HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 5 August 1993

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

SOUTHERN POWER AND WATER BILL

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House the appropriation of such amounts of money as may be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE

A petition signed by 188 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to levy local council rates to fund a local government consumer advocate was presented by the Hon. M.K. Mayes.

Petition received.

NORTHFIELD PRISON

A petition signed by 217 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to redress the deficiencies in accommodation and health care for the inmates of Northfield Prison was presented by Mr Gunn.

Petition received.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I give notice that on Thursday next I will move:

That this House notes the consistent and arrogant approach by the State Leader of the Opposition on industrial matters in that—

(1) He and his shadow Minister for Industrial Affairs refused to meet with the trade union movement in South Australia to discuss the Liberal Party's industrial policies for South Australian workers.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park will resume his seat. If the Chair cannot hear it, no-one else can. The member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It continues:

(2) His refusal to release the Cawthorn report when he was the Minister of Industrial Affairs under the Tonkin Government.

(3) His ongoing support for the member for Bragg's approach—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park will again resume his seat. There is a point of order.

Mr GUNN: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. According to Standing Orders, I understand it is inappropriate to include debate in a notice of motion. I put to the House that the notice of motion contains debate relating to the argument that the honourable member would normally put during debate on his motion.

The SPEAKER: I will undertake to check the motion before it is put on the Notice Paper and, if correction or amendment is required, I will ensure that that is undertaken.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the member for Albert Park finished?

Mr HAMILTON: No, Sir. It continues:

(3) His ongoing support for the member for Bragg's approach to industrial relations in supporting the H.R. Nicholls Society.

(4) As the Leader of the Opposition, his ongoing attack on WorkCover.

(5) His ongoing attack on workers compensation, wages and conditions of workers in this State.

DINGO CONTROL

The Hon. T.R. GROOM (Minister of Primary Industries): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: Mr Speaker, this week I became aware that a notice of seizure had been delivered on Mrs M. Jones of Upper Hermitage requiring her to deliver an animal identified as a dingo to the pound at the council depot of the Corporation of Tea Tree Gully. Officers of the Animal and Plant Control Commission became aware on 18 June this year that a dingo was being held by the Jones family, contrary to South Australian law, following reports to the commission from the public.

Negotiations with the Jones family were unsuccessful and on Monday, 2 August two officers from the Animal and Plant Control Commission were accompanied by local police because of unsatisfactory prior contact with Mr and Mrs Jones to deliver the notice of seizure. On becoming aware of the situation and that the consequence of seizure was that the dingo would be destroyed, I intervened and instructed officers to save the dingo and have it placed in a wildlife park.

Late yesterday the Jones family were notified that an option was available for the dingo to be taken to Gorge Wildlife Park to be integrated with the existing collection at that park but on certain conditions. The Jones family were asked to give this option consideration and in the meantime my officers have been searching for alternative appropriate licensed locations for the dingo to be kept. There are now two further locations in South Australia that can provide an appropriate home for the dingo, known as Diesel—a wildlife sanctuary in Whyalla and a private park near Mt Gambier where one other dingo is held on licence. These placements would ensure that the dingo is not destroyed.

The Jones family have been reported as saying that they would like to see their dingo found a place 'back in the Northern Territory' and if they can arrange for it to be placed there before 13 August that option will also be satisfactory. The keeping of dingos as pets is potentially dangerous to humans and to domestic animals and livestock. It also has the potential to negatively impact on the purity of the dingo species, one of the few native dogs to remain untainted in the wild.

In South Australia thousands of dollars are spent annually by primary producers to maintain the dog fence. This provides protection for production areas, and areas for the dingo to flourish away from civilisation where the species belongs. Everyone in South Australia knows that you cannot keep a dingo as a pet and I am not prepared to waiver from this. I have intervened to save the dingo and while I understand Mr and Mrs Jones' attachment to the dingo I trust that they will accept one of the options being made available to them.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr McKEE (Gilles): I bring up the minutes of evidence given before the Legislative Review Committee on the general regulations under the Firearms Act 1977 and move:

That the minutes be received.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

LAKE EYRE BASIN

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): Why is the Premier writing to the Prime Minister seeking a guarantee that mining can still proceed under world heritage listing of the Lake Eyre region when the Department of Mines and Energy already has advice that mining of a world heritage area conflicts with world heritage values and the Federal Labor Government has reneged on previous guarantees based on what he is asking for? The Premier said on radio this morning that he would be seeking this guarantee from Mr Keating even though the Federal Labor Government has already reneged on previous guarantees to allow a continuation of mining on world heritage listed land in Tasmania resulting in the forced closure of mining operations without compensation.

Further, I have in my possession a note dated 10 May this year, sent by the Director-General of the Department of Mines and Energy to the Chief Executive Officer of the World Heritage Committee, in which the Director-General refers to 'the perception that world heritage areas are not appropriate for the establishment of major economic enterprises such as mines.' This perception has been confirmed in a response from UNESCO dated 14 May this year. In that response, Mr Eidsvik, a senior program specialist at UNESCO's World Heritage Centre in Paris, advises:

> World Heritage sites are established to protect and conserve natural and/or cultural values recognised to be of 'outstanding universal value.' In general, major economic enterprises (mines, dams, resource processing, etc.) have significant environmental impacts which could be detrimental to world heritage values.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I recall that yesterday you instructed all members about the time it takes to ask a question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member will resume his seat. I do not uphold the point of order. I watch the clock on every question and answer. I will make the decision as to whether it is too long.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I note that the Leader was listening to the ABC Radio program. I wonder whether he is still being interviewed by ABC Radio or whether he is still accepting calls from it. It may be that he does not want to do another comedy effort like he did before. The situation with respect to the proposal by some that the Lake Eyre Basin should be world heritage listed has to be taken very seriously, and I have made that point at all stages. It is the reason why the State Government has made it very clear to the Federal Government that, while we accept there should be an environmental assessment of that area to have a proper understanding of the distinctive environmental character of the area—I think we would all agree that it has a distinctive environmental character that we would want to see maintained—it does not mean that there should not be the opportunity for an appropriate and sustainable level of development. At all stages I have said that we need to ensure that we can allow a sustainable level of development in that area, and we need to assess what is a sustainable level of development. I am sure that the Leader would not want to pillage the area or would not want to go in and slash and burn the area—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Or maybe he would. Anyway, the point is that we do not want to go into that. We want reasonable development in the area, but we do not want to see development that will damage the distinctive character of the area. The Leader said that world heritage listing does not allow mining in that area. To take his own quotation, it does not quite say what he said. That is why we are so cautious about the concept of world heritage listing. It would be very good if we could advance the level of understanding of world heritage concepts so that people understood that there can be an accommodation of sustainable development while preserving at the same time the distinctive environmental character of certain parts of the globe. I think that would be a great achievement. However, I accept that there seems to be a perception, much as is stated in this memo that the Leader has quoted, that world heritage does not go hand in hand with the opportunity for mining.

The UNESCO officer, referred to by the Leader, in his letter gives his opinion on this matter, and he says—and the phrase he used is 'in general'—that mining seems to be incompatible with world heritage listing. If that is to be the case, and if it is not possible in the views of some that you can have a world heritage listing and have any mining at all, we would oppose that listing. That is the very reason why we have gone into this debate: to determine what is a feasible level of development within the context of maintaining a distinctive environmental character within that area.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I think that is entirely the correct position to be followed. I would have thought it was a reasonable position to be followed by all people in this place. I think it would be useful to not simply take the words, which I have to say have been somewhat misused by the Leader, of an overseas officer of an international organisation, but rather do something in this country to raise the level of understanding of what we want to do in terms of a proper recognition of the distinctive character of the various parts of the Australian environment. To ensure the proper recognition of the development needs of this country we will promote those development needs. I think that quite clearly what the Leader needs to do is determine for himself and his Party what they are going to do to preserve the distinctive environment—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: We have.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Coles says 'we have'. Well, she has—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Premier to bring his response to a close.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Her view is quite different from the Leader's—that is quite obvious. The Leader and his Party owe it to this State to say what they will do to preserve the distinctive environment—

An honourable member: Read the policy.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: What policy? That is half the joke of it. What policy?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will bring his answer to a close, and he will not indulge in debate across the Chamber with interjectors who are out of order and who, from now on, will be in trouble. The Premier will direct his remarks to the Chair and bring his remarks to a close.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Leader must tell the State what he proposes to do to promote sustainable development in that context in this State.

MOUSE PLAGUE

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Can the Minister of Primary Industries advise the House of the current position regarding the strategies being implemented to control the mouse plague which has been causing damage in the rural community of South Australia?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I appreciate very much the honourable member's question. As members should know, the mouse plague arose because of the unseasonal rains and the very mild months of May and June without rain and without cold weather. The situation was being monitored very closely in both South Australia and Victoria. It was quite clear that, when a certain point was reached, the mouse numbers were going to continue to increase, and the Government took decisive action because of the risk to our rural community. At that stage an estimate of something like $20 million damage was being done to rural areas. The mice had to be stopped, otherwise they would have found their way into the metropolitan area and, of course, would have been in plague numbers in the rural community during the spring.

So, when it reached a particular point a mouse plague task force was set up and, following a decision of Cabinet, the use of strychnine was authorised. Strychnine, as members know, is an extremely dangerous poison, and every care had to be taken with regard to its use. We decided to embark on the campaign in two ways. First, through ground baiting to ensure that all the mechanisms for control were in place, because ground baiting did enable Animal and Plant Control Commission officers to take proper control of the situation, and also educate people in the way in which strychnine baits were to be used. Once those mechanisms for control were in place I was able to authorise the second part of the campaign, aerial baiting.

The campaign has proved extremely successful. At least 63 State Government employees have been involved in the operation, and the latest reports to me indicate that the mouse plague is well and truly under control. There are a couple of provisos to that, and members ought to be aware of them. The plague is under control at the present time and, as country members would know, millions of mice have been killed as a result of the strychnine baits, which have been extremely successful. If we continue to have—

Members interjecting:

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

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I draw your attention to notice of motion No. 6 on the Notice Paper in the name of Mr Blacker, and I ask whether the Minister's response is anticipating the debate on that motion.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. Notice of motion No. 6 refers to the clearing of a natural disaster and a community problem. I think the report by the Minister is a report on the current situation, which is well in order with the question that was asked. However, I ask the Minister to keep it as brief as possible.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: It is a very important topic, and I am sorry that the shadow Minister, the member for Victoria, is not here to listen to it. Representations were made to me by a number of members of the Opposition and, of course, by the member for Stuart with regard to particular problems that rural communities were encountering with the cost of the strychnine. I know that members of the Opposition have stated that they will give it away for nothing: they will give everything away for nothing this side of the election.

But when you actually look at their counterparts in Victoria and at what a Liberal Party would do in government, you see a very different picture. I simply hope that the public and the rural communities understand that, when you are in Opposition, you can say what you want in any way you want. In Victoria (which is one month behind us, because this Government moved very decisively and quickly to protect rural communities) the Government charges $8 a hectare for aerial baiting, whereas in South Australia we charge $5.50. For ground baiting, in South Australia we charge $3 a hectare and Victoria charges $3.50 per hectare. So, Governments—and this was discussed at the ministerial conference—are not the absolute insurers against nature, but Governments do have—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is now definitely debating the question and he is out of order, so I call on the next question. The member for Heysen.

LAKE EYRE BASIN

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): My question is directed to the Premier. Why is there serious conflict between the Premier and the Deputy Premier on Government policy for world heritage listing of the Lake Eyre region? The Premier said on radio this morning that the Government would not support world heritage listing in the Lake Eyre region unless it could be guaranteed that this would not prevent mining operations. However, the Deputy Premier has already told the mining industry to accept world heritage listing as a *fait accompli*. On 1 April this year, he told the Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy that, following the re-election of the Keating Government, 'world heritage nominations are back on the agenda'. The Deputy Premier also stated:

> I believe that, just like Australia being a republic, South Australia will have a world heritage area in the future.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Heysen for his question. I spoke to that conference in those terms and it was very well received—exceptionally well received.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That was in total contrast to the reception given to the Premier of Western Australia at the same conference, because the mining industry does not consist totally of rednecks. There are mining companies operating in this State, in particular, which I believe—and I have told them—ought to be sponsoring world heritage areas in areas where they mine, because I believe they are so good and they mine in such a way that in no way is what they do incompatible with world heritage listing: in no way.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader is out of order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I think I was quite prophetic when I stated to them very clearly that world heritage listing of the Lake Eyre Basin is on the agenda. The very fact that we are debating it here today shows that I was absolutely correct. Mind you, I must admit you did not need to have a great deal of foresight to see that the issue is not going to go away. There are certain areas—certainly not all the areas that some of the more extreme groups have

claimed—that are worthy of world heritage listing. There is absolutely no question about that.

I think as a State we ought to recognise that we have these areas, we ought to be proud of that and we ought to preserve them for future generations. I do not think there is any doubt about that, but within that framework there is certainly a very large area that can be explored, can be mined, and can be mined without doing one skerrick of damage to the environment. There are some places into which the mining companies would be out of their minds to go; it just would not be worth the effort, because they are so sensitive that anybody—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the Minister of Education wish to answer the question?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I just asked her that; apparently not, Sir. There are certain areas that the mining industry would not want to go near, because they are so sensitive, and the mining companies have a respect for those very sensitive parts of our State. Even if commercial quantities of minerals were found, they would not want to go near them, because it would just be too much trouble. I have said to representatives of Western Mining and SANTOS that I believe they ought to be promoting the area for world heritage listing, because I think that Western Mining and SANTOS (I cannot talk about others, but I can talk about those two) could quite safely—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: You go and ask them; they can speak for themselves, and the media are free to go and ask them. I do not need to speak for them. I think what they ought to be doing is promoting some of the areas in the north of our State as world heritage areas. I think it would be a coup for those companies to say that they mine in world heritage listed areas, because I believe they do it so sensitively that they would not damage the areas at all.

In conclusion, I also think that the assurances that have been given to date by the Federal Government are not good enough, because what the Federal Minister says constantly (and I know only by listening to her on the radio) is that there is no incompatibility and that they have their assurance that the mining industry will continue in a sensitive way, as they do, in their areas. I say this to the Federal Government: 'If that is indeed the case, if you believe that, it ought to be possible for you to legislate to guarantee the rights of the mining industry and the pastoral industry (and, by the way, we seem to be forgetting the pastoral industry; I do not) for mining and for tourism, so that their rights are guaranteed in legislation in those areas.'

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It seems to me that everybody in this State—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:—ought to desire an outcome that protects those areas under world heritage listing—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair understood the Minister to say that he was drawing to a close. I would ask that he do so.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes, Sir. It would ensure that the areas were protected under a world heritage regime, if necessary, and that the mining, pastoral and tourism industries could continue. That would seem to be an outcome which would be highly desirable and which would satisfy all the various interest groups in this State.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Does the Premier believe that employment conditions for workers in South Australia are under threat and can he identify from what source this threat might come and how it can be avoided?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It is true that later this year or early next year there will be a State election. The re-election of this Government would not see any threat at all to wages and working conditions in this State.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Were the Liberal Party to be elected, however clearly, there would be a very serious threat. It is about time that questions were asked of the Liberal Party about the unanswered questions and the silence of their policies—in particular, their policy on industrial relations which took such a long time in coming and which, when it did come was a wolf in sheep's clothing. Why do I say that? Because it is ominously clear that that policy is silent on very significant points. It is an act of deception upon the people of South Australia, as it attempts to be one thing when quite clearly it is something else. That ominous silence was a long time in coming, and so much for this wolf in sheep's clothing: more like the silence of the lambs witnessed from the Opposition on this issue.

It was the Leader of the Opposition who, last year, said that he had crossed off the whole of January to work on the policy and put in the details, and at the same time, he, not I, nor anyone on this side—nobody tried to put the words into his mouth—pledged a Victorian style overhaul of this State's industrial relations system. Those were his own words: that is what he said. The Federal election came along and wiped the smile right off his face, and then Jeff Kennett's policies in Victoria came along and wiped the smile even further off his face. He then had to go and put the policy in the shredder. We all know about the shredder episode: the policy that he had put to his own Party went into the shredder. The Party did not like the look of it and were embarrassed by it, so then he had to work on it again. Then he had to do his typical act of 'Oops! Can we start again?'—the act for which the Leader is quite well known: he cannot get it right the first time, he cannot get it right the second time, so he has to try to do it the third time.

Let us look at the references or non-references in the Liberal Party's statement. There are four cursory references to minimum conditions with absolutely no guarantees that employees' conditions of employment will be protected. There is no safety net in that document to protect the rights of workers under a Liberal Government. The Liberals do not indicate what the minimum hourly rate of pay would be. At least John Hewson had the guts to come out with an hourly rate. Of course, at the polls it drove the electors away from his Party in their thousands. The State Liberal Party will not do that: it will not give any idea of what the minimum hourly rate of pay will be, or significantly, who will determine it. There is no guarantee that the 10 days sick leave proposal will be cumulative.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

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

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: We can only assume that, because of their silence on this matter, unused sick leave will be lost to employees at the end of any one year. The Leader of the Opposition clearly does not consider current award minimums to be safe from attack. Penalty rates, overtime rates, shift allowances, holiday leave loadings, award superannuation, long service leave, redundancy provisions, rest and meal breaks and maximum and minimum hours of work are all under threat because of this silence of the lambs policy of the Liberal Party, which is determined to take away employees' rights in this State. There is no freedom of choice. Their policy, by virtue of its silence on so many key issues, is a threat.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Will he confirm that the Government failed to meet its target for public sector job cuts for 1992-93, and will he say what impact this will have on this year's budget? The Government's 1992-93 budget introduced last August required 'a further reduction in overall work force levels of 942 full-time equivalent employees for budget sector agencies' by June this year. The Premier's Economic Statement in April added another 1 500 to this target, to provide total spending cuts of about $85 million this financial year. However, at a meeting of senior business leaders just before the end of the financial year, the Premier told them that the Government's target would not be met by the end of June and that it was likely to be the end of September, at least, before the budgeted job cuts were in place.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The key date in the Meeting the Challenge statement last year was 1 July 1994. We set aside an indicative figure for 30 June this year along the way to that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: We are well on target to achieving the goal by 1 July 1994, so the Deputy Leader need have no fears. Therefore, there is no budgetary impact in the line that the Deputy Leader is talking about. Indeed, I simply refer him to the Deputy Premier's own replies to similar sorts of questions in the last session of Parliament. The fact of whether things happen on 30 June, 1 July or in the first few weeks of July is really rather irrelevant. Employees who are taking up offers of TSPs make their own decisions on what is in their best financial interests as to the best timing of taking such packages.

A number of people—we have had a large take-up of these packages, and that will be more fully reported on in due course—have chosen to take the package after the start of the next financial year, the 1993-94 financial year, rather than in the 1992-93 financial year.

Mr S.J. Baker: Why didn't you say so?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Why didn't I say so? This is a relatively minor point—whether someone wants to take it in the last month of the financial year or the first month of the next financial year. If I was going to address all these petty little details in a Meeting the Challenge statement, it would have run for 1 000 pages as we addressed the minutiae of all the implications of all the things that I announced in April this year. I felt that South Australians really did not want to be bothered with such minutiae: they wanted the core issues, the substance issues, and I am sure that they do not sleep any less easily in their beds at night by knowing that some people have chosen to take a TSP in the first weeks of the 1993-94 financial year rather than in the last weeks of the 1992-93 financial year.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Is the Deputy Leader finished?

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Can the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety advise the House how the Liberal Party's industrial relations policy would affect employees with little bargaining power?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Henley Beach for his question. The policy announced by the Liberal Party in this State is similar to the policy announced by the Liberal Party in Victoria. Members may recall at the time that Mr Gude, the Liberal industrial relations spokesman, had to issue a policy on two occasions because they had never had one. The policy was sprung out and, after the Liberal Party got into Government, it embarked on an adventurous course and changed industrial relations.

Members will also remember the Western Australian Liberal Government's Leader saying, 'I'm no Jeff Kennett and we won't do what they did in Victoria.' What are the facts? The facts are real. The facts are that the Western Australians have picked up and moved on from the Victorians. When one examines the policy of the Liberal Party in South Australia, one can see exactly what it is going to do, particularly when its shadow spokesman wanders around in employment circles in this State indicating that the Liberal Party is going to deregulate the industrial relations system.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: They are saying that. The member for Bragg disputes it, but I know that at one meeting he attended a statement was read out that the Liberal Party would not do anything about shopping hours for two years of government. At the end of the meeting the spokesman said that the Liberal Party would do nothing in its first term of office. Yet another front bencher is wandering around his electorate saying that the Liberal Party will deregulate shopping hours. The Liberal Party should come clean on what it is going to do. The deregulation of the industrial relations system means precisely that. It means taking away the safety net from workers. It means taking away from workers the right to work overtime at overtime rates. It takes away from workers the right to have penalty rates and the right to have an annual leave loading. These are all changes that the Liberal Party said it would undertake. As to this business of enterprise agreements, the Liberal Party made it quite clear that it would encourage them, but what that encourages is a situation leaving workers without a safety net.

It is all right for the Leader to grin, but the reality is simply this: workers when they do not negotiate with their employer are in a very unequal position and will be the people who will be really disadvantaged in this State. They will be the young people seeking work for the first time or people working one or two at a time with an employer who has enormous influence and power over them. On advice I have received where this style of negotiation takes place, some workers have been kept in the manager's office for up

to two hours and not let out until they signed. If they still refuse to sign they do not have a job.

It is all right for the members for Newland and Hayward to try to interject but the reality is that what they really want from an industrial relations system is low wages. They are after low wages with no overtime penalty, no leave loading and workers' well regarded rights being taken away from them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: It is your side and I will not call you until there is silence.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): My question is directed to the Premier. Does the Government intend to proceed with the additional 600 public sector job cuts that he foreshadowed after the Premiers Conference? In a recent speech by the Premier to the PSA Conference, he said the Government was planning to make a decision on further job cuts this week.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: That matter has been fully considered by the Government, and three weeks from now the honourable member will hear the full exciting details when the budget is brought down.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Can the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety advise the House what effect the Liberal Party's industrial relations policy would have on women? I have received a number of approaches from working women in my electorate who have expressed concern that the Liberal industrial relations policy would force them to negotiate directly with their employer.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Stuart for her question. The problem is a real one and I would like to quote a statement by Professor Bob Gregory—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr Armitage: No relation!

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide is out of order.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I am pleased the member for Adelaide is not a relation of mine. Professor Bob Gregory from the ANU is quoted as saying on 5AN on 19 July this year:

> Once you weaken the centralised wage fixation system I think the conditions for part-time workers will weaken and of course they are mainly women and young people.

Professor Gregory is eminent in the economic area of employment and industrial relations. I was once honoured to be mistaken for him and I regarded that as a privilege.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Female employees in our community are the largest single group who will be disadvantaged by the Liberal policy. They are also the highest number of low paid employees and employees in casual and part-time employment—

Mr Oswald interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morphett is out of order.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: They are also particularly vulnerable in the workplace when it comes to negotiating for themselves. Further, a considerable number of those female workers are of non-English speaking background. Again, it is a significant group of workers who, studies have shown, have no understanding of what is happening, and quite often they are the ones who are open to abuse.

What we have seen in the style of deregulation that has taken place and is going to take place under Liberal Governments and conservative Governments that introduce this type of industrial relations policy is the removal of penalty rates for weekend work, nights and public holidays; they are also required to work longer hours. It is all very well for the Liberal Party to deny that it is going to do that, but its shadow industrial relations spokesman is saying at public meetings around town, 'We are going to deregulate the industrial relations system.'

Mr Meier interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: They say they are going to do it, and they know darn well what that means. It is all right for the member for Goyder to interject and say, 'So are your Federal colleagues', but what he does not understand about the Labor Party in this area is that, while the Federal Government and we as a State Government encourage enterprise agreements, we ensure that there is a safety net. The member for Goyder and his colleagues want to take away that safety net; they have no concern whatsoever for the working men, women and children of this country and this State in particular. They do not care; they are callous in this.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Morphett interjected and said 'It's lies'. All I have said is that a front bench member of the Liberal Party has said, 'We will not deregulate shopping hours for two years.'

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is now clearly debating the issue, and I withdraw leave.

CHILD PROTECTION UNIT

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): Will the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services increase resources available to the Child Protection Unit at the Women's and Children's Hospital, so that the unit can deal adequately with cases of child sexual abuse and child abuse generally and with an increasing workload? The case of a three-year-old child alleged to have been sexually abused has been brought to my attention. Because of the child's young age the Child Protection Unit would normally aim to interview her within one week. However, she has been given an appointment for interview three weeks after the event. On further investigation I have established that the Child Protection Unit is unable to meet—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr ARMITAGE:—standards it has agreed with the Health Commission for interview procedures because of a lack of trained staff. Staff resources devoted to therapy are now less than they were five years ago on a proportional basis because of the greatly increased demand for investigative work. Caseloads have been increasing by 30 per cent a year. A delay of between three and four weeks for an initial interview means that often investigations are shelved because parents do not want their children or themselves to relive the experience of child sexual abuse. In addition, the unit is

unable to undertake any research into this important community problem.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: As the member for Adelaide indicates, the demand for service in this area has risen over time as people have become more used to making use of the services that are increasingly available in our community to address this very serious problem. Obviously the individual case that he raises will have to be examined and, if he cares to give me the name of the individual concerned in private, I will—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr Armitage interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.J. EVANS:—have the case examined.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

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

Dr Armitage interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I caution the member for Adelaide on his conduct.

Dr Armitage interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Let me say that the attitude of the member for Adelaide to the Chair leaves a lot to be desired.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: The resources that are available to the unit at the Women's and Children's Hospital and to the Unit at the Flinders Medical Centre have been increased in recent times, and I believe the resources available are reasonable in the context in which we now find ourselves. Obviously those resources can always be increased, as in any area of health or any of the major domestic portfolios, but we are governed by the resources that are available to us and within them we allocate priorities accordingly.

That area is a very high priority, and resources have been increased in that area as a result of that. I will examine the individual case and determine whether any action needs to be taken in relation to that, but I would say that the increase in resources should be more than appropriate in the circumstances in which we now find ourselves.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Can the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety advise the House what impact the Liberal industrial relations policy would have on the WorkCover Corporation and the Occupational Health and Safety Commission?

The SPEAKER: I ask the Minister to answer as briefly as possible.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I have been advised that the Liberal Party has a policy on WorkCover. I have also been advised that it is not prepared to release it. I am wondering what its policy has in store for the injured workers of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

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

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: One can only surmise that the reason it will not release the policy is that it intends to cut benefits for workers.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I know hypothetical questions are not necessarily out of order, but the Minister is now answering a question where he clearly admits that he does not know what he is answering about.

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

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I would not expect the member for Hayward to understand the answer, because the Leader told him to ask the question. One can only surmise that, on their past record in this House, members opposite would slash the first benefits for three months to 85 per cent and 75 per cent after 12 months and then force severely injured workers off on to social services like their counterparts are doing in Victoria and have done in New South Wales. Also, they are most likely, as they have argued in this place, to remove journey accidents and all overtime. I point out that in March this year the fund was $2.2 million under full funding as determined by the actuaries.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Bragg interjects and says that people are not making claims. He knows as well as everybody else that there has been a drop in the number of accidents in the workplace. He knows that but refuses to accept the success of the policies of this Government that are resulting in fewer South Australian employees being hurt at work.

We also have on record the Leader of the Opposition saying on 2 July 1992 that he wanted the relaxation of occupational health and safety regulations. It is exactly those occupational health and safety regulations that ensure that our workplaces are safe to work in. He wants to make them more dangerous. What does he want to do? Does he want to make it worse for our workers in these factories, or is he using a very short-sighted approach to improve our productivity? From time to time people who are involved in occupational health and safety and workplace insurance mention the high cost of injuries to Australian manufacturing industry and industry in general. They also point out the high productivity gains that can be had if there is a reduction in the number of injuries.

I know that the Leader agrees with me on this, but I wish that he would come out publicly and say it, because it is very important that we ensure that the working men and women of Australia are able to work safely, do not have to work in unsafe working conditions and that our regulations conform to the best of world practice. If we are going to have management at best of world practice, let us have our occupational health and safety at best of world practice and workers compensation at best of world practice. The Leader should not wait until the election campaign is on to release this policy in the hope that all the nasties that are in it will be hidden.

ADELAIDE INSTITUTE OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr SUCH (Fisher): My question is directed to the Minister of Education, Employment and Training. Why last week did she deny that the Government had made a decision to relocate stage 5 of the Adelaide Institute of Vocational Education to Chesser House to help bail out the bad bank? Will she review this decision following the compelling case against it put by the institute's council?The Minister's claim that no Government decision had been made in this matter is at odds with the fact that the land on which Chesser House is built was bought by the State Bank on 31 May, and

demolition work to make way for the originally planned development on the institute's Light Square campus, which was to have begun today, has been stopped.

The institute's council also believes a decision has been made. In a letter to the Minister, dated 27 July, the President of the council, Alison Raggatt, states:

> I regret that again the Minister has not consulted with the institute council on a very major decision concerning the institute.

This letter represents a compelling case against this move, including the serious dislocation which will occur to students and staff and the additional costs. The original plan for stage 5 to be incorporated on the existing Light Square campus would have cost $19.7 million. Already, $400 000 has been spent on preparing designs, and tenders have closed. The proposal to relocate to Chesser House will cost more than $28.2 million; there will be additional recurrent costs from splitting the campus; and work for the construction industry will be lost.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. As usual, he has got it wrong again. I made it very clear when I was asked about this matter, and I will make it clear again for the honourable member and the Leader of the Opposition who loves to get involved in some of these beat-ups, that no decision has been made. I made that clear and I will say it again. The department was looking at a range of options, which I think is perfectly reasonable, to ensure that the best decision was made for South Australia and for the provision of the best quality vocational and technical training and education for people attending the Adelaide Institute of Vocational Education. I have said it as clearly as I can.

Let me make it very clear to the honourable member that the situation with respect to looking at options surely is reasonable. I have made it very clear that any decision would be taken after consultation with the council of the new institute, and I have said that a number of times. Obviously, a couple of people who are on the institute council want to make this into some kind of political bun fight. I am not going to do that, because I want to provide the best quality education and training, and I intend to do that.

I can assure the honourable member that if he had bothered to check his facts he would have found that the money that is being provided by the Federal Government, the $19.7 million, cannot be spent by the State without the permission of the Federal Government. There have been no discussions in terms of any changes in the original proposal. The department decided to have a look at a range of options. Does the honourable member seriously suggest that I should come in over the top and say, 'No, you are not allowed to look at options.'? I can assure the honourable member that at the end of the day both Cabinet—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: At the end of the day it will be for this Cabinet and, indeed, for me as Minister to make that decision. It will not be made by the member for Fisher, notwithstanding the way in which he is trying to beat up this issue. I can give this House, the people of South Australia, the institute, the council of the institute, the staff and the students the assurance that this Government will make the best possible decision in the interests of quality education and training. We will make it properly in consultation. We will not—I stress we will not—be stampeded by the Opposition into making a decision.

ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Ross Smith): Can the Minister of Public Infrastructure inform the House of the extent to which the electricity tariff reductions, which came into force on 1 July, have improved South Australia's competitive position with the other States? It has been pointed out that the cost of fuel and transmission has been high in South Australia and record increases took place under the Tonkin Government following a negotiated gas price agreement which resulted in high domestic and industrial commercial tariffs.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader, if he speaks over the Chair again, will be dealt with. The Minister.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I thank the member for Ross Smith for his question. As members will be aware, the new ETSA tariff schedule, which came into effect on 1 July, was specifically designed to assist industrial and commercial consumers and to improve South Australia's competitive position. Business and industry were given nominal tariff reductions ranging from 2 per cent to 12 per cent. Overall, there was an average reduction of 4.7 per cent in tariffs for business and industry, which will be worth about $25 million to those people this financial year.

Analysis undertaken by ETSA indicates that the tariff adjustments have significantly improved our competitive position with the other States. I think that members will be assisted if I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* a document which delineates the situation for various of the categories.

The SPEAKER: Is the table purely statistical?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

INTERSTATE COMPARISON OF ELECTRICITY PRICES
JULY 1993

	ETSA c/kWh	SECV c/kWh	NSW c/kWh	QLD c/kWh	WA c/kWh
Medium Domestic (1 000 kWh/quarter, no off-peak	12.82	15.26	11.22	11.64	14.5
Domestic with J Tariff (1 000 kWh/quarter on peak, 1 000 kWh off-peak)	9.44	9.50	7.47	7.93	10.5
Small industrial/commercial (1 000 kWh/quarter, no off-peak)	19.22	23.15	17.47	14.37	18.4
Medium industrial (35 000 kWh/month, 20% off-peak)	11.80	15.97	12.36	11.71	16.0

INTERSTATE COMPARISON OF ELECTRICITY PRICES
JULY 1993

	ETSA c/kWh	SECV c/kWh	NSW c/kWh	QLD c/kWh	WA c/kWh
Medium to large industrial (NUS customer) (1 000 kW, 450 000 kWh/month)	6.78	5.65	7.68	7.60	9.1
Large Industrial (1 000 kW, 4 500 000 kWh/month) ETSA Top '10' customer	6.13	5.65	7.19	7.31	9.1

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am sure that all members will be pleased to hear that, in the medium industrial, medium to large industrial and large industrial examples used in this comparison, ETSA's cents per kilowatt hour rate is the second lowest on the mainland. In the medium domestic consumption and domestic with off-peak examples, we lie third—right in the middle of the field. In the small industrial/commercial category, we are now in fourth place, having overtaken Victoria as a result of the recent tariff reductions in this State.

These placings are not accidental. They are the result of a continuing campaign by ETSA and the Government to restructure ETSA's tariffs and to pass on to all consumers the benefits of the major efficiency improvements achieved within the Electricity Trust. Given that the real significant reductions in electricity costs of recent years have been made possible largely by the gains from restructuring and rationalisation, I find it almost beyond belief that the Opposition is currently seeking to obstruct a process which offers further major efficiency gains and opportunities to lower both electricity and water charges.

MOUSE PLAGUE

Mr VENNING (Custance): My question is directed to the Minister of Primary Industries. Is it correct that the Minister originally recommended to Cabinet that the Government should meet the cost of strychnine to counter the devastating mouse plague; was his recommendation overruled by Cabinet; and, if so, why? The cost of strychnine and its additives to farmers is working out at approximately $3 per hectare, leaving many farmers having to pay between $3 000 and $6 000 on top of the cost of their grain for bait and the cost of spreading. I have been told about one farmer who had to use nine tonnes of bait, costing him $27 000. Those are sums of money that farmers are not able to meet, and their requests for financial assistance have been rejected by this Government. It has become obvious that, for effective control of this plague, all farmers have to participate and Government assistance will ensure that participation.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I sometimes think that the honourable member must live in fantasy land. In fact, Cabinet has only just approved $1.25 million for the locust plague, which means we will have $1.75 million available. The answer to the honourable member's question on that aspect is simply 'No.' There are concerns with regard to those farmers who might be in difficulty as a result of the cost of the strychnine. I went to Eyre Peninsula in the company of the member for Flinders, and we talked to farmers at Minnipa and Wudinna about these problems. Following that visit, which was about two weeks ago, I asked the task force to identify those farmers who might be in difficulty as a result of having to pay for strychnine. The task force is actually working on that identification, exactly to define the number of people who are in difficulty, and we would take appropriate steps to address any such difficulties in a variety of ways. One of those ways is a general instruction that I have given to extend the time for payment for any primary producer who is in difficulty as a result of that program.

My officers have done a survey with the different regions, and I ask members to bear in mind that the Victorian Government is charging for its strychnine program; it will not be given away for nothing, and the reason for that is that both Governments are dealing with an extremely dangerous poison that, if any accident occurred, could cause the death of a child, or anyone else for that matter. There has to be a mechanism for control in place; there has to be a monitoring mechanism, and there is a cost attached to that monitoring mechanism. Part of the cost of the strychnine is that monitoring mechanism, because you cannot take any risks, in any way, in giving it away for nothing, that there might be a percentage of people who do the wrong thing, stockpile and do not use it. It is essential that officers, in both Victoria and South Australia, monitor what happens with that strychnine, because it is an extremely dangerous substance.

Sixty-three State Government employees have been involved in the operation. So far, about $553 000 has been spent with regard to the various ingredients—for the strychnine, the labour and some administrative costs. We have had to order another 200 kilograms of strychnine, which is another cost of about $260 000.

I said earlier that Governments are not the absolute insurers against nature. The responsibility of Governments is to provide assistance, and the strychnine is already very heavily subsidised as it is. With regard to the difficulties that farmers are facing, I point out that, in Kadina, the majority have paid; in Tailem Bend, the majority have paid; in Streaky Bay, the majority have paid; in Minnipa, approximately 90 per cent are on credit, which has been extended to harvest; and, in Pinnaroo, most of the supplies are on credit. I know that there are difficulties with regard to Eyre Peninsular because of the sheer size of the farms there. That is why I have asked the task force to identify those numbers of farmers who are in difficulty. We cannot get this published, but the assistance to primary producers from State and Federal Governments for the 1993-94 year will be about $70 million. That is a great contribution on the part of the State and Federal Governments—a provision of about $70 million in various forms of rural assistance for 12 600 farmers in South Australia. That is the total number of farmers in South Australia.

I think that this Government is making a great effort. Everything that I have taken to Cabinet in relation to this matter has been approved. Governments are not the absolute insurers against nature, and neither the Victorian nor the

South Australian Government will concede that principle. I know what the members are doing, but the fact of the matter is that the decisive action by this Government has won it support in rural South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I know that members do not like to concede that, and they are chipping away—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.R. GROOM:—because this Government has been very decisive; it is a month ahead of Victoria, and we are keeping costs down much lower than is Victoria. Our costs are very good, and I instructed my officers, because of the plight of rural South Australia and the plight of primary producers, to keep the costs down as low as possible, and we are doing that. It is heavily subsidised as it is.

EDUCATION REFORM

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): Will the Minister of Education, Employment and Training explain to the House the effect that the decision by the Liberal States to delay the national education reform agenda for key competencies and national profiles will have on this State, and what on earth can the Minister do about it?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question, which is very important and raises a serious issue, because the decision taken by the conservative Liberal States in Perth several weeks ago has put in serious jeopardy the ability of Australia, not just South Australia, to compete internationally as a recognised provider of education and educational services. States now are not only competing with each other or doing their own thing but trying to compete internationally, and the decision taken by the Liberal States will mean that they will now be competing with each other for a very competitive market.

I can assure the honourable member that I am moving quickly to ensure that the effects of the decision taken by the conservatives has a minimal effect on South Australia. This State will move forward with a planned, staged and coordinated implementation, monitoring student achievement in the eight learning areas described in the key competencies by Mayer. In South Australia, there is a similarity between the essential skills and understanding as identified in Educating for the Twenty-first Century and the key competencies as identified by the Mayer committee. In the schooling sector, we will investigate the similarities between the two and explore ways in which the key competencies are already found within our curriculum offerings. The decision has taken Australia back about 30 years; the Federal Minister Mr Beazley described it as going back to the 'rail gauge mentality', when the States all adopted their own rail gauges and wondered why they could not trade with one another.

We will not sit by idly while the conservative States, particularly Victoria and Western Australia, drag us backwards: we will move forward with the fundamental reforms which will stimulate job growth. We will be moving forward to train our young people and to promote Australia as a competitive nation, and this Government, in consultation with the Commonwealth, business, industry, the school communities and unions, will ensure that we work together to make Australia and South Australia of the highest possible standard in terms of our training and education. We will not allow the conservatives opposite to be part of dragging this State and this nation back 30 years.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Ross Smith): Two days ago the Leader of the Opposition in this place asked a question and made a subsequent speech in which he accused the Government, and me in particular, of some form of criminal conspiracy in relation to matters dealt with by Beneficial Finance Corporation. This is an extremely grave allegation to be levelled against any member in this place. Since that allegation was made, three things have occurred. First, the Premier has made a statement in relation to the matter and has asked the Leader of the Opposition to provide evidence upon which he would base his request for some sort of investigation into this matter. I understand no such information or material has been provided by the Leader of the Opposition. His response is simply to say, 'I am basing it on the records and the evidence given before the royal commission.'

Secondly, I have addressed in some detail the matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition. I have gone through chapter and verse those documents upon which he purports to rely and demonstrated quite clearly that they form absolutely no basis for the sort of grave charge that the Leader of the Opposition has made. The Auditor-General's report does not support what he has said. The Auditor-General's report certainly refers to a specific matter on which he believes criminal or other behaviour could be established, and I emphasise 'could be established'. He has recommended it be further investigated and, as the Premier has indicated, that is taking place and, indeed, if a prosecution can be launched, it will. I think all South Australians would be very pleased indeed to see that pursued. But that is where it is at the moment. Conviction has not been recorded.

Also, I referred to the findings of the Royal Commissioner, which do not, in his first report in the passage that the Leader of the Opposition purports to rely on, support the allegation that he has made. He simply notes the fact that certain information was available, that that information was no longer pursued, that certain reasons were given by the board for the severance of Messrs Baker and Reichert, and that I, as Premier, simply provided that information to the House.

He makes no reference to the evidence that was placed before the commission—considerable detailed evidence on that matter, by me and by others, which is very relevant if one wishes to draw the sorts of outrageous conclusions that the Leader of the Opposition seeks to draw. That does not support his case. I detailed the question I was asked in Parliament which, by the way in which he has addressed the matter, the Leader of the Opposition (who was not there at the time) obviously had not looked at, and explained how, when asked, 'What were the explanations given', I put those explanations before the House.

It is true that I did not speculate or detail what may have been a ramp of surrounding circumstances which at that stage

had not been pursued and which were not leading anywhere. It would have been irresponsible for me so to do.

All those matters were put before the House, and then came the third event. I challenged the Leader of the Opposition to debate this issue with me and, following that challenge, a forum has been provided to us by the media. I am very happy to accept that: my understanding is that the Leader of the Opposition refuses to do so.

That is extraordinary. Having made this accusation going right to the integrity of a member of Parliament, having deflected the political debate away from his own failings and policies about the future and looked back at the past, he has refused to pick up that challenge. In those circumstances, I expect a proper and decent apology from the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): We have just heard from the $3 500 million man, who has mortgaged the future of every man, woman and child in South Australia through his incompetence and who has the audacity to stand up in this House and put up some defence—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: It was the Premier who destroyed the employment base of this State, and he expects us to sit idly by and attempts to attack us for exposing the incompetence, the disgraceful attitude, that he has inflicted upon the people of this State. My constituents and everyone else's constituents cannot have any decent infrastructure built because of his Government and the crooks that he employed. He did not have the guts to deal with those people, yet he has the audacity to attack the Premier-elect of this State!

If ever a Premier has been discredited because he has destroyed future generations, it is the member for Ross Smith. He could never hold his head high again, because he led the worst public administration in the history of this State and nation, and he has the gall and audacity to come in here and attack the Leader.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader does not have the call.

Mr GUNN: I want to refer to my constituents, who are suffering as a result of the Labor Party in government. A few weeks ago I received a letter from the Cockburn Progress Association, which stated its wishes as follows:

1. To obtain a copy of the results and recommendations of the EIS carried out by P.P.K. Planning approximately two years ago on Cockburn, Mannahill, Olary and Yunta;
2. The evaluation of STA houses carried out by evaluator Mr K.G. Jacobs AAIV from the Department of Lands, Port Augusta;
3. A reference from [the department];

The association requested any further information. The situation is that for some time the State Transport Authority has been attempting to dispose of a number of houses that were previously owned by South Australian Railways. As part of the transfer agreement, when AN no longer wishes to utilise those facilities, they revert to the State Transport Authority. In a letter to the Minister of Road Transport, the progress association has this to say:

The EIS was never made public to us; however, information has sifted back to us and we know that we were to be discouraged from further development or growth. Everything went quiet until recent times when a person approached me with a proposal to bulk purchase STA houses (not land) with the intentions to make a bulk offer to the STA for the Cockburn transportables. The buyer had already made off-the-cuff inquiries about the Cockburn houses to the STA in a roundabout fashion and was told that they were under lease and that investigation would have to be made to gauge residing tenant interest. Within two months of this discussion the enclosed appendix. . . was sent.

This is what the progress association wants:

1. Any premises that residing tenants do not wish to purchase.
2. Any premises that with the above and excluding premises that any resident of Cockburn has expressed interest in purchasing.
3. We would like to pursue purchase of the old Australian National Rest House.

The situation is that the Engineering and Water Supply Department wants these houses removed. It wants to discourage any further development of these small communities. The people living at Cockburn want to know whether the Government is prepared to support them to retain this accommodation so that there is sufficient accommodation available to assist in maintaining a reasonably sized community. It is not an unreasonable request, and I am of the view that the State Transport Authority should transfer the ownership of these houses to the progress association at Cockburn. It has had them transferred back to it at no cost.

They also want to know what is the future of the buildings associated with the school, and that is not an unreasonable request. I raise this matter in the House, because there has been an ongoing attempt by the association to obtain information, and I call on the Minister of Transport Development immediately to release the EIS that was conducted—

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

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Environment and Land Management): I wish to complete the comments I started yesterday with regard to the articles that appeared in the *Courier* and the *Advertiser* concerning fear of crime and the supposed level of fear being encountered by people in Unley. I reached a point of reporting on the Office of Crime Statistics omnibus survey that was conducted in 1992, and was making the point that, in fact, as for increased fear the people of Unley have, against the State average, not increased their level of fear over the past 12 months. I quote from the report, as follows:

When asked, however, if their fear of crime had changed over the last 12 months a small proportion of Unley residents reported an increase in their level of fear. In fact, 45 per cent of Unley residents had experienced no increase in fear of crime, compared with only 37.6 per cent of metropolitan residents in general.

It is quite clear that the articles in the *Courier* and *Advertiser*, when Unley is compared with the rest of South Australia, were very misleading. I want to turn my attention to a summary analysis that was conducted by the Office of Crime Statistics at its own initiative in relation to that article. Obviously, from what I saw on television, it was concerned at the nature of these articles that were being presented by the *Advertiser* and the *Courier*, and the way in which the exaggerations and distortions that were being presented were themselves a catalyst in heightening a sense of anxiety and fear amongst residents not only of Unley but also of the whole of the State of South Australia.

There is a fairly careful analysis by the Head Statistician in regard to that document, which was the student survey conducted by a department at Flinders University. The Director of the Office of Crime Statistics has gone through with a thorough and professional analysis of it. It talks about the response rate, the consequences of low response rate, survey questions, questions about violent victimisation, consequences of question format for violent offences,

questions about fear and avoidance, the *locus* of fear, quality control and the reporting of the survey. Certainly, in the reporting of the survey (if I can turn my attention to that in the brief time that I have) some fairly strong comments are made in regard to the way in which the *Advertiser* and the *Courier* presented the article. The comments are:

> The reporting of the survey results in the *Courier* and *Advertiser* was designed to catch attention and 'cash in' on fear of crime. Also, there are a number of factual errors in the newspaper reports. The *Courier* article includes an emotive graphic which presumably is supposed to represent the type of crime reported. In fact, crime surveys indicate that serious assaults with weapons are very rare events.
>
> The *Courier* quotes population estimates for Unley as if they represent the actual number of Unley voters responding to the survey. The reporter compounds this problem by taking the upper level of the population estimate as the given number. This is irresponsible reporting, since it:
>
> - hides the fact that the number is an estimate, based on a small survey, and
> - takes the upper limit of the estimate range rather than the mid-point of the range, as is standard.
>
> For example, page 16 of the report notes that 'it is possible to say, with 95 per cent confidence, that between 1.3 per cent and 5.3 per cent of the voting population of the Unley LGA had been victims of violent crimes in the 12 months preceding this study.' The survey estimate is 3.3 per cent. In the *Courier* this becomes, 'Up to 5 per cent of people. . . were victims of violent crime in the 12 months prior to the survey.'
>
> The *Courier* reports, 'More than a quarter of people are too scared to venture into their gardens at night for fear of attack.' The question asked about curbing certain activities in the dark when alone. It did not ask about fear of attack. The limitations of this question were discussed in [an earlier section].
>
> The *Advertiser* report was in a similar mould. [The author] spoke to Iain Hay on Wednesday 29 July and he told [the author] that a number of quotations supposedly from an interview with Chris Hackett did not represent the words or content of anything he had said. Chris Hackett also misrepresented the number of respondents to the survey, and reversed the sense of a sentence appearing in the report.
>
> The research report says in bold print on page 7, 'The results of this study cannot be extrapolated to the population of any other place', while the *Advertiser* report says, 'And the university says the results of the study could equally apply to any other suburb in Adelaide.' So much for accurate reporting.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I want to give both praise and an element of criticism to the release in recent times of the *Barossa Valley Review*—the new SDP. The praise is that the five councils involved—the District Councils of Light, Kapunda, Tanunda, Angaston and Barossa—worked so very well together, along with their Chief Executive Officers or Chief Planning Officers and their Chairmen, with support (including financial support) from the Government to address a problem that had become very apparent following the vine pull. At a time when there was a glut of grapes and, apparently, no further opportunity for sales, the Federal Government, associated with the State Government, instituted a vine pull, and in a number of cases the vines that were pulled were starting to destroy the fabric or the appearance of the Barossa Valley floor. That was to the disadvantage of the potential for increased tourism and for a vista which is now known worldwide and which is extremely important for the projection of South Australia.

Along with the action taken by the councils and the supporting staff, a very valuable document has been made available. It concluded its public survey on Friday of last week (30 June) and it will now be for the adjudicators to take heed of the information that has been put before the authority and to consider whether the additional recommendations that have come from the public and other organisations are heeded or ignored.

Notwithstanding that it is a very useful and valuable document, it does introduce one area for criticism, and that criticism has started to appear in letters to the editor and in the public meetings that have been held over the past two weeks, drawing attention to the fact that a number of people will be seriously disadvantaged in respect of the assets that many of them have held for a long period. The assets that they hold are small areas of land in various parts of the target area and, if these parcels of land do not come up to a standard size, permission will not be granted to build on them.

If there are vacant lots in the prescribed townships, there will be a building opportunity. If there are rural properties with adequate size, there will be building opportunity—the opportunity that everybody expects when they have free title to a parcel of land. Where the parcels of land are small (and 20 or 30 acres is not particularly small in the Barossa Valley system), those people will be denied the opportunity to sell those properties with the right to construct a house. That is where the dilemma starts and finishes. The community has rightly asked for a diminution of the number of buildings that go on the floor of the valley but, in asking for that, the community has said to a number of people who have an asset, 'You just discount your asset and do not worry about it. You just bear the cost of what the public demands.'

At a public meeting over two years ago, when this matter first came to my notice, I said that a compensation system needed to be formulated whereby the community became responsible for paying for what it wanted to retain. We have had the situation of the native vegetation legislation whereby, with the first stroke of the pen, there was to be no compensation. Subsequently, as it was found that to give due credence to those people who owned property they should be compensated, the State found large sums of money, to its credit, and I believe it needs to do the same for the Valley.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): My question to the Minister of Education, Employment and Training today arose from an article which I saw in the Melbourne *Age* on 3 July of this year. Two quotes from the Melbourne *Age* in two days I suppose is a bit rich, but on this particular occasion I was not chasing football statistics when I saw it. The heading is 'National education plan scuttled', and the background is that a great deal of work had been done at the Commonwealth level and by the States and Territories towards developing a national plan to coordinate subjects taught in schools across the country and to develop basic work-related skills in schools and in tertiary education.

The most succinct statement of this is what is known as the Mayer competencies, and they are listed as: collecting, analysing and organising information; communicating ideas and information; planning and organising activities; working with others in teams; using mathematical ideas and techniques; solving problems; using technology; and cultural understandings. They all seem to be excellent aims that should be adopted by our education systems.

The article goes on to state that, when the meeting of the Ministers got together in Perth, the conservative States—the Liberal States—and the Northern Territory stunned education authorities, first, by saying they would not be involved in a national plan and, secondly, by calling for all working parties and committees set up by the Australian Education Council to be wound up by 1 September. One refers to this more in sadness than in anger. This is 1993, after all; do we in

education have to go back to the days, which in a sense are still with us, of split gauges in the railways? This is not a word by word prescription for everything that happens in the education system. It was a means of getting some degree of coordination over the system.

It seems to me that the rejection by the Liberal States of this very promising initiative is akin to the rejection in another place in the previous session of this Parliament of the legislation to recognise certain professional qualifications around the country—something else which in its broader sense should be standardised. In any event, it is not only me who is complaining about this. One need only refer to a statement of Mr John Prescott, the Managing Director of BHP, published in the *Financial Review* of 28 July, as follows:

> Young Australians finishing their schooling, irrespective of the State in which they live, face the same social and economic systems, the same political and legal systems, the same job market, a unified higher education system and an increasingly national training system. Any argument that this scenario should be serviced by eight different education systems—for a total population the size of Tokyo, is unsustainable.

I can only echo that. It is a tragedy that this whole scheme has been forced to be abandoned at national level. One can only hope that there will be some rethinking in the conservative States. Indeed, I hope they will consider joining again with the Commonwealth, Queensland, South Australia and the ACT in what was proving to be a very promising initiative. It still can be done. We heard the Minister's answer in the House this afternoon as to the way in which this Government will face up to the problem. It is about time other Governments did the same thing.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Today I am asking the Minister of Primary Industries for one month's extension for comments on the soil conservation and animal plant control amalgamation discussion paper. The proposed amalgamation of the Soil Conservation Council and the Animal and Plant Control Commission is a significant step. Every opportunity must be made for interested persons to have their say prior to a green paper being prepared. Some animal and plant control boards meet only once every three months. As a consequence, they do not have sufficient opportunity to consider the recommendations of the joint soil conservation council/animal and plant control working group.

The lateness of this year's season is another reason why farmers, in particular, need a further extension to put in their comments. One issue which needs full consideration is the amount of rate revenue councils will be required to contribute to an amalgamated board. Some councils currently contribute 1 per cent of rate revenue. This could increase to 4 per cent of rural rate revenue under the proposals. With the difficulties the rural sector is currently experiencing, any rate revenue increase could cause unnecessary hardships, and the implications of such a fourfold increase must be thoroughly thought through. The number of councils per soil conservation board, as against the number per animal and plant control board, may be double. In one area of my electorate the animal and plant control board covers 200 square kilometres, whereas the soil board for the same area takes in over 7 000 square kilometres. Such differences make it essential that proper thought be given to what problems may be encountered through the amalgamation of boards currently covering very different areas.

Members would be aware that originally all comments were to be submitted by 31 July to either Mr Kevin Heinrich of the Animal and Plant Control Commission, or Mr Roger Wickes of the Department of Primary Industries. This was extended until 16 April. I believe another extension of one month to 15 September would give all boards sufficient time to consider the paper. I hope that the Minister of Primary Industries will act accordingly and allow such an extension.

The second item I wish to bring up relates to the continuing problem of maintaining jetties on Yorke Peninsula. I would like to highlight the situation as it relates to the Wool Bay jetty, which is a recreational jetty. Earlier this year I approached the Minister of Transport Development (Hon. Barbara Wiese), whose portfolio covers the marine area, and asked for a specific commitment to be made to the Wool Bay jetty, and I pointed out the problems that currently exist. In her reply to me the Minister said that repairs to the steps leading to the water would occur when low tides coincided with the availability of labour resources from the Department of Marine and Harbors at Wallaroo. However, of major concern to me and to the many people who use the Wool Bay jetty is the deterioration of the jetty's structure below the waterline.

The Minister in her reply to me acknowledges that the deterioration was evident in the department's underwater inspection in March 1990 and that in the interim some of the timber cross brace connections have failed. That was over three years ago when the department's investigation found that the jetty needed attention, and things have got worse since then. In her letter to me the Minister says that the department will undertake a detailed underwater inspection of the jetty in the near future to determine the likely cost of repairs and future action necessary.

I would say to the Minister that the investigations occurred more than three years ago and that she should not waste more money by having another look. It is obvious to the department and anyone else that repairs are needed now. To put off repairs for another six, 12 or more months will simply add to the expense. A stitch in time was not carried out three years ago when repairs should have been undertaken. Repairs need to be undertaken now.

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

MUTUAL RECOGNITION (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) BILL

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to adopt the Mutual Recognition Act 1992 of the Commonwealth (and any amendments made to it before this Act commences), and to refer power to the Parliament of the Commonwealth to amend the Act, so as to enable the enactment of legislation applying uniformly throughout Australia for the recognition of regulatory standards adopted in South Australia regarding goods and occupations. Read a first time.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The purpose of the Mutual Recognition (South Australia) Bill is to enable South Australia to enter into a scheme for the mutual recognition of regulatory standards for goods and occupations adopted in Australia. This scheme is already operating between New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria, Tasmania, the Northern Territory, and the Australian Capital Territory. Mutual recognition is an initiative arising out of the series of Special Premiers Conferences which have been conducted with the objective of achieving an historic reconstruction of intergovernmental relations. The principal aim of mutual recognition is to remove the needless artificial barriers to interstate trade in goods and the mobility of labour caused by regulatory differences among Australian States and Territories. Mutual recognition is expected to greatly enhance the international competitiveness of the Australian economy and is a major step forward in the achievement of micro-economic reform. It involves a recognition by heads of Government that the time has come for Australia to create a truly national market—a policy embodied in the Constitution but not made possible for almost 100 years.

At the Special Premiers Conference in Brisbane in October 1990, heads of Government agreed to apply mutual recognition of standards in all areas where uniformity was not considered essential to national economic efficiency. Heads of Government gave their in-principle support to models of mutual recognition for goods and occupations at the Special Premiers Conference held in Sydney in July 1991, subject to the outcome of a national community consultation process.

National consultation between July and November 1991 involved the release of a discussion paper entitled 'The Mutual Recognition of Standards and Regulations in Australia' and a series of seminars in each capital city led by the Honourable Neville Wran, AC, QC. Input was sought from business, industry, trade unions, the professions, standards—setting bodies and consumer and community representatives on any necessary refinements to the mutual recognition models. Some 200 written submissions were received. Results of the consultation process were considered by Premiers and Chief Ministers at their meeting in Adelaide on 21 and 22 November 1991.

While there was a range of views expressed at the seminars and in the submissions, the concept of mutual recognition was widely embraced as a means to overcome regulatory impediments to a national market in goods and services. The majority of submissions did not call for substantial changes to the models, although some expressed a preference for uniformity. On that point, it is important to note that mutual recognition is intended to complement the efforts of regulatory authorities in achieving nationally uniform standards. It will not impede those effects where it is agreed that uniform national standards are necessary. On the contrary, recent experience with the medical profession, for instance, suggests that mutual recognition will hasten the successful resolution of such endeavours. The mutual recognition proposals were subject to public scrutiny after Premiers and Chief Ministers agreed to release the draft Mutual Recognition Bill in November 1991. Changes which have been made to the draft legislation as a result of submissions received are generally of a minor drafting nature only. Again, overwhelming support for the concept of mutual recognition was evident, with a few notable exceptions, which continued to favour national uniformity. It is an indication of the common sense which underlies the concept of mutual recognition that these proposals have had the clear support of Governments of all different political persuasions from the outset.

All heads of Government agreed, when they met on 11 May 1992, to sign the Intergovernmental Agreement on Mutual Recognition. The Agreement actively promotes the development of national standards in cases where the operation of mutual recognition raised questions about the need for such standards to protect the health and safety of citizens, or to prevent or minimise environmental pollution.

The legislation is based on two simple principles. The first is that goods which can be sold lawfully in one State or Territory may be sold freely in any other State or Territory, even though the goods may not fully comply with all the details of regulatory standards in the place where they are sold. If goods are acceptable for sale in one State or Territory, then there is no reason why they should not be sold anywhere in Australia.

It was not so long ago that it was virtually impossible to market cooking margarine nationally in one package. Western Australia required margarine to be packed in cube tubs whereas the familiar round tub was acceptable everywhere else. Mutual recognition will mean producers in Australia will only have to ensure that their products comply with the laws in the place of production. If they do so, then they will be free to distribute and sell their products throughout Australia without being subjected to further testing or assessment of their product. This ensures a national market for those products. Similarly, goods manufactured or produced overseas which comply with the relevant standards in the jurisdiction through which they are imported will be able to be sold in any jurisdiction.

The second principle is that if a person is registered to carry out an occupation in one State or Territory, then he or she should be able to be registered and carry on the equivalent occupation in any other State or Territory. If someone is assessed to be good enough to practise a profession or an occupation in one State or Territory, then they should be able to do so anywhere in Australia. A person who is registered in one jurisdiction will only need to give notice, including evidence of their home registration, to the relevant registration authority in another jurisdiction to be entitled immediately to commence practice in an equivalent occupation in that second State or Territory. No additional assessment will be undertaken by the local registration or licensing body to assess the person's capabilities or expertise. Local registration authorities will be required to accept the judgment of their interstate counterparts of a person's educational qualifications, experience, character or fitness to practise. I stress that the occupations a person seeks to move between from one State to another have to be substantially equivalent and have to be subject to statutory registration arrangements. I am sure that everyone would agree that in Australia the existing regulatory arrangements of each State or Territory generally provide a satisfactory set of standards.

Thus, on implementation of mutual recognition, no jurisdiction will suddenly be flooded with products that are inherently dangerous, unsafe or unhealthy; nor will there be an influx of inadequately qualified practitioners in registered occupations.

In an innovative move, the States and Territories agreed to empower the Commonwealth to pass a single Act which will override any State or Territory Acts or regulations that are inconsistent with the mutual recognition principles as defined in the Commonwealth Act. The States and Territories are effectively ceding power to one another through the mechanism of Commonwealth legislation.

Let me stress that the additional powers of the Commonwealth will be extremely limited. States and Territories are not granting extensive new powers to regulate goods and occupations. The Commonwealth was empowered to pass a single piece of legislation, namely the Mutual Recognition Act 1992. Amendments to this legislation will require unanimous agreement among all participating jurisdictions. There will be no new powers for the Commonwealth to unilaterally establish new standards or controls. Under the terms of the Intergovernmental Agreement on Mutual Recognition, which all heads of Government signed in May 1992, Commonwealth Ministers, like their State and Territory counterparts on ministerial councils, will be subject to the same controls and limits. A two-thirds majority vote of Ministers in support of a new standard will bind all the parties.

I will now explain the provisions of the Mutual Recognition (South Australia) Bill in greater detail. As I have already explained, the South Australian Bill will adopt the Mutual Recognition Act 1992 of the Commonwealth. Amendment of the Commonwealth Act will require approval by a designated person from each jurisdiction—for South Australia, this person is the Governor. The mutual recognition scheme is to last initially for five years, after which time the Governor has the power to terminate the adoption by proclamation. The mutual recognition principles in relation to goods and occupations are set down in clauses 9 to 11, for goods, and clause 17, for occupations, of the Commonwealth Act.

The legislation will not encroach on the ability of jurisdictions to impose standards for locally produced or imported goods nor for local people wishing to enter into an occupation.

Mutual recognition will not affect the ability of jurisdictions to regulate the operation of businesses or the conduct of persons registered in an occupation, nor is it intended to affect the registration of bodies corporate. Its focus is on the regulation of goods at the point of sale and regulation of the entry by registered persons into equivalent occupations in another State or Territory.

Laws that regulate the manner in which goods are sold—such as laws restricting the sale of certain goods to minors—or the manner in which sellers conduct their businesses are explicitly exempted from mutual recognition. For occupations, the legislation is expressed to apply to individuals and occupations carried on by them. As I indicated earlier, mutual recognition is intended to encourage the development of appropriate uniform standards where

these are considered necessary for reasons of protecting health and safety or preventing or minimising environmental pollution. Thus, provision is made for States and Territories to enact or declare certain goods or laws relating to goods to be exempt from mutual recognition on these grounds on a temporary basis, that is, up to 12 months. During that time, the intergovernmental agreement provides for the relevant ministerial council to consider the issue and make a determination on whether to develop and apply a uniform standard in the area under examination. Wherever possible, ministerial councils are to apply those standards commonly accepted in international trade.

In respect of occupations—the Commonwealth Administrative Appeals Tribunal will hear appeals against decisions of local registration authorities and will have the power to declare an occupation to be non-equivalent. This would occur in instances where there is no technical equivalence—in the sense that the activities that a practitioner is authorised to carry out under registration in two different jurisdictions are not substantially the same.

Declarations of non-equivalence may also be made by the Administrative Appeals Tribunal where there is technical equivalence but there are health, safety or pollution grounds for preventing practitioners from one State from carrying on that occupation in other States and Territories. Such declarations are to have effect for 12 months, during which time relevant State and Commonwealth Ministers have to agree on whether or not to develop and apply a uniform standard. If not, mutual recognition will apply.

The intergovernmental agreement also provides for a concerned State or Territory to refer a matter relating to a particular good or occupation to the appropriate ministerial council for a decision on whether or not to develop and apply a uniform standard. It is expected that where a ministerial council decides that a uniform standard is required in respect of a particular occupation, it will apply a national competency standard if such a standard is available. Heads of Government asked that the process of developing such standards be accelerated. It is hoped that national competency standards will be developed in the near future for all regulated occupations and professions. The legislation also provides for certain permanent exemptions in relation to goods. Heads of Government have agreed that the scheduled exemptions should be extremely limited, focusing on those products for which a national market is undesirable. Examples include pornography, firearms and other offensive weapons, gaming machines, and South Australia's container deposit legislation. Amendment of the exemptions schedules will require the unanimous agreement of all participating jurisdictions.

The mutual recognition principle in relation to goods is intended to operate by way of a defence. That is, it will be a defence to a prosecution for an offence against a law of a jurisdiction in relation to the sale of goods if the defendant expressly claims that the mutual recognition principle applies and establishes that the goods offered for sale had labels saying the goods were produced in or imported into another jurisdiction and he or she had no reasonable grounds for suspecting the goods were not produced in or imported into that other jurisdiction. It would then be up to the prosecution to rebut this or to say that the mutual recognition principle does not apply, because, for example, the goods did not comply with the requirements imposed by the law of the other jurisdiction.

The mutual recognition principle in relation to occupations will mean that a registered practitioner wishing to practise in another State can notify the local registration authority of his or her intention to seek registration in an equivalent occupation there. The local registration authority then has one month to process the application and to make a decision on whether or not to grant registration. Pending registration, the practitioner is entitled, once the notice is made and all necessary information provided, to commence practice immediately in that occupation, subject to the payment of fees and compliance with the various indemnity or insurance requirements in relation to that occupation. No other preconditions can be imposed on the entitlement to commence practice. Conditions can be placed on the practitioner's registration in order to achieve equivalence with the condition of registration applying in the first jurisdiction. In addition, the interstate practitioner is immediately subject to the disciplinary requirements and other rules of conduct in the new jurisdiction applicable to local practitioners.

The Government is confident that participation in this legislative scheme will provide major long-term benefits for South Australia. The unnecessary costs for producers in accommodating minor differences in regulatory requirements of States and Territories in relation to goods will be removed. Genuine competition across State and Territories borders will be encouraged as a result of procedures having more ready access to the Australian market as a whole. Labour mobility will be enhanced with the removal of artificial barriers linked to registration and licensing laws. As a result, we will be able to make better use of our labour force skills.

Australia's international competitiveness will rise as producers capitalise on the economies of scale made possible by mutual recognition. This is a process that will occur over the medium to long term. More efficient standards brought about by competition among jurisdictions should result in community requirements being met at a lower overall cost to both producers and consumers. Wider consumer choice and a greater responsiveness to the needs and demands of consumers among producers and regulators should result.

At the same time, as I pointed out earlier, the mutual recognition scheme is designed to ensure that there is no compromise on standards in the important areas of health and safety and environmental protection.

This legislative scheme is an historic initiative aimed at overcoming the regulatory impediments to the creation of a truly national market in goods and services in this country. I am pleased to acknowledge the substantial contribution made by all heads of Government in fostering and promoting this important development. It is a fine example of what can be achieved when all Governments co-operate and work together in the national interest.

This essential piece of legislation will produce benefits for this State. It will confirm that South Australia is part of the national, and world, economy. It will open up markets for South Australian manufacturers and producers in other States. It will ensure that South Australia attracts those businesses and people with professional expertise necessary to build the economy of the State.

I commend the Bill to the House.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1—Short title

The clause provides for the proposed Act to be cited as the Mutual Recognition (South Australia) Act 1993.

Clause 2—Commencement

The proposed Act is to commence on a proclaimed day.

Clause 3—Interpretation

The clause defines 'the Commonwealth Act' to mean the Mutual Recognition Act enacted by the Parliament of the Commonwealth.

Clause 4—Adoption of Commonwealth Act

The clause provides for the adoption of the Commonwealth Act under section 51(xxxvii) of the Commonwealth Constitution. The adoption will have effect for a period commencing on the day on which the State Act commences and ending on a day fixed by proclamation. The proclaimed day must be no earlier than the end of five years commencing on the date of commencement of the Commonwealth Act.

Clause 5—Reference of power to amend the Commonwealth Act

The clause refers certain matters to the Parliament of the Commonwealth, being the amendment of the Commonwealth Act (other than the Schedules to that Act), but only in terms which are approved by the designated person for each of the then participating jurisdictions. The designated person for a State is defined as the Governor, for the Australian Capital Territory is defined as the Chief Minister and for the Northern Territory is defined as the Administrator.

In a manner consistent with clause 4, the referral of those matters has effect from the commencement of the State Act until a day (occurring at least five years after the commencement of the Commonwealth Act) fixed by proclamation.

Clause 6—Approval of amendments

The clause enables the Governor to approve the terms of amendments of the Commonwealth Act.

Clause 7—Regulations for temporary exemptions for goods

The clause enables the Governor to make regulations for the purposes of section 15 of the Commonwealth Act (temporary exemptions).

Clause 8—Review of scheme

This clause requires the Minister to cause a report on the operation of the mutual recognition scheme to be prepared if the adoption of the Commonwealth Act is still in effect five years and six months after the commencement of the legislation. Copies of the report must be laid before both Houses of Parliament.

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

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION BILL

The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health, Family and Community Services) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the care and protection of children; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The Children's Protection Bill 1993 is being introduced as the third and final Bill to replace the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act 1979. It was a recommendation of the Select Committee on the Juvenile Justice System, November 1992, that there be separate legislation for the Youth Court, for Young Offenders and for Child Protection.

The first two Bills, the Young Offenders Bill and the Youth Court Bill were passed by the House on the 6th May, 1993. The Children's Protection Bill was tabled, 20th April 1993 as the final report of the Juvenile Justice Select Committee.

The Juvenile Justice Select Committee recommendation for separate child protection legislation provided an opportunity to review the provisions of the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act 1979 and the Community Welfare Act 1972. These Acts provide the current mandate for child protection and social welfare provisions in South Australia. At the time of the development of the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act in 1979 the identification of child abuse and neglect was a social phenomenon which was receiving little public attention or recognition. There was substantially less knowledge and expertise in the identification of child abuse or neglect and few specialised services to address the problem.

The legislation reflected the need for State intervention to protect children and has been instrumental in raising awareness in the community regarding the problem of child abuse. The extended provisions for mandatory notification in the Community Welfare Act ensured that the abuse of children was drawn to the attention of the Community Welfare Department. This led to a dramatic increase in the reporting of child abuse and neglect and the subsequent need for more State intervention into family life.

During the past decade, the increased identification of sexual abuse of children has placed additional demand on investigation and assessment services. Some of the investigation processes adopted for establishing information and evidence leading to civil proceedings and criminal prosecution in child abuse matters have been perceived by some sections of the community to be legally driven and adversarial.

The professionalisation of the child protection system, whilst being committed to protecting children from harm, has resulted in a public perception that State intervention largely excludes families from participation in the decisions made about their children. In some instances families have felt alienated and disempowered by a system supposedly devised to support families and to assist them to protect their children. Some families have felt forced into compromising positions by professionals imposing upon them decisions and plans for the future of their children.

Unfortunately, the Court system has also become increasingly adversarial. Some matters before the Court have resulted in protracted trials which have delayed the resolution of the day to day care and protection needs for children. At times this has left families at odds with the very agencies established to assist them and has inhibited the ability to work cooperatively to reach favourable and acceptable arrangements.

These trends and perceptions are not unique to South Australia. Similar factors have been the reason for major reform of child protection law nationally and internationally. Both Britain and New Zealand, who now have internationally acclaimed innovative child protection legislation, were driven by similar concerns.

In addition to these factors, an extensive range of literature and research relating to child protection issues has developed over the years. The knowledge base and expertise in this area continues to be challenged and systems developed to meet community needs. The International Society for the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect has influenced world trends contributing significantly to local reform and practice. In 1991 Australia formed the National Child Protection Council to raise awareness of, and develop strategies for, the prevention of child abuse.

At the State level there has been a number of reviews which have addressed the South Australia child protection system. These include the Child Sexual Abuse Task Force (1986), the Bidmeade Report (1986) which reviewed the procedures for children in need of care, the Cooper Report (1988) into the Department for Community Welfare Policies and Procedures with Respect to Children of Underaged Parents and the Report of the Select Committee of the Legislative Council on Child Protection (1991). Each report highlighted different aspects of the child protection system which required attention. Many recommendations of these reports have been implemented and have contributed to improved practice. However, it is now timely to consolidate these and other changes into an integrated legislative framework.

Children's rights have received increased international recognition in recent years. Australia has formalised its commitment to children by becoming a signatory to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. This Convention was incorporated into the Federal Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Act in January 1993. The preamble to the Convention recognises the rights of all members of the family and recognises the family as the fundamental group in society responsible for the growth and well-being of all members, particularly children. The Convention recognises that families should be assisted to assume fully their responsibilities within the community. The Convention states that in recognising the child in the context of the family, and in taking account of the rights and duties of the child's parents, the rights of the child should be given primary consideration in all action taken by public or private institutions. The State role then is to assist families to care for their children and to exercise jurisdiction only when the family cannot provide the child with adequate care and protection.

South Australia has been prominent in lobbying for the rights of children in Australia. The Children's Interests Bureau was established in 1983 and its functions expanded to include professional advocacy for children in the welfare system in 1988. The status of the child has been raised and a focus on the individual and unique needs of children in the family unit has been promoted. Unfortunately, and perhaps inevitably, there has been a developing perception in the wider community that advocating for children's rights has negated parental rights and responsibilities.

The process of developing and drafting the Children's Protection Bill has drawn on the growing body of child protection knowledge, international and national directions including recent legislative reforms, the recommendations of the various reviews, and current community attitudes and values.

Since the Select Committee tabled the Bill in April, there has been widespread consultation with government departments, non-government agencies and community groups. Thirty four written responses to a request for comment have been received and twelve personal consultations have occurred. Comments and recommendations received during the consultation process were taken into consideration when finalising the Bill which is before Honourable Members.

The Bill aims to establish a child protection system based on the premise that partnership between the community, families and the State will best provide for the care and protection of children. The intent is to address the inequalities of power between families and State agencies. The court will continue to be used for conflict resolution and child protection but wherever possible the child, the family and social workers will work together to find solutions acceptable to everyone. In so doing, the Bill aims to strengthen the family unit to provide safety for the child.

The objectives of the Bill are:

- to provide for the protection of children who are at risk
- to provide children with the stability of safe family care
- to recognise the family of the child as the unit primarily responsible for the protection of the child and to strengthen and support families in carrying out that responsibility

The importance of exercising the powers of the Bill in the best interests of the child are recognised and consistent with that now encouraged by Federal Law. A child who is capable of forming his or her own views will have those views sought and given due weight in accordance with the age and maturity of the child.

The focus of the Bill is on children being cared for and protected by their families. The Minister's functions support the promotion of partnerships between Government, non-government and communities in developing coordinated services to deal with child abuse and neglect. They promote education for parents and other members of

the community to address the developmental, social and safety requirements of children.

An important initiative in the legislation is the inclusion of provisions to specifically address the need of Aboriginal people to be involved in decisions concerning their children, to have preventive and support services directed towards strengthening and supporting Aboriginal community life, to reducing child abuse and neglect and to maximising the well-being of Aboriginal children generally.

When intervention occurs in Aboriginal families in relation to the protection or placement of their children, Aboriginal organisations will be consulted as to the most appropriate arrangements for the child. At all times the traditional and cultural values of the child's family shall be given due regard.

In addition to the specific needs of the Aboriginal population, the cultural diversity of South Australian society is recognised by provisions in the Bill which will ensure that intervention is culturally acceptable to the family and the child's sense of racial, ethnic or cultural identity is preserved and enhanced.

New provisions included under the Minister's functions are those which promote the collation and publication of data, statistics and research and encourage tertiary institutions to address child abuse and neglect in the curriculum of relevant courses.

Consistent with working cooperatively with families to assist them with the care and protection of their children, provision has been made for voluntary custody agreements to be made between guardians of the child and the Minister. Such agreements are time limited to prevent unnecessary separation between children and their families and to facilitate resolution of family breakdown.

Following the recommendation of the Juvenile Justice Select Committee to empower the Police to remove a child from a place of danger and to return the child home, provision has been made to facilitate this except when not in the child's interest to do so. In such circumstances, the Police must refer the matter to the Department for Family and Community Services. The Department will have the authority to provide safe care for the child until satisfactory arrangements can be made with the family for the child's care or until an application may be made to the Youth Court for an Investigation and Assessment order, but in any event will not be able to hold the child beyond the end of the next working day.

When a child is in imminent danger and at risk, necessitating removal from the child's guardian or custodian, the Police and/or an authorised Departmental officer will have the authority to remove the child. Following removal of a child, the Chief Executive Officer will provide care until the end of the next working day, by which time the child will have been safely returned to the family or an application will have been made to the Youth Court for an Investigation and Assessment order.

Departmental officers are provided with the authority to investigate the circumstances of a child whom they suspect on reasonable grounds to be at risk. Police officers (of a certain seniority) may for the purpose of an investigation, on the authority of a warrant, enter or break into premises, take photographs and require persons to answer questions and provide information relevant to the investigation. A warrant will not be required in certain situations of urgency, for example where any delay might lead to concealment or destruction of evidence.

Investigation and Assessment Orders are a major reform in the legislation. These orders will only be required in circumstances when further investigation into a matter is warranted because investigation into the circumstances of a child has been prevented from proceeding, or it is desirable that a child be protected during investigation or while a family care meeting is held. In these matters the Chief Executive Officer of the Department may apply to the Youth Court for an order to facilitate the investigation. The orders that the court may make include orders authorising that a child be taken for examination or assessment, that a child be in the custody of the Minister or that a party who resides with the child refrain from residing or having contact with the child. Other orders may be made as the Court thinks fit. These provisions remain consistent with the philosophy of the Bill which provides for intervention strategies which are the least disruptive to the child.

The commitment to family participation in decision making and planning for arrangements to care for and protect children is formalised by the introduction of the Family Care Meeting model. These meetings are the pivotal point of departmental intervention prior to Court action, and are modelled on the New Zealand Family Group Conference concept of family decision making. The New Zealand model has been adapted to best complement and incorporate the strengths of the existing South Australian child protection system. The model is premised on what we all know, that is, that children are more likely to develop and reach their potential whilst remaining in and being protected by their family network. This will best be facilitated by the family and the child's being involved in the decisions and arrangements for the child's future care.

In recognising the strength of families, it is desirable that support for the child during the Family Care Meeting process be from within the family. A family member who will act as advocate for the child and the child's interest and wishes can ensure that current and future needs for safety are met. Provision has been made in the legislation to ensure such support is provided and in addition, where necessary, may involve the services of a professional advocate. This system will least undermine family responsibility and ensure that the focus of the child is maintained in the arrangements that are planned from this meeting.

The role of the Care and Protection Coordinator in Family Care Meetings is to convene and facilitate the meeting and to ensure that the decisions and arrangements agreed upon meet the care and protection concerns. All arrangements made will address the need for review of the circumstances of the child. Shared participation in and responsibility for the decision making and planning for the child's safety will address the balance of power between professionals, the child and the family. The process of establishing adequate protection for children is the responsibility of the Minister for Family and Community Services and the adoption of the Family Care Meeting model in legislation and departmental procedures will best meet this responsibility.

To ensure that co-ordinators are adequately trained and supervised with a sound knowledge of departmental legislation, procedures and resources, co-ordinators will be employed by the Department.

In the event that arrangements for the safety of the child at risk cannot be agreed upon, and further action is necessary to protect the child, the Minister may, after having convened a Family Care Meeting, make application to the Youth Court for a care and protection order. A range of orders broader than those which currently exist have been designed to best facilitate intensive intervention to maintain the child in the family, to reunify the child with the family, or to provide for the child's long term future.

Care and Protection orders include undertakings by the guardian or the child with provision to supervise the child, orders granting custody of the child to suitable person(s) including the Minister, and short term guardianship orders. When short term orders are unable to meet the needs of the child a long term guardianship order may be made to provide alternative stable care arrangements for the child until the child reaches 18 years of age. An order placing a child under the guardianship of the Minister will be considered as a last resort. All children who are under the guardianship of the Minister will have their circumstances reviewed annually.

The need for services to children who have been under the Minister's care, to assist the transition to adulthood, has been recognised for some time. Provision is made in the Bill to assist this transition.

The responsibility of the Minister for the interstate transfer of children under guardianship is currently a provision of the Community Welfare Act. This provision is to be deleted from that Act and is incorporated in the Bill.

To assist the Court in its administration of mandatory notification matters, an additional provision has been made in the Bill to extend the power of prosecution from six months to two years to enable prosecution to occur in matters which may not be immediately evident.

In summary it is clear that the Children's Protection Bill is legislation which will be innovative in social welfare reform. It places a strong emphasis on the protection of children, the care of children at risk, the recognition of the rights of the child and balances this with the responsibility of the family and the State. It addresses the public concern for family involvement in the child protection system and increases and supports the responsibility of Aboriginal people for their communities. In so doing, it has encompassed international initiatives, recognised the strengths of the existing child protection infrastructure and provided new intervention mechanisms to ensure that South Australia continues to be at the forefront of meeting the needs of its children and families.

PART 1

PRELIMINARY

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

Clause 2 provides for commencement by proclamation.

Clause 3: Objects

Clause 3 sets out the objects of the Act, which are to provide children who are at risk with a safe and stable family environment, and to accord a high priority to assisting families to care for and protect their own children.

Clause 4: Principles to be observed in dealing with children

Clause 4 sets out a number of matters that the Youth Court and the Department must give serious consideration to in making any decisions or orders in relation to a child. However, the best interests of the child must always be the primary consideration. The child's own views as to his or her living arrangements must be sought and given serious consideration, provided that the child is capable of expressing them. All proceedings (of any kind) must be dealt with expeditiously and must be prioritised according to the degree of urgency of each case.

Clause 5: Provisions relating to dealing with Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander children

Clause 5 sets out special provisions for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children. The Minister will consult with both the Aboriginal and the Torres Strait Islander communities and declare a number of organisations to be recognised organisations for the purposes of the Act. Placement decisions or orders relating to Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander children cannot be made unless the relevant recognised organisation has first been consulted. When any decision or order is being made under the Act, regard must be paid to the submissions made by such an organisation, but where no such submissions have been made, regard must be had to Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander traditions and cultural values, as generally expressed by those communities. Finally, the decision maker must pay regard to the general principle that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children should remain within their communities.

Clause 6: Interpretation

Clause 6 provides some necessary definitions. The actions that constitute "abuse or neglect" of a child are set out. The definition of "family" includes a child's extended family, and in relation to an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander child, includes any other person deemed to be related to the child under the rules of kinship. The definition of guardian includes parents, legal guardians, legal custodians and any other persons who stand *in loco parentis* to the child. Subclause (2) defines what it is to be a "child at risk". A child is at risk if the child has been or is being abused or neglected, or if a person with whom the child resides has threatened to kill or injure the child. A child is also at risk if a person with whom he or she resides has killed, abused or neglected some other child and there is a reasonable likelihood that the child will suffer a similar fate. The third limb of the definition deals with the situation where a child's guardians are unable or unwilling to maintain the child, or exercise an adequate level of supervision and control over the child or have abandoned the child. The fourth limb of the definition provides that a child is at risk if he or she has been persistently absent from school without satisfactory excuse.

PART 2
THE MINISTER'S FUNCTIONS

Clause 7: General functions of the Minister

Clause 7 provides that the Minister is to perform some general functions in relation to the care and protection of children. First and foremost is the function of promoting a partnership approach between all sections of the community in dealing with the problem of child abuse and neglect. A strong emphasis is also put on the role of providing, or assisting others to provide educative programs aimed towards preventing or reducing the incidence of child abuse and neglect.

PART 3
CUSTODY AGREEMENTS

Clause 8: Voluntary custody agreements

Clause 8 provides that the guardians of a child and the Minister may enter into an agreement under which the Minister will have the custody of the child while the agreement exists. An agreement has effect for up to three months and can be extended, but no agreement (including any extensions) can go for longer than six months. Generally speaking, all the child's guardians will be involved in entering into such an agreement (certain exceptions are provided, such as where a guardian cannot be found). If the child is 16 or more, he or she can veto the entering into of an agreement and can terminate such an agreement. An agreement can be terminated at any time by any guardian who is a party to the agreement.

PART 4
NOTIFICATION AND INVESTIGATIONS
DIVISION 1—NOTIFICATION OF ABUSE OR NEGLECT

Clause 9: Interpretation

Clause 9 adds a further limb to the definition of 'abuse or neglect' for the purposes of this Division, i.e. where there is a reasonable likelihood (as set out in clause 6(2)(b)) of a child being killed, injured, abused or neglected.

Clause 10: Notification of abuse or neglect

Clause 10 re-enacts the provision (currently in the Community Welfare Act) that requires certain people to notify the Department of suspected cases of child abuse or neglect. Chemists will no longer be required to notify. It is made clear that it is only where the suspicion is formed during the course of a person's employment or official duties that the requirement to notify will apply. Subclause (4) enables a prosecution for an offence against this section to take place within two years.

Clause 11: Protection from liability for voluntary or mandatory notification

Clause 11 gives an immunity from civil or criminal liability for any person who notifies the Department of a suspected case of abuse or neglect, whether that person notifies voluntarily, or because he or she is required to do so under clause 10.

Clause 12: Confidentiality of notification of abuse or neglect

Clause 12 gives notifiers of abuse or neglect protection from being identified, except where a court allows evidence leading to identification to be admitted in any proceedings, or where identity is disclosed by a person acting in the course of official duties to another person also acting in the course of official duties.

Clause 13: Chief Executive Officer not obliged to take action in certain circumstances

Clause 13 makes it clear that the Department is not obliged to act on a notification of suspected abuse or neglect if satisfied that insufficient grounds exist for the suspicion, or that the child's care and protection are properly catered for.

DIVISION 2—REMOVAL OF CHILDREN IN DANGER

Clause 14: Interpretation

Clause 14 defines "officer" for the purposes of this Division to be any member of the police force, or any Departmental employee who has been authorised by the Minister to exercise the powers under this Division.

Clause 15: Power to remove children from dangerous situations

Clause 15 empowers an officer to remove a child from a situation of danger, provided that the child is not in the company of any of its guardians. The first duty is to try and return the child to his or her home, unless the officer thinks it would not be in the best interests of the child to do so.

Clause 16: Power to remove children from guardians

Clause 16 empowers an officer to remove a child from its guardians if the officer has reasonable grounds for believing that the child is a child at risk (within the meaning of the Act) and that the child's safety is in imminent danger. A Departmental officer can only exercise this power in any particular case with the prior approval of the Chief Executive Officer.

Clause 17: Dealing with a child after removal

Clause 17 grants custody of a child removed pursuant to this Division to the Minister, but only until the end of the next working day. If the Department needs to hold a child any longer, it will only be able to do so if authorised by an investigation and assessment order from the Youth Court.

DIVISION 3—INVESTIGATIONS

Clause 18: Investigations

Clause 18 empowers the Chief Executive Officer to investigate the circumstances of a child suspected to be at risk. The Chief Executive Officer can require a person who has examined, assessed or treated the child to furnish a copy of the resulting report. An authorised police officer (i.e. of or over the rank of sergeant or in charge of a police station) may assist an investigation, and may for that purpose, break into any premises, take photographs, etc., and require persons to answer relevant questions. A police officer may only exercise those powers on the authority of a warrant from a justice (which may be obtained in person or by telephone). However, a warrant is not required if the police officer has already been denied entry and has reasonable grounds for believing that to delay for the purposes of obtaining a warrant would prejudice the investigation. The usual immunities are given in relation to legal professional privilege and self-incrimination.

DIVISION 4—INVESTIGATION AND ASSESSMENT ORDERS

Clause 19: Application for order

Clause 19 empowers the Chief Executive Officer to apply to the Youth Court for an investigation and assessment order where it is suspected on reasonable grounds that a child is at risk.

Clause 20: Orders Court may make

The Court can order that the child be examined and assessed, that Departmental officers be empowered to question persons, that persons who have examined, assessed or treated a party to the proceedings (other than the child) can be required to furnish reports to the Chief Executive Officer, that the child be placed in the custody of the Minister, that a party cease living in the same place as the child, that a party have no contact with the child and may make ancillary orders. Orders cannot have effect for longer than four weeks, but may, if the Senior Judge of the Court so determines, be extended for one further period of up to four weeks. It is an offence carrying a penalty of division 8 imprisonment to contravene an investigation and assessment order.

Clause 21: Variation or discharge of orders

Clause 21 provides for an order under this Division to be varied or revoked on the application of the Chief Executive Officer.

Clause 22: Power of adjournment

Clause 22 permits only one adjournment of no more than seven days for an application under this Division. Certain interim orders can be made on such an adjournment, carrying the same penalty for breach.

Clause 23: Obligation to answer questions or furnish reports

Clause 23 obliges a person to answer a question or furnish a report where required to do so on the authority of an investigation and assessment order. The usual immunities are given in subclauses (2) and (3).

Clause 24: Orders not appealable

Clause 24 provides that no right of appeal lies against orders under this Division.

DIVISION 5—EXAMINATION AND ASSESSMENT OF CHILDREN

Clause 25: Examination and assessment of children

Clause 25 provides for the examination and assessment of a child where the Minister has the temporary custody of a child, either pursuant to the removal of the child under Division 2 or pursuant to an investigation and assessment order under Division 4. A doctor or dentist who is examining a child under this section may give the child treatment to alleviate any immediate injury or suffering and may do so notwithstanding that the guardians refuse or fail to consent to the treatment. However, if the child refuses nothing in this section will be taken to oblige the doctor or dentist to carry out the treatment.

PART 5
CHILDREN IN NEED OF CARE AND PROTECTION
DIVISION 1—FAMILY CARE MEETING

Clause 26: Family care meeting must be held in certain circumstances

Clause 26 obliges the Minister to hold a family care meeting before any application for a care and protection order is taken out in respect of a child.

Clause 27: Purpose of family care meetings

Clause 27 provides that the purpose of a family care meeting is to provide an opportunity for the child's family, in conjunction with a Care and Protection Coordinator, to make arrangements for the care and protection of the child and to review those arrangements from time to time.

Clause 28: Convening a family care meeting

Clause 28 provides that a Care and Protection Coordinator will convene and run a family care meeting. The Coordinator must consult as far as practicable with the child and the child's guardians in fixing the date, place and time for a meeting.

Clause 29: Invited participants

Clause 29 sets out who will be invited to attend a family care meeting. The persons who will be invited are the child, the child's guardians, other family members who the Coordinator thinks should attend, any person who has had a close association with the child and who the Coordinator thinks should attend and support persons nominated by the child and the guardians and who the Coordinator thinks would be of assistance in that role. The Coordinator is not obliged to invite the child or any other particular person if the Coordinator thinks it would not be in the best interests of the child to do so.

Clause 30: Constitution of family care meeting

Clause 30 sets out the persons who will constitute a family care meeting. These are the Coordinator, the invitees who wish to attend, a Departmental officer who will present the report on the child's circumstances, an Education Department or school nominee where truancy is involved, any professionals who have examined, assessed or treated the child, nominated by the Coordinator, a person nominated by the Coordinator to act as advocate for the child if the Coordinator thinks it desirable, and if the child is an Aboriginal or a Torres Strait Islander, a person nominated by the relevant recognised organisation.

Clause 31: Procedures

Clause 31 requires the Coordinator to try and ascertain the views of certain persons who will not be attending the meeting and to relay those views to the meeting. Most importantly, the Coordinator must allow the child's family, and the child if appropriate, to hold private discussions as to the arrangements for the child's care and protection. Decisions should be made, if possible, by consensus of the child, the guardians and the other family members. However, unless the Coordinator agrees that the proposed arrangements do properly secure the child's care and protection, then the family's decisions cannot stand. Decisions will be put in writing and signed by those concurring. Copies of the written record will be made available to the child, all guardians, those involved in implementing the arrangements and any other person who the Coordinator thinks has a proper interest in the matter.

Clause 32: Review of arrangements

Clause 32 provides for the review of arrangements. The Coordinator can convene a further meeting at any time and must do so if that was the decision of a previous meeting or if two or more of the child's family members who attend the previous meeting so request.

Clause 33: Certain matters not admissible

Clause 33 provides that evidence of anything said at a family care meeting is not admissible in any proceedings, but the written record of the decisions made at a meeting is admissible for the purpose of proceedings for a care and protection order.

Clause 34: Procedure where decisions not made or implemented

Clause 34 provides that the Minister will proceed to apply for a care and protection order if a family care meeting does not reach a decision, or if any decisions made are not implemented, but only if the Minister is of the opinion that the child is at risk, and needs the benefit of a care and protection order.

Clause 35: Guardians whose whereabouts are unknown

Clause 35 provides that the Division relating to family care meetings does not apply in relation to a guardian who cannot be found.

DIVISION 2—CARE AND PROTECTION ORDERS

Clause 36: Application for care and protection order

Clause 36 empowers the Minister to apply to the Youth Court for care and protection in respect of a child who is at risk and who needs the benefit of such an order. An application may also be made in respect of a child who is not at risk but who is subject to some informal care arrangements that should, in the interests of giving the child a settled and secure living arrangement, be formalised by a court order.

Clause 37: Court's power to make orders

Clause 37 sets out the orders the Court may make on such an application. An order may be made requiring the child or any guardian to enter into undertakings for not more than 12 months. A child may be required to be under supervision during such a period. Orders may be made granting custody of the child to the Minister or any other person for a period of up to 12 months. Guardianship can be granted to the Minister or to one or two other persons for a period not exceeding 12 months, or until the child turns 18. The Court may direct any party to the application to cease residing in the same premises of the child, to refrain from coming within a specified distance of the child's home, to refrain from having any contact with the child except in the presence of some other person, or to have no contact at all. Access orders and other ancillary orders may also be made. The Court is directed to take special care in making long term guardianship orders. Generally, such an order should not be made unless all other orders have failed to secure the child's care and protection. However, if a child has been subject to other orders under this section for a period of two years, serious consideration must be given to making such an order, in the interests of settling the child's long term future. Subclause (3) provides that a child cannot be taken from its parents on the ground that some other person living in the house has abused or neglected the child unless the Court is satisfied that the parents knew, or ought to have known, of the abuse or neglect.

Clause 38: Adjournments

Clause 38 provides for adjournments and the orders that may be made on an adjournment. The period between the lodging of an application and the commencement of the hearing must not exceed 10 weeks.

Clause 39: Variation or revocation of orders

Clause 39 provides for variation or revocation of orders on the application of any party to the proceedings.

Clause 40: Right of other interested persons to be heard

Clause 40 provides that the Court may allow interested persons to be heard in any proceedings under this Division.

Clause 41: Conference of parties

Clause 41 allows for conferences to be held between the parties to any proceedings under this Division.

Clause 42: Effect of guardianship order

Clause 42 makes it clear that a guardianship order gives exclusive guardianship rights to the appointee.

Clause 43: Non-compliance with orders

Clause 43 makes it an offence to contravene an order under this Division. The penalty is division 8 imprisonment.

PART 6
PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Clause 44: Evidence

Clause 44 provides that the Youth Court is not bound by the rules of evidence in any proceedings under this Act. Facts need only be proved on the balance of probabilities.

Clause 45: Service of applications on parties

Clause 45 sets out the persons who are parties to applications for orders under this Act. Provision is made for service of applications on parties.

Clause 46: Joinder of parties

Clause 46 allows the Court to join any person as a party to proceedings if the Court proposes to make an order binding on that person. For example, an order may be made requiring a person (who is not a guardian of the child) to cease living in the same premises as the child on the ground that that person has been abusing the child. The court will give such a person an opportunity to show cause why such an order should not be made.

Clause 47: Legal representation of child

Clause 47 requires a child to have legal representation in all proceedings under this Act, unless the Court is satisfied that the child has made an informed and independent decision not be so represented.

Whether or not a child is so represented, the Court must seek the child's view's as to his or her ongoing care and protection unless the child is not capable of doing so.

Clause 48: Orders for costs

Clause 48 empowers the Court to order costs against the Crown if the Court dismisses any application made by the Minister or the Chief Executive Officer.

PART 7
CHILDREN UNDER MINISTER'S CARE AND PROTECTION

Clause 49: Powers of Minister in relation to children under the Minister's care and protection

Clause 49 sets out the arrangements that may be made for a child who has been placed under the Minister's guardianship or of whom the Minister has the custody. The Minister must keep the child's parents informed as to the care of the child, unless of the opinion that it would not be in the child's best interests to do so. An authorised police officer may remove such a child from any place if necessary.

Clause 50: Review of circumstances of child under long term guardianship of Minister

Clause 50 requires the Minister to review at least annually the circumstances of a child placed under his or her guardianship until 18.

PART 8
INTERSTATE TRANSFERS OF CHILDREN UNDER GUARDIANSHIP, ETC.

Clause 51: Guardianship or care of children from other States or Territories

Clause 51 enables custody or guardianship of an interstate child to be assumed by the Minister if the child has entered, or is about to enter, this State.

Clause 52: Transfer of guardianship or custody to an interstate authority

Clause 52 provides for an interstate authority to assume custody or guardianship of a child in this State who is under the guardianship or in the custody of the Minister or the Chief Executive Officer pursuant to this Act or any other Act.

PART 9
MISCELLANEOUS

Clause 53: Referrals to the Chief Executive Officer

Clause 53 enables the Youth Court, a Youth Justice Coordinator or a police officer to refer a child who they believe to be at risk to the Chief Executive Officer.

Clause 54: Delegation

Clause 54 gives a power of delegation to the Minister and the Chief Executive Officer.

Clause 55: Duty to maintain confidentiality

Clause 55 requires a person engaged in the administration of this Act not to divulge personal information relating to a child, its guardians or other family members or any other person alleged to have abused, neglected or threatened the child. Persons who attend family conferences are under a similar obligation (except for the child and its family). The usual exceptions to the rule of confidentiality are given (e.g., where a person is required by law to divulge information).

Clause 56: Reports of family care meetings not to be published

Clause 56 prohibits the publication of reports of family care meetings.

Clause 57: Protection from liability

Clause 57 gives the usual immunity from civil liability to persons engaged in the administration of this Act.

Clause 58: Regulations

Clause 58 is the regulation making power.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 4 August. Page 95.)

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): At the outset I wish to make some remarks about the functions of Parliament, although let me say that I support the motion. In the first instance, I want to draw attention to a practice that is increasing in this Parliament but not yet to the extent that it has diminished the function of the Federation of the Commonwealth of Australia, that is, the practice of simply using Parliament as a rubber stamp rather than enabling the Parliament to recognise properly the due processes that have to be undertaken in determining what, if any, changes are to be made in the wider community—or indeed what, if any, change is to be made here within the institution that authorises those changes and gives them the weight of law.

In the first instance I refer to the time that was set aside during the proceedings on Tuesday, the first day of the sitting, for condolences and other business that had to be conducted in the House. If we do not respect the people who have served this community of South Australia and the nation and if we do not respect the institution in which they made this service and acknowledge it as being at the pinnacle of all institutions that can perform any service for the community, namely, the Parliament, then no-one else will.

There is ample evidence at the present time that the amount of respect which the rest of the community is paying to the institution of Parliament is being diminished, and that is because the function and proceedings of the Parliament are being prostituted by the media barons for the sake of providing entertainment. Journalists are required to look for the bizarre aspects of proceedings rather than reporting on the other aspects which secure a stable environment in which people can conduct their lives and which are intended to ensure that any change and the rate of that change is well considered before the change begins. We are as much to blame, I guess, as anyone else in that respect, in that by means unknown to me an agenda or timetable was set down on opening day, Tuesday, which really precluded members, myself in this case, from paying tribute to the help given, for instance, by Sir Condor Laucke to me and other members of my family. One could not contribute to that matter without encountering the wrath of other members in the Chamber

who recognised that, during the short time made available, only limited comment could be made in order to get through the other ceremonial matters before the House was to resume for the afternoon business.

However, I will now take the opportunity available to me and pay a tribute to Sir Condor Laucke, and I trust that the Speaker will do me the courtesy of subsequently forwarding my remarks and condolences to Sir Condor's family. Sir Condor was a great help to my mother and members of my immediate family and myself at a time during the late 1950s when we had considerable difficulties, there being 10 children in the family and my father only ever having been, during my lifetime, an orchard labourer. He had been injured in a motor car accident and was unable to work for a long time. Great help was given to him by his employer. In those days there were no laws and people who were responsible employers—and most were in rural areas—looked after their employees.

Sir Condor Laucke ensured that my mother and father knew where my father could get treatment and assistance in that predicament. Moreover, at the time I was personally trying to decide what best to do in my life, and although I do not consider it ought to be the purpose or responsibility of a member of Parliament, nonetheless Sir Condor took the trouble to inquire and ascertain from my mother what was happening to each of us. He suggested that the desire I might have to pursue an education specifically in agriculture should be taken up and he helped me by way of discovering for us where a scholarship might be available, as well as providing other assistance which finally made it possible for me to go to Urrbrae.

I acknowledge in that whole process the help of the Hon. Roger Goldsworthy who, at that time, had not been elected to this place. These kinds of things do mean a lot in that they provide us with the strength we have in the fabric of our community, and it is part of what I regard as a traditional role of a member of Parliament to ensure that the citizen knows what might be available in circumstances where that member of Parliament knows the difficulties being confronted by the constituent. The models of behaviour therefore provided by that fine example, particularly by Sir Condor, which was in keeping with what Sir Thomas Playford had also done, were the basic reasons, I guess, for my serious consideration of the values they had in life and why I sought to represent those same values in anything I might do later on.

At that time I did not contemplate ever becoming a member of this place, and I doubt whether it would have been possible had it not been for the help and encouragement of people like Sir Condor and other members of this place. I thank Sir Condor for that, and I offer my condolences and commiserations to Lady Rose and other members of the Laucke family.

I mention in passing that that was not the only instance in which members of the Laucke family were of great assistance to me. His brother and sister-in-law were a great help to me when I was trying to decide whether to contest preselection for the seat of Mallee late in 1978. And in responding to encouragement which they gave me, and encouragement from Sir Condor himself, I went out to the Mallee and offered myself for preselection, even though I was at that time only part way through my Masters Degree in Business Administration at Adelaide University. The rest of that is now history.

I now pass on from those remarks to other aspects of the Parliament and its purpose and our responsibility in the first instance to it as members of it. If we do not look to ensure that it survives in a form which makes it respected and respectable, we will deserve the ignominy with which history treats us. We will also deserve the contempt which people have currently developed for us to an even greater degree than they have and we may even yet lose the Parliament if we do not.

Parliament is not here for the convenience of the Government in getting its legislation through; it is not here to provide the press with something to write about; and it is not here to be the forum in which activity generates entertainment for the wider public. Yet all of those things seem to be the purpose for which it has been used. Members themselves, I guess, by their behaviour in allowing themselves to be seduced into any one or more of the roles which I have mentioned as the subject of comment, have allowed that process of degeneration of respect to continue. It must now stop.

Parliament, in the first instance, as I said earlier in these remarks, must ensure that there is clear understanding of the effects of any change that might be proposed and that the rate of that change is widely understood in the community. If we do not understand it, how in God's name can we expect the wider community to understand?

Throughout the past 10 years or so that I have been here I have noticed the increasing extent to which Ministers bring in legislation that they do not understand and then attempt to cover up that ignorance. I think that is appalling. Worse than that, they use their minders, through the media, to hide their incompetence and deceit from the public. That is an abuse of this place and the process for which this place was first established and the very name 'Parliament' is intended to mean.

The Federal Parliament is an even better illustration of the malaise to which I refer. Things are much worse there, yet there are some idiots in that Parliament who would have us believe that the best interests of Australian society would be served if we were to abolish the States and the bicameral system that would be left in Canberra and simply use that institution as a rubber stamp. In those circumstances, for God's sake, your sake, Sir, and my sake, members of the unicameral Parliament that remained would not even have to attend the sittings.

I am sure they could change Standing Orders to enable a vote to be taken electronically from wherever they happened to be, doing whatever they sought to do on any day of the week, month of the year, or year of time in which the decision was to be made. We could not ever hold them accountable. Ministers in this place over the past 10 years have denied personal responsibility for decisions that have been made by their departments and the impact of those decisions on citizens. They even admit ignorance of it.

Mr Atkinson: Give us an example.

Mr LEWIS: I do not have the time to provide examples of the Ministers, let alone the number of instances in which they have done that. The honourable member would know daily in Question Time the instances in which Opposition members ask questions of which Ministers have no notice—and that is another abuse of this place; the way Ministers get Dorothy Dix questions asked by members from their own side. They have no information, and so when they are asked such a question they simply say, 'I will obtain a report', or they stand up and quote the head of the department. However, the buck stops with the Minister.

Increasingly I know that legislation has been introduced in this place that provides that the Minister, or the person to whom the Minister delegates the authority and responsibility,

and more recently the director or CEO of the department, whatever title that person may have, is able in law to accept responsibility and delegate it without this place having anyone in it accountable for that authority, its exercise or delegation. I think that is bad because it means that the public no longer has trust in us as members to make the Government accountable because the Government itself passes laws which remove the necessity for it to be accountable.

Mr Atkinson: Is this going to be remedied after the election?

Mr LEWIS: It had better be, and you can count on my support, Mr Deputy Speaker, to ensure that whatever action is necessary will be taken to draw attention to that need. If you are here, Sir, you can count on my support for anything you may wish to do in that regard, and that is regardless of whom it may be and where they may ultimately end up in this place with respect to who has responsibility for the conduct of business here.

We need to take better control of our proceedings and certainly not allow ourselves to degenerate to the mockery which has arisen in the House of Representatives. They mock Parliament, mock the institution and the constitution which established it as an institution and their own membership of it, and they bring the kind of contempt that is abroad in the public, not only on themselves—and God knows they deserve it, and so does Keating as Prime Minister, more particularly than any other member that I can remember having taken a place in that House—but also on us. We suffer in consequence of their misbehaviour and their abuse of what Parliament is intended to be.

Mr Deputy Speaker, let me also draw attention to the stupidity of some of the things the Government is doing without due regard, as was mentioned in the address we were given at the opening. Under law and order we see:

> My Government will continue its program of codification and modernisation of the criminal law with a Bill—

this is the part to which I take exception—

> to abolish the distinction between felonies and misdemeanours.

Members may ask, 'What are you on about?' I will further explain. If we abolish the difference between felonies and misdemeanours in the law, we will also have to amend the South Australian Constitution. In what way? At present—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Spence to order and look forward to hearing his contribution when it is made in this place. In the meantime, the member for Murray-Mallee has the floor.

Mr LEWIS: The reason why this is foolish is that any member of Parliament or citizen who commits a felony can no longer be or seek to be elected to this place. However, I doubt whether a majority of us, and a great majority at that, have not committed misdemeanours from time to time. Of that majority, I am sure that most of us would probably have had that misdemeanour successfully prosecuted against us. I am not saying that the only misdemeanours committed by members of Parliament are those for which they have had to pay a fine to expiate them. Certainly members would have committed misdemeanours in addition to those that might have been noticed. Nobody is perfect. But a felony is another matter.

If we remove the distinction between the two, what are we to do? Do we accept that any citizen committing a misdemeanour is no longer fit to be a member of Parliament? Will we then say that it is all right for people who would commit felonies now to be members of Parliament and/or continue to be members of Parliament in the event that an honourable member committed the felony and was found guilty of it? I just wonder whether the Government has considered that aspect. The casual inquiries that I have made in the corridors of buildings around this city (but not this building) over the past couple of days indicate to me that no consideration was given to the importance of that distinction as it affects eligibility for membership or continuing membership of this place.

I will further consider the remarks that were made in that speech about law and order and tie them in with the remarks that the Government had made on its behalf about health. I declare an interest in the process. My wife is currently involved in a business which sells alarms to people who suffer from some infirmity. A number of these alarms are available in the market place, but only one receives very high commendation, or much commendation at all, from Government agencies in this State and interstate. That is the one that my wife is providing to people who seek it.

Mr Holloway: Is this a commercial?

Mr LEWIS: It is not a commercial: I am pointing out that the Government may be accurate and sensible in saying that it is caring for the ageing. Its intention is that older people on low incomes who purchase security hardware will get extra help; it will be subsidised. In my judgment, that equipment should and could be modified so that it meets certain standards. At present there is no standard, but there should be. There ought to be standards about whether it is waterproof or shockproof by a good measure of reason so that it does not collapse if it is knocked about. It should be connected to a system which will enable those who wish to use the alarm to do so whenever they are threatened with assault in their homes or otherwise fear for their security and safety or if they injure themselves through a fall or suddenly feel seriously ill—be it a heart attack or whatever. I commend the Government for what it is doing in that regard, but I hope it will go far enough to ensure that the trade provides those alarms. I am not engaging in a commercial: I am drawing attention to what I see as a deficiency in what could be provided at reasonable and inexpensive cost as an extra security to members of the general public.

As you would know, Mr Deputy Speaker, the cards that we use to get in and out of this building and will soon have to use to get around the building use the kind of technology which now make that possible. The use of transponders is inexpensive. The equipment would not have to be linked through the telephone system: it could go through the satellite system. However, in the first instance, we might encourage those players in the market providing the equipment to extend the range of circumstances in which the buyers of it can use it to protect themselves against the many threats to their health and welfare in their homes. It is a good idea. It is less expensive than taking older people who cannot defend themselves or who might suddenly become ill and putting them into institutional or semi-institutional care. That is very expensive. It is much cheaper to provide them with a simple alarm. It will be worth only $200 or perhaps $500 and there will be very little expense in a recurrent form to keep it going—a dollar a week or so. That is clearly a more sensible and appropriate course of action to follow from the point of view of benefit to the public purse as well as satisfaction to the ageing citizen.

Another remark to which I wish to draw attention with regard to caring for the ageing and which has been repeated

elsewhere in this Chamber is that statistical evidence shows that people over 60 years are less likely than any other age group to become victims of crime. If the member for Unley has those statistics, why did he not incorporate them when making his speech about that fact yesterday? I should like to see the statistics which show that *pro rata* people over 60 are less likely to become victims of violent crime than other age groups. And he was talking not about all crime but about violent crime.

I turn now to the remarks that were made about safety in the workplace. I do not see why it is necessary for the Government to kowtow to Federal or, as it were, external and externally determined functions in that respect. We live in a federation and we have a responsibility as a State to take care of our own according to what we see as the real risks in that regard. I resent the scare tactics that the Labor Party is already starting to use in order to frighten people into thinking that the Liberal Party will do some injury to them when it is elected to Government following the next election, especially in this domain.

Mr Meier: It was pretty obvious during Question Time today.

Mr LEWIS: It was very obvious during Question Time today, it was yesterday, and it has been in the public domain before that. The Minister, the member for Florey (who will not be here after the next election), is trying to scare the general public into believing that collectively we will do them a mischief.

Mr Meier interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Goyder will get the call later.

Mr LEWIS: He misrepresented the Liberal Party and the policies that we have recently put out. We do have a safety net. Every employee, every wage earner, will be able to remain under their award if that is their wish. There will be a minimum wage for those not covered by an award, which must be complied with in law. That is part of our policy, too. In addition to that, there will be an employees' advocate in the event that someone who is not a member of a union has a complaint—someone may not want to join or there may be no relevant union. The employees' advocate, or ombudsman, if you like, will be there as a person with an office to whom an employee can go with a complaint about their employer or their conditions of employment to have it investigated to see what has been done and, if there is a breach in law, the employer will be prosecuted. It is grossly inaccurate to the highest possible degree—without using the word 'lie', and I do not wish to use that word—and grossly improper for the Minister to stand in this place or anywhere else and try to convince the members of the general public in South Australia that we would do anything irresponsible in labour relations or in regard to terms and conditions of employment.

Let me now turn to another matter in which I find the Minister of Labour Relations has failed to do his duty, in legislation at least. Why under the WorkCover scheme does the job provider—the employer—have to pay by law for the WorkCover premium when paying superannuation? That is a part of the component, the same as those other payments made are also a component on which the WorkCover levy has to be paid. Yet, when an employee has a claim and they are off work, the employer still has to meet that superannuation component whilst the worker is receiving the WorkCover payments. The WorkCover payment, which goes straight to the worker, having been calculated on the superannuation levy, does not cover the superannuation levy. I do not think it is fair that they have it both ways. That is just not according to Hoyle. It is as crook as hell.

Let me cite a couple of other instances in which WorkCover needs to be looked at. Why is it that an injury, so-called, endemic in an industry such as shearing—and that is the case I want to use—should become the cost responsibility of the individual contractor at the time that the worker becomes unable to work through an industrial problem that arises through constant shearing? His back might wear out, to put it quite simply, and it might have been wearing out over several years. I have correspondence from doctors and physiotherapists that illustrates that that was the case, going back several years. But finally when the discs gave out and the pain became so intense that the poor fellow could not go on, as he was working with a particular contractor, that contractor has had his premiums loaded up to the extent that he has to try to collect another 7½¢ a sheep, because that shearer happened to be working for him at the time he decided he simply could not go on as the pain was too intense.

That has put that contractor out of business, because things are so competitive these days that you cannot do it. That is an industry problem, not an individual employer's problem, and it should be borne by the industry; that man should not have been put out of business as a shearing contractor. It appals me that that is the case.

The last instance involves a quarry worker who now finds that, because he has injured himself and has gone back to work part-time in a bottle shop, he cannot afford to run his car or to insure it, and he cannot get to his physiotherapist because the amount of money paid to him to do that is insufficient. The amount of money he recovers from WorkCover, which is supposed to look after him, is not adequate for the purposes.

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

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I have pleasure in supporting the adoption of the Address in Reply and, as is the tradition, I pay my respects to the relatives of those former members of the Parliament who passed away during the parliamentary recess. It was with sadness that this morning I attended the funeral of a life-long friend, Sir Condor Laucke. I first met Sir Condor many years ago in Greenock, in my home town of Tanunda, and in Freeling in the Barossa Valley. Sir Condor said, 'I can remember you the day you were born.' He reminded me of that on many occasions during my parliamentary career, and even the last time that I met him when he was the President of the Senate in Canberra, when he was introducing me to some of his colleagues, as he would do with a typical wry smile on his face, he pointed to the ground and said, 'I can remember you when you were so high.' My parents knew Condor going back to the 1930s. Today was a very sad day in the political history of the Barossa Valley in losing one of its favoured and revered persons in Condor Laucke.

We extend to Lady Rose and her family our deepest sympathy and thank them for allowing Condor to give so much of his time and his life to the district that he loved and to the people of the district, for whom he did everything he could to help them make life a little better and easier. Certainly, the encouragement that he always gave everyone was something that every politician should aspire to in that respect.

Dick Geddes is another man who was well known to my parents in the latter years as the member for the Legislative Council for the Mid North of the State. Dick was a great bloke; I can remember that, when I first came into this House, he would pull me aside and say, 'Hey, listen lad' and give a little bit of friendly advice, and it was the type of advice that I very much respected. I found him to be not the traditional legislative councillor as I knew them in those days of the 1970s but someone who was, I would say, a man's man. He was truly a good representative of the people from the Mid North of our State. Dick's passing was sad from that point of view.

Bert Teusner is another man who knew me all my life, and I knew of Bert Teusner, because he was from Tanunda. He was the first person to ever show me through this House. That was well into the 1950s, when I was the Treasurer of our Church at Warradale. We came here one night as a group, and Bert ushered us through the Parliament and told us what it was all about. I thought, 'No way; you would never get me to volunteer or have anything to do with politics, let alone be a member of Parliament.' Little did I know that some 15 years later I would stand for a seat which the Party did not think we could win and I won it; I have been here ever since. I thank Bert Teusner for my interest. I had never expected to be here, but I always held Bert Teusner in very high regard, again as another outstanding personality from the Barossa Valley.

Another member to whom we pay respect today is Hugh Hudson. I first met Hugh when I was President of the Bank Officials Association—our union. I needed to talk to someone from the Government and Hudson was delegated to meet with me. I met him in the lounge and we had a very long talk, and that happened on many occasions. Hudson was the type of Minister who seemed to be able to handle his portfolio with ease; nothing was too much trouble and, when he had a spare moment, he liked to sit on the lounge in front of the television to relax. You could strike up a conversation with Hugh on almost any subject. He and I used to talk about the State Bank, would you believe, and about various Government authorities which, I always said, I would merge if I were in government; I told him what I would do if I were a socialist Treasurer.

Lo and behold, the Government did it—and made an absolute disaster of it. But if Hudson had been here I do not think that would have occurred. Hudson and I would never have allowed that to happen. We had some great long talks on economics and South Australia. For someone who was not really a South Australian, he had a lot of time for and really valued South Australia as a great State, a great place in which to live and to be involved, and there is no doubt that Hudson gave the best part of his life to South Australia. Certainly, I was critical of Hugh when he set the recent system for water rates. He knew that and we had a talk about that, too. He had his opinion and I had mine, but he was the sort of person who was not frightened to change his mind, and he did that.

At the same time, I found him (as Minister of Education) the only Minister of Education to whom you could get straight through when you rang up his office. When we wanted to expand the property at Plympton High School it was Hugh Hudson who agreed to acquiring Myer oval, which was bought for some $750 000, if my memory serves me right. I said 'Why not buy the adjoining tennis club and bowling green and make it a total complex for all the Education Department staff and the high school? Let's really do something for sport.' But he thought that was a bit rich.

Now they are trying to sell off that second oval and we are battling to retain Plympton High School, although I think we will be able to save it. Of course, the oval now is prime real estate, and I hope it is not lost, because it is of benefit to young people and to the community in that area. At the same time, Camden Primary School was inadequate. It did not have a playing field; it was just patchy bitumen, with the toilet block some 60 or 70 metres from the main school building, which meant that the students got wet during the winter if they had to go to the toilet. They had to negotiate a whole lot of potholes and other dangers of a school yard, and Hudson said, 'If you get the school council to agree, we will build a DMAC school about 500 metres away from the existing site on a block of land the department owns in an industrial area, and we will run this as an experiment to see how it goes. We will landscape it and use all the modern techniques we can, with open space teaching.' The school council agreed and it turned out probably one of the most successful experiments in the western suburbs as a school.

I well remember helping the school council. We would go to fetes, we would have cabarets at the Camden hall, and if we raised $100 it was a great night. Now you go to a Camden school council meeting and we consider where we will deposit the surplus funds on the short-term money market! We are talking to high finance dealers when we are dealing with the funds of the Camden Primary School, because that school council, from those days, worked hard. It accepted the challenge given it by Hudson, but also accepted the challenge that I gave it; that we would never let the school be placed at risk.

There was a threat some three years ago that it should be closed, after a study in the western suburbs, but we hung on to Camden school. It is a wonderful school, offering children in that area not only a first class education but a highly technological one, through the use of computers, music and sport. So, the school council worked extremely hard. It even raised $60 000 to ensure that a multipurpose hall could be built for the benefit of the students and the community. It is a wonderful asset. So yes, Hugh Hudson, you served the State of South Australia very well. We never agreed: we were poles apart on economic issues but, at least, I always had his respect and I respected him for what he did for South Australia.

Each of their families should remember that those of us who served with them have nothing but admiration for what they did in their various ways. I suppose we are all reminded that each one of us—and you, Mr Speaker, often remind me—is here for different reasons, we have different perceptions, and we all make a contribution in different ways—and the State has been far richer for that. That is probably one of the greatest pluses of our democratic system. We will never be satisfied with it: we will never be satisfied that we have the best system and we are always trying to improve it.

That is part of its success, and we look to the younger members of Parliament who will come up in the future to ensure that there will be steady, sound, worthwhile progress for South Australia. That is what worries me. At present, in South Australia we are in a terrible bind. We have the unique and historical situation of a Government held together by three independent members of Parliament and, whilst it is a great success for the Labor Party to be able to form a coalition, it has been extremely damaging to the State because no overseas or interstate investor will invest in South Australia; no-one will come forward in South Australia and expand while you have a destabilised Government.

That is the terrible price that this State has had to pay over the past four years. I well remember all the promises and statements made by the former Premier as to what he was going to achieve for South Australia. He even had the gall to circulate a letter in my electorate saying that a handful of people will decide the issue and that we look forward to a very rosy, prosperous future for all South Australians. It is all very well delegating authority and all very well to say 'Let the managers manage'. I have always believed in that concept but, if you have the right managers, you still have to supervise them. That is where the previous Premier let down the whole of the State.

That disastrous $3 150 million loss of the State Bank has created a huge millstone around the necks of the taxpayers of South Australia; so much so that every South Australian has been saddled with a debt of $9 378 000. That means that, as long as we live, as long as our children and their children live, we will have to meet the payments of that debt. That is the problem when you have a State Bank, a State Government owned bank guaranteed by the State. That is the trap that should have been picked up in the early 1980s as the then General Manager of that bank and the board did pretty well what they liked. They went unchecked; they would not countenance any criticism or anyone saying 'Hey, what are you up to, fellows? What are you trying to do?'

If members recall, back in 1985 I asked a question in relation to why we were lending about $50 million to a shopping centre in Victoria when that money, in my opinion, should have been invested in South Australia. That $50 million could have encouraged people and built many houses. It could have helped the building industry and could have helped many young people obtain reasonably priced housing in South Australia. But no: that was the will and the whim of that General Manager, and there have been questions from there on. I asked something like 35 questions in the following period as to what Marcus Clark and the board were really up to. It was a pretty wimpy sort of board but, at the same time, when you have a person of the calibre of Marcus Clark, the fallback situation should have been within our own State Treasury, which was being provided with reports on a monthly basis, not only from the bank but the counter-checking reports were coming through from the Reserve Bank. That is where the whole issue fell down: somebody in Treasury was not doing his job.

The Premier (as Treasurer) was not doing his job by saying 'Hey, where are these figures?' or, if he was, he certainly was unable to interpret the figures or analyse what was going on. We are now paying about $2 million interest every day to fund the debts accrued by the current Government. The State's total liabilities—that is, the unfunded borrowings and liabilities—exceed $14 000 million. In June 1982, during the Tonkin Liberal Government, the net State debt was $2 600 million, and as at June 1992 our net State debt was $7 268 million, and now we are told it is approaching $8 000 million, which is absolutely disastrous.

In the period 1982 to 1992, on the figures that have been provided to us so far, the State debt has risen by $1 279 000 a day. No organisation, no Government, no country and no State the size of South Australia can afford to continue at that rate. It is a fact of life; we just cannot survive if we are going into debt at that ratio, let alone paying the interest. That is what we are doing: we are paying interest on interest. It very much annoys me to think that we are not making very much progress. We have seen the State Government reduce the Government work force. In fact, in 1991 there were 638 voluntary separation packages; in 1991-92 it had risen to 1 952; as at February 1993 there had been 3 200; and the estimated figure for 1992-93 is 942. So there have been something like 3 700 voluntary separation packages from June 1990, and it is expected to be somewhere in the vicinity of 8 000 by the end of the next financial year.

That is a huge number of public servants who have disappeared from the State work force. Some people might say that it is all very well, that it has been done to save money and, even though the voluntary separation packages have cost huge sums of money, that is an investment in the future. That is not the case, because you can go only so far to reduce your work force and increase your productivity and offer all sorts of incentives. There comes a day when you have to begin replacing your ageing work force. That is not being done: very few junior employees are being taken on to be trained to operate our Public Service in the future.

The taxpayers of this State are paying very dearly for a run-down of services, and to turn around and anticipate what a new State Government would do is totally wrong, because a new State Government will have to rescue the State; it will have to provide an efficient and effective Public Service. We cannot run it down at the rate at which that is occurring and at the same time encourage expansion and development. That is not going to happen unless service facilities are provided by the State. The Government has to make a decision in that respect. I am quite worried about what has happened in South Australia, because it all comes back to the State Bank and where we are headed with the State Bank.

It is well known within my parliamentary Party that I do not favour selling off the State Bank. I did not agree with the merger, but I was outvoted umpteen numbers to one. I would encourage both the State and Federal Governments to act quickly to remove the liability on the State Government—and, therefore, the taxpayers of South Australia—in respect of the guarantee for State Bank depositors. I would transfer that to the Federal Government. Page 27 of the Reserve Bank's annual report for the year ended 30 June 1992 states:

> The Reserve Bank has no statutory authority over State banks and its prudential supervision of them had been based on voluntary undertakings from the banks concerned. During the past year the bank has moved to a more satisfactory basis by entering into formal agreements with the South Australian and Western Australian Governments for the supervision of the State Bank of South Australia and the R&I Bank of Western Australia, respectively. These agreements provide for the bank to exercise powers similar to those it has in relation to Banking Act banks, except for powers to take control of the banks and manage them in the interest of depositors; the liabilities of State banks are fully guaranteed by the Governments which own them. The agreements also provide for direct communication between the bank and the relevant Governments. The New South Wales Government is to introduce legislation which will bring the State Bank of New South Wales under the Banking Act and, thereby, fully and formally under the Reserve Bank's supervision.

I recommend to the Treasurer and to the Premier that this Government do exactly the same; in other words, hand over the main supervision and control under the Government guarantees to the Federal Government and the Reserve Bank. That way, we the taxpayers know that our liabilities and obligations have been and will be met, but at the same time that liability should not increase. I was concerned that at one stage, as the State Bank of South Australia expanded willy-nilly and the assets of the bank exceeded some $20 billion, so did in theory the liability under the State Government guarantee. With the huge borrowings of SAFA (South Australian Government Financing Authority), again about

$20 billion-odd, at one stage this State probably had liabilities under guarantees of some $40 billion. There is no way in the world that the South Australian Government or the taxpayers could ever have met those liabilities had there been a world-wide economic collapse.

It is ridiculous to allow a small State such as ours to undertake such liabilities. That is what happens when there is lack of supervision of the operation of the banking system as we know it. In Sydney on 19 April 1990, Bernie Fraser addressed the annual conference of the Australian Association of Permanent Building Societies in respect of aspects of the Reserve Bank's supervisory function, as follows:

> We certainly do not like to think of a bank failing, and our prudential guidelines should help to avoid such a prospect. However, contrary to some impressions, we do not guarantee the ongoing operation of banks. Our prime objective is to protect banks' depositors. *In extremis* we could assume control of a bank in trouble. The Banking Act also provides that, in the event of a wind-up, repayment of deposits in Australia be given priority over all other liabilities. In a sense, shareholders are expected to look after themselves—'caveat investor'. We are not charged with protecting banks from losing money or from acting recklessly in the belief that the authorities will bail them out. Losses are always regrettable but, as long as they are not so large as to threaten the interests of depositors or the stability of the banking system, they do not indicate a failure of supervision. In the ultimate, any bank on the verge of failure—and I hasten to say that we have had none of these—should exit the industry in what we would hope would be an orderly and timely manner which avoided losses to depositors and instability in the rest of the banking system.

Fraser goes on, referring to the powers of the board:

> It is not easy to say precisely what went wrong. This is because it is not easy to disentangle the effects of the economic cycle from more fundamental problems, such as possible flaws in deregulation and weaknesses in prudential standards and problems in other areas such as failures of directors to meet their obligations.

Bernie Fraser summed up quite well the banking situation in South Australia.

I go along with the recommendations of the Leader: I agree that we should try to partially privatise the State Bank of South Australia. I would be agreeable to, say, 49 per cent (50 per cent at the most) of the value of shares in the State Bank of South Australia being offered to South Australians as a way of raising capital to reduce some of the bank's debt. In addition, the bank should be prudently managed so that the debt can be repaid. I understand that the good bank, as we are led to believe, will make a profit of about $80 million last financial year and that the so-called bad bank—the section that has been removed and separated with all the bad loans—will lose another $230 million. That means that overall there will be a net deficit of about $150 million, although at no stage will the depositors of the bank be at risk: there is no risk to anybody in that respect. The bank will be able to operate quite safely as far as the people of South Australia are concerned.

If the bank is sold in its entirety, and the Premier is on record as saying that he does not care who buys it—whether it be an Asian bank or anyone else—then we will see an asset stripping exercise which will entail staff reductions. It does not matter what guarantees are made, because the bank would be a cheap buy. With 3 000 staff there would be plenty of room for an overseas bank to cut the staffing levels down to the core, and that would be disastrous for South Australia and I would not want to see that happen. The State Bank would represent a good investment for an Australian bank, which could come in, take over, reduce the staff through the duplication of branches, and immediately pick up another $100 million to $150 million. That would be disastrous as well and would serve no purpose at all.

We have to get out and sell the bank to the people of South Australia. We must reinforce the confidence in the bank for the benefit and the advantage of South Australia. Let us look after South Australia first. I fail to see any logic in having a bank operating in South Australia to promote progress and development of the State and to encourage and support our manufacturing and rural industries if we are going to take deposits in this State and lend them to another State or overseas.

As at March this year, if we look at the amount of deposits and assets that the State Bank had overseas—and this is what I do not like—we have foreign liabilities of the State Bank of $3 947 million with assets of $724 million. This leaves a deficiency of $3 223 million. That is how much we owe overseas, and that is where our money is going. Hard earned South Australian dollars are going overseas in interest payments. Who knows where that money was borrowed from: it came from all the tax havens in the world. Let us develop South Australia for the benefit of South Australians. Let us get back to development and progress and create valuable and worthwhile employment for the 40 per cent of the unions that are out of work and for the population at large.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. At the outset I wish to commend Her Excellency the Governor for the way in which she presented the Address prepared for her by the Government of the day. I would also like to commend Her Excellency for the magnificent way that she carries out her responsibilities in this State. I refer particularly to the amount of time she spends travelling around the State. There is no doubt that our present Governor is one of the most travelled Governors that we have known in this State. She is well respected and, as I said earlier, carries out her responsibilities well indeed, and I commend her for that.

Along with my colleagues I would like to add my condolences to the families of Sir Condor Laucke and the Hon. Hugh Hudson, who recently passed away. Sir Condor and Lady Rose Laucke were close friends of my parents. I have admired Sir Condor and respected the contribution that he made in this State over a long period. Much has been said about his responsibilities and the way that he carried them out and the representation that he undertook on behalf of local constituents at State and Federal level and also his capacity as Lieutenant Governor in representing all South Australians.

I join with my colleague the member for Murray-Mallee in expressing some concern in that little time was provided for members of this House to add their comments to the condolences that were made on opening day. I hope that this will be looked at closely and that in future adequate provision is made so that all those who wish to contribute to condolence motions are able to do so.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson was also a person for whom I had considerable respect for the work that he did, particularly as a Minister in this place and particularly as the Minister of Planning. When I became the Minister of Planning in 1979 I was quickly made aware of the respect that officers in the old Department of Urban and Regional Affairs had for the Hon. Hugh Hudson who, as the previous Minister, had carried out his duties well indeed in that portfolio. I always found, as so many of my colleagues have said, that he was an easy person to communicate with. He enjoyed life tremendously, and in my early days in this place I much appreciated

the contributions that he made in debates. Certainly, there were many times when I did not agree with what he said, but I always admired the way in which he said it and the capacity that he had, particularly to retain information, and that, too, has been referred to on a couple of occasions by my colleagues.

During this debate there are a number of matters that I want to raise with respect to the community. I wish to refer to many issues affecting the portfolios for which I now have responsibility. First, I refer to the environment portfolio. I was most interested to read in the *Advertiser* of Saturday 10 July that the State of the Environment report was to be released that day. As the House would know, this is one of the most important reports relating to the environment portfolio.

This report is brought down on average about every four or five years, and I understand that it is five years since the last State of the Environment report was brought before this House and made public. I was concerned about what I was able to gather was included in that report, and I was also concerned—and continue to be concerned—that, so far as I can ascertain, the report has still not been released publicly. That is not good enough, and I hope that the Minister will indicate just what the situation is in respect of that report. We read in the *Advertiser*, and obviously the *Advertiser* was able to procure a copy of the report before anyone else saw it—

Mr Becker: They've got a leak.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It is obvious that it fell off the back of a truck, or the *Advertiser* was able to get it from somewhere else. Perhaps the Minister made it available to the *Advertiser* rather than making it available to the general public and this House. If that is the case, that is a deplorable action. We read in the *Advertiser*, as follows:

> The South Australian environment has been battered by declining water quality, increasing salinity problems, rabbits devouring the native landscape and destruction of marine life.

The *Advertiser* goes on to say:

> The total loss of productivity from soil erosion and loss and salinity and damage caused by feral animals is estimated at more than $1 billion over the past five years.

The report also states:

> The major State Government report—five years in the making—reveals astonishing levels of land degradation, salinity and water pollution.

The accompanying editorial comment states:

> These reports—

referring to the one that I have just mentioned and others—

> together make a quiet but compelling case for the proposition that one of the abiding principal concerns of all South Australian Governments must be good husbandry, intelligent planning and thoughtful resource management.
>
> Salinity control and management of underground watertables are not even exciting let alone politically glamorous. But, without them, South Australia will become all blighted desert; such is the importance of this thoughtful report.

I presume that it is a thoughtful report, and I hope one day in the near future that we will have the opportunity to read it.

I want to refer briefly again—I regret that I have to say 'again', because I have raised this matter on every opportunity that I have had in this place—to the pathetic state of parks and reserves in South Australia at the present time. Our parks and reserves are a nightmare, and the working conditions in our parks and reserves are a nightmare for those battling against all odds to manage them. The morale of rangers and staff is understandably extremely low as the conditions under which they are required to work have deteriorated significantly during the past decade. In 1985, $7.9 million was allocated to manage 4.6 million hectares of parks. In 1991, $11.8 million was allocated to manage over 20 million hectares. In 1991, it cost $8 million to run just one of our high schools and $11.8 million to manage (if I can use that word) our national parks and reserves in this State. About 22 million hectares in South Australia are now under parks or reserves, and there are still some areas of land yet to be dedicated under the National Parks and Wildlife Act.

Fewer than 90 rangers are attempting properly to manage this immense area of the State. It is interesting to note that this is in comparison with at least 128 outside staff who have the responsibility of caring for the Adelaide parklands. There are fewer than 90 people supposedly trying, against all odds, to manage 22 million hectares of the State against 128, or more, who have the responsibility of caring just for the City of Adelaide parklands.

As a result of recent administrative changes in the establishment of the new Department of Environment and Land Management, the National Parks and Wildlife Service has even been stripped of its identity. That is a very great shame. It is now lumped in with the Resource Management Division of the new department. Yes, we are told, the rangers will be able to continue to wear their uniforms and they will be able to continue to use their logo, but when the new phone book comes out it will not be possible to look up the phone book and make a telephone call to the National Parks and Wildlife Service. South Australia will be the only State in Australia that does not have a National Parks and Wildlife Service.

I recall vividly indeed that back in the late 1970s, and I would suggest probably about 1976 or 1977, there were attempts to take such action, when the Hon. Des Corcoran was the Minister for the Environment. He was dead keen to strip the National Parks and Wildlife Service of its identity. He went to great lengths. Fortunately, the Opposition and the community at that time were able to have the then Minister and the Government change their minds. But the regrettable part of this situation is that this change was made without any public consultation, and certainly without any public consultation on the part of those people who have made up the National Parks and Wildlife Service over a very long period of time in this State. I regret very much, and I believe that the majority of South Australians would regret very much, that that action was taken.

One of the most disappointing aspects of the current staffing problem within our parks is that many of the more than 6 000 members of voluntary Friends of Parks groups throughout South Australia are leaving those organisations purely through frustration. Last year these volunteers gave a record 70 000 hours of their time in assisting rangers and staff. We in this State should be very grateful that so many people are prepared, in a voluntary capacity, to help with the management of these parks and reserves. But it would appear that this Government does not care a continental about those volunteers and the work that they are anxious to do and are doing.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: What did you—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park is out of order. He has been spoken to a couple of times today. The member for Heysen will direct his remarks through the Chair; that will cut out the across-the-Chamber debate.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Mr Speaker, I will be delighted to do that, and may I remind the House that it was the previous Liberal Government, between 1979 and 1982, that did so much to encourage the establishment of the Friends of Parks organisations throughout this State. Certainly, we established the consultative committee system, which has probably been one of the most successful systems, in attempting to help with the management of national parks, that has been introduced in this State.

All the rangers and staff with whom I have come in contact over a long period have shown commitment and dedication to their work, and that should be recognised by this Government. Understandably, they are finding it extremely difficult to carry out their responsibilities under the current circumstances, and the sooner the Government recognises that, the better.

I have been interested to learn of the so-called progress of the review into the National Parks and Wildlife Service, a review that, I would suggest, is about the sixth or seventh of its kind in recent times. As I have said in this House before, I can remember instigating a review of the National Parks and Wildlife Act back in 1981. Goodness knows what happened to that review, and I think there have probably been at least half a dozen since that time; the service has continually been reviewed, as my colleague the member for Hanson says.

But we are in the middle of another review. I hope with all sincerity that that review is successful and that, as a result of that review, we come back to appropriate objectives of management of our national parks in this State. I suggest that we should consider the objectives of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972, which are very representative and which spell out clearly the responsibilities of those who work within our parks and, I would suggest, of the Government, which is supposed to provide the resources for these parks, so that everybody knows what we are trying to achieve and how we will achieve, through the objectives of management, improved management of our parks and reserves in this State.

I have also referred previously to problems that we experience in this State regarding our endangered species. Adelaide, regrettably, is the world capital of land mammal extinction. That unenviable reputation could be turned around to make us leaders in wildlife restoration if some incentives were provided by this Government. Saving wildlife begins not with who owns the land but with how it is being managed. The past 10 years, as I have stated, has seen an increase in Government owned land for wildlife protection and a decrease in management that would save it.

The task of saving threatened species is not one for government alone: it is a task that must be shared with the whole community. I believe that the community respects its responsibility in assisting the Government. But the Government has to set the example, and it is refusing to do so in this area. It is a disgrace that the Government continues to allow our endangered species to disappear under the deplorable conditions that they are experiencing at present.

I have mentioned previously my support for the work of Dr Wamsley through the Warrawong Sanctuary and other sanctuaries that have been established in this State. I have suggested on numerous occasions that the members of this House should visit Warrawong or any other of his sanctuaries to see first hand the excellent work that he is doing in saving our endangered species in this State. I commend him and, if I had more time, I would go into a lot more detail regarding the work he is doing.

There are some good things that are happening regarding our environment at the present time. I was delighted to see that the Mount Gambier grazier, Vern McLaren, has earned international respect as being our main representative when powerful conservationists, politicians and scientists meet in Norway next month to participate in the 10 day Fifth World Wilderness Congress. I have known Mr McLaren for a long time. I respect him tremendously for the work that he is doing and for the example that he has set for all South Australians, particularly those who own properties. I commend him and am delighted that he will be representing not only South Australia but Australia at that conference.

There are so many subjects to which one could refer as they relate to the environment portfolio. The lack of coordination in recycling programs in this State is of particular concern to me. I was horrified when I read in the *Advertiser* that the Minister was indicating that he would be forced to bring down heavy handed legislation if local government did not get its act together in regard to the introduction and maintenance of appropriate recycling programs. The Government and particularly the previous and current Ministers have sat on their hands in regard to recycling. They have done absolutely nothing to provide coordination to assist those in local government and the community who are keen to develop such programs, whether they be general recycling programs, kerbside collection programs or whatever. They have also sat on their hands and made no attempt to create markets for recycled products, an area on which I could spend some time but, because of the lack of time, I will not. I was interested to read in an article going back to 7 November 1989:

> A paper recycling plant to handle the State's waste paper would be set up as part of an eight-point State Government recycling strategy for the 1990s.
>
> The establishment of the plant was foreshadowed in July by the Environment and Planning Minister, Ms Lenehan.

There was reference to the 'appointment of a coordinator to work with local government in setting up local recycling services' and provision of 'financial incentives to encourage companies to establish recycling plants'. Where are those things? From 1989 to 1993 we have seen none of them. Recycling programs are continuing in this State not through any assistance that is provided by the Government but because local government and the community are committed and determined to make it happen.

I wonder what has happened to the environmental choice program—the green light for environmental choice, as the Government put it. Much information came out about the important decision that had been made by the Minister to set up this program throughout Australia, and a commitment was made that it would be supported in South Australia. We learnt why it was necessary, what it would do for the community and how it would work. Where has it gone? It seemed to be a very good idea at the time, and it still is a very good idea, but obviously it lacks the support of this Government.

On 23 September 1985 we read that parklands would cover the concrete jungle at the Hackney depot. What has happened to that? If the Opposition had not determined the policy and not gone ahead with the announcement of that policy, it would continue to be concrete. It was only because I made known, as shadow Minister, that I would be announcing the Opposition's policy on that at 12 o'clock on a particular day that the Minister thought, 'Goodness gracious, I had better do something about that,' and three hours later the Government announced its policy and what it was going

to do. That policy was announced in 1985, and eight years later they are still talking. That is what this Government has been all about—talking and rhetoric, but no action. Is it any wonder that the people of South Australia are fed up with a tired Government that has lost the plot and its direction? The vast majority of people in this State want to be rid of this Government. They want some new ideas and directions and a new Government.

I turn briefly to some of the problems facing community services. Labor disasters in this State are certainly hurting people. Let us look at what members opposite said in 1982 in their election policy. The then Premier said:

> In community welfare we will return to concern. We will not ignore problems because they are difficult to tackle. We will establish an inquiry into poverty so that our welfare services can best meet needs efficiently.

Mr Oswald: Did that ever happen?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Of course it has not happened. It is like everything else in this State: there is talk, rhetoric and promises, but no action. Labor did not establish the promised poverty inquiry, because it knew that it would highlight personal and family suffering under Labor's failed economic policies. Adelaide has the highest rate of poverty of any Australian capital city, and they would rather not hear that, but it is a fact.

At the 1989 election, the centrepiece of Labor's program was built on the promises of interest rate relief, $35 million for home buyers, and free STA student travel, despite warnings from many parents that this could lead to increased juvenile crime. Those promises were packaged under a 'Families of the Future' program, promising new measures to help family finances. Again, that was a 1989 election policy speech. Where are those things? They are not to be seen.

However, immediately after the election, Labor narrowed the eligibility criteria for interest rate relief. As a result, in the 18 months during which the scheme operated, only $847 000 in direct assistance was provided to home buyers struggling with Labor's record home loan interest rates. The cost of administering the scheme exceeded the amount of assistance by almost $300 000. Instead of helping the promised 35 000 families, fewer than 1 500 received actual assistance. In August 1991, Labor scrapped free student travel on buses, trains and trams after a massive increase in vandalism and other juvenile crime on the public transport system.

Labor has broken major promises to people most in need while its policies have forced more and more South Australians to seek welfare assistance, and that goes for housing. More than 40 000 people in South Australia now seek emergency financial help. Emergency financial assistance paid by the Department for Family and Community Services to buy food and other essential services has increased more than fourfold over the past 10 years—from $499 000 in 1981-82 to $2 043 000 in the last financial year. As I said, more than 40 000 people a year are seeking emergency financial assistance. This Government is a disaster; it must go; and the people want it to go. The people will demand that it go, and the sooner it goes, the better for all South Australians.

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to Her Excellency's speech. In so doing, I join my colleagues in expressing my deepest sympathy to Lady Laucke and members of the family on the passing of Sir Condor Laucke and to the relatives of the late Hugh Hudson. It was with interest that I and other members listened to Her Excellency's speech as she outlined the program proposed by the State Government.

Mr Oswald: It was a bit thin.

Mr MATTHEW: Indeed, it was a bit thin. The Government's program, outlined in Her Excellency's speech, reflects a crisis-torn Administration in its final death throes. We are presently witnessing the last days of a dying Government. There are no new directions designed to create long-term jobs and revive the State's economy, and I challenge Government members to stand up in their place in this Parliament during this Address in Reply debate and outline initiatives that they are going to introduce through this Parliament to address the two most fundamental problems facing our economy today: jobs and the revival of the economy. If they do not do that—if they have no legislative program—we are a State without government; a State without direction. The legislative program does not give that hope.

I ask members of the Government to reflect in detail on the problems confronting us. We have seen that since 1982 South Australia's job creation rate has been lower than that of any other mainland State except Victoria. Our share of national employment has declined, and if South Australia had maintained its 1982 share of the national employment we would have actually seen 27 700 more South Australians in work today than there are at present. Our population has also declined. Since 1982 we have lost 78 000 people. That is the equivalent of the three largest provincial cities: Whyalla, Mount Gambier and Port Augusta—lost out of this State as part of the mass exodus, to go to greener pastures where there is hope and where there are jobs.

We can also turn to the matter of disposable household income, which has declined significantly under this Government; it is a Government that would have us believe that it is the champion of the worker and the underprivileged but, indeed, it helps them not one jot. We have seen that over the past 10 years the growth in average household income in South Australia has been the lowest of Australia's mainland States. Indeed, South Australia's growth in disposable income is $1 000 below the national average.

Mr Speaker, we only need to turn to the area of taxes and charges to get an indication as to why we are not getting the growth in jobs that we so desperately need: an area that has not been addressed in the Government's legislative program. Indeed, we have seen this Government preside over South Australia's first new tax in the decade—the financial institutions duty, which has rapidly become one of our fastest growing taxes. We have seen this Government fail to contain revenue raising to the CPI, and we have seen total annual tax collections increase in real terms by almost $420 million since 1982.

Aside from the real term figure, it is interesting to look at the actual dollar increase in taxation collections from 1981-82 to the most recently available figure in 1991-92. In the 1981-82 financial year we saw $500 million in taxation collected. That has increased to more than $1 400 million in 1991-92: extra money ripped out of small businesses in this State; ripped out of the pockets of families in this State, reducing their disposable income and effectively thwarting any revival of our economy.

We have seen a huge increase in major taxes such as land tax, which has gone up 144 per cent; payroll tax, 38 per cent; stamp duties, 117 per cent; taxes on alcohol, 51 per cent; taxes on cigarettes, 622 per cent; taxes on petrol, 318 per cent, and so the list goes on and on. As the taxes have

increased, yet more disincentives to employment, growth and to staying in the State have been created by this Government in just one decade.

It is interesting to turn to the small business sector and reflect on the promises that this Government has made and what has actually happened. We have had a Government whose members have stood up in this Parliament and tried to demonstrate a compassion for small business; tried to demonstrate a desire to foster growth and employment, and in so doing we saw that in 1982 in the election policy speech, before the election of this disastrous Government through the last decade, the following statement:

> We will establish a small business corporation to act as a one-stop shop for small business.

We still do not have our one-stop shop for small business in this State. Over the past 10 years we have seen the Labor Government repeatedly promise a one-stop shop for small business—from the 1982 campaign through to the 1985 campaign and through to the 1989 campaign, promises have been made time after time. Is it any wonder, with that sort of track record, why small businesses in this State throw their hands up in the air and say, 'Who would believe one word that passes the lips of a Labor Government member in this State?' Their track record proves that they do not carry out what they say they will. What incentive is there for us to stay in this State under a Labor Government?

Apart from having no one-stop shop, we have Australia's highest WorkCover premiums and the constantly rising taxes and charges I have just detailed. Labor has ignored the needs of small business in this State, and we have seen many businesses close as they become part of the legacy of Labor. Surveys undertaken by a number of groups and companies within our State have indicated that by far the greatest proportion of small businesses—indeed usually in the vicinity of 70 per cent or more—identify WorkCover as being the biggest impediment to their viability and growth.

It was interesting to hear during Question Time in this Parliament today the Minister for Occupational Health and Safety berate the Opposition for daring to look at WorkCover; for daring to consider changes to the system. What the Minister alluded to, of course, was far from what we may be planning in the future. The fact is that WorkCover does need to be looked at in this State, because 70 per cent and more of small businesses identify WorkCover as being their greatest impediment to growth and to employing people.

If we are indeed to do something about the 84 000 people and more in this State who are unemployed as part of the disastrous mismanagement by this Labor Government, we must address WorkCover and State taxes and charges. The legislative program proposed by this Government does not tackle those problems. Is it that Government does not consider it to be a problem? Is it that it does not care, or is it that it has given up? Or is it that it is so busy arguing and bickering over which faction should have the right to a member in a particular seat that it has forgotten why it has been elected to this Parliament?

Mr Oswald: Their minds are back in the 1970s.

Mr MATTHEW: Indeed, as the member for Morphett interjects, their minds are back in the 1970s. Whatever the reason, Mr Speaker, they have forgotten why they are here, and that is to represent their electorates and to do something to better our State; to do something about the problems confronting us. Day after day in this Parliament the Opposition fires questions at the Government seeking answers, seeking reasons, seeking solutions to come out of this Government. We have put together policies to tackle the problems; we are waiting for the Government to act. It would seem that at the next poll there is going to be only one Party with any policies for the future of our State, and that is the Liberal Party.

Mr Holloway interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: Well may the member for Mitchell interject and laugh, but he will have to face the electorate in the very near future, and I would not like to be a Labor member of Parliament facing the wrath of the South Australian electorate at this time, particularly in Mitchell. We have actually seen that since 1986-87, which was the first year that bankruptcies for small businesses in South Australia were collated, bankruptcies increased by a massive 46 per cent, to June 1992.

That is a damning indictment of the failure of this Government to generate hope. Some of the most noticeable bankruptcy increases across small business include: retailing up by 45 per cent; delicatessens and take-aways up 82 per cent; restaurants, cafes and caterers up by 200 per cent; bankruptcies in the car trade up by 10 per cent; bankruptcies among hairdressers and cleaners up by 60 per cent; among small manufacturers up by 100 per cent; and so the disastrous list goes on as more and more businesses finish up bankrupt in this State because they are given no hope, no opportunity to expand, and only have impediments put in their way by this Government.

If we are seriously to tackle our problems in this State, what we would have expected to see is legislation to turn them around. In this place only yesterday I was interested to hear the member for Ross Smith, the former Premier, stand up and have the gall to accuse the Opposition of dragging up the past when we were talking about Beneficial Finance, the State Bank and disasters that have befallen us. Indeed, it is the past that has caused the predicament we presently face.

The former Premier tried to tell this House that his is the Government that will bring our State back into prosperity, his is the Government with the policies to rebuild South Australia. Its legislative program does not reflect those policies, and the only reason South Australia needs to be rebuilt is the Labor Party's actions in destroying it over the past 10 years. One need only see Labor's long list of failures including: the loss of $1.8 million on Government underwriting for the 1987 America's Cup challenge; the loss of more than $200 million on Melbourne's largest construction project, 333 Collins Street; the loss of more than $210 million by the State Bank on the Remm project (much of it, as all members would be well aware, caused by union rorts that the Government supported by virtue of its inaction); total losses of $3 150 000 by the State Bank Group; and total losses of $350 million by SGIC.

We saw the loss of $60 million on the scrimber experiment; the loss of more than $12 million on the Government's investment in a rundown timber mill in New Zealand; and payouts of more than $10 million in legal and other costs after union action forced the cancellation of the Marineland development, including the retention of a dolphin park. We saw a $28 million cost blowout in the Justice Information System; a $6 million blowout in the cost of the new computer system for drivers licences and motor vehicle registrations; a $6 million blowout in the cost of introducing the Crouzet ticketing system by the STA; an $11 million blowout in the cost of building the *Island Seaway* ferry to Kangaroo Island; Government subsidy of the ASER project currently sitting

about $20 million above the original estimates and rising by some $6 million each year; and a $4.2 million blowout in the cost of the State aquatic centre. That list goes on and on and on.

I challenge one member of the Government—just one—to stand up in this Parliament and defend that list I have outlined. I will go further: I challenge just one member of this Government to stand up and defend one point of that list I have outlined. To do so is to ask someone to defend the indefensible, the inexcusable, because no Government, regardless of its political persuasion, can possibly expect to face the electorate, with respect from the electorate, and be given another term, when it has cost our State so dearly.

How many members of this Parliament have experienced unemployment within their own families, be it brothers, sisters, parents or other relatives? I posed that question in my own electorate recently through a survey, the results of which are pouring back into my office. Initial indications show that it is somewhere in the vicinity of 60 per cent. Mine is an electorate with a comparatively low unemployment rate, but the survey indicates that many people within our community have been affected in some way, shape or form directly (or a little less directly through a family member) by unemployment.

That is not the sort of situation in which I would think any honourable member wishes to see our economy, and it is not a situation that will be turned around by the lack of reform, the lack of legislative progress and the lack of vision that we have seen in the Government's legislative program for this current session. It was with disgust, disbelief and disappointment that I read that program and listened to that program unveiled. It is not what we need in our State to move it forward.

But beyond the debt, beyond the economy and beyond the mismanagement there are other things that worry our community, not the least of which is people's own personal safety. That is an area with which I have become very closely acquainted over the past 15 months or so during which I have been the Opposition spokesman for police and emergency services matters. It is with horror that I have done the comparisons on what South Australia was like to live in as a State as between 1982 and 1992. The comparison brings out some alarming figures.

In that 10 year period we have seen violent crime increase by 207 per cent; we have seen property crime increase by 44 per cent to 310 offences a day; serious assaults have increased by 147 per cent; the number of rapes has increased by 293 per cent; drug offences are up by 106 per cent; and motor vehicle theft is up by 128 per cent. It could be argued that this horrifying increase in crime, particularly that of a serious nature, is largely a reflection of our economic climate, a reflection of the frustration experienced by South Australians at not being able to find a job, at not having any hope and wanting to take out their anger at someone, no matter who.

That may be a reason for many of those offences occurring; it is also fair to say that one of the other reasons this is occurring is the very lenient approach to offenders taken by this Government since it came to office. In our State, a person receiving a six year sentence for rape, with a two year non-parole period, will be out on home detention in just eight months. Imagine how the victim must feel, knowing that that offender, who got a six year sentence, is out after just eight months. All the horror will be relived when that person is back on the streets so quickly.

The Government would argue that that person is on home detention; that he has a controlled life. That still does not change the fact that that person is out in the community again, able to work in the community again and able to shop in the community again after eight months. Again, I challenge just one member of the Labor Government to stand up in this Parliament and defend why a rapist who gets six years should be out after eight months. Once again, I doubt whether anyone will, because I am asking someone to defend the indefensible.

We have seen this horrifying leniency introduced through a number of legislative changes. We saw the first leniency through parole legislation introduced in 1984, whereby an offender could be out on parole after serving two-thirds of the parole period. We have seen that further reduced by allowing an offender to apply for home detention when that person has served just one-third of the non-parole period. That latter legislation was introduced through the home detention scheme.

I certainly do not find that acceptable, and I know that my electorate does not find it acceptable. So far 92 per cent of the respondents to my survey have, in responding to a question asking whether the Government is being too lenient on hard core offenders, said 'Yes'. I would call that an overwhelming majority. I would like to hear members opposite try to defend the indefensible. It goes beyond that. On a number of occasions I have brought up in Parliament my concern about drugs in prison. To put someone in prison is not simply a punishment; it is not simply a way of protecting the community by putting someone out of the community for a period of time; but it ought to provide an opportunity to ensure that, on the day of their ultimate release back into society, that person is less likely to offend.

In this State at present, well over 70 per cent of our criminals finish up back in prison within five years of their release. That is not the case in other States or other countries. Why should South Australia compare so badly? I believe the reasons are tied very closely with the fact that in this State serious attention is not paid to education, rehabilitation, counselling or program management of prisoners. We do not have a case management program worked out for a prisoner to determine what needs to occur and to ensure that that person is less likely to offend. We do not have drug management programs of significance that are successful. Indeed, I have revealed in the past that of the prisoners at Cadell, I am reliably informed from within the Department of Correctional Services (I do not mind saying that), only six are drug free. Drugs go in and out of the prison system very easily.

We heard the Minister of Correctional Services admit in Parliament only yesterday that drugs are in the prison system and are exchanged fairly freely for telephone cards. Unless that problem is tackled it will continue to contribute to the continuing crime wave in our society. I became aware of the magnitude of the problem when I started visiting halfway houses, to which offenders go after their release from prison. I was alarmed to hear what was being said by the managers of those halfway houses. When I asked them, 'What is the greatest difficulty you face with an ex-prisoner?' time and again their reply was, 'Getting them off drugs'. I said, 'Well, if a prisoner has been in gaol for three or four years (not that that happens much these days), would getting that person off drugs be a problem?' They said, 'Yes it most definitely is. Non-addicts come out addicts, and often heroin addicts.'

That is one of the problems within our prison system today, and this Government has failed to combat it. The

Government has failed to come up with programs to do something about it, and it has failed to maintain our prisons. The prison farms have weeds that reach a man's waist, yet there is not enough work for prisoners. Our institutions are filled with bored people looking for new ways to commit crime when they get out, while they are high on drugs.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: As the member for Morphett interjects, they have created a culture. Some culture, but at the end of the day those people could be living next door to any South Australian, potentially threatening their well-being and that of their family. The mismanagement does not end there. I turn briefly to the information utility, where we have seen some amazing turn-arounds occur under this Government. We saw the information utility hailed as a step forward in information technology, something that was to be the front-runner for the smart State, South Australia, the State of technology. Let me tell you, Mr Speaker, having spoken to a number of computer companies in this State, I have yet to find a single computer company in South Australia that has any regard for, respect or faith in this Government. They are all totally and absolutely frustrated with the ineptitude of this Government.

I have had major computer companies tell me how they have blown in excess of $1 million trying to put up alternative packages to this Government to convince it that the information utility concept will not, could not, should not and must not work. The Government did not listen. What happened afterwards was that we saw a change in the person driving that project when Mr Guerin was replaced by Mr Crawford. Many of those companies were contacted again, for a second round. A lot of them said, 'No way; we will wait until the election, and then we will talk to the new Government.' Others have put up proposals, never really believing that they will come to fruition, but they have done the background work for after the election. That is a measure of the despondency and the lack of faith that potential major employers have in this State. They have given up on this Government. They have wasted money because of this Government and have been frustrated because of it. However, they are not leaving the State but are hanging on in the hope that this Government will go.

My colleagues and I are approached every day by numerous businesses who tell us that, if Labor is re-elected in South Australia, there will be another mass exodus from this State. There are companies waiting, hoping that we will go to the polls well before Christmas so they can start rebuilding their business, and they are telling us how we can move forward to create employment and incentive in this State. They do not see that opportunity under the present Government. Why should they? Why should they possibly see any hope in a Government that wastes taxpayers' resources in the most appalling way? In this State, the Government owns 882 boats. One might well ask, 'Why would a Government need to own 882 boats?' This is horrifying.

Mr S.G. Evans: To keep afloat.

Mr MATTHEW: My colleague interjects, 'To keep afloat', but not even 882 boats will keep it afloat. The Education Department has 567, the E&WS Department 65, the Department of Road Transport 45, the Department of Primary Industries 44, the Department of Marine and Harbours 33, the Department of Environment and Land Management 30, the Murray-Darling Commission 27, the Department for Family and Community Services seven, the Electricity Trust three, Public and Environmental Health Service one, and the Department of Correctional Services has one, interestingly at Port Lincoln.

They tell me that tuna fishing is very good at Port Lincoln, but I dare not draw any analogies between the two at this stage. The question has to be asked 'Why?' Some of those boats are undoubtedly justified, but all 882? I very much doubt it. It does not end there. This Government also owns 305 petrol bowsers, when there are 24-hour petrol stations. For example, the Darlington Police Station has one such bowser, and it is across the road from the golden mile at Darlington—a whole row of 24-hour petrol stations. Who is paying for the upkeep of those bowsers, for the fuel that evaporates from the tanks? It is the taxpayer. Again I ask, why should anyone have any faith in this Government when it cannot get its act together in dealing with basic fundamental practices? Why should people have any faith in a Government that admits in a confidential memo to Cabinet that it has probably purchased every brand of computer hardware and software imaginable and for that reason its information technology is in a shambles?

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

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.44 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 10 August at 2 p.m.