

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 6 May 1993

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

GUARDIANSHIP AND ADMINISTRATION BILL

At 2.2 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the House:

As to Amendment No. 3:

That the House of Assembly no longer insist on its disagreement thereto.

As to Amendments Nos 4 to 7:

That the Legislative Council no longer insist on its amendments but make the following amendments in lieu thereof:

Clause 21, page 10, after line 35—Insert subclause as follows:

- (2) In performing his or her functions the Public Advocate is not subject to the control or direction of the Minister.

New Clause, Page 10, after clause 21—Insert new clause as follows:

Public Advocate may raise matters with the Minister and the Attorney-General

- 21a. (1) The Public Advocate may, at any time, raise with the Minister and the Attorney-General any concerns he or she may have over any matter arising out of or relating to the performance of his or her functions under this Act or any other Act.
- (2) If the Public Advocate so requests, the Attorney-General must cause a report of any matter raised by the Public Advocate under subsection (1) to be laid as soon as practicable before both Houses of Parliament.
- (3) The annual report furnished by the Public Advocate under this Act must include a summary of any matters raised by the Public Advocate under subsection (1).

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto; and that the Legislative Council make the following consequential amendment:

New Clause, page 38, after clause 83—Insert new clause as follows:

Expiry of Act

84. This Act will expire on the third anniversary of its commencement

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to Amendment No. 10:

That the Legislative Council amend its amendment by inserting after the words 'the Board must' the words ' , if it thinks it appropriate to do so,'

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

DOGS

A petition signed by 101 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to allow

dogs to be walked through the Hallett Cove Conservation Park was presented by Mr Matthew.

Petition received.

**MUSEUM OF SURVEYING, EXPLORATION
LAND HERITAGE**

A petition signed by 48 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to close the Museum of Surveying, Exploration and Land Heritage was presented by Mr S.G. Evans.

Petition received.

ABORIGINAL POLICE AIDES

A petition signed by 136 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to place Aboriginal Police Aides at Darlington and Christies Beach was presented by Mr Brindal.

Petition received.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

A petition signed by 105 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to reintroduce capital punishment for crimes of homicide was presented by Mrs Kotz.

Petition received.

TRADING HOURS

A petition signed by 274 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to resist any further extension to permanent retail trading hours was presented by Mrs Kotz.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

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

ANDAMOOKA AREA SCHOOL

In reply to **Mr GUNN** (Eyre) (22 April).

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Under arrangements entered into last year between Treasury and the Education Department, the processing of claims for school fires is now handled by the Education Department not Treasury. I am advised by the Education Department that the Andamooka Area School contents claim was inadvertently misplaced during the transfer of part of the Education Department's Western Area facilities function from Whyalla to Adelaide. I am further advised by the Education Department that the claim has now been found and arrangements have been made to process the payment next week in the next available account processing run.

**SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT
FINANCING AUTHORITY**

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Speaker, I have pleasure in tabling the Report of the Review of the South Australian Government Financing Authority by the Government Management Board. This review forms part of the ongoing program of reviews being undertaken by the Business operations Reviews Sub-Board. It was carried out by a review team chaired by Mr P.B. Wade, Comptroller of Monash University and former Deputy Head of the Victorian Treasury, and comprised: Mr R.H. Barry, Director of SBC Dominguez Barry Limited, a well respected investment bank; Mr J.N. Bishop, AO, former Managing Partner and Chairman of KPMG Peat Marwick in South Australia; Mr R.J. McKay, former SA Manager of National Australia Bank, and Mr M Schilling, former General Manager of the South Australian Urban Land Trust. The team has undertaken a thorough review of SAFA's activities, with the use of expert consultants as necessary.

In what have been very trying financial times SAFA has proven to be one of the State's most successful financial institutions. The review notes many of the positive achievements of SAFA in recent years. It notes that SAFA handled the financial problems arising from the State Bank issue well and with little disruption to SAFA's position in the capital markets. It notes that SAFA enjoys good relations with its clients, investors, intermediaries and borrowers and has demonstrated a high degree of professionalism in its approach to the primary capital markets.

The report notes that SAFA, at a very early stage in its development, took advantage of international opportunities in both the public and private placement markets. It also notes that, domestically, SAFA's approach to the capital markets has been innovative and progressive.

The review committee has also been impressed by the degree of professionalism that SAFA has applied in the complex area of structured financing. The committee notes that South Australia was, together with Queensland and New South Wales, at the forefront of the development of State central borrowing authorities. The report has 48 recommendations and, subject to minor qualifications, they are all supported by the SAFA Board and the Government.

I am also tabling a full list of recommendations with responses as appropriate by the SAFA Board and the Government. In setting out its recommendations, the report points out that a review of this type tends to concentrate on areas where there is scope for improvement and that its comments and recommendations should, therefore, be read in that context.

Notwithstanding this, 13 of the recommendations, in fact, confirm current policies or practices. These include recommendations that:

- SAFA should continue to be the central borrowing authority of South Australia;

- SAFA should continue to provide risk management skills to semi-government authorities;
- public sector expertise for activities such as structured financing should continue to be concentrated in SAFA;
- SAFA should continue a pooled approach to debt and cash management;
- mandates should be set to control repricing risks by limiting the movement away from the duration of the benchmark portfolio;
- the basic test for the structured financing transactions should continue to be to obtain funds on a legitimate basis that is demonstrably cheaper than a conventional borrowing;
- where SAFA is a significant investor, it should have appropriate Board representation on the corporate bodies involved.

Another major set of recommendations concerns reporting and accounting matters. The review notes that SAFA has accounted strictly in accordance with Accounting Standards and that its statutory accounts tabled in Parliament are well presented and informative. The review, however, does believe that further improvements are possible in these areas and makes four key recommendations accordingly. These include:

- SAFA adopting the market-to-market approach to valuation of its financial assets and liabilities for internal purposes and considering adopting the same approach for external reporting;
- SAFA considering providing consolidated financial information;
- the historical cost of long-term investments being disclosed; and
- the SAFA Board ensuring that appropriate performance reporting is established on a regular basis.

These recommendations are accepted by the Government and the SAFA Board. Implementation of many of them will require systems improvements and this work has been underway for some time and is a high priority. It is expected that the necessary systems development work to enable actual assets and liabilities, together with a benchmark portfolio of liabilities, to be marked to market will be completed this calendar year. Consolidated financial information and historic cost information will be provided in the 1992-93 annual report.

Another group of recommendations concern the structure and management of SAFA's operations. These recommendations cover both technical matters and management of SAFA. They include recommendations that:

- the 'guarantee fee' should not be part of the margin used for calculating the Common Public Sector Interest Rate (CPSIR);
- consideration should be given to the establishment of a separate working capital CPSIR;
- SAFA should review the current level of liquidity; the SAFA Board should make its principal concern the development of appropriate strategies and policies; and
- the two vacancies on the SAFA Board should be filled with persons having broad experience and expertise in capital markets from a private sector perspective.

The Government and the SAFA Board also support these recommendations. Arrangements will be introduced for agencies to pay the guarantee fee direct to Consolidated Account from 1 July 1993. Consultations will be held with agencies in the near future concerning the possibility of a separate working capital CPSIR and a proposal will be developed if a need is identified. The current level of liquidity will also be reviewed in the near future. I will shortly announce two additional appointments to the SAFA Board.

A fourth group of recommendations concerns SAFA's scope and functions. These include:

- the business of long-term credit arbitrage using the Government guarantee, if recommenced, should be managed and controlled by a separate new organisation;
- the rationale for the use of SAFA as the vehicle in which various property and equity investments are held should be reviewed,
- the Enterprise Investment Trust, in view of the developmental nature of this organisation, should be transferred to either the Minister of Economic Development or the Minister of Business and Regional Development.

In relation to the first of these recommendations, SAFA does not intend, at this stage, and the Government would not wish it to, engage in any significant level of new long-term credit arbitrage activities. This reflects changes in the State's credit rating and considerations of balance sheet size. If this issue should become relevant at some stage in the future, the matter will be reviewed by the Government then, but it would be reluctant to establish a new organisation.

In relation to recommendations concerning property and equity investments, as a consequence of current Government policies, SAFA's holdings of equity in public sector entities are being reduced and are likely to diminish further. As a part of the restructuring of forestry operations, it has already been decided that SAFA will not continue to hold equity in these operations. SAFA's other two major equity holdings are in the State Bank and SAGASCO, which are also subject to current Government consideration. As a result, a separate review is not considered necessary.

In relation to property holdings, the Government will be reviewing arrangements for public sector property holdings in any event and on a broader basis. In relation to the recommendation concerning Enterprise Investments, the Government will review SAFA's investment in Enterprise Investments in the near future in light of the role of the Economic Development Board and considering the appropriate body to hold such an investment.

Another group of recommendations concerns the relationship between SAFA and Treasury.

Recommendations falling under this heading include:

- the Treasurer should receive separate and documented Treasury advice, particularly if SAFA is the promoter within Government sector, that the benefits from a structured financing transaction make it worthwhile;
- The Treasurer should receive clear and separate advice on the issue of any Government or

Treasurer's guarantee that may be involved in a SAFA structured financing transaction;

- the senior management of SAFA should be focused on the management of SAFA and that they should not have apparent responsibility for Treasury activities;
- the legislative requirement for the Under Treasurer to be Chairman of SAFA should be removed.

These recommendations are supported.

In relation to the first two of these recommendations, the report does not make any criticism of the advice that has been given under existing arrangements, but does believe that this proposal would provide for a clearer separation of responsibilities. The Government accepts this, as it does the recommendation that senior management should not have other Treasury responsibilities. In coming to this recommendation, the committee was, of course, seeing SAFA under abnormal circumstances with the pressures of the State Bank difficulties. Nevertheless, the Government supports the principle expressed by the committee, while noting the desirability of maintaining the efficiencies which now exist as a result of the close Treasury/SAFA relationship.

The Government has accepted the recommendation that the legislative requirement for the Under Treasurer to be Chairman of SAFA be removed. In making this recommendation, the committee emphasises that it has no reason to question the performance of any of the three Under Treasurers to date, but is focusing on the clarification of organisational arrangements. The Government agrees that, in principle, extra flexibility in this respect would be acceptable, but it does not plan to change the existing arrangement under which the authority is chaired by the Under Treasurer, Mr Emery.

There are three other recommendations requiring a change in SAFA's legislation. These are as follows:

- Sections 11 (1) and 12 (1) of the Government Financing Authority Act be amended to more clearly define the objectives and major obligations of SAFA;
- the minimum number of SAFA Board members be increased from three to four and that there be a quorum of three members;
- the ability of the board to delegate all of its powers and functions to one person be removed.

The Government supports these recommendations and intends to introduce all of the legislative amendments proposed. Implementation of the report's recommendations will be the responsibility of the Treasurer, with reporting to the Government Management Board.

SAFA is now 10 years old. Over this period, it has recorded a large number of achievements. The report sets out in detail these achievements in the areas of domestic, international and structured finance. These achievements, and others which have enabled the State to maximise the benefits of Commonwealth assistance, have earned this State hundreds of millions of dollars. No public sector organisation, no matter what its record, should be immune from review, particularly after it has been established for some time. This review has, therefore, been worthwhile in making a range of

recommendations which will further improve SAFA's operations in future.

In this context, the Government has taken the opportunity to review and endorse the following set of objectives for SAFA:

- (1) to borrow for Government and State agencies and to manage the State's debt with a view to minimising, over time, the net cost thereof consistent with an appropriate risk profile;
- (2) to maintain adequate liquidity to satisfy the cash needs of the Government and other parts of the public sector;
- (3) to manage in a prudent and efficient manner the State's financial assets and other Government assets referred to SAFA in line with Government policy;
- (4) to foster the development of well qualified, motivated and skilled staff who are able to consistently perform in a manner which reflects SAFA's role as a Government financial institution; and
- (5) to understand and satisfy the needs of SAFA's customers in a cost-effective and responsive manner.

SAFA's chief focus is very much on what the Review Committee describes as core central borrowing authority activities. These are borrowing for the Government and State agencies and management of the State debt. In this context, the major objective is to minimise the cost of the State's debt so that the Government and its instrumentalities receive finance at highly competitive rates. This is, however, subject to two important constraints.

First, governments should take a medium and long-term, rather than a short-term, view. There is no point in aiming for low rates in the short term if this unduly increases the risk of high rates over the long term. SAFA aims to minimise the cost of debt over the medium term. This is what is meant by an appropriate risk profile. Secondly, SAFA must also take account of liquidity considerations to ensure that there is sufficient cash to meet the needs of the Government and other parts of the public sector.

Subject to these constraints, SAFA's objective is to provide finance at the lowest possible rates. In this context, the current arrangements under which the guarantee fee is included in the common public sector interest rate tend to distort comparisons with interest rates charged in other States and the Government supports the review recommendations that this be charged separately.

Taking account of this factor and other factors, including differences in credit ratings between the States, SAFA's current interest rates are similar to those in other States. In addition to its central borrowing authority role, SAFA has and will continue to carry out some other activities for the Government, and any such activities taken on by SAFA must, in accordance with its legislation, be taken on a commercial basis. As important as setting objectives is measuring performance against them. In line with the recommendations of the report, SAFA is currently improving its capabilities in this area. This will form the basis of regular advice to the

Government and Parliament on its performance and its risk profile.

This report has fulfilled a very useful role in providing a thorough expert review of SAFA's activities for the Government, Parliament and the public of South Australia. SAFA is a professional operation with many firsts to its credit. It is a very good example of the possibilities for truly commercial achievement within a traditional public sector framework. As in all operations, however, there are areas capable of improvement. The Government supports the review's recommendations and I commend the report to the House. In doing so, I would like to thank the Chairman of the Review, Mr P.B. Wade, and the members of the Review Committee for their efforts in conducting this review.

ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Public Infrastructure): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: During Question Time yesterday and on Tuesday, questions were asked in relation to two specific cases in which ETSA customers have been sent incorrect accounts. I wish to inform the House that ETSA has advised me that the billing system fault which has caused this problem will be fixed by Monday.

MENTAL HEALTH

The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health, Family and Community Services): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: The South Australian Mental Health Service was established in 1991 and brought together several of the then separate adult mental health services incorporated under the South Australian Health Commission Act. Its major task was to transfer beds from Hillcrest Hospital to general hospital sites and Glenside Hospital and to establish a comprehensive network of community-based mental health services. These community-based services were to be financed by administrative savings resulting from the closure of Hillcrest. I would like to stress again that the rationale for closing Hillcrest was so that the Government could transfer beds to other sites closer to where people live and, most critically, to improve and expand community services for the mentally ill. These moves are not and have never been about a further de-institutionalisation of mental health services in this State.

In December last year I announced to the House major changes to the administration of the Mental Health Service. Following the resignation of the Chief Executive Officer, I replaced him and the board with an Administrator, Mr George Beltchev. As well as managing SAMHS, Mr Beltchev chaired a review of the service. The other members of the review team were Emeritus Professor Bill Cramond and Associate Professor Fran Sutton. The review team has completed

its work and Mr Beltchev remains the Administrator until a new Chief Executive Officer and a new board can be appointed.

It is the report of the review team which I now table. It confirms the general direction adopted by the Government in moving beds out of Hillcrest Hospital and improving community-based services. The review notes that this direction is in line with the national mental health policy, which aims to provide a national framework for mental health services in this country.

The review recommends that mental health services should be provided in a variety of settings, ranging from community-based support services to general public hospital facilities and specialised psychiatric hospital beds, with a greater emphasis on the development of community-based services. The review team noted that not one submission of the 23 verbal and 139 written submissions was critical of the proposed system of services. I am very pleased to acknowledge the support of consumers, carers and staff of mental health services for the direction we are taking in this area, and I look forward to the greater involvement of consumers and their carers in the operation of SAMHS, as has been recommended in the report.

The report makes a number of recommendations for improving the organisation of SAMHS so it can better support the implementation of the proposed changes. The review also made a number of recommendations about how the transfer of resources from psychiatric hospitals to community-based services and general hospitals should take place. I commend these recommendations to members.

Most of the recommendations are more properly the province of the Administrator—or rather the new CEO and the new board—rather than the Minister; however, I would like to respond briefly to some of the key recommendations. The review recommends that a new Chief Executive Officer should be appointed as a matter of urgency. This position has already been advertised and I understand that the appointment process is proceeding. The report makes a number of recommendations regarding the structure and size of the board, and I accept those recommendations. I have asked Mr Beltchev to arrange the appropriate constitutional amendments for the early consideration of the Health Commission.

The report recommends that mechanisms be put in place to establish policy and operational links with other components of mental health services which operate within the South Australian Health Commission. Consequently, I have asked the commission to set up a mental health program group to advise on the planning and coordination of mental health services. This group will include people from the Mental Health Service, the universities, the general hospitals and the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service.

The report recommends that double funding be provided to allow for the recruitment and training of existing staff for the new community services and general hospital facilities while maintaining existing services at Hillcrest. I am pleased to announce that this money will be available to South Australia from the \$8 million we have received under the Medicare agreement, which I signed last year. This will allow us to build the new mental health services while maintaining the existing

services until the new services are ready to take over. This will mean continuity of care for patients while ensuring the appropriate training of mental health staff in their new settings and functions.

The review also recommends that any consideration for reallocation of funds which may be freed up by the transfer of beds from Hillcrest Hospital should occur after the devolution process is complete. I can confirm today that no funds will be redirected from the mental health budget to other areas of need while the devolution process is proceeding. At the same time, I must make clear that the Mental Health Service will have to shoulder its share of the efficiencies which are being required of Government as a whole.

The review report has recommended that in-patient facilities be established at the Lyell McEwin Health Service and the Noarlunga Hospital, and that negotiations commence with the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to establish a dedicated acute in-patient facility there. The review also recommended that community-based services be established in parallel with the devolution of beds to new acute in-patient facilities in general hospitals.

The first of these new acute inpatient facilities will be at the Lyell McEwin. I support these recommendations and, in particular, the establishment of the acute inpatient facility at the Lyell McEwin and the associated community services. I wish to thank the review team and, in particular, George Beltchev, for his role as chair of the review as well as for his continued work as Administrator of the SAMHS. Emeritus Professor Bill Cramond and Associate Professor Fran Sutton also deserve thanks for their contributions to a most comprehensive document. I am very pleased to announce that Professor Cramond has agreed to accept the position as chair of the new board of the Mental Health Service. I am sure that this will mean that he will continue to play a vital role in the development of SAMHS in the future.

Finally, it remains to thank the staff and the consumers (as well as their families) of the South Australian Mental Health Service, who have shown great patience and forbearance in very trying circumstances during the uncertainty of the review period and the appointment of the Administrator. This report and the common vision for the creation of a modern and comprehensive mental health service provide a sound basis for the future operation of the South Australian Mental Health Service. I commend it to members.

STATE BANK

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a brief ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yesterday in Question Time the member for Bragg raised a number of matters in relation to Treasury involvement in the luxury car leasing business of Beneficial Finance. I informed the House yesterday that I had been advised that no Treasury officer had been interviewed either by the Federal Police or by the Australian Taxation Office in relation to alleged tax offences involving Beneficial Finance and Luxcar. The member for Bragg mentioned two approaches by Beneficial to Treasury relating to possible SAFA involvement in the Luxcar business.

The first was in May 1986. A search of relevant correspondence has confirmed that the approach was rejected. The second was in September 1989. Examination of the transcript of the royal commission indicates a meeting between Beneficial Finance and Treasury officers. SAFA was not interested in pursuing the matter in its own right. There was a suggestion that Beneficial Finance might be referred by Treasury to another tax exempt body, in particular, the SGIC. According to the royal commission transcript, SGIC was subsequently approached by Beneficial Finance but the proposal did not proceed.

Since yesterday the Treasury and SGIC have not been able to locate any correspondence in relation to these approaches by Beneficial Finance. Treasury, however, has located correspondence relating to Luxcar and a further approach by Beneficial Finance to SAFA in November 1990. This approach was also rejected. This is a matter that has been examined by the royal commission. To date the Royal Commissioner has not reported on it extensively. At this time I am not aware of what, if any, further information I can provide that will assist the member for Bragg in relation to this matter. If any further information becomes available as a result of further examination, I will provide it to him.

Yesterday the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked me whether the payment of a \$52.5 million tax liability by Beneficial Finance entailed any admission of tax offences. I have been advised by the bank that the payment did not involve any admission of tax offences or tax fraud. The Deputy Leader also asked, possibly rhetorically, why no arrests had been made. This is a Federal Police matter and I will bring any further developments on it to the attention of the House.

QUESTION TIME

PUBLIC SECTOR CUTS

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister of Education, Employment and Training confirm—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: You've missed out. Your one and only day of glory!

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader has leave to ask a question, not to talk across the Chamber.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Will the Minister confirm that she has been asked to find 1 000 of the 3 000 public sector job cuts in the education area? I have been informed that there have been some rather heated discussions in Cabinet over where the public sector job cuts are to occur. The Minister of Education, Employment and Training has been asked to find 1 000 of those job cuts in the education area. Cabinet has also told the Minister that she must cut her own staff, which, at almost 20, far exceeds that of any other Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I realise—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will wait until we get order. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I realise that it is the last day of the sitting and generally we do have questions that are either part of a fishing expedition or a little humorous: it seems that this question is both. It is in fact quite humorous and I will be very pleased to answer it. Quite obviously, I have not been asked to deliver that number of positions. I am sure the honourable member is well aware of that, but the Opposition was looking for a question and it was appropriate, I guess, that it be my turn to be targeted and that is fine with me.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Indeed, one of my colleagues suggests that he should be looking after his own back. The Department of Education is now one department—the Department of Education, Employment and Training—which I remind the honourable member now has between 27 000 and 28 000 employees, has the biggest single budget of any department in South Australia and, indeed, provides services directly to about 360 000 South Australians, which is in excess of a quarter of the population of this State.

The department is embarking on what is probably one of the most exciting developments in the provision of services in South Australia which will enable it to provide quality services in the spectrum of education, right through from child-care to the services we provide to industry and business at the TAFE level.

I do not know how many more times I will have to say this; my own members must be sick of hearing me. As the Premier of South Australia has said publicly on a number of occasions, and as I have stated, we are not going to be removing teachers from classrooms, child-care workers from the child-care centres, kindergarten teachers from the kindergartens or TAFE lecturers from the TAFE colleges. We have made it clear—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: They asked the question and they don't want the answer. That is amazing, really. I have made it very clear that we will ensure that we have reductions in the administration area. Everywhere in the world, Governments and the public sector are moving to have smaller administration units, which are strategic planning units, and they are putting their resources into the field of service delivery. That is exactly what we are going to do in education in the new portfolio of Education, Employment and Training. It is something that we are working with—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am happy to explain to the honourable member how we will do it. We will be working with the departments and, indeed, with the Institute of Teachers and the Public Service Association. We will have a very small committee overseeing this particular—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Yes, they ask the question but they don't want the answer; it is quite amazing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is starting to drag on and I would ask her to bring—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is the last day. Let me remind the House that it would be terrible to be thrown out on the last day. I ask the Minister to draw her answer to a close.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The reason I have taken some little time is that this is such a vitally important service delivery area. The answer to the honourable member's question on both levels is 'No'.

JUDGES' CARS

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Can the Minister of State Services confirm that he has now received information relating to judicial car crashes in State Fleet vehicles, and when will he reveal this information to the House? A spate of rumours has been circulating in my electorate regarding what has been described to me as judicial dodgems with State Fleet cars. It has also been put to me by concerned constituents that the Minister owes it to the local community to lay all relevant information before the House to clear up the matter in order that ordinary folk can continue to go about their business.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I think that the rumours were probably started by the member for Coles, who has asked questions on notice and without notice in search of what is occurring in State Fleet with the use by judges of these vehicles. State Fleet currently operates a fleet of 2 500 vehicles and I want to place on record that it does a darn good job in doing so. It is very professional and commercial. With regard to accidents involving cars provided by State Fleet to members of the judiciary, I have been advised that, during the period 1 July 1992 to 13 April 1993, 20 accidents have occurred.

Mr Heron: Where did you get that from?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: As a member of the AJA, I cannot reveal my sources. I understand that some State Fleet clients who have had a persistent crash record will be offered defensive driving advice and a copy of the road rules in order to keep my cars intact as well as in the interests of public safety. I am unaware of whether any of our learned judges—

Mr BECKER: I rise on a point of order. I draw your attention, Sir, to question on notice No. 14 which asks how many Government vehicles have been involved in accidents.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I rise on a point of order Mr Speaker. The question and the answer relate directly to my question on notice No. 455, which appears on page 8 of the Notice Paper, and which the Minister has not yet paid me the courtesy of answering.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: That's what I'm doing now.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: No, you are not.

The SPEAKER: Order! To clarify this matter, I ask the member for Napier to repeat his question because I cannot remember the details of it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw everyone's attention to the question so that we can all listen to it.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Do you want the explanation as well as the question, Sir?

The SPEAKER: No, just the question.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Will the Minister of State Services confirm that he has now received information relating to judicial car crashes involving State Fleet vehicles? When will he reveal the information to the House?

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. Although similar, the question is different, and I will allow the Minister to respond.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The member for Coles seems a bit confused. I know this is her last term and that she is somewhat in her political dotage, but she asked me this question in the House yesterday. I am unaware whether any of our learned judges fall into the category of needing special counselling or advice. I doubt that, but I am not prepared to pass judgment. I will give this matter sober consideration and inform the House and the member for Coles of any progress *sine die*.

SEPARATION PACKAGES

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety assure the House that public servants offered separation packages will not include senior officers who are close to retirement age? I have received a letter from a senior officer of the Department of Road Transport. The letter states:

It has come to my attention recently that there is a possibility of a senior engineer on a salary of \$60 000 or more who may be considered for a voluntary separation package in 1993. As this engineer was going to retire of his own accord when he turned 60 at the end of 1993, I cannot see how the State Government is going to save money by paying out in excess of \$120 000. If this occurs, I regard this action as a waste of State taxpayers' money and of corruption at the highest level in Public Service management. It seems as though directors of Government departments can do whatever they please to justify a voluntary separation package especially if it involves someone else in senior management. These directors must be made accountable for their actions.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Mitcham for his question. It is really a hypothetical one because someone said that this person was going to do something. I well recall members opposite saying they were going to win the election, but they did not. We have to appreciate that voluntary and targeted separation packages have a number of rules attached to them, and those rules are quite clear. If any person is in an age bracket that would mean that the voluntary separation part of the package exceeds what he would have received at the age of 65, he gets that amount of money. The other point is that all packages of senior people are reviewed and considered by Cabinet before they are granted.

The member for Mitcham may not be aware that all separation packages are approved by officers of my department before officers of other departments can agree to those packages being paid to those persons who have been targeted or who volunteer to leave. I can also assure the honourable member that, from time to time, some persons who volunteer are not acceptable because the Commissioner of Public Employment is of the view that they are required employees of the Government.

PUBLIC SECTOR REFORM

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of State Services inform the House whether the Government has any intention of privatising Central Linen, State Print, State Fleet and other business units of State Services? I have been informed that the Western Australian Liberal Government recently announced its intention to sell off its equivalent of our Central Linen Service.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is significant that this question and the previous question have been asked on the actual year anniversary of the historic return to this House of the member for Kavel and the member for Alexandra. It is also the 12 month anniversary of the betrayal of the member for Kavel by the member for Coles—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN:—and the member for Bragg. We heard a great deal of huff and puff the other night from members opposite about what they intend to do. We heard their comments about Central Linen and State Print. I understand that the famous shredded document, which the Leader of the Opposition took to his Party room and which was roundly rejected by his colleagues—although he has assured them that he did not shred it but keeps it in his top drawer—included which asset sales and which privatisations he intended to pursue. I understand that State Systems, State Print, Central Linen and other business units in State Services were high on that list.

Let me rule out any privatisation of those State Services units by this Government. Let me give that assurance to the loyal workers of State Print and the Central Linen Service. Interestingly, part of the Opposition's plan did not involve voluntary or targeted separations but involved compulsory separations, that is, sackings. They were going to sack them, and that was to be their reward for loyalty. Let us see the Leader of the Opposition go down the road to State Print and Central Linen and explain his policies. He will not because he does not have the guts to do that before the next State election.

Recently I had the pleasure to visit all the Adelaide based units of State Services. I was very impressed by the commitment of management and workers. There is a stark difference between the treatment of those people by the Opposition and, of course, by this Government. We all know that members opposite would sell off the Central Linen Service, State Print and other units to their mates, that clearly they are on the Opposition's hit list. Let us look at the facts. Central Linen gave a price on rebate on linen services to public hospitals for the 1992-93 financial year resulting in actual savings of \$140 000 for our hospital system. The restructuring has resulted in total labour cost savings for 1992-93 of about \$200 000, and for 1993-94 savings of \$500 000 will be achieved. Central Linen's productivity and industrial relations are the envy of the industry.

A very loyal service is provided to this Parliament by State Print on these late nights. I would like to see one member of the Opposition stand up and pay tribute to those workers who have won substantial contracts from interstate worth over \$1 million, and the amount looks

like being higher this year. So, I applaud the management and workers of State Print. In addition, State Fleet manages, as I mentioned before, 2 500 light motor vehicles. It is the largest single fleet within Government, and that has been achieved because its prices are competitive with the private sector and it provides an excellent service. State Fleet is operated on a commercial basis, it is trading profitably and will contribute a dividend to Treasury in excess of \$1 million for 1992-93. So, let us see this document that has not been shredded, that is in the Leader's top drawer, so that we can settle this matter once and for all.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the Minister has just about answered the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morphett.

TIMBER ASSETS

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): My question is directed to the Treasurer. Will the Government come clean on its own hidden privatisation agenda?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OSWALD: I have in my possession a memorandum sent by the Crown Solicitor to the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Primary Industries analysing the proposal to amalgamate the timber processing assets of the Woods and Forests Department and SATCO. The Premier's Economic Statement claims that this move will lead to the company seeking joint venture involvement with the private sector in this area. This week's Government statement on public sector reform describes it as 'a model for the further rationalisation of Government activity'. However, the Crown Solicitor has raised serious questions about this approach, likening it to the arrangements adopted by the former Beneficial Finance, which will cost taxpayers at least \$1 000 million in losses.

The Crown Solicitor is seriously critical of submissions that are being put to Cabinet for the commercialisation of public sector activities. He says:

Cabinet is often asked to approve [commercial] ventures without being provided with information which would enable it to make a commercial assessment of the proposal.

In this case, he speculates that the real motive may be the eventual privatisation of timber processing assets, a move that the Government has consistently opposed in the past. Concern within the public sector about this Government's real agenda has been further heightened by the Premier's admission yesterday that some services are to be cut, an admission that he has tried to avoid for a fortnight since giving his Economic Statement.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will deal only with the question and not with the comment. The Government's position is clear.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I beg your pardon?

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Leader says that it is an embarrassment. I do not feel the least bit embarrassed; as a matter of fact, I feel rather good today. I cannot understand the Opposition's tactics. This matter was raised yesterday by the Leader, and it was extensively played on one of the news services last night. However, if the Opposition is so bereft of questions that it has to recycle them over a 24 hour period, I am happy to restate the Government's position, which was stated very clearly yesterday by the Premier. The advice supplied to the Government by the Crown Solicitor was duly taken and the arrangements that were being made for forward products were altered accordingly. There is nothing unusual in that.

As regards the Crown Solicitor's opinion on whether or not matters ought to be privatised, he is entitled to his opinion but it is a matter of policy and the Government has a firm policy on this. We believe that the former Woods and Forests Department is one of the very real assets of this State. I assume the member for Mount Gambier would agree with that. I think it would be a tragedy if assets that were built up about 100 years ago by people with foresight in this State were sold off for the sake of some barren ideology.

There is no doubt that the former Woods and Forests Department could do with some efficiencies being introduced into it—there is no question of that. It has become the norm that wages and salaries in that department are higher than in some areas of its private sector counterparts. Obviously, this puts the Woods and Forests Department at a significant trading disadvantage. What we propose to do about that is to engage in joint ventures where the opportunities arise. If those joint ventures do not arise, we will be disappointed; nevertheless, it means that the operation will continue to be held in public hands—and that is a firm commitment.

The Opposition has a different view on this matter. One of its former Leaders, the member for Victoria, clearly stated that he would sell the forests, and he put out press releases accordingly. The Government will not do that; there is no requirement for it to do that, and I think it would be a tragedy. Those people who, about 100 years ago, decided that this State could do with some public sector investment in this area would be very disappointed with their successors opposite.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

Mr HERON (Peake): Will the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety inform the House whether a national workers compensation scheme would be desirable, given the excellent performance of South Australia's WorkCover scheme? I understand that the National Industry Commission is conducting a year long inquiry into workers compensation schemes to examine the possibility of having uniform costs and benefits under a single scheme.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: This matter was discussed—

The Hon. Dean Brown: Where is your policy?

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

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

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

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: At the conference of Ministers of Labour last Friday, there was discussion about the operations of COMCARE and the extension of that Act, and the effect that that would have on State operated workers compensation schemes. We were advised by the New South Wales Minister that, if COMCARE was to be extended into that State, we would see the average levy rate in New South Wales lift from 1.8 per cent to between 2.5 and 3.5 per cent. The figures that he suggested are actuarially correct. The Victorian Minister is also concerned with the effect this would have in that State.

I am advised that compensation costs in Queensland are continuing to blow out, and there is a desire amongst Ministers to have a common workers compensation scheme. There are advantages in doing that, one of which is that with a common scheme operating throughout Australia similar to what we have in South Australia the Government or the organisation concerned would be able to restrict and control costs and expenditure incurred to ensure that activities are undertaken to reduce injuries and that those who cause injuries in the workplace pay the appropriate penalty. In South Australia, we have a situation where the average costs are reducing, where penalties are being used to encourage employers to undertake safe working practices and where a central scheme has been able to introduce processes and programs of a pilot nature to assist industries with high injury rates to reduce them.

We can also have the ridiculous situation of a worker in the oil fields in the north of our State being injured one foot inside the State line but, if the injury occurs one foot outside the State line, that worker becomes the recipient of an entirely different workers compensation and benefit scheme. We have the ridiculous situation where Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria are dumping injured workers onto the social services system. I am of the view that in Australia we should have a common scheme that provides the benefits that apply in South Australia to ensure that all workers who are injured are properly compensated. It would ensure that employers who operate unsafe industries are penalised and forced to operate safe workplaces, and it would result in a reduction in injury rates and real work being done in containing costs.

PUBLIC SECTOR REFORM

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): Will the Minister of State Services admit to the House that of the 200 to 250 minimum of the 3 000 Public Service job cuts coming from his department, at least 100 of those jobs will come from the Central Linen Service? I am reliably informed that these job cuts recommendations are based in part—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MATTHEW:—on the results of examinations of State Print and the Central Linen Service by a private consultancy company.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The honourable member is very unreliably informed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: If the House comes to order, we will continue with Question Time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: That includes the Leader and the member for Bragg.

MONTAGUE ROAD

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): My question is directed to the Minister representing the Minister of Transport Development. Has the department made further investigations on the stretch of Montague Road between Trenton Terrace and Bridge Road, Pooraka, to ascertain what improvements are required? A new dual carriageway is well under way from Montague Road to Port Wakefield Road. Montague Road, on the eastern side of Bridge Road, is also a dual carriage road, with service roads provided to all houses at that point. Once the new road is complete, Montague Road will be a truly major arterial road carrying heavy commercial traffic, except for the 700 metre strip in the existing Montague Road, which is just a single lane each way without any service road.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Like the honourable member, I am aware of this problem and the works needed to correct it. I am aware of the works that have been undertaken so far because, like the honourable member, I travel there every day. I shall certainly be pleased to obtain a reply for the honourable member from the Minister of Transport Development. However, I want to say that I hope with the spirit of *bonhomie* that is always apparent on the last day of Parliament and in the spirit of bipartisanship that this Parliament really requires, we should find out from the Opposition whether tonight there will be one party, two parties or perhaps none at all.

PUBLIC SECTOR CONTRACTS

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): My question is directed to the Minister of Education, Employment and Training.

Members interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: It is. Will the Minister confirm that a former deputy head of a TAFE college has twice in his retirement been brought back on contract to do paid work for the Department of Technical and Further Education when people already employed are available to do the work? Does the Minister agree that examples such as this raise doubts about the integrity of Government retirement schemes such as the targeted separation packages? I have been informed that a deputy head—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Dean Brown: Don't you realise the Public Service is like a sieve at the moment?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader and the member for Custance are out of order.

Mr INGERSON: I understand that a deputy head of a TAFE college who retired in 1989 was almost immediately employed on curriculum redevelopment on contract. He remained there for 18 months until he was

stood down following protest from the South Australian Institute of Teachers. I am now told that this same gentleman has been re-employed, again under contract, to update information brochures for TAFE—again something for which people already working there are equipped to do.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I would have assumed that the honourable member had the professionalism to give me the name of this particular person. However, if he is not prepared to do that, I shall be happy to give this information to the Chief Executive Officer and ask for a report from her about the allegation. I shall be very happy to pursue it. The honourable member is well aware that by and large we certainly try to ensure that such situations do not occur, and I shall be very happy to get a report for the honourable member.

TEACHERS

Mr HERON (Peake): Can the Minister of Education, Employment and Training explain to the House the benefits that will result from the recommendations of the teacher placement review?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: As members would be aware, I instigated the teacher placement review and it is now just under two months since that happened. I would be delighted to inform the honourable member of some of the benefits that I believe will flow from the recommendations that have come through to me from the consultant. In fact, there were 15 recommendations to be looked at by the Government in the short term, with 16 medium to long-term recommendations that we will need to address, and I intend to do that. Some of the benefits which will accrue immediately or as quickly as possible include increased opportunities for consultation with teachers and schools in relation to placement; further streamlining of administrative processes so that they become more efficient and customer friendly; and improved timing and improvement of content of communication with teachers and all of the stakeholders.

There will be greater local responsibilities for principals and district superintendents and, of course, this means that principals will be held more accountable for the veracity of the information that they provide about staffing, which comes from their schools. There will be improved flexibility and more options for teachers in country and difficult to staff metropolitan locations, and there will be better matching of the work force profile to meet the needs of students. I believe that these measures will lead to greater stability in school staffing and thus to an improvement in the quality of education for all South Australian students.

MINISTER'S STATEMENT

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): My question is directed to the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety. Why has he not yet apologised for the defamatory statement made by him in this House against the Hon. Julian Stefan, in view of the fact that an apology has been given today by a Cabinet colleague, and when will he do so?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Later today.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. Dean Brown: Be man enough to stand up and do it now.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Dean Brown: Come on, we'll wait.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader.

MURRAY VALLEY

Mr De LAINE (Price): My question is directed to the Minister of Environment and Land Management. In view of the approaching long weekend when many people will enjoy the recreational and tourist facilities of the Murray Valley, can the Minister advise what steps the Department of Environment and Land Management has taken to advise visitors of responsible use and care for this important resource?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Price for his question, because it is an important campaign, and it is one that has had some success. As a consequence of the campaigns which have been conducted, particularly last year, the department undertook a survey to find out what sort of impact it had and the effectiveness of this campaign, and it was found that there was a very high awareness in the community about the Care for the Murray campaign. The slogan that has been adopted this year, with brochures and stickers and in the media through promotions is, 'Don't muck up the Murray'—a campaign all of us would endorse enthusiastically because of the sensitive nature of the care that we must take with our Murray River system, particularly as we are the end users and have a very clear interest in how it is treated.

It is important, particularly for South Australians, but the objectives of the campaign are to increase the level of concern of recreational users of the Murray Valley and its environment; to increase the level of understanding by recreational users of the needs and obligations of all user groups; to minimise the environmental impact caused by recreational activities; to encourage user groups to cooperate in promoting the environmental code for the Murray region; and, finally, to encourage the community to become involved in projects and activities designed to promote, support, and provide a repair agenda for environmental programs.

It is fair to say that the communication strategy which has been used, both in the metropolitan and in the regional media, has been very successful. The characters that have been used, for example, Bazza the bunyip—which, of course, has been localised and focused upon by the Murray region—have been very successful. About 200 000 people visited the Murray region last year, so one can see clearly the importance of having a comprehensive media and publicity campaign to ensure that people are aware of the impact they will have by just visiting that region. I am pleased to say that we are continuing that program, and I hope that we can reach all those members of community, whether they be from this State, interstate or overseas, who visit the region to ensure they are aware of how they should look after and protect the Murray region.

ECONOMIC STATEMENT

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): My question is directed to the Treasurer. What confidence should parliament and the public have in the estimates given in the premier's Economic Statement for cost savings and other benefits to be achieved by the commercialisation of some Government activities when the Crown Solicitor has told the Government that advice given to Cabinet seeking the approval of commercial ventures is often very seriously flawed?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Every confidence.

HOUSING COOPERATIVES

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations advise the House what progress has been made in the cooperative housing area since Parliament passed the Housing Cooperatives Act late in 1991?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question, and I am pleased to advise the House that substantial progress has been made in putting this new initiative into place. Indeed, only last Friday, the South Australian Cooperative Housing Authority celebrated the purchase of its loan portfolio with the handover of a cheque for \$70 million to HomeStart Finance. This is in effect the last major step in creating the operational arm of the Act. Since the Housing Cooperatives Act was proclaimed in January 1992, the new Cooperative Housing Authority has entered into contractual arrangements with more than 50 individual cooperatives who, between them, provide housing for more than 2 000 people in this State. These arrangements have the effect of securing the public's interest in the program as well as providing for prudent financial management and future program growth.

I have recently announced the appointment of a new board of the authority, and I am pleased to say it is well down the track to achieving the expansion target of 160 new dwellings. The new arrangements for cooperative housing have provided for greater security in growth in cooperative housing as well as for improved financial arrangements. Indeed, the income to the program from tenant rents has increased from \$570 000 in the year 1990-91 to \$940 000 in the past financial year, and an estimated \$1.6 million this year. That is certainly a statement that shows that social policy and financial efficiency can be married successfully.

South Australia has a reputation for being the first State in Australia to enshrine cooperative housing into legislation and remains the State with the largest *per capita* commitment to cooperative and community housing in this country. This is an area that shows how community and Government can work closely together to achieve common objectives. I can assure the House that the Government remains committed to the ongoing

growth and development of this vital sector in the provision of adequate and affordable housing for South Australians.

ENGINEERING AND WATER SUPPLY DEPARTMENT

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): My question is directed to the Minister of Public Infrastructure. Why does the Engineering and Water Supply Department not know where its major mains are located within the city square mile, and why has it taken the Minister so long to admit this failure? On Saturday 31 October last year, the water supply to the Convent of Mercy in Angas Street was cut off, and I wrote to the Minister seeking an explanation. I received his response this week—six months later. In his explanation, the Minister states that the water supply to the convent was cut off during repairs to a main. However, the convent was not warned that this would occur because the department mistakenly believed that the convent was supplied from a separate main on the other side of the street.

The Minister's letter further advised that 'the relevant plans have now been updated to correctly locate the water supply'. Constituents, who have again contacted me about this matter, are concerned that this suggests that the department does not know the location of its major mains and that that may result in other people being seriously inconvenienced by having their water supply cut off without notice.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I do not really know whether this main is one of those mains that was laid in the 1950s, when it was a cost cutting exercise by the then Liberal Government to not record where the mains were going to be put.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Because that happened. As a cost cutting exercise by a Liberal Government, mains were not recorded, and we had to bring back people who had been retired to ask them whether they could remember where those mains were laid so we could get it down onto a computerised system.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I do not know whether it is one of those mains, but I will check to see. In the meantime, in the past 10 years, the E&WS Department has digitalised and computerised its system—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:—of pipes to the point where it is well ahead of any other such organisation in this country in terms of getting a clear grip on where the information is as to where pipes are. I do not think the E&WS has anything to apologise for, except that it went through a very bad patch when a Liberal Government was in power.

HIB VACCINE

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services advise the House when the new arrangements for the refunding of HIB vaccine will be put in place? HIB causes infection which can lead to meningitis, brain damage, inflammation of the windpipe and death. There have been

150 cases in South Australia since 1987, with three deaths and one case of permanent brain damage. There has been a huge boost in demand for a new vaccine against HIB which is suitable for children two months old and upwards.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: Members will no doubt be aware that the Federal Minister, during the recent election campaign, announced the bringing forward of the grants for the States for the HIB vaccine—haemophilus influenza type B vaccine. In fact, only the other day, Senator Graham Richardson announced that families of children born on or after 1 February 1993 will be reimbursed up to \$35.50 per dose of vaccine provided by a pharmacist, general practitioner or local council. Of course, this will target those children who are two months of age onwards.

Another vaccine for children 18 months onwards is already available and at no cost in public vaccination clinics. Naturally, parents will have to provide proof of purchase, the type of vaccine, the date it was bought and a declaration relating to the purchase, and they will be able to make that claim through Medicare offices, which will have a special HIB claim form available from next Monday. Families who paid for the vaccine between 1 April and the announcement of the new arrangement can be reimbursed \$50 per dose of the vaccine. HIB is a particularly serious illness for young children, and I urge all parents to ensure that they take advantage of this offer to get their children immunised.

ANGOVE SCRUB

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Will the Minister of Environment and Land Management advise the House what negotiations are now proceeding between the Commonwealth and State Governments and the Tea Tree Gully council to protect five hectares of precious and rare vegetation in Angove Scrub from subdivision and housing development, and what is the basis and/or results of these negotiations? My attempts to take a deputation to the Minister have been flatly rejected on the grounds that it would be 'a waste of time'. However, by other means I have learnt that negotiations are active to have the Commonwealth and State Governments share with the Tea Tree Gully council the cost of buying the five hectares at risk, with the Commonwealth paying half. My constituents are interested to know whether the Government is offering alternative land for the subdivision or selling Government owned land to pay for its share.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The honourable member has not received that information: the advice given was that, when I can make a comment on this, I will be happy to see a delegation. The fact is that discussions are going on with the Commonwealth, the Tea Tree Gully council and a number of other organisations. That information was passed onto the honourable member, representatives of the Save the Angove Scrub Committee and local residents in the area. So, they are aware of that; they are being kept informed. The Federal member of Parliament is being kept informed, as is the Tea Tree Gully council. At this time it would be inappropriate for me to make any comments, because discussions are

progressing. I hope that, within the next few weeks, we might be able to make an announcement, but it depends on discussions with the various parties.

ELECTRICITY TRUST

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Is the Minister of Public Infrastructure now in a position to respond to the issue I raised with him yesterday whereby a constituent of mine had to wait 34 minutes before the ETSA switchboard operator was able to respond to his question?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is of the opinion that this is a repetitive question of the same Minister.

Mr HAMILTON: Absolutely not, Sir. I beg to differ, with great deference to you, Mr Speaker: I did not ask this question at all.

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member is asking for an answer to a question he asked yesterday, I suggest that the answer would be the same yesterday or today and that therefore the question must be the same.

Mr HAMILTON: With your leave, I would like to explain, Sir. I raised this matter with the Minister privately yesterday in the House and hand delivered to him a letter from a constituent. The facts of the matter are that I am well aware of the Standing Orders. The reason for my question is the delay of some 34 minutes regarding the ETSA switchboard.

Dr ARMITAGE: On a point of order, Sir, the honourable member indicated that he has already raised this matter with the Minister. This session, his questions without notice—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Adelaide will resume his seat. The honourable member stated that the issue was raised privately and, if it was raised privately, it was not part of the debates of this House.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: the matter was raised as a grievance in this House yesterday. I sat here and listened to it. How can the honourable member claim it is just a private matter? He tried to mislead this House—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —by—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader will resume his seat.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has not referred to a previous debate, which is not allowed under Standing Orders; and he has not asked a question. Therefore, I will allow the question and allow the Minister to answer it. The Minister.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: After all the tremendous amount of interest the question has raised, I can indicate that I did hear the honourable member's contribution yesterday. He did pass me a letter to read, and I have taken that letter, passed it on to the Electricity Trust and asked for a response. When that response is available, I will pass it on to the honourable member.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr MEIER (Goyder): My question is directed to the Treasurer.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr MEIER: Is the Treasurer concerned that an SGIC staff member in the finance area has merely been asked to resign over the disappearance of \$25 000, when the former Corporate Affairs Manager of the same organisation was charged on 14 April with seven counts of false pretences, involving a total of about \$13 000 and, if so, what efforts are being made to recover the money from the SGIC staffer who was told to go?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have no knowledge of this matter. I have been in the place—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:—long enough to be very sceptical of the quality of the information that members opposite put forward in questions, because history shows that more often than not they are completely wrong. They are great peddlers of rumours that, when investigated, have absolutely no basis in fact, and my evidence for that is as recent as yesterday—the nonsense spoken by the member for Bright. However, for the member for Goyder, I will certainly take up the question with the SGIC, and I will respond to him by letter as soon as I have some information from the SGIC.

HOUSING TRUST TENANTS

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Does the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations intend to raise with the newly elected Federal Labor Government the provision of extra housing funds to help overcome waiting lists in South Australia?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFT: First, might I say that South Australia has benefited enormously from funds from the Commonwealth for public housing over a very long period and, indeed, some 12 per cent of the housing stock in this State is public housing, compared with a national average of just over 5 per cent. Some 63 000 houses in this State are providing adequate and affordable shelter for Housing Trust tenants. Might I say that the recently defeated Federal Opposition came forward at the last election with a policy to cease, immediately upon election, the funding that is provided to the States under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. Indeed, even further than that, it was stated that the housing stock would be sold to the private sector.

I debated that very policy on radio in Adelaide with the Federal Opposition spokesperson on housing, and that spokesperson indicated that organisations such as AMP, superannuation funds and others would be offered the housing stock. I can only say that that policy brought strong opposition right across the South Australian community, particularly of course from the many thousands of Housing Trust tenants and their families who would have been drastically affected by that most unfortunate policy. The Housing Trust waiting list in this State is the most broadly based and generous of that in all the Australian States. No other State has adopted the broad criteria that we adopt in South Australia; no other State has the housing stock to offer *per capita*.

The Housing Trust waiting list is a complex and uncertain instrument to determine the housing needs of those on our list and, because of the high level of services provided by the Housing Trust and the enormous housing stock, indeed, many more people are attracted to apply for housing in this State, because they know that there is a very good likelihood that they will access the services that are available. The problem is whether they are indeed the services that most meet their needs. I think that is an issue that we must address in housing policy in the months and years ahead.

An enormous amount has been done in that regard in this State to offer to people seeking housing some alternatives to simply renting public housing. HomeStart, for example, has provided home ownership to 10 000 South Australians. The community housing programs, housing cooperatives and financial support for private renters are a number of alternatives which are being developed, which are very effective and which are now very much part of the South Australian scene for those seeking adequate housing.

On the specific question, I am proposing to meet the Federal Minister for Housing (the Deputy Prime Minister) in the near future to discuss these issues, including what I believe is a very important and valuable Commonwealth program, and that is the Building Better Cities program, which the Federal Opposition also intended to discontinue. With the continuance of that program and the other opportunities available for us, I believe that we can make great progress in this State and across Australia in meeting the housing needs of those who currently do not have adequate housing.

CUSTOMS CLEARANCE

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): What impact does the Minister of Business and Regional Development expect South Australian ports and businesses to suffer from a decision by the Federal Government to impose a national system of customs clearance on imported goods, and what action will he take to protect the interests of the port of Adelaide? We have received notification from the Custom Brokers Council of Australia that it is very concerned at the proposal by the Australian Customs Service to introduce a national customs clearance system that would allow cargo destined for any port in Australia to be cleared electronically at any other point.

This communication states that this will result in a significant shift of business to the larger ports of Sydney and Melbourne, which will: cause staff redundancies in the customs broking industry; contradict the Government's own intention of revitalisation of our exports; reduce in our ports the number of personnel trained to detect drugs; further destroy our economy because of our already low level of head offices in this State; and reduce our slim chances of achieving the transport hub.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am glad that the honourable member has raised this question. It is being taken up with the Federal Government and I am pleased that it will be done in a bipartisan way. I will certainly also be raising this matter with the Minister of Transport Development, who is responsible for the transport hub concept. Also, I should like to pay tribute to the

honourable member today, when you think of what he gave up a year ago by leaving the Federal Parliament and \$200 000 in benefits. That is a sacrifice for this Parliament and his Party that has not truly been acknowledged.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Will the Minister of Business and Regional Development inform the House what progress has been made in the negotiations between Telecom and the Government for the provision of telecommunication services?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I know that the honourable member has traversed this route on many occasions.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I think that the Minister is giving the answer to the next question.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: No, I certainly am not. I understand the honourable member's concern, because it is one that he has raised with me.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, the question has been answered, albeit wrongly, and we should be going to our side of the House.

The SPEAKER: The Chair does not uphold that point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Until the Chair can hear the answer—

The Hon. M.D. RANN: This is a very important question, because the simple fact is—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. Until the Chair can hear the answer, we will not complete Question Time. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Last week, in question after question and speech after speech, members opposite said that the Information Utility was a dead duck. I believe that the honourable member from my side of the House who, right from the start, has been committed to this concept will be very pleased to hear that recently I signed an agreement on behalf of the South Australian Government with Telecom. The signing has been the culmination of months of negotiation between State Systems, the Department of Premier and Cabinet, the Economic Development Authority, the Attorney-General's Department and Telecom.

Indeed, a week ago I met with the heads of Telecom to sign this historic agreement, which gives the South Australian Government a discount on its total Telecom bill for most of its products and services in return for a commitment to a certain volume of services and business cost reduction projects. This discount is over and above any other discount offered by Telecom, for instance, on Flexiplan.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is interesting that members opposite do not want to hear about this. A week ago they were in the *Advertiser*; they hope that the *Advertiser* can look after them, we know that. They hope that the *Advertiser* will be able to give them a little credibility on the investment of their—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The House will come to order. The member for Coles has a point of order.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: On a point of order, the Minister is debating the question and taking an undue amount of time about it.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are two points of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat until we get order. There are two points of order: one is that the Minister is debating the question. I uphold that. The second is that he is taking too long: that is within the jurisdiction of the Chair, but at this stage I do not uphold that point of order. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Members opposite who said that the Information Utility was dead, and gained a great deal of publicity from saying so, will be pleased to know that this agreement that was signed a week ago will involve a discount that will amount to almost \$9 million from Telecom over five years, and there are plans to extend the agreement to include statutory authorities. This could result in an additional \$8 million discount from Telecom over a five year period.

The South Australian Government has been careful, in negotiating the agreement, to take advantage of competition in the communications marketplace. Its commitment to Telecom is of a very substantial nature that leaves room for competition by all carriers for a range of services. A few weeks ago we heard of massive cost blowouts and no Information Utility, yet here is a multi-million dollar agreement resulting in real reductions for this Government and for the taxpayers of this State. Members opposite got it wrong, but they do not have the guts, on this first anniversary of the Leader's wimpy leadership, to acknowledge it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

OPERATION HYGIENE

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr S.G. EVANS: Yesterday when a vote was taken on Orders of the Day: Other Business, No. 6, your casting vote was required, Mr. Speaker. You took the opportunity, which you are entitled to do, Sir, to say that the '...Opposition Whip...well knows that the result of this division tonight would be even, which would be 21 either side', and you went on to say that in that regard I had put you in a difficult position. I want to explain my position.

I know that the method used in this House, where a person like yourself in the Chair gives the vote after all others have been counted, is unfortunate, and I think that there is another way around that. Your vote could be indicated to the clerks beforehand. I was hoping that the

vote would not be an even vote, although it is true that I had a clear indication before the vote was taken that the Government would take one view. I was hoping that most of my colleagues would take the other. But my colleagues would know that I never ask anyone on this side to support a motion. I never put it to the Party room. I just told the Party room that I was going to move a motion, and that is my practice.

I apologise if you, Sir, believe that I put you in an awkward position, but when we have a division all members know that all names are recorded, so it does not matter at which stage we state our position. We are all elected members. My name is mentioned and so is yours. I just hope that you did not see it in the light of how it reads, but I believe that we all come in here elected to express a view and, when our names have to be recorded, it is just unfortunate that yours comes last. I think there is another way of doing it, if the House would like to change the Standing Orders.

MEMBER'S QUESTION

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave has been granted.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I wish to clarify the situation regarding the last question at the end of Question Time. I advised the Minister that I would be asking him two questions today: one concerned Telecom and one concerned the chaotic traffic lanes on West Terrace. Prior to the end of Question Time when it was clear that time was running out I indicated to the Minister that, obviously, there would be time for only one question, but I did not make it clear which one. The Minister being distracted by interjection inadvertently began to give the answer to the wrong question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

MINISTER'S APOLOGY

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: On 24 March 1993, I issued a media release entitled 'Stefan accused of abusing parliamentary powers' which contained a defamatory statement about the Hon. Mr Stefan. My statement stated that the honourable member may have behaved improperly in his position as a member of the Legislative Council. I purported to set out details.

I accept that my facts were incorrect. The Hon. Mr Stefani has not abused his parliamentary powers or position as a member of Parliament. I greatly regret any distress or embarrassment that my statement may have caused to the Hon. Mr Stefani or his family. I apologise to the Hon. Mr Stefani and withdraw my statement unreservedly.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: The proposal before the Chair is that the House note grievances.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): I point out to the House that that apology had to be drawn from the Minister at the end of Question Time, when the Minister knew that most of the TV cameras would have left this Chamber. I find it quite unacceptable that that apology was given in that manner at the end of Question Time, when the Minister had the chance—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is no good the Minister's walking out in a huff now. We have noted, Minister, and Mr Speaker, the manner in which that apology was given to the House. It was an apology obviously instructed by solicitors, but with no meaning behind it whatsoever. I grieve on the fact that the Arnold Labor Government is in absolute disarray over its public sector job cuts. I would like to highlight to the House the extent to which the Government is in disarray.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: From very reliable sources within the Public Service we know that this Government is still arguing about where these job cuts could be. Otherwise, why has the Government not been willing to give the facts to this House and to the public? I challenge the Government now: from where are the job cuts coming? It is not willing to say. Two weeks after the Economic Statement it still cannot indicate how many jobs are to go in the education area.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is very interesting to see. Here is the Minister of Education, who stood up this afternoon and just protesteth too much. She invariably protesteth too much, but she certainly did today. Having stood up and denied the fact that there were 1 000 jobs to come from the education area—

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: And she still protesteth too much. The facts are from very reliable sources. I know that the Minister has been arguing in Cabinet that she is not willing to see 1 000 jobs go within the education sector, even though it has been the Government that has said to her that they must go. It is interesting that it is even more embarrassing—as she walks out in a huff as well—because her personal staff apparently are to be cut under instructions from Cabinet. It turns out that the Minister of Education has a personal staff of 19.9 positions. She has the biggest ministerial staff of all the Ministers. I am amused at some of the other Ministers laughing over this, because they know the extent to which they turned on the Minister of Education and said that her number of personal staff must be cut as well.

Then, we had the brave Minister of Business and Regional Development standing up today and arguing that it was the Liberal Party that was about to start privatising parts of the public sector, when in fact it was their own Crown Solicitor—through a leaked document

which was revealed on TV last night and of which we have a copy—who pointed out that it was the Government that was in fact doing secret privatisations of large sections of the public sector. In particular, he pointed out that the move with the Woods and Forest Department was no more than a move towards privatisation of part of that department.

But it is this very Minister—who accused the Liberal Party of wanting to privatise the Government laundry, State Print and the Government Clothing Corporation—who is about to cut 250 jobs from State Supply, with 100 of those jobs coming from the Government laundry. That information came from the very heart of his own department. This is the sort of embarrassment and confusion that the Government is facing. Members opposite stand up and try to point the finger across the House at the Liberal Party—

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Notwithstanding the restive back bench, the member opposite should be addressing his remarks to you, and not turning his back on you.

The SPEAKER: The Leader will please address his remarks to the Chair.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I certainly will, Mr Speaker. Through you, I challenge this Labor Government to tell us where the 3 000 jobs are coming from and how it will fill the \$430 million black hole that exists in the income as laid down in the Economic Statement. They know that hole is there for 1995-96 and they have refused to give any details whatsoever to this House.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): In 1979, when I came into this place, I was told that the role of the backbencher was to represent his or her electors.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: And I thank my colleague for that. Today we have the spectacle of three members of the Opposition ridiculing me for standing in this place to ask a question on behalf of a constituent—a genuine question about an issue that quite properly aggrieved my constituent. In addition, the member for Mount Gambier and one of his colleagues approached me after Question Time yesterday pointing out they were also aggrieved about the delays in ETSA's answering of its switchboard. Yet we have this idiotic response from the Leader of the Opposition, who casts himself in this Parliament and outside as a future leader of this State. He ridicules the little people, who quite properly want to come to a member of Parliament and lodge a complaint against an instrumentality.

Not only did that happen, but also we had the member for Newland—also a shadow backbencher—standing up and taking frivolous points of order in relation to a genuine complaint. That is the type of leadership we get from a resurrected member of Parliament. I suggest the Hon. Ted Chapman would be bitterly disappointed about the Leader's style and approach in this Parliament. It is absolutely outrageous. He is ridiculed constantly in the *Adelaide Messenger* by Alex Kennedy. He must just

about die every time he opens the paper every week and sees the way in which Alex Kennedy berates him about how he cannot handle his role as Leader of the Opposition.

The fact that the Leader was prepared to take a frivolous point of order in relation to a genuine complaint by one of my constituents speaks volumes for his so-called intelligence. Well may he walk out of the Chamber in shame. It is good to see the back end of him. One would hope that he is not the Leader of the Opposition for very long. It is the sort of thing that I will certainly be putting out to my electorate—the little people, whom the Liberal Party purports to represent. They say that they want to look after the little person in the community, but what are they doing? They are ridiculing at every opportunity and repeatedly taking frivolous points of order. They have done so all this year.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Exactly, as my colleague says, 'No compassion.' In the three minutes I have left, I also want to raise a matter in relation to three women constituents who came to me complaining about the problems of noise and disruption in the community. Time and time again in this Parliament, going back as early as 1990, I have asked the Government to introduce a Bill to address the problems of noise complaints and to give the police the appropriate powers so that of their own volition they can intervene where there are noisy parties and so on in the community. Again, on 3 April, I was approached by these three ladies from Semaphore Park, and I pointed out to them that I would raise this matter again. I was hoping that the EPA Bill, which would incorporate these provisions, would have been introduced in this session.

I understand that there is some difficulty with the drafting, but I hope that in the August session the appropriate Bill is brought before Parliament for debate and that it will pass rapidly through both Houses. In that way, when there is disruption in the community, the police will not have to wait for a complaint from a member of the public. If they see a problem, they will have the power to intervene. In addition, it will negate the need for elderly people to have to complain, go through the courts and fear recrimination. I appeal to the Minister to make sure that the appropriate Bill is before the Parliament in the first week of the next session, and that it has a speedy passage so that the police have the appropriate powers to address these problems.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Today I wish to refute the statement made by the Executive Director of the Adelaide Grand Prix (Dr Mal Hemmerling) that he thought Australia did not have enough female celebrities to enable us to stage a women's celebrity race at this year's Grand Prix. I have news for Dr Hemmerling. The definition of 'celebrity' is that a person is well known, and I propose to give the House the names of 50 South Australian women who deserve the status of celebrity. I hope that the list stirs Dr Hemmerling's imagination and that of his sponsors and jogs his memory. The list is by no means exhaustive and it comprises only South Australian women.

In the category of sport, the list includes: Lisa Ondieki, Olympic medallist and marathon runner; Michelle Fielke, captain, Australian world champion netball team, and captain, Dekker Garville, South Australian national premier netball team, reputed to be the finest netball team in the world; Gillian Rolton, Olympic gold medallist equestrienne; Jane Crafter, Australian women's professional golf champion; Amanda Cross, world champion light-weight rower; Sandy Pisani, Olympic gold medallist, hockey; Valerie Beddoe, Olympic and world champion diver; Pat Mickan, dual Olympic basketballer and champion netball coach; Margaret Angove, champion netball coach; Glynis Nunn, athlete, Olympic gold medallist, heptathlon event; Joanne Faull, Wimbledon tennis player; Julie Nykiel, dual Olympic basketballer and current goal shooter with Class A Contax; Wendy Ey and Judy Daly, gold medallist athletes, World Veteran Athletics Championships.

In the media category, the list includes: Susan Mitchell, author and television presenter; Leigh McCluskey, television presenter; Anne Wills, entertainer and social commentator; Samela Harris, Rae Atkey and Alex Kennedy, columnists; Jan Beasley, television presenter; Julia Lester, broadcaster; and Carole Whitelock, broadcaster.

In the tourism category, the list includes: Maggie Beer, restaurateur, National Gourmet Restaurant Award winner and food writer; Jill Heaven, restaurateur; Ann Oliver, restaurateur; and Pam Dunsford, award winning wine maker. Another category is that of children's heroines, and it must be remembered that a significant proportion of those attending the Grand Prix are children, and I have included Mem Fox, author of the best-selling book *Possum Magic*; and Patsy Biscoe, children's singer and entertainer.

In the arts and entertainment category, the list includes: Robyn Archer, singer and cabaret artist; Julie Anthony, singer; Catherine Lambert, singer; Marilyn Richardson, opera singer and currently the grand diva of Australia; Tubby Justice, rock singer and song writer; Pat Wilson, comedienne; Melanie Salomon, comedienne; Jane Peters, violinist and international award winner; and Emma Balfour, international model.

In public and civic life, the list includes: Jo Tiddy, Commissioner for Equal Opportunity; Mary Beasley, Commissioner for Public and Consumer Affairs; Janine Haines, former Leader of the Australian Democrats, first woman leader of an Australian political Party, writer and speaker; Jill Maxwell, President, South Australian branch of the Australian Medical Association; Jane Rann, alderman, Adelaide City Council; Rosemary Boucaut, alderman, Adelaide City Council; Angela Condous, former Lady Mayoress, City of Adelaide; Lynnette Ninio, Lady Mayoress, City of Adelaide; Lois O'Donohue, Chairperson, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission and, in this year of indigenous people, that would be appropriate; and Barbara Hardy, AC, scientist and environmental advocate.

That is not an exhaustive list, to which can be added one Federal and three State Ministers of the Crown, one Federal and one State shadow Minister, and one Federal member and three State members of Parliament.

If these women have not been accorded the status of celebrity, it is because men in the media at the level of

editor, sub-editor and journalist have decided that a large number of ordinary men deserve elevation to the status of celebrity and that a large number of outstanding women should be condemned to anonymity. Some of those women may not choose to drive in a Grand Prix celebrity race. Many of them are running another race, the race of life in which they are impeded by the ball and chain of prejudice, discrimination and the kind of thoughtlessness that was behind the remarks of Dr Hemmerling.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): During Question Time today I asked a question about Montague Road, the recent developments that are starting to come to fruition, funded as I understand it from Commonwealth sources through the local Department of Road Transport, and the problems that this will create in my electorate. Members who live in the area or have recently travelled on Main North Road will have noted that there is a temporary arrangement at the intersection of Main North Road and Montague Road, while a new stretch of Montague Road will proceed through what was the old SAMCOR lands down to Port Wakefield Road.

As I understand it, it will be a three-lane road and will involve a major upgrade of the intersection of Montague Road and Main North Road as well as the new Montague Road and Port Wakefield Road. Some other works are taking place at the other end of Montague Road where it intersects with Bridge Road at Pooraka. That intersection badly needs an upgrade and I am pleased to see that a good deal of work is being done there to allow the smooth flow of traffic.

The issue is this: all the way from Modbury to the corner of Bridge and Montague Roads it is a two-lane and, in some parts, three-lane dual carriageway with service roads provided to all the houses anywhere near the vicinity of that road. That makes it a much safer prospect for not only pedestrian traffic but also vehicular traffic. However, the new Montague Road that is being constructed on the SAMCOR lands will, in my view, see a dramatic increase in the amount of commercial traffic that will filter into the Port Adelaide region, down through Montague Road onto Port Wakefield Road and beyond. As I understand it, the Department of Road Transport has further plans to take the road beyond Port Wakefield Road and, eventually, down to the Gillman site.

All these are welcome developments and the people in my area welcome the road funding that will see the new Montague Road connector, as it has been called. However, the new intersection on Main North Road/Montague Road will be almost the extremity of the road developments on the existing Montague Road. If one were to proceed several hundred metres to the east on Montague Road from Main North Road, one would come to Trenton Terrace, which is at the very end of the road developments. That leaves approximately 700 metres of Montague Road sandwiched between two dual carriageways carrying an inordinate amount of commercial traffic to service the area.

My constituents who live on Montague Road find it extremely difficult, given the two lanes (one in each direction), to safely back their cars out onto this road at any time of the day. During peak hour, it is almost

impossible to move on or off Montague Road, if one is unlucky enough to live on that very busy stretch in the electorate of Playford. There are 16 000 vehicles a day currently using that road with a very high proportion being commercial traffic. Once the new connector is put in place I anticipate that those traffic conditions will double, and that will mean that the life of the people who, unfortunately, have houses that were built—

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

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I want to raise one or two matters today, the first of which concerns the ongoing performance of the Minister of Tourism. Obviously he has become quite paranoid about the Government's policy of privatisation and public sector cutbacks, because every time he comes into the House he gets onto that track. He tries to deflect criticism of the Government by making wild unsubstantiated allegations about members of the Opposition. We all know that this Government is engaged in that activity, that it is going to privatise everything; in fact, there will be nothing left for us to privatise when we come to Government. The Minister is so paranoid about this process that he appears to have lost his political balance. He makes the wildest allegations. I suggest that he have a cold shower before Question Time so that he will be a little more rational and will make only half as many wild accusations. There will be nothing left for us to privatise; the Government will have done it all.

The Government's privatisation policies go far beyond anything that the Opposition had in mind in 1985. It has exceeded its own expectations. Let us not have any more of this nonsense from the Minister. Let him answer to the people of this State for their problems, because he and his colleagues sat idly by while all these statutory authorities got completely out of control. They spent all the money, and now they are trying to recoup it and to blame the Opposition. That is the kind of foolish escapade that we are seeing. If it had not been for the State Bank and SGIC and all these other things, the Port Augusta Hospital would not be making representations to the member for Stuart and me to ensure that there is no doubt about its future redevelopment.

I say from the outset that I strongly support the upgrading of those facilities, because they provide badly needed health care not only for the people of Port Augusta but for all my constituents who live in the northern parts of the State and those people who utilise the excellent Royal Flying Doctor Service, which is based at Port Augusta. That project has my ongoing and continued support. I sincerely hope that the announcement on Tuesday by the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services will be put into effect as soon as possible and that an absolutely watertight assurance is given that this matter will not become an ongoing saga with further delays.

The member for Stuart indicated her support for Mr Gordon Coulthard who was elected to the Corporation of Port Augusta. I too was pleased to see Mr Coulthard stand for election, because in discussions that I had with him in the past few months I encouraged him to put forward his nomination. I am also pleased that a member of the Coober Pedy Aboriginal community,

Mr Robin Walker, was elected to that council. I have had a lot to do with Mr Walker over many years. He was my representative on the Coober Pedy school council, and I am pleased to see that he is now playing a prominent part in the civic affairs of Coober Pedy. I congratulate all councillors who were re-elected and particularly those who were elected for the first time. I give my sincere thanks to people such as the former mayor of Quorn, Mr Roy Deakin, who has given outstanding service to that town far beyond what most people would expect.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood interjecting:

Mr GUNN: You cannot argue with the ballot box. I believe that the people should be given the opportunity on regular occasions to exercise their franchise.

The Hon. J.P. Trainer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: I look forward to the next session of Parliament so that the Opposition can make its final arrangements for taking over the affairs of this State.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I will leave the member for Eyre to his own little fantasy.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Indeed; John Hewson regularly used to say that. I want to speak on an environmental theme. I am reminded as I get to my feet that in a previous speech when I spoke in appreciative terms about the work done by a particular scientist on revegetation I got the name wrong. I referred to Dr Jackie Gillen, who is well known in the environmental movement. However, it has been pointed out to me that I got my Jackies wrong, and that, in fact, it was Dr Jacqui Yenning who did a lot of work on revegetation in the Department of Environment and Planning. I take the opportunity to correct what I said on that matter.

Some time ago I read a report by the Conservation Council on vegetation corridors in the Inman Valley. The report addressed in part the use of 1080 for the removal of vermin feral species. It noted that although 1080 was used for rabbit and dingo control it was not used in this State for the removal of foxes and that that was a little unusual because it is used in other States and it has certain advantages over the strychnine baits that are used in South Australia.

I took up this matter with the Minister and I now take the opportunity to correct the record, because 1080 is being used for fox control in South Australia at present. The document I have in front of me suggests that the National Parks and Wildlife Service is conducting three large scale 1080 poisoning trials directed at foxes. One is being conducted on pastoral country to protect colonies of the yellow footed rock wallaby; another is in the Flinders Ranges National Park for the same reason; and a third is being conducted in the Venus Bay Conservation Park to remove foxes to allow the reintroduction of the brush-tailed bettong.

Other trials have been postponed pending the outcome of the first three. I sincerely hope that these trials are successful and that there may be further such programs, because we know of the devastation to our native mammals as a result of predation particularly by foxes and cats as well as the effect that the grazing animal, the rabbit, has on the native environment. Strychnine has a

number of drawbacks: it has an odour and a taste, and it is quite likely that a fox will gag on the bait and expectorate. In those circumstances, of course, the bait would not do what it is intended to do, which is to kill the fox. On the other hand, 1080 is odourless and tasteless.

In addition, 1080 is found in the bloodstream of native animals; indeed, most native animals are relatively tolerant to it. It was suggested to me once, I think in relation to the numbat, which is one of the few non-nocturnal mammals that we have in this country, that snakes rarely bite numbats. If a snake bit a numbat it would wriggle away in agony and die because of the very high level of 1080 that is in the numbat from the vegetation that it consumes, 1080 of course occurring naturally in various forms of native vegetation.

So, 1080 not only is odourless and tasteless but it tends not to have a devastating effect on the native species whereas I assume that strychnine is unselective as to its impact on both native species and feral animals. I commend the National Parks and Wildlife Service for the trials that are taking place in relation to the use of 1080. I hope they continue and that other forms of control of feral animals can be found, because there is little doubt that the thoughtless introduction of feral animals into this country in the last century has had a devastating impact on our native species.

Mr QUIRKE: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable those Orders of the Day: Private Members Bills and Orders of the Day: Other Motions set down for Wednesday 12 May where debate has ensued to be taken into consideration forthwith without debate.

Motion carried.

CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS (DISPLAY OF INDECENT MATTER) AMENDMENT BILL

Third reading.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (28)—H. Allison, M.H. Armitage, P.B. Arnold, M.J. Atkinson, S.J. Baker, H. Becker (teller), P.D. Blacker, M.K. Brindal, D.C. Brown, J.L. Cashmore, M.R. De Laine, B.C. Eastick, M.J. Evans, S.G. Evans, P. Holloway, D.J. Hopgood, C.F. Hutchison, G.A. Ingerson, D.C. Kotz, I.P. Lewis, W.A. Matthew, E.J. Meier, J.W. Olsen, J.K.G. Oswald, R.B. Such, J.P. Trainer, I.H. Venning, D.C. Wotton.

Noes (14)—J.C. Bannon, F.T. Blevins (teller)
G.J. Crafter, D.M. Ferguson, R.J. Gregory,
K.C. Hamilton, T.H. Hemmings, V.S. Heron,
J.H.C. Klunder, S.M. Lenehan, C.D.T. McKee,
M.K. Mayes, J.A. Quirke, M.D. Rann.

Pair—Aye—G.M. Gunn. No—L.M.F. Arnold.

Majority of 14 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (INTOXICATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 26 August. Page 392.)

**The Hon. M.J., EVANS (Minister of Health, Family
and Community Services):** I move:

That this Bill be read and discharged.
Bill read and discharged.

NATIONAL RAIL CORPORATION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gunn:

That this House calls on the Government to resist signing away running rights to the National Rail Corporation until the future of Australian National and the rail industry in this State is guaranteed; calls on the Federal Government to re-examine the NRC concept and ensure that the NRC does not interfere in the continued operation and survival of AN and the rail industry in this State and in particular the rail workshops at Port Augusta and Islington and further, calls on the Federal Government to immediately commence work on the Darwin-Alice Springs rail link and release \$17.5 million for the refurbishment of the Indian Pacific:

which Mrs Hutchison had moved to amend by—

- (a) leaving out the words 'calls on the Government to resist signing away running rights to the National Rail Corporation until the future of Australian National and the rail industry in this State is guaranteed';
- (b) leaving out the words 're-examine the NRC concept and' and
- (c) leaving out all words after 'Link'.

(Continued from 29 April. Page 3244.)

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

McKINSEY REVIEW

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Venning:

That this House notes the recently released Organisation Development Review Report of the Department of Agriculture but has great concern at the intended closure of nine regional offices vital to extension services in rural South Australia, which Mrs Hutchison had moved to amend by leaving out all the words after 'Agriculture'.

(Continued from 21 April. Page 2981.)

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

WATER QUALITY

Adjourned debate of motion of Hon. D.C. Wotton:

That this House condemns the Government for its blatantly irresponsible attitude in condoning the ongoing polluting of our marine and riverine environment resulting from the discharge of effluent and waste water from Engineering and Water Supply Department sewage treatment works.

(Continued from 21 April. Page 2982.)

Motion negatived.

STATE BANK

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr S.J. Baker:

That this House views with concern—

- (a) the actions of the State Bank in the management of its non-performing loans;
- (b) the composition of the GAMD Board; and
- (c) the potential for further significant losses to be sustained by the GAMD;

and therefore calls on the Treasurer to—

- (i) reconsider the composition of the GAMD Board to ensure that it contains people with proven track records in banking and management of businesses in receivership; and
- (ii) provide quarterly financial statements, audited by the Auditor-General, to the Parliament on the operations of the GAMD.

(Continued from 19 November. Page 1595.)

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (21)—H. Allison, M.H. Armitage,
P.B. Arnold, S.J. Baker (teller), H. Becker,
P.D. Blacker, M.K. Brindal, D.C. Brown,
J.L. Cashmore, B.C. Eastick, S.G. Evans,
G.A. Ingerson, D.C. Kotz, I.P. Lewis,
W.A. Matthew, E.J. Meier, J.W. Olsen,
J.K.G. Oswald, R.B. Such, I.H. Venning,
D.C. Wotton.

Noes (21)—M.J. Atkinson, J.C. Bannon (teller),
F.T. Blevins, G.J. Crafter, M.R. De Laine,
M.J. Evans, D.M. Ferguson, R.J. Gregory,
K.C. Hamilton, T.H. Hemmings, V.S. Heron,
P. Holloway, D.J. Hopgood, C.F. Hutchison,
J.H.C. Klunder, S.M. Lenehan, C.D.T. McKee,
M.K. Mayes, J.A. Quirke, M.D. Rann, J.P. Trainer.

Pairs—Ayes—D.S. Baker, G.M. Gunn.
Noes—L.M.F. Arnold, T.R. Groom.

The SPEAKER: Order! There being 21 Ayes and 21 Noes, I cast my vote for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

RETIRED PERSONS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D.C. Wotton:

That this House commends the Federal Coalition for the sympathetic assistance it will provide in government to self-funded retirees under the Fightback package in recognising the unsympathetic taxation discrimination that has been of major concern to those who have prepared for their own retirement.

(Continued from 24 March. Page 2606.)

Motion negatived.

SEWAGE EFFLUENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D.C. Wotton:

That this House congratulates the Mayor and the Albury City Council for their responsible and momentous decision to proceed with total off-river disposal of its sewage effluent, which Hon. D.J. Hopgood had moved to amend by leaving out all words after 'responsible' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'decision to end the direct disposal of its sewage effluent to the River Murray, and urges the council to ensure that effluent from the new facilities will be unable to enter the Murray through flushing by high rivers and flooding'.

(Continued from 21 April. Page 2982.)

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

GAMING MACHINES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Lewis:

That this House urges the Government to establish regulations which require licensees of premises in which poker machines and other electronic gaming machines are installed for public use, to ensure that the people who play them are not at risk of losing their family's housekeeping money or becoming bankrupt, and which require the licensee, if that happens, to—

- (a) refund sufficient money on the player's losses to prevent his/her family becoming dependent on taxpayers through the welfare system; and
- (b) pay an equal sum as a fine into a fund used to research the adverse consequences of gambling and assist in ameliorating its effects in the community.

(Continued from 19 November. Page 1592.)

Motion negatived.

STATE TAXES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr S.J. Baker:

That this House views with concern the impact of State taxation on South Australian business prospects and in particular the pressure being placed on such businesses to move their operations interstate to avoid the highest rates of taxation in Australia being imposed by the Government.

(Continued from 31 March. Page 2777.)

Motion negatived.

ENVIRONMENT POLICY

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D.C. Wotton:

That this House welcomes the coordinated and the cooperative approach to environmental enhancement and protection which will result from the Coalition's environment policy and looks forward to working with the Federal Coalition in establishing a 'National Commitment to the Environment' with distinct goals and obligations for all levels of Government and the community.

(Continued from 24 March. Page 2597.)

Motion negatived.

MURRAY RIVER

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

That this House, recognising that the River Murray is of vital importance to South Australia for water supply, environmental and recreational purposes, urges the Minister of Public Infrastructure to make strenuous and urgent representations to

the Albury City Council and the Government of New South Wales with a view to the adoption of full, off-river disposal of existing and future sewage effluent at Albury.

(Continued from 31 March. Page 2778.)

Motion carried.

ARNOTT'S BISCUITS LIMITED

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.P. Trainer:

That this House condemns the opportunistic, unsolicited and unwelcome attempt by the Campbell Soup Company of America to take over Arnott's Limited of Australia in an effort to gain control of what Campbell's President described as 'Those fabulous brands (those) precious jewels that we see incredible value in' as a basis for Campbell's expansion into Asia to benefit American shareholders regardless of the impact of its takeover on Australian employees of Arnott's, including those working in the Marlestone biscuit plant.

(Continued from 29 April. Page 3251.)

Motion carried.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Quirke:

That this House notes that on 16 February, 10 years have elapsed since the second of the Ash Wednesday bushfires and further notes that the disaster suffered by this State on that occasion was measured in severe loss of property and, above all else, lives; this House commends the gallantry of all the firefighters, both regular and irregular, who risked their lives in the service of South Australia; moreover the House particularly notes the suffering of those injured that day and the grief of families in which life was lost.

(Continued from 31 March. Page 2783.)

Motion carried.

MURRAY-DARLING SYSTEM

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

That this House notes the continuing community concern with the quality of water in the Murray-Darling system, in particular, with the volume of nutrients entering the rivers of the system from agricultural, horticultural, dairying, industrial and domestic activities evidenced by outbreaks of blue-green algae; the House therefore urges the upstream States to follow South Australia's lead in drastically reducing nutrient intake particularly from sewage and asks that South Australia's representatives on the Murray-Darling Ministerial Council draw this motion to the attention of other members of the council.

(Continued from 31 March. Page 2784.)

Motion carried.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Quirke:

That this House notes the industrial relation policies of the Liberal Party at the Federal level and, in particular, the policies of the Kennett Government in Victoria and also notes the Opposition in South Australia has promised to support similar anti-worker, anti-union measures aimed at undermining decent

standards of living for all South Australian wage and salary earners.

(Continued from 31 March. Page 2785.)

Motion carried.

TARIFF REDUCTIONS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Holloway:

That this House calls for a moratorium on tariff reductions particularly for the motor vehicle and textile, clothing and footwear industries, until the national economy has recovered and it can be demonstrated that those industries are in a position to withstand any such reductions.

(Continued from 31 March. Page 2786.)

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON BUSHFIRE PROTECTION AND SUPPRESSION MEASURES

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier) brought up the report of the select committee, together with the minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I move:

That the report be noted.

Mr De Laine interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: My colleague the member for Price interjected and said, 'About time!' I know that was said with the best of intentions. However, I do not apologise to the House for the fact that the select committee investigated the terms of reference exhaustively so that, when the report finally came down, it comprehensively covered all its terms of reference. The select committee was appointed to inquire into and report on bushfire protection and suppression measures on public land and was established on 28 November 1991. The House would be well aware that it was established by a private member's motion of the Hon. Ted Chapman as a result of a fire on Kangaroo Island in October 1991. The motion was supported with amendments which ensured that the committee looked at fire prevention and suppression throughout the State, with emphasis on Government managed land.

At this point, I would like to pose the question to the House why the committee was set up and how the matter eventually went before the select committee. I think it is fair to say, without in any way casting any form of criticism on the Hon. Ted Chapman, that the motion was moved in this House as a way of carrying out a witch hunt against the then manager of the Flinders Chase National Park. The idea was that the select committee would report under very narrow terms of reference, in all probability giving a guilty verdict against that manager; the Hon. Ted Chapman and some of his colleagues on Kangaroo Island would have been satisfied.

The method that the then Minister used to counter that fairly easily read intention of the Hon. Ted Chapman was to cloud the issue completely—to give the committee massive terms of reference to ensure that it would get bogged down and would not be able to give any clear indication to the House and, perhaps more importantly, to the community in regard to what was required not only as a result of the Flinders Chase fire but also in

relation to bushfires generally in South Australia. It is to the credit of this committee that it actually grasped every term of reference, exhaustively examined those terms of reference with the witnesses who appeared of their own volition or whom the committee canvassed from other parts of the State and from overseas to give evidence to the committee.

It is the opinion of the committee (and I think history will judge that our opinion is correct) that this report will be classed as the benchmark, the guide, for future fire prevention and suppression technology not only on Government land, which is the main thrust of this report, but also on private land. Again, it is a credit to the committee that it actually travelled the length and breadth of the State, holding public hearings. In fact, it received evidence from Canada, the United States, Canberra and interstate in order to come to some form of agreement and recommendations.

Unfortunately, mid-way through, the Hon. Ted Chapman and the Hon. Roger Goldsworthy had to depart from the select committee because they chose to leave the cloisters of this building, and they were replaced by the members for Eyre and Murray-Mallee. May I say that there was a complete change in style with the coming of the members for Eyre and Murray-Mallee as opposed to Ted Chapman and Roger Goldsworthy but, without trying to curry favour with my colleagues over there, I think the change was for the better. That is in no way a reflection on Ted Chapman or Roger Goldsworthy.

The member for Murray-Mallee introduced into the questioning and deliberations a scientific approach which (and I say this very seriously) rather surprised me. I had never realised the depth of knowledge of the member for Murray-Mallee in relation not only to bushfire prevention and suppression but also to the ecology as a whole. Also, the member for Eyre—the 'simple country boy', as he often describes himself—gave us the (if I can use the analogy) hessian sack, the bucket of water and the old Bedford truck approach to bushfire prevention and suppression, and in doing so he gave us the benefit of his years of experience of actually dealing with bushfires.

Of course, I must not forget my colleague the member for Playford, who was actually a participant in the Ash Wednesday fires. In some ways, when we were out there talking to the public, especially in the Hills areas, the member for Playford could be somewhat scathing in his comments to witnesses who appeared before us—so totally unlike his attitude elsewhere, either in this House or as Chairman of the Economic and Finance Committee. The member for Mitchell and I were, in many cases, willing learners, and the final make-up was quite good.

Having said that, I would like to thank the many witnesses who appeared before the committee. We had a problem where some witnesses wanted to attend four or five times, and we had actively to discourage them; they felt they had so much to offer and, after the first two or three times, even we felt we had had more than enough.

I would also pay tribute at this time to our research officer, Neil Collins. Neil came to us from Woods and Forests with the reputation of having a good relationship with the Country Fire Service and National Parks and Wildlife officers throughout the State, and I feel that that

tended to make witnesses more relaxed and able to give evidence. Looking at the overview, we acknowledge that we will always have fires; each year South Australia is subject to a hot dry summer, during which wild fires occur over the rural areas of the State.

As an indication, the Country Fire Service fire attendance records show that, since the 1980-81 fire season, there have been approximately 25 000 reported rural fire attendances. In comparison, approximately 1 000 fires have been associated with Government lands. Although a direct comparison of the two figures cannot be made, the order of magnitude is of value when determining the priority that should be given to fire management on Government reserves as opposed to other community concerns. The committee found that concern about fire control appears to be for those fires greater than 1 000 hectares in area or those not controlled in one shift. These types of fire, from the information given to us, involve less than 1 per cent of the Country Fire Service turnouts in the past 10 years.

The committee found in its extensive travelling around the State that there is no consistency across the State between the number of fires, particularly large fires, in a region, and public concern over their management or other fire problems. Other issues appear to be involved and need to be addressed by the local community, and some extreme opinions will never be met. We found that on many occasions. It is interesting to note that, as the Chairperson of this committee, on the one hand I was restraining the member for Eyre from attacking someone and then, on the other hand, I was restraining the member for Playford likewise from attacking someone from a different area of the community and concern.

If I did not learn anything else I learned that it is very easy to kick Graham Gunn on the leg to stop him rising but it is harder to get the member for Playford to stop once he gets it in his head that he will have his say! We would like to think that this report does meet most people's concerns: genuine, intelligent people's concerns. In some ways we will never be able to satisfy those people who belong to some of the movements that wish to dictate what we do in regard to bushfires. There are 64 recommendations and, obviously, neither I nor anyone else on the committee has time to go through those, so I have gone through and picked the main findings that I feel are of importance and address the whole area.

Perhaps the member for Eyre, the member for Mitchell, the member for Playford or the member for Murray-Mallee will wish to highlight other areas to the House. After considering the evidence, the committee concluded that the district bushfire prevention committees, with adequate support from the CFS and all relevant land managers, should determine what is the hazard in their area and what actions should be taken. That is at the local level: that is where it should be established.

No matter how sophisticated you become, and no matter how sophisticated your training, it is evidence and knowledge at the local level that will be of prime importance. The fire management plans for Government land must be public documents. They need to be realistic and put into an order of priority so that the community knows what to expect. Lateral thinking solutions to fire

protection and management problems were found throughout the State. Those community owned approaches need to be undertaken in more localities. That in a nutshell was what was wrong with Flinders Chase, with Kangaroo Island, with the manager and with the local CFS. They were not talking to each other.

They were not operating with a publicly owned document and did not know exactly what to do when the actual outbreak took place. Past natural fire regimes cannot be emulated, because of the many factors that have changed since European settlement, and any prescribed burning regimes for conservation purposes should be addressed through public involvement in determining what the community wants from Government managed land. What that in fact says is that National Parks no longer has the mortgage on what is and what is not prescribed burning: it consults with the CFS, with other Government managers, with landowners and everywhere as to what takes place in regard to prescribed burning.

We also found that there is a lack of common valuation of natural assets and a distinct lack of coordination of fire research in South Australia. Without both of these, planners, courts, conservationists, landowners and firefighters find it hard to come to agreement on fire management. Unless they get their act together in line with the recommendations that we are putting before them, I would say that the bulk of the recommendations of this report will actually be for nought. It is important that the planners get together and work out where they are going.

We also found that fires do not stop at cadastral boundaries—not that we needed to be told—and under the AIIM (Australian Interservice Incident Control Management) system fire management teams should not necessarily change because of a cadastral boundary, and the management of fire should be looked at on a regional basis. I am sure that the member for Eyre, if my 20c bet is to be won, will mention the Mount Remarkable fires in his contribution. If we looked at the Mount Remarkable fires on a regional basis with all the other knowledge we now have, things would not have been as bad then as they actually were.

Now that the AIIM system has been introduced throughout Australia for rural firefighting authorities, campaign fires should be assessed by CFS groups and the prominent non-Country Fire Service resources involved. Some communities, particularly those subject to campaign fires on an annual basis, are determining the best way to fight those fires. Those examples should be presented to other localities as possible solutions to fire management problems.

And what of the future? Large and traumatic fires will occur in future in South Australia. However, preplanning and knowing who will undertake what roles will go a long way towards lessening the long-term concerns in the community affected by the fire. Everyone must undertake his own fire prevention and, until this lesson is learned, no amount of blaming someone else will affect the fire problems we all face every year. Actual fire problems need to be addressed to ensure that expenditure on fire management will be effective, given that there is no certainty in the world of nature.

But probabilities of events occurring can be determined. Local communities have to get on with the job in their own back yard, and this report and the recommendations are there to enable this to happen. This was the first and, judging by where I am in my parliamentary career, only select committee I have ever had the pleasure to chair. I must confess that at times certain members of the committee almost drove me to distraction, but one thing I will say is that everyone who had a point of view put it forcefully. Eventually, as with all good select committees, the spirit of compromise emerged. As the Chairperson, I would like to thank personally all my colleagues who served on that select committee with me. As I said earlier, this report justifies the long time that we took in preparing, writing and presenting it ultimately to this Parliament.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to take part in the noting of the select committee report, being one of those members who joined the committee halfway through its proceedings. My interest in this subject is well known and I agreed to become a member of the select committee because I have one desire only, that is, to see that commonsense prevails, that in the future the taxpayers are not put to great expense, unnecessary inconvenience and disruption and that fires burn unnecessarily out of control.

When I joined the select committee, one of the first duties I had was to attend a meeting in the Adelaide Hills on a very cold night. I am not particularly keen on slide evenings at any time, and we had a witness who I think had a misplaced view of her position in history. She was going to change or save the world, and we were to be subjected to a slide evening. From my earliest memories of family slide evenings, nothing I can think of can send people to sleep more quickly or bore them more. However, this lady, in her wisdom, was determined that we would see the slides come hell or high water.

Later in the evening I was forced to make some rather strong comments to one or two of the witnesses, because I thought the performance and the comments of some of those witnesses would have to take the cake as being some of the most irresponsible nonsense I have ever had to listen to. Following my attendance at that meeting I was advised that an official complaint had been made about me, to my Leader I think, but one interesting thing happened as a result of that complaint. The complaint was originally made in relation to me and the member for Murray-Mallee.

On reflection, they were somewhat mistaken, because I understand that the second villain of the exercise was the member for Playford, not the member for Murray-Mallee, who did not attend that meeting. Although I had an official complaint made about me, I am not a bit concerned, because I was most perturbed that reflections were being cast upon the good, hardworking, diligent people of Kangaroo Island. I was not going to sit there idly when criticisms were being made of them that were, in my view, grossly inaccurate.

We all know that this select committee was established following an unfortunate bushfire on Kangaroo Island. The member for that area at that time was the Hon. Ted Chapman. He raised a number of issues in relation to that fire on a daily basis in this House. Eventually the

Government saw the wisdom of having a select committee and the member for Napier was then given the job of chairing the committee.

I have enjoyed my term on the committee and I thank the member for Napier for being tolerant and understanding and for endeavouring to reach a sensible conclusion. At the end of the day, no matter how much evidence is taken, the recommendations put forward have to be sensible, because you can recommend what you like but if you cannot get those recommendations into law you have completely wasted your time. In my view these are reasonable, responsible recommendations. I hope all the agencies that have been involved will read them carefully and will understand that this is their last chance to get on together.

I was particularly disappointed that the Director of the Country Fire Service, Mr Macarthur, did not himself give evidence, because I think through such evidence we would have had a better understanding of how the Country Fire Service operates. Unfortunately, a Mr Howard McBeth gave us the benefit or otherwise of his knowledge. This is all public evidence. I well recall attending a public meeting at Melrose after the first bushfire had occurred there. At that time, Mr McBeth was involved with the national parks. The comments he made on that day were some of greatest drivel I have ever heard.

Unfortunately, from the evidence he gave to the select committee, I think he still believes he is working for National Parks, because he did not appear to grasp the issues we were discussing. Further, he had the audacity to attempt to put all the blame for the problems on Kangaroo Island back on the local communities. Those people are conservative in nature and engage in practices and have religious beliefs that may be contrary to what most of us would believe is appropriate, but that is a matter entirely for them; that is their business. In my judgment, for Mr McBeth to try to justify the actions of one National Parks officer left a lot to be desired.

I suggest to the Director of the Country Fire Service that in future he does not let Mr McBeth give evidence to select committees. A more appropriate role for him might be to collate the history or to be engaged in upgrading the filing system of the Country Fire Service; he would then not be wasting our time with the irrelevant nonsense we had to put up with.

There are other matters of which I think people should be aware. For as long I can remember there has been an ongoing dispute between local Country Fire Service groups, the National Parks and Wildlife Service and other Government agencies. This select committee has made some very appropriate recommendations in regard to that matter. What they all have to understand clearly is that this select committee has determined that, at the end of the day, the Country Fire Service will be in command, whether or not they like it. They have had their chance and in my view they have left a fair bit to be desired. Therefore, this recommendation has been put forward to solve this question once and for all.

I was disappointed with the Chairman of the Native Vegetation Authority. He had a rather peculiar outlook on life. He did not understand anything about fire breaks and the reasons for them. Not only do they serve the purpose of stopping some fires but they also cause a

break. They give people somewhere to drive to and turn around so that they can get out. I believe the view he expressed that five metres was an adequate width was complete nonsense. If that is the sort of evidence he is going to give, I think there must be a better role for him than being involved with people dealing with native vegetation. I was far from impressed. I am delighted with the recommendations that the select committee has made in relation to that particular matter.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I have already dealt with Mr McBeth and what I think his role should be. I suggest to the Chairman of the Native Vegetation Authority that he is obviously not a practical person; he has little knowledge of bushfires and far less of what are appropriate prevention measures. I sincerely hope he is never caught in a scrub fire where there are no fire breaks—anything could happen—he would have a quick lesson and would then understand me. When a fire is coming towards him it is a bit late to try to construct the break; he should have had it there weeks before, and there are various ways of doing that.

It has taken a long time to bring this report to fruition. However, I think it clearly indicates that the committee gave the matter a great deal of consideration. There was a lot of discussion and public evidence taken. I was not involved in the early public meetings, but my former colleagues were. I sincerely hope that in the next session the Government will see its way clear to implement these recommendations through legislation. Commonsense can then prevail and people in the community can get on with life knowing that the law has been changed to provide the best measures possible to afford the protection to which people are entitled. The Country Fire Service would then be in a position to carry out its very important role without having its hands tied behind its back. Further, local communities, through their bushfire advisory committees, can participate and ensure that local knowledge is given adequate and proper consideration.

When one sets up select committees of this nature they attract strange bedfellows. People often wonder why members of Parliament become a little short tempered in public. If anyone took the trouble to read the evidence of some of those meetings that we had to attend, I think even the most reasonable person would be provoked. I am a most reasonable person and I cannot help recalling the incident in the Adelaide Hills. It was a very cold night and the seats were very hard. One lady was complaining profusely about the local council's having the audacity to put in fire access tracks, because noxious weeds grew on them. When I suggested that Roundup was a very suitable way of controlling that problem, I think that was the final straw for her, because she appeared not to understand or appreciate the great value of that chemical. I have found it to be an invaluable weapon in dealing with excessive growth around sheds, fence lines and broadacres. I therefore recommend it to the good lady.

If parliamentarians and other people listened to those groups then we would not live in a very responsible society. It is the responsibility of the Parliament and the Government to make decisions based on commonsense and to ensure that people's property and rights are

protected. I believe that if people build houses in bushfire-prone areas they should, first, be made aware of the dangers and, if they still proceed, they should be required to take some minimum fire prevention steps. I do not believe it is fair that the rest of the community has to go to considerable expense and trouble to protect those homes when bushfires start. The people concerned should be fully aware of the dangers, and their houses should be constructed in a manner that gives the best protection possible, but at the end of the day they should be made accountable. They should not expect the public to pay.

I have had problems in my electorate where councils have had to take action against people who have failed to comply with orders to clean up their properties. Those people have telephoned me most irate and asked why they did not get much sympathy from me. They have failed to carry out the sensible orders asked of them and they have taken umbrage at the council. Had a bushfire started, they would have been the first on the telephone trying to get the local CFS to do something about it. It is a two-way thing.

I enjoyed my participation during the latter part of the select committee and I think it made considerable progress. I hope the Government will legislate to put its recommendations into effect. I thank the Chairman for his tolerance. We all got on very well and dealt with the matter in a constructive way. I enjoyed the participation of all members of the committee and I look forward to seeing legislative action follow this report.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I should also like to add to the comments that were made by the member for Napier, who chaired the committee, and the member for Eyre, who played a very significant role in respect of many of the recommendations now before us. First, let me say that I, too, remember freezing cold nights in a couple of halls. I remember another one in the Hills—I also recall listening to evidence about why things burn, how they burn, how hot they burn, how horrible it is that they burn and how inconsiderate it is that they burn. Just the same, a lot of constructive evidence came from the meetings.

I also remember the slide show, and I must say that it was one of the highlights. I sat there with my mouth shut but I was still complained about. One of the worst insults that I have ever had was when it was thought that I was the member for Murray-Mallee. I still have not got over that, and I want to get that on the record. I understand that the Leader of the Opposition received an official complaint about the 'two bearded ones', namely, the member for Eyre and me. The member for Murray-Mallee was not there, so it must have been me. We were most reasonable, too!

Another comment I must make concerns the Chairperson. In many respects, the Chairperson is a wise old man although he does not play that role in the Chamber too often. As the wise old man of the committee, he knew when he had to horse trade. What he said today was interesting. He spoke about the member for Eyre, the member for Mitchell, the member for Murray-Mallee and me and said that there were a number of issues that we felt strongly about and argued about. I give the member for Napier full credit because,

when he knew he was done, he was done, and he accepted it gracefully. It is not an easy job to get done and on many of the issues he did not perceive the same necessity of putting them in the report as did other members. However, as Chairperson of a committee that brought together distinctly disparate elements, he did an extremely good job, and he needs to be commended for that.

What triggered the select committee were the fires on Kangaroo Island in 1991. The then member for Alexandra raised questions in the House in respect of the management of fires on Government land. As a result of that questioning procedure, the honourable member put a motion to the House calling for a select committee to look at fire management on Government land in the broadest of terms. It needs to be said that the Kangaroo Island experience was not a happy one. It was expensive and fingers were pointed as to the extent of the fire, the amount of resources consumed in fighting the fire and whether or not the resources were truly needed in those instances.

I am pleased that no other fires occurred when the committee was operating because it would have had to look at them. In many respects, most of us hoped that the committee would have finished its work before the bushfire season started in November last year. I am pleased to inform the House that it is raining and that it seems as if the fire season is totally finished. If these recommendations are accepted by different Government agencies and are put into legislation, they may feature in the next fire season or the one after that.

The nub of the problem was the control of fire on Government land. In many instances, the committee found a sense of possession of the land, mainly involving the National Parks and Wildlife Service, whereby cooperation between that entity and the Country Fire Service was less than productive. The episode on Kangaroo Island gave me that impression, as it did other members of the committee. Equally, there are instances in which members of the Country Fire Service are employees of the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the two roles go together very well. The committee received evidence that on some pieces of Government land such as at Cleland and other national parks the relationship between National Parks and Country Fire Service personnel seems to be very good.

As a consequence of the activities that gave rise to this select committee and the concerns over many years in respect of bushfire suppression, particularly on Government land, the AIIM management system that the member for Napier spoke about has come into play. The committee concluded in the report that, where AIIM is not at work but where pre-arranged plans for fire suppression prior to the start of the bushfire season and prior to the start of any fire are in place, with the cooperation of the Government agency that owns the land, be it Woods and Forests, National Parks or E&WS, together with the Country Fire Service, and with the relevant amount of training, there is a great deal of confidence in those arrangements surviving the fire and leading to a satisfactory strategy of suppression of the fire.

As is noted in the report, where AIIM is not in place, the Country Fire Service is responsible for the

Suppression of fires in that area, and that is a very useful recommendation. If my house were to catch fire, the Metropolitan Fire Service would assume control of the operations and would be responsible for its suppression. I do not believe that Government landholders should occupy positions different from anyone else. It may be simplistic, but it should be noted that the Country Fire Service and the Metropolitan Fire Service are the primary agencies for fighting fire. However, the committee found that useful roles can be played by Government agencies, particularly the agency that is responsible for looking after bushfire suppression on Government land. The AIIM scheme has much to commend it. In a number of years from now fire may come to the national parks and other areas of our State, so at some stage it may be appropriate for us to review how the AIIM system has worked and compare it with areas where that system has not been put into place.

I learnt a lot from this select committee in a number of key areas, particularly in the scientific area of bushfire suppression. I went into the committee with the view that the system of mosaic burning is an appropriate management tool and that the use of cool fire—that is, fire to reduce fuel loading where it is excessive or there is no great need for it—is a key weapon that should be used in the Australian bush. The evidence shook me out of my simplistic view for several reasons. First, it depends very much on which area of South Australia we are dealing with. No doubt in the more barren, flat lands bushfire suppression involves the multiplication effect of fuel stocks year in and year out. However, in the Hills area and in the extremely high rainfall area around Cleland, the committee discovered a number of interesting points, one of which involved the regular pattern of mosaic burning; that is, burning every few years in different areas.

In most of that region one could then expect a variable fuel stock so that, if a major bushfire occurred, such as the two Ash Wednesday fires, that reduction in fuel stock would have a significant effect as the fire burned through that land. The evidence shows that after a five year period, whether or not the fuel stock is regularly burnt, there is a constant level of fuel in those areas generated by the climate and the depth and density of the undergrowth. So, that does not give rise to the view that a regular pattern of burning is all that useful.

I turn now to other issues that emerged on the same topic. The introduction of many of the more exotic weeds stems from controlled burning that has taken place in a number of areas. It is also true that much of that exotic weed, particularly in the Cleland area, which the committee viewed, was the result of the first Ash Wednesday fire where the intensity of the fire was so great that much of the existing vegetation regenerated either not at all or in a very sparse manner. Another issue that needs to be raised concerns Yarrabee Road where many South Australians lost their lives in the second Ash Wednesday bushfire. The committee was interested to see an experiment by the CFS and National Parks in the use of grazing as a means of fuel reduction immediately in front of houses in that area which saw so many deaths. The committee saw evidence that day to the effect that, compared with areas that had been deliberately burnt, grazing as a means of fuel reduction

was very satisfactory and did not lead to the introduction of nearly as many exotic weeds that were evident half a mile further up the road.

Most members of the committee had an enjoyable and certainly an educative time. I could spend more time on it, but in the interests of brevity and of allowing other members to comment, I conclude by saying that the very cornerstone of the committee's report is a demand or an instruction that Government agencies should get their collective act together to fight and suppress bushfire. This is very evident on Government lands. I hope this report reinforces what appears to be a movement in that direction which the committee clearly perceived. I commend the report to the House and I thank all members who participated on the committee.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): First, I would like to commend the Chairman for the uncommon objectivity and civil good humour he displayed throughout the sittings of the committee after I took my place on it following the resignations of the Hon. Ted Chapman and the Hon. Roger Goldsworthy. I found his attitude to be uncharacteristically refreshing, and I underline that word. I had no difficulty working under the direction of the Chairman. His commitment was to a clear personal understanding of the issues involved and an objective assessment of the information provided in evidence by witnesses to determine how best to formulate the statements we have made in this report.

I commend the work of the committee's research officer, Neil Collins, without which it would not have been possible for us to have produced the kind of report we now have before us. It is a matter of record for others who might have already researched this subject, but this is the first select committee with which I have been involved. My involvement was not complete, I was a Johnny-come-lately, having only arrived on the scene in March last year. I did not hear evidence given to the committee in places other than Lameroo where I attended in my own right as the local member. I gave evidence to the select committee and I then became a member of it. I presume that is a first. I do not know of any other instance in which a member of a select committee has given evidence to that committee and then participated in the preparation of the report.

Neil Collins should be commended not only for the hours he put in but for the focused attention he gave to the detail of the committee's work and the incisive way in which he summarised volumes of information so that the committee could make sense of it for the House and the wider community of South Australia in a readily digestible form. He brought to the committee an outstanding array of academic qualifications as well as practical experience. Having worked with the committee, he now has skills to contribute in the future, and I hope that the Government does not overlook that. The committee's recommendations include a number of things that must be done if we are to avoid the devastating consequences that will otherwise accrue when we have days like Ash Wednesday twice over and Black Sunday.

It is crazy for us to ignore the implications of fire and its effect on our community at large. It would be a good investment of a few hundred thousand dollars a year over the next few years for us to get these recommendations

properly in place, in a way which will ensure that all available resources are used effectively, and that includes appropriate levels of training for people who perform in different roles in the course of managing the suppression work that has to be undertaken as well as directing control operations if such fires break out.

I said 'if', but I should not have, because it is not a matter of if fires break out but a matter of when and as they will break out. On really bad days more than one fire will break out. The ease with which we can minimise the damage will be a direct consequence of the effectiveness of our attention to the recommendations contained in the report, in my judgment.

Passing right along, there are some matters to which I want to draw attention. Before doing that, I want to thank the bulk of the witnesses for their objectivity as they came before the committee. Without exception, all of them were very sincere in the way that they explained the propositions they were putting to us, whether we found in support or against their view, we certainly did not doubt the sincerity with which they placed their opinion and argued that position. I want to thank them greatly for doing that, especially those witnesses from interstate who came to give evidence to us at no expense to the taxpayers of South Australia.

These were people who were expert and who had a great deal to offer by way of well-researched experience and understanding—not just anecdotal evidence but well-researched experience and understanding. Without taking up too much time of the House, I would like to point out that on page 11 is to be found an overview of the report that the committee brought down, where we had a joint Country Fire Services/National Parks and Wildlife Service and Department of Woods and Forests submission, which states:

Fire has been part of the Australian environment for millennia. Native flora and fauna have evolved with fire regimes prior to European settlement.

There is no doubt about that. That is at the basis of our better understanding now of the matter we had to examine and upon which the report is based. Whilst I could dwell on much of the useful, relevant data, argument and opinion contained in the next few pages, I nonetheless commend the report to people for their reading. I draw attention to page 21 and what I think members of the public with a general interest in this subject ought to be aware of, and I refer to information which would enable them to get a better handle on what is involved.

Certainly, it would be useful for them to understand fire behaviour determinations, that is, the physics of combustion, where the three determinants of fuels, terrain and weather are set out. Under 'fuels' we have listed the fuel arrangement, the compactness, the volume (especially per unit area) and moisture content. Under 'terrain', we have listed slope steepness, the elevation above sea level and the aspect of the slope, whether north, south, east or west. Under 'weather' we have listed whether it has rained or not or is about to rain, the temperature, which is an important factor, humidity in the atmosphere, which varies and accordingly will dramatically affect the rate at which combustion occurs and the wind—not only its direction but its velocity.

There are a few matters now to which I would direct the House's attention and which go to the nub of the committee's work. We found in looking at the present regions into which the State is divided for the purpose of giving information to the general public and administering fire control and suppression to be inappropriate, which is why our third recommendation is:

That on the basis of the climatology study currently being undertaken by the Country Fire Service, consideration be given to rationalising existing regional fire prevention committee boundaries and, if required, district fire prevention committee boundaries.

It is not appropriate to continue to use geographic boundaries just because they represent convenient places on a map. It is far more appropriate to look at the factors which will affect how fire behaves in those localities. Those behaviour patterns are more likely to be affected by climatology than by any other factor because it will affect not only the way the fire burns but also the fuel from the kind of vegetation that grows there. If it is not wet, it will not grow, because everything needs moisture.

Further, I draw the House's attention to the statement to be found on page 26, as follows:

The committee was of the opinion that the Government agency Prescribed Burning Working Group (PBWG) formed in 1989 offers a good opportunity to put together existing data—

However, it needs a broad base—much broader than it is at present—and it needs to be ongoing. It needs to continue into perpetuity and it needs to coordinate the research that is being done and to determine the effect on species and communities of species where prescribed burning is to be used.

The next page contains recommendations that are important in that context, as follows:

5. That all current South Australian and interstate fire study information, be collated and analysed as soon as practicable. The information should be used to form the basis of the strategic plan—

that should be across the State—

6. An objective, management-oriented, strategic plan for applicable fire research in South Australia be formulated and monitored by an independent steering committee that reports to the Natural Resources Council.

(2) practicable measures to minimise bushfire hazard on both public and private lands.

That resulted in our recommending that fuel reduction works should be concentrated close to the immediate vicinity of heavily used areas, fire vulnerable human-made assets, sensitive habitat areas and community determined fire suppression lines, all of which have been clearly defined in the planning process. We know what our target is and how best to protect it with the minimum amount of cost and minimum impact on the natural surroundings. We further stated:

That fuel reduction works for Government lands be determined on the basis of wildlife threat analysis in conjunction with either the interim or completed land management plan and these works incorporate dates for implementation.

It is just not good enough to go on putting work off because we cannot be sure when the next bad fire will occur. I draw attention to comments made to us in evidence that we found particularly useful and sensible, which are to be found on page 29, as follows:

In the Ferries/McDonald Conservation Park there is no fire access on the east to north boundary.

If we bulldozed and maintained fire access tracks on that fairly flat country on the reserve, it would cost about \$40 000. By having a series of gates that can be linked up, opening into paddocks outside the reserve, we can reduce the cost to about \$2 000 by installing the gates to enable rapid access all around those boundaries. That provides far more effective fire management. The local folk have determined that it will fight fires from that pre-determined line. There is not a requirement for perimeter breaks around all the reserves with this sort of solution.

In exactly the same way community members involved with the Ngarkat set of reserves have similar propositions. They have an emergency fuel break line permanently indicated by iridescent markers every 50 or 200 metres on the southern and western boundaries of the reserve. They have determined that the right location for the distance of the markers from the edge of the park is dependent on the vegetation type at that location, because that determines the kind of fuel that is there. In the long term, the local CFS group is working to get gates put in at these locations so that fences will never again have to be cut.

I commend the people around the Ngarkat park in those various communities from north of Bordertown, east of Keith and Tintinara, Coonalpyn and south of Geranium, Lameroo and Pinnaroo for the way in which they have got together and sensibly analysed how to deal with the kinds of fires that can occur in that region, whether resulting from lightning strikes either inside or outside the park or any other cause which may need to be controlled. It has been a long, hard road to hoe. The fact that we got started on it early in my time as member for Mallee, prior to my becoming member for Murray-Mallee, is testimony to what can be achieved if people sit down after things have cooled off and talk through what happened and why it happened, and try to determine inexpensive and effective ways of ensuring that they can prevent the occurrence or minimise its damage, for the benefit of everybody and everything, including the natural ecosystem, which is vital in this instance.

I have only a short time left, so I want to draw attention to one recommendation which I believe has already been mentioned by the Chairman and the member for Playford. Unfortunately, I had to leave the Chamber whilst they were speaking to comment upon the hazards of the chemical spills that occurred just this afternoon in the Riverland near Waikerie. I am not quite sure what they were saying to the House.

The recommendation to which I wish to draw attention is that whereas we have made plain that the CFS, in the final analysis, will take control of fires, regardless of where they may be and whoever else is present. Under recommendation 57, the select committee has strongly recommended in favour of the AIIMS Incident Control Team approach. That team at the scene of an incident is to be recognised, though amendments are needed to the Country Fires Act. Section 53 of the principal Act has to be amended to include a requirement that control operations, brigades and persons at the scene of a fire or other emergency are to be exercised, as follows:

(a) if an incident management team is, in accordance with the relevant incident management strategies, to take charge of operations, and the team or a member of it is present, the most senior member of the team present at the scene of the fire or other emergency is to have control of operations, brigades and persons at the scene of the fire or other emergency;

and

(b) in any other case, the operations, brigades and persons present at the scene of the fire are to be under the control of the most senior member of the CFS in attendance.

That clarifies what has forever been an ambiguous situation until now. Unless we address this in the near future, we will continue to have this ruddy mess where the people present do not know who legitimately and lawfully can and must take control of the attempts being made to put out the fire and otherwise minimise its damage. That is the nub of the problem.

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

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): First, I would like to thank the Chairman, the member for Napier, for the superb way in which he has conducted the chairmanship of this select committee; it has been a pleasure to be on it. I would also like to thank the other members of the committee, both the present members and the two previous members, the Hon. Ted Chapman and the Hon. Roger Goldsworthy. I would also like to thank Neil Collins, the research officer. As the member for Murray-Mallee has just said, without the work that Neil Collins had put in, it would not have been possible to prepare a report of such quality, as I believe this report is. I would also like to thank Anthony Murphy for being an effective secretary of the committee.

The report of the select committee is, indeed, a comprehensive report of over 60 pages and 64 recommendations, and it will make a worthy contribution to the management of bushfire protection and suppression in this State. The committee was fortunate enough to visit a number of places throughout the State, and I guess there we saw the best and the worst of fire prevention and suppression in operation. Certainly, in parts such as the Upper South-East, for example, I was very impressed with the cooperative way in which the various agencies—the Government agencies, the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the local CFS brigades—had worked together. There was no doubt that they had developed a very effective system for addressing the fire problem in their region. However, in other regions of the State, unfortunately, the situation was not so promising. Undoubtedly the worst situation was Kangaroo Island and, of course, as has been mentioned, the problems in that area were one of the reasons why this select committee was established in the first place.

As well as seeing the best and worst of how the present system operated, one thing that those trips to the various regions of the State impressed upon me was just how different the issues were in different regions of the State. I certainly became aware very early in the piece that what we needed was a regional approach to the various problems: no one general grand strategy would solve the problems in all areas.

There has been a considerable debate already on the main issues, and I will not go over that, but I would just

like to comment on a couple of the more general problems we face. One of the big issues related to native vegetation preservation and how that could be reconciled with sensible hazard reduction. That really was the main issue. As the member for Murray-Mallee said, we had sincere people from both sides of the debate coming before the committee: there were those who believed that preservation of nature vegetation came above all else; and there were those who believed that fire hazard reduction measures should prevail over all else. We had to steer a course through that and, through all the various strategies and regimes that we have recommended in this report, we have the most sensible reconciliation of those two objectives, and they are covered in some detail in the body of report.

The key to the solution of all this is better fire management plans. Of course, what the report recommends is the further adoption of the AIIMS management scheme, which is based on firefighting schemes in overseas countries. So, undoubtedly, the adoption of those strategies will improve the situation as far as fire management is concerned. One of the other big issues was whether the managers on Government lands, in particular the National Parks and Wildlife officers, should prevail in the management of fires in their areas over the local CFS brigades. Again, what the committee has come up with is a solution to that.

I mentioned that Kangaroo Island was one of the most difficult situations because, undoubtedly, there is a very divided community in that region, and I would like to make the point that, where a community is as polarised as it is on Kangaroo Island, it would be almost impossible to get effective firefighting regimes, even with the best legislation in the world. What we need there is some appreciation of local community concerns by the Government land managers in that region and we need improved attitudes on behalf of some of the local community in that area. It will be a difficult problem, and one can only hope that, with the adoption of the recommendations of this report, we can solve the problems on Kangaroo Island.

There will always be bushfires, and on days of extreme fire danger we will always have destruction on a large scale, but I believe that with the recommendations of this report we can certainly make a great improvement as to how the situation is handled. Again, I thank the members of the committee for the way they have conducted it; we have come up with something that is worthwhile for the South Australian community, and I look forward to the speedy implementation of this report.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I wish to say that I appreciate the effort the committee has gone to on this matter. I have not read the report—many others would not have read it at this stage—so I do not wish to refer to it, although I have read some of the recommendations. I am one who has seen both sides of this argument and one who has suffered both sides. I was present the day the three policemen were burnt. It comes back to a comment made by the Chairman of the committee referring to the member for Eyre and his local knowledge and down-to-earth approach: I was there in the 1950s when a local man said to those three officers, 'Don't go because, if you go down there, you won't come back.' When the

sergeant said to him he was going and that some of the others should go, we were advised as young men by some of the older local people not to go.

I have seen the other side in modern times, when people have sought to sue: that was not the practice previously. The community pulled together. I have seen my family burnt out by others and we have not sued but, when the reverse came about (and somebody is still looking for a guy on a motorbike with a haversack), a judge said at the time, 'I don't care whether you find the arsonist; I will find that you are negligent.' Yet, the council at that time had operated the dump on the same basis as every other dump in the country. Nobody had 24 hour equipment or staff on site in any one of them anywhere in this country. However, a learned judge had the opportunity to make that judgment. It changed every aspect of the potential for bushfire so that people have to clear around their property or the neighbour might sue: ETSA has to worry about trimming back the trees or somebody might sue. Because of this whole approach, many more people from now on will be sued, including some of the strong conservationists who retain bushland and who do not have firebreaks around it.

When the matter of an adequate firebreak was raised in the court, nobody could put a size on it; nobody knows what an adequate firebreak is, because it depends on the conditions on the day. It was my Party that was in power at the time. When there is wind of such velocity and the sort of heat that was experienced on the two Ash Wednesdays or in the fires of 1915, 1933, 1939 or the mid-1950s, the climatic conditions are a natural disaster. It is no different with rain and flood; if more rain falls than the streams can carry, they flood. On these days, we had more wind and heat than was normal, so the fire started and away it went, whether or not somebody fell off a motorbike and started it.

I will be leaving this place soon, and I hope those who follow think about what is a natural disaster. In the case of a dam or a reservoir, if there is a freak and unexpected storm and if the bank bursts, is there negligence, or does that occur because of freak circumstances caused by nature? I know that the members of the committee were dedicated, and I do not wish to say any more. I wish to have my comments on record, and I hope that the recommendations in that report help people not just to control, prevent and fight fire but also to understand what it is all about. With those comments, I support the motion.

Motion carried.

CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendment with the amendments indicated by the annexed schedule.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS DUTY (REDUCTION OF DUTY) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (REGISTER OF INTERESTS) (RETURNS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendment and had made the following consequential amendment:

Clause 4, page 3, lines 15 and 16—Leave out 'has had the use of any property of another person during the whole or a substantial part of' and insert 'has been a party to a transaction under which the member or person related to the member has had the use of property of the other person during'.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: I move:

That the Legislative Council's consequential amendment be agreed to.

Motion carried.

GUARDIANSHIP AND ADMINISTRATION BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: I move:

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

In so doing, I would like to thank the members of the House of Assembly who attended the conference with me during the extended period this morning. The House of Assembly members acquitted themselves well, and the result is the document before members. Amendment No. 3, that the House of Assembly no longer insist on its disagreement thereto, is a reasonable proposition. It limits the power of the Minister to refer any further matters to the Public Advocate. That will ensure that any changes to the Public Advocate's functions are required to be made by legislation.

While that does to some degree restrain flexibility, the wide variety of matters already allocated to the Public Advocate by the Bill are quite sufficient, and it is not entirely unreasonable that any further addition should be made by way of Bill. As to amendments Nos 4 to 7, alternative amendments are suggested. These ensure that the Public Advocate will continue to report to the Minister to whom the administration of the Bill is committed, which is presently, of course, the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services and is likely to remain that way.

However, while the Public Advocate continues to report in that way, these clauses ensure that the Public Advocate is quite independent of political direction and that the Minister is unable to direct the Public Advocate in the way in which he or she performs his or her functions. This guarantees the independence of the Public Advocate in respect of those advocacy and investigative matters but does, of course, continue to allow the Minister to direct the Public Advocate in normal matters of day to day Public Service administration, and that is quite proper.

Proposed new clause 21a ensures that the Public Advocate has the right to report to the Minister and the Attorney-General any concerns that he or she may have over any matter that arises in the performance of his or her functions and, if the Public Advocate requests, the Attorney must table a copy of that before both Houses of

Parliament. The annual report of the Public Advocate must also draw attention to such matters. This will guarantee that the Public Advocate has a right of public notification and that his or her independence is further secured. In order to guarantee that this new process works effectively, a sunset clause of some three years is inserted into the Bill.

As to amendment No. 10, the Legislative Council managers agreed to a slight softening of the position by ensuring that the Guardianship Board is required to approach the parents of a patient only if it thinks it appropriate to do so and, while maintaining the spirit of the amendment, this limits the process to those occasions where it is necessary and essential that this be done.

So, overall the result of the amendments is satisfactory. It ensures that the Public Advocate and the Guardianship Board retain their health focus with the minimal amount of legalistic approach. I believe that this will be the best approach for the patient, but it does address those concerns properly raised by another place to ensure the appropriate independence of the Public Advocate and, perhaps more importantly, to ensure that the public perceives that the Public Advocate is an independent officer of the Public Service and of the Parliament. I commend the results of the conference to the Committee.

Dr ARMITAGE: In speaking to these amendments, I would like to say that the conference system that we underwent this morning was an example of the inimitable style of the Westminster system in its best form, where the two Houses of a bicameral system came together in a spirit of compromise and, after an efficient three or four hours discussing a couple of very small amendments, we ended up with what we have before us, a glowing example of the strength of our parliamentary system.

With regard to the amendment in clause 21, page 10, after line 31, in which a subclause indicating that the Public Advocate is not subject to the control or direction of the Minister was agreed to be inserted, it was my view that it may have been more specific to provide 'in performing his or her advocacy functions, the Public Advocate is not subject to the control or direction of the Minister'—

My reason for discussing that with members of the conference was that clearly there will be other day to day functions that the Public Advocate will be expected to undertake, and he or she would be expected, certainly by all members of the conference, to be subject to the control or direction of the Minister in the performance of those functions. This was inserted in an attempt to signal to the community that the Public Advocate was indeed an independent person, not subject to the control or direction of the Minister, and hence able to be a fearless advocate for people within the system, and to undertake that advocacy without fear or favour.

During my second reading contribution on this Bill I noted on a number of occasions and spoke in the Committee stage about the independence that was necessary to be perceived in the community for the Public Advocate. There were two roles for the independence which the conference discussed. One was the legislative one, or the role within the Public Service, and I believe that we have attempted with these various amendments to cover that, but it is also very important

that the populace at large understands the importance with which the members of the conference, and I am sure members of both Houses of Parliament, believe that the Public Advocate is an independent person; hence the people who wish to have complaints brought before an independent person can do so with the Public Advocate with confidence in that person's independence.

I understand the opposing views regarding the fact as to whether the Public Advocate ought to have a primarily legal function—because a lot of the disputes in relation to the Guardianship and Administration Bill may well be legal—or whether the Public Advocate ought to have a primary health focus. I think there are arguments on both sides. However, by putting in a sunset clause it was the view of all people in the conference that it was a case of attempting to do the best by the clients and also to satisfy a number of budgetary needs—which are an unfortunate feature of all legislation today.

However, in trying to satisfy those budgetary needs this position would not have been created unless it was funded from within the Health Commission. In attempting to satisfy those budgetary conditions, we have also agreed to the Public Advocate being within the Guardianship Board, but not subject to the control or direction of the Minister. As such, the sunset clause will allow us to see exactly how this legislation works in practice.

It was certainly my view, and the view of other members of the conference, that, if the legislation were in fact causing a barrier from within the community of people to whom the Guardianship and Administration Bill might be applied and if the independence of the Public Advocate were perceived not to be working in this situation, it could well be changed. As such, given that that was the prime rationale for the decisions, and having put the view on record that if it does not work we will certainly change it, I am happy to agree to the recommendations of the conference.

Motion carried.

[Sitting suspended from 5.57 to 10.40 p.m.]

STATE BANK

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier): I move:

That upon presentation to the Speaker pursuant to subsection 25 (5) of the State Bank of South Australia Act 1983 of copies of any report of the Auditor-General relating to the State Bank of South Australia made pursuant to his appointment under section 25 (1) of the Act, the Speaker is hereby authorised to publish and distribute such reports.

Motion carried.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 8 June.

It is usual, at this stage of the parliamentary year, to express a few thoughts of the preceding six months or so and some of the trials and tribulations that we have all

gone through in serving the people of South Australia. I think we can say that the trials and tribulations have perhaps been a little more than usual and certainly more in some cases than one would have liked. I am sure that that does not apply just to members but to all people who work in and around Parliament House.

In his speech prior to the Christmas break the Premier went through and made some very interesting comments about changes in the composition of the House. Whilst there have been no further changes in the composition of the House, it is interesting to see that there have been some changes in the seating arrangements. Obviously there have been battles won and lost. Some are still in the process of being fought, and we look forward to the outcome. At this stage I do not want to draw the attention of members to the last time the House rose for a substantial break and the surprise we all experienced the following morning. Nevertheless, it does keep us all interested and gives the press something to comment on.

I wish to thank a few people for the cooperation that I have personally had and that all of us have experienced. As the new Leader of the House, I have had enormous cooperation and assistance from members on my own side—which I expect—and I thank them for it.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: With the occasional lapse. I want to express my thanks for the cooperation that I have had as Leader of the House from the Opposition's managers of business. The member for Bragg and the now Deputy Leader have given an enormous amount of cooperation. I think the very few times that the guillotine has been moved is testimony to the degree of cooperation. I can also say that any arrangements that have been made informally have always translated into what actually happens on the floor. That gives a great deal of confidence when we are trying to manage the business. I would like to thank the Deputy Leader and the former Deputy Leader for their cooperation.

I would also like to thank the people who have assisted. I suppose we are the *prima donnas* of the system. We are the ones who enjoy whatever good has come our way from time to time and we are the ones who get the glory—whatever glory it is, however fleeting. It may be glory for only a day but nevertheless we are the ones who enjoy it. The people who support us make that possible because I think we would all readily concede that without that support we would be very ordinary mortals indeed. I would particularly like to thank *Hansard*. I am never quite sure why they have difficulty with some of these Australian accents around the place but it is clear that they manage to polish them up and they read pretty well. In fact, when you read them, if you do not read them with a jaundiced eye, you would think that you were a lot better than you actually are. Thank you *Hansard* from all of us.

The clerks at the table diligently work in both the House and the committees. They give us advice from time to time. Some we like and some we do not like; some we agree with and some we do not agree with. That advice is given to all members of the House—it is not advice given to the Government particularly—and all members get very good service from the clerks and I thank them. The attendants, I suppose, along with the

catering staff and the housekeeping staff, are the workers in this place who do more than anybody else to keep the nuts and bolts of it together and make sure that we are still ticking over with some degree of sanity at this time of the night. The service that is given by the housekeepers, those in catering and the attendants is exemplary. The caretakers play a very significant role. It is not a role that is in anyway obtrusive but nevertheless it is critical.

I would also like to thank the police that we see around the place from time to time. The masses do not threaten us other than electorally, but nevertheless it is comforting to see those uniforms around the place in a building which has an almost total lack of security. We do have that feeling of the police being there to take care of any slight incident in a very professional and discreet way. I thank them. I also want to thank the press who suffer these long hours and who, from time to time, make mention of the hours that members of Parliament work, the salaries that we get and other things. We respect them for their views knowing that they go through all the trials that we endure. Nevertheless, we have a symbiotic relationship and to a great extent use each other.

Finally, I want to mention one person who has now left the Parliament, and that is Bernadette Schubert. Bernadette was enormously helpful to the House of Assembly, the individual members and the staff. It is a great loss to the Parliament that Bernadette has gone, but we do thank her for the 10 years service that she gave us. I do not know whether she has moved sideways, upwards, downwards or whatever. However, I know she will be an enormous success in her new position, despite what may be very difficult circumstances from time to time. Bernadette, thank you very much.

There have been some momentous events since we last had a debate of this nature. All around the world it seems to be that things are breaking apart on occasions. But certainly, Australia and South Australia are islands of stability—sometimes unpredictable and sometimes we get a very great pleasure from some of the events that occur. I think we would all agree that perhaps 13 March was one of them. Also, I have to mention the events in Manchester over the past weekend. The strange thing about reading these debates of what went on years ago is that people always seem to mention football. I do not know whether it is just because of the member for Walsh that the Crows get a mention; I have never quite seen the connection. However, as it is tradition and as I am a traditionalist, I will mention the momentous events in Manchester over the past weekend.

I hope that all members of the House and all staff of the House have a break. I know that it is not, as can be portrayed, a form of holiday: it is absolutely nothing of the sort. However, I hope that people get some time to themselves and with their family, perhaps to reflect on the meaning of life or whatever else it is that we do. Nevertheless, I do hope that everyone has a substantial break.

I am remiss in not mentioning one other person. Linda is retiring from the catering staff after 23 years. Anyone who has put up with members of Parliament for 23 years certainly deserves some recognition. With those few words, I commend the resolution to the House.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I guess after such a contribution from the Deputy Premier it is hard not to be wandering off and thinking of other things. We have spent an interesting four months in this House. The Deputy Premier talks about the battles being fought, and I am looking forward to the biggest battle of all in this State in the not too distant future.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: I am reminded that it will not be much of a battle: nevertheless, it has to be fought. The Deputy Premier spent so much time speaking that I was wondering whether he was speaking on the wrong Bill and that we were not actually going to have to come back before there was a change in this Parliament and in the Government of this State. However, that remains to be seen.

It is the normal function of the two managers of the House in some way to eulogise the contributions that have been made by the various players in the Parliament. The Deputy Premier has done that particularly well. If I go right through the whole list again, in the long way that it has already been done, I will be repetitious. However, it is important that we recognise at this time the people who suffer because of the antics of politicians.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: 'Some politicians', as the member for Chaffey says. It is appropriate that we reflect on some of the stupidity that we force upon ourselves and other people. It does put strains and stresses on the staff of this Parliament. I thank very kindly the clerks of this House, who have done another great job. Their cooperation has been excellent and the advice they have given has certainly been what we would have expected. The quality of the service has certainly been there. They have served us well, under difficult circumstances on occasions, because they have to put up with us. They have made a special effort and it is appreciated.

The attendants, who look after our needs within the Chamber and elsewhere in the Parliament, have been prompt, courteous and very efficient. Special mention must be made of the catering staff. I had a list of things I was supposed to say to the catering staff. The food has been wonderful and the service has been excellent. Someone suggested that the peas and the carrots need a bit more cooking, but other than—

Members interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: The desserts have been superb, I understand. There is no comparison with the meals that I enjoyed 10 years ago when I entered Parliament.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton interjecting:

S.J. BAKER: The member for Heysen goes back 18 years; I do not go back that far. I do not believe that any person in the Parliament would have cause for complaint about the quality of the service provided by the catering division of this Parliament. We have a wonderful *Hansard* staff. They make wonderful changes to my speeches and to those of all members.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmere: Speak for yourself.

Mr S.J. BAKER: With the one exception.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: That is not true.

S.J. BAKER: The Deputy Premier suggests that even the member for Coles has been helped out on

occasions. But we are all helped. Even if the words are not changed because someone is perfect in his or her delivery, the fact is that there is continuing accuracy. I know, having visited a number of Parliaments in Australia and having talked to the administrators of those Parliaments and to the parliamentarians, that we really do have a superb *Hansard* staff in this State.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr S.J. BAKER: There are many other people who make the place work very effectively.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes, the member for Napier gives a lot of help. There are other players in the system, such as the library staff and the caretakers who on occasion make the air-conditioning system work in weird and wonderful ways so that we have entertainment during the sittings of the Parliament just to change the pace. I pay particular tribute to anyone who has spent 23 years on the catering staff looking after our needs, as has already been mentioned.

This 'thank you' that we give is probably a little bit longer this year, basically because we do not know when we are going home—whether it will be tonight or tomorrow—and that is nothing unusual. However, I would like to mention that we will have a change in another place, presumably on the first sitting day when the Parliament resumes—which at this stage we still do not know. The Hon. Bob Kitson will not be with us as a parliamentarian at the start of next session, because he is retiring from Parliament to take up other interests. We do not normally talk about members of another place, but I wish to record my thanks to Bob Kitson for his service and the contribution he has made to the Parliament, especially for his deliberation on Bills, particularly health matters, which have enriched the Parliament.

The library staff, the caretakers and a number of other people make our life liveable in this place. Our security staff in the form of the police ensure that at least during the sittings of Parliament and at other times we feel safe and secure. That is something for which we should be thankful, because such a state of security might not exist in other countries.

I join with the Deputy Premier in wishing everyone a good break. I know that some of the committees will continue, so that *Hansard* will not have a complete break, but at least they will not have to contend with the continuum that we have had over the past four months. If we had a suggestion box I would suggest that the Government get its act together and work out when it wants to sit so that we do not have some of this stupidity that we have seen.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: It is the Upper House.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister suggests that the fault lies with the Upper House, but it was not the Upper House that extended for the additional three days last week or the extra sittings this week—it had nothing to do with that. The Deputy Premier talked about the cooperation that he has received from his side of the House. It is not quite apparent when Ministers are rushing Bills through at the last moment. If we do not go to an election, I hope that the Ministers, especially the Minister of Health, get their act together.

Finally, I thank you, Mr Speaker, for your deliberations. I know that we have tested your patience on one or two occasions. You have deliberated over this Parliament with a great deal of fairness. In the 10 years I have been here I have appreciated your efforts to make this a more humane and effective functioning Parliament. I have a special request for Ministers: if they could clean out their offices in the break, it would be appreciated. I support the motion.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Some of us share your view, Mr Speaker, that the Parliament is still relevant. In particular, Parliament is a bicameral institution. Some of the matters that we might well reflect on at this time include the fact that in this Chamber where we sit legislation was first introduced to provide that children should be given freely and universally the opportunity to obtain an education—a unique proposal in any democracy anywhere on earth—that there ought to be a system of lands titles so that everyone could be sure that they own the land they claim to own regardless of whether fire burnt the piece of parchment that said they did, and that women should obtain the vote. That all happened about 100 years ago when people thought they were on the threshold of a great revolution in democracy. We probably stand in the same place in history now. I stand to make these remarks not only because of my respect for Parliament as we know it in South Australia as a bicameral institution but also because I am a member of the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee of which you, Sir, are Chairman every other year alternating with the President in another place.

I thank the attendants for their help and cooperation during the session. I thank the Catering Division for making it possible for us to function in the way we do in spite of the exigencies that we impose upon their lives in consequence of the way in which we go about our business. I also want to thank the library staff for their contribution to our understanding, those of us who want to understand, particularly the backbenchers, of what is happening in the course of the decisions we have to make so that we are able to contribute something factual to debate to support the views we express. Members opposite as much as members on this side need to remember that that is an important part of the meaning of the word 'Parliament'. If we should ever forget what Parliament means, it will be a sorry day for democracy, regardless of whether we choose a future as part of a democratic republic or a constitutional monarchy.

Backbenchers in this forum and in the other place need to be able to provide for themselves the information they require to make a contribution not only on behalf of the people who put them here but also relevant to the debate of the moment. Without the library, its resources and research staff, we could not do that. I do not think that at present the library has adequate resources to give us what we need. For a few extra thousand dollars, there would be great enhancement of our ability as parliamentarians in the true meaning of the word to do our duty as we were elected to do, regardless of whether we belong to a political Party.

More important if not at least as important as anything else I have said or will say in this speech, let me say that *Hansard* is vital to this institution as a part of democratic

society. Anything that is said here is taken down and may be quoted at any time in future to remind us all of what we said and, if the language means anything, what we meant. *Hansard* has had to undergo a great deal of change recently. If that change has been painful, I apologise, but I insist that it has been necessary. I commend *Hansard* for the way in which it has met that challenge to adapt from what was the process to what is becoming the process, for we have not yet arrived. The *Hansard* staff have done an enormous amount to ensure that their work is relevant, efficient and understandable. It is relevant in the sense that the record is still kept not only of the proceedings of this and the other Chamber but also of the parliamentary committees.

I commend the way they have done this because, with electronic data processing equipment, we are now able to provide that record at much less expense than was previously possible—because the *Hansard* staff were willing to cooperate. The taxpayers of South Australia will be grateful for the cooperation of *Hansard* whether or not other members in this place think so. Their commitment has saved taxpayers not just tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of dollars but certainly over a million dollars. This means that we can get quick and accurate reference to what has been said not only in these two Chambers but also in the committees far more quickly and accurately than was otherwise possible.

I am grateful to them and I commend them for their willingness in such short time to accept and adopt those changes which have made those savings possible to the taxpayers of South Australia. You, Mr Speaker, would understand that as the alternating Chairperson of the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee. I want to commend also, in spite of the criticism which may have been levelled at them by gossip or otherwise, the table officers.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I do not mind that I may sometimes be considered as being verbose in making these remarks. There are people who make the process of democracy not only possible but relevant and enduring, and they are people who are not elected to this place but who are committed to serve it. The table officers suffer great criticism from time to time.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I wish *Hansard* could record all of that, for it lies at the base line of what I am now saying. As an individual it can be sometimes difficult to accept what appears to be no more than gossip as to distress that any one or more members of the staff of this or the other Chamber may experience. I regret that: it is unnecessary and I think most of that criticism more often than not is ill informed; certainly in my experience that has been the case.

I thank Bernadette Schubert for what she has done and I wish her well in the future in her new chosen employment outside service to this Chamber. Also, I thank the caretakers, the police and cleaners for what they do to make this place safe, habitable and pleasant for us to work in. Certainly, if it were not so safe or pleasant, it could pretty soon become the occupation most venial in the minds of the community regardless of

what other remuneration might be paid to anyone elected to this place.

It is equally important for us to acknowledge the role played by people not paid from the public purse but who ensure that the public understand the relevance of this institution for democracy—and they are the press. They have to have our continued respect regardless of whether or not we believe they have done a fair job. I do not intend my remarks to mean that I question whether or not they have done a fair job but that they have done a job and that the public have some understanding of what has happened here.

If it were not for the press, what we seek to do in the name of the public interest would not be understood by the public whom we represent. I suggest that, unless in the very near future we undertake to modify the way in which the recordings of this Chamber are broadcast to the public—in the same way as the Hansard family undertook to do that over a century ago—we will find that the proceedings of the Parliament where the images are projected by radio waves into the living rooms of people on a selected basis, whether in the medium of radio or television, will distort what we do here to the point where we are held in contempt.

That worries me in that if it is appropriate for us to have the written word, as it were, controlled by a committee of this Chamber and the Parliament, (namely, the written word as recorded by *Hansard*) then we must now also take care too, where the electronic radio images projected from this place to the public are at present beyond control. That is a serious and, to my mind, important consideration. I do not mind how many of the 47 members here present—not all of them are—think that venial, but I hold it to be an important aspect of the future survival of parliamentary democracy. If we ignore it, we will do so at the peril of this institution and we will do so—

An honourable member: The end is nigh.

Mr LEWIS: Yes, it is for the likes of those people who choose to interject with such inanity. It is important for us to do what has been done by our forebears and secure the survival of the institution in the public interest.

Finally, let me say how much I appreciate the work the police have done to prevent cranks from outside the institution from taking control of the events that occur here from time to time. Were it not for the police, we could not feel secure—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: —and we could not rely on your ability, Mr Speaker, to control not only the way we conduct ourselves but also the way in which members of the general public who wish to observe what we do are able to do that without fear of violence and, in the case of some people, without fear of having the process otherwise subverted by their own agenda where it is not endorsed by the elected representatives, the 47 of whom sit here.

Mr SUCH: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I did not hear all of that contribution—Can it be repeated?

The SPEAKER: Standing Orders do not allow for two contributions in this debate.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): I will not comment on that address in reply, other than to make the serious point that locked up in here we tend to lose contact with the outside world, but we nevertheless occasionally receive messages about what is happening outside and it would appear that there must be a full moon. On these occasions we deal in a more lighthearted manner with parliamentary procedures and what has taken place and what we look forward to in the future; we wish well those who have assisted us, and either one or both Whips make a few comments.

I believe that the member for Davenport, the Opposition Whip, has a harder job to cope with in some ways than mine. We have to provide you, Mr Speaker, with assistance with our choreographing of who is speaking, asking questions and replying on both sides and we liaise across the floor. We also have to try to exercise some sort of control upon the back bench. In this case it is obvious what a problem you have, Mr Speaker, when the cage door has been left open. We also have to liaise with the leadership but, on my side, I believe I have a little easier task because the leadership is much more clear cut.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of those who have assisted, the attendants and all the other officers, although I will not list them all. There is at least one individual who has been of particular service in recent weeks who has not been mentioned, and I would like to put on the record my appreciation and that of my colleagues for David Bridges, the Acting Clerk, in recent weeks in the absence of Geof Mitchell. Through you, Mr Speaker, we thank David for the good work he has put in and we wish Geof Mitchell a speedy recovery.

Like others, I wish to express my thanks to the quick thinking specialists of *Hansard*, who record our words and manage to create silk purses out of sows' ears and good naturedly submit themselves to hours of verbiage. In one sense they suffer worse from the verbiage in here than we do because they have to remain behind for half an hour, an hour, or longer, after Parliament has risen in order to finish recording those golden phrases.

I would like to add my special thanks to Bernadette Schubert whom we have all appreciated for the good natured help she has given us here. Our loss is the member for Bragg's gain. I would like also to add my thanks to the caterers, in particular, to Linda. All the caterers have been of great help to us. They bring special qualities to the Parliament such as courtesy, warmth, good humour and helpfulness, and we particularly wish Linda well in her retirement after 23 years of working in this Parliament.

Lastly, I would like to put on record my appreciation for the fact that the Whips' offices have finally been provided with the resources that they need. I am sure the member for Davenport would join me in indicating that he has found it much easier to carry out his duties expeditiously and efficiently, and with me he would not make any comment about what has happened in the past but would support me in commending the current administration for that. I look forward to our all resuming in the near future and again engaging in mortal combat.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I wish to speak in this debate, because in this business of politics you never know when will be the last time you will have the opportunity to speak—and I guess that is the same with life. I support all the comments that have been made about the staff—whoever they may be—and also politicians—whoever they may be and whoever's side they may be on.

Having said that, I thank the Government Whip for the cooperation I get from him in the work we must do. I find private members' business difficult, because it is very hard to get members to understand that they should be around the place if they have anything on the Notice Paper. In saying that, I want to refer to the member for Flinders, whom I find most cooperative. Like others in the past, he can be difficult, but he is cooperative. If he wishes to take some action, he makes a request and it is accommodated if possible. I thank him for his cooperation, knowing that the position he is in, and given the Parliament as it is constituted now, can be difficult.

Mr Speaker, I thank you for the cooperation you have given me. I do my best not to make too many errors. However, you are cooperative and understanding, and I appreciate that. I do not blame you for getting angry at times, so long as you do not blame me if I get bit niggly, too, as I did yesterday.

Linda came here as a young woman when I was already here, and I thank her for her service over the years and wish her all the best in her retirement. In relation to catering, I have one complaint: as someone who was born and raised on a farm in an era when vegetables used to be cooked, I find it difficult when the broccoli jumps off the plate when I go to cut it. When I told my dear mother, who is 97 years of age, that overcooking vegetables was unhealthy, she said, 'Well, that's strange; I've been in hospital only once since 1932.' So, I am not sure that half cooked vegetables are necessarily a healthy move, but I take this opportunity to register my complaint, because I will not have to say 'No' to those vegetables much longer.

Our telephonist and relieving telephonists are good to us—and I think they have been referred to—and they do a great job for us. Barbara Guthrie, in helping us with the children who go through here, is involved in an area that has concerned me for a long while. She does an excellent job. Many children come through here, through her guidance, that of members of Parliament or that of some other staff member, to learn a little about Parliament. I congratulate the schools on undertaking their subject of legal studies. Members of Parliament are, in a way, power hungry and ignore the people.

I say that because hardly one of us would know every aspect of every law we pass in this place, but those we represent are supposed to understand it. We do not seek to try to help them understand it by doing some of the writing ourselves. We rely only on the journalists and the electronic media to highlight the things that they think are sensational. If members think about that, they must realise that the public is expected to understand the law, and it is damned impossible today to do that with the number of laws we are putting through this Parliament in such haste. I say that with a lot of conviction, because it does really worry me.

Mr Brindal: Why don't you just say, 'Farewell'?

Mr S.G. EVANS: The member for Hayward should note that I may be around a little longer. I appreciate the extra staff that has been given to the Whips, and I have appreciated some of the other changes that have taken place. I hope that some of our other equipment is updated to modern technology, because we are falling behind the private sector.

Members of *Hansard* must suffer all of us to a degree, and I apologise to them for the times when I have tried to give them an indication of the time we will adjourn and that indication has been wrong. It is important that we try to let staff—whether they be *Hansard*, catering or others—know approximately when we expect to finish because they have families, commitments and interests in life other than this place, and it does help them in their considerations. I apologise for often not giving those staff the correct finishing time, and I do not suppose we will ever remedy that.

The others on the fringe who help us, whether they be the couriers, the car park attendant, the electrician, the people involved with the air-conditioner or whatever, are all part of the scene. In a way, we are like a club, and the public sees us as a club, although sometimes there is a bit of friction within it. I endorse all the comments made by other members about the support staff. I wish our clerk a speedy recovery. I believe he will come back after this session. Have a happy winter. May the netball girls, the footballers and the Deputy Premier's soccer players have a win, too.

The SPEAKER: In endorsing all the complimentary remarks that have been made to the staff here, I would like to make a few observations. Over my nearly 14 years here, I have probably had the opportunity, through the vagaries of this Parliament, that is, as Speaker of the House and as a Chairperson of the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee, to see how the Parliament works much more than most other members of Parliament would take the time, make the effort or have the opportunity to do. From my observation, everybody who works to service this Parliament and its members strives to do the very best they can. They work hours that you would not believe—and I am talking about only those people in my own experience.

I accept and agree with all the comments about *Hansard*, the catering staff and the attendants. They all try to do the best they can to make our jobs easier. Sometimes comments are made from the floor in this place about a paper or report being late, and that really does nothing for the standing of members or to recognise the effort that the various officers put in.

In particular, I would like to register now my special appreciation for the extra effort the table staff and the support staff of the House of Assembly have made in recent times, due to the unfortunate absence of our clerk, and I wish him well. I hope he is back on deck as soon as possible. I congratulate David Bridges on the effort he has put in. He has done very well, and so has, as I have indicated, the rest of his staff.

Comments were made—I think by the member for Murray-Mallee—this session about some reflections on the table staff. That does concern me. In fact, I had discussions with the clerk when this occurred and was going to take action from the Chair. Certain events

occurred and I did not, although I should have, and that is one thing I regret. The reflections upon the staff of this House I believe are absolutely unforgivable and unnecessary. These people work fairly, impartially and very hard to serve all of us as members. Reflections when they cannot respond (I cannot think of a word that will not be insulting to people) certainly are unacceptable to me, and I regret very much that I did not take action at the time.

I do wish everybody a restorative break, and I hope that we come back refreshed and well. If members look around their desk or drawers, they will find a little green book called the House of Assembly Standing Orders. I would like members to take it with them and in moments of reflection please read it so that when we do return we all know what we are doing. I give my best wishes to everybody, to all members and everybody who services the Parliament, and I look forward to a lively session later in the year.

Motion carried.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the House to sit beyond midnight.

Motion carried.

YOUNG OFFENDERS BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1 Page 4 (clause 7)—After line 29 insert new subclause as follows:

‘(2a) An explanation given to a youth or the signing of an admission by a youth worker under subsection (2) should take place, if practicable, in the presence of—

- (a) a guardian of the youth; or
- (b) if a guardian is not available—an adult person nominated by the youth who has had a close association with the youth or has been counselling, advising or aiding the youth.’

No. 2 Page 5 (clause 8)—After line 33 insert new subclause as follows:

‘(4a) If a youth enters into an undertaking under this section to apologise to the victim of the offence, the apology must be made in the presence of an adult person approved by a police officer.’

No. 3 Page 6, line 8 (clause 8)—Insert ‘if the youth requires the matter to be dealt with by the court—’ before ‘lay’.

No. 4 Page 6, line 9 (clause 8)—Leave out all words in this line.

No. 5 Page 6, lines 16 to 18 (clause 8)—Leave out subclause (8) and insert new subclause as follows:

‘(8) If a police officer deals with an offence under this division, the officer must—

- (a) ask the victim of the offence whether he or she wishes to be informed of the identity of the offender and how the offence has been dealt with; and
- (b) if the victim indicates that he or she does wish to have that information—give the victim that information.’

No. 6 Page 6, lines 20 to 27 (clause 9)—Leave out the clause and insert new clause as follows:

‘Youth justice coordinators

9. (1) The following are to be Youth Justice Coordinators:

- (a) The Magistrates who are members of the Youth Court's principal or ancillary judiciary; and
- (b) The persons who are appointed by the Minister as Youth Justice Coordinators.

(2) A person appointed as a Youth Justice Coordinator will be appointed for a term not exceeding 3 years specified in the instrument of appointment and is, on the expiration of a term of appointment, eligible for reappointment.

(3) A person cannot be appointed as a Youth Justice Coordinator unless the Senior Judge of the Youth Court has been consulted in relation to the proposed appointment.

(4) A person appointed as a Youth Justice Coordinator is responsible to the Senior Judge of the Youth Court (through any properly constituted administrative superior) for the proper and efficient discharge of his or her duties.’

No. 7 Page 8 (clause 12)—After line 20 insert new subclause as follows:

‘(6a) If a youth enters into an undertaking under this section to apologise to the victim of the offence, the apology must be made in the presence of an adult person approved by the family conference or a Youth Justice Coordinator.’

No. 8 Page 9, lines 7 to 9 (clause 12)—Leave out subclause (10) and insert new subclause as follows:

‘(10) If a family conference deals with an offence under this Division, the Youth Justice Coordinator must—

- (a) ask the victim of the offence whether he or she wishes to be informed of the identity of the offender and how the offence has been dealt with; and
- (b) if the victim indicates that he or she does wish to have that information—give the victim that information.’

No. 9 Page 10, lines 10 to 12 (clause 14)—Leave out ‘explain to the youth the nature of the allegations against him or her, and inform the youth of his or her right to seek legal representation’ and insert the following:

- ‘—
- (a) explain to the youth the nature of the allegations against him or her; and
 - (b) inform the youth of his or her right to seek legal representation; and
 - (c) take all reasonable steps to inform—
 - (i) the guardian of the youth;
 - (ii) if a guardian is not available—an adult person nominated by the youth who has had a close association with the youth or has been counselling, advising or aiding the youth, of the arrest and invite him or her to be present during any interrogation or investigation to which the youth is subjected while in custody.’

No. 10 Page 11, line 16 (clause 17)—Insert ‘the offence with which the youth is charged is an indictable offence and’ before ‘the youth’.

- No. 11 Page 16, line 7 (clause 33)—Leave out 'child' and insert 'youth'.
- No. 12 Page 21, line 17 (clause 38)—Leave out 'or' and insert 'and'.
- No. 13 Page 23, line 30 (clause 42)—Leave out 'six' and insert 'three'.
- No. 14 Page 25, (clause 44)—After line 11 insert new subclause as follows:
'(2a) Before entering into arrangements under this section, the Minister must allow the guardians of the youth a reasonable opportunity to make representations on the question whether the transfer is in the best interests of the young offender.'
- No. 15. Page 26 (clause 45)—After line 17 insert new subclause as follows:
(2a) Before entering into arrangements under this section, the Minister must allow the guardians of the youth a reasonable opportunity to make representations on the question whether the transfer is in the best interests of the young offender.'
- No. 16. Page 28 (clause 51)—After line 23 insert new subclause as follows:
'(2) The attendance by a youth at an educational or training course approved by the Minister for the purposes of this section will be taken to be the performance of community service.'
- No. 17 Page 29, lines 1 to 20 (clause 52)—Leave out the clause.
- No. 18 Page 30, line 11 (clause 53)—After 'District Court' insert 'Who is not a Judge of the Youth Court'.
- No. 19. Page 31, line 13 (clause 56)—After 'Act' insert 'including the giving of formal cautions by police officers'.
- No. 20. Page 31, line 24 (clause 57)—Leave out '31 October' and insert '30 September'.
- No. 21. Page 31, line 27 (clause 57)—Leave out '31 October' and insert '30 September'.
- No. 22. Page 32, line 1 (clause 57)—Leave out 'As soon as practicable' and insert 'within six sitting days'.
- No. 23. Page 32, line 2 (clause 57)—Leave out 'subsection (1)' and insert 'this section'.
- No. 24. Page 33, line 18 (clause 9)—After 'age' insert 'but any offences so dealt with will be regarded as of minor significance'.

Consideration in Committee.

Amendments Nos 1 to 16.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 1 to 16 be agreed to.

The Legislative Council has proposed quite a range of amendments—some 24—to the Young Offenders Bill. With one exception those amendments are reasonable propositions. I find some disagreement in principle with some parts of the amendments, but I believe that together they form a very workable package. There is no doubt that the process which this Parliament has followed in reassessing its attitude towards young offenders and the way the juvenile justice system in this State has been reconstituted has been proved to be very effective. I believe I indicated during the debate on the Bills that all members of Parliament, particularly those in this Chamber (and I will become more specific about that in a moment), can take considerable credit for their participation in a process of reform which has extended

over a considerable period and which has involved substantial consultation with the public. It has produced some very workable legislation and some substantial changes to the way we address the problem of juvenile justice in this State.

Those changes will ensure the involvement of families in that process; they will empower local communities through their local police officers to take significant measures in relation to young offenders, and they will ensure that juvenile justice is quick, responsive and proportionate to the needs of the circumstances young offenders find themselves in. Those are the hallmarks of any effective juvenile justice system—speed and efficiency to ensure that every offence carries a consequence and that that consequence is immediate. It does not need to be particularly serious if the offence does not call for it, but it certainly needs to be quick and it certainly needs to be something that ensures that the young offender is aware of the fact that society and our community are not prepared to tolerate a repetition of that behaviour.

There are some aspects of the amendments from the other place which give me cause for concern. In particular, I find that there are a number of areas where the police are required to involve a guardian of the young person, be that a parent or adult friend. The committee had proposed a number of opportunities for that to occur, and indeed section 79a of the Summary Offences Act makes substantial provision for that. It is possible that in some circumstances that could be used to frustrate the efforts of police to pursue an offence, but I believe on the whole the package is quite workable and I therefore propose to the Committee that we should accept the amendments of the other place.

There is one aspect of this matter that gives me cause for substantial concern, and that is that the other Chamber has seen fit to remove all reference to parental liability from the legislation. That is one aspect of this matter that I find very hard to understand. When this matter was before members of the select committee, they adopted a common position and recommended to the Chamber, the Parliament and the community of South Australia that we should incorporate principles of parental liability. The committee recognised the difficulties in that area; it recognised the potential pitfalls and it made significant provision to ensure that where that was inappropriate those parents who did exercise reasonable care and exercised their responsibility in relation to their children were not subject to liability clauses.

When the matter was before the Government I, as Minister, further amended the proposition to take account of those circumstances where any potential liability for parents would have had the effect of imposing significant hardship on the family and other young members of the family. Those amendments as a package would have ensured a workable and appropriate system of parental liability in this State, as has applied in New Zealand and in continental Europe for a long time. Those countries find parental liability to be a workable system, and that is indeed an appropriate course. It reminds that very small percentage of parents who need reminding of their responsibilities—and it is a very small percentage, as you would know, Mr Chairman. However, they represent a

significant problem in this country, where young people are allowed on the streets late at night to participate in criminal activity that should be known to the parents were they exercising the appropriate care that the overwhelming majority of parents in this State exercise.

Although members of the Opposition in the select committee supported the position of the committee on this matter, quite properly, the Opposition looked at it again and when it was before this Chamber the Opposition spokesman for this area agreed to the broad proposition of parental liability but qualified it. The qualifications which the Opposition proposed in this Chamber which, while I did not agree with them and while the Government was not able to support them, at least acknowledged the issue of parental liability and what the select committee had said: that there were circumstances—limited, certainly—where parents should be held liable for the criminal activity of their children. The select committee recognised that. The Opposition in this Chamber modified that position but did not back away from the principle, and I think that is a very important point in its favour in this Chamber.

While the Government did not support the points it put forward, it certainly understands the qualifications which the Opposition sought to impose. They were monetary limits, and certainly it would have been possible to discuss and debate those monetary limits and there were qualifications, just as the Government had imposed qualifications on that principle, and certainly that left room for discussions and debate. But, when this matter was dealt with in another Chamber, it was dealt with in a way that totally excluded parental liability from the legislation.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Why are you agreeing to it?

The Hon. M.J. Evans: The member for Heysen asks a very reasonable question. The reality is that, at this point of the session, given that this is not the first time this issue has been debated, the Opposition in another place has rejected this issue again and again. How many times must we put this up and debate it in this Chamber? We have recommended it in a select committee. The Opposition here has accepted the principle, but again in another place the principle is totally rejected—not modified, not qualified, but totally rejected. And this has occurred on two previous occasions in this place.

This Government is patient and reasonable, but we cannot repeat the exercise again and again. We know what the ultimate fate of this is: we have done this before. It seemed to me that, when we put the matter up again in this context, we had the support of the Opposition in the committee and we had the support of the Opposition in this Chamber, with qualifications. Of course, I understand the point that was being made, but the principle was basically accepted. However, when it reached another place, again we were confronted with the absolute rejection of this principle.

I do not believe there is any point in wasting the time of members in this Chamber with repeated discussion into the small hours of the morning, having been through this process previously. If this were the first time this issue had been debated, I could understand that it would be reasonable to follow through with that process, but it is not the first time, and to repeat this exercise and to

subject this Parliament to that kind of process again and again is not relevant. It is for that reason that I have suggested to this Chamber that we should reluctantly accept that part of the proposal.

It would be pointless for me to proceed through each of these amendments. Many of them are consequential and many are perfectly acceptable to the Government. I am sure that, had we had the opportunity to discuss it in that context, had the Opposition's attitude in this Chamber prevailed and had the attitude that was very responsibly taken in the select committee by all members prevailed, we would have had a reasonable package of parental liability in this State. Certainly not absolute, as is the case in Europe and New Zealand, but qualified in some appropriate way.

But when confronted again and again with the absolute rejection of this principle, I do not see that we have anywhere to go. Unfortunately, the Opposition and the Democrats in another place have combined to reject this principle. They have ensured that that small minority of parents who do not exercise reasonable responsibility will not be held accountable for their failure and negligence. The overwhelming balance of the community must continue to pay for their crime. I am afraid that that is not a position with which I can agree. I am sure that it is not a position with which the Opposition can agree. I know that it is not a position with which the select committee agreed, but I am afraid the circumstances of this place leave me with no alternative.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: There is no doubt that the legislation as it comes into this place at this stage is a vast improvement, as the Minister indicated. There have been some very significant changes to the Bill that was brought before this House, and there is no doubt that those changes will satisfy to a very large extent the concerns in the community about juvenile justice and the way it is now administered in South Australia. I believe that the mood for change that has been evident for some time will to some extent be satisfied.

Before I get on to the matter that the Minister has referred to as a matter of some concern, I also want to take this opportunity again to commend the bipartisan select committee that has brought down an excellent report and has brought with it much improved legislation. I, too, want to speak about the matter of parental liability. At the outset I want to say that, as the Minister indicated in this Chamber previously, I expressed my concern about this matter. I brought to this Chamber amendments that were rejected by the Government, and I can only say that I am surprised that the Minister and the Government have been prepared to accept the amendments from the other place.

If the Minister and the Government wanted to, they could have taken this matter to conference. The arguments put forward by the Minister are weak, to say the least. So, I suspect that what will happen is that the Minister will sit back at this stage and accept the amendments that come from another place and then will go out and be extremely critical of those amendments. I repeat: the Minister could have taken this matter to conference—in fact, the Opposition expected it to go to conference.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Deputy Premier, out of his seat, makes reference to a member in another House. I do not intend to refer to members in that place. I am saying that, as far as the Opposition is concerned, we would have been prepared to go to conference to deal with the matter of parental liability. Let me repeat that, both in this place and in another place—

An honourable member interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will give the member for Spence the call after this, if he requires it.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Both in this place and in another place, amendments were put up that to some extent would have been a halfway position in this matter. Amendments were put up and the Government opposed those amendments in this place and in another place. The Minister can sit here and say what he likes, but when we have the opportunity to look carefully at *Hansard* we will see the true picture, because the Government had the opportunity to accept those amendments but rejected them.

It is no good the Minister and the Government sitting here and saying that they accept the situation and then go out into the community and be critical of the Liberal Party for the stance that is being taken. Again, I say that it is not too late for the Government to go to a conference if it so wishes on this matter. I have set down my thoughts and those of the Opposition in this place. We certainly expected to go to a conference on this matter. So, while the Opposition, like the Government, believes that this legislation is a vast improvement on what we have seen in the past, the Opposition in this place expresses concern about the way in which the Minister and the Government have been prepared to sit back and accept this situation in regard to parental liability without even attempting to go to conference on the issue.

Mrs HUTCHISON: I realise that we will be accepting these amendments, but I would like to put on record my concern about the fact that youth justice coordinators can also be magistrates in the judicial system. That causes me some little concern. One of the reasons that the New Zealand system worked so effectively was the fact that it was not in the formal system—it was in the informal system. The youth justice coordinators were not part of the judiciary, and that was why it worked. I have a particular concern because of the way I think it can affect the Aboriginal community. In New Zealand the Maori community found that the structure of their system worked very effectively for them. It was able to incorporate the family and the victim and all those bodies that were able to offer the young offender some sort of work to do in the community service order line. But, it was mainly because it was out of that formalised system that it worked.

I was hopeful that this would remain the same sort of system. I know that that will not be now because magistrates will be involved. I realise, of course, that sometimes magistrates will need to be used in country areas. I do not think it is always necessary, because it could have worked with just the youth justice coordinators being hired from the general community.

Without making too much of an issue of it, I would like to lay my concerns before the Parliament because this matter was thrashed out fairly exhaustively in the

select committee. We viewed the system in New Zealand specifically to have a look at that informalised process of family group conferences and we saw that it worked very effectively. I would like to put on record that I do have a concern in that area.

Mr S.J. BAKER: We have heard an absolutely hysterical contribution from the Minister here tonight: if he cannot take the pace, he should go home and let other more capable people carry his portfolios. I know that he is treading in other areas but, if the Minister of Primary Industries were here, we would have seen a proper disposition of this matter. It is just not sufficient that the processes of the Parliament are hijacked because of some smart footwork on behalf of the Minister and other people associated with the other side of politics.

It is quite clear that in every jurisdiction 19 beats two on every occasion, and that is the situation that would have arisen had a conference been held. For the Minister to say, 'Well, we were prepared to go halfway but they knocked it out in the Upper House', is not the truth. It was quite clear that on the floor of the Parliament in another place that indeed there was an opportunity for the Government to support the amendments rather than lose the clause. This is just a cynical, pathetic attempt by the Government somehow to embarrass the Liberal Party on this issue. We were absolutely sure that this amendment would succeed, because we knew that the Democrats would in no way support any form of parental liability.

In principle we support an element of parental liability which I believe would have the full support of the community—not the draconian measure that would pass in this House because we did not have the numbers to have our amendment accepted. I am sure that, if we had taken the issue to a referendum, we would have had the full support of the community, yet the Minister and the ALP have hijacked this Parliament.

Mrs Hutchison interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: If the member for Stuart wants to make another contribution on this issue, she will have to wait until next session. The lengths to which the ALP will go to try to create divisions never cease to amaze me. The Minister said in this House, 'I didn't like it, but at least it was recognising parental liability and it probably would have been acceptable.' For him then not to allow that to occur does not do justice to him or to his side of politics.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: There has been a comment made from the floor by a member, who is not in his seat, that we could go to 5 o'clock. I believe that on occasions the Parliament has gone through until Saturday. If we need to go through until Saturday to make sure that justice prevails, to ensure that the proper procedures of the Parliament are fulfilled and that the will of the Parliament is met, we will do it, but I am not going to be placed in the situation where it is obvious that the vast majority of the members of Parliament, except two members up there, would accept the compromise situation. That is absolutely clear.

For the Minister to shake his head, unwilling to have that matter tested, is quite diabolical. The Minister said, 'We have to go to a conference.' The Minister said, 'We have been hanging around all night waiting for this

conference to be set up'; we knew that once the conference was set up it would take just a small amount of time to have this matter sorted out and the Liberal amendment accepted. Even the Minister said it was almost acceptable. It was not what he wanted—

The Hon. M.J. Evans: I said I understood why you moved it.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister changes his tune when the occasion suits him. I make the point, and make it very strongly, that it does no-one any good and it certainly brings some discredit to this Parliament for the Minister to have acted in this way. He was saying he did not know when we would resume business but it was absolutely vital that we got this conference set up so that we could sort the matter out. He has also said tonight that it was more acceptable than having no provision in the Bill at all. If the Minister cries foul, let it stand on his head; let him go and talk to the people out there; let him go and talk to the community groups that want some level of parental responsibility; let him explain why he dived it; and let him explain why he sabotaged it. The Liberal Opposition cannot be blamed.

No-one should expect the Parliament blandly to accept the legislation that is brought before this place. It is flawed on so many occasions and it needs scrutiny: it needs change. We are recommending a number of changes in this Bill which will strengthen it and which are acceptable to the Minister. I know that we all get into the silly season and we do some strange things on the last sitting night of the Parliament, but there is no excuse for the behaviour of the Minister on this occasion. He is an intelligent person; how can an intelligent person in this House say, 'Well, it was all more or less acceptable, but we do not want to accept it; we do not want to go to a conference; we do not even want to test the matter'? It defies description.

I strongly support the principle, as did all my colleagues, that there has to be some parental responsibility. We have talked about it for so long. We talked to the schools and we talked to the parents of kids who are subject to peer group pressure and who make mistakes, and what they want is a reinforcement of values. Other organisations operate in different directions. We know that, for example, the Minister's own department (FACS) is letting these kids run loose.

I could cite examples in my area where 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 year olds have been assisted somehow to release themselves from the guidance of their parents. In some cases they have had the child removed from the parents on the say so of the child—because the child says that the situation has become untenable. The Minister's department has not assisted in terms of parental responsibility on many occasions, so perhaps there is a hidden agenda. Perhaps the Minister does not want to have to face up to his responsibilities as a Minister.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: The member for Albert Park has parents in his area who want their rights to guide their children reinforced. They do not want them reinforced by the stupidity of their member.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Albert Park to order.

[Midnight]

Mr S.J. BAKER: They do not want those rights reinforced by the stupidity of the original proposition in this Bill; it was absolutely untenable.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I call the member for Albert Park to order.

Mr S.J. BAKER: They would have supported the amendment that we placed before this Parliament. For the member for Albert Park to spit his dummy at this hour of the morning does not reflect particularly well on him. It was quite clear where the Democrats were going, as the member for Mitchell said by way of interjection. It was quite clear from the outset what the Democrats were going to do: they were going to refuse any form of parental liability. They made it quite clear. There was a very simple situation: when that amendment came up, knowing the feeling that prevailed, the Minister could have instructed that his side of politics accept it—19 beats 2 any day of the week. Even if he said, 'I am going to stick by my principles,' he had a duty to take the matter to a conference. So, I suggest that the way this matter has been dispensed is not in the best interests of South Australia, and it is highly regrettable that the ALP has acted in such a destructive fashion.

Mr HAMILTON: It was not my intention to enter this debate, but I could not sit here and listen to the diatribe and the tripe that came from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Let him remember that last year, when a Bill came before this Parliament, in which we were seeking penalties for those parents who would not accept their parental responsibility, he and his ilk refused to accept that proposition. Yet today we have heard the huffing and puffing and the pompous hypocrisy of the honourable member opposite, who wants to stand up and try to bluff his way through the Parliament with his contribution tonight. And it was a pathetic performance, as he well knows. He wants to talk about my electorate, and the gutless wimp walks out of the Chamber—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr HAMILTON: He comes back. That's good. I am glad he can accept—

Mr S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Chairman. I request that the member for Albert Park withdraw those comments.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order. I rule the language unparliamentary and I ask the member for Albert Park to withdraw.

Mr HAMILTON: On your request, Sir, I withdraw. I believe that politically the honourable member is a wimp and that he is gutless, because he is not prepared to stand in this Chamber and take it. He can dish it out, but he cannot take it. The facts of the matter are that throughout my electorate last year, when this Bill came before the Parliament, I distributed to every household evidence of my support for such a proposition, and that was supported by the Government.

However, we have heard a contribution here tonight from an honourable member who is playing politics. He is not concerned. Let him read any contribution I have made in this House in relation to law and order: on every occasion, as members opposite know damn well, I

have supported this concept of parental responsibility. They can check it out.

The Minister quite properly pointed out in his contribution here tonight and, indeed, in his previous contribution in the Parliament—I recall it most vividly—that under section 27 of that Act there was an out: the judge or the magistrate could say that, where a parent had done everything in his or her power, there was an out. But members opposite politically wimped out on this issue. They know it and I know it, and they are not prepared to accept it here tonight.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I will not be shouted down by that clown opposite, who knows damn well that what I am saying is 100 per cent correct. The record of the Parliament will reveal they are wimping out on their responsibility to the community.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I call the member for Heysen to order. I have had to call members on the other side to order and, in order to allow the member for Albert Park to speak, I ask the honourable member to show the same courtesy. The member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: Thank you for your protection, Sir. Over the almost 14 years that I have been in this place, I believe I would be equal to any member in this House—but there may be others—in addressing the problem of law and order. This issue of parental responsibility is one that I have continually supported in my electorate. But tonight, the Opposition has been caught out. In my opinion, it has played a stupid game. It has played a game of one—upmanship to try to water down this legislation, and it has been caught out.

The facts of the matter are that last year members opposite had every opportunity in this Parliament, if they were fair dinkum about juvenile crime, to give support in terms of parents who did not accept their parental responsibility for their child. They wimped out: not this Government.

An honourable member interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will give the honourable member the call next time.

Mr HAMILTON: It was not members in the other place. They did not support this proposition. In trying to turn around tonight, they have been caught out. They have been caught out consistently. I have said previously in this Parliament, 'Go out and talk to the people in the electorate. Go and talk to the person who has lovingly restored his motor car in a street in Seaton.' I will not identify that person, but he lives not far from my home. He had a car that was lovingly restored taken out and wrecked, because the parents of a particular child were not prepared to accept their responsibility in terms of looking after that child. The record will reveal—and I challenge the member for Heysen to peruse the record—what I have said in this place in relation to parental responsibility.

I was brought up in a very regimented family, and I believe that discipline starts in the home; that is where it starts. Members opposite would not support that Bill last year. Let them twist and gyrate whichever way they want, but the facts of the matter are that they did not support it last year; they did not support it this year; and

they stand condemned because they have gone soft on crime.

Mr MATTHEW: The facts are that the member for Albert Park and other members of the Labor Party have gone soft on juvenile crime tonight. Why will not the Labor Party go to conference on this Bill?—because it has gone soft on juvenile crime. What we are talking about are some quite simple, straightforward sensible amendments. Those simple, straightforward, sensible amendments to clause 51 limit parental liability to \$10 000. They remove the reverse onus of proof, they make the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services jointly and severally liable with the child when the Minister is the guardian and they also make a drafting change to the definition of 'parent' to ensure that both the natural and adoptive parents of a child are not liable.

If the member for Albert Park wanted this Bill to get through and wanted it to get through with parental liability, all he had to do was walk across to this side of the Chamber: 23 plus one is 24. That is more than half of 47. Game, set and match: Bill through. The same thing applied in the Upper house. All that had to happen was for that measure to be supported.

The Hon. M.J. Evans interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr MATTHEW: That is all that had to happen. It is interesting that the Minister chooses to interject. The Minister is proving to be an obstacle, I would suggest, in accepting responsibility for part of this Bill. The Minister has proved to be an obstacle in that he does not believe that he should be responsible, as Minister of the Crown, for children under his charge. I put to every member of this Committee that the community would expect that a department with a child under its guardianship would, through its Minister, be responsible and liable for the behaviour of that child.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: And not just lie down and accept it.

Mr MATTHEW: Exactly. It is a perfectly reasonable amendment. But the fact is that the ALP does not want the parental liability clause to be passed. If it did, all that needed to occur was for the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services to agree to a conference, but the Minister refused to have a conference, because he, the member for Albert Park and all other members of the Labor Party do not want this Bill to be passed with a parental liability clause. If they do, the opportunity is there. All they need to do is to accept the amendments and the Bill will go through.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr MATTHEW: What could be more simple? Do members need the Opposition to spell out syllable by syllable the intent and meaning of these changes? The Minister has an opportunity to get this Bill through. All South Australians will hear the message loud and clear that parental liability will not be part of this Bill because the Labor Party does not want it. The Labor Party turned down the opportunity to ensure that parental liability would be included in this Bill.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr MATTHEW: I realise that interjections are out of order and far be it from me to respond, but I have been reminded that the Minister's own department (the Department for Family and Community Services) does not want to be held responsible or liable for children under its control, because the fact is that time after time juveniles under the care, custody and control of that department go astray and break the law. I am aware from the number of police who contact me how fed up they are with the Department for Family and Community Services. Many police officers have said to me what a joke it would be if parents were made responsible for the crimes of their children and if the department escaped that responsibility, because it has failed time and time again in its duty to take appropriate responsibility for juveniles under its charge.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: So has the Minister.

Mr MATTHEW: As the member for Heysen interjects, so has the Minister. I conclude by saying again that if the Labor Party wanted parental liability included in this Bill the Minister simply had only to agree to a conference or the Labor Party had only to agree to the amendments—or, indeed, just one member, the member for Albert Park, in spite of all the huff, puff and bluster—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr MATTHEW: If the member for Albert Park had been serious about juvenile crime, he could have joined the Liberal Party in the vote. One more vote was all that was needed. Because that one more vote from the Labor Party was not there, juvenile justice in this State continues to run out of control.

Mr HOLLOWAY: I think it is a very sad day when we have been so badly let down by the Liberal Party and the Democrats.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr HOLLOWAY: This most important issue has been before the South Australian community for some months and it has been brought before Parliament on a number of occasions, yet what have we seen? On every occasion we have seen the Liberal Party in another place combine with the Democrats to reject it. It has done so again. What we have been witness to in this Chamber in the past half an hour or so has been a desperate attempt by members opposite to find some way to justify their position of rejecting the parental responsibility provisions that were part of this Bill. The performance we have seen is incredible. No wonder they are embarrassed; they deserve to be. They should be shrinking underneath their desk because of what they have done.

I want to put on the record that I am extremely disappointed that the Liberals and the Democrats in another place saw fit not to support the original provisions of this Bill, which were very reasonable. After all, they were the recommendations of the select committee. It is no good members opposite talking about watered down versions. We should not forget that the original recommendations that were made by the select committee, as I understand from the debate, were unanimous; yet, they were rejected by members opposite. Let us have none of this humbug from members opposite in an attempt to salvage their position.

The reality is that they rejected the recommendations of the select committee.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: I am amazed. The people who have opposed parental liability time and again not only in this Chamber but in public—

The Hon. D. C. Wotton interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Minister to sit down. I call the member for Heysen to order. This debate takes the same form as a Committee debate. The honourable member has the opportunity to speak three times. Rather than interject as he has been doing, I ask him to take the opportunity to speak again if necessary. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: Time and again the Opposition in this State—and I use that phrase collectively because it covers not just the people in this Chamber, most of whom I frequently find to be very reasonable, but those in another Chamber as well—collectively have formed a policy on this issue. The public of South Australia have seen that policy demonstrated time and time again not only in this Chamber and in the other Chamber but in public, on the radio, on television and in newspapers. I have debated the matter in public.

Again and again we have had arguments about parental liability, and again and again they have voted against it in this Parliament. Who has the public record of credibility on this issue? The Government has put forward this proposition on three occasions. On three occasions the Government has sought through one means or another through legislation in this Parliament to achieve parental liability in a form that is acceptable. While it was discussed in this Chamber and while some members put forward their own views on the issue, obviously those views are not the considered views of the whole Party, because what has come back from the Legislative Council but rejection—not compromise but rejection.

This is not the first occasion. I would understand and accept it if this were the first occasion, but this is the third time around. How many opportunities do members opposite want to be given to say 'Yes'? They say 'No', they say 'No' again and finally we presume they will say 'Yes'. How can members opposite promise to deliver their colleagues upstairs? Time and time again we find that they cannot. The public record on this issue is clear. If this Government did not want the concept of parental liability in this legislation it would not have put it forward and argued the case intensively in the select committee. We spent a fair bit of time on that matter. It was the Government members who argued for the insertion of these clauses. The Government introduced the previous measure and the one before that. If the Government were opposed to it why would it repeatedly introduce it? How many times are we expected to put up with this performance before the Opposition finally says 'Yes'?

The Opposition promised a speedy passage. The member for Bright said, 'We will give you speedy passage in a conference.' I am sure that we could trust the statement of the member for Bright and that he would deliver his own vote in that context were he a member of the conference. However, in the same contribution he goes on to state his total opposition to other vital

elements of the package; that is, the liability of the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services in respect of the children under his control. He goes on to indicate a totally contrary position to that which the Government is proposing in relation to this package of amendments.

They are not severable; the proposal is put forward as a package. The honourable member cannot have one without the other. He cannot say, 'We agree with you; we support you, but we do not support all these elements which make that vital link in the package.' The reality, as we have debated in this place time and time again, is that those children who find themselves under the control of the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services are not those who would come under this definition.

If we look at the exclusions that are available to others in this context, they are where that child is not normally able to be subject to normal parental responsibility and discipline. Clearly, that is how in many cases those children have ended up in the control of the Minister. The Minister is the guardian of last resort, yet the honourable member wants the Minister to be liable as if it were a normal parental arrangement. Clearly, it is not. The Minister is the guardian of last resort.

Mr Matthew: And should be—

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: I guarantee to the Committee that the Minister will act responsibly in relation to those children under his control, but I say to the Committee and to the member for Bright that it is impossible in relation to those children who have proved to be uncontrollable by their parents, who have proved not to fit into the normal family relationship, that he expects the Minister of the Crown to form the same kind of bond and control that one would have with one's own children in relation to those children of whom the Minister is the guardian of last resort.

That is clearly an impossible proposition. Parents exercise control and responsibility because they are the biological parents of those children. They provide for them on a day to day basis. They live with them and exercise that kind of control through emotional bonds and links which establish the parent/child relationship. That is not a relationship which exists between the Minister and those children under his care. The Minister is the guardian of last resort. He is not a full-time parent to each and every one of those children. It is not a practical proposition. It is certainly not a feasible alternative for the Minister to be held accountable in that way. Certainly, the Minister must be responsible and the Minister certainly is, but the Minister cannot be liable in those circumstances for those children. That is clearly an issue for which it is not practical to provide.

The Liberal Party at one point claims to support this proposal, yet then goes on to deny the elements of the package—they vote against it again and again. They argue against it again and again in public and defeat the whole clause in the Upper House. Then they come back here and say, 'But we secretly are in favour of it. Secretly, we were always in favour of it.' How far back does that go? Does it go back to the original proposition? Have they been concealing their support from the public of South Australia through all three of these proposals?

Does it date back to day one, when the Government first had that proposition defeated?

I cannot give the date at this hour, but that process has extended over years, so for how long has the Liberal Party been concealing from the public of South Australia their true support for parental liability? I think the public will understand the Government's reluctance to press this matter to a conference, knowing the incredible history which the Liberal Party has put us through in order to now tell us that all the time it was a facade, that all the time it was concealing from us its true position in relation to it.

I have heard of the proposition of holding one's policies back until just before an election, but that is absurd. To keep it from the public for this long is a bizarre way to do business. The Government has reached the conclusion that the total defeat of that measure in the Upper House for the third time around is a strong hint to the Government that they were not prepared to proceed. Apparently we were misled by our colleagues in this context, but I believe that that is not our fault. After three occasions we could have taken the hint that they did not like the proposition.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Minister will have the chance to test his credibility in terms of whether or not he is prepared to have any parental responsibility retained within this Bill. We will do that by the Liberal Party in this Committee opposing amendment No. 17. We will divide on that and we will be able to test whether the Minister's statement that the Liberal Party's proposal for parental responsibility as laid down in another place is far better than no parental responsibility whatsoever. That is what the Minister indicated to the Committee, and we will test the Minister on that. After all, the Liberal Party has argued throughout—

Mr Matthew interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Bright is not helping his Leader by interjecting. The honourable Leader.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Liberal Party has argued throughout that it supports parental responsibility. It has put down conditions under which that parental responsibility should apply—they are the four conditions in the Upper House.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: And in this place.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: And in this place. Now the Government will have the opportunity to find out whether through its own petulance it is willing to throw out parental responsibility completely, rather than accepting the conditions put down by the Liberal Party by testing this in a conference. For the Minister to strut around saying that the Liberal Party is opposed to parental responsibility is quite false: it is just a matter of degree between the two Parties on what parental responsibility should be and we will test the Minister to see whether, by his petulance, he wants the entire responsibility thrown out or whether this evening, at a deadlock conference, he is willing to make sure that some form of parental responsibility is retained. Of course, the exact form lies entirely in the hands of the deadlock conference.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I point out to the honourable member that he also will have the chance to

test whether or not he wishes to retain some parental responsibility—in fact, a large amount of parental responsibility—in this Bill. If he wishes to, all he needs to do is join the Liberal Party and vote against amendment No. 17 so that this matter can go to a deadlock conference, which can work out what form of parental responsibility should be retained within the Bill.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The interesting interjection that comes from the Labor Party is that it would rather try to play politics on this issue by being petulant than being willing to accept some form of parental responsibility. That is what it has got down to tonight. The Labor Party would rather play politics and throw this clause out than be prepared to sit down in a deadlock conference and resolve the issue. We will have the chance to finally test—

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: We will have the chance to finally test where the true integrity of the Labor Party lies on this issue and determine whether or not it is willing to vote for some parental responsibility tonight or whether, due to its petulance, it will throw it out altogether. If it wishes to support parental responsibility, it will come back and support the Liberal Party in opposing amendment No. 17.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 17

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 17 be agreed to.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (21)—M.J. Atkinson, J.C. Bannon, F.T. Blevins, G.J. Crafter, M.R. De Laine, M.J. Evans (teller), R.J. Gregory, K.C. Hamilton, T.H. Hemmings, V.S. Heron, P. Holloway, D.J. Hoppood, C.F. Hutchison, J.H.C. Klunder, S.M. Lenehan, C.D.T. McKee, M.K. Mayes, N.T. Peterson, J.A. Quirke, M.D. Rann, J.P. Trainer.

Noes (21)—H. Allison, M.H. Armitage, S.J. Baker, H. Becker, P.D. Blacker, M.K. Brindal, D.C. Brown (teller), J.L. Cashmore, B.C. Eastick, S.G. Evans, G.M. Gunn, G.A. Ingerson, D.C. Kotz, I.P. Lewis, W.A. Matthew, E.J. Meier, J.W. Olsen, J.K.G. Oswald, R.B. Such, I.H. Venning, D.C. Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker. Noes—L.M.F. Arnold, T.R. Groom.

The CHAIRMAN: There being 21 Ayes and 21 Noes, I cast my vote for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Amendment Nos. 18 to 24 carried.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 18 to 24 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

YOUTH COURT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No.1 Page 1, line 7, Long Title—After 'powers;' insert 'to make a consequential amendment to the Courts Administration Act 1993;'

No. 2 Page 8, lines 7 to 16 (clause 22)—Leave out subclause (2) and insert new subclause as follows:

(2) The appeal lies—

- (a) in the case of an interlocutory judgment given by a Magistrate, two justices or a special justice—to the Senior Judge;
- (b) in the case of an interlocutory judgment given by a Judge—to the Supreme Court constituted of a single Judge;
- (c) in the case of any other judgment given by a Magistrate, two justices or a special justice—to the Supreme Court constituted of a single Judge;
- (d) in the case of any other judgment given by a Judge—to the Full Court of the Supreme Court.

No.3 Page 12—After line 17 insert new Schedule as follows:

'SCHEDULE

Consequential Amendment

The Courts Administration Act 1993 is amended by striking out paragraph (c) of the definition of 'participating courts' in section 4 and substituting the following paragraph:

(c) the Youth Court of South Australia;'

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to. I believe that the motion will have the Committee's support. The amendments principally vary the provisions for appeal. They were the subject of discussion and agreement between learned legal minds in another place and, indeed, provide an appropriate mechanism for ensuring that appeals from the youth court system are heard in a relevant and expeditious fashion. The other amendments are consequential on ensuring that the Youth Court is part of the courts administration system. I believe the amendments are not controversial, and I commend them to the Committee.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Opposition supports the amendments.

Motion carried.

WORKERS REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION (REVIEW AUTHORITIES) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No.1. Page 1, line 15 (clause 2)—Leave out 'This' and insert 'Subject to subsection (2), this'.

No. 2. Page 1 (clause 2)—After line 15 insert new subclause as follows:

'(2) Sections 3 and 14(ac) will come into operation on assent.'

No. 3. Page 1, line 17 (clause 3)—After 'amended' insert the following:

'—

- (a) by inserting 'under section (9)' after 'in the Gazette' in subsection (1a)(a);
- (b) By striking out subsection (4) and substituting the following subsections:

- (4) Where a worker has been charged more than the amount that the worker is entitled to claim for the provision of a service in respect of which compensation is payable under this section, the Corporation may reduce the charge by the amount of the excess.
- (4a) A decision of the Corporation under subsection (4) is not reviewable.; and
- (c) by inserting “where the charge has been disallowed under subsection (5)” before “the provider’s right” in subsection (6)(a)(ii); and
- (d) by striking out from subsection (8) “of a kind approved by the Corporation for the purposes of this section” and substituting “provided by a person who has an agreement with the Corporation for the provision of those programs or services”; and
- (e) [The remainder of clause 3 becomes paragraph (d).]
- No. 4. Page 2, lines 1 to 8 (clause 4)—Leave out subclause (7) and insert new subclauses as follow:
- (7) The Corporation may, in an appropriate case, by notice in writing to the worker, redetermine a claim.
- (8) The redetermination of a claim does not give rise to any right on the part of any Corporation to recover from the worker money paid under a previous determination unless the previous determination was made in consequence of the worker’s fraud.
- No. 5. Page 2, line 16 (clause 6)—Leave out ‘(1a) (a),’.
- No. 6. Page 3, lines 21 to 23 (clause 8)—Leave out subclause (1) and insert new subclause as follows:
- ‘(1) A review officer is to be appointed for a term of five years and is, on the expiration of a term of office, eligible for reappointment.’
- No. 7. Page 5 (clause 14)—After line 28 insert new paragraph as follows:
- ‘(ab) by inserting ‘(including a decision in the nature of a redetermination of a claim)’ after ‘compensation’ in subsection (2) (a); and’.
- No. 8. Page 5 (clause 14)—After line 28 insert new paragraph as follows:
- ‘(ac) by striking out subsection (2) (da) “or reduce”; and’.
- No. 9. Page 6, line 28 (clause 16)—Leave out “seven” and insert “five”.
- No. 10. Page 6 (clause 16)—After line 31 insert new subclause as follows:
- (7) Proceedings cannot be instituted before a Review Officer after the commencement of section 3 of this Act in respect of any decision of the Corporation under section 32(4) of the principal Act before that commencement.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I move:

That the Legislative Council’s amendments be agreed to.

Mr INGERSON: In agreeing to these amendments, I would like to make a couple of comments about the legislation’s coming back to this Chamber. It is pitiful that very important and significant amendments have been introduced into this place in the past five minutes. They have been debated in the other place only as a response to a Bill that was initiated here. The Government ought to get its act together. It happens so

many times at the end of a session that it is a disgrace. It is my view that the amendments are very important, and they should have been before this Chamber when the Bill was introduced—and could have been, with one exception. There were three amendments in all, and one of them could not be avoided.

I would like to point out a couple of things that result from the amendments from the other House. The first is that we now have a situation where the WorkCover Corporation can look at fees set by a profession and say they are not acceptable. Not only can they say they are not acceptable; those fees cannot be reviewed. So, if the corporation decides to reduce the fees set by a profession by, say, 50 per cent, which could be an absolutely extreme point of view, the profession has no opportunity now to have those fees amended in any form at all. What was attempted in another place was to enable the profession to go to an independent tribunal and argue before that tribunal whether or not their fees are reasonable. I think that is a fairly simple, reasonable exercise to expect.

The Federal Medicare system has a review process so that, if there is a difference of opinion over charging between two professional groups such as physiotherapists and doctors or whatever, they are able to take their case before a tribunal and have it adjudicated. That was the proposal put forward by the Liberal Opposition in another place, and I believe that is fair and reasonable.

I point out that I moved the amendment to make sure that the professional fees as set by the association were not different with regard to WorkCover compared with its private charges, so I am very cognisant of the argument by the WorkCover Corporation to keep professional fees under control. However, there are times in which there will be disagreement between the two parties, and it is my strong belief that the corporation should not be the group that just says, ‘This is what we are prepared to pay,’ and that is the end of it, with no review. So, we are concerned about that.

The second point that was introduced in another place was the situation of a court decision or a decision of the rehabilitation provider that is currently before the courts. I understand the reason why the corporation wanted this amendment to come in; it was a position of clarification. However, it is my view (and a very strong view again) that this Parliament should not make decisions that change the law of the land when a particular company or individual is before the courts having their case heard, because it is possible that the individual may win the appeal case. One of the things that I think is important in our democracy is that the two powers—the legislative power and the courts power—are completely separate. I have no objection if, after the courts have made a decision, the Government chooses to make relevant amendments. However, to make amendments prior to the case being finished is unfortunate and incorrect. The amendments before us have been agreed to in another place. I believe that in most instances they are fair, reasonable and supportable, but I wanted to make those other points in putting our point of view.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Bragg for his comments on this matter, and I will deal with the matter of review first. The member for Bragg would well remember that, when this Bill was originally

debated in 1986 and discussed before that, a review system was established by the Act to enable workers or employers who disagreed with decisions of the corporation to seek to have those matters reviewed. If they were dissatisfied with the outcome of the review, they could then have those matters determined by the Workers Compensation Appeal Tribunal. What has happened is that a group of medical practitioners who were not very happy with the outcome of discussions between their professional association and WorkCover sought to have those matters reviewed by the review officers. There are about 1 100 of those cases before the review officers at the moment, and some of those individual cases involve over 60 procedures.

So, we have a situation whereby, using a provision in the Act which sets up an appeal process where workers and employers who may be aggrieved with a decision can appeal and seek reconsideration of that, it can be used for another matter. I suppose one could then take the logical extension of that, namely, that people could then argue that, if they provide services to WorkCover and WorkCover is prepared to offer only a certain amount of money, they could appeal there, as well. What they are doing is clogging up the appeal process. As you will recall, Sir, the member for Bragg was a member of the select committee that heard evidence from representatives of employers and employee organisations and from WorkCover, which indicated that an enormous amount of work had been done to reduce the backlog so that workers could have decisions made quickly.

I have had discussions with officers of the Australian Medical Association and I was of the view that the best and most appropriate way for the professional associations to deal with the WorkCover organisation was for any unresolved matters to be dealt with by private arbitration and that both sides meet their costs, because if we do not go down a particular route in this matter problems could arise. I point out that medical association representatives have advised me that in all but one instance they reached agreement with WorkCover. They are still discussing that matter, because it is a new procedure involving a new and quite expensive form of X-ray, and they are gathering more information before determining the costs.

There we have a situation where a professional association worked out how it was going to do it, but all that need happen is for a member or non-member of that association to run off and use the appeal process that was set up for another purpose. I have given undertakings to that professional association that I would request WorkCover to discuss with it the mechanisms for setting up a private arbitration system, and I am confident that over the next month or two both those parties will agree on a form that will be acceptable to both of them. I will then ask the other professional associations that WorkCover deals with to do that.

I might point out that WorkCover is able to ensure that medical treatments that are being provided for injured workers are appropriate. They are able to put a handle on excessive medical costs and they are able to understand what is happening in the area of medical treatment of persons injured at work. What they are doing is reducing the cost without reducing the effectiveness of that treatment, and I think this is the best

way to do that. Other workers compensation schemes around Australia want to know how South Australia is doing it, so they can copy it. I do not see any reason to change what is happening. I think we ought to be quite proud of it, but I do think we ought to stop people from using a backdoor method.

With respect to the rehabilitation provider, I think we have an obligation. In the drafting of legislation that comes before this Parliament (and this is legislation that has been under an enormous amount of scrutiny) it could become apparent to the organisation, WorkCover, or to the Minister's office that amendments are necessary. For example, Crown Law might advise that, when appeals are made in respect of the operation of legislation, it is likely that the appeals will be upheld and the original intention of the legislation will not apply. If that occurs, the Government has a right to amend the legislation so that we can put it back to what it ought to be.

What we have seen over the past six years is a series of amendments that has done precisely that. It is returning the scheme to what it ought to be: providing compensation for people injured at work, rehabilitation, and an early return to work. There was handed down in this Parliament recently a report that set out in some detail how successful previous amendments to the Act and changes in the administration of WorkCover have been in achieving that. It is ridiculous for a rehabilitation provider to have its right to be a rehabilitation provider under the scheme taken away by WorkCover, and then to insist that it still has a right to provide rehabilitation.

What it means is that WorkCover does not have the ability to manage what is happening, to keep the costs down and to ensure that the treatments being provided to injured workers are the appropriate treatments and not the excessive and inappropriate treatments that have happened from time to time. There are several other amendments that the Government proposes to accept. They do not change the thrust of the legislation; they just change some times. I commend the amendments to the House.

Mr INGERSON: There is no doubt that what the Minister said in terms of the groups of individual doctors and physiotherapists who are clogging up the review process is not an acceptable way to go. But it was never my intention nor that of the Liberal Party in the other place to accept that situation. It was our argument and the very strong argument that what should happen is that, if there is a disagreement between the professions, whoever they are, there should be a simple mechanism that would enable them to sit down with WorkCover and argue it before a tribunal, as we have done in recent times in this same Act when we deal with legal profession costs.

It seemed to me a pretty simple and logical thing to do to say that, if we have a tribunal that is prepared to look at legal costs, we ought to be able to send any other costs in the medical area that are not agreed upon before that group, and there was a slight inference from the Minister that we did agree that it should remain in the review process. That is not the case. We believe it should have been out.

I also accept the comment of the Minister that it should be the associations making that argument in terms

of what the costs and charges should be and not the individual. If the Minister remembers, in moving that amendment some time ago that was the argument that I put—that it ought to be a collective arrangement between the profession and WorkCover.

It is interesting that the Minister has suggested that we should have a private arbitrator. I remember clearly the argument put forward by the Minister and the Government when we were looking at legal fees, and we did not want to go to the private sector then. We wanted to make sure that the President of the tribunal was the person who was concerned. I thought it was logical to have a bit of consistency in this area and have the same person look at this fees area. We agree that it should not be in the review process in terms of the reviewing of claims. It should be a separate issue worked out by WorkCover and an independent tribunal.

It is also interesting that the Minister said that the original intention of the Act was to give WorkCover the power to decide who should be the rehabilitation providers. I suggest that the Minister have a look at the Act, because there is no mention in the Act of who should be providers or what numbers of individuals or companies should be the providers. All that is required is that they be registered with WorkCover to carry out the procedures. It is my understanding that we would want as many people as possible who are providing a reasonable standard of rehabilitation to be available to the worker and to the employer. The more opportunities there are for the private sector and individuals within the private sector to provide rehabilitation services, in my view, the better, because the more competition we have, the better the services we will get from the provision of rehabilitation.

Giving WorkCover the power to say to any individual group or company that it can no longer practise in the rehabilitation area as it relates to workers compensation is draconian. I have no argument with WorkCover's saying to a particular group or company that its practices in this instance are not acceptable, and I have no hassle in WorkCover's saying, 'We will not pay these costs, because we believe they are unreasonable'. That individual then has the right under the legal system to challenge that and to take on WorkCover. What I do not believe is reasonable is for WorkCover to say to any company or group that it can no longer practise in this area in South Australia because, in essence, we are going to give it a licence. With those few comments, we support the amendments in principle.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Rehabilitation providers have a contract with WorkCover, and it is quite reasonable when you have contracts with organisations, if you are not satisfied with the performance of that contract, to cause it to cease. I can well imagine the member for Bragg in a former life as a pharmacist having a contract with a cartage company to deliver goods for him, not being satisfied with that delivery process, severing the contract and then getting a writ to say 'Look, you still have to keep doing it for me, because I want to keep doing it.' That is ridiculous. What happens in this situation is that WorkCover does have the responsibility of ensuring that the providers are proper and do have a contract and, if they do not perform under that contract, they are out.

Other rehabilitation providers are then at liberty to seek contracts with WorkCover. If they perform, they keep them; if they do not, they are out. And that is precisely how it ought to be. I find the member for Bragg's comments about the fee business amazing. It is marvellous that we have two classes of how we should treat people to get paid for their services. If they happen to be a blue or a white collar worker, let them be at the mercy of the boss. Take away their award coverage, let them just go and talk to them, and that is what they have been talking about in the Liberal Party. But when it comes to the professions, leave them alone. Let them get out there and rip them off. That is what the member for Bragg is saying.

What I am saying is that, if people in the profession want to provide services as providers in this WorkCover area, they ought through their associations to be able to negotiate the appropriate fees and then stick to them. That is what we are talking about. The association, which is made up of professionals, who are supposed to be the leading lights of our community, who are supposed to have this superior education, ought to be able, like other professional associations who have a dispute, to use the services of an arbitrator.

That is all it is about—a private arbitrator where both the parties in dispute agree to who it will be. I would venture to say that very rarely would that ever happen, because we have the experience of the Australian Medical Association, South Australian branch. On every matter it has been able to reach agreement—with the exception of one, and that is because it is a new procedure, and they are still working out the costs.

Mr INGERSON: It always ends up as a class row when it comes to the Minister's final dig, and that is unfortunate. He knows that, on behalf of the Liberal Party, I intended to remove the ridiculous practice of having charges in the medical area, and that went right across all professions, in which there was a higher charge for workers compensation claims than in the general area. I moved to have that changed, and I believe that that was a good move. It is my view that a person who visits a doctor, a pharmacist or a physio, whether they are injured at work or injured in an action in the community, should pay the same price. It was my amendment initially which provided that. For the Minister to suggest that the professions are ripping off the system is absurd.

It is my view that the charges for medical and legal costs are too high, but there are a few within the professions, whether it be legal or medical—and I use the word 'medical' in a very broad sense—who are doing that. It is the minority who are doing it, and we need to have a system that overcomes that. I hope that this private arbitration system will achieve what I desire. If it does not, in the next Parliament we will move amendments so that within the statutes there is a clear obligation on WorkCover to make sure that, in a case of disputes, an independent arbitrator is used.

Motion carried.

**OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH, SAFETY AND
WELFARE (REGISTRATION FEES) AMENDMENT
BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

EDUCATION (TRUANCY) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, lines 21 and 22 (clause 4)—Leave out paragraph (a).

No. 2. Page 2, line 2 (clause 4)—After 'an authorised officer' insert 'who is a member of the Police Force'.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

The two amendments from the Legislative Council basically delete the members of the teaching profession from the list of authorised officers. They still require every member of the Education Department's staff to use their best endeavours to ensure that truancy is minimised and, of course, that is an on-going problem to which there will never be a permanent solution but which I am sure the profession and the Government of the day will continue to work towards resolving.

The powers of the authorised officer, which were originally contemplated by the committee in relation to forcibly taking a child from some location, such as a shopping centre, where they might have been truanting, back to the school, will now be exercised by a member of the Police Force. This will ensure that there is no conflict with the very reasonable and responsible advice which parents give to their children not to go with a person who is a stranger to them, but in this case, of course, where that person is a uniformed police officer, there can be no doubt about the matter.

I am happy to move that the amendments be accepted. They reflect a reasonable compromise in this area. The committee was keen to ensure the maximum participation by the teaching force, but there are certainly inherent problems in that, and I believe that the compromise evolved in discussions with the Legislative Council and with members of all those interested groups has ensured a reasonable outcome.

The officers of the Police Force will be able to take the appropriate steps to ensure that any child who comes to their attention and who is truanting can be returned to their parents or to the school, and this will ensure a much more effective way of tackling the problem— It has in fact proved successful in some communities already, and the country areas, which the select committee visited on its travels, were able to provide some very relevant examples of the way in which this kind of program can be successful. Therefore, I commend both the amendments to the Committee.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: It is with some reluctance that the Opposition accepts the amendments. There is a very clear indication from the work undertaken by the select committee that there needs to be a more concentrated and, shall I say, workmanlike approach to truancy and matters of straying from the school yard than has been the case over a long period.

I take the point, which was raised first in this House by my colleague the member for Fisher, that likewise it is extremely important that a child who has almost certainly been advised by their parent not to move off with somebody whom they do not know be given some protection by perhaps being re-educated to the fact that, if a person has an identification card with a photograph, that circumstance would change their attitude.

There is the problem of realising that there are some 20 000 teachers. If we then add those who are ancillaries and those people who are within the child-care and more particularly the kindergarten systems, we see that the preparation for all those people to fulfil an obligation as authorised officers becomes something of a logistic problem.

I would hope that some of the difficulties which have been foreseen by our colleagues in another place and which are based on those views put here by the member for Fisher, and I believe a member of the Democrats in another place, will be sorted through between now and when the House comes back into session, and that at some early later stage further issues as may be necessary in respect of the Education Act and the responsibilities of all those in the Education Department will receive the attention of this House.

I know that you, Mr Chairman, are not in a position to enter this debate, but you have indicated over a long period, certainly on the select committee, your real concern about the problems of truancy and management within the school system. I believe that you, along with others, will be making quite sure that, whatever other amendments may be necessary or are proven to be necessary to fully implement the intent of the select committee—and I believe now the intent of Parliament—they will be forthcoming at the earliest possible moment. I support the Minister's recommendation albeit with the reluctance I have demonstrated.

Motion carried.

**CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION
(MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

The SPEAKER: I rule that the amendments made by the Legislative Council to the amendment of the House of Assembly are not in order as they amend a money clause.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health, Family and Community Services): I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council informing the Council that the Assembly is not able to consider the amendments to the amendment of the House of Assembly.

Motion carried.

HERITAGE BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 3, line 7 (clause 4)—Leave out 'The members' and insert 'Seven of the members'.

No. 2. Page 3, line 9 (clause 4)—After 'field' insert 'and the other member must be a person with knowledge of or experience in heritage conservation nominated by the Local Government Association and approved by the Minister'.

No. 3. Page 3 (clause 4)—After line 9 insert new subclause as follows:

(3a) Before filling a vacancy in the membership of the Authority (other than a vacancy to be filled by a person nominated by the Local Government Association), the Minister must, by advertisement published in a newspaper circulating throughout the State, invite interested members of the public to submit (within 14 days of the advertisement) the names of persons whom they regard as suitable candidates to fill the vacancy.

No. 4. Page 3 (clause 5)—After line 29 insert new paragraphs as follows:

(f) to encourage all levels of government to provide incentives (apart from financial assistance) for heritage conservation;

(g) if, in the opinion of the Authority, a council is not acting appropriately with respect to heritage conservation of places within its area—to assist the council to do so.

No. 5. Page 4 (clause 7)—After line 20 insert new subclauses as follows:

(5) Meetings of the Authority must, subject to subsection (6), be held in a place that is open to the public.

(6) The Authority may order that the public be excluded from a meeting in order to enable the Authority to consider in confidence any matter that it considers to be confidential or if it considers that exclusion necessary to protect a place that is or may be of heritage value.

(7) The minutes of meetings of the Authority must be available for public inspection without charge.

No. 6. Page 9, lines 10 to 12 (clause 18)—Leave out subclause (9) and insert new subclause as follows:

(9) The Authority must take all reasonable steps to make a decision about whether a provisional entry should or should not be confirmed within 12 months after the date on which the entry was made and if the Authority fails to make a decision within that period or such longer period as is allowed by the Minister in the particular case, the provisional entry must be removed from the Register.

No. 7. Page 9, line 14 (clause 19)—Leave out 'confirmed' and insert 'made'.

No. 8. Page 9, lines 36 and 37 and page 10, lines 1 to 3 (clause 22)—Leave out subclause (3) and insert new subclause as follows:

(3) The Authority must give notice of the application by advertisement published in a newspaper circulating throughout the State inviting representations on the question whether a certificate of exclusion should be granted on the application within three months of the date of the notice.

No. 9. Page 12, lines 21 and 22 (clause 30)—Leave out the comma and all words in these lines after 'subsection (1)' in line 21 and insert the following:

(a) the Authority must forthwith apply to the Court for an order under this section; and

(b) if the place is not entered in the Register, provisionally enter the place in the Register.

No. 10. Page 12 (clause 30)—After line 29 insert new subclause as follows:

(5) If a place that is subject to an order under this section is removed from the Register, the order ceases to have any effect.

No. 11. Page 15 (clause 38)—After line 24 insert new subclause as follows:

(2a) Before making an order under this section the court must give—

(a) any person with a registered interest in the land constituting the place; and

(b) if the land is within the area of a council—the council.

a reasonable opportunity to make submissions on whether the order should be made and, if made, the term of the order.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Opposition also supports the amendments. The Opposition believes that the amendments moved both in this place and in another strengthen the Bill significantly. It is a much improved Bill compared to that which we dealt with when it was first introduced in this place. The Liberal Party is pleased to be able to support the Bill in its present form.

Motion carried.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendment but had made the following suggested amendments:

No. 1 Paragraph (a)—Leave out '\$10' and insert '\$6'.

No. 2 Paragraph (b)—Leave out '\$40' and insert '\$25'.

No. 3 Paragraph (c)—Leave out '\$60' and insert '\$40'.

No. 4 Paragraph (d)—Leave out '\$20' and insert '\$13'.

The SPEAKER: The President informs the House of Assembly that there are concerns about the adequacy of procedures and Standing Orders for dealing with a money clause in the circumstances surrounding this Bill and expresses the wish that at a mutually convenient time in the future a conference between representatives of the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly be arranged to discuss further those concerns. I advise the House that the Constitution Act clearly covers the matter of amendments to money clauses. Clause 62(1) clearly states that the Legislative Council may not amend a money clause.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendments be agreed to.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I endorse the Speaker's comments regarding the rules that pertain between the two Houses. The Legislative Council is well aware of the rules, and for it to send that message was a little cheeky under the circumstances.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 2.9 a.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 8 June at 2 p.m.