

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY****Tuesday 2 November 1993**

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

**ASSENT TO BILLS**

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated her assent to the following Bills:

Appropriation,  
 Classification of Films for Public Exhibition (Arrangements with Commonwealth) Amendment,  
 Classification of Publications (Arrangements with Commonwealth) Amendment,  
 Environment Protection,  
 Environment Protection (Sea Dumping) (Consistency with Commonwealth Act) Amendment,  
 Land Tax (Rates) Amendment,  
 Motor Vehicles (Driving Whilst Disqualified—Penalties) Amendment,  
 Petroleum (Pipeline Licences) Amendment,  
 Prince Alfred Shipwrecked Mariners Fund (Transfer and Revocation of Trusts),  
 Residential Tenancies (Housing Trust) Amendment,  
 Road Traffic (Breath Analysis) Amendment,  
 South Australian Film Corporation (Administration) Amendment,  
 Statutes Amendment (Abolition of Compulsory Retirement),  
 Statutes Amendment (Landlord and Tenant),  
 Statutes Repeal and Amendment (Places of Public Entertainment).

**SOUTHERN DISTRICTS WAR MEMORIAL HOSPITAL**

A petition signed by 103 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to retain surgical and obstetric services at Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital was presented by the Hon. M.J. Evans.  
 Petition received.

**FOCUS 2000**

A petition signed by 148 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to retain the current ownership and funding of the *Focus 2000* newspaper for South Australian Housing Trust tenants was presented by the Hon. M.J. Evans.  
 Petition received.

**CAPITAL PUNISHMENT**

A petition signed by 61 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to reintroduce capital punishment for crimes of homicide was presented by Mr Becker.  
 Petition received.

**ANIMAL HUSBANDRY**

A petition signed by 277 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to phase out

intensive animal husbandry practices was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

**SHOPPING HOURS**

A petition signed by 1 115 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to extend permanent retail trading hours was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

**PLASTIC MILK BOTTLES**

A petition signed by 580 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to allow the introduction of milk bottles was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

**STATE BANK**

A petition signed by two residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to allow electors to pass judgment on the losses of the State Bank by calling a general election was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

**OAKLANDS DRIVING CENTRE**

A petition signed by 840 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to retain the Oaklands Driving Centre as recreation space was presented by Mr Brindal.

Petition received.

**LEADED PETROL TAX**

A petition signed by 23 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to call on the Federal Government to abandon the increase in tax on leaded petrol was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

**ABERFOYLE PARK POLICE STATION**

A petition signed by 223 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to establish a police station at Aberfoyle Park was presented by Mr Such.

Petition received.

**QUESTIONS**

**The SPEAKER:** I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

**VICTIMS OF CRIME SERVICE**

In reply to **Mr MATTHEW (Bright)** 12 August.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** My colleague the Attorney-General is in receipt of both the proposed 1993-94 budget for VOCS and of the letter from which the honourable member quoted for additional support, by way of assurances for deficit funding, should that be necessary.

The Attorney General has written to the Chairman of VOCS Council, Mr John Halsey, advising him of the following:

- approval for a funding package for 1993-94 of \$355 000 representing a 6 per cent increase at a time when Government agencies are experiencing budget reductions;

- reassured VOCS of his and the Government's continuing support for VOCS and the work they do in the community and advised them that he is happy to meet with them;
- given them an assurance, as sought, that extra financial assistance will be available later in the financial year, should that be necessary.

#### GARBAGE RECYCLING TRANSFER CENTRE

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park)** 9 September.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:**

1. The Environment Protection Office is not aware of any experience of expertise that the proponent could have gained in relation to the operation of a materials recovery facility.
2. The proponent has no similar facilities at other locations in the metropolitan area.
3. The proponent has not been denied a licence under the Waste Management Act for other proposed operations.
4. The application lodged with the South Australian Planning Commission does not show that provision has been made for toxic solubles to be treated separately from stormwater runoff. A number of concerns have been raised by Government agencies about this aspect. The proponent is being asked to respond to these concerns before a decision is made on the planning application.

#### EUROPEAN CARP

In reply to **Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey)** 9 September.

**The Hon. T.R. GROOM:** In 1989 the Government approved the implementation of revised management arrangements for the Murray River fishery. Amongst other things the arrangements specify that commercial fishing be restricted to existing licence holders except where the number of licences is reduced to a low level, or for other reasons, the Minister is prepared to grant special access for the taking of carp species for sale. Furthermore special provision was made for licence holders to take non-native species (this includes carp) from approved backwaters using approved fishing gear. In this regard, the Government has encouraged licence holders to target carp species. It is understood that a number of licence holders are taking advantage of these special arrangements.

With regard to the taking of European carp to feed southern bluefin tuna, the suitability of carp as a food source for tuna is unknown.

Carp are a freshwater fish, living in a completely different habitat from pilchards. As a result they taste different, have different and unknown nutritional status, carry different parasites and bacteria. All of these pose risks to the use of carp as a food source and indicate significant research would be required to overcome the risks.

More importantly, different food sources result in different taste of the final product. It is reasonable to suggest that preparing carp to meet the requirements of tuna farming would necessitate significant processing. It is questionable as to whether this would be economically viable as previous assessments have shown that fish meal plants relying on carp would not be economically viable. Experience in other fish farming operations has shown that reliance on trash fish is not sustainable in the long term.

The tuna farming industry is already embarking on a research and development program for the production of an artificial food which is cereal-based. This has been proven to be the most cost-effective method of fish farming which provides for appropriate nutrition, growth and cost effectiveness of fish farming. Under the circumstances, it may be appropriate for the tuna farm interests to discuss such requirements with licence holders operating in the river fishery.

#### DYNAMICE

In reply to **Mr VENNING (Custance)** 7 October 1993.

**The Hon. T.R. GROOM:** Primary Industries (South Australia) has imposed a minimum pack size of 5 kilograms for the product Dynamice (containing strychnine) in the interests of public health. It is our view and that of the South Australian Health Commission, that the availability of strychnine in small packs is a serious and unacceptable risk to public health. Strychnine is an extremely dangerous chemical; there is no known antidote. It is also very fast acting.

If small packs were available through rural agencies in country towns there is a high probability that some of these packs would find their way into the homes in those towns. This poses an unacceptable risk, particularly to children. Domestic use of Dynamice must be

strongly discouraged. Small packs because of their size and low cost encourage domestic use.

For situations where 5 kilograms of Dynamice is too large a quantity and in domestic situations there are several alternative registered rodenticides which can be used with much greater safety. It is illegal for people to buy and then subdivide the poison under Section 11a of the Agricultural Chemicals Act 1955. For these reasons, the minimum pack size for Dynamice will remain at 5 kilograms.

#### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

Department of the Premier and Cabinet—Report, 1992-93  
(Ordered to be printed Paper No. 91)

By the Minister of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission and Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs—Report, 1992-93  
(Ordered to be printed Paper No. 29)

By the Treasurer (Hon. Frank Blevins)—

Casino Supervisory Authority—Report, 1992-93  
Gaming Machines Act—Report on the Administration of, 1992-93

Group Asset Management Authority—Report, 1992-93

Police Superannuation Board—Report, 1992-93

Friendly Societies Act—Amendment to General Laws of the Mutual Community Friendly Society of SA and the Friendly Societies Medical Association Inc.

Lottery and Gaming Act—Regulations—

Lottery Licences

Various

Stamp Duties Act—Regulations—Exempted Business

By the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Attorney-General's Department—Report, 1992-93

Children's Court Advisory Committee—Report, 1992-93

South Australian Co-operative Housing Authority—  
Report, 1992-93

Director of Public Prosecutions—Report, 1992-93

West Beach Trust—Report, 1992-93

(Ordered to be printed Paper No. 158)

Magistrates Court Act—Magistrate Court—Rules of Court—Civil—Various

Supreme Court Act—Supreme Court—Rules of Court—  
Admission Rules

Criminal—Arrestment Day

Pleadings, Christmas Vacation

Recovery of Costs—Personal Injury

Planning Act—Crown Development Report on relocation of classrooms, Victor Harbor Primary School

Development Act—Regulations—Various

Environment, Resources and Development Court Act—  
Regulations—Fees

District Council By-laws—

Angaston—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties

No. 2—Street Hawkers and Traders

No. 3—Bees

No. 4—Animals and Birds

No. 5—Garbage Removal

No. 6—Dogs

No. 7—Repeal of By-laws

Light—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties

No. 2—Street Hawkers and Traders

No. 3—Bees

No. 4—Animals and Birds

No. 5—Garbage Removal

No. 6—Dogs

No. 7—Repeal of By-laws

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Bookmakers Licensing Board—Report, 1992-93  
 Greyhound Racing Board—Report, 1992-93  
 Harness Racing Board—Report, 1992-93  
 Racecourses Development Board—Report, 1992-93  
 Totalisator Agency Board—Report, 1992-93  
 Racing Act—Rules of Harness Racing—  
 Artificial Insemination—  
 Semen Extenders  
 Transportation of Semen  
 Offences—Use of whip

By the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—

Department of State Aboriginal Affairs—Report, 1992-93

By the Minister of Environment and Natural Resources (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—

Botanic Gardens of Adelaide and State Herbarium—  
 Report, 1992-93  
 Department of Environment and Land Management—  
 Report, 1992-93  
 (Ordered to be printed Paper No. 92)  
 South Australian Film Corporation—Report, 1992-93  
 Libraries Board of South Australia—Report, 1992-93  
 Regulations under the following Acts—  
 Beverage Container—Plastic Milk Containers  
 Heritage—Fees  
 Native Vegetation—Clearance Exemptions  
 Prevention of Cruelty to Animals—Model Codes of  
 Practice  
 Real Property—Definitions  
 Strata Titles—Revocation of Schedules  
 Waste Management—Contribution by Licensees

By the Minister of Education, Employment and Training (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—

University of Adelaide—Statutes

By the Minister of Public Infrastructure (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder)—

Electricity Trust of South Australia—Report, 1992-93  
 Electrical Products Act—Regulations—Safety Criteria

By the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—

Commissioner for Public Employment—Report, 1992-93  
 Office of Public Sector Reform and Government  
 Management Board—Report, 1992-93  
 SACON—Report, 1992-93

By the Minister of Business and Regional Development (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

National Road Transport Commission—Report, 1992-93  
 Harbors Act—Regulations—Commercial Pricing Policy  
 Review  
 Motor Vehicles Act—Regulations—Historic Vehicles  
 Registration

By the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services (Hon. M.J. Evans)—

Foundation SA—Report, 1992-93  
 Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science—Report,  
 1992-93  
 South Australian Psychological Board—Report, 1992-93  
 Regulations under the following Acts—  
 Food—Unwrapped or Unpacked Food  
 Medical Practitioners—  
 Company Registration Fee  
 Qualifications for Specialists  
 South Australian Health Commission—Surgically  
 Implanted Prostheses Fees

By the Minister for the Aged (Hon. M.J. Evans)—

Office of the Commissioner for the Ageing—Report,  
 1992-93  
 (Ordered to be printed Paper No. 144)

By the Minister of Primary Industries (Hon. T.R. Groom)—

Metropolitan Milk Board—Report, 1992-93  
 Primary Industries South Australia—Report, 1992-93  
 Soil Conservation Boards—Report, 1992-93  
 Apiaries Act—Regulations—Registration Fees  
 Veterinary Surgeons Act—Regulations—Fees.

## LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I table the Local Government Constitution Bill for community comment. This is the first Bill in a comprehensive review of local government legislation. A framework for this review was negotiated under the Memoranda of Agreement signed by the Premier and the President of the Local Government Association of South Australia. The Local Government Act 1934 has, due to numerous amendments over the years, become unwieldy and confusing. A major aim of the local government legislative framework review is to create a simpler, easier-to-use set of provisions. When the local government legislation has been completely revised the operations of local government will be based in a consistent and accessible set of Acts of Parliament which will allow State and local government authorities to work cooperatively and effectively together.

The purpose of this Bill is to separate some basic constitutional features of local government from provisions which govern matters of an operational nature. This will make councils' general purposes, functions and powers clearer and the scope of local governments' role easier to grasp. The Bill retains councils' broad powers to carry out activities and provide services in the interests of the local community and includes the range of ways in which the council is accountable to its community. I would like to recognise the role of the Local Government Association of South Australia in the shaping of this Bill. The association is in general agreement with the scope and structure of the Bill, although it has not had the opportunity to comment on the drafting of each specific provision. The consultation and discussion that will now ensue will assist in the final drafting of this important legislation.

## RACING

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Recreation and Sport):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** There will not now be time to introduce or debate in the House the racing (miscellaneous) legislation, but I encourage broad community discussion on these amendments. These proposed amendments to the Racing Act 1976 are:

- an amendment to the Racing Appeals Tribunal, that is, the definition of 'Registrar' and the constitution of the tribunal for appeal hearing;
- an amendment to the rate of taxation payable by racing clubs on on-course totalisator turnover;
- a proposal to extend the opportunities of betting by bookmakers to include various events declared by regulation;
- a proposal to allow bookmakers to accept bets on various events at venues that are declared by regulation.

These amendments have been the subject of consultation with the racing industry and will be of considerable benefit to most sections of the industry.

#### YOUTH STATEMENT

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Education, Employment and Training):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** As Minister responsible for youth, I am today tabling the South Australian Government's Youth Statement, which draws together the Government's programs and initiatives providing support for young people. This statement is an important step in the Government's plan for South Australia's social and economic future and deals with programs for young people who will shape that future. Priority areas covered by the Youth Statement include a youth employment and training strategy to be announced shortly; a Youth Week in 1994 to celebrate the achievements of young people; youth media—

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:**—awards for excellence in reporting issues of importance to young people; a Safety Beat community policing strategy for young people, including the *Cops, Kids and Crows* program; a literacy and learning program focusing on schools with a high proportion of disadvantaged students—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will cease for a moment. The member for Albert Park is out of order and the Deputy Leader is out of order.

**Mr Hamilton:** Sorry, Sir.

**The SPEAKER:** 'Sorry' does not comply with Standing Orders. Interjections are out of order. The Minister.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. Priority areas include a literacy and learning program focusing on schools with a high proportion of disadvantaged students; an education social justice plan; increased responsiveness of the public transport system to young people; better access to legal information and advice; an Aboriginal education policy and operational plan; youth health, youth housing and youth arts policies; and better access to sport and recreation. This statement will become an annual publication and demonstrates the extent of this Government's commitment to young people. It reflects a strategic plan to ensure Government services for young people and to ensure they are fair, equitable and relevant. It also provides a strong base for the future development of new programs to meet the needs of young people in a rapidly changing environment.

#### ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** I bring up the eighth report of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee on environmental resources, planning, land use and development aspects of the MFP Development Corporation for 1992-93 and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I bring up the ninth report of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee

on the Port MacDonnell breakwater and boat harbor and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

#### MATTER OF URGENCY: OPPOSITION STRATEGY

**The SPEAKER:** I have received the following letter from the Premier:

Dear Mr Speaker,

It is my intention at the commencement of business today to move an urgency motion to permit the following motion to be discussed:

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Does the Deputy Leader have a problem? If he has a point of order, he should make it in the proper way, otherwise he should remain silent. The letter continues:

As an election date has now been announced and this will be the last sitting day of Parliament, the Leader of the Opposition stands condemned by this House for stating that he will not present his debt reduction strategy until one week before election day.

This House invites the Leader of the Opposition during this debate to detail to the House and the people of South Australia what services will be reduced and what taxes will be increased if his stated target of a debt figure of \$6 billion by 1997 is to be achieved in the event of his Party winning the forthcoming election.

The House notes that the Premier and Treasurer presented the Government's debt reduction strategy to Parliament on 22 April 1993 in the Meeting the Challenge statement.

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Is the Deputy Leader finished? It continues:

Furthermore that the budget presented by the Treasurer on 26 August 1993 to this House confirmed the responsible strategy previously outlined.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I will suspend the House to the ringing of the bells and have a discussion with the Deputy Leader if we cannot get some business done.

The letter is signed, 'Yours sincerely, Lynn M.F. Arnold, Premier'. I accept the motion as urgent. I ask those members who support the proposed motion—

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Mr Speaker—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! For a start, there has been no completion of the motion—

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. You said you had already accepted the motion.

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

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have to cover my head because you are standing.

**The SPEAKER:** The Leader will resume his seat until we have—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I have a point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I will complete this and then I will take the point of order. I ask those members who support the proposed motion to so indicate by rising in their places.

*Government members having risen:*

**The SPEAKER:** I will now take the point of order.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Mr Speaker—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader will resume his seat for the moment. If I cannot hear the point of order, I certainly cannot make a judgment on it. The Leader.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Mr Speaker, I move dissent with your ruling. I formally move:

That this House dissents from the Speaker's ruling on the ground that the matter is not urgent and denies the long established rights of the Opposition to hold the Government accountable to the people through the Parliament.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! A point has been made by the Chair but there has not been a ruling. I have accepted a motion as being urgent.

**An honourable member:** It's a ruling.

**The SPEAKER:** I have not made a ruling to be disagreed with.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Mr Speaker, I point out that Standing Order No. 52 requires you as Speaker to make a determination, which is a decision by you, as I understand it. I also point out that Standing Order No. 135 clearly says, 'If a member objects to a ruling or decision of the Speaker'. I am objecting to your decision that this is a matter of urgency, and I therefore move the motion to which I have referred.

**The SPEAKER:** Which motion?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I will move my motion again:

That this House dissents from the Speaker's ruling on the ground that the matter is not urgent and denies the long established rights of the Opposition to hold the Government accountable to the people through the Parliament.

**The SPEAKER:** I would also point out that, under Standing Orders and the precedents of this House and other Parliaments operating under the Westminster system, any member has the right to put forward a matter of urgency. In this case it happens to be the Leader of the Government, as is the case with the Leader of the Opposition who has brought forward a motion as Leader of the Opposition. In fact, according to Standing Orders, any member has the right, and I have accepted the letter from a member.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Let us clear up a couple of points. The Deputy Leader threatened the Chair earlier today when he left my office. I cannot remember the exact words, but he threatened the Chair on a decision.

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I do not remember the exact words. I am in this Chair as the Speaker of this House, and I was threatened. At the same time—

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Only a few minutes before that occasion, the Leader had accepted my ruling on the urgency motion.

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Then you had better move a dissent motion, too. That is exactly what happened. The Leader stood in the Clerk's office and said he accepted it. However, all that aside, a point has been raised as to whether or not I have made a decision. If I say I have not, it will disallow this motion; if I say I have, the debate will be taken up on the established rights of the Parliament. I see them both as ploys to have a debate take place. We cannot have them both. In my opinion, the original motion is the senior one.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I assert that you can have both, because this motion dissenting with your ruling takes two speeches of 10 minutes

each, one from each side of the House. We can dispose of that matter and then it will be up to the House as to what the next move is. I point out that there is a motion of dissent with your ruling and decision and it needs to be dealt with immediately. The House can deal with both matters if that is what the House decides.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I agree with the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition. Standing Order No. 135 is very clear and refers to 'a ruling or decision'. I therefore accept the motion.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** In moving this motion of dissent with your ruling I make the point that the decision to move this urgency motion this afternoon is yet another very bad decision by the Premier of our State. It is another classic example—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! We are in the last day of the Parliament. We can treat it as a joke and make a real show of the place, or we can get on with the very legitimate motion moved by both Leaders—it is up to members. However, I have a point of order from the member for Napier.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** Mine is a very simple point of order; it is that when members stand in this place to speak they must address you and face you.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I uphold the point of order, and all members should heed that. The Leader.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** As I was pointing out to the House, the decision by the Government to introduce this so-called 'motion of urgency' today is yet another bad decision by the Premier of this State.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader will resume his seat. The member for Walsh.

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: the Leader can canvass only matters regarding his dissent from your ruling; he cannot canvass matters which may or may not be the subject of the debate that may or may not take place in a few minutes time.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I uphold that point of order. That is correct; speakers in this debate may speak only to the motion to dissent from my decision. That is the subject of the debate. The Leader.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** My motion of dissent from the decision of the Speaker specifically refers to the rights of the Opposition in this Parliament. It specifically refers to the fact that members in this House have an obligation and a right to stand in this Parliament and question Government Ministers. This afternoon we have had a classic example of the Labor Ministers of this State once again running from the people, not being willing to stand in this Parliament and face the truth.

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I assume the point of order is the same as the last.

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER:** Also that raised by the member for Napier, Sir.

**The SPEAKER:** The Leader will confine his remarks to the motion he has moved.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I will confine my remarks to the motion, Mr Speaker, because it deals with the right of the Opposition in this State to question the Government. It disagrees with your ruling, and I highlight that this matter that we have before us in this so-called 'urgency motion' is nowhere near as important or pressing as the far more

fundamental issues facing South Australia at present. The Opposition was going to raise some of these issues in Question Time today: for instance, the fact that under the Medicare agreement we are facing a blowout in costs and receipts in this State of \$90 million.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader will have the opportunity to raise all these points in the further debate that should take place this afternoon. However, in this debate I would once again remind the Leader and all members of the Opposition that the motion is very specific in dissenting from the ruling of the Chair, and I would ask all members to direct their remarks to that matter. The Leader.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I point out that this whole motion of urgency is no more than a gimmick by the Government, and it distresses me, Mr Speaker, that you have fallen for that three card trick, because the people of this State know that there are far more fundamentally pressing problems facing South Australia. It is unprecedented that a Premier of the State should be moving a motion of urgency. I highlight that the motion we have before us is not a substantive motion: there will be no vote on this motion. The Government has not been prepared to move a motion that requires a vote—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Once again, the motion before the Chair is dissent to the Chair's ruling—nothing else.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I was pointing out to the House the procedure under this vote and the fact that no vote will be taken on this motion because of the particular Standing Order under which it has been moved. If the Government wanted to push home this issue this afternoon it should have had the courage to move a substantive motion, but, no, it does not have the courage—it was not prepared to test the motion on the floor of the House with the numbers.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader will lose all his time if he keeps digressing from the matter before the Chair.

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER:** On a point of order, Sir, the Leader is making remarks that he would wish to make in the debate later. I do not know why he is making them now.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I do not uphold the point of order. However, the remarks in this debate will be directed to the motion put forward by the Leader, or the Chair will have no choice but to withdraw leave.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I highlight again to the House that we are disagreeing with your decision, Sir, to bring on this matter as a matter of urgency when there are more important issues. In fact, it highlights the lack of courage of the Labor Party, in particular the Premier, to try to test this issue with a suspension of Standing Orders and bring in a substantive motion. If he was really concerned about the issue, if it was the top priority of the Government and you, Mr Speaker, the Government would have come to you and asked for your support to suspend Standing Orders. We would then have had a substantive motion to test on the floor of the House with a vote. This is a sham, an absolute sham and a move that I think is unprecedented in this House. The Premier is trying to hide behind a rarely used Standing Order to cut out Question Time—that is all he is trying to do this afternoon.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I point out to the House that we asked the Clerk for a precedent for the Premier of the day moving such a motion. The Clerk of the House could not find such a precedent. That is how rare it is: we have no precedent whereby a Premier of the day has hidden from Question Time

to the extent that this Premier is doing today. It disturbs me, Mr Speaker, that you should support him. I am particularly concerned because you, Sir, have just come back into the State having been overseas for a number of days. How can you judge, having just come back into the country, whether or not this is an issue of urgency?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Mr Speaker, I appreciate that this matter was thrust upon you after 1 o'clock today and that you have had little opportunity to look at the real issues at stake, that this Government, having called an election while you were away, is panicking because today is its last day in the Parliament. It is scared to have a Question Time, and it is scared to face the people of South Australia on fundamental issues such as health funding in this State, where we are likely to lose \$90 million, and a number of other key issues.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader is digressing.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Mr Speaker, by supporting the Government's urgency motion you are depriving the Opposition of bringing up some of the most fundamental issues confronting the State this week. They are far more important, frankly, because it affects the opportunity and right of people to get hospital beds in this State at present. The fact that the Women's and Children's Hospital this week has had to cut back on the number of hospital beds—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader is flagrantly disregarding my directions. On about five occasions the Chair has made the point that the Leader must be relevant to the motion that he has put forward. It is his motion.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I realise that it is my motion and I point out that if you, Sir, wanted an issue of urgency the issue would have been that it has just been announced that the Women's and Children's Hospital has cut back on operation times—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I can stand here and talk for the one minute remaining to the Leader. I do not want to do that—I want everybody to have a full debate. The Leader is really testing the Chair. The Leader has some seconds left and I ask him to speak to the motion as put forward.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Again, I appeal to you, Mr Speaker, to allow the Opposition the chance to have one last Question Time. This Government has deceived the State for so long, it has refused to answer questions in this Parliament previously and has run from the truth on the State Bank and SGIC. Now, on the last day of this Parliament, we are being denied the chance once again to pin this Government to the wall.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader's time has expired. The Treasurer.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition was given a fair go.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Does the member for Murray-Mallee have a problem with that? If he has, I ask him to bring it forward. The Government did not interrupt the Leader of the Opposition. I ask that the same leniency be shown to the Treasurer.

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier):** Sir, I will stick to the motion before the House, which is that your

decision be dissented to. I find it difficult to understand how any rational person could agree with such a proposition. Mr Speaker, you have absolute discretion under the Standing Orders to decide what you believe is urgent and what is not. It is not for me to second guess you, Sir, or to try to work out why you thought it was urgent or otherwise. The decision is purely within your discretion. It would be very easy to apply one's mind and come up with a whole host of reasons, but the principal reason is that it is the last day of Parliament prior to the election. It is the last opportunity for the Parliament to debate what is probably the most fundamental question that will be before this State over the next six weeks.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** It is the most fundamental question, namely, how to deal with the State's debt and the consequences of that.

*The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** That is one example.

*The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** That is why I assume that you took it upon yourself, Sir, to rule it a matter of importance. The Leader argued that this is unprecedented. That may or may not be the case.

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

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

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the Deputy Leader.

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I have warned the Deputy Leader. It would be foolish to stretch the friendship on the last day of Parliament.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** There is not a more important issue that the Parliament can debate. I would have thought that as the highest forum in the land, without any intermediaries, the press, faxes and so on, members opposite would welcome the opportunity to put before the Parliament what they propose if they win the election. I would have thought that they would welcome that opportunity. It may be unprecedented but, I would argue, so is a Leader going into an election unprepared until the last week of the campaign to debate the most significant issue. I argue that that is also unprecedented. I am not concerned about a vote at all. I am sure that whatever was proposed, within reason, would have been carried. We could have carried the fact that the Leader is whatever the House chose.

*The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The urgency motion simply allows time for the Leader to put his policies before the House on this critical issue as well as before the people of South Australia and before the Parliament. I commend your wisdom, Sir, in permitting that to occur and urge the House to uphold your ruling. I point out that if members opposite, as has occurred in the past, choose to have a Question Time, they only have to move a motion and we will see how the House deals with it. I can give an assurance that, as the Leader of the House, I will have no problem agreeing to that. Nevertheless, the answer is in the hands of the House, as always.

The House divided on the motion:

AYES (23)

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

NOES (23)

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There are 23 Ayes and 23 Noes. Before casting my vote, I indicate that the Chair has the right to defend itself in a dissent motion. First, I do not believe the motion as put forward denies the citizens of South Australia anything at all. It allows for a full debate upon the policies. I am on record as having said that I believe that both major Parties contesting this election should put up their policies, and I am sure that the television—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I believe that the people of South Australia have a right to know what the policies are with plenty of time to look at them.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** That is my opinion and that is why I supported the motion. As far as Question Time is concerned, it is only a motion of the House to suspend Standing Orders and bring back Question Time, and quite candidly I will support that if it is moved. The citizens of South Australia have had two debates, including one involving dissent from my ruling. I believe my ruling was correct. The House can also have a Question Time, so we can have three debates to prove the same thing. I do not think there was much point at all in this motion. I believe the other motion can now be fully debated and both sides can have a full say. If members want a Question Time, the Chair will support such a move. I cast my vote for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr Speaker, based on the invitation you have issued to the House, particularly the Opposition, I would wish to move for the suspension of Standing Orders—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I certainly will support that. However, we have the motion before the Chair which has been agreed to.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair will accept the motion at the end of the debate.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I have the right to move for the suspension of Standing Orders, and I therefore—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader does not have that right when there is a matter already before the Chair.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Premier):** I move:

As an election date has now been announced and this will be the last sitting day of Parliament, the Leader of the Opposition stands condemned by this House for stating that he will not present his debt reduction strategy until one week before election day. This House invites the Leader of the Opposition during this debate to detail to the House and the people of South Australia what services will be reduced and what taxes will be increased if his stated target of a debt figure of \$6 billion is to be achieved by 1997 in the event of his Party winning the forthcoming election. The House notes that the Premier and the Treasurer presented the Government's debt reduction strategy to Parliament on 22 April 1993 in the Meeting the Challenge statement. Furthermore, that the budget presented by the Treasurer on 26 August 1993 to this House confirmed the responsible strategy previously outlined.

This is a very important matter which South Australians will have to consider over the next six weeks prior to the election on 11 December. On 22 April this year in my economic statement Meeting the Challenge, which was followed by the Treasurer's budgetary statement, I set out a comprehensive strategy designed to bring South Australia's debt under control in just three years—not three generations as the Leader has been saying but in three years. That strategy primarily is based on restricting growth in the real level of Government outlays, in particular, by reducing administrative overheads.

That is why my Government has embarked on a major restructuring of the major bureaucratic machinery of Government, designed to reduce the number of departments and Government agencies without cutting the quantity or quality of South Australia's fine public sector services. The effect on controlling debt of the reductions and outlays is supplemented by a defined program of assets sales, including the State Bank and the Government's interest in SAGASCO, as well as the tax compensation package provided by the Commonwealth Government for the sale of the State Bank, which all members know is a very generous package and certainly much more generous than the one John Hewson was prepared to offer had he been elected Prime Minister.

The strategy requires that each budget achieve three simple disciplines over this and the next two years: first, that outlays decline in real terms; secondly, that debt decline as a proportion of gross State product; and, thirdly, that debt decline in real terms as well. We achieved each of these targets in the budget which my Treasurer handed down on 26 August, demonstrating that our debt strategy can work—it is working.

At the end of three years our strategy will have succeeded in stabilising our debt by eliminating the deficit on the recurrent account. It will do this, inflicting the minimum amount of pain on the community. It is true that we could do it faster and harder, but the Government made a judgment. We as a Cabinet considered the faster and harder option and made a judgment based on the community's interest in maintaining the quality and quantity of services enjoyed by all South Australians without putting up taxes.

I note that the Leader of the Opposition has been calling for an election ever since I became Premier, more than 14 months ago. Every day almost we have calls, 'Go to the polls, go to the polls.' In recent months the Leader has been saying, 'You have to have an election on 27 November.' Members

will recall the times when the Leader said it had to be 27 November. Now that I have named 11 December, the Leader of the Opposition has run for cover and refuses to show his policies. The Leader is going into all sorts of ploys to stay away from putting his own policies on the public agenda.

Remember, it was the Leader who said that we should go to the polls on 27 November. What is he now saying about the 11 December date? He is saying that his campaign will not start until after the Grand Prix. If that is what the Leader honestly believes should be the case—that there should not be a campaign over the Grand Prix period—he must have believed that before, when he was saying that 27 November should be the date. What was the Leader wanting to say to South Australians? What was he suggesting as to how much time they should have to debate and scrutinise the policies of the Parties? In his view, a 27 November election, given that campaigning would not start until after the Grand Prix, would see only three weeks to scrutinise his policies.

In fact, he has trumped even himself on that because, on the first day of this campaign, the Leader said he would not let the public see his debt strategy until the last week before the poll—six days before the election. My strategy was on the public record six months before the election date and we have given an election campaign of six weeks. All the Leader is prepared to do is to give six days. The Leader is hiding his debt reduction strategy and running for cover, and there is only one reason—the Leader knows that it will not withstand the scrutiny it deserves to receive.

My debt reduction strategy has been in the public domain for six months and there has been ample opportunity for commentators to analyse it and subject it to rigorous questioning. I have never run from the rigorous questioning and have been prepared to face that full debate on my policies since I have been Premier. The Leader should be prepared to do likewise. More than that, our policies are being implemented, yet the Leader will not even give the six weeks of the campaign to discuss this matter: all he wants is six days.

This is part of a disconcerting pattern that we have seen emerging from the Leader since I called the election last week. First, the Leader refuses to release his policies, and then he avoids debates with me. The Leader wants the absolute minimum scrutiny on all counts. As to debates, it needs to be noted that we have both been offered three television debates by Channel 7. A press release dated 29 October states:

Channel 7 has offered to host three television debates between the Premier, Mr Arnold, and the Opposition Leader, Mr Brown.

Unlike most Leaders of the Opposition, who would be glad to put their point of view to the public in such a forum, to face the voters and take those three opportunities, the Leader wants to limit them. The Leader is running away from those opportunities and people must ask why he is doing that. It is clear that the apparent Party of free enterprise wants only one debate, but it says it might settle for two debates. The Party of free enterprise wants one of the debates to be only half an hour on the ABC. It does not want debates on the top rating commercial television stations and it certainly does not want three of them.

The Party of free enterprise seems to discern that there may be some buyer resistance to its policies. Well it might. It has been noted that the Opposition does not want to have any debate in the last week of the campaign. I understand that the Opposition might just consider, if its arm is twisted



behind its back, the Monday of the last week, but nothing later than that. Why is the Opposition hiding?

Last Sunday on the *Sunday* program, Laurie Oakes asked the Leader a question about an article in last week's *Bulletin* which suggested that the Liberals had received advice on three new taxes: a new CBD tax, a one-off debt reduction income tax and a corporate tax surcharge. Those members who watched the program will have heard the Leader say that the report completely lacked any credibility. The Leader went on to state:

It was interesting the reporter did not even bother to come to me and ask whether it was true.

However, the reporter was watching the program as well and took exception to the claim that he failed to check the material in his article. The reporter wrote to the Leader of the Opposition and, as it happens, I have a copy of the letter from the reporter, and I will read it to the House for all members to note. From Robert Mayne of the *Bulletin*, the letter states:

Dear Mr Brown,

I noted your comments on *Sunday* this morning that I did not speak to you about the taxation matters referred to in the current issue of the *Bulletin*. In fact, you may have forgotten that I approached you on 23 September and told you I was interested in pursuing this matter. As you were about to get into a car I suppose it is not reasonable to expect you to remember, although you didn't seem too keen to discuss the subject then, or later. But I did speak at some length on this and other matters with your two press advisers on 8 October. Yes, they denied it, but I did raise it with them. Quite honestly, I would expect a potential future Government to canvas taxation policies in an exhaustive way. It's what you do about it that actually matters, of course. Cordially, Robert Mayne.

We have the Leader saying one thing on the *Sunday* program, yet we have the advice that it was absolutely wrong.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** There is a word for that.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** There is a word for that and people can make their own judgments about it. The public want to know quite specifically, if the Liberal Government is going to cut debt to \$6 billion—they are the Leader's words, and that is what the Leader said he will do—how will it do it?

The public have a right not just to hear that on the eve of election day but to have the chance to ask tough questions and get answers from the Leader. What programs will be cut? What taxes will be put up? What assets will be sold? Why are the public not being told? As I said, we considered whether to cut debt further and faster. We consciously rejected it as unnecessary, as not the right recipe for South Australia. In fact, we believed it could be potentially damaging in the circumstances of the tender economic recovery under way and contrary to the wider social objectives which a Labor Government has and seeks to implement—part of the Labor Party philosophy of social justice.

There is no doubt that the Leader has a different set of values and different priorities. The people have a right to know from both the Parties. I have had it on the record for six months and I have been prepared to answer the questions right throughout and remain so. It is time for the Leader to stop running; it is time for the Leader to realise he cannot hide; it is time for the Leader not only to face me, which he is refusing to do in debates at the moment, but also to face the people of South Australia. He has a six week campaign in which to do it. This motion is giving him time to debate it. I do not intend to use all my time, so he can have time to give his debt reduction strategy to this House and to the people of South Australia. He can run but he cannot hide.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition):** I indicate to you, Mr Speaker, and the House that immediately after this one hour debate, for which there will be no vote whatsoever because of the fact that this Government was scared to go to a vote on this particular issue—but I will come back to that in a moment—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Yes, you were all scared—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:**—to test this motion before the House this afternoon. You were all scared to do that. You had to grab an urgency motion, for which you knew there would be no vote whatsoever.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Mr Speaker, I say from the outset that I will accept your invitation to support a suspension of Standing Orders to allow one hour of Question Time immediately after this one hour debate so that we do have a chance to have this Government, this Government that has been running from the people of South Australia for the past four years, face up to some questions. The Premier himself might like to hear what one of those questions will be. Let me put it to the House now, so that he has three quarters of an hour, at least—

*The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:**—to think of an appropriate answer, because it is about a far more important and urgent issue than this vote. It is all about jobs in South Australia. Let me put the question now to the Premier so that he can think about it for the next hour.

**Mr Ingerson:** You listen, you might get a shock.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The question that was to be put to the Premier this afternoon is: is it a fact that the Premier recently filmed and photographed at the North Plympton factory of Castalloy Manufacturing for the production of Labor Party election advertising—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:**—claiming in doing so that South Australia is on the move (to use his words) and undergoing an export boom, creating jobs? Is he aware that 35 employees have just been dismissed from the same plant after the loss of an export order? Will he give a guarantee that he will desist from visiting other manufacturing plants during the next six weeks, so that he does not put the same curse on the other manufacturing plants as he has just put on Castalloy?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** This Government is running from the people of South Australia; it is running from this Parliament; it is not prepared now to put itself under public scrutiny. Let me deal, right from the outset so that we bury it well and truly, with the reporter who actually approached me from the *Bulletin*.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** As I literally stepped into a car and shut the door, he grabbed my arm and said, 'Some-time I would like to talk to you about some of your Govern-

ment policies.' There was no mention of any specific taxes whatsoever. So, how can the Premier make this sort of claim? Let me refer to the three allegations of new taxes apparently contained in the *Bulletin* article: one was a special CBD tax, another was a surcharge on company tax, and the other was a surcharge on individual taxation. The Premier seems to know so little about the Australian constitution that he does not realise that no South Australian Government—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:**—has such power to impose any of those three taxes. So, what credibility do they have? I can give an absolute guarantee to this House and to the people of this State that no such proposal has been put to me whatsoever. Let us come back to the motion before the House about debt.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** And the pertinent question for everyone in South Australia to ask is: who created the debt? Who lost our money in the State Bank? They did—\$3 150 million of taxpayers' money. Who lost the money in the SGIC? They did. Who lost the money down at Marine-land? They did.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Every member knows that only one member can speak at once in any debate in this House. I thought that, whichever Leader was on his feet, his own side would pay him respect. I would ask all members to pay respect to the member on his feet. The Leader.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I pose another question to the House: who lost the \$60 million in Scrimber? They did. It is this Labor Government of South Australia that has now imposed \$8 000 million of debt on South Australia. It is this Labor Government that has imposed a debt of \$22 000 on the average family in South Australia—\$22 000. Who are the people who should be standing up and being accountable for this? The Labor Government of South Australia. They should. Under the last—

*Mr Hamilton interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the member for Albert Park.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** When this Labor Government came to office 11 long years ago, the State debt was \$2 600 million. Today, it is \$8 000 million because of the financial incompetence, starting with the member for Ross Smith, the present Premier and all his Cabinet colleagues—the very people who sat at the Cabinet table and reappointed the same people to the boards of SGIC and the State Bank, the very people who sat on their hands, just as the honourable member is sitting on his hands now. They sat on their hands and failed to heed any of the warnings whatsoever. When they are asked to come out in the count, or even to apologise—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I point out to the people of South Australia that we have not even received an apology from the Labor Party for what it has inflicted upon this State over the past 11 years. For every day that Labor has been in office, the debt of this State has increased by \$1 million. The only reason I was calling for an early election was to get rid of this Government—to get rid of the people who were creating that debt.

The quicker we had the election, the quicker we could have stopped the increase in the State debt. Every day that the Minister of Education, Employment and Training, the Minister of Public Infrastructure and the Treasurer—who now all face the loss of their seats—sit on the benches opposite, the debt increases by another \$1 million.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** It is appropriate to take this opportunity to point out to South Australians that for every day this Government stays in office, as a State we are spending \$2 million in interest alone on the State debt; we are spending \$790 million a year in interest payments on the debt created by this Labor Government. I am sure that the taxpayers of South Australia would be horrified to know that more than 50¢ in every dollar of tax that they pay to the State Government goes towards paying interest on this debt alone. In fact, about 54¢ in every dollar that we pay to the South Australian Government goes purely to pay the interest on the debt created by this Labor Government.

This Premier is shortly to be terminated. In fact, he has already been terminated by people like Keith Conlon who cut him off at the knees on the first day of the campaign. So did Murray Nicoll, who turned to me and said, 'Well, Premier Dean, we are delighted to have you here.'

Imagine any Government with the financial record of this Government having the hide to come into this Parliament and trying to make an issue out of the debt that now hangs around the necks of all South Australians. This group of desperate men and women want to try to crawl their way back into Government telling every possible untruth they can, trying to rewrite the history of South Australia, even during the election campaign itself, but still being unwilling to face the facts as outlined by the Royal Commissioner. Even the Royal Commissioner highlighted the fact that in 198889 serious concerns about the State Bank were expressed to the Premier and he failed to heed those warnings; and, because he failed to heed those warnings, the final debt of the State Bank collapse—

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER:** Instead of posing for the cameras, should not the honourable member be addressing you on his policy, Sir?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The Premier is clearly trying to run on his track record in this election campaign, because he has put down no policies whatsoever. He brought down his own debt reduction strategy. But where is it today? It is in absolute tatters. Already, on his own admission, he is more than \$50 million a year out in his debt reduction strategy, which was brought down in April this year.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Eight months after you brought down your debt reduction strategy it has fallen apart.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The House will come to order. The Leader will direct his remarks through the Chair and the Premier will cease interrupting and interjecting. The Leader.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I point out, Mr Speaker, that we have had no policies from the Government at all, except

the economic statement, and that is in tatters. The economic statement set out two particular things: first, a debt reduction strategy, which is in tatters and has a \$400 million black hole in it; and, secondly, to boost business confidence in South Australia, and it has absolutely failed on that score, miserably and completely.

Everyone knows that I cannot bring down a final costing summary of my policies until I bring down my policies, and everyone knows that the normal time to bring down important policies is in the policy speech. I am afraid that the Premier will have to withhold his excitement for just a few moments longer—until the policy speech comes down, when I shall be able to outline the full costing summary of all my policies.

In the meantime, I urge the Government to start to refocus on the important issues in this campaign, once again building up confidence in the future of South Australia, building new investment, creating jobs, and making sure that our essential services like hospitals, schools and public transport are rebuilt. They are the issues that South Australians want after 11 desperate, dark years under Labor.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister of Education, Employment and Training has had a fair go. The Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier):** Mr Speaker, it is my lot, the way that the sequence of debate was to go, to follow the Leader's 15 minutes and give a very quick but nevertheless expert analysis of the debt reduction strategy that we expected to be laid down in not precise detail but broad outline. I think it is a great shame and an insult to the Parliament and to the people of South Australia that the Leader was not prepared in any circumstances to give us the slightest hint of his policies in this area.

Some of the measures that the Leader chose to talk about, whether hospitals or industrial development, are absolutely important, but they will all be affected in one way or another by the way that the State's debt is managed. There is no point in coming out with nice sounding policies on this, that and the other thing, making sweeping generalisations such as, 'We will put people back to work; we will do this; we will do A, B, C and D', without bringing out the key to do a large number of those things, and that is managing the State's debt.

What we have had to date from the Leader is very thin, but, as much as we can draw it together, it appears that the Leader can reduce the debt by 1997 to \$6 billion. That is something like an additional \$1 billion over and above those things that have already been nominated. He can do that without reducing services or increasing taxes; in fact he can do that with increased spending in a number of areas.

There is not a commentator in South Australia who thinks that is anything but a joke. It may be that reducing the debt by 1997 to \$6 billion is a responsible thing to do. I would argue that it is not, but that is my opinion. It may be that the financial commentators will say that is a totally responsible thing to do. All that is required to make it credible is to answer the question: how? I can state now that what cannot be done is precisely what the Leader has said in broad terms he will do. You cannot bring the debt down to such an extent without increasing taxation, without reducing services or without having asset sales of a fire sale nature such as to be financially irresponsible.

You simply cannot do it. I have a great deal of respect for most of the financial commentators in the media in this State and indeed in Australia, because, whilst they do not generally

support me or my line on these things, at least they are prepared to say what you have to do if you need to get into the area of very rapid debt reduction. They say you do have to cut the public sector. Cliff Walsh, the guru of members opposite, says you have to reduce the public sector by 9 000 people, and I think that he is about right in his estimate; that is what you have to do to get the debt down to that extent and at that speed. Cliff Walsh also tells them that we have to impose a poll tax similar to the one they have in Victoria if we are going to get the debt down to the rate that the Leader has nominated in that period. Cliff Walsh has no axe to grind in this. Obviously, he has an ideological position, which coincides with the Leader's, but what Cliff Walsh is prepared to do is openly tell people how to do it, not just state that it is desirable. Lots of things are desirable; the question is whether it is capable of being done.

To enable the Deputy Leader and one other member to speak, I will conclude on the question of asset sales. The Leader has suggested that asset sales are the way to go. I would point out that to get the debt down to what was nominated in the budget, the SAGASCO sales have already been factored in and the bank has been factored in, and one only has to take a cursory look at the balance sheets of SGIC to realise that, if any sell-off takes place there, it will be for very minimal amounts of money indeed. The only other assets of substance that this State has in a saleable form are the Electricity Trust and E&WS.

If the Leader is suggesting that the asset sales include ETSA and E&WS, again, let us have that debate. That may or may not be desirable—I am sure Cliff Walsh would say it is desirable, but I would say it is undesirable—but at least let us have that debate. Again, it is perfectly clear that even selling off assets of that size will not bring the debt down to \$6 million by 1997, even if we get top dollar for them. So, there is absolutely no salvation in asset sales. If the assets are any good they are bringing in revenue stream which is already counted in the State budget.

I look forward to the eventual debate on the Liberal Party's debt reduction strategy. I think it is an absolute insult to the people of this State and the financial commentators that that critical, crucial debate will not be held until six days before election day, and I can only urge the media to keep the pressure on the Opposition to release those policies.

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The Deputy Leader laughs at my plaintive plea. It appears that the Deputy Leader feels that the press does not care, that it is not interested. I can tell him that is wrong. I think the press has a very significant role in a democracy and has a right and an obligation to inform people within this State of the crucial issues of the day. The media (not just the people) and this Parliament are being denied that. What we have seen today is what the Deputy Leader told us during the budget debate, when he laughed across the Chamber and said, 'You'll get no policies out of us.' It is all there in *Hansard*. The Parliament ought not to let the Liberal Party get away with that; the media ought not to let the Liberal Party get away with that, and the people of this State also ought not to let the Liberal Party get away with that approach.

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** The Treasurer still had eight minutes to go, and I know he convinced the television cameras to be elsewhere.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Members opposite must really wonder about themselves; they cannot take a trick. Here was the latest stunt to take themselves out of Question Time, divert people's attention away from their own inadequacies, and say, 'It is really the Opposition that should be coming forward and giving its debt reduction strategy', just to try to avoid the last Question Time, which they knew would be so damaging. If members had their time again I suggest Government members would have rethought all their actions today and the way they have carried out this exercise, because this is indicative of a Government that has no control over itself, no control over where it is going and no capacity to perform. What we have seen today is pathetic. It is an indication of a dying Government, and all it can do is carp and say, 'We would like to see your policies.' In the past 11 years, when has this Government put a debt reduction strategy before the people of South Australia? When you put out your policies—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is well aware that he cannot use the term 'you'.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Government members have done it on their own time frames, just as we will be doing. We have a plan for Government, we have a plan for delivering the policies, and they will be delivered. The people will be satisfied and this Government will be out of power.

I would like to bring up some very important issues in this debate in relation to debt. I am reminded that one of the major contributors to the debt in this State is the State Bank, to the tune of \$3 150 million, plus over \$400 million in other debt servicing related to that bank, so we are talking about \$3.5 billion.

Let us talk about one of the matters that I believe is dear to the hearts of the people of South Australia, and that happens to be the Hindmarsh Island bridge. For some time we have been concerned that the bridge was being built for other than economic reasons. We have obtained a report given to the Government by Ferrier Hodgson about this bridge, and it has opened up a number of questions which we would like answered. We know the report states that within the Chapman group (and there are 20 companies in that group) there is a deficiency of funds of about \$9.3 million. There is an \$800 000 advance from the State Bank to the Goolwa marina development, even though the Government has publicly and obviously falsely claimed (in fact, it could almost be classed as a lie) that the State Bank had not provided any funding for the Hindmarsh Island development—that is on the record—and \$7.221 million for the Wellington marina development.

The question that was always being asked by the Opposition was why the Government would get itself into such a mess, and the answer lies in the Chapmans' involvement in the Wellington marina. The mortgage documents I have been shown reveal that the Wellington marina was transferred from Beneficial Finance to the Chapman group on 30 June 1989. I have been told that the previous developer of the Wellington marina had foundered and that the Government was anxious not to have another marina debacle on its hands in the lead-up to an election in 1989.

*The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:*

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The Premier asks what this has to do with debt reduction. I suggest to the Premier that if he did not get himself involved in such deals we would not have \$3 150 million worth of State Bank losses, \$350 million of SGIC losses and interest costs, as the Leader has mentioned, of almost \$2 million a day. At the time to which I have been

referring, the Government had already failed with the Jubilee Point development, the Kingston Park marina and the Marino Rocks marina.

Accordingly the former Premier, the member for Ross Smith, personally intervened to protect the Government's position. He encouraged the Chapman group to take over the Wellington marina to ensure that Beneficial Finance could recover from its loan. The deal was that, if this occurred, the Government would agree to share in the costs of the bridge to support the Hindmarsh Island marina. The deal for the Chapman group to enter into a joint venture on the bridge and to split its cost was finalised just before the calling of the 1989 election. Throughout this fiasco the Government has been keen to turn the spotlight away from this project, a project on which taxpayers face losses of several million dollars, based on the Beneficial Finance exposure of more than \$7 million.

It is obvious why the Government had hoped that the public would ignore the vital link between the Wellington marina and the funding of this bridge, because the Wellington project ties the Government's hands. It has forced the Government to agree to fund the bridge up front despite the continuing deterioration of the financial position of the Chapman group. The action by the former Premier to involve the Chapman group at Wellington has obliged the Government to continue to support the Chapman group with the Hindmarsh Bridge irrespective of the cost and irrespective of the economic outcomes.

Returning to the Ferrier Hodgson report, one of its recommendations was that the State Bank should consider entering into possession of the Wellington development. That means that it wanted the State Bank to dispose of the Wellington development. Searches of the company records indicate that this action has not yet been taken. The last charge over the property was created in February 1990—two years before this damning report to the bad bank, which put the financial position of the Chapman group beyond recovery. Of the 20 companies examined, only one was solvent. I understand that a copy of this report was provided to the former Premier very soon after it was given to the bad bank (the Group Asset Management Division).

It is quite clear that there was personal intervention by members of the Government to ensure that the Chapman group was allowed to continue with its plans for a development on Hindmarsh Island, despite its deteriorating financial position. It is quite clear that the Chapman group—as companies with loans with the bad bank—has been protected from the sort of treatment that other companies have suffered at the hands of the bad bank. Many companies have been sent to the wall, but the Chapman group has been allowed to continue with its Hindmarsh Island development and now taxpayers have to pay up front for a bridge to underpin its viability. This is yet another financial scandal created by this totally discredited Labor Government.

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The Deputy Premier says, 'What about another speaker?' We understood that it was going to be 15 minutes each. If he is not capable of doing his 15 minutes, I am happy. I can understand why the Deputy Premier does not have—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I am speaking for another seven minutes—you can make up your own mind.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Treasurer will cease interjecting. The Deputy Leader will direct his remarks through the Chair.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I remind the House that it is normal for this debate to last a full 60 minutes and we have 15 minutes each, unless there is an agreed departure. There was no agreed departure today. I cannot understand what the Deputy Premier has been doing. The problem I find with this motion is that it has ruined a very good press release that I intended to put out tomorrow. However, I will now tell the press about the Government's costings and its debt management strategy to enable us to determine how well they stand up to scrutiny. We have heard the constant squeals from the Premier and the Deputy Premier for a debt reduction strategy. We have told everyone that when all the policies are out we will give the costings. That, Sir, is absolutely acceptable.

Let us look at the Government's record. Whilst we guarantee to deliver our policies at the due time, let us look at the path followed by this Government over the past four years. Does the Treasurer remember that in 1989 the then Treasurer predicted that he needed \$154 million to fund the budget? In fact, he needed \$26.2 million more to fund that same budget—a miscalculation of 17 per cent, or a 17 per cent overrun. That was in the space of about nine months. Not to be outdone, in 1990 this Treasurer predicted that he would need to borrow \$260 million—almost double the amount of the previous year. In fact, he needed a further \$99.1 million on top of that. So, that was a miscalculation of 38 per cent. In 1991 the Treasurer decided that he needed to borrow even more—he needed \$330 million. However, at the end of the day he needed an extra \$140 million on top of that. So, that was a 42 per cent miscalculation. How could anyone get it so wrong over three critical budgets? The budget deficits amounted to a massive \$744 million and blew out to \$1 009 million with an error rate of 36 per cent.

This Government says, 'We want your costings.' What gross hypocrisy! In 1992 the Treasurer said, 'I will try to get it right this year.' The predicted outcome was \$317 million, and it was brought in under budget at \$305 million. However, there was a little trick, because he grossly underspent on the capital budget and then took \$23 million out of the State Bank just to make the figures look good. They were not budgeted figures. So, we could say that over the past four years we have seen budgets of disgraceful proportions and costings that have not lasted more than two or three months and have still been out. This Treasurer and this Premier have the gall to ask the Opposition immediately for its costings. If we could do 5 per cent better than that, we would be a mile in front. We will deliver.

The Premier says, 'Look at our economic statement. It stands up to scrutiny.' I can tell him that it is not even fit for use in the toilet because it is already outdated and already beyond the point where it can be sustained. Very simply, a budget surplus of \$120 million has been predicted this year. We are already behind. The Premier is spending money like it is going out of fashion. We have all these cute little deals to provide the \$120 million surplus, including ripping \$300 million out of the State Bank and ripping off special deposit accounts to the tune of \$142 million. All these cute little deals are designed to create the impression that the budget is in surplus and that it can be ripped off to fund the false promises of this Government. It is all just a bit crook and, if any credibility is left opposite, Government members should stand up and admit their mistakes, apologise to the people and retire gracefully. If they are going to talk about

costings, let them talk about something simple like the State Bank. The first estimate of the losses was \$1 000 million. Then the Treasury officials said, 'I don't think that's right—let's make it \$2 200 million.' The next estimate was \$2 300 million. Not to be outdone, the next estimate was \$3 150 million, and we still know there is no end to it. So, do not talk to us about our costings. We will deliver on time. The Government has never delivered.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Education, Employment and Training):** We have been subjected to what can only be regarded as a travesty of democracy in this place this afternoon. The people in the gallery, the media and indeed members on this side of the House know, as do members on the other side, that members of the community are asking very loudly for the Opposition's policies. They want to know what members opposite will do in terms of meeting their debt reduction strategy. This afternoon we have been subjected to tirades from the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader, but there has not been one word of policy, and there has not been one word about how the Opposition's debt reduction strategy might be carried out. So, I will go back and refer to some of the statements by the Leader of the Opposition that are on the public record.

Let me begin by saying, as the Premier and the Deputy Premier have said, that the Leader of the Opposition has said that he will fund the reduction of the State debt to \$6 billion by 1997 from the sale of Government assets. He is also on the record as saying that there is an enormous potential to sell Education Department assets. On 7 October last year on 5AN the Leader of the Opposition said:

Well, if you look at the issues and what has occurred here you will see there is an enormous similarity with Victoria.

On that very same day the Opposition Leader went on to say that he would cut public sector funding by 15 to 25 per cent, and that is there for everyone in the media, everyone in the Parliament and for everyone in the community to refer to.

The only thing we have seen coming out of the Opposition has been a 'Make the Change' mission statement. When we look at the policy direction for education, for example, we find that it is nothing more than an insult to the education community of this State. I will quote the Leader of the Opposition, because he said, 'The exception was a vague proposal to make schools responsible for curriculum development and local school budgets.' In Victoria this is called Schools for the Future, and it is based on a total devolution and the commercialisation of schools. I do not have to remind members of this House what that meant. It meant the wholesale closure of large numbers of schools. In fact, we are up to 214 with a cut in education of \$145 million, and a promise of \$500 million. We know there is an education hit list for schools with enrolments under 300, and that amounts to 363 schools.

The community justifiably can be very nervous about the man they are calling 'Dishonest Dean', because they know that there are questions that must be asked. I would like to put some of those questions on the public record. First, does the Opposition Leader propose to reduce the State commitment to education, health and community services (as conservative Governments right round this country and right round the world have done) and allow the funds to be channelled into programs which produce profits for shareholders—shareholders that conservative Governments have historically supported from time immemorial? Does the Opposition

Leader propose a major attack on social values as we know them and the redistribution of wealth in the community? Of course he does. We only have to refer to the examples that have been raised in this Parliament over the past few months in terms of what has happened in Victoria.

Let me pose a second specific question: will the Opposition Leader tell the people of South Australia how much it will cost, and what is his time frame for achieving his goal for Adelaide to become the export capital of Australia? Journalists highlighted this issue on 5AN's midday special when the Leader of the Opposition had to be asked 'Do you know what you said Mr Brown?' There was a pause while the brain moved into gear. The second time the question was asked the Leader replied, 'Oh yes, I know what I have said.' He was then asked how long he thought it would take South Australia and Adelaide to overtake Sydney and Melbourne in terms of becoming the export capital of Australia.

This is the man who seriously puts himself forward as an alternative Premier in this State. People out there will not be fooled. Those in the media who are probing will not be fooled. Indeed, this morning he did not even know the history of Kangaroo Island, which is in his own electorate. He did not even know the history of his own electorate. I would like to now turn to the question of jobs.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** The Leader has talked about creating 200 000 jobs. When the Opposition spokesperson on employment was asked where Mr Brown got this notion of 200 000 jobs, his answer was, 'Well, it is a simple 10 per cent arithmetical calculation based on John Hewson's 2 million jobs.' I ask you: is this an example of some kind of economic skill, or is it just the ramblings and ravings of somebody who wants to grab power at any cost? He will not tell the people of this State what he is going to cut. Is he going to cut community services, as was the case in Victoria? Will he cut family planning and mothers and babies services? Is he going to charge for mothers and babies services? Is he going to sell off kindergartens to the private sector?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** What are you going to do? You do not know and you will not tell us.

At 3.50 p.m., the bells having been rung, the matter was withdrawn.

## QUESTION TIME

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition):** I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended to enable one hour of Question Time to be taken into consideration forthwith.

**The SPEAKER:** Before putting the question, I would indicate to the House that the Chair believes that the debate today has precluded the time that would have been used for grievances and I will not be calling upon grievances.

Motion carried.

## MEDICARE

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition):** What urgent steps will the Premier take to renegotiate the Medicare agreement with the Federal Government, which on present indications will mean that South Australian public

hospitals will lose up to \$130 million by the end of this financial year? Does he now agree that the agreement which his Government signed in February 1993 sets impossible targets for hospitals to meet and that this will cause a financial crisis for those hospitals by the end of this financial year? I understand that the figures have now been submitted to the South Australian Health Commission by public hospitals detailing their inability to meet public and private bed day targets established under the new Medicare agreement. That is for the first three months of this year.

This agreement incurs a penalty of \$405 per occupied bed if the hospital falls below the ratio target set. The Health Commission has been told that on present figures the losses to hospitals will range from \$40 000 per hospital to \$1.25 million by the end of the financial year, representing between 5 and 15 per cent of their total hospital budgets. This is at a time when their budgets have already been reduced by between 5 and 7 per cent through funding cuts under this Labor Government. I have received a report from the Hospitals and Health Services Association of South Australia which expresses grave concern. It concludes with the following words—they are not my words but those of the report:

This aspect of the current Medicare agreement promises to cause irreversible damage to the health system.

Yesterday, I received verbal confirmation that losses to our hospitals will be at least \$92 million and indications are that they may be as high as \$130 million for the year.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Obviously, some detail to do with hospitals I will refer to my colleague the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services. As to the Medicare agreement itself—and this is the agreement about which we are talking—it is the agreement that has now been signed by every Government. This is the agreement—

*The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:**—which, in the five minutes remaining before the closing of the formal governing period before the caretaker period commenced prior to the last Federal election, Victoria and New South Wales were banging on the door to get in to sign the agreement. This is the agreement they could not wait to be part of when they suddenly realised they might miss out on the opportunity to be part of the funding arrangement. They were eager to get there. True, they had done a bit of politicking themselves—

*The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:**—before they went to sign the agreement. Indeed, they rather hoped it would be forgotten that they did an about face on this matter. They had postured around the place that they did not want to have anything to do with the agreement but, when their people went through the figures and had a close look, they realised that their politicking and gesturing were simply cutting off their nose to spite their face and that they were turning down a good deal. When the election was called, I can imagine the fright that was felt in those States when the Prime Minister announced the election date—the fright when they suddenly realised they would have to hurry to get the money before the Government went into caretaker mode. It is to the credit of the Federal Government that it allowed those discussions to take place until the last moments of the formal governing period before the caretaker mode commenced and the agreement was signed. I have not heard many thank you's

from Jeff Kennett and John Fahey, in New South Wales, but those are the facts of the matter.

In South Australia, in the last budget the funds available to the health system in South Australia showed a real increase on the previous year. That cannot be disputed. That is the situation. There was a real increase, and that point has been detailed by my own Minister in ministerial statements to the House. That real overall increase is then available to the many units within the Health Commission and the situation from unit to unit does vary from year to year, and that is the situation that members opposite have full opportunity to question in the Estimates Committee process in order to get answers on those matters.

The bottom line is that every State in Australia knew that this deal was a deal that they should sign and those States which postured about it nevertheless rushed to get into it when it looked like they might not have a chance. Secondly, we have had a real increase in health funding in this year's budget. Thirdly, Medicare is a very popular program with the people of Australia, and those who have tried to posture against the overall Medicare program inevitably have to change their tune—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:**—because they feel the electoral cost of it when they start to attack what is a very popular program with the people of Australia.

*The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! We have had a couple of debates here already. My voice is starting to go. I do not intend to call for order on every question all the time. It is Question Time. The main complaint was that there was not going to be a Question Time. There is now a Question Time. Let us treat it with respect. The member for Walsh.

### STATE BANK

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh):** My question is directed to the Premier. In view of the political points that the Liberal Opposition has tried to make about the Bannon Cabinet's not being informed of the scale of the impending disaster in the State Bank until after new consultants were called in December 1990, does the Premier believe that the Liberal Opposition was guilty of deliberate and calculated dereliction of duty by not acting in a bipartisan manner using the inside knowledge it claimed to have had?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Walsh.

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER:** It has come to my attention that the Liberal Opposition prior to the last election had a leak placed fairly high up in the State Bank hierarchy who was providing it with information which varied drastically and dramatically from that which the bank was providing to Treasurer Bannon. After several questions had been asked in the House of Assembly, the then Leader was pressured by the Adelaide establishment to desist, and for a while Opposition questions were instead passed onto the member for Coles to ask in the House so that the Leader would not be associated with them, but this also ceased in response to business pressures within the Liberal Party. It has been put to me that much of the State Bank disaster could have been avoided if the Opposition had taken its information to the Government on a bipartisan basis to initiate a proper and discreet inquiry. In other words, it appears that the Liberals thought only of

seeking political advantage regardless of what happened to the community of South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If you want only three questions, that is up to the House.

**Mr Meier:** Who wrote that for you, John?

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the member for Goyder.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I am very interested in the reaction of some members opposite. I was particularly interested in the reaction of the member for Coles who, when it was suggested the questions were passed onto her, by her interjections she took offence at the suggestion that she had not been the author of those questions. But what the member for Walsh is referring to is that it is now easy for members opposite in the light of the events that have happened with the State Bank to claim that they knew all that was to be known, notwithstanding the fact that the then Leader of the Opposition, the member for Victoria, at least had the candour to say, on the occasion of the first bank bail-out, that he had no idea that the problem of the bank was of that magnitude. That was the first bank bail-out. Of course, since that time it grew even more. He at least had the candour to admit that he was not privy to any of the kind of information that now so many members opposite claimed to have had from that time and claimed that the Government must have had—by some obscure reasoning—right from that time.

It is to be noted that the magnitude of the problems of the bank were not initially known even to those consultants brought in to assess the situation—J.P. Morgan—in the month just before the first bail-out was announced. J.P. Morgan did some assessment work on that and had access to the books and accounts of the bank, coming out with a figure that was later to prove not a full reflection of the total financial problems of the bank. These were people who had access to the bank's finances.

We then had the person put in as Chair of the bank, Mr Nobby Clark, a well known and well respected banker in this country. Likewise, he was to acknowledge later that the problems that were there on the first day were only a part of all the problems that existed within the bank and he was later to discover the problems were bigger than he was aware of on his first taking over. That was someone who was Chair of the bank after the bank had the first bail-out and who therefore had the opportunity for rigorous questioning throughout the bank's structure to find out what the problems were.

However, Opposition members—apart from the member for Victoria—are saying that somehow they had access to more information indicating that the bank was in much more serious trouble than was being claimed by anyone else. If that is the case, they were guilty of reprehensible behaviour—that they chose not to let that information be known more widely, that they chose not to publicise that information. They cannot have it both ways. They have to work through the logic of their own arguments. The logic takes them either to one position or to another position, but they cannot attempt to straddle the two positions. The simple facts are that, as the member for Ross Smith as the then Premier acknowledged, they had asked some perceptive questions but, as their own Leader of the time acknowledged, it was on the basis of no information about what was actually happening in the bank, and that really reflects the situation that was faced by the community in South Australia generally.

The Opposition seeks to make many points out of the bank, as would be expected, but it really should not start to get into revisionist rewriting of history: it should examine the role it really played at that time, and examine the role of certain individual members on the other side.

### SURGICAL PROCEDURES

**Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide):** My question is directed to the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services. What hospitals, other than the Women's and Children's Hospital, are being forced to reduce their operating theatre times through funding cuts; and what urgent action is the Minister taking to alleviate the problems confronting the Women's and Children's Hospital, which has disclosed that its surgical operating times will be shortened by half an hour a day, thereby dramatically reducing the number of procedures which can be conducted at that hospital?

I have in my possession an internal memorandum from the hospital's Acting Chief Executive Officer, Ms Judith Dwyer, informing departmental heads that operating times would finish half an hour earlier than previously 'due to funding constraints'. I have been told that with this reduction in hours, any operation which cannot be finished by 4.30 p.m. will not be started because of a ban on overtime and that the lengthy waiting lists for surgical procedures will inevitably be further exacerbated.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** I think the Premier's answer to the first question this afternoon set the appropriate tone for this question. The reality is that the current Medicare agreement has provided this State with an extra \$22 million, but expenditure on health has increased under this Government's budget this year, and that follows a long-term trend in this State by this Government to provide substantial and increasing funding for health care. The reality is that the Opposition simply cannot cope with that; it simply cannot produce policies which match it. Instead, we have policies which talk about \$50 million reductions in the funding available to health care in this State.

We have seen the effect of that in Victoria; we are starting to see the effect of it in Western Australia. We have seen hospitals closed. What the Opposition cannot tolerate is the idea that this Government can provide effective and efficient management of our hospitals and where appropriate economies will be effected. Millions of dollars have been saved over time in our hospitals by sensible and rational efficiencies in the management of those hospitals, in cleaning contracts and so on.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** Let us look at waiting lists, since members opposite mention that matter by interjection. During this election campaign, half the people now on the waiting list will have their procedures undertaken in our hospitals. Of that 8 000—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** Of that 8 000—which members to my right are fond of discussing—the reality is that, during the 45 days of this election campaign, 4 000 people will go through our hospital system; they will receive the very high standard of care which this health system provides. That high standard has been confirmed on an international best practice survey under which health scored 90 out of 100 points in this

country. That international ranking puts us in the top class of health systems when all factors are taken into account. That clearly shows that under the decade plus of Medicare, and indeed of Labor Governments nationally and in this State, we have evolved an appropriate way of funding and managing our hospitals which guarantees the very highest standards of health care to this State, to this country—indeed a world best practice model which is of a very high standard. That is what we are happy to defend in this House, what I will be happy to defend out of this House, and what the honourable member and his policies cannot possibly match.

### WORKCOVER

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** Can the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety advise the House of any changes he plans to make to WorkCover in the light of the recent call by the Opposition to bring back private insurers? These were the same institutions that handled all workers compensation premiums until the introduction of WorkCover in 1987.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** In September last year, more than a year ago, the Leader of the Opposition stated, 'Our plans will be clearly announced before the elections'—and he said 'elections' plural. Since that time there has been an election in the Federal area and an election announced for this State, yet the Opposition has still made no clear exposition of what it intends to do with WorkCover.

The member for Bragg is reputed to have given a statement to a press reporter setting out how the Opposition would reduce the levy payments by reducing payments to workers. One can construe from that only that it is the Liberal Party's intention, if it gets into government, to introduce what it has been trying to do in this Parliament for some time—that is, to reduce after three months the 100 per cent to 80 per cent of average weekly earnings and, after that 12 months, to 75 per cent, and in the second year review to dump those people back onto the social service system, as it has done in the Eastern States.

In considering that, one can come only to the conclusion that the attacks will be on workers themselves. We have a scheme that is working extremely well in reducing injury rates, and it is reducing those injury rates faster than in the Eastern States. The scheme is extremely well managed and it can ensure that all the people who participate in it come under some scrutiny. That includes the medical profession and all its facets. The workers themselves are properly managed on the basis of their returning to work as quickly as possible, and the reforms to the Act and within the administration of WorkCover itself have meant a quicker return to work. Consequently, the introduction and the bite of bonus and penalty schemes in South Australia has seen an unprecedented interest by employees in having a safe work place.

Only last week I launched an occupational health and safety plan for the motor repair industry. As we all know, that is an area in which people are working sometimes in dangerous situations. It is a credit to the employers that they have undertaken this work. They would not have done that if it had not been for this scheme. The idea of bringing competition back by putting the area out to insurers flies in the face of what is actually happening. Over 90 per cent of the people who deal with WorkCover are satisfied with the way they are dealt with and over 85 per cent of the employers are happy with the way they have been dealt with. They do not want to go back to the private insurers, who were beggaring them in



1985, 1986 and just before 1987. Their rates were going up at 25 per cent per annum. The average rate now is less than it was in 1986 under the private companies.

One has to appreciate that our workers compensation scheme is the best managed in Australia and, if we want to ensure that we run the safest work places in Australia, if we want to ensure that the least number of people are injured, we need to maintain the current scheme with the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act and all the things that flow from that, because that is reducing injury rates. If we adopt the scheme suggested by the Liberal Party—and it is suggesting it in a very snide sort of way—what we will see is an explosion of injury rates; we will see more people being hurt; and we will see more people being shelved off on to social services.

### ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COURT

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the Premier. Is it a fact that on 18 October Cabinet approved the appointment of a former Labor member of this House to the important position of full-time Commissioner of the Environment, Resources and Development Court? Is it also a fact that this appointment has not yet been gazetted? Will the Premier explain why the appointment has not been gazetted, and confirm that the appointment will now not be finalised while his Administration is a caretaker Government?

I have a document which records Cabinet approval for the court to come into operation on 6 December 1993, a court described by the Government as 'the primary forum for all matters involving the development and management of land'. Cabinet also approved the appointment of 10 part-time Commissioners of the court, all of which were announced in the *Government Gazette* published last Thursday. However, the *Government Gazette* did not announce the appointment of Ms Dianne Gayler as a full-time Commissioner of the court, even though Cabinet also approved her appointment on 18 October, according to the document I have. Ms Gayler was a Labor member of this House between 1985 and 1989. She has held the position of Policy Director of the Environment Protection Authority for less than six months, so this latest proposed appointment represents a further significant promotion over a very short period.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** That decision of Cabinet was made and it has not been acted on further because, since that time, I firmed my own view as to when the election should be held and when I was going to call it, hence bringing into place a caretaker Government. While the caretaker Government does not come into place until the issuing of the writs, it was my assessment that an appointment of this nature should be held over until after the election.

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** When the decision was first made there was not at that stage any decision about the calling of the election or the timing of its calling. The initial decision to appoint Di Gayler was entirely correct, because she is a very talented person with a lot of ability and highly suitable for a job such as the one in question here. In fact, other names were suggested, and while the other people concerned certainly had talents and capabilities of their own she was a natural selection from the list of candidates that it seemed were available for the position. I do not in any way have any embarrassment about the suggestion that she should

fill that position. I think that she would be a fine candidate for it, and the reason why the matter has not been proceeded with is in no way a reflection on her.

I think it is unfortunate that sometimes in the timing of things matters cannot be proceeded with. If the matter had arisen a few months ago, I would have had no problem whatsoever in saying that the appointment should proceed to the final stages. However, because it came within days—as the Deputy Leader mentioned, the gazettal took place on the day after I announced the election date and the other appointments—I believed, in the propriety of the matter, it was not proper to proceed at this stage. However, I remind members that the actual—

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** That is right. If the Opposition does not think that I have made the right decision on this matter, naturally I shall be happy to reconsider it. I point out that formally the technical caretaker period does not commence until the closing of business on the day that the writs are issued. It was a toss of a coin sort of decision that had to be made on this matter. It has been unfortunate for an excellent candidate that she will have to wait a bit longer before her appointment can be made. I repeat, I have full confidence in her ability and there was no suggestion whatsoever of any reflection on her ability.

I think it is very important that positions like this should be filled on ability, not on some kind of view that wants to pick on the political perspective that somebody may have. That is just as outrageous a proposition as picking on somebody for any other views they may hold, such as religious discrimination or other forms of discrimination. She should not be a victim of that. Ms Gayler has, however, come into the timing of events that brings us very close to that caretaker mode.

### CAPITAL LENDING PROGRAM

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** Will the Minister of Primary Industries explain the consequences for the rural community of the Liberal Party's recently announced policy of scrapping the capital lending program, which is worth \$25 million?

**The Hon. T.R. GROOM:** I thank the member for Stuart for her question, because it is becoming loud and clear that the rural community is most unhappy with this aspect of the Liberal Party's policy, and rightly so. To bring out a policy of this nature, it is quite clear—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.R. GROOM:** Well, you listen and you will get it. It is quite clear that the Liberal Party sees rural voters as a safe bet, and this aspect of the policy clearly shows that it feels that it does not need to worry about meeting the real needs of primary producers.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.R. GROOM:** I think that the Leader and the shadow Minister should seriously reflect on this aspect of the policy that has been announced.

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.R. GROOM:** You had better get up and say that because this is what members opposite said in the policy statement that was released.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will direct his remarks to the Chair and cease debating across the Chamber.

**The Hon. T.R. GROOM:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. In the policy statement that was released—I know this is harmful—the Liberal Party said that its philosophy is that Governments should not lend capital to farmers. That is the policy statement. This year the Arnold Government is increasing capital lending to farmers from \$6.6 million in 1992-93 to \$25 million in 1993-94.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.R. GROOM:** If your policy and philosophy are that you do not lend capital moneys to farmers, that is scrapping capital lending. What does that do? The department's capital lending program is an alternative to the banks. We keep interest rates down because we compete with the banks in the marketplace. Better than that, we lend at varying heavily subsidised interest rates.

This is a blow for individual farming families trying to improve their operations, because if this is implemented it means that a farmer has only one stop, and that is the bank; he does not get capital lending from the Government. I know what is occurring, because rural people are very upset about this policy.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.R. GROOM:** You can laugh about taking \$25 million from rural people, but the shadow Minister is getting the same calls as I am getting in relation to this matter.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The shadow Minister and the member for Kavel are now getting a call from the Chair. I draw the attention of both members to their conduct in this House. All you are doing is delaying Question Time. The Minister.

**The Hon. T.R. GROOM:** Axing the department's \$25 million of capital lending to farmers—if your philosophy is not to lend capital, that is axing it—will leave farmers at the mercy of the banks. While the banks might be constrained now and might be cooperating, we all know what the banks did to farmers in the 1980s.

### STATE BANK

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** Will the Premier name those members of the Labor Party who, according to the Premier in his current election advertising, have made mistakes in their handling of the State Bank; and will he say what those mistakes were?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** To expedite matters, I refer the member for Bragg to the answers that I gave at a press conference last Thursday, which has been detailed extensively, covering all those matters.

### POLICE PATROLS

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** Will the Minister of Emergency Services reassure the House, the South Australian public and, indeed, my constituents that police will not be withdrawn from patrols and assigned to clerical duties as alleged by the member for Bright in this morning's media?

My office has received calls from Tennyson, Woodville West, Seaton and Royal Park following claims by the member for Bright that patrol cars are being taken off the road so that police officers can do clerical duties. The member for Bright also alleged that officers of the mounted cadre are being withdrawn from duty spotting crime in suburban car parks to take up clerical duties in police stations.

One elderly constituent told my electorate secretary, 'I am aware of Mr Hamilton's ongoing attack against crime and vandalism, and therefore request that he direct a question to Mr Mayes to clarify this situation.' Hence my question.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I thank the member for Albert Park for his question. He has an ongoing interest in and obviously shows a great deal of concern about the way in which the member for Bright has conducted this scare campaign in the community.

*Mr Matthew interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I will go through the facts in detail so that members can relay them with a great deal of comfort to their constituents. The resources provided by the police through the Government will continue to provide the community with the safety they are entitled to expect as South Australians. The member for Bright, who has been on the radio this morning and on various radio programs, has made a number of claims and comments. One was that I should direct the Commissioner to undertake a review and instruct him to reinstate the so-called patrols that he alleged will be taken off the streets of Adelaide and South Australia, and he cited a number of locations.

The honourable member should know better than that, because if I were to entertain that sort of approach I would be publicly declaring my lack of confidence in the Commissioner of Police. I am not about to do that, and the member for Bright implies a lack of confidence in the Commissioner. It is quite clear that the South Australian Police Force and the resources provided to it are the best in Australia. We have the highest number of police *per capita* and the highest number of operational police *per capita* of any State in Australia. The budget has grown by 6.6 per cent in real terms since the last election.

*Mr Matthew interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** Indeed, we have initiated, by taking out of—

*Mr Matthew interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The member for Bright continually interjects. The Minister.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** In fact, from the point of view of decentralisation and taking the administration of police operations out of the central office, 440 officers have been placed in regional and local areas over the past 10 years. That is part of our restructuring and it will continue as a consequence of the reports we have had. Let me report what the Commissioner of Police has indicated today in a memo to me regarding Mr Matthew's claims. The memo is headed 'Police Department—Impact of civilian staff reductions on police patrols'. I hope the member for Bright is listening, because it is an important statement and it is vital that he listen and not continue this fear campaign. The memo states:

Press reports this morning indicate that Mr Matthew, MP, has claimed that patrols are or will be taken off the road to cover civilian staff reductions in police stations. As you know, I have previously advised you that the 1993-94 budget strategy involving a reduction of civilian staff will not affect police patrols—this situation has not altered. I have attached a copy of the statement you made to the parliamentary Estimates Committee on 21 September 1993, which outlined the proposed civilian staff reduction strategy. It is obvious that Mr Matthew is being misled, as there is clearly no intention, or in fact a need, to withdraw patrols as a result of this measure. Perhaps Mr Matthew should be asked to identify his source of information.

There we have it; the Commissioner has given his commitment. Either the member for Bright accepts it or rejects it. If he rejects it then that is a vote of no confidence in the Commissioner of Police and he should come out and say so. He should have the courage to say whether he has confidence in the Commissioner of Police. I do, and I will stand by the Commissioner's statements.

### TEACHERS' SEPARATION PACKAGES

**Mr BRINDAL (Hayward):** My question is directed to the Minister of Education, Employment and Training. How many teachers were sent letters last week offering targeted separation packages in a continuing move to reduce teacher numbers in our schools? Education Department sources believe that at least 300 teachers received offers of TSPs, although they concede it may be more. I have been told that six teachers out of 38 from a north-eastern high school have received separation package offers, the youngest of these being only 27 years of age. Liberal members have received many complaints from teachers about these separation packages. One of these reads in part:

I arrived home from work on Wednesday 27 October to find a letter from the Education Department asking me to consider an early retirement. As a highly skilled teacher of health education for the past 15 years and a family man in his 30s, imagine the disgust at the suggestion that I am not valued or needed. Cutting costs is the only concern of this Government. It has made the mess and wants people to suffer for it.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I thank the honourable member for his question; I will assume that it is asked out of a genuine interest to ascertain the facts of the matter, and I am very pleased to provide them. This Government has made very clear that what we are doing is providing the most effective and efficient education system in this country. In doing so, in negotiations with the Institute of Teachers, we have identified that (and I will start with the deputy principals) there are positions within the deputy principal range where people have indicated that they would be happy to have a targeted separation package. Therefore, a number of letters went out from the department—not from me as the Minister but from the department—to deputy principals, to some principals and to a number of teachers, that is, teachers who were surplus to requirement for specific areas.

The honourable member makes some kind of point out of 27-year-olds: is he suggesting that, where we have a surplus of teachers in a particular discipline, we do not treat them fairly and equitably under the law, or is he suggesting that we just target individuals? The honourable member clearly has no understanding of the system. The system, may I state categorically, is voluntary; in other words, teachers can accept the targeted separation package or they can reject it. There is no compulsion, and what the department has obviously decided to do is say, 'We will treat all teachers in a particular area equally. We will not select individuals out.' If there is an excess—for example, of physical education teachers—the packages will be sent out to those physical education teachers and then—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** It is interesting; the honourable member asks the question and he is now carrying on a conversation with his colleagues around him. Does he want an answer or not?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. The honourable member obviously was not asking a genuine question; he did not want the answer. I will very quickly summarise: the answer is that all the targeted separation packages have been of a voluntary nature. Unlike in Victoria, no teacher has been forced out of the education system. Indeed, we have done things very differently, and well might members of the Opposition start to squirm, when they know that 3 000 teachers have lost their jobs in Victoria without any kind of targeted separation packages of the nature that we have offered in this State. Quite obviously, the honourable member does not want us to abide by the spirit and intent of the law, which treats people in this State equitably, and that is exactly what the department was doing in sending out the letters. I am sorry if teachers misunderstood or if somehow they felt affronted by that letter, but certainly they were given the information that they could choose or not choose to register for the offer being made to them. I would have thought that the honourable member who purports to be some kind of an expert in education would understand that.

### SCHOOLS FUNDING

**Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell):** Will the Minister of Education, Employment and Training advise the House of the level of Commonwealth support for schools in South Australia, and will the Minister further state what would be the implications for this support if State expenditure were reduced?

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I thank the honourable member for his question, because it really is very important. The question is in two parts. I will answer the first part with a simple answer, because in fact we received \$91 million from the Federal Government towards the recurrent expenditure within the schools sector of my department. The second part of the answer, which relates to the implications of Federal funding and cuts therein if we were to reduce our expenditure on schools, requires me to refer to remarks made by the Federal Education Minister, Ross Free, in the Federal Parliament on 20 October when he was asked a similar question. I have not received a detailed answer at this point.

However, his answer is very enlightening to South Australia because, in response to a question about the implications, he talked about what has happened in Victoria in terms of the expenditure by the Federal Government, which is an increase of 1.6 per cent to something now in the vicinity of \$750 million. He very clearly put on the public record that the Kennett State Government in Victoria has reduced primary spending by 5.3 per cent, secondary spending on education by 5.9 per cent and school support spending by 5.8 per cent. He went on in a very detailed answer to highlight his disgust at this approach to education, and he quoted from a principal who had written a eulogy for his school in the *Saturday Age*. I will quote Mr Maguire as follows:

Yesterday my school died, killed by Government fiat, sacrificed to economic expediency. With it dies a little bit of myself—no thanks for the countless hours devoted to ensuring that the school functions effectively. With it dies a culture developed over the past 80 years, one that concerns itself with fairness and equity.

Mr Free then went on to say that Mr Maguire probably would find himself in breach of the Victorian Government's infamous order 140, which was circulated to all schools in September and which said that teachers were banned from speaking out publicly against the Kennett Government. More

than that, teachers were also barred from accepting gifts and indeed from lending money to each other. That is nothing more than a travesty of human rights for teachers in that State.

The Federal Minister then said that he would look quite seriously at the implications in terms of Federal funding if States reduce their funding. The question South Australians must ask themselves is, 'What will happen here if a Brown Government gets into power?' given that the Leader has promised to slash education spending by 15 to 25 per cent. The Opposition is committed to this.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** On a point of order, Sir, the Minister is debating the answer.

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister is certainly debating the answer. I ask her to close as soon as possible.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** The implications for South Australia are dire indeed and must be contemplated by all South Australians. We would lose the funding that we currently receive from the Federal Government. It is interesting that this Government has increased its funding to education in this budget, as opposed to Victoria and New South Wales.

#### PRIMARY INDUSTRIES MINISTER

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria):** During the next six weeks, will the Premier be campaigning in support of the re-election to this House of the Minister of Primary Industries and, if not, does his withdrawal of support mean that the Minister will cease to serve in Cabinet when the writs for the election are issued?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** As I said earlier, the caretaker mode of Government starts from the close of business on the day the writs are issued. However, the Cabinet handbook provides that Cabinet continues to meet during a caretaker period. Special provisions exist in the event that certain emergency decisions need to be made. During the caretaker period, which is the election campaign, my all consuming objective is to campaign against the Liberal Party and to campaign for the re-election of my Government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair was under the impression that Question Time was very important today. If we get some order we can continue with it.

#### SHOPPING HOURS

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** Will the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety outline to the House the demand for certificates of exemption to the Shop Trading Hours Act allowing supermarkets and grocery stores to remain open to 9 p.m. Monday to Friday?

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** I welcome the question from the member for Napier. I advise that 188 stores have been granted exemption with another 23 having applied and waiting for my signature. I am advised that these exemptions extend from Roxby Downs to Mount Gambier and that virtually all interested stores in the country and city areas have applied for the exemption. In South Australia our groceries are the cheapest in Australia. We have found that people now have an opportunity to go to stores and purchase these cheap groceries. Another issue that has come to light in this argument is that interstate evidence shows quite clearly that prices have not gone up with extended hours. We have seen that that is competition at its best. The Liberal Party's

policy on this matter amazes me. Not that long ago the shadow Minister met with Coles management and said, 'Don't worry about the extended hours until 9 p.m.; just wait for six months—'

**Mr Ingerson:** No, we didn't.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** Yes, the member for Bragg did. He told them to wait for six months until they deregulated the industrial relations system, at which time they could have all the shopping hours they want. He mentioned the deregulation of the industrial relations system. What does that mean? It means that all the men, women and young people working in retail will have their wages lowered. It does not take into account the enterprise agreements already reached and which are working extremely well. It does not take into account the fact that customers are voting with their feet because they are going to these shops and purchasing at their convenience. It does not take into account the change in the working hours of the men and women of South Australia so that people can purchase the necessities of life at their leisure instead of having to rush as they have in the past. We have opened up South Australia for business. All this lot would do is close it down.

#### SCHOOL SPORTS ASSOCIATIONS

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport or the Minister of Education, Employment and Training confirm that the Government has plans to bring both the primary and secondary school sports associations (SAPSASA and SASSSA) under the administrative control of the Division of Recreation and Sport with effect from 1 December this year? I have in my possession a document dated October this year marked 'Confidential' and headed 'Information related to the curriculum division proposals to change line management of SAPSASA and SASSSA in 1994' with the recommendation of a transfer to the management of Sport SA through the Director of the Division of Sport.

It has been put to me by school principals that the Principals Association clearly wants sport to stay with principals and schools, sport to be part of the curriculum and SASSSA still to be the body to manage sport in schools through the principals. A representative of the Principals Association has also advised that the Education Department would be abrogating its responsibility to children and sport if SAPSASA and SASSSA move over to the Sports Institute.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** It is rather difficult to understand the philosophy of the Opposition on this matter. It is trenchant in its criticism of the existing system provided in our schools and yet is asking for the *status quo*. Either it wants to change the system or it wants to leave it as it is. It should make up its mind and tell the community about it. That is another policy that we will not hear during this election campaign.

Regarding the suggestion that some change is under way, I do not know of any change in the administration of the Division of Recreation and Sport and Racing. I will be pleased to see whether any officers have been involved in discussions with the Education Department. The responsibility and funding for those sporting associations come through the lines of the Education Department. They are the recipients of very generous funding, more generous than in any other State in this country. I believe that we have been served very well by a longstanding commitment by many people, principals and others in our schools, to organise competitive sport and a range of other activities. However, as we have

discovered in recent years, there are other forces at play that detract from the capacity of our schools and the marshalling of other resources in order to provide the competition and opportunities that we would like for the broad base of students in our schools.

We are addressing those issues as a Government and, of course, we will release those details during the election campaign. Already, my colleague the Minister of Education, Employment and Training and I have released a good deal of information about ways in which we will encourage—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** As I have said we have already released a good deal of information about ways in which we will encourage competitive sport in our schools in the future. We want to encourage as many young people as possible to participate in competitive sport. However, I note that the Opposition intends to compel every young person in every State school and in every non-Government school in this State to participate in sporting competitions. I do not believe that is practically possible, but the costing of that—and it is disappointing that we will not hear about these costings until the last few days of the campaign—would be tens of millions of dollars. We would all be pleased to know where that will come from.

#### URBAN DEVELOPMENT

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Baudin):** My question is directed to the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations. What measures are being taken by the Government to ensure that future urban growth on the Adelaide Plain is sustainable and planned to achieve the best result for the community? I think I am quoting correctly when I refer to Douglas Pike saying that ‘South Australians always attach themselves to some conscious theoretical purpose,’ and I think it was Hugh Stretton who said that that is ‘often centred around the whole question of urban form and town planning’. As South Australia has a strong tradition in this area, one would hope that it is continuing.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I am proud of what has been achieved in this State with respect to urban development and the legal and other structures that we have in place to protect the environment of our city and to see it enhanced in the future. The 1989 Planning Review—and the consequential Development Act, the strategic planning exercise in which we were all recently involved—has resulted in South Australians having a clear and practical vision of the way in which this city will grow in the future. Importantly, we have established clear processes to achieve this objective. As a result of the Premier’s Meeting the Challenge statement, we have been able to ensure that the role of Government is to support and reinforce urban growth in a sustainable way.

I recently announced in this place support for the construction of the Southern Right Home in the new suburb of Seaford, which demonstrates what sustainable urban development means in an everyday living situation. So, not only the general but the specific have captivated our attention. Last week, I announced the new stamp duty rebate initiative, which will provide rebates of up to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Morphett and the member for Hayward are out of order. The Minister.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** Last week I announced the new stamp duty rebate, which will provide for rebates of up

to \$3 000 for newly constructed, medium density housing within the city of Adelaide and graduated to the outer suburbs. I am not sure whether the honourable member has been asleep for the past few days or has not been reading advertisements in the newspaper. Hundreds of people have received the information when they have rung the Stamp Duties Office—

*Mr Ingerson interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:**—which administers that scheme, which has been received with applause by all sections of the industry in this State. Not only will that initiative play an important role in encouraging people back to the city but it will also reduce pressure on the urban fringe and make better use of existing infrastructure such as roads, public transport and the water and power network. Indeed, in the long run it will save the Government money.

I am pleased to report that hundreds of South Australians have taken advantage of the hot line set up to provide information about the rent rebate scheme. Conversations that I have had with builders and developers confirm that the construction industry is very excited about the role this initiative will play in encouraging higher levels of activity. These are just a few examples of how the Government is pursuing sustainable urban development in a practical and realistic manner. It is all very well for those on the other side, as we have seen in recent weeks, to stand up at a winemakers’ luncheon and promise to protect their vineyards and then to stand up a little later at a developers’ luncheon and promise to give them free rein. Once again, we have these conflicting statements without costings and without any sense of reality. That might trick the *Advertiser*—and that may not be hard to do—but it will not deliver sustainable urban development, stability or security for those who invest in developments around this State.

This Government’s commitment to shaping the future of Adelaide is clear. It is clear through our commitment to the Urban Lands Trust and the expansion of its role into the metropolitan area. It is clear through our commitment to the South Australian Housing Trust and the 20 000 houses that we have built in this decade alone. It is clear through our commitment to HomeStart finance and the 14 000 home buyers who have been assisted by that scheme over the past four years. These are practical arms of sustainable urban development. I can only say that the Opposition’s policies in this area are confused, inadequate and—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is a point of order. The Minister will resume his seat. The member for Davenport.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** The Minister is now debating the answer.

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister is debating the answer. Has the Minister completed his answer?

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** Finally, I might say that those policies lack equity.

#### MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** My question is directed to the Premier. What are the results of discussions held in late October between the Federal and State Governments over the allocation of unspent Federal funds for the MFP from the Better Cities Program; will the \$10.2 million originally allocated in the 1992-93 financial year, but not spent, be now lost to the MFP; and does he agree with his colleague Senator Schacht that there has been ‘undue delay’

in reaching agreement over the expenditure of this money? Senator Schacht was asked last week in the Senate a question about the allocation of \$10.2 million not spent on the MFP as originally intended and whether this money would still be available. The Senator's reply was that the decision to use Better Cities money for Gillman, taken two years ago, was now a matter for negotiation between the Federal and State Governments and that there had been 'undue delay' in reaching agreement.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** This meeting took place a few days ago. I have not had a report about it yet, but I will seek a report and get that information. When I am here as Premier at the next sitting of the House after the election I will table the report, and as we will not reconvene the Parliament probably until February I will do the honourable member the courtesy of sending the report to him for his information in advance of the sitting of the House.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

## CHILDREN'S PROTECTION BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, lines 16 and 17 (clause 3)—Leave out 'a system of care and protection for children who are at risk' and insert 'for the care and protection of children and to do so in a manner'.

No. 2. Page 1, line 25 (clause 4)—Leave out 'of the child is' and insert 'and welfare of the child are'.

No. 3. Page 2, line 14 (clause 4)—Leave out 'should' and insert 'must'.

No. 4. Page 3, line 31 (clause 6)—Leave out 'significant'.

No. 5. Page 3, line 32 (clause 6)—After 'injury' insert 'detrimental to the child's wellbeing'.

No. 6. Page 4, line 5 (clause 6)—Leave out 'an employee in the Department' and insert 'a member of the staff of the State Courts Administration Council'.

No. 7. Page 5, line 17 (clause 6)—After 'absence' insert '; or'.

No. 8. Page 5 (clause 6)—After line 17 insert new paragraph as follows:-

'(e) the child is under 15 years of age and is of no fixed address.'

No. 9. Page 5—After line 17 insert new clause as follows: 'Care and Protection of Co-ordinators

6A. The person responsible for appointing Care and Protection Co-ordinators must ensure that, as far as is reasonably practicable, the Co-ordinators represent between them an appropriate cultural diversity.'

No. 10. Page 7 (clause 8)—After line 18 insert new subclause as follows:-

'(3A) If a child under the age of 16 years appears to have a sufficient understanding of the consequences of a custody agreement, the child must be consulted before such an agreement can be entered into (or extended) by his or her guardians.'

No. 11. Page 11 (clause 15)—After line 30 insert new subclause as follows:

'(1A) A member of the Police Force below the rank of commissioned officer (as defined in the Police Act 1952) cannot remove a child pursuant to this section without the prior approval of a commissioned officer of the Police Force, unless he or she believes on reasonable grounds that the delay consequent upon seeking approval would prejudice the safety of the child.'

No. 12. Page 13, line 15 (clause 18)—After 'investigation' insert 'and the safety of the child to whom the investigation relates'.

No. 13. Page 18 (clause 26)—After line 10 insert new subclause as follows:

'(3) Notwithstanding subsections (1) and (2), the Minister is not obliged to cause a family care meeting to be convened or held

if he or she is of the opinion that the seriousness of the case is such that the matter should be brought before the Youth Court without delay.'

No. 14. Page 18, line 18 (clause 28)—Leave out 'Chief Executive Officer' and insert 'Senior Judge of the Court'.

No. 15. Page 18 (clause 28)—After line 19 insert new subclause as follows:

'(1a) The Coordinator must arrange for a suitable person to act as advocate for the child at the meeting, unless satisfied that the child has made an independent decision to waive his or her right to be so represented.'

No. 16. Page 18, line 21 (clause 18)—After 'the child's' insert 'advocate and'.

No. 17. Page 19, lines 19 and 20 (clause 30)—Leave out paragraph (e) and insert new paragraph as follows:

'(e) if one has been appointed, the child's advocate; and'.

No. 18. Page 20, line 10 (clause 31)—After 'information' insert 'including all relevant written reports.'

No. 19. Page 20, line 11 (clause 31)—Leave out 'is' and insert 'are'.

No. 20. Page 20 (clause 31)—After line 27 insert new paragraph as follows:

'(ab) the child's advocate; and'.

No. 21. Page 26, lines 12 and 13 (clause 47)—Leave out '(who may, if necessary, be appointed by the Court)'.

No. 22. Page 26—After line 22 insert new clause as follows:

'Court may refer a matter to a family care meeting  
47A. Without limiting the reasons for which the Court may adjourn proceedings under this Act, the Court may adjourn the hearing of an application for the purpose of referring specified matters to a family care meeting for consideration and report to the Court by the meeting.'

No. 23. Page 27 (clause 49)—After line 20 insert new subclause as follows:

'(1A) In making provision for the care of a child pursuant to subsection (1), the Minister must, where appropriate, have regard to the desirability of securing settled and permanent living arrangements for the child.'

No. 24. Page 27 (clause 50)—After line 35 insert new subclauses as follow:

'(4) Subject to subsection (5) the Minister must cause a copy of the conclusions reached by a review panel to be given to the child, the child's guardians and the persons who have the care of the child.

(5) The Minister is not obliged to give a copy of the panel's conclusions to a particular person if—

(a) the Minister is of the opinion that it would not be in the best interests of the child to do so; or

(b) the whereabouts of the person cannot, after reasonable inquiries, be ascertained.

No. 25. Page 30—After line 2 insert new clause as follows:

'Children's Protection Advisory Panel  
52a. (1) The Minister must establish a panel to be called the 'Children's Protection Advisory Panel.'

(2) The panel is to consist of not less than three or more than five persons who have expertise in the field of child welfare.

(3) At least one member of the panel must be from the non-Government sector and one other member must be a legal practitioner.

(4) The functions of the panel are—

(a) to monitor and keep under constant review the operation and administration of this Act; and

(b) to report to the Minister, on the panel's own initiative or at the request of the Minister, on any matter relating to the operation or administration of this Act; and

(c) to make such recommendations to the Minister as the panel thinks fit for the amendment of this Act or for the making of administrative changes.'

No. 26. Page 30—After line 33 insert new clause as follows: 'Officers must produce evidence of authority

56A. An employee of the Department authorised by the Minister to exercise powers under this Act must, before exercising those powers in relation to a person, produce evidence of that authority to the person.

Penalty: Division 10 fine.'

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be disagreed to.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I would ask members to sit down or leave the Chamber.

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** In moving that all the amendments be disagreed to I believe the Committee will appreciate that the reason for at least part of that is procedural because I support some of the amendments which were moved by representatives of the Government in another place. However, in my view the vast majority of the amendments are not conducive to the proper functioning of the Bill. Indeed, in a number of areas they will make some parts of the Bill quite inappropriate. For example, I believe that the requirement for the employees who are to administer the family care meetings to be employees of the court system of the State rather than employees of the Department for Family and Community Services is most inappropriate as it will lead to the wrong connotation being put on those meetings. It invites comparison with the juvenile justice proceedings where youth court coordinators will preside over the meetings of families and where some penalty will be ascribed to a young person. They are quite different in character from the family care meetings which are envisaged under the Children's Protection Bill.

To draw the allusion that in some way these meetings are similar and that therefore they ought to be presided over by representatives of the courts would draw quite the wrong conclusion. In my view, it would invest those meetings with an adversarial character. I will say a little more about that in a moment. Since the public on the whole are used to the courts being an adversarial jurisdiction where one side is pitted against another, in this context it could well lead to the view that there is a situation of child versus the family which is being presided over in these circumstances. That is not really the intention at this point in the proceedings. Further, it would promote a situation where the Department for Family and Community Services could be required to institute quite separate proceedings before the formal court-ordered family care meeting because the department will still need to talk to members of the family in a way which will be formalised in this legislation.

There are a number of other amendments, including a requirement for advocacy and a requirement which sets out the very basis on which children will be represented in these meetings. Again it assumes in some ways an adversarial approach to this which I would not like to see introduced into the Bill. There are a number of other consequential amendments, which I feel should be further debated in the consequence of rejection of this set of amendments, because in most cases they are not conducive to the proper working of the legislation. So, I think it would be most appropriate if the Committee were to reject all the amendments, but bearing in mind that, if the normal dispute resolution procedure between the two Houses follows, it may well lead to some sort of conference at which these matters can be discussed in detail and may ultimately and hopefully lead to an appropriate compromise on these issues.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The Opposition supports strongly the amendments that come to us from another place. As the Minister has indicated, it is quite obvious that this Bill will now go to a conference of both Houses. The Opposition has received very strong support from a wide cross-section of the community and, in particular, from a large number of the non-Government agencies that have a concern for the care and protection of children. The Minister has referred to the main amendments, and I want to refer to them briefly also.

The first amendment relates to what the Opposition sees as the need for the independence of the family care meeting coordinator. The Bill that came before this House provided that the coordinator should come from the Department for Family and Community Services. The Opposition has received strong support for ensuring that that person is independent of the department, and it has been determined that the Care and Protection Coordinator should be a member of the staff of the State Courts Administration Council. The Opposition feels very strongly about that matter.

I was very concerned to read the comments of the Minister in an article attributed to him in the *Sunday Mail* under the heading 'New Move on Child Abuse Law'. In those comments the Minister expresses concern that family care meetings would become court-like proceedings. I can assure the Minister and the Committee that that is not the intention of the Opposition. As the Minister has indicated, the opportunity will be provided for these matters to be discussed in conference, so it is not my intention to go into these areas of concern in significant detail. However, the Opposition has very strong concerns regarding this matter indeed, and a little later I will refer to representations that the Opposition has received from organisations which back up those concerns.

The second amendment that we feel strongly about is the need for every child to be given the opportunity to have an advocate represent them. From well before the time that this legislation was introduced the Opposition received very strong representation on this matter from a wide cross-section of the community who feel very strongly that there is an absolute need for a child to have an advocate in these circumstances. As it comes out of another place, the legislation provides:

The coordinator must arrange for a suitable person to act as advocate for the child at the meeting. . .

There is no description of what that person should be, whether that person should be a professional or whether that person should be somebody who is capable of advocating for the child. The clause further provides:

. . . unless satisfied that the child has made an independent decision to waive his or her right to be so represented.

We realise that a situation may occur where the child determines that he or she does not want representation by an advocate.

Again, I was disappointed with the Minister's comments in the article that I referred to earlier where he said:

The amendments provide for an advocate to appear for every child at family care meetings.

That matter is for the child to determine. There is no definition in the Bill of who should be an advocate, whether that person be professional or otherwise. That is something that can be determined by the coordinator. We believe very strongly that it should be the right of every child to be represented by an advocate.

The third area that we feel very strongly about is the amendment to the definition of 'abuse or neglect'. There was considerable discussion on this matter in the Liberal Party room as to whether or not the word 'significant' should be removed, and a decision was made that that should be the case. I am most disappointed about the way the Minister defined this new provision in his statement in the *Sunday Mail*, where he said that parents who speak sharply to sons and daughters could be charged with child abuse. Even, the Minister would have to recognise that that is a ridiculous statement.

That would not be the intention of the Opposition. It would certainly not be the intention of this Committee. We have been through this over and over again, but we do feel that there is a need to redefine what we mean by 'care and protection' and 'abuse or neglect', and that is why we have made the decision and support the amendment made in the Upper House to take out the word 'significant'. It now reads:

'Abuse or neglect in relation to a child' means physical or emotional abuse of the child or neglect of the child to the extent that:

1. the child has suffered or is likely to suffer physical or psychological injury detrimental to the child's well-being, or the child's physical or psychological development is in jeopardy.

We feel very strongly about those amendments and we realise that this matter will need to be dealt with in conference. I look forward to the opportunity of being able to sit down around the table, and hopefully we will be able to ensure that the legislation proceeds in a way that is acceptable to the community and, in particular, to those people who have over many years represented the care and welfare of children.

I want briefly to refer to some of the representation that the Opposition has received since the amendments were moved in another place. The first is a letter that comes from the Child Protection Coalition, and I remind the Committee of the member organisations that make up that coalition. They are the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia, Action for Children S.A., Anglican Community Services, the Law Society of South Australia, Catholic Family Services, Norwood Community Legal Service, the Youth Housing Network, Service to Youth Council, Emergency Foster Care, the Placement, Prevention and Substitute Care Association, and the Australian Early Childhood Association of South Australia. They are all very well known organisations and organisations that are well respected in their field.

This letter, which has, I understand, been written to all members of Parliament, states:

We write on behalf of the Child Protection Coalition to urge you to support the Children's Protection Bill as amended by the Legislative Council on 21 October 1993. The Child Protection Coalition strongly advocated amendments to the legislation introduced to the House of Assembly on 5 August. Many of the amendments we sought were accepted by the Legislative Council, whilst others did not secure majority support. Despite some ongoing reservations about aspects of the legislation in its amended form, the Bill is better balanced than the original. We believe it more adequately protects the interests of children and their caregivers and should be passed without further delay.

A report in yesterday's *Sunday Mail* by Mike Duffy stated, 'Parents who speak sharply to sons and daughters could be charged with child abuse.' This sensationalist claim is a falsehood and misrepresents the statutory reference to 'injury' under the definition of 'physical or emotional abuse'. Normal parental discipline would not be impinged on in any way under these amendments.

Similarly, the reference to family care meetings becoming 'court-like proceedings' is misleading. The amendments relating to advocacy and coordination of the family care meeting are intended to ensure all voices are heard in the meeting process and that the meeting is in the hands of an independent, skilled coordinator seeking to ensure an outcome in the best interests of the child. There is no suggestion of adversarial proceedings.

That is signed by Kym Davey and Barry Fitzgerald representing the coalition. A further letter received by the Liberal Party is from Professor Bailey-Harris, the Dean Professor of Law at the Flinders University of South Australia. I will read her representation. She writes:

For the sake of the welfare of children in the State, may I urge you and other members of your Party to stand firm on the amendments to the Children's Protection Bill which have been passed in the Legislative Council. The proper protection of children will be jeopardised if the Bill, in its unamended form, were to find its way into law. As you know, the amendments passed in the Legislative

Council have very widespread support from a variety of organisations and individuals committed to the welfare of children, including the Coalition for Children and the Children's Interests Bureau. I am particularly disturbed by the representation of those amendments by the Minister as reported in the *Sunday Mail* yesterday. In my opinion, those representations, at least in the form reported, are misleading. The introduction of a child's right to an advocate at a family care meeting will not turn such meetings into 'court-like proceedings'. There is no implication in the amendments that such an advocate must be a lawyer. Moreover, it is not correct to say that 'the definition of child abuse has been widened to an unacceptable level'; the relevant amendment removes the requirement that alleged abuse be 'serious', thereby ensuring greater protection for all children potentially at risk.

I am also concerned at the portrayal by the Minister of the Opposition as 'holding up' this legislation for no good reason. What the Liberals and the Democrats in the Parliament have done is deserving of the highest commendation, not criticism. They have tried to turn a bad Bill into a good one. In so doing they have received and listened to many representations from those with expertise and concern in the field of child protection. Many such representations have been made to the Government in the course of the Bill's history but they have apparently not been heeded.

Our State has an admirable past reputation in the field of child welfare. Let us ensure that it is continued into the future.

Finally, I will read into *Hansard* a letter from the Children's Interests Bureau addressed to the Premier of South Australia, the Hon. Lynn Arnold, and I have permission from that organisation to read this letter. Dated 28 October, it reads as follows:

Dear Premier,

The Children's Interests Bureau at its board meeting on Wednesday October 27 unanimously endorsed the amendments to the Children's Protection Bill passed by the Legislative Council on Thursday October 21 1993. The bureau has been concerned that the legislation as initially drafted and put before Parliament did not adequately protect the rights and interest of children.

The Children's Interests Bureau welcomes the inclusion of the paramouncy principle, the power to refer serious cases of child maltreatment to the Youth Court, the removal of the word 'significant' as a precursor to injury, the establishment of a Children's Protection Advisory Council, the appointment of independent coordinators and the redefined police powers in relation to children at risk. The Children's Interests Bureau believes that the credibility of the legislation will depend upon the independence, competence and objectivity of the coordinators. Independent coordinators provide a degree of reassurance that families will not be prejudged and that all views will be objectively assessed and evaluated. They will provide an independent check and balance.

The Children's Interests Bureau reaffirms its commitment to professional specialised advocacy for children and makes further comment on this matter based on its long experience involving over 2 000 abused children. The Children's Interests Bureau believes that the debates on the subject of advocacy have revealed a misconception as to what the purpose of advocacy is, with the emphasis being placed on adversarial court proceedings.

Effective advocacy requires a commitment to the integrity of the individual child in the short and long term and must not be subsumed by adult interests, however well meaning. The aim is to secure the best possible outcome for the child. Legal advocacy in the court system and specialist advocacy such as presently provided by the Children's Interests Bureau must be distinguished from the support of a child by a family member or friend.

Experience from other jurisdictions shows that non-professional, non-specialist advocacy is fraught with difficulties.

And so the letter goes on. It concludes:

In conclusion, the Children's Interests Bureau welcomes the amendments to the Children's Protection Bill and reiterates its view that the welfare and interests of children in need of care and protection will be further enhanced if advocacy on their behalf is provided by trained and experienced people.

That letter is signed by the members of that interest bureau, and I will indicate who those members are. First, the Chairman is Mr John Steinle, AO, a previous CEO of the Education Department; Professor Rebecca Harris, who I have



already indicated is the Foundation Professor of Law at Flinders University; Dr David Caudrey, the Deputy Director of Disability Services; Dr Helen Winefield, Senior Lecturer in Psychiatry at the University of Adelaide and also a noted authoress in matters relating to juvenile health; Professor Donald Robertson, Professor of Paediatrics at the Adelaide Children's Hospital—

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

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** It was not my intention to seek to conduct a further second reading debate on this matter but, in view of the extensive comments of the member for Heysen, a number of matters need to be replied to on the record. I will seek to do that briefly. The honourable member maintains his strong position about the employment of family care coordinators, the chairpeople of these meetings, as employees of the courts system. He is also claiming that this will not lead in any way to the development of an adversarial system and that it is done solely to achieve the independence of these people.

That makes a number of assumptions. I do not know an employee of the courts system or of any court in this State which is not based on adversarial proceedings. The very basis of our courts system is an adversarial proceeding. When we go to a court room, we have an independent person who is a judge who is legally trained, we have several lawyers who argue the case on behalf of their respective parties and we have some determination by the judge which is the outcome of the trial. That is adversarial proceedings and it is what the public sees our courts system do every day, day after day, in the newspapers. That is what they see the courts do every day on television screens and that is the whole historical basis of the western judicial system.

The reality is that anyone who believes that the courts system can control a process but not lead to the development of an adversarial process within that system is not looking fairly at the proceedings. It would then lead to the Family and Community Services Department developing independent and separate proceedings prior to the court proceedings which would be initiated in the home and which would be prior to the court proceedings which might well be initiated in the courts leading to another step in the process.

That is not what families want at this time in their lives. At a time bound to be stressful and difficult for families, they do not want further intervention by the courts system and they do not want another layer in the process. On that basis I firmly reject the amendment. I am also concerned at the implicit allegation that Family and Community Services staff are not independent in as much as they are not there for the sole purpose of protecting the child. That is the whole basis of the Family and Community Services involvement in the matter. It is the whole obligation under the Bill, which would then be translated into law, that the safety of the child would be paramount. That is the whole basis on which this is conducted and every person present at those meetings is constrained to act in the best interests of the child. That is the whole basis of the meetings.

To imply that the department's officers would not act in that way is an unfortunate reflection on those highly professional staff members. It is an inappropriate way to proceed in this debate, because the independence of those staff members in protecting the role of the child is unquestioned in this area. I believe it is most unfortunate that the honourable member has chosen to cast those reflections on the work of the staff.

Other matters have been raised and extensive correspondence from people with a wide interest in this area has been tabled. The member for Heysen did not read out the representations from SACOSS, which has a different view in this matter. It is firmly in support of the Bill as it left the House of Assembly and I am sure the honourable member would want the Committee to have a balanced presentation in this matter. SACOSS is an important and peak body in this area. SACOSS is firmly in support of the proceedings so far as the Government has undertaken them in this place, not because SACOSS is supporting the Government's line *per se* but because it believes the way in which the Bill has been structured provides that appropriate balance and focus of interest.

The honourable member would have done the Committee a great service by indicating not only the representations he received which supported his view but also those he received which did not support his view. Although I do not wish to conduct a further second reading debate at this point, the extensive comments of the member for Heysen necessitated some reply and I hope, without taking the matter too much further, we can conclude it at this point.

The Committee divided on the motion:

AYES (21)

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

NOES (21)

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

PAIRS

Arnold, L. M. F.	Gunn, G. M.
Crafter, G. J.	Ingerson, G. A.

**The CHAIRMAN:** There are 21 Ayes and 21 Noes. I give my casting vote for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

## MEDICAL TREATMENT AND PALLIATIVE CARE

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

That this House resolves that—

- (a) on or before 31 August in each year, the Minister of Health should prepare a report on the care of the dying in South Australia, noting progress on the implementation of the Select Committee on the Law and Practice Relating to Death and Dying recommendations, with particular reference to:
- (i) provision of palliative care services;

- (ii) adequacy of hospice care services;
  - (iii) the effectiveness of prevailing legislation and public awareness of its provisions;
  - (iv) professional education in relation to the care of the terminally ill in the dying process;
  - (v) care and treatment of terminally ill AIDS patients;
  - (vi) and any other relevant matter;
- (b) the Minister should confer with the Hospice Care Coordinating Committee in the preparation of the report;
- (c) the report must be tabled in Parliament within 14 days of the Minister receiving it and shall stand referred to the Social Development Committee for its consideration; and
- (d) that a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting its concurrence thereto.

Members will be aware that it is now some time since the Select Committee on the Law and Practice Relating to Death and Dying presented its final report to this House. The interim report of that committee and the final report recommended to the Parliament that a motion such as the one that I have just moved should be adopted by both Houses, which would then lead to the ongoing monitoring of the outcome of the report of the select committee and, indeed, the whole process of the law and practice relating to death and dying in South Australia. Of course, it was originally intended that this motion would be moved after the legislative recommendations which flowed from the committee's report, and that this motion and recommendation would be moved after the Consent to Medical Treatment and Palliative Care Bill, which is now before another place, had been approved by both Houses. Unfortunately, despite the very substantial period of time involved—in fact almost 12 months since the Bill was first introduced by the Government in this place—the Bill has still not passed another place, although it did, of course, receive very substantial support in this Chamber; indeed near unanimous support.

The matters which have been dealt with by the select committee, by the legislative proposals which are before the Parliament and, indeed, by this motion, are very much a bipartisan matter. The committee was formed on the original initiative of the member for Coles who, of course, has played a very substantial role in the whole of this process and, indeed, she has spent much time in the course of this Parliament coordinating and working with members of the community who are concerned with hospice care, and with members of the Parliament who share her interest in the matter, ensuring reform and substantial progress in this area.

Indeed, the legislative proposals which are still before the Parliament would, I believe, be a substantial improvement on our present situation and it is an important part of this motion that the Minister and the Social Development Committee should examine the ongoing progress in relation to the reform of the law, and that will form an important part of the report. That will be particularly so in the unfortunate event that the legislation is not approved by the Parliament today.

It is very critical to the work of the committee that there should be an ongoing monitoring of that work and that is what this motion sets out to do. I know that other honourable members wish to make a contribution in this debate and so I will refrain from covering all aspects of it; but rather I will seek to summarise the overall impact of it. I know that even since the report of the committee was first released there has been a significant increase in the awareness of the general public in relation to these areas, and particularly in the professional area, whether that be the medical profession, the nursing profession or some of the specialities of that, or amongst those concerned with religious affairs in this State.

There has been a significant lifting of the general awareness of the law and practice procedures which have been raised by the committee, and I believe that a very healthy and useful debate has taken place in the community, on very much a bipartisan basis, seeking to improve community education in this area and seeking to improve the practice which applies to hospice care in this State. Those issues are very important. It is essential that they continue to be monitored and that further progress continues to be made and, most critically, it is important that the Parliament give serious consideration to the legislative proposals of the committee or some variation thereof, because I think they are an essential focal point for the actual practical changes which will then flow into the broader community. I commend the motion to the House.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles):** I have pleasure in supporting the motion and, in doing so, I express my personal appreciation to the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services for the strenuous efforts that he and, indeed, his predecessor have made to ensure that these matters were kept before the Parliament and that literally in the last hours of this Parliament the House of Assembly would have the opportunity to debate this motion.

Before speaking to the motion I wish to declare my interest in the matter. About three weeks ago I was elected to the chairmanship of the South Australian Association for Hospice and Palliative Care. I had been invited to accept that position more than a year previously following the tabling of the first and second reports of the select committee, and following my announcement to retire from Parliament. At the time I was asked to take the chair of the association, which would have been in October last year, I explained that I would be willing to do so but not until the Bill, which was the recommendation of the select committee, had passed both Houses of Parliament, because I wanted to be able to debate that Bill unfettered by any interest or any perceived interest that went beyond that of a legislator.

When it became clear at the time of the annual general meeting of the association in October this year that the other place was by no means near taking a vote on the Bill I felt that due to my then closely impending retirement it would be unjust to keep the association waiting yet another year, having kept it waiting already 12 months, and so I agreed to take the chair. But the House should be aware that I now have a personal interest in the matter which I did not have when the select committee was set up, nor did I have that interest when the select committee made its recommendations to the Parliament.

Of the 37 recommendations which the select committee made after two years' intensive and bipartisan work, 15 of those recommendations related to reform of the law. As the Minister has said, those reforms were overwhelmingly accepted by this House by an almost unanimous vote. Because the matter is still before another place it is not appropriate for me to comment beyond expressing, even at this very late stage, the heartfelt wish that that Bill may be passed before the Parliament is prorogued. If that is the case I will feel that in that respect my final term in Parliament, and despite much frustration and disappointment, has been the most rewarding of all the work that I have done in 16 years in this place.

The remainder of the 37 recommendations of the select committee referred to policy matters. The motion identifies those policy matters: the provision of palliative care services,

the adequacy of hospice care services, the effectiveness of prevailing legislation and public awareness of its provisions, professional education in relation to the care of the terminally ill and the dying process, care and treatment of terminally ill AIDS patients, and any other relevant matter. When the committee concluded its work it was very much aware of the demography of South Australia and the fact that whatever it had recommended in November 1992, which was the date of the tabling of the final report, would be out of date very quickly indeed.

The demand for hospice and palliative care services in South Australia will increase inexorably for at least the next two decades. The committee therefore tried to establish a mechanism by which the Parliament could be made continually aware of the needs in this area and continually updated as to the implementation of the committee's recommendations. We therefore devised this resolution as a means of ensuring that there is an annual report to Parliament of the progress of the implementation of the recommendations and that the report is referred to the Social Development Committee for its consideration. By that means we hope to ensure that the needs of the dying in South Australia are continually monitored and that no aspect of the select committee's recommendations can be overlooked.

The only other precedent I can think of for such annual reporting on the progress of either legislation or parliamentary recommendations is what was first known as the Mallen committee and subsequently the Cox committee reporting on abortions in South Australia. These recommendations go way beyond statistical reporting and into the realms of policy. To give members some idea of the vast expanse in need, I refer them to the second interim report of the select committee, paragraphs 1 and 2, in which the committee sets out the overall picture of the advance of cancer as a cause of death in South Australia. I mention cancer because that is a disease which, above all others, requires hospice and palliative care for the relief of patients and their families and for the development of what can best be described as a 'good death', that is, a death as free as possible of pain, with the dignity of the patient maintained and with the consideration of the patient's family and nearest and dearest being at the forefront of the minds of the carers.

Indeed, the definition of 'hospice and palliative care' is the provision of specialised medical, nursing and allied services for people who are terminally ill, together with emotional and psychological support for patients, their families and friends. The whole family is considered the unit of care. Care continues throughout the final illness and the period of bereavement. Emphasis is placed on controlling pain, relieving other symptoms of disease, preparation for death and coping with loss and grief.

I will not go into the matters which I addressed in my second reading contribution nor those I addressed in speaking to the motion to establish the select committee. Suffice to say that we are talking about what is known as holistic medicine rather than acute care, which is aimed at all costs at extending the life of the patient. That is not the goal nor is it the outcome of palliative care. To give the House some idea of the enormous challenge facing the health services in South Australia, I quote from page 2 of the introduction to the second interim report as follows:

In 1985 it was estimated that by the year 2000, the number of people dying from cancer would have increased by 30 per cent. One in four deaths in South Australia is now caused by this disease. Patients with chronic and progressively fatal non-malignant diseases

(e.g. chronic neurological conditions such as motor neurone disease, multiple sclerosis, chronic chest, lung and liver failure and AIDS) are cared for in hospices. However, in most hospice and palliative care programs, 90 per cent (or more) of patients are cancer sufferers.

That means that if cancer is increasing at the rate that is predicted, the demand for hospice care beds will explode, and I use that verb advisedly. I quote from page 17 of that same report:

The committee was told that most of these services—that is, the services provided in South Australia from the Daw House Hospice, the Philip Kennedy Centre, the Northern Hospice Service, which comprises the Lyell McEwin Health Service and the Modbury Hospital Unit, the Mary Potter Hospice and the Royal Adelaide Hospital—

are working well beyond capacity with a consequent serious risk of overload and 'burn-out' of dedicated staff. At present only the clinical nurse consultant in palliative care is deployed in each of the four metropolitan palliative care services to advise on all nursing aspects of patient care, assisted by a clinical nurse position which is temporarily internally funded by the Royal District Nursing Society.

Since that report was tabled, the situation has deteriorated still further. The question of the adequacy of provision of palliative care services is one that must be continually monitored by this Parliament. It is pleasing to know that the Commonwealth Government has recently allocated \$1.1 million per annum for the next four years to South Australia. The manner in which those resources are to be allocated within the State has not yet been determined but it would be my wish to ensure, as far as possible, that the western metropolitan area of South Australia, which is presently very poorly served, should receive a substantial proportion of those funds, as should the regional services in the country, which are stretched to breaking point.

The next point of the resolution, which refers to monitoring the effectiveness of prevailing legislation and public awareness of its provisions, may well be an element which the next Parliament, and in particular the Social Development Committee, can examine more closely. I have no doubt that both the major Parties will be asked before this election campaign is over to state their intention in respect of this legislation.

**Mr Ferguson:** It would be nice to see a bit of policy.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** It would be nice to see a bit of policy on both sides of the Chamber, acknowledging that portions of this Bill presently before another place are matters of conscience. It would still be good to see a commitment from both the major Parties that this Bill, if not passed in this Parliament, will be reintroduced in the first year of the next Parliament and will be brought to a vote one way or another; that there will be no filibustering; and that everyone will have had ample opportunity to examine the provisions of the Bill.

A further point in the resolution refers to monitoring of professional education in relation to the care of the terminally ill and the dying process. The first interim report of the select committee made clear that there is an urgent need for the development of professional education. A submission from Dr Roger Hunt, on behalf of the South Australian Association of Hospice Care, as it was then known, stated:

Until recently there has been an absence of palliative care content in medical training. A recent survey of general practitioners in the southern region (of metropolitan Adelaide) has shown that most feel that their preparation for terminal care was poor or non-existent . . . preparation for it was abysmal. Every health care professional needs to be involved in palliative care in one way or another—nurses, doctors, and social workers.

To that, the committee added ministers of religion, funeral directors and a broad range of professional and para-professional people who come in contact not only with the dying but with the families of the dying. The care and treatment of terminally ill AIDS patients was a matter which the committee was not able to address in the manner it would have wished simply because evidence which it sought from the AIDS Council was not forthcoming in any depth or breadth, nor in good time for it to be considered by the committee. However, it is clear that that issue also will place greater and greater demands on the health system in South Australia, and the Parliament should therefore monitor it.

The motion concludes with the all-embracing clause that any other relevant matter should be considered. The motion calls on the Minister to confer with the Hospice Care Coordinating Committee in the preparation of the report. The Hospice Care Coordinating Committee is a committee of the South Australian Health Commission which comprises the Directors of Hospice Care in South Australia and which advises the commission and the Minister. I like to think that the South Australian Association of Hospice and Palliative Care might also have an input into that process, acknowledging the personal interest that I have already stated. The report must be tabled in Parliament within 14 days of the Minister's receiving it and shall stand referred to the Social Development Committee for its consideration.

A number of the recommendations of the select committee are not specifically the responsibility of the State Government. Some are the responsibility of the State Government in conjunction with the Federal Government through advocacy; some are the responsibility of hospital boards for internal hospital policy; some are the responsibility of the AMA and the Royal College of General Practitioners; and some are the responsibility of the heads of churches and relevant professional and occupational groups.

The select committee's date deadlines for the implementation of policy have long since passed because it did not occur to us that a Bill could take so long before the Parliament without coming to a vote, and we had imagined that this motion would have been debated long before this. I understand that the Minister's office has amended those deadlines and advised the relevant bodies of their responsibility to fulfil the wishes of the select committee and, subject to the passage of this motion, the wishes of the House of Assembly and I hope of Parliament.

Other members wish to speak to the motion and I believe there will be time after the dinner break to do so. However, I conclude by again expressing my heartfelt appreciation to every member of the select committee and to the two Ministers of Health who have successively chaired the committee and without whose personal commitment the motion in its present form would not have come before the House at this stage on the last day of the sitting of the Parliament. I commend the motion to the House and I commend to future Parliaments the concept of the importance of monitoring this matter closely so that, instead of being involved in a crisis, we are able to plan sensibly and practically and meet needs as they arise.

**Mr FERGUSON** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### **STATUTES REPEAL AND AMENDMENT (CHILDREN'S PROTECTION AND YOUNG OFFENDERS) BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### **COMMUNITY WELFARE (CHILDREN) AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### **FISHERIES (R & D FUND AND OTHER) AMENDMENT BILL**

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendment No. 2.

#### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (ATTORNEY GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO NO. 2) BILL**

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### **HOLIDAYS (PROCLAMATION DAY, AUSTRALIA DAY AND BANK HOLIDAYS) BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### **STATE LOTTERIES (INSTANT LOTTERIES) AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### **PARKS COMMUNITY CENTRE (REPEAL AND VESTING) BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### **CHILDREN'S PROTECTION BILL**

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments be insisted upon.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** In the absence of my colleague the member for Heysen, I accept the inevitability of the situation that now confronts us, nevertheless bearing in mind that the honourable member spoke quite strongly against the proposal embodied in this motion now before the Committee. The fact that the parliamentary system enables this matter to move to a conference of managers as a means of reconciling the differences that exist is the reason why on this occasion the Opposition will accept the motion.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Mr Atkinson, Mrs Kotz, Messrs M.J. Evans, Quirke and Wotton.

**MEDICAL TREATMENT AND PALLIATIVE CARE**

Adjourned debate (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 1079.)

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** I support the motion and congratulate the Select Committee on the Law and Practice Relating to Death and Dying, whose recommendations I believe should be heeded by Parliament and the Administration. The proposal that each year there be a report to the Parliament on the provision of palliative care and hospice care services, and so on, is desirable, and my attitude to this measure is reinforced by the submissions that have been made to me since the committee was established.

I took a deeper than normal interest in the palliative and hospice care services when I had a bout of cancer in 1989. The plight of some people who had various forms of cancer and who were in hospital was brought home sharply to me. Submissions have been made to me by constituents who have been to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital (and some of them have been there for sometime) and who have been told that nothing further can be done for them. In the past, it has been the practice that these people are sent home so that their last days are taken at home, with their family around them. But in modern day situations often this does not happen often, because the nuclear family is far smaller than it used to be, and quite often the family itself has, for example, work commitments so that they cannot take the proper care of those who are in this situation. As the local member in the western suburbs, I have been called to attend two public meetings of the Palliative and Hospice Care Association that has itself been formed by people in and around the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. There is a very deep interest in this area; people believe that we as a community should provide more services for those who are in the unfortunate situation of facing death.

Recently, we have been notified that the palliative and hospice care section of the St Margaret's hospital at Semaphore is now being closed down, and there are very few services of this nature in the western area. I have been approached—and I have already made representations to the Minister—to see whether we can open up one of the wards in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to provide the sort of service that is necessary for these people.

From time to time, I have been approached by constituents who have been told that no further treatment is available for them and that the bed they occupy is required by the hospital. Unless they are well covered with private health coverage and can go into a private health hospital, the situation becomes very difficult indeed.

I have no problem in supporting the proposition that is before us, that is, that a report be made on or before 31 August each year, with particular reference to the provision of palliative care services, the adequacy of hospice care service, the effectiveness of prevailing legislation and public awareness of its provisions and all the other provisions that are being suggested by this motion. It is an area where the need in South Australia is becoming greater as our population gets older and as the incidence of cancer continues to increase. I hope that this proposition is taken totally seriously and that in the future that the community is prepared to provide more amenities for the provision of palliative and hospice care services, particularly in the western area.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** On this occasion I rise in what is possibly the last act of my parliamentary career.

**Mr S.G. Evans:** Oh no!

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Oh yes! But I am happy in the one sense that I had the opportunity to be part of the select committee that brought forward so many of the recommendations to this House directly associated with medical consent, palliative care, hospice care, and the like. I am, however, grossly disappointed that those recommendations, which have been before the House for almost 12 months, have not seen the light of day in the final legislation. It is rather unfortunate that the passage of the final documents through the Upper House, whilst following through the normal democratic and proper parliamentary processes, came to a semi-halt, pause or slow progress due mainly to an amount of double talk which was provided by some of the people in the wide world passing judgment upon various aspects of the Bills that they had not passed when they were witnesses before the select committee.

Certainly, one or two of the persons who lay claim to being experts and who are recognised in the wide world as being experts in various aspects of ethics have much to explain in relation to their own ethics, because the advice that they subsequently gave and the promotions that they made on a very wide cross-section of the community led to some quite strange bedfellows and some quite strange subsequent amendments to the legislation as it left this place.

I realise fully that whatever leaves this place to go to the other place runs the gauntlet of that other place. Likewise, anything which leaves them in the first instance to come here runs the gauntlet of this House and eventually, whether it be by way of a conference of managers, as we have just arranged for another piece of legislation, or whether by unanimous vote by both places, the Bill does not become an Act until all those processes have been completed.

However, the length of time which has been unfortunately permitted to expire in relation to these measures and some of the promotions which have been undertaken and which have turned out to be spurious or questionable in their method of presentation cause me some anguish at this late stage of the passage of these parcels of legislation.

Let me say from the outset that it was a very revealing select committee. By virtue of my professional training at a rather different ethic—if one can use the term without offending—death and euthanasia are of quite common knowledge to me; I have practised it many a time in relation to the health and well-being of animals. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

**CHILDREN'S PROTECTION BILL**

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference, to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 7.30 p.m. this day.

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

That the sitting of the House be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the Bill.

Motion carried.

*[Sitting suspended from 6.1 to 9.54 p.m.]*

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

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

### ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 8 February 1994.

This will be the final adjournment before the Christmas recess and any other events that may take place between now and then. I would like to put on the record the appreciation of the Government—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I can hear you, although I would rather not hear you at the moment.

**An honourable member:** You've turned grey.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The hair is blond and it is getting blonder every day. We will not be back until after the Christmas break and (whilst it is traditional it is also no less heartfelt for that) on behalf of the Government I would like to thank all the people who have made these past 12 months possible and in most cases enjoyable. Mr Speaker, I know that the Speaker's is not always the easiest job, particularly when the Parliament is evenly divided. At times it takes the wisdom of Solomon to make sure that everybody comes out reasonably happily, but in any event everybody respects the way you have conducted the affairs of the House. Everybody would have to concede that, given your position, people have been treated fairly, and they certainly respect your position.

The clerks and the table officers again have made this place work in a way again that is always smooth. The clerks and the table officers (I believe there is a distinction; I am not quite sure what it is) have given advice impartially to all members of the House and ensured that the traditions and Standing Orders of the House are well known to all members—whether members always abide by them is another question. So, to the clerk and his table officers I express our appreciation. I mention also the attendants, the clerical staff and the committee staff; again these are all people who make the Parliament work, and we appreciate what they do.

As for *Hansard*, there is no doubt that all of us hold *Hansard* in high esteem. They can take our somewhat mangled words (on occasion) and turn them into something that is certainly more presentable than when we uttered them. The concentration required from the *Hansard* people is enormous and I know they absorb every word of our speeches and turn them into something of which we can all be reasonably proud.

The Parliamentary Library staff sit here all the time that Parliament is in session, and that means some very late hours. Members get tremendous service from what is, compared to other Parliaments, a relatively small staff. We appreciate that and their expertise. The catering staff who look after the inner person, the caretakers and storepeople here in Parliament House all serve the Parliament and serve us as Parliamentarians extremely well.

The geniuses who operate the switchboard find us when perhaps we do not always appreciate being found; nevertheless, they do their job with a great deal of skill and their

patience is legendary. Then there are the police officers who come here. My suspicion is that this is probably not a cream posting for police officers; they have to take the good with the bad, the rough with the smooth, and I am sure that at times they would rather be doing something a little more interesting and creative than protecting us. Nevertheless, they see their role quite properly as doing their duty in whatever sphere they are allocated. We do thank them because from time to time some people do not appreciate us as much as we appreciate ourselves. Indeed, if left to their own devices perhaps they would not treat us all that kindly. We seldom see the housekeepers and maintenance staff, but they make the place presentable and keep it in good order, and it makes our life that much easier.

I give special thanks to the press. The press sit with us night and day and ensure that anything we say that is newsworthy is broadcast to the people at large. They ensure that the democratic process is known to everyone in South Australia. Nobody in this place ought to feel that they can get away with anything, with having attitudes that are not conveyed to the populace at large, because the press is fearless and it reports, I am advised, without fear or favour. Nevertheless, they share with us the excitement, the boredom and everything else. By and large we can all say that overwhelmingly they serve the democratic process well, with some arguments from time to time. I am always nervous that I have forgotten somebody. I hope that that is not the case on this occasion. I hope that everybody who serves the Parliament has been mentioned.

*The Hon. J.P. Trainer interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I hear the Whip interjecting, so I will give the Whips a very special mention. The Whips have a difficult job and perform it to the very best of their ability. I personally thank the Deputy Leader, whoever that may be from time to time, who has made the running of the House particularly easy for me, with some ups and downs on occasions.

I mention the retiring members of Parliament. All these people are great friends who have decided that they have exhausted their parliamentary career. Without exception, they will be going onto other things. On this side I refer to the members for Ross Smith, Baudin and Napier who have served the Parliament well. Everyone of them has had their ups and downs in the Parliament, as we all have, but I know that all members wish them well in their future careers. I thank them for their contribution. The members for Light, Davenport, Coles and Chaffey have accumulated vast experience and have served their individual constituents and the State of South Australia very well. The whole of the Parliament wishes them well. They are not going out to pasture but are going on to interesting and exciting things outside the Parliament.

Each of them has had a long career, and on behalf of the Government I wish them well. Christmas obviously is a time when we get some relaxation and hopefully some rejuvenation. I know that everyone in the Parliament will spend time with their families, particularly country members whose families sacrifice a great deal. While the country members have been here enjoying themselves, legislating and living the exciting life, their families have been at home and have paid a price for that. That applies to all partners, spouses, family and friends of members, but I know it more particularly applies to country members.

I wish everybody a merry Christmas and a very happy and prosperous new year. I know that not everybody will have all

their new year wishes brought to fruition, but I know that in one way or another everybody in this Parliament—the members and those who have served the Parliament—has had an exceptional year. I will utter a slight blasphemy: it certainly has been a hell of a year for a great number of people, and a well deserved break is coming up for all of us. So, on behalf of the Government I wish everybody a merry Christmas and a very happy new year.

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I thank the Deputy Premier for his comments. This is very unusual because, as members will recall, we do not normally have the opportunity to do this. Normally it is the prerogative of the Premier to call the election and it is invariably not forecast well in advance, and therefore what is actually the last parliamentary sitting day is not known and we do not go through the normal niceties. On occasions during the past 11 years I have reflected on the extent to which we wish everybody the compliments of the season before we depart the Parliament, yet at a time when some people depart the Parliament in an involuntary fashion because of an election, and even those who depart in a voluntary fashion, we do not go through the procedures and processes to the extent that I think we should. However, that is politics. We do not normally have this opportunity, and I think it is unique.

I would like to endorse the remarks of the Deputy Premier. It is a time when we can reflect on the good things that happen in the Parliament and the support we receive. I compliment the Deputy Premier on the way that he has assisted the processes of the Parliament despite the differences that have occurred due to practice, ideology and management. However, they are not matters for debate right now. When we have dealt with each other in the House we have conducted ourselves in a very humane fashion, and that is a compliment to all members of the Parliament.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** You have no sense of occasion. To you, Mr Speaker, I have appreciated the way you have handled the Parliament over the past four years. We all have moments when we might disagree with particular aspects, but in the 11 years that I have been in the Parliament I have appreciated your term in office as Speaker of the Parliament and I know that everybody else would join with me in complimenting you on the way that you have handled the Chair, Sir.

The Deputy Premier has made reference to all the staff in the Parliament, and we have a fine body of people who serve us well. They start at the front of this Chamber with the clerks, and then there are the attendants, the support staff, the people who assist us, whether it be on the accounting side, the cleaning side, the kitchen staff or the constabulary who look after our safety. Everybody makes a contribution to the smooth running of the Parliament. The *Hansard* staff, as the Deputy Premier noted, makes wonderful productions out of some very poor performances on occasions and really presents the Parliament for those few who read *Hansard* in a very positive light, because some of the things that are written are not necessarily reproduced the way they have been delivered. I congratulate the caretakers who serve after hours and make sure that the fire alarms go off on occasions just to keep us excited.

As to the voluntary retiring members, this is a time when we can take a few minutes to record their service, and I know that my Leader wishes to comment about the retiring members, so I will not concentrate on that aspect now. However, it is useful to reflect that each of those members

who is retiring has made a contribution to the Parliament and, on many occasions, positive contributions indeed. They are all long serving members of the Parliament who have seen Leaders, Premiers and changes and they have managed to maintain a fairly balanced approach to life. I know that each retiring member will make a new contribution in a different field, and those members have been mentioned.

Other members will be involuntary retirees and obviously they will need to readjust to change and the need to make new careers. It is a time of change and a moment in history, and I join with the Deputy Premier in congratulating all the people who have made the Parliament so workable.

I congratulate all members of the Parliament on what has been a constructive contribution and, on behalf of the Liberal Parliamentary Party, I wish everyone a good Christmas. True, we have one or two things to do before that time but, irrespective of where people find themselves, we must remember that Christmas comes around every year and, no matter what the shape of politics, Christmas is to be enjoyed: it is a time for family, a time for fun and a time of great moment. To everyone, merry Christmas and may the New Year, wherever you may be, bring great achievement.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition):** I wish to take this opportunity to pay tribute to four retiring members of the Liberal Party who have made an outstanding contribution, first, to the Liberal Party, secondly, to this Parliament and, thirdly and particularly, to South Australia. All four of them have had long and distinguished careers in this Parliament serving the public of this State. The member for Light entered Parliament in 1970 and served as Leader and then as Speaker. The member for Coles entered Parliament in 1977 and was an outstanding Minister of Health who did so much in terms of refocussing the attention of South Australians onto the fundamental health issues. The member for Davenport entered Parliament in 1969 and, I think, holds every single record for being a Whip in a Parliament probably anywhere in the world. Certainly, he has represented the people of Davenport with great enthusiasm over that period.

The member for Chaffey entered Parliament in 1968, lost his seat for a few years, and then came back as Minister of Water Resources. He made an outstanding contribution to this State in broadening the understanding of the need to conserve and better use our water, and he raised awareness of the problems of salinity. To all four of those members I pay tribute, particularly to the member for Light, for the role of leadership that he gave to this Party, for the tremendous contribution he has made to the Governments in this House and for the dignity and wisdom that he brought on so many occasions in terms of the conduct of the House.

Also, I pay tribute to the members opposite who are known to be retiring at this stage. The member for Ross Smith and the member for Baudin together as the former Premier and Deputy Premier contributed a tremendous amount of effort, time and energy over many years. Few people understand the pressures and the workload of a Premier and Deputy Premier; both have worked hard for this State and we certainly appreciate their contribution.

Also retiring are the members for Henley Beach and Gilles and—do not worry, I have not forgotten, despite the haircut—the member for Napier. He saw me in the corridor earlier, and I know we should not refer to conversations in the corridor but he said, ‘For goodness sake, try to think of something kind to say about me.’ I say again to all five retiring mem-

bers, on behalf of the people of South Australia, we appreciate the contribution you have made; in particular I know that the people of those electorates appreciate the work that has been done for them—of course, at a broader State level by the former Premier and Deputy Premier.

Mr Speaker, we appreciate your role. You and I have sometimes had some minor differences of opinion on matters but I have always appreciated the role that you have played as Speaker in this House and, can I say, before that your role as an independent Labor member representing a safe Labor seat in this State. I think you have served your electorate extremely well. I wish you all the very best with your fishing or the other activities you may take on. I appreciate very much the position that you have held within this House.

There will be other members of the House who will not return after the election. To all of them I make the same comment: I am sure the people of this State appreciate what they have contributed and I wish them all the best in their life after politics. I could offer them a counselling service if they would like, because there is a life after politics. People need to realise that, although it is initially a shock when you lose your seat, the most important thing is to find some new challenges in life, get out and do it, and make sure the challenges are big. I am sure that, if that is the case, after about six months you will probably appreciate the fact that you have had a change in career.

I also add to the comments made by the Deputy Premier and my Deputy Leader about the tremendous contribution made by all the staff of this Parliament. I will not go through them because that has been covered by the two previous speakers, but I also appreciate them all. I would doubt, even under a new Government, that the House would sit before Christmas, and so I wish all members a very happy and thoughtful Christmas as they share Christmas with their families after a busy year. I wish them a period where they can sit back and reflect on the meaning of Christmas and have, I am sure, a happy time with their families and friends, but also a very holy time and a chance to reflect on where we take the State into the new year.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Premier):** I want to join with other members in wishing all who work in this place, and indeed all South Australians, all the best for the season to come, particularly members of both Houses of Parliament. To the staff of Parliament House I extend my very best wishes and my appreciation for all the work they contribute to the working of this Parliament. In our own ways, regardless of the partisanship of things, we all work for the betterment of South Australia, and I think that should be acknowledged.

To the staff who work in the building, they have some very difficult times to go through as they seek to help us to fulfil those duties. To the *Hansard* staff, the catering staff, the attendants, the caretakers, the maintenance people, and all those who keep this building functioning, whether the clerks of the Parliament, the officers in the library, and the like, my very great appreciation.

This will be the last sitting day. I note that the Leader said that whatever happens it is unlikely we will sit before Christmas, so this is the time to extend Christmas greetings and best wishes to those who leave the Parliament by retirement. I want to acknowledge and thank those members who will be leaving by retirement for their service to the Parliament of South Australia. I mention Don Hopgood's sterling contribution to the South Australian Parliament,

being the longest serving Labor Minister to date, starting his career in 1970.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Probably in the world, yes. I also mention the member for Ross Smith, my predecessor, with whom it has been a great pleasure to serve likewise. He entered this Parliament in 1977 and I believe we will all be sorry to see him leave the Parliament. He is in fact the longest serving Labor Premier to this point in time.

*Mr Olsen interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** It will take me some years to get there, but I will be getting there. To the member for Napier (Terry Hemmings), my close friend, colleague and cab fare, I must say I was about ready to pay his cab fares home, but he decided to leave the Parliament so that made things easy.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** You do not have to worry about it; it is an in-house matter. The member for Henley Beach leaves this place, but goes on not to finer but higher things in another place. I certainly hope he enjoys that move. It has been a pleasure to work with him in this place. The member for Gilles leaves this place but in time he, too, will be going on to a higher place. I look forward to having him with me in the Caucus at the time when that is fulfilled.

To you, Mr Speaker, I particularly express my appreciation of the excellent way in which you have served as Speaker in this Parliament. I have greatly appreciated that. You have done it with great distinction, and I want to put on record my own and my Party's recognition of that. To everyone I extend best wishes for a very merry Christmas and for the season.

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** I should like to join other members who have already spoken and wish all members very well for the Christmas break that is to come. I should like to make special mention of the retiring members of Parliament and give special thanks to each of them for the cordial relationship that I have had with them and the trust that they have given me at the appropriate time. I sincerely thank them for that.

In particular, I can say that at all times the member for Davenport's word, as the Whip, has been his bond in dealings with me and I trust that my word has been my bond with him. I should like to think that that trust in one another can be shared among other members of Parliament. I think at some time or other I had something to do with the member for Light aspiring to a higher office in this place.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr BLACKER:** As somebody said, that is history. I have no regrets about doing that, because I believe I played a part in bringing one of the better Speakers to this House at that time. I am sure that other members have commented previously on his contribution to this House. I, too, thank the member for Light for his contribution.

As regards the member for Coles, in her ministerial capacity at the time I think I can say that we were able to appreciate one another's position and similarly had that trust. The member for Chaffey, similarly, was a Minister in that category. The member for Baudin, who was Deputy Premier and held various ministerial positions over a lengthy period, was probably the most experienced Minister in this Chamber. I thank the member for Henley Beach, who as somebody said is going to the other place, and also the member for Napier, as a former Minister of Housing, for their contributions. I



certainly had the opportunity to talk to the member for Ross Smith, the former Premier, and I appreciated the occasions on which we were able to do that. I also include the member for Gilles, who has been here for only one term.

I did a bit of mental arithmetic and found that 155 years of experience will be voluntarily leaving this House on the last sitting day. That is something to reflect on, because there is probably 40 years of ministerial experience going as well. I wonder about the new Parliament, because there will be many new members without that experience to bring the stability that we need. It will require a very conscientious effort on the part of everyone in time to come. It is a little worrying to me because I think I will be one of three of the longest serving members remaining in the House after the next election, and one tends to worry about that when the time comes.

I would like to pay special thanks to you, Sir, for the role that you have played. I take it that you will not be holding that position after the next election, and I thank you for your direction. To members of the staff, *Hansard*, the Clerks, the parliamentary Library, the caretakers and the media I say thank you for the support you have given. As Chairman of the Parliamentary Christian Fellowship and on behalf of its members, I would like to extend to every member of this House and to all those with whom we work a very merry Christmas and a happy new year, and may God's blessing and safety rest with you all.

**Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide):** I wish to contribute briefly to this debate. I acknowledge all the words of previous speakers, but I wish particularly to draw attention to the person who has been my room-mate (not my inmate) in this place for the past four years. I have roomed with the member for Light over that period and I did so on the excellent basis that he is one of the non-smokers on this side of the House. He has an encyclopaedic knowledge of the House which will be missed, and he has been an excellent adviser to new members on this side of the House following the 1989 election. I note from having overheard his telephone calls, which is inevitable in a room of the size which he and I share with his seven filing cabinets—and my zero filing cabinets—that he is a tenacious representative of the electorate of Light. I note also through contact with his family, one of whom has been ill, that he has enormous respect and love for his family, and that is terrific. My lasting memory of the member for Light will be of a sea of brown envelopes, a wall, over which he occasionally looked in order to come up for air. Once, just once, he was unable to find something in that sea of envelopes and his temper was uncontrollable for about four days. I would like to thank the member for Light for his help over the past four years.

**Mr OLSEN (Kavel):** I join with other speakers in congratulating those who are about to voluntarily retire from this House for their outstanding contribution to the Parliament and to the people of South Australia. I acknowledge the amount of sacrifice, hard work and dedication that they have put into discharging their duties. I think it was the Leader who said that the wider community does not generally understand the sort of sacrifice that a member of Parliament makes in discharging their duties effectively and efficiently. That is unfortunate, because if the public of South Australia had a better understanding of that commitment, they would appreciate, acknowledge and support members of Parliament

and, therefore, their cynicism towards the political process might well be less.

Regarding the four members of the Liberal Party and those Government members who are about to retire, I wish them good health and a challenging and rewarding time in their retirement so that they may be able to do some of the things which their duties as members of Parliament have precluded them from doing. I hope they will now enter another phase in their life that will be interesting and enjoyable for them and their family.

I would like to mention two members in particular who served with me in two roles during the period that I was Leader. The member for Light and I share some distinction, as Leader of our Party, in that we both missed by one seat the opportunity to form Government. The member for Light obtained a majority of votes in the 1975 election and was denied the opportunity to form Government by one seat and, unfortunately, that was the case in 1989 for me, so we share some sort of rare distinction (and I trust it will continue to be a rare one) in this Chamber.

In 1975, when the member for Light was Leader of the Party, I was campaign coordinator of the Party during the course of that election campaign. We shared the exhilaration of getting the popular vote and the despondency, frustration and absolute let down of not being able to form a Government despite the fact that the majority of South Australians actually supported the Party at that time.

With respect to the member for Davenport, who served a period as Whip whilst I was Leader, Leaders well understand the important role of Whip in terms of assistance, coordination, advice and support. During my term as Leader, as Whip the member for Davenport was unstinting in his support and dedication. I thank the members on this side for the friendship that they have accorded to me during the period that I had the privilege of being the Leader of the Liberal Party in South Australia.

I guess also, looking across the Chamber, that the member for Ross Smith, my adversary for so many years, will be leaving the Chamber. I suppose there are many ways one can describe seeing one's political foe leaving the Chamber before oneself, and I guess at least in this respect I live on in some form in this Chamber and the member for Ross Smith embarks upon a new career elsewhere. With the members of the Liberal Party, I wish him well in that regard.

As with other members, I commend you, Mr Speaker, for your role as Speaker in the House. To all members and members of staff, I wish them well for the festive season. After the election campaign is out of the way, and we settle down to a new role, function and direction in South Australia, I wish everybody the peace, happiness and joy of Christmas, and may 1994 bring for them and their families a more prosperous and peaceful future, and certainly, individually, a rewarding one.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Baudin):** Never being one for unduly prolonging debates, but since a number of members have risen to place on record their appreciation to those members who are voluntarily retiring, on behalf of all of those members, although some may wish to speak for themselves (although I hope not everybody does), may I express our gratitude for what has been said about our time in this place.

I also want to place on record that which I have done personally or tried to do during the break this evening when I have wandered around this place and thanked people who

work in various avenues of service to us, such as the *Hansard* staff, Library staff, and so on, for the great deal of kindness and cooperation I have received over the very many years I have been here. I have certainly appreciated all the friendships I have built up over those years; more, though, I have appreciated the opportunity to serve the people of South Australia in the various roles in which I have served.

Before I sit down, there is one other thing I should say to, as it were, square the ledger. In the last day of sitting, I recounted to the House certain information which had been given to the Government by a rather reliable source. I want to say to the member for Bragg, who got to his feet immediately after my speech and placed on record his understanding of events, that whatever else might have happened I certainly accept what he said to the House on that occasion.

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** I took the opportunity a couple of weeks ago to say my farewells, but there are some things that perhaps I missed and would like to have recorded. I apologise to *Hansard* because they have some eats up there and I said I was not going to speak again tonight; but I will take this opportunity to do so.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** Because a couple of my colleagues said that it was about time I wore my coat and tie here late at night, I went and put them on; but I will say now, as I have always said, that the air-conditioning in this place is too hot and that I prefer not to wear a coat. It was not like that in the olden days. Can I say that one of my problems in leaving this place is that I have every letter that I have ever written or received. Considering that I have been here a sixth of the time of white settlement, there are a lot of letters and I am wondering what I should do with them; whether I should have a fire and invite everybody along to it and let them throw one piece on at a time, or whether I should let some historian have a look to see whether there are not one or two pieces that should be kept. But I do have every letter that has ever been written to me or dictated and sent out by me.

I recently went to a function where Brenton Sanderson, who is going to Victoria to play football, was in attendance and it jogged my memory then that it was about time that I did leave this place, because I went home contemplating that his grandfather was my cricket captain, and then I thought of the people I have served with in this place who have passed on—and I think it is 27 or 28 people, in either the Upper or Lower House—since I have been here. It brings one back to the reality that maybe it is time to move on and that one is not making an error. In doing that I thought of some of the unusual incidents in my life, and I suppose, as far as a parliamentarian is concerned, one was with the Eden Hills Primary School, where the Government would not buy the house adjoining the school and the school had a small playground, so I signed a contract under my name or a nominee and went to the Minister. He agreed then to buy it but he called me a nasty name—politely of course. Sometimes members have to do that.

I want to thank the member for Flinders for his comments. He has always been frank and honest with me and he has never broken his word and even though he belongs to another Party he has never left this place without making sure that I was aware that he was leaving and where he was going. Some members have referred to my representing the Davenport electorate, but first of all I had Onkaparinga, then Fisher, and then Davenport, and in that time I have seen many changes in the Hills. It is not the sort of area that I came in here

representing and that I appreciated; it has changed and so has the attitude of people. That can be disappointing. I will not reflect why but it can be when that change takes place.

When I spoke the other evening I did not thank those people who have supported me or those who have helped me in the electorate over the years, and I want to thank them tonight. I support all the comments that have been made about staff and others associated with the Parliament. But those who are out in the electorate, and in particular the volunteers who work for each and every one of us, for no reward and who are dedicated to a philosophy, regardless of which Party, are paramount in the democratic system operating within this State. I hope it always remains so and that those volunteers are always there and encouraged, and that people do not try to change the system to do away with some of the jobs that they do, jobs which they like doing and which enable them to take a keener interest in politics—jobs such as handing out how-to-vote cards.

Sir, I thank you and I wonder at times whether you have contemplated what the position would be at the moment, what the result would have been, had you taken the other path four years ago and supported another group, the Opposition as it is now, in Government. I hope, Sir, that at some time you will contemplate that, as you move out, whether you go on and attempt to be a member or whether you decide to step down and have a trip around Australia to see what happens in other parts of this great country.

To those who have sent words of gratitude to me, I have done my job to the best of my ability, but in particular I want to thank the friends I have on both sides of politics whom I know I can trust with a comment, and I could name some issues in relation to which I have had to go and front people and, even though they are on the other side of politics, they have been 100 per cent loyal to their word.

If a person is not and they tell you one lie you can never trust them again in business, in private life or in this game. I remember a young lass at Blackwood High School asking me whether I agreed that in the main all politicians are liars, rogues, thieves and cheats, or words to that effect, and only think of themselves. Her name was Daphne Spencer and she came from a great family. I said in front of 700 students, 'I don't know whether or not that is true; I can't prove that. But I will give you a politician's answer: I believe that the Parliament truly represents the society that elects it.' I think that is true today—we come from all walks of life, we represent all attitudes, and I hope that is always the case because we are supposed to represent the society.

I thank everyone again and I wish everyone a merry Christmas and a successful future whatever they may do in retirement. If anyone wants some gardening done, I might be 'Stan the Handyman' and I will be looking for work.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** I wish to express appreciation to members from both sides of the House who have referred to the service that I have been privileged to provide to this House, to the people of Light and I believe, through the capacity as a member of Parliament, to the people of South Australia. I deem it an even greater privilege that I have been able to nominate my own removal from the House. So many people have the unfortunate experience of being drummed out. The former most long-serving member for Light was actually deposed from the House through lack of attendance. That is a good many years ago now, but collectively that member, as the member for Light or the member for Wooroora, had over 35 years of service to the Parliament

of South Australia, but less than the 23½ as the member for Light that I have been privileged to fulfil. To all members and staff I express my best wishes for the Christmas and New Year period. May they enjoy one another's company, that being of their family and friends, and may their health be ever with them.

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** As the member from this side of the Chamber who has the honour and responsibility to represent the views and interests of people here on the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee which ensures that this House and, more particularly, this institution called Parliament works and continues to reform itself; on behalf of all members I say 'thank you very much' to the various organs within the staff structure of the Parliament and the House of Assembly for what has been accomplished by them in the past 12 months in particular, and in the past four years in general.

Those four years warrant mention because of the enormous changes we have managed to achieve without additional expenditure, indeed with some considerable saving, both in the Library and, more particularly, in *Hansard*. In *Hansard*, had we continued with the old technology we had at the time that this Parliament was elected, it would be costing us over \$4.5 million a year now to produce that record. However, the challenge of change has been understood and met by the people who work in *Hansard* and keep a record of our contributions in this Chamber, not only for the benefit of posterity but more particularly for the benefit of large numbers of people throughout the State who rely on the accuracy of that record to provide them with the information about what goes on in here. To *Hansard*, I say 'thank you most sincerely'.

In retrospect, it was my pleasant duty to be the convenor of a subcommittee charged with the responsibility of working with the people in *Hansard* in changing the way in which the record is made. The principles of an accurate record still prevail, but the costs to the taxpayer are enormously reduced. I know that members on this side of the House, and I am quite sure members on the other side also, share my view that we appreciate what members of the *Hansard* staff have achieved individually and collectively in doing that work—changing the technologies they use to record and then present the record of proceedings.

More than that, though, I want to thank everybody, whether the building caretakers, the attendants in this Chamber, the table officers, the servants of committees or people who provide us with the papers we require on our benches—the non-persons who serve our needs and interests—and also those in the catering division who provide for our creature comforts in ensuring that we are fed on time and pleasantly. I also thank the people in the library, and the contract cleaners who have kept this place habitable as a result of their efforts in cleaning away what is left after the day's work has been done and making sure that it is a pleasant place for members of the general public to come to see us and for all of us who work here, whether staff members or parliamentary members.

All those people are very important, not forgetting the telephonists and those who work in the plant room who ensure that the temperature in this building is so far as possible comfortable to enable us to work without too much distraction. Without that kind of service the institution itself could not function as efficiently as it does and we as members of Parliament could not make our contribution to the process

of determining what ought to be done in the wider community without the prickles and discomforts we would otherwise suffer.

Turning to another aspect of our being, I want to congratulate those members who are retiring voluntarily for the contributions they have made and for the assistance they in their separate ways have provided to me in reaching a better understanding of my role and function here. I am particularly grateful to the member for Light for the thoughtful encouragement he has given me, not the least of which was to teach me how to play lawn bowls and to always get my bias right. I think that is vital: it really is an important part of parliamentary life, although so little time is spent in that way. It means so much to those of us who have participated, because it is something like the experience of going to a CPA conference: you make friends in other Parliaments, and you are able through that network to ring anyone from any side of politics to get an understanding of what is going on elsewhere in this nation without having to worry about whether they will regard your inquiry as being inane or otherwise. That arises as a consequence of their participation for four days a year in a game of bowls with other members of Parliament.

**An honourable member:** Hear! Hear!

**Mr LEWIS:** And I note other members who have shared that experience and value it, saying so. Sir, with those remarks, I wish everybody, particularly the people who work here, a very merry Christmas and I look forward to a considerably changed Parliament when this House next resumes, and I believe that there will be great changes even though I may not shift very far, if at all, from where I presently sit.

**The SPEAKER:** As this is definitely the last day that I will sit in the Chair in this House, perhaps I should take the opportunity to make a few comments. First, I support absolutely all the congratulations that have been made to everybody who works in this place. There is no doubt that they do their very best for us at all times. One thing about being elevated to a position such as Speaker in this Parliament is that you do begin to understand just how complex an organisation it is.

It makes us appreciate the quality of the staff we have—the table officers, the clerks and the support mechanism all the way through this Parliament—without whom it would not work. The member for Davenport and other members have spoken about the dedication of members. I can say that in my time here, which is now 14 years, I do not believe I have seen a member who has not tried at all times to do his or her best. I do not agree that on all occasions they have done it the correct way, but they have tried to look after the electorate they represent, and that obviously means the people of South Australia.

One point I want to make here is that this Parliament has to look to itself, that is, to the way we are running this Parliament; whoever forms the next Government and the Government after that will have to look very positively at the way we operate this Parliament in future and also at how members will be accommodated. We are all aware of the situation, but we have not grasped the nettle and resolved it, although that must be done. It is an issue that is raised continually, and in one's elevated position one becomes acutely aware of the problem.

I wish to thank this Parliament for the honour it has given to me by allowing me to be the Speaker of this House for nearly four years and also for allowing me to hold the other

high office I have held on behalf of members in the CPA. I served when the Hon. Roger Goldsworthy stood down from the executive committee of the CPA and, taking up the words of the member for Murray-Mallee, it was an indescribable experience to mix with people from all over the world, debating matters that I do not normally encounter. Certainly that has been of great benefit to me, and I hope that benefit has been reflected in this Parliament.

I now wish to congratulate the members who are leaving voluntarily for the service they have given—as the member for Flinders says, some hundreds of years of combined service. Those members will be missed; that experience does give a backbone to this Parliament and, as the member for Flinders said, with the influx of new members we will probably have some difficulty in the next Parliament. To those who will be leaving involuntarily, I wish the best: I really do not know what more I can say than that. I know that every member tries his or her best and in all contests somebody wins and somebody loses, so some will go.

In conclusion, I wish everybody who has anything to do with this Parliament—members' staff and support staff—a merry Christmas and all the very best. It is a hard job; as members have said, the time and effort that goes in are not recognised, nor is the time away from family and friends. I wish everybody a calming and recuperative time over the Christmas period. May the next year bring them everything they wish for themselves and may it bring for South Australians the very best we can do for them.

Motion carried.

#### MEDICAL TREATMENT AND PALLIATIVE CARE

Adjourned debate (resumed on motion).  
(Continued from page 1080.)

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** I do not want to delay the House, because I recognise that it is important that this message be conveyed to another place. I would like to make five quick points. I congratulate the former Minister of Health, the Hon. Don Hopgood, and the current Minister of Health, Family and Community Services for having accepted the plethora of recommendations which were put forward by the committee. They were so great in number and in their content and extent that any Minister could perhaps have been forgiven for wanting to walk back from a number of them, yet collectively they are so important in the future for the dignity of persons who will inevitably die, and the important aspects of those recommendations must be put into effect at the earliest possible moment.

Secondly, I want to point out that in the first recommendation, (a), we talk of the care of the dying in South Australia, and I pick up the point which was made during the course of the inquiry, and which does not have specific reference in the terms that have been passed on to the House, of the great importance of any future Health Minister having regard to the dignity of the dying in nursing homes to which funds have been made available in order to give dedicated care to persons who are in that serious stage of their life. It is an area which requires additional and special attention, and I look forward to that occurring.

In relation to recommendation (a)(3), dealing with the effectiveness of providing legislation, it has been very apparent that the existing natural death and consent to dental and medical treatment legislation is not well known by the public, very few people having taken the opportunity

presented to them under the natural death measure, and an absolute lack of knowledge having been apparent on the part of so many people appearing before the committee in connection with the provisions contained in the consent to dental and medical treatment measure. When the new legislation is enacted that educational program will be absolutely important.

Recommendation (a)(4) deals with the importance of professional education. It is a fact of life that members of the professions, particularly once they leave the university, seem to fall into the trap of being so busy in practice that they do not follow through with the programs made available to them by their professional organisations and others and do not update their expertise in areas which are important to the patients they serve. I am most keen that the professional education aspects be taken up and given serious consideration by the Government.

I indicate to the Minister that I believe a word is missing from paragraph (c). Accordingly, I move:

Paragraph (c)—After the words 'the report must be tabled in Parliament within 14' insert the word 'sitting'.

I point out that, in anticipation that the Parliament would be sitting soon after 31 August when the report would be made, we still have the circumstance which unfolded here again in 1993. I refer to the fact that, when Parliament was suspended for the purpose of the Estimates Committees, two weeks were lost, followed by a non sitting week. It would not have been physically possible to bring it down within 14 days because Parliament was not sitting.

By inserting the word 'sitting' that difficulty is overcome. I would certainly express the hope that no Minister would hold it for 14 days and that the Minister, whoever he or she may be, would put it to the Parliament at the earliest possible moment. I commend the motion before the Chair and duly request that my amendment be accepted.

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health, Family and Community Services):** The member for Light has moved an amendment, and I am sure he will bring it up in writing at any moment. I would like to thank members for their contributions to this debate. It is unfortunate that it could not be in the context of a freshly approved Consent to Medical and Palliative Care Bill, but nonetheless the progress which has been made on this Bill to date and the acceptance of this resolution by the House and hopefully by another place will take us further down the track towards a significantly improved palliative care system in this State. As members have said, the monitoring is a very important part of that together with the public awareness and all the factors that go with it. Certainly from my point of view I remain committed to the reintroduction of that Bill as Minister of Health in the first session of the next Parliament. I thank members for their contribution and commend the motion and the amendment moved by the member for Light to the House.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

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

*A quorum having been formed:*

#### STATUTES AMENDMENT (ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO NO. 2) BILL

Second reading.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

This Bill makes a number of amendments to Acts within the Attorney-General's portfolio.

*Legal Practitioners Act 1981*

In the *Legal Practitioners (Reform) Amendment Act 1993*, an amendment was made to Section 52 of the principal Act dealing with the professional indemnity insurance scheme. The amendment provided for the insurance scheme to be authorised by the Attorney-General rather than promulgated in the Regulations.

The amendment to Section 19 of the *Legal Practitioners Act* made in this Bill is consequential to the earlier amendment as it removes the reference to the regulations.

*Trustee Act 1936*

Part 3 of the Bill makes a number of amendments to section 5 of the *Trustee Act*.

Perpetual Trustees has drawn attention to Section 5(1)(b)(i) of the Act which, in relation to mortgages, defines an authorised investment in terms of 'land in the State.' There are examples in other States where investments in mortgages are not restricted geographically but can be made in relation to land in 'any State or Territory of the Commonwealth.'

In 1987, the Inter-Departmental Committee on Authorised Trustee Investment Status presented its Report to the Government. The Committee recommended that the Authorised Trustee Investment Status of certain first mortgages be expanded to include such mortgages in any State or Territory of the Commonwealth of Australia. The Committee was of the view that, while investing in a mortgage over a property some distance from the investor may be somewhat more difficult, it is not inherently more risky and should therefore not be denied authorised trustee status.

Therefore the Bill inserts a provision to allow for first mortgages over land in 'any State or Territory of the Commonwealth'.

Perpetual Trustees have also advised of a difficulty with the operation of the South Australian Act. Under Section 5(1)(c)(i), a trustee may invest in 'a deposit with any bank carrying on the business of banking in the State.' Under Section 5(9), a bank is defined as 'a body corporate authorised under the *Banking Act 1959* and includes the State Bank of South Australia'. However, the effect of those provisions is to rule out investments in deposits, bills etc of the State Bank of New South Wales, and the R & I. Currently, the Perpetual Trustees At Call Fund has investments in these banks.

Treasury has advised that it is not aware of any prudential reason for limiting the definition of an acceptable bank in this way. It is understood that Queensland, New South Wales and Western Australia adopt a definition that is not restricted geographically, or exclusive of, State Banks.

The Bill provides for an amendment to allow any bank operating in Australia to have trustee status, provided it is authorised to carry on the business of banking by a law of the Commonwealth or of a State or Territory.

National Australia Trustees has written requesting that its Common Fund be included in the list of authorised investments under Section 5(1)(g) of the *Trustees Act*. Treasury has advised that it does not oppose the inclusion of the National Australia Trustees At Call Common Fund as an authorised investment.

*Trustee Company Act 1988*

Part 4 of the Bill amends the *Trustee Company Act* by including IOOF Australia Trustees as a trustee company authorised to operate in this State. IOOF Australia Trustees incorporates the business formerly conducted by Farmers Cooperative Executors and Trustees and maintains the business known as Bagots Executor and Trustee Company Limited. I commend this Bill to honourable members.

Explanation of Clauses

PART 1

PRELIMINARY

*Clause 1: Short title*

This clause is formal.

*Clause 2: Interpretation*

This clause provides that a reference in this Act to the principal Act is a reference to the Act referred to in the heading to the Part in which the reference occurs.

PART 2

AMENDMENT OF LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT 1981

*Clause 3: Amendment of s. 19—Evidence of insurance to be produced to Court*

This clause amends section 19 of the principal Act by striking out from subsection (1) 'Where regulations are in force' and substituting 'Where a scheme under section 52 is in force' and by striking out from subsection (1) 'regulations' (second occurring) and substituting 'scheme'. These amendments are consequential on the enactment of the *Legal Practitioners (Reform) Amendment Act 1993*.

PART 3

AMENDMENT OF TRUSTEE ACT 1936

*Clause 4: Amendment of s. 5—Authorised investments*

This clause amends section 5 of the principal Act to authorise a trustee to invest trust funds—

- on first legal mortgage of an estate in fee simple in land in any State or Territory of the Commonwealth or of a perpetual lease (granted under a law of this State or the equivalent of such a lease granted under the law of any other State, or a Territory, of the Commonwealth);
- on deposit with any bank authorised by a law of the Commonwealth or of any State or a Territory of the Commonwealth, to carry on the business of banking.

Section 5 is further amended by inserting the common fund of the National Australia Trustees Limited into the list of authorised investments and by striking out the definition of 'bank' from subsection (9).

PART 4

AMENDMENT OF TRUSTEE COMPANIES ACT 1988

*Clause 5: Amendment of Schedule 1—Trustee Companies*

This clause amends Schedule 1 of the principal Act by striking out 'Farmers' Co-operative Executors and Trustees Limited' and substituting 'IOOF Australia Trustees Limited'.

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):**

The Opposition supports the Bill. It is infinitely sensible. It needs to be progressed speedily so that it is in place during the recess as soon as possible. It deals with two matters: first, the professional indemnity insurance scheme relating to legal practitioners; and, secondly, the amendment to the Trustee Act 1936. Given the changes that we have here the Opposition is more than happy to have this matter dealt with now, and we support the Bill.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations):** I thank

the Opposition for its support of this measure and indeed for its cooperation in facilitating its passage for the reasons that the member for Mitcham has outlined to the House.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

**CHILDREN'S PROTECTION BILL**

At 11.8 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the House:

*As to Amendment No. 1:*

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

*As to Amendment No. 2:*

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on this amendment.

*As to Amendments Nos 3 to 8:*

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

*As to Amendment No. 9:*

That the Legislative Council amend its amendment by leaving out the word 'must' and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'should'. And that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

*As to Amendments Nos 10 to 15:*

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

*As to Amendment No. 16:*

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on this amendment.

*As to Amendment No. 17:*

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

*As to Amendments Nos 18 to 20:*

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on these amendments.

*As to Amendments Nos 21 to 26:*

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

Consideration in Committee of the recommendations of the conference.

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

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

However, I do so with some reluctance. The basic position, as it emerges from the conference, is that the amendments moved by the Legislative Council in relation to a number of very vital issues on this Bill have been accepted. The conference proceeded for some time in discussion of these matters and many issues were canvassed in that, but, unfortunately, I find myself quite unable to support some of the outcomes of that conference.

Of course, the way the system works one is required to support or not to support the package. The reality is that in this context a Government would be irresponsible not to support the adoption of the Children's Protection Bill. Contingent on that is the whole of the juvenile justice package, which this Parliament has approved, and it would be irresponsible and, indeed, the community would be rightly concerned if that juvenile justice package were not adopted by this Parliament given that this is the last day of sitting. But I think a number of points need to be made about this.

First, one of the principal areas of concern I have with the legislation as it will now exist is that the care and protection coordinators are to be employed by the State courts system. This will mean that when the family care coordinators hold a family care meeting they will not be doing so in a non-threatening atmosphere, where people are working together as a family to work for the best interests of the child and where the safety of the child will be paramount: this will become an adversarial proceeding. Those who speak against this will claim that that is not the course that will be followed.

I have to tell you that the experience which we have of the Western legal system is that it is based on adversarial principles and, in my view, it will evolve into an adversarial system. That is the price you pay for putting the courts in charge of the system. Where the proceedings are judicial or quasi-judicial, as they are under the young offenders legislation—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** Indeed, how can they support such a thing? Where the proceedings are judicial or quasi-judicial, where there are outcomes for the young person, as in the case of the young offenders legislation, those outcomes are punitive; they deprive the young person of their liberty in some cases; they impose what amounts to fines on that young person; and there are judicial consequences in relation to the meeting.

Therefore, it is appropriate, as this Parliament has provided, that those people should be employed by the courts system. They provide judicial impartiality for those punitive outcomes. This is not about punitive outcomes for the child; that is the reverse of the situation. We are dealing with children who have been injured or abused in this process, where there is psychological or physical injury, and those children are entitled to hearings and discussions within a

family environment where there is no threatening adversarial and judicial atmosphere. If necessary, at the end of the day the Minister can take proceedings before the Youth Court which are adversarial where the court's judicial approach is necessary and where it is appropriate that it should prevail. In this context this is a precursor. This precedes the legal process and it should be in a family environment, not a court environment. The ultimate consequence of putting the court in charge of this system is that it will turn into an adversarial system. We have to look at this in the context of the further amendments which provide for compulsory advocacy.

*The Hon. T.R. Groom interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** As my colleague the Minister of Primary Industries says, they will end up with QCs for the children and that will be in a family context. This is QCs against the parents, and that is where we are left in the context of the Bill.

While I think the legislation is a significant improvement on where we were and while it is necessary as part of our young offenders package, I do not think we should translate the principles which were accepted in the young offenders package into children's protection. We are dealing not with young people who have offended against the law but with young people who are themselves the victims, and that is a totally different approach. To translate in some direct fashion the principles which are accepted as part of the Young Offenders Bill into this legislation is a travesty of justice for the young people concerned.

The Department for Family and Community Services, in properly executing its role of providing social work and assistance to families, will now necessarily have to establish a pre-trial system. There will be meetings with the family in an informal way, because it is no longer mandated by the legislation, and that family group meeting will have to occur in an informal context because the department will still need to work with the families. That will still have to occur. Therefore, we are requiring families to go through a two-stage process in which there will be an informal family care meeting organised by the Department for Family and Community Services and there will then be what amounts to a pre-trial conference supervised by a court responsible officer who will conduct the proceedings, in my view, ultimately in an adversarial context, and that will possibly lead to court proceedings. We are now subjecting families to further stages in this process in which new people will be required to be informed about the circumstances of the family. They will be required to go through the process again, and it will be quite inflexible and unfortunate in its approach. I am very concerned about that.

Indeed, we have the change to the definition of 'abuse' and 'neglect' where the word 'significant' has been removed and the somewhat meaningless qualification of 'detrimental to the child's wellbeing' has been inserted by the Legislative Council instead. That process broadens the definition of abuse to include almost any injury, which is so widely defined now. The member for Heysen previously was scathing of my comment about the way in which this might operate. I would not say that would be the normal course of events, but it is certainly unreasonable to quote as one possible example that normal parental discipline, as we would understand it, will fall within that definition. The qualifying phrase of 'detrimental to the child's wellbeing' has not been tested judicially. It has not had the opportunity to work in practice and it is quite vague. It will not be a significant barrier at all. I believe that the definition of 'injury' and

'abuse' has been widened to the point where there is some concern about it. There are a number of minor amendments which I will not canvass because, in the normal course of discussion between Houses, it is acceptable for minor matters to be dealt with in that way and I am not concerned about those.

**The ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mrs Hutchison):** Order! The member for Spence and the member for Heysen will cease interjecting across the Chamber.

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** However, I am very concerned about those provisions which I have already detailed and indeed the mandatory advocacy provisions because, while they could have been acceptable in some context, I think when you put all the amendments together and examine the impact of the court approach, the advocacy approach and the widening definition of abuse and neglect, what we have seen is an attempt by the Opposition and the Democrats to ensure that this legislation—

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** Order! The member for Eyre will cease interjecting.

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:**—will be far less practicable in its benefits. It will deprive parents of many of their previous rights; indeed, in my view it is quite contrary to many of the expressed statements over the years by members opposite who have previously maintained the position of supporting families and who have been critical of Family and Community Services for always taking the child's approach. I recall members opposite talking about a child-centred approach, of which they were critical. The amendments before us tonight are not appropriate in that context. Indeed, contrary to the member for Bright's approach of trying to abolish committees and boards and the like, we see the further establishment of another committee—an advisory panel—in these amendments, so we have a further *quasi* statutory body to contend with in relation to these amendments.

So, while I accept that the package as a whole will be necessary, I believe that we have unnecessarily subjected parents to a court approach rather than a family approach. In summary, the Opposition is putting the courts ahead of our families, and I do not believe that is an appropriate response. This legislation is essential and, even with these elements within it, I believe that the Parliament should adopt the package as a whole, because, included with the juvenile justice package, it is worth the community's while.

It is an appropriate attitude to take that it is necessary to accept the totality of what we have before us, but I think that the intransigence of the Opposition in relation to this matter and its refusal to compromise, in effect threatening the community that we would not have the essential juvenile justice legislation in place unless these changes were adopted, will not assist children's protection in this State. In this context I certainly would claim a mandate on behalf of this Government when it forms a Government in the next Parliament to amend this legislation back to a reasonable standard.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** At the outset I refute the Minister's comments.

*Mr Hamilton interjecting:*

**The ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** Order! The member for Albert Park will cease interjecting.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** It is quite obvious that members opposite do not like what has happened.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** If anybody has gone soft, your Minister has gone soft.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** Order! The member for Spence is out of order. I ask him to cease interjecting.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I say also at the outset that the member for Spence is out of order, because as I understand it he has breached Standing Orders—

**The ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** Order! The honourable member will be seated.

**Mr ATKINSON:** On a point of order, Madam Acting Chair, if the member for Heysen wishes to accuse me of breaching Standing Orders he should do so by substantive motion.

**The ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** I uphold that point of order. I would suggest that the member for Heysen would have had a chance to invoke Standing Orders, but I call the member for Heysen to continue with his speech.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The fact is that the member for Spence has contacted a radio station, has spoken on that radio station and has indicated the outcome of the conference prior to the report being brought back to this House or another place. That is outrageous and, as I understand it, a breach of Standing Orders.

**The ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** Order! Would the honourable member please be seated. What is the member for Napier's point of order?

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** My point of order is that a radio station has nothing to do with the results of this conference.

**The ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** I do not uphold the point of order but I would ask the honourable member to come back to the point of discussion, and that is the amendments that have been moved and the results of the conference.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I am delighted to do that because I believe that as this Bill comes out of the conference it is much improved legislation. With the support of the Government the conference has been able to achieve three important provisions: first of all, the provision of an advocate to support the child in a family care meeting when a child is at risk.

*Members interjecting:*

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

*Mr Hamilton interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I would not like to have to name the member for Albert Park at this late stage.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** It is totally appropriate that that should be the case—that an independent advocate be provided to assist the child, because that is what this legislation is about, the welfare of children. We have also achieved the provision for an independent coordinator who is attached to the Courts Administration Authority and who is to have the conduct of family care meetings and to provide balance within those meetings.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I call the member for Spence to order.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The Minister has indicated to the Committee that this provision will be threatening to the child and to the family. If the Minister were concerned about this matter being under the control of the courts, I point out that the opportunity was provided by the Opposition to either involve the Children's Interest Bureau or have the coordinator

appointed from the Attorney-General's Department. The Minister refused to accept either of those suggestions. They were two alternatives that were put up, so that if the Minister were concerned about the involvement of court administration those other alternatives could be considered, and he refused to accept either of those amendments. We have also improved the definitions of 'abuse' and 'neglect' and I repeat that the sensational—

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I hope members are not interjecting out of their seats; otherwise I will have to take action.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I repeat that the sensational claim that again has been made by the Minister tonight is a falsehood and completely misrepresents the statutory reference to injury under the definition of physical or psychological abuse, and I would suggest that normal parental discipline would not be impinged on in any way under the amendment that has been adopted by this conference. The improvements that have been made are substantial. I regret that, as a result of the Minister's insistence, it has been necessary to not proceed with an amendment that was put in the Upper House in regard to the principles to be observed in dealing with children, because the Upper House was very supportive of the fact that the welfare as well as the safety of the child be considered.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I call members to order. I know that this is the last Committee, but I will be forced to suspend until the ringing of the bells if this keeps up.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The Opposition has felt all the way through that it was important that, under the principles which are to be observed with regard to this legislation, the welfare of the child should be considered. Regrettably the conference has agreed that welfare should be removed, so in considering any exercise of power under this Bill in relation to a child the safety of the child is to be the paramount consideration, not the safety and welfare of the child.

I find it extremely difficult to determine why the Minister was so absolutely pig-headed about this situation. I would have thought that this Bill was all about the welfare of the child. It would have been totally appropriate for the amendment moved in the Upper House to be adopted by the conference and by this Chamber. The decisions that have been made by the conference vindicate the support shown by many organisations from the non-government sector involved in working with children and families. A large number of those organisations have made representations to the Opposition, and those representations in turn have been conveyed to this Parliament.

The Liberal Party is committed to ensuring that the child's interests are paramount but that families are also given support in difficult situations involving their children. The agreement between the two Houses means that the juvenile justice package supported by both major Parties can now come into effect on 1 January 1994. At this stage the Opposition looks forward to implementing the significantly improved legislation when it assumes the Treasury benches after the election.

**Mr ATKINSON:** I am the father of three small children aged six, four and two. I love them very much but I also smack them when they are naughty.

*Mr Gunn interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr ATKINSON:** I was smacked by my father and I believe—

*Mr Gunn interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The member for Eyre will have an opportunity later.

**Mr ATKINSON:** I believe the right of parents to chastise their children reasonably is important. That right has now been seriously infringed by amendments to the Bill moved by the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party pretends to be the Party of the family and the Party of conservative values, but tonight the Liberal Party has betrayed those values. I was enthusiastic about the Bill in my capacity as Chairman of the Health Committee of Caucus. I introduced the Bill into the parliamentary Labor Party; I went on talkback radio and supported the Bill; and I attended a meeting of Torn Apart Families at Woodville Town Hall and told them how this Bill would redress many of their grievances about unjustified State intervention in family life.

I am sorry that the Opposition spokesman is leaving the Chamber and abandoning this debate to go on radio himself. I supported the Bill because it introduced a qualification to the best-interests-of-the-child test, and that qualification was that the Department for Family and Community Services should take into consideration the need to keep families together. I was enthusiastic about the Bill. However, tonight I will vote against the Bill and, if there were one red-blooded person on the Opposition benches prepared to support conservative values and family values and oppose the Bill with me, I would call for a division, but I do not believe there is one decent conservative on the Opposition benches—they are just a bunch of left liberals following their left liberal Leader.

There were three aspects—

*Mr Ingerson interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** I do not care. In response to the interjection by the member for Bragg, I do not care what the vote on this is. I do not care if I am the only member of Parliament who is opposed to this Bill.

*The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I call the member for Heysen to order.

**Mr ATKINSON:** The member for Heysen interjects, yet a moment ago he was a defender of the sacred right to confidentiality of joint conferences. He now stands before the Committee contributing the details of those conferences. There were three aspects of this Bill which I was most enthusiastic about and which I was happy to relate to the listeners on Radio 5AA and my constituents. I was happy to stand in front of my constituents and say that there were three aspects of this Bill I supported and which were improvements to our law.

The first was that this Bill gave police officers the right, if they found children on the streets committing crimes or in danger of abuse, to take those children back to their school, if it was during school hours, or to return them to their parents. I believed that was a very important improvement in the law and one which was approved by the parliamentary Labor Party. That improvement to the law has been neutered by the Liberal Party and the Democrats. What they have done is restrict that right to police who are commissioned officers or above that rank. How many of the police on the streets are of that rank? Very few indeed.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!



**Mr ATKINSON:** The obligation of the police under the child protection law to return truanting children or graffiti vandals found committing an offence to their parents or to school has now been defeated by the Liberal Party, and, unfortunately, the Government seems sufficiently intellectually weak to accept this amendment.

Just tonight, during the dinner adjournment, when I was returning to Parliament from the All Souls Evensong at my church on Port Road at Hindmarsh, I noticed two juveniles spray painting railway property in the vicinity of the Chief Street underpass in Brompton. I walked a little closer to see what they were doing and just at that time a police car arrived, because the underpass is around the corner from the Port Road Police Station. I said to the officer, 'The people up there are acting suspiciously. They appear to be spray painting railway property.' Under the Bill that we were going to bring in that police officer would have been able to say to those two children, 'In the back of my car. You are going home to your parents at Croydon', because they were from Croydon High School.

The police do not have that power now. We were going to give the police that power. The Liberal Party and the Democrats have taken away that right from police officers below the rank of commissioned officer. That is a bad decision. It is a decision that the great mass of South Australians would not approve of if they knew about the back-room deal that has been done here tonight.

I should add that the Liberal Party did not support these kinds of amendments in the select committee. In fact, in the select committee it took a position which Liberal Party voters in this State could understand and support. Those voters ought to know that the Liberal Party has changed its position and is now diametrically opposed to the view it held on the select committee. I know that members opposite want to go home and contest the election and that they do not want Parliament to keep sitting. This Bill in its present form is a disgrace, and the people of South Australia have a right to be informed about that. I will speak against it, and I do not care if you all go home. I turn to the second aspect of the Bill that I supported, and that is the family group conference.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Mr Chairman, I draw your attention to the state of the Committee.

*A quorum having been formed:*

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

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

Motion carried.

**Mr ATKINSON:** I was moving to the second aspect of this Bill which was worthy of support and about which I was enthusiastic, namely, that the Bill introduced family group conferences. When the Department for Family and Community Services—the State—intervened in the family for the purpose of, say, removing a child from the family, we proposed, and the Liberal Party supported us, a family group conference. That would mean that the coordinator of the Department for Family and Community Services in charge of the case would call a family group conference comprising all the relatives and the child and they would try to solve the problem by conciliation. I believed that was a good change to the law that ought to be supported.

Now we find that the Liberal Party, together with the Australian Democrats, has introduced an amendment

whereby the departmental coordinator has to arrange for a suitable person to act as an advocate for the child at the meeting. That means a panel of full-time bureaucrats and lawyers, paid for by the taxpayers of South Australia, to act as advocates at family group conferences, in some cases on behalf of naughty children. A 15-year-old can run away from home alleging that his or her parent is unreasonably forcing them to do the dishes, smacking them or not buying them tickets to see the 36-ers.

As now, the Department for Family and Community Services will sometimes set up these children in the Noblet Street flats in Findon in my electorate and provide them with money with which they buy alcohol. Now we find that, if those children are called to a family group conference for the purpose of conciliation with their parents, they will be provided with a lawyer or a FACS bureaucrat to be their advocate at the cost of the taxpayer. As if it was not costing the taxpayer enough to set them up in the Noblet Street flats, to pay for the rent, to pay for the furniture and to pay for the booze, now, when the law tries to bring them into conciliation with their own parents, their own flesh and blood, the children will be provided with an advocate by the taxpayer. The State can appoint an advocate to argue on behalf of the child against that child's own parents.

I do not believe that the conservatives on the other side of this Chamber really support that. I do not believe that the members for Hayward, Bright, Eyre or Newland support it. I do not really believe that they support it. What has happened is that they have been hijacked by the left liberal faction of the Liberal Party. I do not believe that the member for Custance supports it either, to his credit. What has happened here is that the Dean Brown forces have hijacked the debate; the Opposition spokesman in this area, the member for Heysen, is acting as the toy boy of Dr Tina Dolgopool, the left wing academic from Flinders University, and putting up amendments which are basically left wing in character and which undermine family and conservative values. All these amendments undermine family and conservative values, and I find it hard to believe that some of the members opposite are supporting these kinds of amendments.

I want to give some credit to members on this side also for the work they have done in establishing the juvenile justice select committee and the changes to the law. Mr Chairman, you would know that these changes arise out of the first successful Caucus revolt that I have seen in my time in this Chamber. The juvenile justice select committee was an initiative of the Labor back bench and in particular an initiative of the member for Albert Park. All these changes in favour of a stricter enforcement of the criminal law, of juvenile justice and of parental rights came from the Labor back bench and in particular from the member for Albert Park. In my view, it is a tragedy that some of the best reforms have foundered on this, the last night of Parliament, defeated by the Liberal Party—the Party that was supposed to stand up for conservative values and the unity of the family. The Liberal Party has killed off these very good changes that were initiated by the Labor back bench.

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

**Mr ATKINSON:** What time?

**The CHAIRMAN:** The honourable member's time has expired. He needs to know his Standing Orders. The question before the Chair is that the recommendations of the conference be agreed to. The member for Newland.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! Will the member for Newland resume her seat. I find this extraordinary. As the Chairman of the Committee, I will recognise anybody who stands up. The matter is open to the Committee. The member for Newland.

**Mrs KOTZ:** Thank you, Mr Chairman, for your recognition. The amendments which have come through from the Upper House and which have been accepted by the conference most certainly improve what is a most important Bill in the area of children's protection. There are obviously areas within the Bill that still could do with some amendment, but the action taken in both Houses and by the conference that was arranged tonight means that what we have before us is the best that this Parliament can come up with.

Having listened to the most incredible rendition from the member for Spence I can only say that it is most interesting to hear the member for Spence make his intentions known in this Parliament because he does not appear to make his intentions known in any other area that he is committed to when it comes to either select committees or conferences. It would be interesting to all of us if the member for Spence would make his intentions and opinions known before action is taken by others on a bipartisan basis during a conference. Unfortunately the member for Spence chooses to make his opinions known, for reasons that I have yet to determine, only when it comes to this place. I presume that his listeners on 5AA, as he put it, are about to be misinformed once again of the legislative intent of this Bill.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mrs KOTZ:** Quite obviously the member has a lot to learn about parliamentary procedures, and breaching Standing Orders appears to be one of them.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mrs KOTZ:** Now that we are coming to the last night of this Parliament the member for Albert Park should consider taking up horticulture because I believe he is interested in gherkins: he keeps calling people dills!

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mrs KOTZ:** The member for Spence referred to clause 15(1)(a). The member for Spence stood in this place and said he was most disappointed that, because of the amendments moved by the Opposition, the police would not be able to remove children from a situation that was determined 'at risk'. The member for Spence needs to pick up this Bill and read the words that are in it and then determine whether he can understand what it is that he is reading, because clause 15(1)(a) gives the police powers, and even though it says, 'a member of the Police Force below the rank of commissioned officer—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mrs KOTZ:** We both got that right. Let me read on and see whether he can understand the rest of it.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the member for Newland to address the Chair and not be drawn by interjections.

**Mrs KOTZ:** Thank you, Mr Chairman. The clause provides:

A member of the Police Force below the rank of a commissioned officer cannot remove a child pursuant to this section without the prior approval of a commissioned officer of the Police Force unless he or she believes on reasonable grounds that the delay consequent upon seeking approval would prejudice the safety of the child.

That is not a denial of the right of an individual police officer to remove a child at risk. That clause gives a police officer the right to determine the situation at hand and, if they

determine that the situation indicates that the child should be removed, they have every right to do that. For the member for Spence to stand in this place and make such a misinterpretation is absolutely outrageous, and if it is his intent to leave this place and tell his so-called listeners on 5AA—and I am sure Bob Francis would be most interested to hear that—

**Mr Atkinson:** My constituents.

**Mrs KOTZ:** Your constituents need to know the truth, and the truth is that the police—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the member for Newland to address the Chair.

**Mrs KOTZ:** Mr Chairman, the police can indeed remove a child at risk from any place where they consider that is necessary at any time they so desire under this clause. I am making the point very strongly that the member for Spence has denied the truth of this interpretation of that clause. In effect, he has stated that the Liberal Party was in fact denying the rights of children to be removed from such situations when that is a total untruth.

The amendments to this Bill have allowed advocacy for children. We have heard not only the member for Spence but also the Minister misinterpret again what the area of advocacy in this instance means for children. It means that it is not necessarily a matter of lawyers being brought into a situation that is either costly or brings our judicial adversarial system into a family care conference. It means that any person who is in support of that child, whether it be a parent, a minister of religion or the sports master at the school who has the care and support for the child, can actually be the advocate for that child. The nonsense that I have heard tonight from the member for Spence only emphasises the fact that he has absolutely no idea what this Bill provides. Not only did we have a non-contribution from him in the conference but we have also had a considerable non-contribution from him here tonight.

The member for Spence also talked about the conferences that would be held as the family group conferences. He also has that wrong. The family group conferences relate to juvenile justice, and the conferences that will be called under that system. The conferences to be called under this system are family care conferences. One area of this Bill was not conceded to by the Minister, and that is one of the areas from which the Liberal Opposition had to back off in an effort to get this Bill passed for the protection of children, and that related to principles to be observed in dealing with children. Under clause 4, where it refers to the safety and welfare of the child to be of paramount consideration, the Minister has refused to accept that the welfare of the children is of paramount consideration. He has insisted that the word 'welfare' be removed from that section of the legislation. His interpretation of the welfare of children relates to the safety of children, and only the word 'safety' is to be—

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** On a point of order, Sir, is it appropriate for a member of this House to listen to radio 5AA in the precincts of this Chamber?

**The CHAIRMAN:** It is not appropriate for radios to be used in this House.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The member for Spence has just been doing that.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Well, I cannot see the member for Spence.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! If the member for Spence is listening to the radio, I ask him to leave the Chamber.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mrs KOTZ:** I consider that this is quite a serious Bill. It is a shame that there are members opposite who do not consider it in exactly the same way. We are talking about the safety and welfare of children in a Children's Protection Act. The Minister has denied that the word 'welfare' has any part in this Act. To enable the Bill to be passed tonight, the compromises that were made by the Liberal Opposition included giving in to the Minister on taking out the area of welfare, but not without advocating the fact that I believe it is considerably wrong, and that word should be there. To use the word 'safety', as I have argued before, only talks about the physical condition of an individual. Without using the word 'welfare', we are not contemplating the total picture that looks at psychological and physical injury. I put forward those arguments in the second reading debate, and I will not debate them any further.

At this point, I am happy to support the Bill with the reservations that I have expressed tonight. I can only say that I was extremely disappointed that the Minister himself appeared to have a particular mind set in relation to this Bill. I can only suggest that that has blurred his judgment on some of the areas that he has refused to consider as being pertinent to this legislation.

Motion carried.

#### **MEDICAL TREATMENT AND PALLIATIVE CARE**

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's resolution.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

At 12.18 a.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 8 February 1994 at 2 p.m.

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 2 November, 1993

### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

#### ROAD TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT

**63. Mr BECKER:**

1. What was the annual postage bill for the Department of Road Transport for each of the years ended 30 June 1991 to 1993?

2. By how much have these amounts been exceeded by income received from advertising leaflets?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The replies are as follows:

1. 1990-91	\$1217 726
1991-92	\$1455 803
1992-93	\$1262 518

2. Income received from advertising leaflets, in effect, provides an offset to the department's various fixed annual costs of which the postage bill forms part.

By way of comparison, the income received through the advertising leaflet scheme in 1992-93, its first full year of operation, was \$248 336.

#### GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

**69. Mr BECKER:**

1. What Government business were the driver and passenger of the vehicle registered VQE-200 attending to whilst driving on Sudholz Road, Holden Hill displaying 'L' plates on Tuesday 8 June 1993 at approximately 11.00 p.m.?

2. To which Government department or agency is this vehicle attached?

3. Were the terms of Government Management Board Circular 90/30 being observed by the driver of this vehicle and if not, why not and what action does the Government propose to take?

**The Hon R.J. GREGORY:** The vehicle in question was allocated on 8 June 1993 to an employee of SACON as a replacement vehicle. In accordance with the guidelines set down in the Government Management Board Circular 90-93, SACON had assessed and approved the allocation of a vehicle on a permanent basis to the Senior Construction Officer, Transportable Buildings Program, as it is a more effective way for him to perform his duties.

The driver of the vehicle has indicated however, that in accordance with the guidelines the vehicle was parked on his property from the time he arrived home from work on 8 June until the next morning when he departed for work. A Statutory Declaration of this fact has been provided by the Officer.

**128. Mr BECKER:**

1. What Government business was the driver of the vehicle registered VQN-287 attending to at Bunnings Shopping Centre Mile End, on Saturday 21 August 1993 between 10.20 a.m. and 10.35 a.m.?

2. What purpose had the driver and the passenger in the garden centre and what was purchased by the male passenger at the All Phones store?

3. To which Government department or agency is this vehicle attached?

4. Were the terms of Government Management Board Circular 90-30 being observed by the driver and, if not, why not and what action does the Government propose to take?

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** The reply is as follows:

1. The vehicle was being driven by a nurse allocated to the Central Community Treatment Team of Glenside Hospital.

2. The purpose of the trip was to purchase a deaf aid telephone and gardening items to enable an outpatient of Glenside Hospital to be established in a SA Housing Trust flat.

3. Glenside Hospital.

4. Yes.

**129. Mr BECKER:**

1. Where were 18 Government vehicles travelling at approximately 2.20 p.m. on Thursday 1 July 1993 when they were seen passing in a northerly direction over the bridge at Port Augusta?

2. Why did 17 of the 18 vehicles only occupy the driver and why was car pooling not encouraged?

3. To which Government department or agency are these vehicles attached?

4. Were the terms of Government Management Board Circular 90/30 being observed by the drivers of these vehicles and, if not, why not and what action does the Government propose to take?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I am unable to provide an answer to this question, unless registration numbers are supplied.

#### TECHNICAL AND FURTHER EDUCATION

**131. Mr GUNN:**

1. How many people are currently involved in retraining programs through TAFE and in particular how many are attending such courses at Port Augusta and Port Pirie?

2. How many people are involved in the Skillshare program in South Australia and in particular at Port Augusta and Port Pirie?

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** The replies are as follows:

1. TAFE offers over 500 courses and 10000 subjects from which individuals may select their program of training. Whether the program selected by an individual is classified as initial training or retraining is wholly dependent on the individual's current skills and the reason for undertaking the training program. Consequently the exact number of individuals involved in vocational education for retraining purposes cannot be ascertained.

However, an estimate can be derived if we assume that all individuals over 30 years of age are undertaking training due to the need to retrain. In such a scenario 45.5% of all individuals undertaking TAFE vocational education are retraining. For Port Pirie and Port Augusta combined, the figure is 42.3 per cent. These percentages represented 28 491 of 62 545 individuals at the state level and 737 of 1 742 individuals at Port Augusta and Port Pirie.

26.9 per cent of all individuals undertaking vocational education do so in the short course fee-for-service program areas. This is 21.2 per cent for the Port Pirie, Port Augusta region. Such programs are self-funded and demand driven by industry and individuals wishing to upgrade their skills outside of the formal study structure. These percentages represented 16 814 of 62 545 individuals at the state level and 369 of 1 742 individuals at Port Augusta and Port Pirie.

2. The Skillshare program is a community based program funded by the Commonwealth and administered through its Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET). The South Australian TAFE sector is not involved in the provision of Skillshare training as this is undertaken by various community organisations.

Consequently any inquiries on the Skillshare program, in the first instance, need to be directed to Minister Beazley in Canberra.

#### FRASER, Mr IAN

**142. Mr BECKER:** Was the consultancy employing Mr Ian Fraser advertised and, if so, when, where and what is the value of the consultancy?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Mr Fraser's assignment is an extension of contractual arrangements first entered into in 1991-92 during the project development phase of the centre's operations. Prior to this arrangement, Mr Fraser had been loaned to the project as an employee (Human Resources Manager) of the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust by arrangement made between the Premiers Department and the trust. This current consultancy involving Mr Ian Fraser was not advertised.

Mr Fraser is currently Executive Assistant to the Executive Director of the Grand Prix Board, Dr Mal Hemmerling, and in such capacity was assigned to manage the Entertainment Centre effective from 1 July 1993, for a period of six months. The value of this consultancy is \$31 068.

#### ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE

**143. Mr BECKER:** Has the management of the Entertainment Centre ordered two Chesterfield lounge suites for the boardroom or for any other room of the Centre and, if so, why and at what cost?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I am advised that the Adelaide Entertainment Centre has no chesterfield lounges on order.

#### BALLANTYNE, Mr DANIEL

**144. Mr BECKER:** What specific qualifications does Mr Daniel Ballantyne (Administrator), formerly I.D. Photographer hold

and was Mr Ballantyne secretary to the former General Manager of the Entertainment Centre, Mr Peter Nicholson?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Mr Ballantyne was not secretary to the previous General Manager, Mr Peter Nicholson, but rather he was Mr Nicholson's Executive Assistant. Mr Ballantyne's qualifications, *inter alia*, are as follows:

- (a) Bachelor of Economics
- (b) Graduate Diploma in Arts Administration
- (c) Trainer Certificate
- (d) Theatre Fireman's Certificate
- (e) DOS Computing Certificate

#### ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE

145. **Mr BECKER:** Is the Entertainment Centre replacing qualified back of house staff with people from Administration who lack qualifications in this work and, if so, why?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The Entertainment Centre is not replacing qualified back of house staff with unqualified Administration staff. The Manager Technical Services and the Centre's Facility Coordinators, who are part of the administration, work in the back of house area and are qualified to do so.

#### ADELAIDE CONVENTION CENTRE

146. **Mr BECKER:**

1. How many companies have contracts for carparking at the Adelaide Convention Centre carpark?

2. Does the Casino have a contract and, if so, for how many spaces and when does it expire and, if it previously had a contract which has not been renewed, why was it not renewed?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The replies are as follows:

1. The number of companies who have contracts for car parking at the Adelaide Convention Centre Car Park is 12.

2. The casino does not have a contract.

It previously had a contract with the Adelaide Convention Centre which expired on 19 September 1993. It was not renewed as the Casino called for tenders and appointed another car park operator.

#### GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

148. **Mr BECKER:**

1. When Government vehicles are required to be cleaned on weekends as the vehicles are in demand at other times of the week, are employees paid to convey the vehicle for cleaning and, if so, for what period of time?

2. Why is it not departmental procedure to have employees handwash a car assigned to them at home?

**The Hon R.J. GREGORY:** The replies are as follows:

1. State Fleet does not require vehicles to be cleaned at weekends.

2. State Fleet's policy is outlined in the driver's handbook and this states that long term hire vehicles must be cleaned regularly by the hirer. An inspection of vehicles at replacement time suggests that they are generally maintained in a satisfactory condition. Short term hire vehicles are cleaned by State Fleet staff throughout the week.