as it presently stands and as it is presently managed. Local people believe that efforts could be made to make the forest much more commercially viable than was the case. Certainly many local citizens on Lower Eyre Peninsula in particular were very concerned that their source of fencing poles and posts dried up when the Government decided it would no longer cut and treat posts from that area. For many of the local people, the type of timber grown there was a good, serviceable fence and shed post, and that particular avenue of enterprise no longer could exist.

Having made the decision for whatever reason it cared to name, the Government then sought expressions of interest in relation to the ongoing future of the forest. As a result, nobody considered that it was possible as a commercial operation as such, and PLAO members put together a proposal to try to undertake the management of the forest, partly as a training scheme and partly as a workplace for Aborigines to train in certain areas. One could always argue whether that training would be of long-term benefit. However, the PLAO people have sought this and have endeavoured to carry it through to the end.

There was some local concern that adequate fire control measures might not be in place. Some of the local farmers were concerned that they might get burnt out as a result of a fire within the forest getting out of control. One could only hope that, with proper training and proper firebreaks, the same precautions that have been used over the past 60 or 80 years could be maintained. That was a concern expressed by some of the residents.

Another concern relates to the pressure treatment plant currently on the site but no longer operational. There was some contamination of the soil immediately adjacent to that plant. An undertaking was given by the Woods and Forests Department that there would be restitution of that land and that it would be locked away, so that it would be impossible for anyone either to traverse that land or to further extend the contamination. Furthermore, undertakings were given that, should there be a natural watercourse in the area, it would be diverted around that section. I seek the Minister's assurance that the undertakings presently given will be honoured. I believe that work is currently under way; in fact, it may even be completed, although I cannot be sure of that at the moment. That matter needs to be addressed because the potential contamination in an uncontrolled area as a result of spillage from the pressure treatment plant could have longer-term ramifications. The last thing that PLAO wants is to be held responsible for that contamination at some time in the future.

I took the trouble to contact the District Council of Lower Eyre Peninsula concerning this matter, and there have been long-term and ongoing discussions between the council and PLAO. The council, which has no concerns whatsoever, believes that the negotiations that have taken place have been fair to all parties, and it supports the acceptance of this motion.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Lands): I will not take the time of the House other than to put on the public record a response to the honourable member, who is the local member. I want to reassure him that, as he is probably aware, under the agreement between the State Government and the Aboriginal Lands Trust, the Woods and Forests Department agreed to fence the area of contaminated land and to divert the surface water from the site and to plant the land with appropriate ground cover both to prevent wind erosion and to discourage human access.

The honourable member was kind enough to ask me about this matter when I moved this motion, and I am informed that all these works are presently in progress and will be completed by the time of the hand-over to the Aboriginal Lands Trust. I ask the honourable member to give his constituents an assurance that the undertakings that have been given will be carried through, and that they will not have to bear any responsibility for that area—which, of course, is contaminated because it was used for the treatment of timber. I think we are all well aware of the consequences of that kind of treatment with CCA and other harmful substances. I am very pleased to have on the public record that the honourable member's request will be met.

Motion carried.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST (COPLEY)

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. S.M. Lenehan:

That this House resolves to recommend to Her Excellency the Governor that, pursuant to section 16 (1) of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act 1966, section 1278, out of hundreds (Copley), be transferred to the Aboriginal Lands Trust; and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

(Continued from 14 August. Page 172.)

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Once again, the Opposition in principle has no difficulty in supporting this proposal to transfer the land at Copley where it is outside the hundreds. However, we are worried about which piece of land is involved, and wonder whether the Minister has satisfied herself that it has been accurately and properly identified on the ground. I leave it to someone with much greater empathy with the area, the member for Eyre, to explain in some detail how and why the Opposition has some concern in this regard.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I have no problem supporting the motion. I am well aware of the piece of land and the building in question, which is in very close proximity to the community hall at Copley. As I was in the area, I visited the site on Friday to make a brief inspection and to determine whether there was a boundary between the land on which the community hall is situated and the land currently

known as the community welfare office, which is situated on the old common land.

The building will be put to good use, and I have no problem with that. I would be pleased if the Minister could advise the House whether a correct survey has been carried out to ensure that there will be no confusion in relation to the title of the hall, and that the land that we are agreeing to transfer is the land in question and not some other piece of land. I am sure that the Aboriginal people will put the land to good use. There is a sizeable community at Copley. That community needs a facility, and this is the most suitable. I have been in the office a number of times, and I sincerely hope that the Minister can assure me that there is no problem with the adjoining landholding.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Lands): The honourable member paid me the courtesy of letting me know that he would raise this question. I have before me, and am very pleased to make available to the honourable member, an official survey plan or diagram, whatever the proper terminology is, showing that the survey was carried out on 17 December 1990. Signed on behalf of the Surveyor-General on 20 December 1990, it clearly spells out that this involves the transfer of section 1278, out of hundreds (Copley), to the Aboriginal Lands Trust.

I thank the honourable member for raising this matter. It is important, and we must make sure we get it right. The honourable member informed me that there were two buildings in very close proximity and it was very important that a proper survey be carried out. I am informed that that occurred and I am happy to show the honourable member the official plan.

Motion carried.

JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D.J. Hopgood:

That a select committee be established to examine—

(a) the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act and the effectiveness of its operation;

(b) the administration of the Children's Court;

(c) the resources devoted to the juvenile justice system and their effectiveness;

(d) the adequacy of custodial and non-custodial programs for juvenile offenders and the extent to which the services provided by Government agencies and the Children's Court can more closely be integrated;

(e) the problems of truancy; and

(f) such other matters which relate to juvenile justice.

(Continued from 22 August. Page 453.)

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): It is nice to see that the State Government has suddenly decided that the administration of juvenile justice in this State needs a thorough overhaul. There is no doubt about that, and the Opposition is in total agreement. The public knows it; the Opposition has been telling the House now for some six years that the Bannon Government has been in trouble with its administration of juvenile justice and, indeed, I think it is about time that this select committee was set up. The present system has failed. There is no doubt about that; it has failed and juvenile crime is out of control in this State.

We are no longer bringing children before the courts quickly and, when we do, the children do not even know where they stand, and I will talk about that shortly. The community is fed up with the way children are constantly recycled through the system. There is no deterrent to recidivism, and I would be interested if anyone in the debate tonight puts forward an alternative point of view. The perception in the public arena at the moment is that there is no deterrent.

The aid panels are filtering out about 85 per cent of young offenders, but 15 per cent are getting through. Of these 15 per cent, about 200 children are constantly being recycled through the courts, and the Bannon Government is floundering about ways to combat this. It is a grave indictment that, when we work on the statistics, we find that nearly three-quarters of those now in adult prisons have been through the juvenile court system at some time or another, which means that the impact of that system has been a total failure.

The senior judge of the Children's Court, Judge Kingsley Newman, is on record as saying:

> I fear we have a very good system for those children who do not need it and not a great deal to offer those that do.

What an indictment of the Bannon Government's law and order policies. The role of the select committee is to find out what is wrong with the present system. We know from the statistics that the system has failed, and I will refer to those statistics shortly. The select committee must identify what is wrong with the administration between the Department for Family and Community Services and the court that the hard core of budding criminals is not being detected and stopped from reoffending. It is very obvious that present sentencing options and the Family and Community Services Department policies have not had an impact on the accelerating crime rate in our community. Indeed, it can be said with some substance that FACS policies are indeed helping it. I will come to the allegations that have been made to me, shortly.

The committee's consideration of sentencing options will also be vital. The time it takes to sentence youngsters is extraordinary when one considers the time the offence took place. I know of one case where, by the time a child who had shoplifted a $5 watch was eventually brought before the judge, 12 months had elapsed.

This time was taken up with deferrals in the court, adjournments, legal opinions being sought and various other procedures. When that child came before the judge 12 months after the event, she was wondering why she was there. The case went for a full day, at great expense to the taxpayer. That case was to be adjourned and brought on the next day, but was headed off only because the senior judge spoke to the prosecution and asked where the case was going. Members may well ask what relevance penalties have so long after the event. Indeed, that has to be part of our study and I will come to it later. We have the ludicrous situation in this State whereby children are re-offending whilst waiting for previous offences to be heard.

I know of cases where children who are under supervision on a bond, re-offend. They wait 12 months for their case to be heard, and during that time other offences build up. The first case is heard and they are discharged, and other cases are still pending—it is ludicrous. With this select committee we have the opportunity to set in place procedures to speed up the flow through the Children's Court. If we do not do that, the committee will fail. It is no wonder that people hold the system in contempt. It is no wonder that the community also lacks confidence in the system and in the Government's attitude on crime prevention when children are constantly recycled with the system having no impact on them.

I thought the idea of children coming before a court is for them to feel some shame. However, most of them feel no shame at all. They stand there like matches. The adversarial system is such these days, with legal representatives and social workers speaking for the child, that seldom is

the child or the parent spoken to. Seldom is the victim involved: usually they are not even informed of the court hearing. At the end of the day the child walks out of the court and says, 'Did I get off?' That child does not feel that it has been part of the justice system. Indeed, the select committee will have to look carefully at the handling of children so that they feel that they have been part of the court procedure and feel some shame for what they have done.

The interaction between the court and the Department for Family and Community Services, responsible for implementing the Children's Court penalties, will occupy much of the time of the committee. All members at some time or another have been confronted with this issue by constituents. It has been put to me that, rather than faithfully implementing a magistrate's penalties, the department varies them administratively without reference back to the court. That serious allegation has been made to me on several occasions. I will raise that issue on the select committee.

I said a moment ago that children stand like a match before the court, but the judge is in the same position under the present system. Assessments are done by the department and, before the child appears before the court, the legal play goes on between the social worker and the lawyer representing the child. The judge is compelled to accept the assessment, otherwise the department will not implement it, and indeed it is usually the assessment that carries the day. In fact, the assessment is worked out well before the case is heard by the court. I have heard judges and magistrates say that they play no role in the administration, handing down or working out of penalties. That is wrong and is another matter to which the committee needs to pay careful regard.

One of the reasons for the increase in crime is that court orders are becoming ineffective and irrelevant. They are certainly not creating a deterrent, and it is interesting how many of these juveniles stop offending when they turn 18. They seem quite happy to roll along with their litany of offences, but as soon as they turn 18 it is marvellous how dramatically the offence rate drops off. What worries me is that under the present Government it is made so easy for youngsters to reoffend that, when they grow up, they continue to commit offences. That is borne out in the statistics which were provided by Judge Newman two or three weeks ago and which show that 74 per cent of prisoners in the adult jurisdiction have at some time gone through the juvenile courts.

The link between the Children's Court and the ongoing supervision of children by the Department for Family and Community Services, which is not accountable to the sentencing judge or magistrate (and that must be born in mind) will also have to be addressed. I will refer to that later, because I imagine that all members have read the green paper and the paper put out by the Attorney-General and by Judge Newman. The judge is appealing for improved accountability by social workers to implement the wishes of the bench. As I said, it is a ludicrous situation where the bench is no longer in a position to influence the sentence and then see that it is carried out. We can have a situation where the department, through the chief executive officer, and perhaps the head of SAYTC, get into a position where they can administratively change the wishes of the judge. That is quite incredible.

The role and functions of screening panels and aid panels must be subject to scrutiny. The green paper puts up the French system. Whether that system is accepted in its entirety or whether we decide to accept only parts of it is a matter for consideration by the select committee, and it could be compared with other systems and jurisdictions. But, we will have to look at the role of those screening and aid panels, particularly to establish whether we decide to retain them in the context of a changed court system.

Whatever system we recommend, it would have to be an improvement on the present system, where the department does not expeditiously deal with all court requests and administratively changes court decisions. Whether that is because of lack of personnel or clear Government policy directive is something for the select committee to work out. However, we obviously have an hiatus of the views of the bench—the judges and the magistrates—and those views of the executives of the Department for Family and Community Services, and, no doubt, the Minister, in how it is intended that the juvenile justice system of this State should be administered. They are poles apart at the moment and it is up to the select committee to bring them back together.

Members may recall two articles in Monday's *Advertiser*. One dealt with the graffiti on 15 carriages of the Ghan and the other dealt with the rock band that has been placed on trains running between Adelaide and Gawler to assist in making them safe. In relation to the first case, one asks why it happened. In the second case, one could ask the same question: why must we provide entertainment to make a train safe and to divert the behaviour of a few youths?

The select committee will have to address this issue, but we do not need a select committee to come up with what is the obvious conclusion; that is, that there is no fear of the consequences if one is caught when one is a juvenile. Consequently, these kids tend to misbehave themselves. There is no fear of the consequences. That is the bottom line: how do we implement change so that these youths feel some shame for what they are doing? If this committee does not address community attitudes and the relationship that exists between the generations, we are wasting our time.

We will have to address community behaviour as well as the rewrite of the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act. We must examine how far we are really prepared to accept the argument for the rights of the child and the family without cutting across the rights of the parents to guide and discipline their children during their formative years. If we do not set down guidelines about where discipline starts and stops in the home and about the rights of parents, as has happened in years gone by, it is pointless trying to change the behavioural patterns of children. We must examine how far we are prepared to go in our schools in allowing teachers to teach children their 'rights'.

Whilst I concede that it is necessary to have a safety net so that children who are subject to abuse or violence have somewhere to turn, I believe that nowadays a lot of kids in schools have their minds crammed full of knowledge about their rights but, through immaturity, do not know how to handle this knowledge. Then, the conflict starts at home; the kids leave; the home breaks up; and the behavioural problems start when they get mixed up in peer groups.

We must never take away the rights of parents to administer reasonable discipline in the home. Many parents do not know where they stand any more under this present Government; many kids play on this; and their parents are left in a dilemma. We are talking about discipline and behaviour both in the community and in the juvenile justice system once children start to offend and then become offenders in the broader sense.

Paragraph *(a)* of the motion refers to the effectiveness of the operation of the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act. Various questions are to be asked. First, what is wrong with an Act which allows children to be

recycled through the Children's Court and which allows recidivism to rise to such an extent? One point of support of Judge Newman's green paper is that Paris is the only city in the world that is presently seeing a dramatic drop in juvenile crime, whereas elsewhere it is on the rise. So, perhaps there is something to be said about his system.

Secondly, why is the Children's Court no longer a deterrent? I have on file in my office a case which concerns a child who has stolen 10 motor vehicles, committed six break and enter offences and has already received several bonds with supervision. That child went back to the court, and the department's assessment was that another bond with supervision should be entered into. That child could walk out the door of the court on a bond with supervision and quite easily steal another motor vehicle that same night. So, there was no deterrent to prevent that child from reoffending.

It has been put to me (and I can quite believe it) that a good deal can be done by amending the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act so that it can deal with these 200 odd kids who are constantly being recycled through our courts. In many cases the magistrates find themselves hamstrung in handing down meaningful sentences. They have become bogged down in a slow and ineffective juvenile justice system. It is strange that the magistrates and the judges are the ones who are complaining about this, and I think this means that there must obviously be something wrong.

In his green paper Judge Newman proposed major changes to the whole court system. How much of it will be accepted by the Government will depend largely on the select committee. However, a good deal of legal argument has already been put forward indicating that the French system is not necessarily the way to go, and that we would achieve the same thing if we redrafted the Act and firmed up the powers of the judges so that they were able to make orders that would not be countermanded administratively by FACS or SAYTC.

Paragraph *(b)* of the motion concerns the administration of the Children's Court. Things must be pretty bad if the judge who set up the system is now saying that, because the courts are constantly cluttered with relatively minor matters, they cannot deal with the serious hard core group of offenders. On many occasions courts have become bogged down in complex legal argument over a case between legal counsel and social workers without the child ever becoming involved, and I have described that situation to the House. Again, in the words of Judge Newman, 'Defendants no longer present their own account of what has occurred and their victim is officially a nobody.'

The time taken to get a child before the court is ludicrous. It becomes very expensive when cases involving legal counsel and social workers are continually adjourned, especially when star players are brought from the country. There are many cases on record of the State paying for witnesses, children, parents, social workers and others to be brought to the city only to find that the case has been adjourned; in other cases, a matter is to be heard in a country town and the judge or magistrate is present, but counsel is not ready to go on. Either way, it is a very expensive process and, 12 months later, when a child has gone through this process, they come before the court and the penalty is totally irrelevant.

If a child is brought before a court a year after an offence was committed, the impact of the sentence is lost and contempt for the system by the child and the peer group is bred. We must also ask why in South Australia under the Bannon Government it takes three or more weeks to process an in need of care order whilst interstate it takes only three or four days. Once again, there is something wrong with the procedures of this court. I would like to think that a select committee could spend quite a bit of time trying to speed up the procedures because the department is child protection driven. The emphasis is now on this phase and not on the correctional area, yet it still takes three or four weeks to process an in need of care order whereas interstate it takes only two or three days. Something is radically wrong, and the committee should look at this matter.

In Adelaide, all these resources go to in need of care kids during processing but, once they have been placed in foster care or in support by the department, it is incredible how dramatically the services drop off because, once again, resources are being poured into the child protection area and very little attention is being given to the justice area.

Bonds with supervision are handed out virtually every day, yet supervision as such rarely exists. I contact foster parents on numerous occasions, and too many of them tell me that supervision is a joke. Indeed, judges believe that these kids are being put onto programs, but in fact they are virtually non-existent. I urge members to speak to foster parents who have children in these circumstances. Those people laugh when asked to describe the programs in which these children are involved; they tell me that the only programs available are those that the foster parents themselves put together.

As I said earlier, the administrative link between FACS, SAYTC and the Children's Court is one matter that I expect the select committee to examine in great detail. There are grave problems in communication and in the way the various agencies are competing against each other, and at the end of the day the children feel that they are not even part of this system. Furthermore, they do not feel shame for what they have done.

It has been put to me that the departmental objective is to reduce the numbers in detention and that senior officers in FACS are paranoid that lock-up statistics may show that they are not doing their job properly. We must examine this suggestion. Quite clearly, there is no joy in locking up children, and I have never advocated it. If children are locked up, they come into contact with people with whom we would not want them to come into contact. But there has to be a deterrent. If there are no programs for these kids on bonds with supervision, we will have to set up programs that are effective, and at the end of the day some children may have to be detained.

It has also been put to me that FACS is juggling the figures to make it look as though it is doing a good job. I think that the committee will also be looking at that with great interest. In South Australia FACS has taken away the court's responsibility for the administration of juvenile justice. It has been put to me that the social worker's report and recommendations seem to have more impact than the views of the bench. The select committee will have to deliberate carefully on the balance between the influence of the bench and the influence of the Chief Executive Officer of FACS on behalf of the Minister and those at SAYTC. I never thought that I would ever make a speech in this House in which I was able to report allegations of conflict in those areas of responsibility after hearing the judiciary publicly say that it is powerless to implement its will in the courts. The judiciary knows that crime is escalating, it knows it has a problem and it feels powerless.

For the quarter ending March 1991 juveniles were responsible for nearly half of the offences cleared. I should like to quote a couple of statistics to amplify the point. Among all crimes, juveniles accounted for the following: breaking and

entering of shops, 52.25 per cent; motor vehicle theft, 51 per cent; shop stealing, 47 per cent; other vehicle theft, 73 per cent. It is the major part of crime in the community, so it is small wonder that there is enormous public concern at the moment.

I turn to paragraph *(c)* which relates to the resources devoted to the juvenile justice system and their effectiveness. Resources that are currently devoted to the juvenile justice system seem to be going toward in need of care children and child protection, and the balance will have to be addressed. Although I do not want to detract from the importance of the work of child protection, I would think that the select committee will have a view on this balance when the statistics to which I have just referred are taken into account.

It is becoming apparent that the department's philosophy is child protection driven and most of its resources are going into this area. When it is recognised that the Bannon Government has neglected the other parts of the department which are involved with young offenders, I would hope to see new resources put into this vital area to protect the public and to restore law and order.

Paragraph *(d)* relates to the adequacy of custodial and non-custodial programs. I will refer only to the non-custodial programs. Earlier in my speech I referred to the supervision aspect of bonds with supervision as being a joke—and that is not my word but the word used by many foster parents. Not only do they suggest that it is a joke but they say that the programs are non-existent. Indeed, if the select committee can come up with programs for these kids, we shall go a long way towards reducing recidivism.

People blame the system. If the system breaks down, it will involve the original family unit, the schools, the streets or places where kids congregate, the police, FACS, aid panels, SAYTC, the courts and foster families. The select committee is looking at the whole community. It will not merely rewrite the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act. I imagine that it will have to travel around Australia and take evidence from the community and from legal people. Once children leave the family unit and commence circulating through these areas of the community, they are vulnerable and they need support and guidance. That is not being provided at the moment.

I would commend the select committee to the House. It will receive the absolute cooperation of the Opposition. The Minister ridiculed the question that I asked two weeks ago about bonds with supervision and said, 'I am sure that there is not a problem'. The department's response indicates that it knows that it has a problem with supervision. We know that there is a problem with the wording of the Community Welfare Act, and the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act has been before this House twice now, so we need to review it.

This is an excellent opportunity to examine the judges' proposals, to look at what other magistrates and the judiciary are thinking, to get some views back from the department and, at the end of the day, to ensure that we do something about the escalation of crime in this State. I certainly support the proposition, and I look forward to serving on the committee.

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I would like to strongly support the formation of the select committee, to consider what the people of this State have identified correctly as a significant problem in terms of the day-to-day life in the community. It is certainly a matter that they expect this Parliament to address in no uncertain terms. The debate that we have had, with the contribution originally by the Minister, when he moved this motion, and this evening by the member for Morphett, has correctly identified the wide range of issues that need to be addressed by the committee.

I do not intend to debate them this evening because they will be addressed in detail by the committee itself. However, one amendment needs to be made to the motion before the House. It is not a significant or expansive amendment, but simply includes an additional area of consideration within paragraph *(e)* of the terms of reference. I move:

After '*(e)*' insert 'Student behaviour management policies and'

Therefore, paragraph *(e)* would read:

Student behaviour management policies and the problems of truancy;.

This would also bring within the purview of the terms of reference of the committee issues relating to the Education Department and other school policies in behaviour management, an area that can have some direct relevance for juvenile justice proposals.

While I do not consider this a major topic before the committee—obviously the other terms of reference will take much greater precedence—I believe that it needs to be reviewed and incorporated in the work of the committee. In conclusion, I support the formation of the committee and commend to the House the amendment circulated in my name.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I support the motion. As members on this side of the House in particular would know, I strongly support the appointment of a select committee. I would have dearly loved to serve on this committee but, because of other commitments, I am compelled to stand aside for others of my colleagues. Nevertheless, there is no question of my commitment to this issue since I came into this place in 1979. I have addressed many of those issues, including the problems associated with and leading up to the request on 17 November 1983 in this House for a Neighbourhood Watch scheme in South Australia, and many other problems in the community, particularly the issue of graffiti and vandalism, and the question of juvenile crime. That is all on the record in this place.

In addition, as many of my colleagues on this side of the House would know, I have undertaken interstate visits to look at the programs in operation in those States, including what applies in Victoria and in Western Australia. I have also taken much notice of the way in which the problems of juvenile crime have been handled in Western Australia. Indeed, as I have indicated to my colleagues, I will be returning there in October to speak to people about matters pertaining to juvenile crime, which is a real problem in the community.

As I have indicated to my colleagues recently, problems concerning juvenile crime were such, particularly in Western Australia, that only last week 20 000 to 30 000 people massed on the steps of the Western Australian Parliament complaining bitterly about the deaths of three people, when juveniles were involved. Those problems included stolen cars, and I can imagine the anger of parents when one of their loved ones is killed.

The problem of juvenile crime is very complex. I do not believe there is a simplistic answer to it. I wish the committee well in its deliberations. I suspect that it will involve a hell of a lot of travel and a great deal of talking to many people. When the committee reports, I suspect that its report will incorporate many recommendations, including the addressing of parenting problems. I may be wrong, but I believe that many of the problems we see in the community manifest themselves because of problems that start in the

home. I am a great believer that discipline starts in the home.

Having said that, I am not prepared to go down the same path as the member for Morphett, who wanted to make a political statement to the effect that the Bannon Government had been responsible. I am concerned about those who are suffering as a consequence, including parents, the judiciary, members of the Police Force and others who must address these problems. I do not see a simplistic answer in that either one or the other is wrong.

With respect to parenting skills, I believe that the community has failed. Successive Governments may have failed in relation to this inability to provide sufficient parenting skills; this has been because of the pressures on the community today vis-a-vis those which existed in your era Mr Speaker, and mine. They are much stronger today, in my view.

In concluding my remarks, I wish all members of the committee success in this area. I sincerely hope that they will be successful for the sake of these kids and the people of South Australia. I may have a simplistic view, but I believe that one way or another the society will have to pay for the problems caused by these juveniles. Either we try to assist them in a complex series of ways, or we lock them up. The latter option is less palatable to me, but I understand what the community is saying. I am not ignorant of how the community feels. I wish the committee well in its deliberations.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Family and Community Services): I thank all members for their attention to this motion. I indicate my support for the amendment that has been moved by the member for Elizabeth. I am a little sorry that the member for Morphett indulged in a number of shibboleths and some political sloganeering. One hopes that he will bring a more open mind to the deliberations of the committee than he seems to have brought to the House this evening.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

The House appointed a select committee consisting of Messrs Eastick, M.J. Evans, Ferguson and Groom, Mrs Hutchison, Mrs Kotz and Mr Oswald, of whom four shall form a quorum; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on Thursday 28 November.

Mr S.G. EVANS: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

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

That Standing Order 339 be so far suspended as to enable the select committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it thinks fit, of any evidence presented to the committee prior to such evidence being reported to the House.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I wish to mention the unsatisfactory situation that has occurred with respect to the dry zone areas within my electorate. Following the disturbances that took place in Glenelg, which resulted in the setting up of a dry zone, there has been an increase in drinking problems in Henley Square. People who have found themselves barred from areas of Glenelg during the summer months are attending Henley Square in order to sit on the lawn and imbibe alcohol. Personally, I have no objections to people imbibing alcohol in public places. I have had the pleasure of visiting many public squares in Europe where alcohol is imbibed and where the behaviour is excellent.

You, Sir, are probably aware that in many of the public domains in Italy, France, Germany, Greece and other European countries it is common at any hour of the day or night to see people sitting at tables having a glass of beer, champagne or wine, and the behaviour of those people is of a high standard. Unfortunately, however, this is not the situation that is occurring in summer at Henley Beach.

Because there are now dry areas in Glenelg, people who would normally have travelled to Glenelg now travel to Henley Beach and, I am afraid to say, their behaviour is not what everyone would like to see. There are young men who gather there during hot summer nights and imbibe too much alcohol and, as a result, there is a deterioration in their behaviour, which is a matter of concern to local residents.

The Henley and Grange council has made an application to the Government to have the area proclaimed as a dry area but, unfortunately, has not received a reply one way or the other from the Government. I am the first to agree that merely proclaiming dry areas in particular parts of the State is not a way of solving the behavioural problems of those people who drink too much and who are, therefore, a nuisance to their fellow members of the public. However, I do believe that there is an unresolved problem at Henley Beach that needs to be addressed, and at the moment those people who are in authority appear to be running away from the problem.

I have taken the opportunity from time to time to write to the Minister for Local Government Relations about this situation. I believe that the State policy on dry areas under section 132 of the Liquor Licensing Act is sensible, but different areas need different solutions. Personally, I am in favour of giving local government the opportunity to proclaim through their by-laws the ability to declare dry areas, provided that they take on the responsibility of policing those dry areas. I think that there should be sufficient power to enable them to apply expiation fees and all the other necessary policing powers, and then they should take on the responsibility themselves of whatever area they proclaim to be a dry area.

I am aware of the 'dry areas' documents that were produced by the Department of Local Government in South Australia that put forward a series of suggestions as to how local government could tackle the problem of dry areas. They suggested things like an increased acceptance of low alcohol beer, the attention of the Drinkwise Campaign, which focused primarily on schools, about the dangers of alcohol, the setting up of sobering up centres, the ability to use the Drug and Alcohol Services Coucil, the Together Against Crime programs, the youth developments officers and so on.

Most of these initiatives are well worthwhile and I would commend them to councils for their consideration. However, of all the suggestions that have been made I cannot see a solution to the problem that is occurring in Henley Square, and I took the opportunity of writing to the Minister of Local Government Relations to ask her what programs could apply to the Henley and Grange council. I received an answer that told me of the programs that Henley and Grange council is facing and of the programs it is undertaking in these matters. This was something that I was already aware of before I sent the correspondence to her.

Unfortunately, the steps that are being undertaken so far are not working. One of the problems also relates to the fact that council by-law-making powers under various aspects

of legislative responsibility are being considered by both State and local governments in the context of negotiating a new relationship under the memorandum of understanding. Back in July, I wrote to the Secretary of the Local Government Association, seeking advice as to how the Local Government Association was prepared to tackle this question, and to date I have had no reply.

Mr Speaker, you can see that this particular question of the dry zones is a political hot potato. Government departments and the Local Government Association, I am afraid, do not wish to tackle this problem. Unfortunately for me as the local member, there is a problem and there is increased criticism from members of the public as to the lack of initiative by people about tackling this problem. I do not believe that this problem should be lain totally at the door of the Henley and Grange council. Most of the people who are causing the trouble do not come from within the council boundaries.

It is unfortunate that it is believed that the council, which maintains a very small strip of the coastal area, should have to take on the burden of tackling this problem when it is a problem for the whole of the metropolitan area. Many of the problems in relation to dry areas have been tackled in country areas, which have a different sort of problem from the one that is occurring at Henley Square. During the summer months the problems there are usually created by white male persons of about the age of 25 or more, who are imbibing too much alcohol and who are seriously misbehaving, making suggestions that I would not like to repeat here to any female who goes past. Other problems include urinating on the lawn in Henley Square.

I have had absolute cooperation from the police and have been in constant contact with the Henley Beach police station, but they cannot be involved in the square every hour of the day and night. They have a particular burden in summer.

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

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): The honourable member who has just resumed his seat has been referring to alcohol problems in the Henley Beach area, and I take the opportunity tonight to refer to some of the drug awareness committees operating in the Riverland and the concern in that community about the problems of drugs in that part of South Australia. The fact that a considerable quantity of drugs is produced in the Riverland, as in most other irrigated areas of Australia, causes considerable concern in the community.

The recently established Loxton drug awareness committee wrote to me seeking my support in an endeavour to have a toll free number made available to the drug squad hotline in Adelaide. So often these things are established in the metropolitan area for a good cause but, unfortunately, access for country people is difficult in that it involves a trunk line call at considerable cost. Again, country people are significantly disadvantaged. I will read to the House a letter from the Secretary of the Loxton drug awareness committee, as follows:

> Recently, due to public concern a drug awareness committee was established in Loxton. As a committee, one of the initial aims is to encourage the use of both the Riverland drug information line and the drug squad hotline (081) 212 3335 by local people. Our committee would like to lobby for the conversion of the drug squad hotline to a toll free 008 number. It is felt that people outside the metropolitan area are disadvantaged and may be deterred from volunteering information because of the STD cost. Converting the drug squad hotline to a toll free number would increase access to the hotline for rural people and may encourage the utilisation of this number to a greater extent.

I raise this issue tonight because the request is a valid one and I would hope that the Minister of Emergency Services will take the necessary action to give country people concerned about the problem of drugs in the community the same sort of access to the drug squad hotline that is available to people living in the metropolitan area. I give full credit to the drug awareness committees endeavouring to assist in country areas, particularly in the Riverland community, by making available as much information as possible to the police in an endeavour to help overcome the problems experienced by the community as a result of the use of drugs. I trust that the Minister of Emergency Services will seriously consider making the toll free number available to the drug squad in Adelaide.

The other matter to which I refer relates to the Minister's resources tax on water or what is commonly becoming known as the 'windmill tax'—a tax of some $26 applied to a resource which, since the beginning of time, has been freely available to the people. We have had meter rental charges, and so on, in the past. However, there has been a principle in South Australia that there be no charge on water in this State. There never has been. The only charges relating to water in this State have been for the costs of administration, distribution, electricity and whatever other built-in costs are incurred in getting the water from its source to the consumer. Now we have this windmill tax, which is a direct tax on a natural, renewable resource. One might just as well say that there will be a tax on air, because water is a natural substance and is as freely available as air. For the Government to stoop to the level of applying a tax on something that falls as an act of God from the skies on one's property is absolutely staggering.

Of course, this is of great concern to many people, particularly those living in the country who, in many instances, must provide the infrastructure for the water. That is highlighted in a letter I received from a Mr and Mrs Edmonds of Renmark. The letter, sent to the Premier, the Minister of Water Resources and me seeking some action in relation to this matter, states:

> Re administrative charges for stock, domestic pumps and windmills.
>
> There are many like myself who have had water licences over a period of many years and being required each year to apply for an annual licence. The domestic allocation is limited to stock and domestic; surely as the E&WS already has a record of these licences it would be more prudent and money could be saved by both parties if it did not have to be renewed annually by the licensee. Presumably the licence is for the life of stock and a necessity for the user and should not even have to be renewed each year.

Mr Edmonds is trying to make the point that the annual licence which is issued to enable country people to divert water for stock and domestic purposes involves a significant cost. The licence is never refused, but there is a significant administrative cost to the department and to the licensee. Consequently, this is another area in which the Government is involving itself in unnecessary cost.

Another example of this relates to the rents imposed by the Department of Lands and, particularly, those that are set in perpetuity. Many perpetual leases go back many years, and the rents on those leases are about $2.50. We are all aware that, from an administrative point of view, it costs the Government between $20 and $25 to service those leases—to send out notices, do the necessary book work, maintain the records in the department, collect the money, and so forth. So, it costs the Government $25 per annum to collect $2.50 in lease payments.

It would be far better for the Government to convert those perpetual leases to freehold titles, thus saving itself $20 a year. If one added up all those $2.50 leases, one would

find that there would be an enormous saving to the Government if it simply converted the leases to freehold title and, thus, rid itself of all the book work that goes with them.

In so doing there would be a significant saving to the people of South Australia, and we would get rid of the necessity for a lessee to renew their licence every year. It is somewhat similar to the farsical situation of a person having to apply for their annual water licence.

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

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Tonight I will talk about my pleasure in representing the Parliament of South Australia, during the parliamentary break, at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association seminar in Douglas on the Isle of Man in June. I took up that great honour and challenge to go to Douglas on the other side of the world having very little experience of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association and the various things that make up that body. When I arrived on the Isle of Man, where I was made to feel very much at home, everything was totally new to me.

In my view the seminar was a tremendous success, and I think the seminar delegates from the far flung parts of the British Commonwealth would all rejoice in that comment. At that conference there were a couple of friendly faces who were once well known in this Chamber. One was the Hon. David Tonkin, who was there in a very different capacity to the one he used to occupy in this place. There were representatives from various smaller Parliaments of the Commonwealth such as Africa, the West Indies, the Americas, India, Asia and some of the Pacific Islands. In fact, the conference, which lasted a week, had input from the four corners of the world.

Many of the topics discussed at the conference have been raised in this Parliament either informally amongst members or formally as Government and Opposition. The issues covered parliamentary privilege, the limits on parliamentary privilege, the role of parliamentary privilege and the role of Parliament itself. Issues that have been important in this place in the past two years were given a different perspective by delegates who represented Parliaments as far afield as Quebec. One of the delegates came from the north-west territories of Canada, and he told me that the North Pole was in his constituency. In fact, he said that Santa Claus and his wife were constituents.

A number of issues were discussed at the seminar, the first being the continuing role of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. However, it has now a very different role to the one that was envisaged years ago. Its role now concerns people with different experiences who, in many respects, started out at the same baseline in that they inherited a Westminster parliamentary tradition that was set up, almost in all instances, during the nineteenth century, although a few were set up much later than that. However, many of them have grown and developed in different ways. A key issue that came out of the seminar was that while we have many issues in common—and discussions on those issues were extremely useful—there are now many points of divergence.

The economic issues of the past 30 years, which have seen the coming together of the various countries in Europe and, in particular, the decision that Great Britain made in 1963 to enter into the European Economic Community and its consequent effect upon the British Commonwealth at that time, were quite clearly evident in the discussions that took place in Douglas. In fact, the issue of world trade and its impact on places such as South Australia and as far away as St Vincent and the Grenadines was discussed. The seminar also discussed how diplomacy follows trading patterns and that Government to Government relations are strong where trade and economics are strong.

At the seminar I argued that Australia and New Zealand had taken separate paths since 1963. In the case of Australia, we faced up to the fact that we could no longer be dependent upon capital and trade with Great Britain and that we had to broaden our perspective. On the other hand, in my view, New Zealand, from 1963 until the present day, never managed to face the reality that Britain would finally become a part of Europe, turning its back on its former Commonwealth partners and, in essence, leaving New Zealand in the lurch.

At this conference, that was an issue that concerned the West Indies. The West Indies and the various States which make up those islands debated, on the one hand, the autocracy of the Foreign Office and the way in which dictums arrived by mail telling them how to conduct their administration and, on the other hand, how they get shut out of agricultural markets in the United Kingdom and Europe and how that is having a very serious and adverse effect on their economy.

This particular conference, as with all of these conferences, never resolved anything. However, it raised a number of issues which I have brought back to Australia and which the other delegates have taken to other parts of the world. During this trip I also had the pleasure of visiting a couple of other cities in Europe, including Montpellier and the French MFP Sophia Antipolis. Sophia Antipolis has been in operation for many years now, and I think it would be wrong for me to try in a few minutes here to give a digest of how and where it is going. There is no doubt that at least the first stage of Sophia Antipolis kept pretty much on track with what its designers had in mind. The second stage of Sophia Antipolis experienced problems, which we in South Australia may experience with our multifunction polis, where cash strapped Governments of the future use land, which has become very much more valuable because of development that has taken place on it, for quick speculative ends to fund budget problems.

I believe that Montpellier has much more to offer South Australia as a model. Montpellier's geography is very much like Adelaide. It is one quarter the size of Adelaide in population terms but, like Adelaide, Montpellier is a place to which you have to be going—it is not on the road to anywhere. It has a climate very similar to South Australia and, like Adelaide, it has an artistic tradition. Montpellier and its Mayor (Monsieur Freche) welcomed me and showed me how they took their strong points and developed around them a whole new concept for development into the future. One of those concepts related to education, a second to medicine and a third concentrated on the arts. In each one of those endeavours the people of Montpellier, through their elected representatives, concentrated a total effort and worked out a 20-year plan. In many respects what has happened at Montpellier in the past 12 years has been discussed by other members. I shall have more to say on another occasion.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 29 August at 11 a.m.