HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 7 February 1996

The SPEAKER (Hon. G.M. Gunn) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

SUPPLY BILL

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Administrative Decisions (Effect of International Instruments),
Building Work Contractors,
Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games),
Consumer Transactions (Miscellaneous) Amendment,
Controlled Substances (General Offences—Poisons) Amendment,
Criminal Law Consolidation (Appeals) Amendment,
Criminal Law Consolidation (Mental Impairment) Amendment,
Dog Fence (Special Rate, etc) Amendment,
Environment Protection (Forum Replacement) Amendment,
Friendly Societies (Miscellaneous) Amendment,
Housing Cooperatives (Housing Associations) Amendment,
Local Government (Boundary Reform) Amendment,
Office for the Ageing,
Opal Mining,
Racing (Amalgamation of Pools) Amendment,
Security and Investigation Agents,
South Australian Housing Trust,
South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission (Constitution of Commission) Amendment,
South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage (Miscellaneous) Amendment,
Stamp Duties (Valuations—Objections and Appeals) Amendment,
Statutes Amendment (Courts),
Statutes Amendment (Courts Administration Staff),
Statutes Amendment (Drink Driving),
Statutes Amendment (Sunday Auctions and Indemnity Fund),
Statutes Amendment (Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation),
Statutes Repeal and Amendment (Commercial Tribunal),
Summary Offences (Overcrowding at Public Venues) Amendment,
Superannuation (Contracting Out) Amendment,
Water Resources (Imposition of Levies) Amendment.

AMBULANCE SERVICE

A petition signed by one resident of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to make public all information relating to the funding, naming and operations of the South Australian Ambulance Service was presented by Mr Quirke.

Petition received.

QUESTION

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

EDUCATION, SHARED FACILITIES

In reply to **Ms WHITE (Taylor)** 11 October.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The Minister for Education and Children's Services has advised that the following funds are owed to the Government from non-government agencies sharing facilities with the Department for Education and Children's Services:

Capital ($)	Recurrent ($)
323 000	139 470

Some of these funds refer to agreed repayment of loan schedules by non-government schools where the funds 'owed' simply indicate future repayment amounts. Other examples relate to unpaid shares of electricity and water accounts dating back to 1982. The department is seeking to ensure repayment of all overdue accounts as soon as possible.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations (Hon. E.S. Ashenden)—

Memorandum relating to the purchase of land at Walkley Heights by the Gandel Group.

PORT ADELAIDE FLOWER FARM

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Members will recall that the operations of the Flower Farm and the Port Adelaide council have been the subject of several statements in the Legislative Council by the Hon. Legh Davis during the past 12 months. By way of background, the scheme was established in August 1988 with the approval of the then Minister of Local Government under what was section 383a of the Local Government Act. The scheme involved a flower farm for the production and export of cut flowers in the Le Fevre Peninsula area on 13 hectares of reclaimed land. The Flower Farm was a high profile example of the use of local government powers to enter into non-traditional or entrepreneurial schemes.

In August 1995, as a result of continued poor operating results, the Port Adelaide council decided to discontinue the operations of the Flower Farm and liquidate its assets. In recent months intensive debate in the Legislative Council about this whole matter has generated substantial media and public interest. The Hon. Mr Davis raised a number of issues of significant public concern, including allegations that the Flower Farm was not commercially viable, that the true extent of the loss was concealed by the Chief Executive Officer of the farm and the council and that the council was misled by over-optimistic revenue forecasts.

The statements provoked a flurry of communications and reports from the various involved parties which have been made available to me in my capacity as Treasurer and which have been subject to some preliminary examinations. It is also evident that there are large discrepancies between the financial results reported by Port Adelaide council with respect to the Flower Farm and those contained in the statements made by the Hon. Legh Davis.

Preliminary analysis of publicly available financial information suggests that the primary reason for the discrepancy lies in the recognition by the Hon. Mr Davis of notional interest costs on the Flower Farm's debts, converted to equity in 1992, and on the original capital contribution made by the council. Those costs do not form part of the financial statements prepared by the council. Depending on the inclusion or otherwise of these costs, the total accounting

losses attributable to the farm since its establishment in 1988 to 30 June 1995 are considerable: between $2.8 million and $4 million of public funds. A significant and highly visible example of a local government enterprise has gone awry in controversial circumstances.

Advice has been sought from the Crown Solicitor about options open to the Government. The most appropriate avenue for an investigation, on the information currently available, is for a request to the Auditor-General under section 32 of the Public Finance and Audit Act. It is against this backdrop that I have decided to exercise my power in accordance with that Act in requesting that the Auditor-General examine the accounts of the Port Adelaide Flower Farm Board and examine the efficiency and economy with which the board has conducted its affairs to date.

Particularly, and without limiting the generality of his examination, I have asked that the Auditor-General:

1. Inquire into and report on the nature and extent of the financial losses which arose from the operations of the Flower Farm and the principal causes of those losses.

2. Inquire into and report on the extent of financial reporting by the board to the council on the financial performance and financial position of the Flower Farm and whether that reporting was adequate.

3. Inquire into and report on the relationship between the board and the members and officers of the council in so far and to the extent that this relationship is relevant to the efficiency and economy with which the board has conducted its affairs to date.

It is my belief that the ratepayers of Port Adelaide and, indeed, of South Australia deserve some explanation of this matter, not only in order to satisfy themselves about this particular failure but also to avoid the recurrence of such circumstances in future.

HART, MEMBER FOR

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development): I seek leave to make a brief ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Yesterday, I announced to this House that SA Water had moved another significant step closer to delivering filtered water to an additional 100 000 South Australians. Following that statement, the member for Hart in the Grievance Debate made a number of allegations that the three consortia short-listed for the contract were not selected on merit. I offer a confidential briefing to the member for Hart by the Chairman of the board on the board recommendation to me which will clearly indicate that selection of the three bidders was on merit, subsequent to which I hope the member for Hart will withdraw his unsubstantiated and unwarranted allegations made in this House under parliamentary privilege.

WALKLEY HEIGHTS DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN (Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I am responding to serious allegations raised in an article in the *Advertiser* this morning, which quotes Salisbury Mayor, Mr David Plumridge, concerning the sale of a parcel of land at Walkley Heights.

I will address each of the allegations as referred to. First, I categorically state that the sale was not done secretly, as claimed. Since the property had been on the market since March 1995, it was hardly the quick money grab Mayor Plumridge alleges. I am disappointed that Mayor Plumridge did not have the courtesy to contact me regarding his concerns—all of which are unfounded. Instead, he chose to spread misinformation through the media. In March 1995, the Urban Projects Authority offered approximately 11 hectares of land on the corner of Walkleys Road and Grand Junction Road, Walkley Heights for sale by tender. The land, which is zoned residential, was offered as a part of three separate parcels associated with Walkley Heights disposal. The property was advertised nationally and tenders closed in May 1995. Due to the nature of the national market a buyer was not found at that time. A 'for sale' sign was therefore placed on the site clearly visible from Grand Junction Road from May 1995.

In mid-October 1995 the purchaser took an option to purchase 11.7 hectares of the land, which is zoned residential, with the option finally expiring on 22 December 1995. The land is now subject to a Planning Amendment Report (PAR) proposing to amend the zoning to accommodate a bulky goods retail store. That PAR was submitted to the Development Advisory Committee for recommendation on 20 December 1995 and subsequently approved for public consultation on 9 January 1996. The PAR was initiated by Enfield council during the course of negotiations of the sale, but I stress the sale was agreed prior to either, first, the release of the Development Advisory Committee (DPAC) recommendations to me on whether to release the PAR for consultation with the public; or, secondly, any decision by me of whether it was appropriate to allow the PAR to proceed to the stage of public consultation.

In fact, I took steps to ensure that there was a separation between the decision by the purchaser to obtain the property and the release of the DPAC recommendation and my approval. This was done to ensure that the purchaser accepted the risk of any rezoning process. Prior to the decision to purchase, the only step taken was agreement on the Statement of Intent that would guide any draft proposal by council. As I am the Minister responsible for the South Australian Urban Projects Authority, which owned the land before its sale, I thought it desirable to guard against any conflict of interest by removing myself from the final decision by delegating my authority to another Minister who has no responsibility for the South Australian Urban Projects Authority or the recovery of the sale receipts.

I sought and received assurance from the Department of Housing and Urban Development that the DPAC recommendation would be kept confidential until after a sale decision on 22 December 1995. I have this assurance in writing from the Manager of the Development Policy Branch. I table a copy of his letter dated 22 December 1995. Members will note that DPAC was reminded on 20 December of the need for confidentiality. There was therefore never any conflict of interest, and I am satisfied that due process was followed in relation to the separation of the sale and the rezoning application and that all reasonable actions were taken to ensure that the purchaser had to accept the risk of any future rezoning process. Public consultation on the PAR will be completed by 11 March 1996. Council will then hold public hearings and submit the PAR together with its response to submissions and any amendment to the delegated Minister—in this instance Minister Wotton. I repeat: the Government

has at all times been careful to ensure probity and that the developer accepts the full risk of the rezoning process. I strongly reject any suggestion that the Government has acted other than with the strictest integrity in this matter, and I resent the totally groundless allegations made by Mayor Plumridge.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): I bring up the fifteenth report of the committee and move:

That the report be received and read.

Motion carried.

Mr CUMMINS: I bring up the sixteenth report of the committee and move:

That the report be received and read.

Motion carried.

Mr CUMMINS: I bring up the seventeenth report of the committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Questions that would normally be directed to the Minister for Tourism will be taken by the Deputy Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Standing Order 137 will be a considerable handicap to many members if they continue to interject.

FORESTS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Treasurer agree with the criticisms of the plan to privatise the harvesting and management of the State's forests—criticisms outlined in a report by the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies prepared last October for the former Minister for Primary Industries? The Opposition has obtained a copy of the Centre for Economic Studies' report, which states that the Asset Management Task Force proposal to privatise the harvesting and management of the State's forests had not been properly evaluated. The report states that the proposal could lead to a lessening of competition. It says that the proposals could:

...see the entire forest assets currently owned by the Government being owned by a single private owner. The consequences of this for the prospects of the existing private millers in the South-East, as well as the economic development in the South-East in general, could be dramatic.

The report is also critical of the plan in relation to its impact on jobs. It states:

It is not apparent that these questions have been adequately considered in facilitating the proposals for the sale of Forwood Products and the South-East forests. The document both states and confirms that there were proposals by the Government to sell off the State forests, which the Premier has denied.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: We heard some more gratuitous comments from the Leader of the Opposition, who cannot help himself. This is quite topical. I say at the outset that I do not believe I have ever seen the report. I will take on—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Just hold on a second.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Do you want a copy?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: No, I do not need a copy. I have the substance of what you have said. I do not believe that I have actually seen a copy of the report. However, I will take on the substance and assume that the Leader of the Opposition has made a good summary, which is a gross assumption, but I will answer on that basis. Let us go back a bit, clear the record and do it again. There has never been any contemplation of the sale of the forests. Let us get it right.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has asked his question. The Treasurer is now giving his response.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Cabinet has never considered, in my time, the sale of the forests. How many times do you have to be told? Cabinet has never considered the sale of the forests—point one. Point two is that before the election we said that we wanted to get the maximum value and the best result for South Australia out of the forests. We made it quite clear and I said that yesterday, if people were listening.

I would like to dwell on one or two other issues that I did not touch on yesterday because time did not allow. The history of the South Australian forests is a disgrace. The member for Playford in his Economic and Finance report can well remember his cutting criticism of the way the forests were valued and the accounting methods used. Ask the member for Playford. Go back through all the reports of the Auditor-General on the management of the forests and you will see time and again problems associated with the forests and profits being brought to account simply by increasing the value of timber.

If anyone wants to go to the library and do some research, they should do so, because it makes for interesting reading. Anybody can read the Auditor-General's report. This year we had to give a qualified report. If you want to look at why I believe the South Australian people and the South-East have been duded, go back through those reports. Let us get that on the record.

The issue is, what should be done to ensure that the people of the South-East and South Australia get the best out of the asset which they own, and it is a very important asset which has been acknowledged by this Government if not by the previous Government. If we look back over some of the trials and tribulations, leaving aside bushfires, the fact is that $15 million was lost on a Greymouth timber mill. We should have learnt from those lessons, but we did not. The State Bank ventured into timber milling operations and $60 million was lost on Scrimber, and who was at fault? It was the ALP Government—$60 million and jobs lost. Another great debacle by the former Government.

The mismanagement and the dubious and cunning methods that have applied regarding the forests of South Australia, and particularly of the South-East, are an absolute disgrace. This little effort to try to cover up this mismanagement does not do great credit to the current Opposition. At least when we came into government, the then Minister for Primary Industries said, 'We will try to make these areas perform.' Indeed, we have seen some improved performance. A report was produced on the timing of timber cuts, silviculture and forestry management. At least when we took over we said, 'We will do the right thing by the people of the South-East and South Australia.' And, consistent with our record, we initiated the sale process of Forwood Products. All that is on the record.

I would like to address the financial issue, and I would suggest that anyone who wants a record of the statements that have been made—

Mr CLARKE: I rise on a point of order, Sir.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: He does not like it, does he?

Mr CLARKE: Sir, I would ask you to rule with respect to Standing Orders. With respect to the Minister, Standing Orders provide that the Minister must answer the substance of the question, and the question was: does the Treasurer agree with the criticism of the plan to privatise the harvesting and management of the State's forests. And where was reference to the report of the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies prepared last October. The Minister's replies to date are well short of answering the substance of the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! When the House comes to order, the Chair will give a ruling. It has never been the practice of the Chair to suggest or direct in any way as to how Ministers should answer questions. The honourable member is correct that the Standing Orders give guidance to Ministers but, as I indicated on a previous occasion, I refer the Deputy Leader to some of the answers given by the now member for Giles when he was a Minister in the Government: I thought he distinguished himself in answering questions but perhaps not getting very close to the subject matter. The Treasurer.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Sir, I hope you do not imply that I have the same practice. I hope I am far better than that. It is important to go back to 1988. The then Premier, Mr Bannon, recognised what a debacle had been created by the former Government. The then Government virtually destroyed an industry in the South-East, and we were intent that that should not happen. At the time, the then Premier, Mr Bannon, said:

> If we are going to get the most value out of our large timber holdings, if we are going to ensure that employment is maintained in some of those areas of the South-East which at the moment are virtually totally dependent upon Government activities, then we ought to also be looking out for any commercial opportunities.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: If the Deputy Leader would just contain himself—

Mr Clarke: All I want is an answer. Is that too much to expect?

The SPEAKER: Order! All the Chair wants is for the Deputy Leader to wait his turn.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Yes, you can ask another question if you like. I ask all members to go back over the *Hansard* record of 1989 and the statements made by the then Liberal Opposition in 1991 when we consistently said, 'We do not want to sell the forests, but we must get a much better performance.' The sale of the forest timber was mentioned in those statements. I suggest all members go back to the *Hansard* and look at our election undertaking, including the fact that we wanted to see the best result out of the forests in the South-East for the people of the South-East and South Australia—not like the putrid record of the previous Government. In summary, we believe that we have embarked on an appropriate process, and we repudiate any suggestion that the forests should be sold.

HEALTH, FEDERAL POLICY

Ms GREIG (Reynell): My question is directed to the Premier. What benefit, if any, will the Federal Government's health policy provide in the reduction of hospital waiting lists?

The SPEAKER: I suggest to the Premier that in answering the question he relate his comments purely to how the South Australian Government's involvement will be affected and not canvass general Federal issues.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Certainly, Mr Speaker. Under the proposed health scheme put forward yesterday by Mr Keating, South Australians could be the big losers. The reason for that is that South Australia already spends more than any other State of Australia per head of population on health care. Yesterday, Mr Keating proposed to put aside an extra $150 million for those States which are prepared to spend more money over and above their current spending on health care. I point out that South Australia already spends $635 per person on health care. Compare that with New South Wales where under the present budget the figure is $570 per person. This State has 4.9 acute beds per 1 000 people compared with the Australian average of 4.2.

Mr Keating has said that he will put aside $150 million for those States which increase their health expenditure. But our State is already the highest: therefore, quite naturally we will be penalised as a State, because we are already spending more and we have more hospital beds than any other State of Australia. So, under this grand scheme put forward by Mr Keating yesterday, South Australia faces the prospect of getting the worst deal of any State of Australia simply because it already spends more on health care.

The Federal Labor Government has destroyed the private health insurance industry in Australia. Since 1989, an additional 142 000 people in South Australia have become dependent on the public health system.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Members opposite do not like this. They will not acknowledge that we spend more on health care per head of population than any other State of Australia. They will not acknowledge the fact that we have more acute hospital beds per head of population than any other State of Australia. Under Federal Labor policies, we have had a crash in private health insurance with 142 000 extra people relying on the public hospital system, and that has actually cost this State since 1989 an additional $124 million. On top of that we have the worst deal under the Medicare Agreement signed by the former State Labor Government.

Mr Keating is clearly proposing to put this extra $150 million into the Labor States as he has just done with the Better Cities money in Queensland and New South Wales. Queensland received over $100 million of the latest allocation of Better Cities money, while South Australia received $500 000 or one-200th of what Queensland got. Victoria, which has a bigger population than Queensland, got a mere $900 000, while Queensland got over $100 million. That is the extent to which Mr Keating is prepared to pork barrel the States where he needs to win seats. He does not care a damn about South Australia: he never has cared a damn about this State, Western Australia, Tasmania or the Northern Territory. That is not from where he sees Australia being run: he sees Australia being run from Canberra, Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane—and to hell with the rest of Australia!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

FORESTS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Treasurer. Did the Asset Management Task Force hold talks with US company Rayonier over the sale of harvesting rights to the State's forests, and have those talks continued since the Premier's statement to this House on 30 November and since the Premier sacked the member for MacKillop as Primary Industries Minister? Rayonier is one of the companies that bought into New Zealand forests when they were privatised. The Crown Law minute of 14 September 1995, revealed by the Opposition yesterday, indicates that the Government was considering the New Zealand model. Today I have obtained yet another confidential Government memo dated 16 October which claims that Rayonier is alleged to have sold its rights to New Zealand's forests to a United States pension fund for four times the purchase price just a couple of years after it bought those rights too cheaply. Rayonier New Zealand has just recently opened an office in Adelaide.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I am delighted that Rayonier has set up in Adelaide.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to order.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I hope it has an interest in what we are doing with Forwood Products. I want some competition in the marketplace. I do not want a result for Forwood that is not what it is worth in terms of dollar outcome. I would encourage any competitive bids for our South-Eastern timber milling operations, because they are an important element of our total forestry and value-adding process. In terms of who discussed what with whom, I can inform the House of certain things of which I have been made aware as a result of the Asset Management Task Force's pursuing the sale of Forwood Products. One interesting aspect—and I have mentioned this previously—is that the world is changing very rapidly. In many countries of the world, there has been a movement out of forests by Government. That is not to say that Government loses control but simply that Governments are getting out of forests. I mentioned that yesterday; that is no secret.

I understand Rayonier—as well as a number of other world companies—is looking for opportunities right around the globe, including Australia, both interstate and in South Australia. It is a very healthy position for South Australia to have people interested in it. Perhaps down the track we will have an opportunity to export finished product or input product of a high quality rather than having wood chipping or product involving some of those processes where we do not get maximum value. As a part of this operation, the South-East could be one of the really dynamic regions in Australia for the forestry industry and could enhance its very good reputation today.

In terms of who may have an interest, Rayonier is one of the companies that have expressed some interest in the South-East. We are commencing a review of the forests. That review is under very strict terms, and in a nutshell it says three things: first, that whatever the outcome, we should not sell off the forests.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Secondly, the review says—and there are lot more conditions—that we should maximise employment and job opportunities in the South-East, no matter what outcome is being sought.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition will come to order.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: For a deal that has not gone to Cabinet, a deal that has not been signed off anywhere—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: You are talking about a deal; I am saying that there is no such thing as a deal until it is signed off.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows the rules.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Given the performance of the Opposition—given the performance of the former Government—in this area, we have one thing in mind only, and that is to get the maximum results for the future benefit of South Australians and the South-Eastern people.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The member for Giles was obviously looking at the same proposition. That is not the subject—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: As I said on radio, the review is simply to start with a clean sheet of paper and ask, 'What can we do to maximise our opportunities in the South-East?' Everybody knows that. The misrepresentation going on in this House does not do any credit for the former Government, which did such a shocking job for everybody in South Australia.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart will come to order.

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Newland to order. If members want to continue the conversation, they should do so in the lobby.

EMPLOYMENT

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): Is the Premier aware of further evidence of growth of employment opportunities in South Australia highlighted in a recent major national survey?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: This is a subject which is dear to all our hearts and is no doubt particularly dear to the member for Kaurna who, in her area yesterday, had a major forum on youth unemployment. Some very good figures came through yesterday that showed that, on the latest Morgan and Banks survey, there is a proposal for a 9.4 per cent increase in employment opportunities in South Australia over the next quarter. That compares with a national decline of 8 per cent right across the whole of Australia. It shows how South Australia, once again, is moving in its economic performance much better than any other State of Australia. It shows that Mr Keating's economic policies are slowing down the national economy, particularly causing the loss of jobs in States such as New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria. But in South Australia we are moving against that national trend. We have the fastest economic growth of any State in Australia, and this latest survey shows that we have

a proposal for a 9.4 per cent growth in employment when the rest of Australia is falling.

It is interesting to see those areas where the greatest potential demand occurs. Hiring intentions are up 67 per cent in electronics; 63 per cent in engineering; 40 per cent in tourism; 29 per cent in manufacturing industry; and 25 per cent in information technology. They are the very areas of the economy where this Government has put down a very strong position indeed. We have put forward a strategy for the IT industry which, up until we came to Government, was an absolute shambles and a mishmash. Although companies like EDS and IBM had come to the previous Government and expressed some interest in creating up to 1 000 jobs here, the door was slammed in their face. In just two years this Government has turned that around completely and is now creating these opportunities for jobs.

It is the same in tourism, given that in the last year we have increased by 20 per cent the number of international tourists coming into South Australia. Again, that justifies the expectation that hiring intentions in tourism will increase by 40 per cent. It is the same in the manufacturing industry; we have made it more competitive and focused it on the Asian market. The same applies also to the engineering and electronics industries. It shows that the South Australian economy is based on a very sound footing across a whole range parameters, and that is the reason why we have had a very substantial growth in this State, both in December and November last year, and we look forward to that continuing.

FORESTS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Has the Treasurer written to the member for MacKillop demanding that the honourable member neither release nor discuss documents he held as Minister for Primary Industries relating to the valuation and possible sale of harvesting rights to the State's forests and, if so, what has been the honourable member's response?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Whatever I write to anyone remains confidential.

POLICE RESTRUCTURING

Mr WADE (Elder): Will the Minister for Police outline the plans for the future restructuring of non core police activities and, in particular, the Police Air Wing?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The process of change in the Police Department has commenced. A report was produced by Arthur Andersen on the operational effectiveness and efficiency of the police, on the issue of wage increases and whether there could be sufficient trade-offs in operational efficiencies to cover those wage outcomes. As a result of the Arthur Andersen report, which was conducted in conjunction with the Police Department, there are a number of areas where the Police Department and the consultant believe changes can be made by police no longer participating in certain activities. Some of those areas have been outlined previously.

Certainly, infringement notices and their processing should not be part of the Police Department's functions. Similarly, radio maintenance can be left to specialists and it is unnecessary to have people on board for that purpose. Again, for rehabilitation coordination, there is no special need for that to remain as a core police function. As to photographic processing of materials, be they speed cameras or whatever, again there is no special reason for that to remain within the Police Force as a core function. It has already been agreed that the courier function is another area where gains and operational efficiencies can be made.

Another report was produced relating to the Police Air Wing. Recommendations have been made about the efficiency and effectiveness of the wing, given that we have two Cessna 402C aircraft for police operations. A number of conclusions were drawn from that report. It is important to understand that the patronage and use of those flights has decreased over the past five years: we have had a 35 per cent fall in patronage and an 11 per cent reduction in flights over that period. Both aircraft are ageing and lack flexibility for the things required of them by the police and other agencies.

The analysis has been completed. The recommendation is for the fixed wing aircraft to be sold and that we outsource the provision of those services on a contractual basis. The consultant has considerable expertise in this area and believes we can have a more efficient and effective system as a result. Again, that is not core business for the police. We need flights to cover a number of emergencies and operational matters, and they can be supplied from existing resources under a contractual arrangement. We will be selling the hangar we lease on FAC premises at Adelaide Airport. This represents another area of change and improvement for police operations in South Australia.

QUESTIONS, REPLIES

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Has the Premier or his staff received a memo from several Government backbenchers complaining about answers provided in yesterday's Question Time by the Premier and the Deputy Premier? The Opposition has been advised that a number of backbenchers sent a memo to the Premier critical of what they saw as an unfair implication by the Deputy Premier—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting. I ask him to ask his question and then explain it.

Mr CLARKE: —that the former Primary Industries Minister had leaked information to the Opposition. They were also reportedly unhappy about the Premier's failure to explain adequately the real reasons for last year's Cabinet reshuffle.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I challenge the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to name them.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Name just one.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. The Chair was close to ruling the question out of order. I ask members to contain themselves while the Premier answers the question. I point out to the Premier that, when answering the question, he is not at liberty to invite further questions.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have received no such memo whatsoever; no member of the Party has put such a proposal to me, so there is absolutely not one skerrick of truth in what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has said this afternoon. Now he understands the very reason why it would be inappropriate to have this Parliament sitting the week before a Federal election: the Deputy Leader is willing to stand up and say things that are just pure fantasy, trying to grab some sort of headline on television or in the newspaper.

The Deputy Leader has absolutely no regard for the truth—no regard whatsoever. He is willing to use the protection of Parliament to make whatever outrageous claims he likes.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If members continue to be unruly, I will call on the Orders of the Day and we will have no further questions.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Premier, of all people, has reflected on the truthfulness of a statement made by another member of Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If members do not conduct themselves appropriately, the Chair, while endeavouring to be tolerant, will name members without warning. I will not give another warning. The first member who interjects or defies the Chair will be named in accordance with the Standing Orders. I do not care where they come from. The Leader of the Opposition has raised a point of order in relation to the Premier using the term 'untruthful'. The Chair is not of the view that that is unparliamentary. We are all aware of other terms that are unparliamentary. I suggest that all members, when they are making comments in the House, be aware of the consequences of those comments.

TRACK AUSTRALIA

Mrs HALL (Coles): Can the Minister for Infrastructure—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Giles will be named if he interjects again.

Mrs HALL: —report to the House on the implications for the Australian National monopoly price rail link to the Leigh Creek coalfields as a result of the Prime Minister's intention to establish Track Australia to take control over the main rail links through Australia?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The announcement that Track Australia will establish its headquarters in South Australia is to be welcomed. It is logical because of the low cost of operating in South Australia and the conducive business climate that we have established in South Australia for such instrumentalities. The interesting point is that Track Australia will have power to negotiate with private contractors to run freight, dramatically increasing competition. This is a move that this Government has been attempting to impress on the Keating/Brereton Government regarding Australian National and the Leigh Creek coal freight line in particular. For the past two years we have been trying to get it to acknowledge the need for private competition running over that line to ensure the competitive base of the generating capacity of power in South Australia and to give surety to the Port Augusta power generating plant and Leigh Creek employees.

We understand that Track Australia intends charging an access fee to operators using particular rail networks to recover only the actual costs of providing the rail corridor. The scale of these charges will reflect each operator's usage and priority requirements. This is the very arrangement that we have been seeking from Australian National for some time. Australian National has a monopoly over the Port Augusta to Leigh Creek railway line and rail corridor. AN has consistently refused to negotiate in reasonable terms charges which would reflect competitive pricing. AN's approach is in direct contradiction to the Hilmer competition reform principles. ETSA estimates that excess profits by AN will exceed $250 million over the potential life of the Leigh Creek mine if current charging levels are maintained.

In a national electricity market, that will put the coalfield and its generating capacity at risk in the future. That is why we have been so aggressive in taking up this issue with the Commonwealth Government. ETSA has initiated a competitive tendering process for an above-the-rail haulage operation. Twelve organisations have been invited to submit proposals by 15 February; and, following short-listing, ETSA anticipates that negotiations to determine the best commercial proposal for a long-term contract will be concluded within three months. In parallel, ETSA is continuing discussions with AN and relevant Federal departments to determine an acceptable level of access arrangements to those railway lines and corridors. AN has indicated a level of annual access charge, which ETSA cannot accept as it perpetuates the monopoly pricing in excess of profits of about $8 million a year. AN has said that it will negotiate with ETSA but that the fee for access to the rail line will compensate for the profits if it were running the line in its own instance, which makes arrant nonsense of the competition approach.

Therefore, we are continuing negotiations. ETSA will also be seeking price arbitration from the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission. ETSA is also considering the option of making an application to the National Competition Council to have the service declared. This would force the issue to arbitration so that we can get the parties to the table and get an outcome that is in the interests of South Australia in terms of the cost of generating power as well as an outcome in the interests of the people who are employed at Leigh Creek and at Port Augusta.

FORESTS

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Why is the Minister for Primary Industries spending $200 000 of taxpayers' money on a third report into the State's forests only 18 months after the Government received the Australasian Agribusiness Services report commissioned by the former Minister for Primary Industries on the management of our State forests, and only a few months after a major study conducted by the Centre for South Australian Economic Studies? How much have all of the studies cost?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: The fundamental answer is that we had a long way to go following the management of the forests by the previous Government. Two years ago we took over forests that had suffered many years of very poor management right across the board. The first report looked at the management within the forests, the silviculture, the rotation lengths, fertilisation, the management of the forests themselves, etc. So, that was one thing that needed to be handled, and another was the rate of returns. We now need to look at how far we have come in the past two years, and we have come a significant distance—there is no doubt about that. However, there is always room for a lot more improvement.

On top of what was achieved through the management review, which was what the Deputy Leader referred to, we also need to look at the viable options for maximising the value of the forests in the South-East through processing. We need to look at what is happening elsewhere in the world as far as the timber industry is concerned. We need to look at all the opportunities for development in the South-East and how we can generate the greatest number of jobs down there. We also need to look at the size of the forests and all of the other

management issues. Basically, it is about producing better benefits for the South-East and the State from that massive resource. It is not about selling the forests: it is about identifying how we can do a lot better for the State and the region. The other reports have not covered all of this. As I said, the reason we need three reports—and we may need more—is the fact that—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: No, we need this third one. We will continue to monitor how we are going in the forests. We will not turn our back on the forests, as happened for many years before we came into government.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is warned for the second time.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr BASS (Florey): Will the Minister for Health inform the House of the Government's attitude to private management in the light of 12 months' experience of private management in the Modbury public hospital?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I am delighted to address the matter of the first 12 months' experience of the private management of Modbury public hospital. In doing so, I acknowledge the continued representations of the member for Florey, the member for Newland and the now Minister for Housing and Urban Development in his role as the member for Wright in pressing matters to ensure that any contract which the Government wrote in this exciting development would ensure that the best possible result ensued for their constituents. Yesterday, 6 February, was the first anniversary of Healthscope's managing Modbury public hospital. I happened to be at Modbury Hospital today in relation to another matter, and a number of the people there, including local councillors from Tea Tree Gully council and so on, said to me, 'I do not believe that it is 12 months since it happened.' The reason that is the case is that everything has gone so well.

The transfer to private management was an historic occasion. It was the first time in Australia that a private company had taken on the management of an existing public hospital. When we let that contract, Healthscope was set three main goals. The first goal was to increase patient activity to the previous record levels of 1992-93, and that goal has been met in the first year. The second goal was to maintain the hospital's high quality standards, and that goal is being achieved. The third goal was to achieve cost savings, and that goal is on target. In fact, Healthscope has managed the Modbury public hospital in such a way that in the past 12 months Healthscope and the hospital have extended the ear, nose and throat outpatient clinic session; they have increased ear, nose and throat surgery from 78 patients in 1994 to 329 patients in 1995; they have appointed an Associate Professor of Medicine; they have appointed an outreach nurse to provide support for patients returning to their homes; they have increased the hospice beds from six to eight; and they have provided officers to support the work of the Red Cross.

During its management, Benson and Partners has significantly upgraded radiology services. It has upgraded cat scan equipment; it has increased and upgraded the colour Doppler ultrasound units; and it has introduced tele-radiology which provides specialist radiology consultants in an after-hours capacity. This is a litany of positive things that have happened in the past 12 months. The question which the member for Florey asked is: what is the Government's attitude to the private management of a public hospital? We are compelled, by the facts which I have just given to the House, to acknowledge that private management is a real option for public hospitals. But, knowing the tactics of members of the Opposition, I know what they will try to do, particularly in an election context. Opposition members will try to say that we will have every public hospital under private management.

Indeed, the Labor Party's candidate for the Federal seat of Adelaide is already spreading that scurrilous rumour. I remind the Federal Labor Party candidate for the seat of Adelaide and I remind members of the Opposition, who bleat on and on about all of these plans, to review what happened in Port Augusta—the most recent example where these services were put out to the competitive tendering process. In the Port Augusta exercise the Government specifically rejected the private management of the new facility for the reason that that particular option was the best one. Our goal is to deliver world-class services cost effectively, and we are doing just that.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Did the Premier consult the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development and did he agree with the changes made last month to the operations of the former Economic Development Authority, including a change of name and diversion of functions formerly undertaken by the EDA to the Premier's Department of Information Industries?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yes, I did consult the Minister and he agreed with the statement that I made last year. I forget the exact date, but it was just prior to Christmas. The Minister had discussed certain aspects such as refocussing manufacturing industry at Cabinet level, because the South Australian Centre for Manufacturing is reviewing its functions, as the Minister has already publicly indicated. So Cabinet had made decisions on that and I discussed the proposed announcement that I made with the Minister and went through the detail with him.

ISLINGTON RAILWAY WORKSHOPS

Mr ROSSI (Lee): My question is directed to the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources. Has South Australia formulated an official response to the Federal Government's offer to pay $5 million towards the clean-up of the contaminated Islington railway site?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I was fascinated to learn of the contents of the Federal Minister's press conference at Islington on 24 January—just days before the calling of the Federal election. One would think that, when a Federal Minister is offering a State $5 million, he would be keen to follow that offer up quickly with a call or letter setting out in black and white all the details and conditions. If that did not happen, it would be like another well known white board allocation—'Now you see it, now you don't.' In fact, it was not until Friday—more than a week after the Minister's announcement—that this State received any formal advice in regard to a $5 million offer to clean up part of this State.

It was not until Monday that the State Government received a copy of the full CSIRO report into the rehabilitation of the site; yet we are now told that it had been sitting on

the Federal Transport Minister's desk since December. Being a technical document of significant size, it is now being considered by the Environment Protection Authority.

Despite this ongoing comedy of inefficiency at Federal level, I must say that I am delighted that the Federal Government has at last accepted responsibility for the land which it bought lock, stock and barrel in the 1970s and which at that stage and later wanted to hand back to the State without any liability whatsoever. We are pleased that is happening. Despite the strange way in which the Minister decides to do $5 million worth of business with South Australia, I believe this offer represents a win for the local residents.

It is also a significant win for the Federal member for Adelaide, Trish Worth, who, through a considerable amount of persistence—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: —has been able to convince the Federal Government of its moral and legal responsibility for what has been described as a toxic waste dump. I assure the member for Lee that South Australia is keen to get on with the job of cleaning up the site. I say again that, if it had not been for the Federal member for Adelaide, this goal would not have been achieved.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to understand what the Standing Orders require when a person is named for the second time. If he wants to complete the rest of the session, I suggest that he contain himself and not carry on in a manner which is not appropriate to the office that he holds.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Will the Premier give an assurance to the House that the Government will not reduce funding to programs supporting manufacturing in South Australia following his decision to reduce substantially the role of the former Economic Development Authority by transferring many of its functions to the Department of Information Industries under his control?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The honourable member's assertion is wrong to start with. Frankly, he completely fails to understand exactly what has occurred. What I said when I came back from overseas in September last year was that it was my intention to consolidate the areas of information technology which sat in a number of agencies, and I will go through them. There was a strategic part in the South Australian Development Council, there was a part in terms of industry attraction in the Economic Development Authority and there was the Office of Information Technology. I said that I was going to consolidate all those together into one Government department, because this is the fastest growing manufacturing industry in the world and it deserves special recognition.

The figures that I have cited to the House today show that there is enormous demand now in information and computing technology. The fact that there has been a 74 per cent increase in the number of people enrolling at Adelaide University for Bachelor of Computing Science reflects the potential demand that exists.

The growth rate potential for employment in information technology is huge as companies are prepared to base their operations in Adelaide not just for South Australia or Australia but for the Asian area. I refer to companies such as Tandem, which has set up its Asian development operations here; EDS, which is setting up its data management centre and other centres as well for the whole of the Asian area; and Motorola, which has set up one of six software development centres in the world in Adelaide, again focusing on Asia.

We are transferring a very small number of staff. The Minister and I were talking about it this morning. I think that only five staff are involved. In fact, this Government has increased the amount of money for manufacturing industry. We have found that there is an enormous opportunity for manufacturing industry in South Australia because we have made the environment here more competitive, and we have helped those companies to focus on the much bigger and broader Asian market. Last year we were able to increase by a substantial 17 per cent the exports of elaborately manufactured goods. That is the fastest growth of any State in Australia, and that is where we see growth potential. We have one department specifically focused on manufacturing industry, regional development, small business and trade, and we have another new department focused specifically on this fast growing information technology industries area. It is very exciting in terms of what it can achieve for South Australia. The economic and employment growth rate in this State is the result of the programs, policies and strategies that this Government has put down, and clearly they are working.

PRISON ESCAPES

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): Will the Minister for Correctional Services advise the House what action is being taken to limit the number of prison escapes? I understand from the annual report of the Department for Correctional Services, tabled in this House yesterday, that there were 34 escapes from Correctional Services institutions during the year 1994-95.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Probably one of the most unenviable tasks faced by any Correctional Services Minister is to explain individual escapes and the level of escapes from correctional institutions. That is something of which I was particularly critical in opposition and of which I remain critical, the only difference being that in government we have a chance to do something about the problem.

Almost 12 months ago I highlighted in this House that 1994-95 would be the last period of high numbers of escapes from correctional institutions in South Australia. As predicted, the number of escapes was high. The reason for that is very easy to home in on. Most of these escapes occurred from the now closed Fine Default Centre and the Cadell Training Centre. In the past financial year at this time there had been 18 escapes. Measures we have implemented have reduced that level of escapes to the extent that the number in this financial year to date is seven. I sincerely hope that it will remain at that level and will further reduce in the following financial year.

Looking first at the Fine Default Centre, undoubtedly it has been a national disgrace. It was closed, appropriately, by this Government, by me as Minister, on 3 August 1995. During the short time the Fine Default Centre was operating—opened by the previous Labor Government and set up in the first place despite the objections of the then Liberal Opposition and by me as Opposition Correctional Services spokesman—it was responsible for 26 escapes. During the past financial year, of those 34 escapes 15 came from the Fine

Default Centre. Of the seven during this financial year, two came from the Fine Default Centre.

I have advised this House previously that the closure of the Fine Default Centre has seen fine defaulters interned in Yatala. Their numbers have dropped from 20 to 25 a day to less than 10 a day on average. Fine defaulters do not want to go to Yatala and the reasons for that are obvious. Since fine defaulters have been interned in Yatala, there has been not one escape by fine defaulters from prison. There is little doubt why. That is one mess cleaned up.

The second mess has been the Cadell Training Centre and one in which I believe you have an interest, Mr Speaker, as the member for Eyre, as has the member for Chaffey. By the end of this calendar year, the Cadell prison accommodation area will be securely fenced so that escapes from that institution will be much more difficult to effect. That will then ensure that the two main problems in the prison system—escapes from the Fine Default Centre and escapes from Cadell—are finally brought to an end. Indeed, of those 34 escapes during the past financial year, 24 were from the Fine Default Centre and Cadell.

Each of the remaining escapes, scattered across various institutions, has been looked at carefully as to the reason for its occurring in the first place. Some reasons have been procedural and others involved physical security measures, which had to be rectified. They have now been rectified and I look forward to the prison system starting to record the lowest escape levels on record and I look forward to the financial year that will reveal no escapes at all from our prison systems.

CENTRE FOR MANUFACTURING

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I direct my question to the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development. Despite the Premier's answer to my previous question, will the Minister now confirm that a decision has been made to cut the Centre for Manufacturing's manufacturing modernisation program by $7 million, reducing it from $12 million to $5 million in the 1996-97 financial year? Will the Minister tell the House what impact such a cut would have on the activities of the Centre for Manufacturing?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has made a number of comments. He has been here long enough to know that the rulings of this House are that members ask their question and briefly explain it. If he does not understand that, he should read the rulings of Speaker Trainer, who enforced them far more rigidly than I do.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Sir, any question that is based on pure speculation as to what might occur in the next financial year is entirely false, particularly as I assure the House that no Government agencies have even put up proposals yet—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is out of order. That is not a point of order. The Chair has permitted the question. I direct that the honourable member briefly explain it or leave will be withdrawn.

Mr FOLEY: The Opposition has been advised that a decision has been taken by Government to cut the Centre for Manufacturing's funding by $7 million.

The SPEAKER: Leave is withdrawn. The honourable member knows the ruling. If he wants to get the call again, he should not defy or tempt the Chair.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Like yesterday, as with today, the member for Hart has it wrong. He is not only partially wrong but 100 per cent wrong, because the department has not formulated its budget submission this year. In fact, I am not scheduled to go before the budget committee for another couple of weeks. I assure the member for Hart that we will do all our homework prior to going before the budget committee and I will be in there fighting as hard as any other Minister to get the fair share of the action for portfolio areas that are important.

The only part of the question that the member for Hart had right was his allegation that the Centre for Manufacturing does a good job: it does, as does the Business Centre and the department. That is why there has been significant investment in South Australia over the past couple of years, and why economic indicators, as reported this morning by Morgan and Banks and referred to by the Premier in Question Time earlier today, are encouraging signs not only in terms of employment opportunity for South Australia and new businesses opening up in South Australia. If the member for Hart wants me to read the four or five page list that I have, I am more than happy to do so, to clearly indicate that these agencies have been successful and will continue to be successful in providing, coupled with lower ETSA tariffs and lower water costs for business operators in South Australia, a conducive business climate and a reason why people would want to site a plant or manufacturing facility in South Australia.

That is why Safcol has come out of Victoria and will site its headquarters at Elizabeth in South Australia and why a range of other companies are shifting out of the other States into South Australia—because we have turned the tide, after 20 years of Labor Administration, for a conducive business climate, and that means jobs.

INDUSTRY, TRAINING AND SKILLS DEVELOPMENT

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education highlight new initiatives to assist South Australia's industries in the area of training and skills development?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I thank the member for Colton for his question. Before I get on to the specifics of his question, I pay tribute to him as the member for Colton. On Sunday I had the privilege of opening the new Grange Community Centre, which has been supported by the Department of FACS, as well as by my own department. I publicly acknowledge the excellent work done by the Henley and Grange council, led by Mayor Harold Anderson, and Chairperson Graham Pike on the Grange Community Centre. It was obvious given the large crowd that they have great support for and recognition of the role played by the member for Colton as a terrier for his district, going in to fight hard to get support.

With regard to the question, again it is good news, to which I trust the Opposition will listen closely. First, in the northern area, the Northern Adelaide Skills Training Centre, because of the excellent work of Chris Pyne (a public servant in my department), has been able to secure a national training grant to provide the world's most advanced computer-aided design and manufacturing technology equipment. This equipment, using Unigraphics software, will be available for General Motors, DSTO and other companies such as ROH and Email, to mention some that will access this equipment where previously they have had to send staff interstate for training. This is world's best quality software that we are able to obtain. It relates to an earlier question. It shows why

industry is progressing in this State under this Government: we are working flat out to assist it to be world competitive, to export and to create more jobs here. That grant in total is $300 000 and warmly welcomed, not only in the northern area but throughout the State.

The other significant announcement in recent times has been the conversion of the West Lakes High School into an automotive centre of excellence, to train not only South Australians but also people from the Asia-Pacific area. I pay tribute to the strong support given by Richard Flashman and members of the Motor Trade Association and Brenton Pilkington, executive officer of the Automotive Industry Training Board.

As a result of cooperation, we have been able to secure, at a minimum cost of $2 million, the conversion of that old high school into the very latest training facility for the automotive industry. The classrooms will be converted into literally drive-in classrooms with the latest electronic and other diagnostic equipment. The facility will focus on training people in the retail, repair and servicing side of the automotive industry, which currently employs 20 000 people in South Australia. These are two examples—and there are more to come in the next few days—of our cooperating with industry, trade unions and industry advisory boards to get good results and to create jobs for South Australians.

APPRENTICES

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education investigate the possibility of providing additional incentives to employers to encourage them to increase their intake of trade apprentices? The business sector is continually critical of the severe shortage of qualified trades people in South Australia yet, at the same time, many young people with very high vocational standards cannot obtain apprenticeships.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: As a Government, we are committed to doing all we can to increase the number of apprentices and trainees. I have been conveying the message to companies for the past two years that they need to employ and train young people, otherwise they will face a very serious skills shortage. People can look at the record and see that that has been stated for the past two years. It is a bit like insurance: people often postpone or do not take out insurance, and when the fire is near their house it is too late. It is the same with having skilled trades people on board: you cannot pull them off the shelf.

It is no good hoping to bring trained people in from overseas, because (a) that is unacceptable to local people; and (b) the skills shortage is world wide. The answer lies in companies training more people. As a Government, we have tried to halt the decline in the traineeship system within State Government, and that has been recently boosted through the technical trainee scheme arrangement using group training companies. Plenty of incentives are there for companies to employ. We have State Government incentives under 'Let's Get South Australia Working', but many other incentives are provided by the Federal Department for Education, Employment and Training.

We are facing shortages in areas such as toolmaking. Today's toolmaker is not simply a fitter and turner with a few years experience: it is someone with computer capabilities with an understanding of and an expertise in computer design equipment. We are facing skills shortages in the areas of greenkeeping and hospitality. Not enough chefs are being trained and, despite increasing our intake substantially at Regency and elsewhere this year, we cannot meet the demand for chefs and commercial cooks, particularly in the lead up to the Sydney Olympics. A whole range of areas are crying out for more people to be taken on board.

Only this morning I met with Garry Donaldson, from Group Training Australia, to look at ways in which we can expand training even further through the group training scheme system. I support what the honourable member is saying: there is a chronic shortage and an even greater shortage is looming. I appeal to industry to take on more young people, to train them and to give them experience, otherwise it will be caught short in a few years as economic growth in this State really takes off at an even higher level.

PEST CONTROL OPERATOR

Ms HURLEY (Napier): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. What is the result of the Health Commission's investigation into the operation of a pest control operator who is alleged to be doing substandard work, and has any action been taken regarding the licensing of that agency? The South Australian Health Commission is responsible for issuing licences for pest control operators. Allegations have been made that a pest control company has not been using sufficient chemicals to do the job properly, and these claims have been before the Health Commission since October last year. In early January, the Minister said that the Health Commission was already well advanced in its investigations of the allegations and it would be in a position to make a recommendation within a month.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: It is an important question for a number of reasons, and I intend to give a reasonably detailed answer, but I indicate to the member for Napier that I signed a letter yesterday, so she should get the full answer. One of the problems with this whole exercise is actually determining the information. There is a need to discuss with other members of the building fraternity their practices, and so on. Unfortunately, investigations were hampered by the fact that a vast majority of builders go on holidays over the Christmas period. They have only just returned to work, I am informed.

A number of allegations were made which did not support the explanation that further soil had been placed on the particular prepared slab of soil, which was then obscuring the presence of the treated soil. So, there were a number of difficulties in obtaining the samples as well. Advice is being sought from Legal Services in relation to the appropriate action regarding the allegations and information which have been passed to the Health Commission. Meetings have been held with the person who is alleged to have been not undertaking the appropriate practices. As is required under the Act, a number of explanations have been provided, and then, of course, matters of natural justice arise in relation to the explanations being investigated, and so on.

There is a further complication in that the Department of Housing and Urban Development (which has responsibility under the Building Code of Australia) has had to be brought into the loop as well. Discussions on the matter took place on 1 February 1996 with representatives from that department and with the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs, which has had to be involved as well. The bottom line is that it would appear that there is no risk to public health. Once that risk has been excluded it is a matter—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: People may laugh, but if you choose to ignore matters of natural justice in matters such as this, I would be very surprised. The simple fact of the matter is that as soon as an answer is appropriately provided by the myriad of people involved in these sorts of investigations we will be only too happy to clear up the matter.

TRADE PROMOTION

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): My question is directed to the Treasurer. What consideration is being given by the Government to tidying up the act of some businesses with respect to their so-called 'trade promotion practices'?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I appreciate the member for Ridley's interest in this issue. Members will recall last year that, as a result of a national meeting involving all personnel from gaming activities within the States, some resolutions were reached. As a result of those resolutions, we promulgated a regulation which controlled the use of 0055 telephone numbers. However, we withdrew that regulation as a result of considerable unrest amongst the media. Whilst the meeting reached agreement the implementation was much slower in other States. We said that we needed a national scheme and that we did not want South Australia to be different.

Some progress has been made on the issue, and the gaming Ministers met on a range of issues involving the gambling industry, including Internet, advertising and protocols for machines. One of the issues concerned 0055 telephone numbers and, under our laws, the competitions in question are illegal. We said that we would put the matter on hold for a particular period until we saw where the national determination was taking us in terms of States getting together and doing the same thing. We will be including in the regulation, with the agreement of my colleagues, a maximum 50¢ charge in relation to 0055 telephone calls.

We will be reflecting initiatives already taken by other States that have said that a maximum 50¢ charge is comparable with 45¢ for postage. Also, we will be adopting the New South Wales determination on the scrutiny of competitions. One problem with these competitions is that they are well covered on TV, radio and in the newspapers, advertising for people to ring a 0055 number. Some of the practices associated with them, however, open up a number of questions about the propriety of those lotteries, including a requirement to keep calling the telephone number in question: it does not involve just a single call.

The fact is that there have been some fairly dodgy draws in other States, and we do not want that to happen here. From our point of view, some regulations will be put in place. The extent to which promoters can benefit from these promotions other than through trade has again been discussed at the national gaming Ministers' conference. Agreement has been reached that promoters should not benefit except through an increase in trade; however, the practical implementation of such a proposal needs further examination. So, that has been set aside, and we will now proceed with formulating regulations consistent with what the national gaming Ministers have concluded as far as 0055 is concerned, but other matters will have to be addressed as time goes by.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Ms HURLEY (Napier): Since last October when the South Australian Health Commission was given information about a pest control operator who was doing substandard work, hundreds and hundreds of homes have been built in Adelaide. Many of those homes are supposed to have been sprayed for termite control by this particular pest control operator. Those homes are not sufficiently covered for termite control and may well develop termite infestation over the next couple of years. During all this time, the Government has been having meetings, waffling on and doing absolutely nothing about the matter.

I have received a series of complaints from other pest control operators and queries from people who have had their homes built recently as to who this operator is. I will name this operator at this time, because I think it important that people start asking questions of their builders regarding just what protection they have. The information that I have received is that this company, which is called Complete Pest Control, has been spraying chemicals in such diluted quantities that it is spraying little better than water on new home sites.

Mrs Rosenberg: Who has done an analysis?

Ms HURLEY: Independent analyses of samples from three different sites taken by the industry have shown that less than one-100th of the required concentration has been used by this pest control operator. In fact, there are reports from within the industry itself that operators of this company have walked onto the site, put on the stickers without the statutory information required on them, and simply walked away.

This sort of information has been with the Health Commission since October last year, but nothing has been done by the Government in spite of the fact that pest control operators themselves and the people who supply the chemicals have been pressuring the Government and the Health Commission to take some sort of action against this operator. The pest control industry wants to see proper regulation of its industry so that it can go ahead with a good reputation for work decently done.

Mr Evans interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Becker): Order!

Ms HURLEY: I was coming to that. I have with me a copy of a guarantee from Complete Pest Control which prominently and proudly states that it is fully licensed by the South Australian Health Commission and guarantees its work for 10 years. There is a significant body of evidence that this company is not doing the work that it is supposed to do and that its guarantee is worthless. I am of the understanding that the builders are responsible for the level of work and that if people find that their house is infested with termites it is the builder's responsibility to address that problem. It seems to me that the building industry is either very concerned—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Ms HURLEY: —about which pest control operators are not doing their job properly or they have a fair idea but are turning a blind eye.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Mitchell and the member for Unley. Interjections are out of order. The member for Napier.

Ms HURLEY: This matter is of great concern to me, because my electorate contains areas with a high level of building activity, and I am very concerned that my constituents are buying and moving into houses having paid for pest control either directly or through the builder but, to all intents and purposes, have no termite protection whatsoever. Those people need to be able to check to see whether they really have termite protection. This Government has been doing absolutely nothing. The industry has been told that the Health Commission is suffering from a lack of staff and resources and that this is not the Health Commission's core business, yet the Health Commission's name is featured prominently on this guarantee as the licensee of this pest control operator. This guarantee is worth absolutely nothing. The Minister and his department are handballing this matter around and not doing anything.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. I remind members that this is a grievance debate and that all members are given a fair go. I do not like having to rise to my feet to draw attention to the state of the House or the behaviour of members. Members are only interrupting one another and wasting time. I call the member for Florey.

Mr BASS (Florey): Claims by the member for Hart have reached a new level of fantasy and overstatement in connection with the SA Water outsourcing contract. His wild and inaccurate statements yesterday in this House are a disgrace to himself and the Australian Labor Party, because they fly in the face not only of the facts as stated by the Minister for Infrastructure but of independent authority to the contrary. Not only are his statements an embarrassment to himself and his colleagues, but they are an insult to the integrity of the many people who worked extraordinarily hard and for long hours to deliver the outsourcing contract with its tremendous benefits for South Australia. Included among these individuals are members of the board of the SA Water Corporation and independent and highly regarded leaders in commerce both in Australia and beyond who have staked their professional reputation not only on the process leading to the contract but also on its outcome.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr BASS: The member for Hart should not overlook the fact that the board made the final recommendation to the Minister in both the case of the outsourcing and the BOO project announced recently by the Minister.

For the benefit of the House I will recall the member for Hart's latest chapter of fantasy. He claimed that 'every single issue of probity was broken and every proper due process was thrown out the door'. He said that it was a 'Laurel and Hardy process by senior SA Water officials'. He said that it was 'grubby and smelly right through this entire bidding process'. In addition, the honourable member made remarks about the conduct of the organisation's Chief Executive which are contemptuous for their cowardice. To malign with the most defamatory of accusations one of the State's most senior and respected bureaucrats in this Chamber under privilege and without any chance of an equal reply is a bitter, vengeful and shameful act.

The member for Hart did all this under the guise of a mock heroic struggle to uncover the truth by asserting facts, by challenging the Government. If he were interested in the truth of the real situation, he would temper his rhetoric and look toward more appropriate forums to confirm what other independent statutory officers have found. He would seek the assistance of his colleagues in another place to make the select committee into outsourcing, the establishment of which the Government supported, actually useful with regard to this issue not as a theatrical adjunct to his grandstanding and conspiracy mania in this Chamber.

Let us look at the facts concerning the letter of the contract. Fact: the Solicitor-General in his summary statement of 17 December 1992 stated explicitly and without qualification:

> . . . it is not fully appreciated just how complex this transaction has been. Although improvements can obviously be made, the procedure adopted by SA Water was generally excellent.

Generally excellent! This does not sound like a Laurel and Hardy show or like the contract handling was 'absolutely disgraceful and comical'. Fact: the Auditor-General in his letter accompanying his December report, which was also sent to the Leader of the Opposition, stated:

> There are no facts known to me at this time nor has any evidence been made available to me from any source that would warrant my stating that the fact findings of the Solicitor-General are other than materially accurate.

Simply put: the member for Hart does not like what he hears. He does not like the sign-offs from the independent officers. He does not like the fact that the probity auditor signed off the process; the fact that the Auditor-General had an ongoing role in this process and his office, too, signed it off. He does not like the fact that his conspiracy theory does not play out into reality. So his defence is to stand in this Chamber, issuing hollow and pathetic challenges to 'prove him wrong'. The member for Hart has reduced himself to a self-fulfilling prophecy. His accusations will prove him wrong, and sooner than he thinks.

If the member for Hart were serious, if he had any real reasons to back up his claims of complete incompetence on the part of SA Water and the Minister for Infrastructure, he should put them before the appropriate authority for investigation. Even worse, the honourable member named North West Water as being involved in a conspiracy with the Government and alleged that it has been threatened by the Government. The member for Hart has insulted North West Water and Lyonnaise, and he knows they are good companies.

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

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I look forward to making a few remarks on water in South Australia; I will do it when I get a bit more time. One day I would like to tell the House exactly how business is done in this State with regard to tenders, and so on. I find the remarks about the probity of the Government's approach to water absolutely fanciful. I know my local dentist approaches the tender process for teeth amalgam with a bit more due diligence than this crowd's approach to this question! I will have more to say about that later, as well as about open tendering and the fact that about 40 or 50 people got to look at a tender. Surprise, surprise, Kinhill did pretty well out of it. I will not say any more; I will say more next week. I used to frequent a room when I was Chairman of the Economic and Finance Committee in which—I must confess to the House—I used to say words that are unutterable on the parliamentary *Hansard*

record because I would see deals going to a certain cast of characters, and I see that with the water contract, too.

I wish to talk about a response that was given yesterday that has upset a few people. Yesterday, in Question Time, I asked a question of the Deputy Premier about the impact of gaming machines on certain charities. Last year, the Hill report was much trumpeted by this Government at and before its release, yet we heard no more about it 24 hours after its release. A number of charities in this State—not only those directly associated with gambling or the rehabilitation of gamblers—that relied on bingo tickets and the like told of the impact gaming machines had on their finances, and they provided much information to the Hill report about that.

In 1992 we listened to the now Deputy Premier when he pleaded with us in this House to provide affected charities with at least $5 million out of the estimated $55 million generated by gaming machines. We were so impressed by that argument that we dragged it out ourselves after gaming machines came in, and we thought it was a pretty good way to go. However, we now find that the Deputy Premier has changed his mind. We now find that, instead of its being a $55 million haul for Treasury, it will be $125 million, and out of that only $1 million will go to affected charities. So they have done pretty well out of it!

I must say that the Deputy Premier has undergone a miraculous conversion. In typical style yesterday, he made some comments in his reply to my question which, alas, have upset a few organisations. What they wanted was a bit of solace and a few dollars to make up for what they have lost in terms of revenue from gaming products. What they got from the Deputy Premier is the same sort of oafish advice that he gives to many organisations. I hope that, if he ever goes Federal, he is never put in charge of the Department of Defence or the Foreign Affairs Department, because we would have a real problem. I refer to the Deputy Premier's reply yesterday, as follows:

> The review also showed that many of the charities which got into difficulty did so as a result of their own management problems.

Instead of offering the few miserable dollars he talked about 3½ years ago, the Deputy Premier is now saying, 'Look, these organisations have got into trouble all on their own.' According to the Deputy Premier, they do not need any help from him or from Treasury; they have got themselves into their own mess. One would presume from that approach that they will have to dig themselves out of it. We do not think that that is good enough. We think that a realistic and reasonable amount of that $125 million needs to go to a number of affected organisations. A number of charities may not be directly aligned with gambling but they do a lot of community work, and they rely on gambling revenue.

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

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): I wish to draw the attention of the House to the Victims of Crime Service, and in particular to its court companion initiative. For most of us, our first contact with a court of justice is when we become a victim of a crime. Having already been traumatised by the crime, the subsequent experience of the legal process and possibly a court trial can be devastating. Those who commit crimes receive a large measure of publicity and help in an effort to reform them. Along the way, the victims of crime are often forgotten. Just how much they are forgotten was brought home to a former Police Commissioner, Ray Whitrod, when the mothers of two of the Truro murder victims visited him separately. Their anguish, confusion and reality of having no-one to whom to turn who understood their despair prompted Mr Whitrod to ask, 'Why doesn't somebody do something?'

As he said at a public meeting, it is a question no-one should ask, because that someone invariably turns out to be the one who asked the question—in this case, him. However, out of that experience the Victims of Crime Service was born—a service that has become recognised internationally. The operators of the Victims of Crime Service (VOCS) better than anyone else in the community are aware of the trauma associated with court appearances. They better than anyone are aware of the legal processes that are mystifying to the general public. When a person becomes involved in some of those processes, the experience can be quite terrifying. So the idea of court companions, trained people who could accompany victims to court, was added to the agenda of VOCS.

Last year, it was my pleasure to attend the official launch of that service in Port Lincoln. Three local people who had been trained for their role joined a network of court companions around South Australia. A court companion is a trained volunteer who provides support, friendship, comfort and information to a victim of crime at the time they are required to appear in court. That support and companionship is provided to both the victims and the witnesses for the prosecution. Programs exist in Adelaide, Mount Gambier, Kadina, the Riverland, Port Augusta, Port Pirie and now, I am pleased to say, in Port Lincoln. Court companions are a brilliant concept, fulfilled by very dedicated people. With society the way it is today, any one of us could find ourselves in the position of facing a court appearance. Most people are totally unprepared for the confrontation, aggression, disbelief and abasement they encounter in court.

The support of a court companion and the knowledge that they can pass on about the procedures to be faced are strengths that are valuable to a vulnerable person and are greatly appreciated. The work of a court companion begins before the court appearance when the companion meets with the victim or witness so that each can get to know the other. The companion accompanies the person to the court building to familiarise him or her with the layout of the courtroom. On the day of the hearing, the court companion meets the victim at the court or their home and goes with them to the court, organises for the victim to sit in an area away from the defendant and remains with the person while they are waiting to be called into court to give their evidence.

The court companion will ask officials to answer any questions the victim or witness might have and will accompany the person into court while evidence is being given. The court companion will return with the person if attendance is required for more than one day. The encouragement that a court companion gives cannot be priced. We all benefit through victims and witnesses giving clearer testimony along with being more confident of handling the legal process, thus facilitating the work of judges in making informed judgments. Court companions are assisted in their work by the advice of other services. Professional counselling and advocacy and information about a victim's rights and criminal injuries compensation claims are two of these. The service is well placed to be an advocate for reform of the criminal justice system.

Support for victims has been extended, with the establishment of a women's support group and a group for women whose children have been sexually abused. Children are very

much part of the VOCS program through a court preparation program for children who have to appear in court. Community education is undertaken through seminars on crime information and prevention for the elderly, training seminars for professionals who have contact with victims of crime and talks to community groups. It is through such education that the need for VOCS and its invaluable contribution to the betterment of society is publicised.

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

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Part of our Yuletide cheer was the news that the member for Hanson was challenging the member for Morphett for his Liberal Party preselection. The State District of Morphett, based on Glenelg, is a much safer Liberal seat than Hanson. Until recently, the member for Morphett had been the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations and the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. The Minister resigned his commission at the Premier's request and, as is the norm in a Party as social Darwinist as the South Australian Liberals, natural selection began to take its course.

The argument from the challenger was that the member for Morphett had served the Parliament for 18 years, had lost his ministry and should now hand over his safe seat to a younger man whose political career might otherwise be cruelly cut short by Labor's winning his marginal seat at the 1997 general election. I predict that the member for Morphett might quietly have retired from Parliament had he been allowed to serve in the ministry until that general election. Now we will never know.

The key to this struggle was obtaining a simple majority at the February annual general meeting of the Morphett Liberals. So, the members for Morphett and Hanson sought to recruit as many new members to the Morphett Liberal Party branch as they could, taking advantage of the long-standing Liberal Party rule that members may be recruited from anywhere in the State or in the country. Labor, by contrast, requires that all members voting in a preselection plebiscite must be on the electoral roll for the particular State district or Federal division. The member for Hanson recruited fresh people, many of whom shared his Christianity. He was roundly condemned by the member for Unley for facilitating the participation of Christians in politics. Despite the warnings from the member for Unley about a right wing Christian fundamentalist takeover, it should be noted that the member for Hanson is an adherent of the Liberal Movement faction—or left faction—of the Party, led by the member for Coles.

On the principle that my enemy's enemy is my friend, the dries or conservative faction of the Liberal Party rallied to the standard of the member for Morphett. After all, if he retired short of the next general election, they would be in a position to choose his replacement. Spurred on by the Chairman of the South Australian Jockey Club, Mr Rob Hodge, who has good reason to be grateful to the member for Morphett on account of his handling of the racing portfolio, the dries transferred financial Liberal Party members from other branches around the State into the Morphett branch and recruited some new members. I pause here to commend Mr Hodge: all politicians should doff their hat to gratefulness in politics. There is so little of it.

Waiting on the sidelines of the battle—rather like the Stanleys at the Battle of Bosworth Field—were a Glenelg councillor, 26 year old Darren Amos, and his mentor, the Liberal member for the Federal division of Hindmarsh, Mrs Chris Gallus. Mrs Gallus might need the State District of Morphett as a bolt hole if she loses Hindmarsh in the coming Federal election. On the last day of 1995 the *Advertiser* predicted that Mr Amos might be a candidate for preselection in Morphett. On 3 January, a letter was published from Mr Amos in the *Advertiser* denying that he was considering standing for preselection. Mr Amos wrote:

> Mr Oswald is the sitting member for Morphett and as such has my full support. While Mr Leggett may be a candidate for Morphett at this time, I am not. I am fully occupied working in my family's business and fulfilling my duties as a Glenelg councillor.

A few days later I was speaking to Gerard Stone on Radio 5AA's midnight to dawn talk program. I had rung Gerard from my office. When I replaced the telephone receiver in my office, the phone rang. It was a retired gentleman who lived in the part of Glenelg where I had been raised as a child. The gentleman was a Labor voter. He had voted for Darren Amos in the May 1995 council election because he thought young people ought to be encouraged in local government. Mr Amos had approached him in the month of January, asking him whether he would like to join the Morphett branch of the Liberal Party. My informant replied that he had been a Labor man all his life and his late father would spin in his grave if he joined the Liberals. Mr Amos replied that that was most unfortunate because he was very much a working man himself. He intimated to my informant that if he became the Liberal member for Morphett he, Mr Amos, would be as Labor as you could get in the parliamentary Liberal Party. Mr Amos added that the fee for retired persons wanting to join the Liberal Party for the balance of the financial year was a bargain at only $20 and that, if my informant had difficulty finding the money, Mr Amos could help him.

I repeat: Mr Amos was willing to pay my informant's fee. When my informant replied that it was not a question of price, Mr Amos explained his disappointment by confiding in my informant that he was working seven hours a day on boosting the membership of the Morphett branch of the Liberal Party. Mr Acting Speaker, if we cannot trust the young, what is to become of our political system?

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I wish to continue with what I was on about yesterday, namely, the lady with two children who seems to get around the State at an enormous rate of knots covering electorates here, there and everywhere, including the massive electorate of Grey, which covers most of the State. She has also appeared in various other areas, including Prospect and Hindmarsh, and I daresay she has been in other places as well. It is the lady who has been identified by such people as Senator Chris Schacht, Senator Nick Bolkus and Labor candidate David Abfalter as saying that she voted for the Brown Liberal Government at the last State election but added, 'I'll never vote for the Liberals again.' Certainly, those members were caught out, which just shows the depth to which the Labor Party is prepared to go to try to confuse people, to misinform them and spread untruths. I could deal with that in itself, but I wonder whether the Labor Party would then create another lady and two children who, instead of criticising the Liberal Government, would start to praise the Liberal Government for the massive achievements created in the two years that the Brown Liberal Government has occupied the front benches.

In that time confidence has been restored in this State's economy. We have had more than 20 000 jobs created. South Australia's unemployment rate is at its lowest level for almost

five years, and in fact fell from 11.2 per cent at the election to 9 per cent now. Full-time employment rose by 3 900 in December alone, after a rise of 6 000 in November. There have been major job creation projects, including the EDS contract, the metropolitan water and waste water service contracting out, the Westpac Mortgage Centre, where some 580 jobs have been created in the first phase of staff intake, while also bringing new people into South Australia at long last, and the Bankers Trust Investment Management Centre, where about 400 staff have been able to gain employment.

In considering the EDS contract alone, I hope members, and particularly the lady with the two children, are aware that this will create savings of at least $100 million over nine years, generating at least 900 jobs in South Australia, establishing the EDS Asia/Pacific Resource Centre headquarters here in South Australia, including establishing graduate training programs and recruiting graduates from universities. That is excellent.

I refer also to the transfer of General Motors-Holden's mainframe data processing from Melbourne to Adelaide. There are many positives for South Australia. I refer also to United Water, which has the water contract. It is estimated that the contract will achieve savings of 20 per cent each year on the current cost of operating and maintaining Adelaide's water and waste water systems. This represents a saving of more than $164 million over the life of the contract. I say to this fictitious lady and her two children that they will benefit to the tune of $165 million minimum in fewer taxes to keep the water service going. In addition, this United Water contract will stimulate export focused water industry for South Australia, which will earn $628 million in net exports over 10 years. This represents another $600 odd million coming into this State that we would not have had if this contract had not been entered into and signed. Of course, as most of us know, it will maintain if not improve current service and environmental standards. There are only positives for the Liberal Government's achievements.

Yesterday, I touched briefly on the decrease in the waiting lists for public hospitals. Today, the Minister identified the many achievements that have been realised through outsourcing the running of the Modbury Hospital. Surely, this lady and her two children and, therefore, the Labor Party which created this lady and her two children, should applaud the achievements in South Australia and should recognise that we will save taxpayers millions and millions of dollars over the coming years.

SUPPLY BILL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act for the appropriation of money from the Consolidated Account for the financial year ending 30 June 1997. Read a first time.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: 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.

Last year the Government decided to bring forward the tabling of the budget from the traditional time of the end of August to the beginning of June. The Government has decided to continue with this practice this year by introducing the 1996-97 Budget on 30 May 1996. A Supply Bill will still be necessary for the early months of the 1996-97 year until the Budget has passed through the Parliamentary stages and received assent. In the absence of special arrangements in the form of the Supply Acts, there would be no Parliamentary authority for expenditure between the commencement of the new financial year and the date on which assent is given to the main Appropriation Bill. The amount being sought under this Bill is $500 million which is $100 million less than last year's Supply Bill. The Bill provides for the appropriation of $500 million to enable the Government to continue to provide public services for the early part of 1996-97.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides relevant definitions.

Clause 3 provides for the appropriation of up to $500 million.

Mr CLARKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TIMBER CORPORATION (SALE OF ASSETS) BILL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the privatisation of the South Australian Timber Corporation, to amend the South Australian Timber Corporation Act 1979, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: 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 provides for the eventual sale of Forwood Products Pty Ltd ("Forwood") and such of the assets as are owned by the South Australian Timber Corporation ("SATCO") and utilised by Forwood in its business operations.

It is intended that this asset sale will be concluded in the early part of 1996. Forwood was established for the purpose of corporatising, and ultimately privatising, the Government's sawmilling and timber processing operations in the South-East of this State.

As of 1 July, 1993, the timber processing, marketing and related service activities of SATCO were amalgamated with the sawmilling operations previously operated by the South Australian Department of Primary Industries and located at Mount Burr, Mount Gambier and Nangwarry. This resulted in the transfer of the Woods and Forests assets into SATCO and all of the amalgamated operations being undertaken by Forwood, a wholly owned subsidiary of SATCO.

The key objectives of the amalgamation was to create a single integrated production, distribution and marketing group for timber products produced by Government owned facilities and to improve the ability of the previous separate businesses to respond to changing market conditions in a co-ordinated manner. Forwood undertakes its operations through the lease of the SATCO owned sawmills and the SATCO owned plant and equipment located at these mills.

Since 1993, Forwood been successful in meeting the objectives of the amalgamation and has gained a significant market share of the Australian market for structural radiata pine sawn timber, timber engineered products and plywood. As such, it is a important employer and contributor to the economy in the South East. It is important that the full potential of the company an the economic benefits it brings to the State will be maximised as much as possible.

The sale of Forwood will provide an opportunity for the company to seek capital it cannot otherwise obtain from the Government. The injection of such capital will further enhance the ability of the company to continue to consolidate and improve its profitability. Given that it is no longer feasible for the Government to properly fund further capitalisation of the company nor continue to fund the commercial risk associated with the operations, the necessary capitalisation can clearly only be achieved through significant private sector participation. Such private sector involvement is the only means by which the full potential of the company and the economic benefits it can bring to the State can be achieved.

As with all asset sales, the sale is an also important part of the Government's program to substantially reduce the State's debt.

In selecting a purchaser, the Government will not determine the matter on price alone. Although price is a key objective in the process, it is a matter to consider along with the other objectives of:

- achieving economic benefits to South Australia;
- ensuring fair and equitable treatment of all Forwood employees;
- ensuring that the Government carries no residual responsibility for, or liabilities from, its prior ownership of the assets and businesses;
- ensuring a viable and pro-competitive ownership structure for Forwood post-sale;
- maintenance of good relations with existing suppliers and customers; and
- achieving a timely sale.

As with all sales, the Government is aware of the sensitivities of employment issues. The management and employees of Forwood have worked closely together to achieve many production efficiency initiatives and gains. These gains and other improvements have resulted in making Forwood an attractive purchase option for those persons seeking to enter into, or expand their operations in, the market for sawn timber, timber engineered products and plywood.

In this sale transaction, the future welfare of the Forwood management and employees is of primary concern to the Government. Although the purchaser will not be obligated to offer employment to all Forwood staff, the skill base developed over the years is such that there is a realistic expectation that the purchaser will require the skills of the majority of the Forwood staff. In addition, all potential purchasers will be required to provide full, accurate and detailed written explanations of their intentions towards these employees.

Whilst the objective of fair and equitable treatment of all Forwood staff is a factor in the assessment process, the Government will give high regard to proposals which:

- provide a range of on-going employment commitments to the Forwood staff; and
- demonstrate an appreciation of staff and client needs and a capability and preparedness to consult and accommodate such needs where possible.

Further, in accordance with other sale legislation such as the *Pipelines Authority (Sale of Pipelines) Amendment Act 1995*, the Bill will also provide a means by which those Forwood employees who are members of the State's contributory superannuation schemes will be able to preserve their benefits under the existing resignation preservation or alternative lump sum provisions os those schemes. As with the PASA sale, this will ensure that there is a "clean break" from the Government at the time of sale.

Although the proposed sale of Forwood and the ancillary assets of SATCO will result in a significant diminution of the assets owned by SATCO, the sale will not involve all of the SATCO assets. These assets will not be of sufficient quantity to require a Board. Accordingly, the Bill seeks to reconstitute SATCO as a sole corporation constituted by the Minister to whom the administration of the Act is committed from time to time.

The Bill also seeks to provide certainty to the new owner as to compliance with all building and development work undertaken over the years on land presently owned by the Government through SATCO. This certainty is sought as there is some doubt that the work undertaken over the years for and on behalf of the Crown was required to comply with such requirements. In deeming compliance, the necessary certainty can be provided to the new owner.

The Bill will enable the successful sale of Forwood and ancillary assets owned by SATCO and utilised by Forwood in its business operations.

I commend this Bill to the House

Explanation of Clauses

PART 1 PRELIMINARY

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

Clause 3: Interpretation

Clause 4: Territorial operation of Act

This clause applies the Bill outside the State to the full extent of the extra-territorial legislative power of the State.

PART 2 SALE OF ASSETS

Clause 5: Sale of assets and liabilities

This central provision authorises the Treasurer to enter into an agreement for the sale of the assets and liabilities of the SA Timber Corporation, Forwood (a wholly owned subsidiary of the Corporation) or a Forwood Subsidiary (International Panel and Lumber (Australia) Pty Ltd, International Panel and Lumber (New Zealand) Limited or IPL (Marketing) Limited). The clause contemplates a sale by way of a transfer of shares (which may incidentally include transfer of assets from the Corporation to Forwood or a Forwood Subsidiary) or a transfer of other assets (land, plant and equipment) and liabilities.

The clause provides that any balance from the net proceeds of the sale, after discharging or recouping outstanding liabilities of the Corporation, Forwood or a Forwood Subsidiary, must be used for retiring State debt.

Clause 6: Transferred instruments

This clause allows the sale agreement to provide for the modification of instruments to enable the purchaser to succeed to rights and liabilities as a consequence of the sale.

Clause 7: Legal proceedings

This clause allows for the continuance of legal proceedings by or against the Corporation, Forwood or Forwood Subsidiaries, subject to the terms of the sale agreement.

Clause 8: Registering authorities to note transfer

This clause allows the Treasurer to require a registering authority to make relevant entries relating to a sale agreement.

Clause 9: Stamp duty

This clause exempts transfers from the Corporation to Forwood or a Forwood Subsidiary incidental to a sale agreement from stamp duty and related receipts from financial institutions duty.

Clause 10: Evidence

This evidentiary provision allows matters relevant to a sale to be certified by the Treasurer. A certificate is to be accepted by courts, arbitrators, persons acting judicially and administrative officials.

Clause 11: Saving provision

This clause protects the parties to a sale agreement from adverse consequences through entering the agreement and prevents a sale agreement having unintended consequences.

PART 3 PREPARATION FOR SALE OF ASSETS

Clause 12: Preparation for disposal of assets and liabilities

This clause authorises relevant persons to prepare for the sale including by making relevant information available and providing assistance to prospective purchasers authorised by the Treasurer.

Clause 13: Protection for disclosure and use of information, etc.

This clause provides protection to persons involved in that process.

Clause 14: Evidence

This evidentiary provision allows matters relevant to preparation for a sale to be certified by the Treasurer.

PART 4 MISCELLANEOUS

Clause 15: Act to apply despite Real Property Act 1886

Clause 16: Interaction between this Act and other Acts

This clause excludes the *Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing) Act 1994* and Part 4 of the *Development Act 1993* from applying to the sale.

SCHEDULE 1 Staff and Superannuation

This schedule creates a transitional superannuation scheme for employees affected by a sale who were members of a State scheme.

SCHEDULE 2 Consequential Amendments and Transitional Provisions

This schedule amends the *South Australian Timber Corporation Act 1979*, including by providing that the Corporation is constituted of the Minister and allowing the Corporation to be dissolved by proclamation.

The schedule also removes any inhibitions to a sale by reason of any past non-compliance with building and development rules.

Mr CLARKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL (DUTY TO VOTE) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Electoral Act 1985. Read a first time.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: 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 is re-introduced with the object of removing the criminal sanctions which flow when a person fails to exercise their right to vote.

Australia is one of the few democracies which compels (via the use of penalties) its citizens to vote in elections.

In all other democracies the right to vote entails the right not to vote. The fact that Australia persists with compulsion is something which may generally be seen as incompatible with a fair and democratic society.

Most democracies see the right to vote as embracing the fundamental right of individuals not to vote if they so choose. One of the principal reasons Holland abolished compulsory voting in 1970 was the view that to force people to exercise their right to vote was to destroy the very nature of that right. Another critical factor influencing the Dutch was the view that election results should be based on the clear choice of voters voluntarily participating in the election process. Election results should not be influenced by the votes of those who would not bother to vote but for compulsion. This Bill therefore removes the threat of criminal sanctions against those who do not vote.

As previously advised, at the last State election 64 734 individuals failed to vote, prompting 33 746 please explain notices and 9 814 expiation notices. In November, 1994, 5 756 summonses were issued, and of those 4330 were not able to be served by a process server due to address changes. A further 418 were withdrawn due to sufficient explanation, 366 people paid a late fee and 642 proceeded to court and were convicted. Since that time, nineteen people have been imprisoned for a period of 2-3 days for failing to pay the fine imposed in consequence of the failure to vote.

As the process of following up non-voters is only half completed, it is predicted that up to five more individuals may be imprisoned in the next few months for the same reasons.

It is expected that the costs of court action to pursue these individuals will be in excess of $250 000. This does not include costs incurred by the Electoral Commissioner in following up non-voters in the by-elections of Torrens, Elizabeth and Taylor.

Chasing up non-voters is a costly and time consuming process and the end result is that non-voters are penalised for failing or choosing not to exercise their basic democratic right to vote.

The arguments for and against compulsory voting have been debated extensively, so there is no need to repeat them all.

At the December, 1993 State election, this Government promised to abolish compulsory voting. Legislation to abolish compulsory voting and to introduce voluntary voting has twice been before Parliament and was defeated on both occasions in the Legislative Council. First, the Electoral (Abolition of Compulsory Voting) Amendment Bill, 1994 came before Parliament in the Autumn Session of 1994. This Bill sought to remove the requirement for each elector to vote at an election.

Secondly, the Electoral (Duty to Vote) Amendment Bill, 1994 (the Bill) came before Parliament in the Spring Session of 1994. The Bill sought to remove from section 85 of the Electoral Act, 1985 (the Act) (being the section that creates a duty for every elector to record a vote at each election in a district for which he or she is enrolled) those subsections that require the Electoral Commissioner to send out a notice to each elector who appears not to have voted in an election, and that create various offences in relation to failing to vote.

The Bill, as re-introduced, preserves the expression of the basic duty of citizens to vote but removes the sanction of a criminal penalty where the citizen chooses, for whatever reason, not to vote. It is the view of the Government that the obligation to vote and the exercise of the right to vote should not be subject to the sanction of a criminal penalty. Those who would rather not vote should not be subject to that coercion. If they do not vote they should not be penalised and if, ultimately, they refuse to pay any fine and costs it should not be possible for a non-voter to end up in gaol.

Finally, the Bill is reintroduced with an additional provision granting a person the right to choose to have his or her name removed from the rolls under the Act (other than after the close of rolls for an election). Section 29 of the Act provides that a person is entitled to be enrolled on the rolls if the person meets certain conditions. While it is not compulsory to be enrolled under the Act, there is no power to request that a name be removed once it is on the rolls. It follows that if a person has a right not to have his or her name put on the rolls, that there should be a right to choose to request that his or her name be removed from the rolls up to and including the date fixed by the Governor for the close of the rolls for an election.

This Bill achieves that end.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 32—Transfer of enrolment

This clause makes a consequential amendment on account of proposed new section 32A. In particular, a person will not be liable to prosecution for failing to notify an electoral registrar of a change in address if the person has applied to have his or her name removed from the electoral rolls under the Act.

Clause 3: Insertion of s. 32A

It is proposed that a person will be entitled to apply to have his or her name removed from the rolls under the Act. However, a name will not be able to be removed if the rolls has been closed for an election (until after the relevant election).

Clause 4: Substitution of heading

This clause provides a new heading to Division VI of Part IX of the Act as a consequence of the amendments to be effected by clause 3.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 85—Duty to vote

It is proposed to remove from section 85 of the Act (being the section that creates a duty for every elector to record a vote at each election in a district for which he or she is enrolled) those subsections that require the Electoral Commissioner to send out a notice to each elector who appears not to have voted in an election, and that create various offences in relation to failing to vote.

Mr CLARKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

BIRTHS, DEATHS AND MARRIAGES REGISTRATION BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): 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 repeals the *Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act, 1966* and replaces it with an Act which will continue the system of compulsory civil registration established in South Australia in 1842 but will bring the administration of that system up to date in a number of significant ways.

There is no need for the Government to stress the importance of the registration system. It is at the same time an indispensable social record and the source of data which is essential to a wide range of community services and activities.

The Bill follows closely the provisions of a model bill which was developed by the State and Territory registrars of births, deaths and marriages over a period of several years, drafted by the South Australian Parliamentary Counsel, and approved by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General earlier this year.

It is expected that, over the next year or so, all States and Territories of Australia will enact legislation based on the model, giving a very desirable degree of consistency across all jurisdictions and providing mechanisms to facilitate co-operation between the various registries which have not previously existed.

The significant differences between this Bill and the present Act are as follows.

The Bill provides for the Minister to enter into agreements with the ministers of other States and Territories, to provide for registrars to exercise each other's powers and functions and to establish joint data bases and control access to the information they contain. In time, this will enable greatly improved services to people living away from the State or Territory in which their birth or marriage is registered, and co-ordination of the provision of data to the registrars' corporate customers, including other government agencies, utilising modern electronic communications facilities while maintaining the privacy, integrity and ownership of the registers.

Still births will be registered in the same manner as live births, bringing South Australia into line with existing practice in all other States and Territories. In the case of a still birth, however, there is no requirement that the child be named in the register.

References to legitimate and illegitimate birth have been removed, consistent with the general body of family law. It will be the joint responsibility of the father and the mother of the child, whether lawfully married or not, to provide information necessary for the birth to be registered, unless the registrar sees good and sufficient reason to accept an information statement signed by only one parent.

Parentage details can be added to, or corrected on, an existing birth registration by agreement between the parties concerned. It will only be necessary to take the matter to court if a dispute exists.

Parents will be able to register their child's birth using any given name or surname they wish, provided only that it is not a prohibited name as defined in clause 4 of the Bill. The provisions of the present Act, whereby the child's birth must be registered in either the father's surname or the mother's or a combined form of the two, do not cater for the naming practices of a number of communities of non-European origin within our multi-cultural society. They are clearly discriminatory, and have no place in this Bill.

Providing the registrar with details necessary for registering a death is now the responsibility of the funeral director or other person arranging disposal of the deceased's remains. This has long been the case in practice, but is not consistent with the present Act.

Division 4 of Part 7 of the Bill contains important provisions requiring the registrar to protect personal privacy as far as practicable in the exercise of his discretion as to who may or may not have access to the registers and under what conditions. The registrar is also required to maintain a written statement of his access policies, and to provide a copy to any person, on request.

Finally, any person who is dissatisfied with a decision of the registrar under the Bill may apply to the Magistrates Court for a review of that decision.

The *Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act* has important operational interfaces with the *Coroners Act 1975* and the *Cremation Act 1891*, and the Second and Third Schedules to the Bill propose necessary consequential amendments to those pieces of legislation.

I commend the Bill to Honourable Members.

Explanation of Clauses

PART 1

PRELIMINARY

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Objects of Act

This clause sets out the objects of the Bill.

Clause 4: Definitions

This clause defines certain terms used in the Bill.

PART 2

ADMINISTRATION

DIVISION 1—THE REGISTRAR

Clause 5: Registrar

The Bill is to be administered by the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages (subject to the Minister's control and direction).

Clause 6: Registrar's general functions

This clause outlines the Registrar's general functions under the Bill.

Clause 7: Registrar's staff

This clause provides for the Registrar's staff. A Deputy Registrar is to have the powers and functions of the Registrar but is subject to direction by the Registrar.

Clause 8: Delegation

The Registrar may delegate powers.

DIVISION 2—EXECUTION OF DOCUMENTS

Clause 9: The Registrar's seal

The Registrar has a seal.

Clause 10: Execution of documents

This clause provides for the manner of execution of documents by the Registrar.

DIVISION 3—RECIPROCAL ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

Clause 11: Reciprocal administrative arrangements

Under this clause the Minister may enter into an arrangement with the Minister responsible for the administration of a corresponding law providing for Registering authorities in each State to exercise each other's powers and functions to the extent authorised by the arrangement. An arrangement may also establish and provide for the use of a data base in which information is recorded for the benefit of all the participants in the arrangement.

PART 3

REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS

DIVISION 1—NOTIFICATION OF BIRTHS

Clause 12: Notification of births

This clause imposes a duty on health care professionals to notify the Registrar of any births they are involved in. Where a hospital is involved in a birth, it is the chief executive officer's responsibility to give the required notice under this clause but, if no hospital is involved, the doctor or midwife responsible for the professional care of the mother at the birth must give the notice. The maximum penalty for failure to give notice is a fine of $1250.

This section also requires that a notice and death certificate be provided to the Registrar where there has been a still-birth. A copy of a death certificate provided under this clause must also be given to the funeral director or other person who will be arranging for the disposal of the remains.

(N.B. a 'still-born child' is defined as a child of at least 20 weeks' gestation or, if it cannot be reliably established whether the period of gestation is more or less than 20 weeks, with a body mass of at least 400 grams at birth, that exhibits no sign of respiration or heartbeat, or other sign of life, after birth.)

DIVISION 2—REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS

Clause 13: Cases in which registration of birth is required or authorised

Any birth occurring in the State must be registered in this State and a court of any State or the Commonwealth may direct the registration of a birth.

The birth of a child on a flight or vessel during a journey to a place of disembarkation in the State may be registered under the Act as may the birth of a child outside the Commonwealth, if the child is to become a resident of the State (or in the case of still-births, the child's parents are or are to become residents of the State). In these cases, however, the Registrar must not register the birth if it is registered under a corresponding law in Australia.

Clause 14: How to have the birth of a child registered

A person registers a birth by lodging a 'birth registration statement' (to be prescribed in the regulations).

Clause 15: Responsibility to have birth registered

This clause provides that both parents of a child are responsible for having the child's birth registered but the Registrar may accept a birth registration statement from one parent if satisfied that it is impossible, impracticable or inappropriate for the other parent to join in the application.

In the case of a foundling, the person who has custody is responsible for having the birth registered and, in general, the Registrar may accept a birth registration statement from a person who is not a parent if satisfied that person has knowledge of the relevant facts and the child's parents are unable or unlikely to lodge a birth registration statement.

Clause 16: Obligation to have birth registered

A birth registration statement must be lodged with the Registrar within 60 days after a birth. The maximum penalty for failure to lodge the statement is a fine of $1 250. The Registrar must, however, accept late statements.

Clause 17: Registration

Registration of a birth consists of making an entry in the Register containing the particulars prescribed by the regulations. If necessary, the Registrar may register a birth on the basis of incomplete particulars.

DIVISION 3—ALTERATION OF DETAILS OF BIRTH REGISTRATION

Clause 18: Alteration of details of parentage after registration of birth

The Registrar may add information about a child's parents in the Register on the joint application of both parents or on the application of one parent where the other parent cannot join in the application. The Registrar must add information when directed to do so by a court or when notified of a finding as to parentage by a court (of any State or the Commonwealth).

DIVISION 4—COURT ORDERS RELATING TO REGISTRATION OF BIRTH

Clause 19: Application to Court

This clause specifies that a person may apply to the Magistrates Court for an order relating to the registration of a birth.

Clause 20: Power to direct registration of birth, etc.

This clause provides that if, in the course of any proceedings, a South Australian court finds that a person's birth is not registered or is incompletely or incorrectly registered (whether under South Australian or interstate law) the court may make appropriate directions.

DIVISION 5—CHILD'S NAME

Clause 21: Name of child

A birth registration statement (other than a statement relating to the birth of a still born child) must state the child's name, but the Registrar is empowered to assign a name to a child under this clause if—

- the name proposed is a prohibited name ie. the name is obscene or offensive, or is such that it could not be estab-

lished by repute or usage (eg. because it is too long, or consists of symbols without phonetic significance) or it resembles an official title or it is otherwise contrary to the public interest; or

- the parents of the child are unable to agree on the child's name.

Clause 22: Dispute about child's name

Either parent of a child may apply to the Magistrates Court for resolution of a dispute about a child's name.

PART 4
CHANGE OF NAME

Clause 23: Change of name by registration

A person's name may be changed by registration under this Part.

Clause 24: Application to register change of adult's name

An adult person who is domiciled or ordinarily resident in the State or whose birth is registered in the State may apply for registration of a change of name.

Clause 25: Application to register change of child's name

The parents of a child who is domiciled or ordinarily resident in the State or whose birth is registered in the State may apply for registration of a change of the child's name.

An application may, however, be made by one parent if he or she is the sole parent named in the registration entry, there is no other surviving parent of the child or the Magistrates Court approves the proposed change of name.

The Magistrates Court may approve a change of name if satisfied that the change is in the child's best interests.

If the parents of a child (for whatever reason) cannot exercise their parental responsibilities, the child's guardian may apply for registration of a change of the child's name.

Clause 26: Child's consent to change of name

A change of a child's name must not be registered unless the child consents to the change or is unable to understand the meaning and implications of the change.

Clause 27: Registration of change of name

Before registering a change of name the Registrar may require evidence of certain matters specified in this clause.

The clause also provides that a change of name under another law or by court order may be registered under this Act and that the Registrar may refuse to register a change of name if the proposed name is prohibited.

Clause 28: Entries to be made in the Register

Registration of a change of name consists of making an entry in the Register containing the particulars prescribed by the regulations. The Registrar may also, if requested, note a change of name in the entry in the Register relating to the person's birth, in which case a birth certificate issued by the Registrar for the person must show the person's name as changed under this Part. There is also provision for requesting an interstate Registrar to similarly note a change where a person's birth is registered in that Registrar's jurisdiction.

Clause 29: Change of name may still be established by repute or usage

This clause specifies that this Part does not prevent a change of name by repute or usage.

PART 5
REGISTRATION OF MARRIAGES

Clause 30: Cases in which registration of marriage is required

Marriages solemnised in the State must be registered under the Act.

Clause 31: How to have marriage registered

A marriage is registered by lodging a certificate under the *Marriage Act 1961* of the Commonwealth or, if the marriage occurred before the commencement of that Act, the evidence of the marriage required by the Registrar.

Clause 32: Registration of marriage

A marriage may be registered by including the marriage certificate or particulars of the marriage in the Register.

PART 6
REGISTRATION OF DEATHS
DIVISION 1—CASES WHERE REGISTRATION OF DEATH IS REQUIRED OR AUTHORISED

Clause 33: Deaths to be registered under this Act

The Registrar must register deaths occurring in the State and deaths that a court or coroner (of any State or the Commonwealth) directs him or her to register.

The Registrar may register a death that has occurred in an aircraft or vessel travelling to a place of disembarkation in the State or the death, outside the Commonwealth, of a person domiciled or ordinarily resident in the State or who leaves property in the State. However, the Registrar is not obliged to register deaths in these categories if they are registered under a corresponding law.

Still-births are not to be registered as deaths under this Part.

DIVISION 2—COURT ORDERS RELATING TO REGISTRATION OF DEATH

Clause 34: Application to Court

This clause specifies that a person may apply to the Magistrates Court for an order relating to the registration of a death.

Clause 35: Power to direct registration of death, etc.

If, in the course of any proceedings, a South Australian court or coroner finds that a person's death is not registered or is incompletely or incorrectly registered (whether under South Australian or interstate law) the court or coroner may make appropriate directions.

DIVISION 3—NOTIFICATION OF DEATHS

Clause 36: Notification of deaths by doctors

This clause provides that doctors must, in certain circumstances, notify the Registrar of deaths and provide the Registrar, and the person who will be disposing of the remains, with a death certificate. The maximum penalty for failure to comply with any part of the section is a fine of $1250.

Clause 37: Notification by coroner

This clause provides for the coroner to give notice of certain matters to the Registrar and provides that the Registrar may register a death even though it is subject to coronial inquiry.

Clause 38: Notification by funeral director, etc.

This clause provides for the Registrar to receive notices relating to the disposal of human remains.

DIVISION 4—REGISTRATION OF DEATH

Clause 39: Registration

Registration of a death consists of making an entry in the Register containing the particulars prescribed by the regulations. If necessary, the Registrar may register a death on the basis of incomplete particulars.

PART 7
THE REGISTER
DIVISION 1—KEEPING THE REGISTER

Clause 40: The Register

The Registrar must maintain the Register, which may be in the form of a computer data base or any other form the Registrar thinks fit. The Register must, however, be indexed so that the information contained in it is reasonably accessible.

DIVISION 2—REGISTRAR'S POWERS OF INQUIRY

Clause 41: Registrar's powers of inquiry

The Registrar may conduct an inquiry to gain information about registrable events and may, by notice, require a person to answer specified questions or to provide other information within a time and in a way specified in the notice. Failure to comply with a notice is an offence punishable by a maximum fine of $1250.

DIVISION 3—CORRECTION OF REGISTER

Clause 42: Correction of Register

The Registrar may correct the Register and must correct it if required by a court.

DIVISION 4—ACCESS TO, AND CERTIFICATION OF, REGISTER ENTRIES

Clause 43: Access to Register

The Registrar may allow a person or organisation that has an adequate reason access to the Register or information extracted from the Register.

In deciding whether an applicant has an adequate reason the Registrar must have regard to the nature of the applicant's interest, the sensitivity of the information, the use to be made of the information and any other relevant factors.

In deciding the conditions on which access or information is to be given, the Registrar must, as far as practicable, protect the persons to whom the entries in the Register relate from unjustified intrusion on their privacy.

Clause 44: Search of Register

This clause provides that a person may apply to the Registrar for a search of the Register for an entry about a particular registrable event. The applicant must, however, have an adequate reason for wanting the information to which the application relates. In deciding whether an applicant has an adequate reason the Registrar must consider the relationship (if any) between the applicant and the person to whom the information relates, the age and contents of the entry and any other relevant factors.

Clause 45: Protection of privacy

In providing information extracted from the Register, the Registrar must, as far as practicable, protect the persons to whom the entries in the Register relate from unjustified intrusion on their privacy.

Clause 46: Issue of certificate
This clause provides for the issue of certificates by the Registrar certifying particulars contained in an entry or that no entry was located in the Register about the relevant registrable event.

Clause 47: Access policies
The Registrar must maintain a written statement of the policies on which access to information contained in the Register is to be given or denied and must give a copy of the statement, on request, to any person.

Clause 48: Fees
The regulations may prescribe fees, or a basis for calculating fees, for the various services provided by the Registrar.

The regulations may allow for fees to be fixed by negotiation between the Registrar and the person who asks for the relevant services.

Clause 49: Power to remit fees
The Registrar may remit the whole or part of a fee.

PART 8
GENERAL POWER OF REVIEW

Clause 50: Review
A person may apply to the Magistrates Court for a review of a decision by the Registrar.

PART 9
MISCELLANEOUS

Clause 51: False representation
This clause makes it an offence punishable by a maximum fine of $1250 to knowingly make a false or misleading representation in an application or document under the Act.

Clause 52: Unauthorised access to or interference with Register
This clause provides offences relating to unauthorised access to or interference with the Register. The maximum penalty under the clause is a fine of $10 000 or imprisonment for 2 years.

Clause 53: Falsification of certificate, etc.
This clause provides offences for forging the Registrar's signature or seal ($10 000 or imprisonment for 2 years) and forging or falsifying a certificate or other document under the Act ($10 000 or imprisonment for 2 years).

The clause also gives the Registrar power to impound certain documents.

Clause 54: Immunity from liability
This clause provides for immunity from liability for the Registrar.

Clause 55: Regulations
The Governor may make regulations for the purposes of the Act. Regulations may impose a penalty not exceeding $1250.

SCHEDULE 1

Repeal and Transitional

This schedule repeals the *Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1966* and provides transitional provisions allowing for the continuation of the Register maintained under that Act and the continuation in office of the Principal Registrar and deputy registrar.

SCHEDULE 2

Amendment of Coroners Act 1975

This schedule makes various consequential amendments to the *Coroners Act 1975*.

SCHEDULE 3

Amendment of Cremation Act 1891

This schedule makes various consequential amendments to the *Cremation Act 1891*.

Mr CLARKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

LIQUOR LICENSING (DISCIPLINARY ACTION) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): 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 several technical adjustments to the *Liquor Licensing Act 1985* relating to the disciplinary powers of the Licensing Court.

It rectifies an existing deficiency in the Act whereby disciplinary actions can only be maintained against existing licensees.

The amendments will result in the ability of the Licensing Court to discipline persons other than only existing licensees, for instance, approved or former approved managers, persons who occupy or have occupies positions of authority in bodies corporate holding licences and persons directly deriving financial benefit from a liquor licence.

There will now be the option of a maximum fine of $15 000 and an extended ability for the Licensing Court to impose periods of suspension and disqualification from being approved or licensed under the Act.

Provision is also made for a person occupying a position of authority in a licensed body corporate to be vicariously liable to disciplinary action for misconduct on the part of the licensed body subject to the defence that the person could not have prevented the misconduct by the exercise of real diligence.

Explanation of Clauses

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1: Short title
This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement
This clause provides for the measure to be brought into operation by proclamation.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 83—Rights of intervention
Section 83 of the principal Act currently authorises intervention by the Commissioner of Police in proceedings before a licensing authority to introduce evidence or make representations as to whether a person is a fit and proper person to hold a licence. Section 83 is amended so that the provision relates not just to the licensing of a person but also to the approval of a person to occupy a position of authority in a licensed body corporate, approval as a manager of licensed premises and approval under section 106(4)*(c)* as a person who may derive profits from a licensed business.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 106—Prohibition of profit sharing
Section 106 of the principal Act provides for approval by the licensing authority of a person who may receive profits or proceeds under some agreement or arrangement with a licensee. The clause amends this provision so that it is clear that such a person must be a fit and proper person in order to be so approved.

Clause 5: Substitution of Part 8

PART 8
DISCIPLINARY ACTION

Part 8 currently deals with disciplinary action against licensees only.

124. Persons to whom Part applies

This proposed new section will allow disciplinary action to be taken against a wider range of persons—

(a) a person who is or has been licensed or approved under the Act;

(b) a person who has sold liquor without a licence;

(c) a person who occupies or has occupied a position of authority in a licensed body corporate or a body corporate that has sold liquor without a licence;

(d) a person who supervises or manages or has supervised or managed a business conducted in pursuance of a licence or a business in the course of which liquor has been sold without a licence;

(e) a person who, as an unlicensed person, has acted contrary to section 106 (sharing in the profits of a licensed business).

125. Cause for disciplinary action

This proposed new section retains the existing grounds for disciplinary action against a person but adds the following further grounds:

- if any licensing or approval of the person under the Act has been improperly obtained;
- if the person is or has been licensed or approved under the Act but is not a fit and proper person.

The grounds for disciplinary action have been recast so that they may apply to the range of persons set out in proposed new section 124 and not just to licensees.

As under the current section, a complaint may be lodged with the Court setting out matters that are alleged to constitute grounds for disciplinary action under this Part.

The replacement provision as to the persons who may lodge complaints on various specified grounds is the same in effect as the current provision.

Subclause (4) is a new provision intended to make it clear that a complaint may be lodged and disciplinary action taken against a person in respect of conduct that constitutes an offence despite the fact that the person has not been prosecuted for the offence.

125A. Disciplinary action

Proposed new section 125A deals with the orders that may be made if the Court, on the hearing of a complaint, is satisfied on the balance of probabilities that there is proper cause for taking disciplinary action against the person to whom the complaint relates.

As under the current provision, the Court may, in the case of a person licensed under the Act, add to, or alter, the conditions of the licence.

The Court is given power to suspend or revoke an approval of a person in addition to the power, as under the current provision, to suspend or revoke a licence.

The new clause retains the power to reprimand a person. It also adds further powers to impose a fine not exceeding $15 000 on a person and to disqualify a person from being licensed or approved under the Act.

Provision is made so that the Court may determine the period of operation of disciplinary orders and may vary an order imposing a suspension or disqualification.

Subclause (3) makes it clear that if a person has been found guilty of an offence and the circumstances of the offence form, in whole or in part, the subject matter of the complaint, the person is not liable to a fine under a disciplinary order in respect of the same conduct.

The new clause repeats the provisions contained in subsections (2) and (3) of the current section 125 dealing with disciplinary orders.

Clause 6: Substitution of s. 135

135. Vicarious liability for offences or misconduct by bodies corporate

Current section 135 provides that if a body corporate is guilty of an offence against this Act, the directors and the manager of the body corporate are each guilty of an offence and liable to the same penalty as is prescribed for the principal offence. The new provision extends this to all persons in a position of authority (as defined in section 4(5) of the principal Act) and adds that it will be a defence if it is proved that the person could not, by the exercise of reasonable diligence, have prevented the commission of the offence by the body corporate.

The proposed new section also provides for vicarious liability in relation to disciplinary action so that if there is proper cause for disciplinary action against a body corporate under Part 8, there will be proper cause for disciplinary action under that Part against each person occupying a position of authority in the body corporate unless it is proved that the person could not, by the exercise of reasonable diligence, have prevented the misconduct constituting the cause for disciplinary action against the body corporate.

Mr CLARKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

WORKERS REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION (SGIC) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 November. Page 783.)

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): The Opposition has no great problem with this legislation. Essentially, we take the view, as the Government does, that it is consequential legislation, given what has happened to SGIC over the past 12 to 15 months. In fact, SGIC was an important component in the WorkCover arrangements in the middle 1980s emanating eventually into SGIC taking a more back seat role with the creation of the WorkCover Corporation. Whilst I could make a number of comments on that corporation and its role over the last so many years, it is not within the scope of this Bill to enter into that debate today. I would be remiss if I did not say that workers' compensation insurance would have been better off had it stayed with SGIC. This gives the House some inklings of my view of the WorkCover Corporation, which is not shared by some of my colleagues. But then I have had a lot more experience dealing with some of the half truths and lack of information that has come out of that corporation over many years.

Having made those remarks, I believe it is essential that the legislative deck be cleared, so to speak, so that we can proceed with Workcover in South Australia and so that all the obligations of SGIC can be discharged prior to its sale.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer): I thank the member for Playford for his support of the Bill. As he rightly pointed out, this was a matter that was previously mentioned in relation to the changes that would take place consequential upon the sale of SGIC. There has been a reserve fund set aside. There is the issue of claims management, which does not naturally reside with the Motor Accident Commission. It is important to take it out of that operation. It has no synergies and no relevance to the CTP fund or to the tail of SGIC, which will be managed under the MAC. I thank the member for Playford for his support of this Bill.

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

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 November. Page 737.)

Ms HURLEY (Napier): Mr Acting Speaker, I am not the lead speaker in this debate. This Bill is an interesting example of the way in which the Government is operating in its first term of office. The Bill is a very bungled attempt to achieve what the Government has wanted to do. About two minutes ago I saw a whole series of Government amendments to this Bill which cut, chop and change its nature considerably. I have not had time to digest all the amendments, but I was aware that some changes would need to be made to the Bill, because the Government has gone about it in the wrong way.

In the fashion of many Ministers, this Minister has talked about what he proposes to do. In the so-called consultative phase he has let people have their say and then seemingly ignored what they have said, allowed the drawing up of a mish-mash of a Bill and tried to put it quickly through the House to avoid any proper scrutiny. The Bill was introduced late last year and was through the second reading stage before a number of concerned groups, including the Conservation Council of Australia—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: This is the second reading stage now.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Becker): Order!

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier has the floor.

Ms HURLEY: It had reached that stage before a number of interested groups, including the Conservation Council of Australia, had had a proper chance to look at it. Had the draft Bill been circulated previously, the Government would not have had to come back with a page and a half of amendments. People who are deeply concerned, interested and knowledgeable about these issues would have had a chance to point out the Government's mistakes. But, no, it is introduced in this bungled form and we have to be on the ball to make sure that such legislation does not go through.

We have taken the opportunity to consult the interested groups about what the Bill should encompass. Even though the Government might be prepared to chop and change the

Bill and eliminate some of the worst mistakes, basically it boils down to the fact that the Government has thrown away the chance to put in a series of very positive changes which would benefit our parks and reserves. The Government had a chance, through the report of the Living Resources Committee, to do something really valuable, but it has wasted that chance and put offside a number of interested groups and individuals who were willing to work with it in setting the future direction for our national parks.

The basic issue is that the Government has failed to consult and take the opportunity to do something worth while, because it does not have the commitment to the environment and to national parks that it claims to have.

Members interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: I am laughing at the series of amendments that was handed to me and seeing how much the Government has had to back down on the initial Bill. I should not laugh, because it is not a joke, as national parks are very important to every person in this State. Most people maintain a strong interest in what is happening in national parks and want to see something done in an ordered and responsible way, not the way that the Government has gone about it.

The Government has pursued a number of agendas in this Bill, including seeking almost to privatise our national parks in its rush not to have to commit any Government money to our parks, but to seek private sponsorship and support for them. It seems to me that there is nothing in this Bill that cannot be achieved in existing legislation by way of culling and harvesting. I am not sure what the Government is attempting to do, because it has not clearly stated what it is attempting to do. The Government has used bureaucratic clauses and phrases and chopped and changed its position, so it is difficult to see what its intentions might have been. We do not know whether the indications from the initial Bill to allow private companies to harvest resources from national parks was intended or whether it was a consequence of its own ineptitude.

The Opposition is supportive of changes to the way that our national parks are managed; we understand that we need to improve the way that our resources and national parks are managed. We shall be interested to hear the Government's explanation of the amendments that I have just seen. We shall be looking at the Bill very carefully in its passage through this House. Also, our colleagues in the other place may introduce further amendments to tidy up this appalling Bill.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): I particularly want to participate in this debate because this Bill threatens the very reasons for the national parks and reserves established and managed under the National Parks and Wildlife Act in South Australia. The prime purpose of the National Parks and Wildlife Act is to preserve and manage our natural ecosystems, and the Opposition will not support any amendments to the Act which undermine its fundamental purpose. It has taken generations and many years of foresight to establish the system of parks and reserves which now covers 20 million hectares, or one-fifth of the State.

The Labor Party recognises the growing demand for resources to manage these areas and to address issues such as endangered species, pest plants and feral animals. The Opposition is not opposed in principle to increasing the level of funds derived from national parks, nor to dealing with the private sector to facilitate this, but only in the context of increasing funds for the maintenance and extension of national parks without compromising the very values that the parks system exists to protect. The Labor Party will not support plans to focus the management of our reserves on commercial outcomes at the expense of short and long-term environmental goals.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is interesting that we are getting some negative comments from the Liberal side of the Chamber. As founder of the South Australian Youth Conservation Corps a few years ago, I stood with David Suzuki in a national parks system at Para Wirra and launched a scheme designed to involve young unemployed people in working to enhance what the national parks clear purpose was, namely, to preserve and protect. That is why he agreed to be the patron of this scheme and why David Bellamy, the British ecologist, agreed to be one of the patrons of the scheme: they could see that we were involving young people in assisting the national parks system to become better and to perform their fundamental task, namely, to preserve and protect.

If these amendments are passed, the focus of the Act will change; the management of reserves will no longer have the preservation of the natural environment as its primary goal but will be compromised by the need to make decisions to harvest our reserves for profit. That is why I hope common sense will emerge in discussions both in this place and in the Upper House.

The thrust of this Bill is to generate income from the reserves to replace funding cuts by the Brown Government. In its first budget this Liberal Government cut the budget for the Department of Environment and Natural Resources by $6.4 million. The management of national parks took a cut of $813 000. We are hearing a lot of nonsense. We are going to talk about bringing in the commercial sector with a bit of sponsorship here and there. It is really about not thinking of ways of increasing what we are doing in the parks but compensating for a Liberal Party cut into our national parks system and into the protection of our environment. That is what this Bill is all about. It is about a top up because of previous cuts.

The Bill is indicative of the 'Give it to the private sector' ethos of this Government. We have seen it with water, health and public transport and now we are seeing it with national parks. With these amendments we are seeing the thin end of the wedge. It is all being dressed up with, 'We want to get them involved—a bit of harvesting here, a bit of farming there and a bit of sponsorship here'. Again, it is the thin end of the wedge. As with health, education and water, Labor believes that the continuing protection of our parks and reserves for future generations is one of the fundamentals of Government. Our national parks and reserves have been the means by which we as a community sought to set aside our valued natural ecosystems to protect them in perpetuity.

The reserves system is designed to ensure that large areas of the natural environment remain undisturbed so that the ecological balance is maintained for generations to come. It is not a source of profit and it is not a supply of native flora and fauna to be sold off when convenient. Our national parks cannot be seen as some kind of natural quarry for the private sector. This is the shared view of our community about our national parks. It does not, however, appear to be shared by the Government which, with this Bill, signals that the reserves system will be up for grabs if not now in the future.

In the past 18 months there have been two major reports on the future of our environment. One is the national parks review and the other is the interim report of the joint commit-

tee of this Parliament into living resources. Both made many recommendations for improvements to the reserves system. Both have been ignored in this Bill. The first recommendation of the Joint Committee on Living Resources was that the conservation and development of South Australia's living resources take place within a policy framework formed on the principles of ecologically sustainable development. This Bill gives no such commitment. For the Government, apparently profit is the most important motive, regardless of the long-term cost. This Bill threatens the values of the system, and the Opposition will be moving amendments to the Bill when introduced in the Legislative Council.

I will turn to those sections of the Bill designed by the Government to systematically undermine the fundamental values of the reserves system with the apparent concepts of parks for private profit. First, I will talk about changes to the advisory committee. The Bill seeks to replace the Reserves Advisory Committee with a South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Council. Although the Government argues that this follows from a recommendation in the national parks review to revamp the advisory committee, the composition of the new council is not that recommended by the review. The Government has worded this Bill so that business and user interest could dominate the council. Perhaps the Government wants a council dominated by business views to recommend that some sections of the reserves system should be privatised.

The emphasis of the recommended composition of the committee in the parks review was knowledge and experience of wildlife and ecosystems, a field of science that is of importance to the environment, implementation of policy relating to the environment, and agriculture as it relates to conservation and experience in the education and management of parks visitors.

This Bill uses terms like 'financial management', 'marketing' and 'business management'. If you look at each type of experience required in the Bill, it is obvious that the descriptions are so vague that it would be possible to have the committee made up of people hand picked by the Minister to give the sort of advice he wants to hear. This suspicion is reinforced by the listing of the functions of the council, which includes the development and marketing of commercial activities within the reserves system and reinforces the thrust of the Bill towards making money out of the State's ecological resources. It raises with me the fear that down the track we will be looking bit by bit, in a piecemeal way, towards partial privatisation of parts of the parks system.

It is quite clear that business interests have a lot to offer in the management of the reserves system, but we are seeing a major change in focus. Let us have some business expertise, but not to dominate. The sort of advice must not replace the valuable experience brought by scientists and experts in environment policy and implementation. This Bill is clumsy. It might be that I am assuming foul motive on the part of the Government. That would surprise me with this Minister because, having served with him on the Public Works Committee some years ago, I thought that he was a fairer minded person. The point is that some of the clauses in this Bill were put past the Minister, and that is why he will withdraw them. There was a clear intent to open up our parks for greater environmental degradation.

This Bill was a clumsy attempt to skew the council's composition, and amendments in the Legislative Council will seek to redress this balance in order to make the council more representative of the community's concern for the future of the reserves system. There are similar concerns about the advisory and consultative committees. The advisory committees are asked to advise on, amongst other things, the possibilities of private sector sponsorship for the management of reserves and wildlife. The defining issue should be that committees be established to serve the long-term end of preserving and protecting natural ecosystems. I place on record today that national parks under a future Labor Government will be about that: the long-term end of preserving and protecting natural ecosystems.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Opposition's amendments will bring safeguards to ensure that this purpose remains primary.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We have the Minister getting himself all inflamed and agitated. Let us look at changing the status of reserves. People are rushing around the environment community saying, 'We didn't really mean it—it was all a mistake.' What a lot of hogwash! The Government has indicated to some community groups, in the face of their opposition, that it will drop the clauses referring to changing the status of the reserves. The fact that those clauses were ever introduced in draft form, got signed off by this Minister in a Cabinet submission which detailed the clauses and which was endorsed by Cabinet and then put to this Parliament is an enormous discredit to this Government and basically reveals what it is all about and what it stands for. Those clauses were a blatant attempt to remove the authority from the Parliament and give it to the Minister.

The Act currently demands that all changes to the status of reserves or the declaration of new reserves must go through both Houses of Parliament, and that is the way it should be and the way it will always remain. But this Minister brought into the Parliament a Bill that sought to go around the edge of Parliament; to ignore Parliament, just as this Government has done in so many areas, including the water contract—sign the contract and no legislation, but he was caught out. The Minister says, 'It was all innocent. It was all a mistake.' That is an absolute untruth—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —by this Minister. The Bill sought to remove the power from Parliament and grant it to the Minister if the state of the reserve was to be changed. Two major problems arise with this: first, the Labor Party is committed in principle to matters of importance being debated in Parliament. We believe that this is the democratic way to decide on issues of significance to the State, and the changing of the status of reserves is certainly one of those issues. That the Government proposes to remove such power and grant it to a single Minister—a Minister who has not proven to be tough in the face of Cabinet opposition—is disquieting and in line with the secretive manner in which the Brown Government has gone about privatising the management of Adelaide's water system and outsourcing the Government's information technology.

The second problem is that changing the status of reserves is not as simple as upgrading one to another. Let me remind the Minister if he does not know: national parks, conservation parks, recreation parks, game reserves and regional reserves all serve different purposes, and it is inappropriate simply to put one above the other. This is highlighted by the issue of joint proclamation, which is a mechanism by which, when a new national or conservation park is declared, it can be

simultaneously declared to be available for exploration and mining. A national or conservation park cannot be opened up for this activity after it has been proclaimed: it can only be done simultaneously.

A number of conservation parks are currently protected from mining. This Bill contends that a national park is more highly protected than a conservation park, and that the Minister could therefore simply declare that a conservation park be upgraded to a national park. Here is the danger of the Bill: nothing prevents the Minister then jointly proclaiming that piece of land when constituting it as a national park, and all this could be done without any parliamentary debate. It was a sinister motive and it was deliberate. I am not surprised that certain members of the community were outraged by this proposal.

I have been told that the Minister has pleaded ignorance about this consequence, and I am astonished that he claims that neither he nor his advisers are sufficiently familiar with their own Act to realise what their Bill was proposing. If not only are these clauses removed by the Government but also an undertaking given that no attempt will be made by this Government in the future to reintroduce these clauses, then they will be certainly opposed by the Opposition in this House, in the Upper House and by people in the community.

A large section of the Bill is devoted to farming, harvesting and culling native flora and fauna. The uses to which our native wildlife may be put is a vexed issue. The farming of native animals, meaning that protected species are bred and kept in a form of controlled captivity for selling meat or other products, is and will continue to be a growth industry. It is, however, of paramount importance that the effect of the farms on the native populations and the surrounding environment be assessed accurately. The two major issues are that the source of the farm animals be independent of wild populations, that is, that farms not be continuously restocking from the wild, and that the land use for the farm not have any adverse impact on the quality of the environment.

This Bill contains a clause that would permit a trial farm to operate for six years with a draft management plan only, and for three years with no management plan at all. This opens up the possibility of serious damage being done either to the environment or to the population before any assessment has been undertaken. The harvesting of native animals is entirely separate to their farming and to culling. While culling is a management tool used only when the stresses of a population on their environment call for it, harvesting exists for the sole purpose of making a profit out of the products of killing wild animals.

This Bill, however, refers only to harvesting, which is the potential to establish profit-driven industry motives on the killing of native wildlife, and we must obtain real assurances from this Minister and protection in this Act that that never happens. That must never be the motive for harvesting; it must never be a profit motive for harvesting. We must ensure that the protection of the environment and the habitat comes first. The danger is that, if we went down that track, as populations vary from year to year the Government may be pressured to permit the taking of native animals even when there are insufficient numbers, because industry will have developed expectations of regular income and market.

We do not want to see that, and I would like to hear the Minister today categorically say that that will never happen. The Opposition will be giving some consideration to options where the carcasses of animals culled from national parks can be sold in order not to waste them where appropriate, at the same time ensuring that industry is not driving the culling or harvesting process.

This Bill also allows for the collection of native vegetation for the purposes of making a sale. The example given in the Minister's second reading speech is that of broom bush for brush fencing. In his speech, the Minister said that it was possible to harvest this as a renewable resource. Again, the Opposition has many doubts about the advisability of creating an industry around a wild-growing plant with unpredictable growth patterns and cycles. I am not convinced that the safeguards of the Bill are sufficient to prevent over exploitation of native vegetation. As always, the principle must be that the integrity of the reserve system comes before any other consideration. That is something I would like to see the Minister embrace today publicly and in this forum, where it is required for Ministers to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

The final area of concern for me is the clause which permits the Governor, i.e., Executive Council, i.e., Cabinet, to alter the list of threatened species simply by regulation. The South Australian record of extinction of native species requires the protection of endangered species to be a matter of public concern. The Opposition will be proposing amendments that allow for full public consultation about any change to that list.

In conclusion, I want to reiterate the commitment the Labor Party has to the natural environment, the expansion of our reserves and parks system under Labor Governments, and our deep concern about any attempts by the Government to treat it as a source of profit for the private sector, either now or in the future. The continuing protection and management of the reserve system in South Australia requires careful planning and not simplistic amendments to the Act.

The Opposition will oppose any attempt by the Government to remove the powers of Parliament over these matters. The South Australian community has a reasonable expectation that politicians will secure our natural resources for the good of many generations to come and we intend to fulfil that expectation. I am quite happy for people with private sector backgrounds to be involved. I am quite happy to look, at least, at the options about harvesting, but the point is that the focus of this Bill moves away from the primary focus of national parks, and that is to preserve and protect.

I am very pleased that my plans for the Youth Conservation Corp went to all other States in this nation and then was adopted nationally. I am also pleased that other political Parties have sought to adopt such a framework. But when we are back in Government and I invite my good friend David Suzuki to return to Adelaide to speak at the launch of the next Youth Conservation Corp, I want to be able to tell him that our national parks are driven by the protection of species and not by profit motives that, in a fundamental way, alter the very purpose of the parks.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): That was certainly an interesting contribution by the Leader of the Opposition. In fact, it is one of the few times in the two years in which I have been in this Parliament that I have heard him even talk about environmental issues. We understand why. I would like to put on the public record that, whilst the Leader of the Opposition often is a competent debater and does not have to use notes because he is well aware of the content that he wants to deliver, in this instance I noted with interest that he had to read word for word almost the whole of his speech.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. It is interesting that the honourable member is reflecting on this side of the House, but at least I can read.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Becker): There is no point of order. I warn members about frivolous points of order.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Thank you for your protection, Mr Acting Speaker. Let us get on with the job that we are here for today. The fact of the matter is that the Labor Opposition in this State knows that for the past two years the Government has gained far more credibility and gone far further than it ever thought a Liberal Government would when it comes to conservation issues. Let us think of some of the things that this Government has done in the short term in which it has been in office. Let us look at things such as addressing the degradation and salinity of the soil, water catchment management policies in the metropolitan area and now along the Murray River, the fact that this Government led and drove nationally the direction for the protection of the Darling Basin, and the fact that it has been very serious about looking at things such as litter and the micro and macro areas of conservation in the environment of this State. That is what this Bill is all about.

We know what the previous Government's record was when it came to national parks and conservation. It did a fine job of buying land. The Leader of the Opposition said that we now have 20 million hectares (in other words, one-fifth) of this State as national parks. On the surface, that may sound like a significantly good record, but what happened to those national parks and that land during the past 13 years of the previous Government? There has been nothing but degradation. There have been enormous problems with vermin and pest plants, and very few resources have been put into trying to handle that one-fifth of this State which is under the total direction, control and management of the State Government. Let us also put on the public record the fact that, over and above that, we must redress the economic debacle that we inherited and, at the same time, correct this State's financial mess. Clearly, there has been an absolute lack of resource when it comes to looking after our environment and national parks in this State.

The Leader of the Opposition and other members opposite say that in no way should there be any private involvement whatever in national parks and the environment. I ask them: show me one good reason why there should not be? For argument's sake, has the Leader of the Opposition ever been to Kruger National Park in South Africa? That is just one example. We all know of the difficulties that have occurred in South Africa, economically and in other ways, but Kruger National Park receives major input from the private sector. In fact, the Vaucross Bank is the No. 1 sponsor of Kruger National Park. It has reached a point where it has built diverse and enormous accommodation and information infrastructure in the Kruger National Park.

If you drive through Kruger National Park as a tourist—and I might add that you are allowed to drive through less than one-fifth of that park—you will see no degradation and very little in the way of vermin and pest plants. You will see that, whilst it is the second-most visited national park in the world, it is on the improve. Why? Because the Government of South Africa and the private sector have combined to improve the environment in South Africa. I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition and any member who does not believe me that they should use some of their travel allowance and go there for themselves to see what has happened.

What has happened is that the profits that have been generated by that infrastructure investment through the Vaucross Bank and, I might add, other companies, including recycling manufacturers and the like, have gone directly into improving and enhancing that park. On top of that, four-fifths of the park is kept totally away from the public. That four-fifths is used for animal breeding programs, research and improving the whole of the national park. Surely that is a good thing. Why should we not do that in this State? Why cannot we as human beings work together with the biodiversity and ecology of this State to improve it and reap the benefits that will provide a win-win situation for both?

I should also like to touch on another point. Professor John Walmsley of the Warrawong Sanctuary is another classic case of a person who had to lead the way because the previous Government under Susan Lenehan neglected the maintenance, management and care of the parks and did very little to look after endangered species. Along came John Walmsley, whom I know personally. He said to me, 'Robert, something must be done to get these endangered species looked after, and I can do it on a commercial basis.' That man left university to take on this dream and turn it into reality—and reality indeed it is. The fact is that now there is an ecotourism development operation that is increasing all the time. Private investors are buying shares and the environment is improving. Endangered species are being brought back and a good job is being done for South Australia.

It is a sensible solution. These sorts of proposals will preserve and manage and, most importantly, allow community involvement in the management, care and direction of our parks to increase, something which I believe is a commendable act by the Minister who is accepted throughout the conservation community as one who cares passionately for his portfolio and has a particular interest in making sure at all times that he consults. That is why this Bill was tabled before the last session of Parliament went into recess, and that is why this Bill sat there over the Christmas break: to allow the community at large to look at what the Minister put down in black and white, no innuendo and no ifs and buts. The draft Bill was tabled in the Parliament, and the people were allowed to have a good look at it.

There has been plenty of consultation on this Bill. I am a member of the Minister's backbench committee in a portfolio area for which I also have a passion, particularly from the point of view of a farmer who understands how important the environment is. The committee is always consulting, and the Minister's door is always open for consultation on the environment. However, the fact of the matter is that this legislation will bring more and more people into consultation. Look at the people down my way such as The Friends of the Onkaparinga National Park. They know—it is on the public record—and the people in the southern region know what a great job those friends have done. This sort of Bill that we are debating now will allow those groups to have more input into the direction of that park. We cannot lock up everything and expect to see it looked after. Why should we? Why cannot the people of South Australia be given the opportunity to enjoy the environment for which they pay enormous taxes as well as protect it?

Members should drive around the greater part of this State, go to the Simpson Desert and places such as the southern end of Hindmarsh Island and many other areas and have a look at what we can experience on our doorstep. It is as good as

the Kruger National Park, but we have locked up so much of it and not talked about it, we have not got involved properly in ecotourism, and we have not been able to show people that in South Australia we are the outback, we are the environment, and we have a lot to offer. By doing that, we will be able to create jobs—we all know that we need jobs—and that will help to reinstate the economy. Once we get the economy reinstated, surpluses which will be on our doorstep in South Australia by 1997, 1998 or 1999 will be able to go into those crucial areas to allow further improvement of our national parks and wildlife.

In essence, that is what this Bill is all about. As the Treasurer said today, in a nutshell this Bill is about consulting more of the community regarding the development of national parks and wildlife. It is also about creating new jobs—real jobs—and about creating an opportunity on the export market in relation to native plants and animals. Unfortunately, we have seen what can happen; for example, Outback Foods, which now suffers because of the calicivirus. We should look at what it was able to do just with one animal that was considered to be a pest. This Bill will create a future in respect of products derived from kangaroos, emus, and so on; and much of the profit from that can go back into further development of the parks.

The Leader of the Opposition said that he was not happy with the composition of the new National Parks and Wildlife Council. Four out of the seven persons appointed must have qualifications and experience on the conservation of animals and plants; on the management of reserve land; on the management of natural resources; and on organising community involvement. I would have thought that they are the four fundamental elements needed for a council to work with the Minister and the Government of the day to look after the future of the parks. On top of that, it is proposed that a couple of people have some qualifications or experience in ecologically-based tourism, and some business, financial and marketing management. What is wrong with that? Out of the seven people, only two are required to have that.

Irrespective of whether we are setting up an environment council, a board to administer a welfare agency or a board to develop the State economically, we must have some people who have those abilities. In the past, the problem with the previous Government was that it ignored all those basic principles of setting up any council. It always said, 'We must have one of our union mates.' Union mates might have a bit to do when it comes to industrial relations or whatever, but what do the unions know about national parks? If the union movement was setting this up, it would have two or three people running around looking at national parks who did not have a clue about the development and best interests of the environment and the national parks and wildlife in this State.

The South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Council will be responsible for certain functions: planning of research and wildlife; funding involving sponsorship and the development and marketing of commercial activities; community consultation and participation; public education and promotion of conservation; and advice on the development of policy. I would rather see that sort of enhanced program offered to a council than to the Parliament, because we will get the sorts of expertise and input we need. Many of us in this House—and I include myself in this—do not have that expertise to offer, but we can find the right people in the community who want to get involved in these areas.

We will involve Aboriginal people in the management of the land and wildlife, and what a great achievement that is. There has not been enough direct involvement. Over the years, plenty of lip service has been offered, but in the past there has not been enough true involvement of Aboriginal people—and they know a lot about managing the land and the wildlife. This Bill proposes to make sure that they have a good say.

We have seen what has happened in the Northern Territory with crocodile farming. We know what can happen with emu farming in this State, and this Bill provides an opportunity for that. However, most importantly, it does it within the framework of making sure that three fundamental things always occur when it comes to national parks and wildlife: first, community involvement and control over the direction and development of opportunities; secondly, that there is total accountability (if one reads the Bill, one will see that there is no doubt about that as it will encourage more people to become accountable for once); and, thirdly—and most importantly—it will start to address our terrible dilemma regarding national parks in this State.

I have mentioned some of the good national parks of this State but, when I went to others, I was appalled to see just how degraded they are. Frankly, after looking at them, I believe some of them should never have been made national parks. All they have done is take resources from the budget allocation that should be put into the areas of most importance. Most people would agree with that when they consider how much land we have in that area.

Finally, the Leader of the Opposition talked about getting young people involved in national parks. The innuendo from the Leader of the Opposition is that, under this Bill, we will deny young people the opportunity to be involved. It is absolutely to the contrary: this will broaden the opportunity for young people—and all people, for that matter—to be involved in the future direction of national parks. We will be able to allow opportunities such as SA Green jobs, further developing the LEAP program to which our Government has been so committed. That program is cutting out the olive trees in the Onkaparinga National Park, and it is working with the friends of that park to rebuild fences, and so on.

This is a good, well-rounded Bill. It covers all aspects, and it is one on which I would hope the Opposition will not try to politically point score just because it is rated—by the people I talk to—at probably three out of 10 when it comes to its real interest in the environment. As I said at the beginning of my address, we have gone up in the expectations of most people when it comes to the environment, and the beauty of that also for this State is that there is a lot more good news ahead.

We must not be hamstrung. We must be allowed to create opportunities to produce the jobs that we desperately need in this State to preserve, enhance and give us a solid direction to look after our national parks and wildlife and further develop our ecotourism which, when it suits them, people like to get all warm and fuzzy about. This will create opportunities for direct ecotourism. They are three fundamentals that we can achieve but only if we receive support from the Opposition. So I throw it back to the Opposition. Whilst the Leader of the Opposition wants to politically point score at every opportunity, this is a chance for him to get behind the Minister for Environment and Natural Resources and applaud him on his direction and say this is the sort of chance that we now have to look after our parks for once to improve the opportunities for all South Australians.

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): It gives me great pleasure to support this Bill, which contains provisions that are long overdue for the economic development of our State, and particularly for my electorate of Flinders, while preserving our heritage and valuable flora and fauna. The broad range of experience and qualifications required by the proposed South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Council members should mean a much more innovative and proactive approach to the management of our national parks and the flora and fauna within and outside these parks. The electorate I am privileged to represent has three national parks with 74 000 hectares situated on Kangaroo Island, and 59 000 hectares on Eyre Peninsula. In addition, it has 53 conservation parks, with another 40 000 hectares on Kangaroo Island and 173 000 hectares on Eyre Peninsula. Therefore, I am in a position to be able to comment on parks.

Currently, some of these parks, after years of Labor neglect, are woefully under-utilised and in poor condition. In many of them, vermin and pest plants abound. Aleppo pines, bridle creeper, African daisy, along with foxes, cats and dogs, can be found. This is not the fault of the rangers who, from my observation, are usually dedicated people who have been severely under-resourced in the past, which has hampered them in doing what they know needs to be done. Now that this Government has recognised that these parks are a wonderful resource and are of great value, this will no longer be the case. This Bill will go a long way towards assisting the kind of sustainable development that is required to optimise the potential of these parks, to provide jobs for our people and income that can be used to maintain the parks properly. This can be done, while maintaining the integrity of the parks and ensuring the preservation of the biodiversity within them.

I hope to see sensitive private enterprise developments within some of the parks to help provide the funds necessary to improve the maintenance, and to assist with the tourist development of nearby towns. With the restructuring that has been occurring in farming in my electorate, there is a great need to find alternative employment for people within the country towns or many of the health and educational services will be lost, as their populations decrease. The rangers have already commenced the necessary entrepreneurial development in some of the parks with historic lighthouse keepers' cottages being rented within the parks on Kangaroo Island and, more recently, on Eyre Peninsula. In fact, last month I attended the opening of Donnington cottage in the Lincoln National Park.

Fees are now being charged to enter some of the parks. Parks and their facilities everywhere are being upgraded. In Flinders, councils, farmers, land care groups, friends of the park groups, the Society for Growing Native Plants and even people in Port Lincoln Prison and those on work orders from the courts, to name just a few of the groups, are busy working with a new sense of purpose to help restore our parks and unlock the value which for so long has been overlooked. Fantastic walking trails are being constructed, such as the trail through the Tumby Bay wetlands. Roads are being improved and lookouts such as the lookout at Point Labatt near Streaky Bay are being built. The Bill contains statutory recognition of the consultative committees: 16 of these already exist, with several located within my electorate. These committees will provide the necessary local input to ensure that the people most interested will be able to have input into the management decisions affecting them.

Also, there is provision in the Act for specialist advisory committees to be formed to advise the council, in part, on the management of wild life. Again, my electorate of Flinders is in the forefront of change, with the harvesting and farming of native animals and their management involving sustainable use. Emu farming on Eyre Peninsula is already a reality and on Kangaroo Island we are well on the way to having the first trial farming of wallabies. Harvesting of kangaroos has been undertaken for some time in Australia but, until now, thousands of wallabies on Kangaroo Island have been culled and many left to rot where they dropped. This has been a terrible waste of a resource that I believe this Bill will help to rectify. The leather goods merchant R.M. Williams said that wallaby skins were highly sought after and the company intimated that it could take all available skins from Kangaroo Island.

It has taken us about 200 years to realise that our native flora and fauna have not only commercial promise but also great medicinal value. Within the emu industry numerous products have been developed. One Aboriginal man who visited an emu industry stall at the recent 1996 Tunarama expressed his pleasure at the availability of emu oil. He said his father, an acute arthritis sufferer, used to kill emus and place the unprocessed fat on his joints to relieve the pain. Emu oil is now used as a sport liniment by the Australian Institute of Sport in Canberra. The liniment has been taken to Mexico with the Australian Cycling Team and is used by the 36ers, the Crows and, I believe, by the South Australian Cricket Association. Permits to harvest broombrush, *Melaleuca unicata*, from farms, parks and reserves has produced a viable financial industry based on this renewable resource on Eyre Peninsula and in other areas of the State. The next step is to farm the broombrush instead of relying solely on native stands.

A similar commercial venture has emerged on Kangaroo Island with *thryptomene erica*. The life of these bushes is extended when the branches are cut at flowering and, therefore, the commercial exploitation of this species is beneficial to plants growing in the wild. However, research is already under way to farm it. I am especially proud of the national parks, conservation parks and reserves in my electorate of Flinders. Few places in the world have wilderness areas so easily accessible from towns containing all the services and comforts of modern living. We are only now seeing the tourism potential. It is interesting to note that Flinders contains two of the State's nine tourist regions, and I believe for good reason.

This Bill is a positive move by our State Government to keep up to date with the changing expectations in our communities. Conservation and preservation are covered, while the burgeoning interest in native flora and fauna for farming purposes is also dealt with. I commend the Minister and support the Bill.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): The Leader of the Opposition raised substantial inconsistencies in and concerns about the Bill, and I must say that I support him in that regard. The Leader brought to the attention of the House the arrogance of this Government. He spoke of the report brought down by the Living Resources Committee. As a member of that committee, I want to make a few comments on the Bill. The committee's report was jointly supported by all members of the committee, it is true to say, and the Minister in the House at the moment chaired the committee and will confirm the exhaustive processes and consultation that took place before the report came down and entered the public arena for even further consultation.

The problem that I see with the Bill is that the issues at hand cannot be pushed through in haste, as is being done, because we will certainly repent at leisure. We have a duty to protect our environment. During the committee sittings, issues were raised about the protection of native fauna and flora species, about farming and harvesting and about when culling should take place. Some committee members believed that, without a proper and thorough investigation into those processes, much damage could be done. That view is explained for members who read the report. The Bill also needs to define 'farming' and 'harvesting'. We know what culling means, but farming and harvesting need to be spelt out specifically.

Further, I believe that the comments in the committee's report have been largely ignored in the Bill. As to the issue of private exploitation of natural resources, I believe that the Government has ignored the consultative process. Indeed, I use the words of the honourable member opposite, 'It pays lip service to those processes.' The Bill is driven by profit motives to be derived from natural resources and, frankly, that is unacceptable. We have a responsibility to future generations to ensure that we have proper parks and proper management, and that will come about only by putting in proper consultative processes.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I must say that I was astonished to hear the kind of Machiavellian paranoia that streamed forth from the Leader of the Opposition during his contribution as lead speaker for the Opposition on this measure. It never ceases to amaze me that he can be so inventive of scenarios that put what he wants the public to believe would become reality when, in fact, they are off the planet, out of this world and not anything like reality at all. I offer comment that the remarks might have had some credibility had he been of a mind to say those kinds of things when he was in government, but he did not. The sorts of decisions taken by former Ministers in the last Government—especially the last two Ministers—were quite bizarre in the way they dealt with matters relevant to preserving the natural ecosystems of South Australia through the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the national parks themselves.

They were bizarre in the sense that they failed to recognise the necessity to identify any goals in establishing a national park, for instance. Why on earth did they simply buy up land, leaving intact on that land the populations of invaders, be they feral animals or exotic plants, or both? Why on earth did they buy up land of which they already had an abundance; sufficient to ensure many times over the survival in adequate genetic biodiversity of all the species living in those ecosystem niches on the land they were proclaiming as national parks? By locking up the land, they not only made the proclamation *per se* but the then prevented access.

Without any management plan whatever for the existing national parks, further parks were added. Moreover, they were added in a piecemeal fashion that had no semblance whatever to any necessity and purposes which should have been defined for management practices. Without any reference whatever to that, access was provided for some activities in some places which seemed politically expedient, or at least that is how I have seen it during my 17 years here. Mr Speaker, you and I both know that, if an exotic animal like a sheep eats a blade of grass that happens to be danthonia or that if a goat (which is also an exotic animal) chews a piece of native acacia in a national park, it is considered undesirable by me and by the Opposition at present and when it was in government. Yet that is no less the case when you graze the flowers of native plants to remove the nectar from them using feral bees, or if you allow unrestricted access of other insects to areas where great damage can be done to the ecosystem you seek to preserve.

All these remarks I have made to this Parliament repeatedly over the time I have been here, from the time we were last in government when the current Minister was then Minister, where he sought during his term, toward the end of our time in office, to set up the framework and establish which areas were necessary for each of the purposes for which we dedicate parks (by category) in each locality—the microclimatic niches and variable soil types—and to ensure that there were also sufficient areas provided for people's access, as well as areas which should be locked up away from people.

Whilst a better public understanding of those imperatives developed, I could not get them to develop it in the minds of Susan Lenehan, Kym Mayes or any other nutters on the front bench of the Labor Government when the opportunity to debate them arose on occasions when legislation came before the chamber or in Estimates Committees. They all thought that I was trying to have a go at them, to embarrass them or something, yet on no occasion did I attempt to score points from them. I merely set out to explain what I saw as the scientific imperatives which should provide us with a legitimate basis for the parks network we have in the principles upon which we have established them.

In the first instance, we need to ensure, wherever possible—and it is too late in some cases—that there are adequate areas set aside, whether it is wet land or dry land or a combination of the two where they interface, whether they are ephemeral or not, to secure space for the survival in perpetuity of the species that live there with sufficient biodiversity that it will be secure.

Secondly, we need to provide an adequate area for study. We simply must lock some of it up and make it wilderness. We need to eradicate the feral animals and exotic plants and keep everyone out of there. In my judgment, no-one should be able to get into those areas without a permit to do so, and it might need to take as long as four or five years of careful study to determine whether we should allow that core wilderness to be invaded. We need to keep people out, because they carry weed seeds on their boots and they disturb behaviour. We do not need to know what is going on. In many instances, we may not even know what species are there, be they animals, plants, insects, fungi, bacteria or whatever. They are all an essential part of the fabric of life in that situation and need preservation.

The third category that we need to provide for in national parks is for unstructured, informal activity that is very low impact; such that we go there and study the wildflowers when they are out, if we want to, and study them also when they are not out to see what they look like then. Just because they have flowers on them it may be interesting to look at them at that time, but it does not make them, to my mind, any less interesting when they do not have flowers. Equally, we allow people to watch animals and birds that inhabit those ecosystems and the animals, and provide them with enjoyment that comes from being in communion with nature.

The fourth category is those areas of parks to be set aside for unstructured recreational activity that is not so passive: where people can ride bikes and so on instead of just walking and where tracks are provided for horseriders or vehicles to get around. Finally, there are those parks and the areas within them, such as is the case at Belair, where we also provide

access and facilities for structured activity. I am talking about tennis courts, golf courses, playgrounds and places for children to ride bikes and the like in competition with each other, and so on.

These are all the reasons why we need to have different categories of land use of the area within the parks system, some of them being within national parks, others merely being recreational reserves perhaps. Clearly, they are the reasons we need to apply when we decide the use of land we have dedicated for national parks. Then we must include them in a management plan, area by area. Moving right along from that, this Government is committed to that course of action.

We can then go further than that, and we can learn by looking at what happens in New Zealand or, indeed, closer to home: we can learn what happens for instance in New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria and Tasmania where people pay a fee for access to national parks. Those funds are used not only to finance the cost of payment of salaries for professional staff to manage the people who go there, but also to provide interpretative centres and annual recurrent expenses servicing debt which might have to be incurred in capital works to reduce visitor impact to the point where it is at a desirable and sustainable level.

Let me illustrate my point. We have board walks in our St Kilda mangroves so that people can not only get around but will not damage the mangroves. So, we could have board walks in the Coorong over fragile soils and in areas where the plants cannot sustain very much traffic, yet areas to which people wish to go in great numbers. We cannot allow them to do that if they destroy the place in the process. Furthermore, there should be save places to leave their vehicles and places to put rubbish. We need money to control feral animals such as foxes, cats or other undesirable feral animals that might disturb that ecosystem.

Clearly, the drivel which I heard the Leader putting on the record will come back to haunt him as it demonstrates his measure of incompetence in analysing the policy imperatives that have to be pursued if we want a system of national parks which are sustainable in perpetuity for all the purposes for which we have put them there; a system of national parks which have a comprehensive plan for their management, short and long term; and a system of national parks that provide for all our needs.

Look at the Jenolan Caves and the national park area surrounding them and what it contains. Not only does one pay a fee to get into the caves and to meet the cost of providing a guide—it is more than enough to cover that—but one also has to pay for access whether one goes into the caves or not. Within the national park there are chalets, accommodation and restaurants to feed the day trippers as well as others who want to stay for up to a week or more to enjoy the ambience of those surroundings. It has been like that not just for 10, 20 or more years, but getting on for 100 years. It was the first national park in Australia.

Consider the Goulburn Caves: they are the same. I am not suggesting that it is just caves where we need this kind of thing, but they illustrate for us how we can do it elsewhere. For instance, it is being done in the Alpine National Park. Thredbo Village is in the park and there are high rise buildings, but they are controlled as to where they can be erected, the materials from which they can be made and the architectural styles of their form and structure. There are other facilities such as chairlifts, and so on, so that the recreational activities of all different categories of visitors can be better provided for.

I illustrate my point further by referring not just to chairlifts, steps, and so on, but to the enormous length of steel pavement (more than six kilometres long) from the top of the chairlift at Thredbo across the alpine heath to the summit of Kosciusko so that the alpine pasture and the soils do not suffer from the heavy foot traffic. Thousands of people every day want to walk to the summit and go hiking across the high plains. Without that steel grid to carry the impact of the foot traffic across that terrain, it would in no time become so badly damaged, with the soil structure being destroyed by the foot traffic to the point that very serious erosion would result. It was already happening, but since the pathways have been constructed the impact of that traffic has been relieved.

It is interesting to me, having made a study of the way in which we provide access to our national parks outside this State over the past couple of years, that underneath the footway we found alpine marsupial mice, and so on; but worse, which has emerged recently, is the diversity of types and density of weeds near the beginning of the trail underneath the grid. Obviously people were carrying seeds on their boots and as they set out those seeds were shaken off. There are fewer of them and fewer types the closer one gets to the top of Kosciusko. I invite anyone here to go and look at it. This simplifies the way that we can control those weeds, because people are not just wandering everywhere; they stay in the one spot. Therefore, it is easy to get the measure of the exotic plants and to clean them up.

So much for my points about national parks. There is intrinsically no evil in having the means to meet the cost of providing those services through a fee for service any more or less than getting the money from general revenue. I have to tell the Leader of the Opposition that he is not occupying the moral high ground to claim that we will do a better job because the money comes from general revenue for the purpose of providing the vehicles and the salaries of the staff to get around in the national parks to do the jobs that have to be done to manage them effectively. Clearly it is not. In fact, it is crazy for him to have put that proposition. It is no less effective to have someone who is contracted to the department to do the work as opposed to permanent staff of a department doing it. So long as they are competent to do the work and the arrangement specifies the quality of work that has to be done in each instance, the nature of their employment and the relationship between them and their employer does not matter; the work will still be done just as well.

We can see in Barmah Forest that no damage is being done by harvesting some of the timber. Time denies me the opportunity to expand further on that as I must address one or two of the other aspects of the legislation about which the member for Flinders spoke. I refer to the necessity for us to develop the farming of our native species more sensibly than we have in the past.

I commend the Minister for his courage and the common sense he has adopted in the consultative process that he has pursued in providing us with a comprehensive legislative framework through which that can be done. There is no question but that we can simply and sensibly get on with the job of selecting those species which can be most effectively farmed for commercial purposes and allowing them to be developed to the point where it is an industry which earns huge export dollars for us and for the people who wish to participate in it. That framework is very good, but it is not the framework through which it will be possible for anyone to subsume the interest of that species in the wild for the sake of commercial exploitation. That is all provided for and

protected. The public interest on every aspect is catered for in this Bill.

I am pleased about that because it now means that the very bureaucratic model, which was adopted by former Minister Mayes, can be committed to the history books. It is, to say the least, a ruddy mess. It did not provide and has not provided a good framework for the emu industry and it is not a good model to use for other species. This is a far superior model and it is the kind of model closer to what I sought in the first place. However, I wish that the means were available for those industries to do their own promotion.

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

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): I am pleased to support this Bill. Overall, it is a good Bill because it strikes a good balance between continuing the protection of native species and at the same time promoting, supporting and encouraging important development in this State. I support the Bill more specifically because it directly affects my electorate. There are significant areas of national parks in my electorate and some entrepreneurial people are getting involved in the opportunities with respect to native species to which I will allude shortly. As I said, I am pleased to support the Bill and the amendments in it.

The Government in this Bill is seeking to amend the Act, which provides:

> . . . for the establishment and management of reserves for public benefit and enjoyment; to provide for the conservation of wildlife in a natural environment; and for other purposes.

I am sure that some of the terms used to describe the Act have undergone considerable change in the public's mind. I refer to concepts such as public benefit and enjoyment. I suggest that the community now fairly asks and expects that things like cultural and ecotourism opportunities need to be adequately defined. Really it reflects that community values in this arena have changed. At the same time, the marketing of these opportunities is a critical component of maximising the benefits and advantages of our natural heritage.

The administrative reforms that will result from this Bill, and in particular the establishment of the National Parks and Wildlife Council to replace the Reserves Advisory Committee, will, I believe, bring a broadening and refocusing of its advisory role and, in effect, will ultimately create a more relevant administration and ecologically sustainable use of our natural resources.

I believe that we need to look at how we provide for the conservation of wildlife in the natural environment and what are considered to be acceptable 'other purposes'. In effect, 'other purposes' are largely what much of the Bill is about. They need clarifying and redefining. In this Bill we have had to reassess the present legislation in terms of how it has been designed to restrict the management of protected species and to what extent obstacles are being placed in the way of innovative developments.

Therefore, we have to consider the consequences of the current provisions on sustainable development and our use of natural resources in the process. Briefly I focus on amendments to Parts 4, 5 and 6 of the Act as these relate to the conservation of native plants and animals and miscellaneous provisions with respect to permits. If we do not recognise the commercial potential of native plants and animals and enable new industries to emerge, there may well be interstate and overseas interests who will develop industries without our participation.

Mr Lewis: They have already, haven't they?

Mr ANDREW: Exactly. There are historic examples. Overseas countries in the past have imported Australian wildlife, as indicated by the member for Ridley. Eucalypts are found thriving in many areas around the world, as are wallabies and plantings of macadamia nuts, which I am led to understand are in greater production in overseas countries than in Australia—the country of origin. For most of the period of white settlement in Australia we have relied heavily on the importation of methods and flora and fauna, particularly from Europe, for our economic development. There is no doubt in my mind that opportunities to better utilise our natural resource should be assisted by the Government and not held back. That is what this Bill does.

Potential commercial opportunities have been identified involving species such as water fowl, pigeons, wallabies, kangaroos, possums, birds and some reptiles. The economic potential of native flora needs no better example than the success of Red Ochre Pty Ltd, which operates a nursery called Australian Native Produce Industries in my electorate of Chaffey, at Renmark and Paringa. This company is one of a number whereby bush tucker has become readily available on a commercial scale to the public at large in Australia.

Andrew Beal, a director of Australian Native Produce Industries, has suggested to this Parliament's Joint Committee on Living Resources, which has been referred to by previous speakers and which reported during last year, that the development of a greater range of native species based products does face a number of unnecessary legislative barriers. He provided valuable knowledge, comment and suggestions regarding this legislation and I thank him for his contribution and for the consultation I have had with him since that time.

A number of different types of products have been alluded to in this regard, whether they be the muntry berries, bush tomatoes or acacia seeds. Under current legislation there is limited or no access to conservation areas for the collection of plant material, which means that seeds and cuttings which could be a source of superior genetic material are not formally available. Research and development of potential food and medicinal sources can be hindered or are being so hindered by locking away our natural resources in this regard. I am sure that by being locked away in that way they are in many ways potentially under threat of being devastated by some disease or other natural occurrence and that genetic material could be lost forever.

I turn briefly to species of protected animals and the farming of them. Emus are the only native fauna listed on schedule 11 under the current Act. The history of the emu industry is a useful case and example here. I understand that an Australia-wide study in recent times (1992) indicated that an emu farming industry did not exist in South Australia. In 1996 there is in my electorate the biggest emu processing works in the State, and it held its fifth successful trial kill only last month. I have been working closely with the principals and proprietors of that establishment in their search for State Government funding to expand and develop that industry, and it is no coincidence that tomorrow I am participating in a delegation with that undertaking and other members of the emu industry to pursue the establishment of an emu abattoir export processing works.

Estimations are that around 10 000 birds are to be slaughtered in South Australia in 1996, and I doubt that the extraordinary growth of this industry was foreseen five years ago. I mention this to indicate clearly that this reflects the

type of potential that may well develop from freeing up, as this Bill does, the extra opportunity for harvesting of other native species.

I am pleased that this Bill will enable trial farming of protected animals under permit conditions and, whilst there is likely to be some public concern over which native species will be permitted to be trialled, I understand that this type of complex and sensitive issue will be appreciated. In that regard, there will be an advisory committee or at least the opportunity for such a committee to be formed under division 2A of the Bill. This specialist committee will have responsibility for forwarding such recommendations specifically to the Minister.

Clause 31, which amends section 63 governing permits for farming protected animals, also requires that there will be different permit provisions when animals are specifically being trial farmed. I am confident that the processes that this Bill will put in place will ensure the continued protection of native wildlife while at the same time giving adequate but significantly greater scope for identification of development opportunities and commercial ventures with respect to such species.

These amendments will enhance management and conservation responsibilities while broadening the scope and stimulating interest in how our natural resources can create economic benefit, viable industries and overall additional potential benefits for this State. I commend the Minister for his commitment and determination with respect to this Bill to get a fair, reasonable and workable balance. I congratulate him on the extent of the consultation he has employed which I believe has resulted in creative legislation that will be flexible and responsible and will enhance the development of our unique natural resources in South Australia.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles):

The Opposition is not opposed in principle to increasing the levels of funds derived from national parks nor with dealing with the private sector to facilitate this, but only in the context of increasing funds for the maintenance and extension of national parks without compromising the very values the park system exists to protect. The Opposition will not support plans to focus the management of our reserves on commercial outcomes at the expense of short and long-term environmental goals.

I do not think that anyone in this Parliament or outside the Parliament would oppose those sentiments, and I am quite sure that the Minister would agree. That was a quote from the speech of the Leader of the Opposition earlier this evening.

The Opposition's view is very clear: we believe that national parks have a cherished role to play in our society and one that we on this side will maintain and assist in maintaining at all costs. However, I do not think that any Government will be going to the next election advocating tax increases to pay for additional facilities in national parks. It is probable that they ought to, but I can guarantee that they will not. Neither Party will be doing that.

There are infrastructure problems in our national parks which have to be dealt with; they cannot be ignored and, if the private sector will assist in putting in the very necessary infrastructure, I can only applaud that. There will be no strings attached, I am sure. I do not think that the decent commercial companies would want any strings attached other than the publicity, probably the tax deduction and being seen as good corporate citizens. I do not think there will be any shortage of takers: I certainly hope not. So, we would applaud that.

Care always has to be taken when introducing any element of outside commercial sources into sensitive areas such as this, but I am convinced that the Bill can be tightened up to ensure that the Parliament does have the final say in some of these commercial activities. Again, I believe that the Minister would have no particular problems with that. It has been flagged by our spokesperson in this area (the member for Napier) that a number of questions will be asked in Committee and that amendments may be moved, depending on the answers in the other place.

I understand from the Conservation Council that it is unhappy with the make-up of the advisory committee. I have some sympathy for the Conservation Council in those reservations. I think that the advisory committee ought to be expanded. It is, after all, an advisory committee, not a committee that can compel the Minister or the Government to do anything and, if people feel that their voice is not heard in these advisory committees, I think it is just asking for trouble.

Whether the Minister takes any notice of the committee is entirely up to him. Whether the community agrees with his taking notice or not is again something that will be sorted out at election time. However, people have to be heard and must feel that they have an important role, and I will certainly be supporting any amendments, if they are forthcoming in this place, to give the Conservation Council a larger voice in this very important area. I do not agree with everything that the Conservation Council says, but it is a legitimate body with a legitimate voice and a legitimate point of view, and it is entitled to have it heard more loudly than is proposed in this Bill, as in this Bill it does not have a statutory right to be on the advisory committee. So, I certainly support that.

I thank the Minister for supplying the officers of his department. It has been a long tradition in this Parliament that officers are supplied to the Opposition to go through the Bills, and I found these two officers particularly helpful, and helpful to all my colleagues who were at the meeting. Those officers clarified matters a great deal for us, so I wish to thank them. From talking to them it appeared clear to me that everything that was in this Bill could be achieved by the Minister if the Bill went out the window. I do not think there is anything new in here for the Minister.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: If that is the case we will all go home and have tea. It is certainly not what I have been told.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thank you. It will make life easier for the Minister and for the Government. That is not always a good thing: that life is made easy for Ministers. They do have an awful lot of work to do, and from time to time people in the departments with agendas of their own, if they have the right to do certain things without coming back to Parliament, get Ministers in trouble. And they are never here at Question Time when you want them! So, I think it is important that very many of these proposals that the Minister wants to effect and, more or less, the new way of arranging how these issues are dealt with by Governments come back to Parliament rather than a Bill allowing changes to be made by proclamation rather than by regulation.

Given that regulation is better than proclamation—and I am sure the Minister will agree because he has advocated it strongly in the past, and I can give him the *Hansard* references if he wishes—we will be trying to ensure that the Minister's previous views on this issue are held consistently and applied to this Bill. I am particularly interested in the parts of the Bill that relate to the farming of native species. I am a strong supporter of the farming of native species as

long as suitable and sensible safeguards are in place. It can be done already, but it is a clumsy, time consuming and, probably, old-fashioned way of arranging it. I do not believe there is anything to stop the farming of native animals now, providing the Government wants it to occur and, with a majority in Parliament, that certainly can be done, but it is clumsy.

The time it took to allow people properly to farm emus is an example that the legislation really is tired and ought to be replaced with something that is more suitable. I support the farming of native animals with all sensible safeguards on principle, but also because of my electorate. Plenty of places in my electorate would be totally suitable for the farming of native animals. I wonder about the suitability of some parts of the electorate that are now farming exotic animals. I believe the land would probably appreciate native animals being farmed on it rather than the domestic animals that are there now.

The farming of native animals can be a very strong conservation measure, both for the land and for the species. If a species is made commercial, you can stone-cold guarantee there will be an awful lot of them around; eventually there is a glut and people go broke. It is a cycle, but that is the nature of farming. Again, with suitable safeguards, which will be teased out in Committee, I have absolutely no problem with that and nor does the Opposition. The farming of melaleuca is excellent.

I make it clear that we are not talking about farming within national parks. I would not like those who read *Hansard* to think that, when we talk about farming native animals, it has anything to do with national parks. In a way, it is a pity it is in the same Bill (and I understand why it is), because people can confuse the two issues in their mind. We are talking, in all cases, about farming outside national parks. If people wish to grow and harvest melaleuca on suitable lands, again, that is excellent: people could only applaud that happening. I commend those principles in the Bill which deal with farming outside national parks, but I believe there ought to be some clarification of that. If the Minister wishes speedy passage of this Bill through the other place, he should consider those matters mentioned by the Leader and the member for Napier. I know the Minister will accept changes to the Bill readily. In Opposition, the Minister and other Ministers were very strong on changes being made by regulation rather than by gazettal.

I understand completely why people in the conservation movement and in our Party were hostile to the Bill as it came into the House, and the way it was going to assist in changing the definitions of national parks, as far as I could see, making them very vulnerable to inappropriate commercialisation. I understand that the Minister is withdrawing those provisions. If the Minister feels aggrieved that those sections that were originally in the Bill have been attacked, he has only himself to blame. Neither we nor the Conservation Council put them in the Bill; the Minister put them in it. The Minister is responsible for the Bill; he approves it, puts it to Cabinet and argues it in Cabinet if anybody has objections, and then introduces it into Parliament. It is always the Minister. The Minister has advisers, and whether or not he listens to them is entirely his prerogative.

It is entirely understandable that a lot of people were up in arms about the Bill as it came into Parliament. During the Committee debate I will be interested in the Minister's attitude to some of the contentious issues that have been raised, because I think that, particularly in relation to the farming of native animals, some very worthwhile provisions in this Bill ought to go through the Parliament with the minimum of delay.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources): What a fascinating debate! I find it quite incredible. I will go through a number of the issues that have been raised, but quite obviously the Opposition has attempted through scaremongering to have us believe that the action that this Government is taking with regard to this legislation is inappropriate. It would have us believe that it is committed to the natural environment in this State. Just as a sideline, I find it interesting that, when so much huffing and puffing has gone on this evening about the Opposition's commitment to the environment, I as Minister was last asked a question by the Opposition in this House in April last year. I find that incredible, and now members opposite are all jumping up and down saying how green they are. Let me just say right at the outset that this Government will never compromise our natural environment. We recognise the responsibility that we have, and in fact we will do everything we can to complement what is already there. Particularly with regard to the legislation that is in place under the National Parks and Wildlife Act, this Government will do everything to complement that legislation.

It is all very well for the Opposition at the present time to be coming forward with the right words, but it has never followed them with action. Our parks are currently under threat by weeds, feral animals and lack of maintenance, which come as a direct result of the previous Labor Government in this State allowing our parks and resources to run down entirely for 11 years.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I will talk about that in a minute, because the Leader of the Opposition is not right about that either. It is no good the Leader of the Opposition trying to give lip service to where the Labor Party stands regarding the environment. I suggest that anyone who has an interest in this matter look at the record of the previous Labor Government during its 11 years of service—it is not very good.

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: After all the huffing and puffing on the part of the Opposition regarding this legislation, it seems quite interesting that at this stage there is no-one on the other side of the House to participate in this debate.

I want to refer to a number of issues that have been raised by members opposite—in particular, consultation. It has been suggested by members opposite that there has been inadequate consultation regarding this matter. I made a decision very early in the piece with respect to the formation of this legislation that it would be much more appropriate to move towards the preparation of a draft Bill than to go through the sham or the process which the previous Government went through when it brought forward white papers and green papers that had absolutely no resemblance at all to the legislation when it was finally brought into this House. I would have thought that it was totally appropriate that a draft Bill be prepared and that that legislation be tabled in this House and allowed to sit there to enable consultation to take place. I made the Conservation Council aware of that. I

brought the President of the Conservation Council into my office and explained to her that that would happen.

Ms Hurley: You didn't explain it well enough.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The honourable member opposite says that we did not explain it well enough. I am not quite sure how we could improve that situation. I made quite clear to the President of the Conservation Council what we intended to do. I made quite clear that we had drawn up legislation—following a considerable amount of consultation, I might add—and that it would sit on the table until this Parliament was ready to debate it. Immediately after the legislation was introduced, we received a copy of a press release put out by the Conservation Council castigating the Government for introducing this legislation and proceeding through the second reading. In fact, the honourable member opposite made the same point. She started her contribution this evening by saying—

Ms Hurley interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The honourable member opposite did not say 'up to'. She suggested that we had proceeded through the second reading before any opportunity was provided for further consultation or amendments to come forward. I would have thought that it was totally appropriate for the legislation to lie on the table and then, if there were matters of concern to the non-government sector, the Opposition or anyone else, amendments could be brought forward. I have indicated previously on a couple of occasions in this place that as Minister I have no difficulty with working through that consultative process: bringing in a piece of legislation and allowing it to lie on the table. Then I would have no difficulty if, as Minister, it were necessary for me to amend that legislation.

I would have thought that that would have been seen to be totally appropriate, but obviously the Opposition does not agree with that process. I point out again that it was not just a matter of laying the legislation on the table for consultation. A considerable amount of consultation took place in the way of informal meetings and discussion prior to May of last year with representatives of the Conservation Council and other groups with regard to this legislation.

I will refer in more detail to the national parks review later but, if we consider the national parks review, we see that this Bill is to a very large extent consistent with the recommendations that came out of that review, and I would have thought that it would be very difficult indeed to organise for more consultation on a particular issue than was the case through that review process. That was all provided for as well. On top of that, of course, I might remind members of the Opposition that they introduced a Bill into this House in 1991, but it sat on the table and was not proceeded with because, at that stage, it was felt there had not been adequate consultation. I am not quite sure where the Opposition is coming from in this matter, but I certainly recognise and always have recognised the need for appropriate consultation. I believe that that consultation has occurred in regard to this legislation. I might also say that, with respect to the 1991 legislation that was introduced to the House and not proceeded with, some of the provisions foreshadowed have been brought forward in this legislation.

I think it is a great pity that there has been such a significant amount of confusion in the minds of the Opposition about this piece of legislation. The major part of the Bill is about community participation—through the local council, advisory committees, consultative committees, etc. I indicate again that that is very much in line with the recommendations that came out of the Living Resources Committee. In respect of our parks and the natural environment generally, by innovation this Government is seeking to improve management and resourcing to achieve more community involvement. I would find it difficult to see that anybody would object to those objectives.

We also need to realise that reserves do not stand alone. Management needs to be integrated right across the landscape. It is not just a matter of having a piece of legislation that deals just with national parks. It needs to be integrated management. I think the Opposition has rather conveniently confused the responsibilities that we have as a Government to enhance our national parks with the opportunities we are seeking to provide in an ecologically sustainable method for the farming or harvesting of native flora and fauna. The resultant investment of resources and research into species and habitats will benefit the long-term conservation of our native species in this State. The kangaroo management program is an example of that.

The suggestion was made that, through this legislation, we were ignoring the living resources report and the national parks review. I refer to the national parks review first, because much of the spirit contained in the review has been adopted in this legislation; in particular, I refer to the establishment of the council. Members opposite have indicated that this council was interested only in the commercial aspects of native conservation. That is totally wrong, and it is inappropriate to say that. Five out of the seven appointments are quite consistent with the recommendation that comes out of the national parks review.

Ms Hurley: What happened to the other two?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: As far as the other two are concerned, I have never shied away from the idea of conservation and ecotourism working more closely together. I am interested that the Opposition believes that that is inappropriate. I would have thought that it was totally appropriate for that to be the case. I also would have thought—and I will make reference to this later—that it was important to be able to encourage the corporate sector to become more involved in providing facilities in our parks and reserves. The member for Giles indicated that he supported that very strongly. I have no difficulty with that whatsoever. If somebody in the corporate sector is prepared to come along and assist in the provision of interpretive centres, with funding for pamphlets—

Ms Hurley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: —or with other facilities in national parks, I have no difficulty with that whatsoever. I would have thought it totally appropriate to be able to recognise the support that can be given in that way through having on that council a person who has business and marketing skills. As has been said by a number of speakers opposite, the substantial issue with park management is resourcing, and I will explain that later. In relation to the advisory council, I make the point that that is exactly what it is. It is not a management board: it is there purely to provide advice to the Minister. It can raise any issue it wants to raise for the consideration of the Minister and of the Government—and I would suggest, in the way we have planned it, on the part of the community as well.

This advisory council will cover wide responsibilities under the Act. We believe very strongly that people should be appointed on their expertise and not just because they hold a position in an organisation. If all people who are representa-

tive of various groups make up that council, it will encourage factions. It will mean that we will finish up with a huge, unwieldily council that will be of no benefit at all in what we are trying to achieve. Through the establishment of this council, we are attempting to gain a balance between expertise and community involvement. I would have thought that that would be welcomed by the Opposition.

The establishment of the council also provides a mechanism for broad participation, particularly through the council and through the advisory committees. Having established the council, we intend that we would then use this forum for a more comprehensive review of the Act, taking into account all the recommendations coming from the Living Resources Committee report and other areas that need to be dealt with in this legislation. Again, I would have thought that that was totally appropriate.

In relation to the substantial issue of the resourcing of our national parks, I say, very clearly, that the privatisation of our parks is not on the agenda. I make that quite clear: the privatisation of our parks and reserves in this State is simply not on this Government's agenda. However, we are keen to encourage involvement—

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

The SPEAKER: I do remind the House that when the House proceeded there were no members on my left in the Chamber.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: There will be plenty from now on, Sir, on both sides.

Ms Hurley: Thirty seconds late.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will not question the ruling of the Chair.

Ms Hurley: Thirty seconds late coming into the Chamber.

The SPEAKER: I suggest that the member for Napier confine her remarks to the forming of a quorum. The Chair does not have to answer for his comments.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Prior to that interruption, the point I was making was that the Government would be looking to encourage the involvement of the corporate sector in providing much needed facilities, as I have explained to the House, along with expertise in marketing with the specific aim of increasing the viability and the visibility of our parks throughout the community. This Government is at least tackling the long-term resourcing and management of our parks, and it has not happened previously.

Within a month or so, I will bring down a major statement with regard to the future direction in which the Government will be moving regarding our parks and reserves. As an example, I refer to the situation on Kangaroo Island, where the park service is now the biggest single employer. That provides an exciting example of conservation working alongside ecotourism, and it is important to recognise that. The alternative, as the member for Giles said earlier, is higher taxes, which will not be acceptable, or deteriorating parks—increased vermin and weeds and so on—poor conservation standards and a further threat to species. I do not believe that anyone would be keen to see that happen.

I briefly refer to the argument that was put forward by the Opposition that this legislation was not in line with the recommendations of the Living Resources Committee report. As Chair of the committee that brought down that report, I thought it was an excellent example of tripartisan support for its recommendations. I will quote one of the recommendations, as follows:

> The joint committee recognises the development potential of the State's living resources and strongly recommends that all avenues for advancing new commercial ventures based on the sustainable utilisation of native flora and fauna be actively pursued, including appropriate legislative and administrative frameworks.

The actions refer to the review opportunities under the National Parks and Wildlife Act for domestication of native animals and also provide increased opportunities and support structures for people to access the development potential of local flora and fauna. That is exactly what this legislation is about, and that is one of the major recommendations in the report. Another recommendation states:

> The joint committee recommends that the State Government support the development of an ecotourism industry that is ecologically sustainable.

The actions listed there are to identify opportunities for ecotourism development, identify extent and impact of tourism in sensitive areas and work with local communities to develop sustainable tourism strategies in key areas. Again, that is exactly what this legislation is about. Finally, I want to make reference to the comments of the Leader of the Opposition, who referred to the budgetary situation.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It is quite obvious that the Opposition, with the two members who are sitting opposite, want to disrupt this debate as much as possible. They can do that because it will not make any difference to where the Government stands on this important issue, but it is particularly petty of those two members to insist on calling more members into the House at this time. I refer to comments that were made by the Leader of the Opposition regarding budgetary issues as they relate to national parks, and I compare the previous Government's capital budget with this year's budget. In 1993-94, we had a capital budget of $2.5 million in comparison with 1995-96, when more than $4 million has been provided in the capital budget for national parks.

The Opposition raised a number of specific matters, and I want to refer to those briefly. It was claimed that, in this legislation, we have permitted the upgrading of reserve status without reference to Parliament. The Government will be taking action and will be introducing amendments to remove that possibility. The sections of the Act provide for the constitution of reserves either by statute or by proclamation. As the Bill went out of Cabinet the amendments were written to provide a simple mechanism for upgrading the status of a reserve without the need for parliamentary approval unless otherwise stipulated in the Act. What we were talking about was the opportunity to change from a national park to a conservation park, or something like that, without having to bring the matter to Parliament. Clauses 9 to 17 were intended to provide a simple mechanism for upgrading the status of a park to a higher category through name change. As the Bill stands I have been advised that technically it allows for a simultaneous proclamation providing access, for example, for mining without first having to go before both Houses of Parliament. As soon as we were made aware of that we realised that it was important to remove that opportunity. It was never intended that that should be the case, and action will be taken through amendment to retain the *status quo* in that area.

As far as the questions that were asked regarding farming of native animals, I want to put on record—and I have

indicated to the Conservation Council in particular that I would do so—the process by which the trial farming provisions of the Bill will be enacted. It is intended to use an advisory committee established under the provisions of this Bill to advise on all aspects of trial farming. In particular, an advisory committee will advise on the species of native animals which may be considered for trial farming, the format of the application, including the information required to assess a trial farming permit and also the condition restrictions and limitations which should be applied to trial farming permits either for a species of animal or for an individual permit. I remind members that we are not talking about farming or trial farming in national parks: we are talking outside of national parks.

This process will ensure that any proposals for trial farming are given every opportunity to develop into sustainable enterprises whilst also ensuring that the standards under which native animals may be farmed addresses the protection of species in their natural environment. It is important that that should be the case. As far as the harvesting of native animals is concerned, I will be introducing amendments in regard to that matter. The first of the amendments expands the definition of harvesting to ensure that, where an animal is to be utilised but not necessarily sold after being killed, the harvesting provisions of this Bill apply. The more significant of amendments to this clause relates to concerns that, where there is a genuine need to cull native animals from a reserve, the harvesting provisions, if applied, could result in culling being driven for commercial gain rather than to achieve objectives for managing the reserve. In order to make it quite clear that stringent criteria apply to the use of any protected animals culled from a reserve, amendments are proposed to deal with that issue.

The final matter relates to clause 38 and the provision to revoke or replace schedules 7, 8, 9 and 10 of the Act which are, respectively, the endangered, rare, vulnerable and unprotected schedules of the Act. In response once again to submissions on the Bill, it is proposed that the word 'revoke' be removed from this clause, and this will still allow the deletion of 'species' to each schedule by regulation. However, the responsibility for revoking any of these schedules will remain with the Parliament, and I believe it is important that that should be the case.

Those are the main issues raised by the Opposition. I conclude by saying that there is misunderstanding between what we are trying to do in improving our national parks and what we are trying to do in providing the opportunity for the appropriate harvesting and farming of our native species, and it is important that we recognise that is the case. Again, I make the point that the Government will not compromise on our natural environment; rather, we intend to complement what we already have in this important area.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Acting Chairman, I draw your attention to the state of the Committee.

A quorum having been formed:

Clauses 2 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—'Constitution of national parks by statute.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I oppose clause 9. As I explained to the House during the second reading debate, it was intended to provide a simple mechanism for upgrading the status of a park to a higher category through name changing; it was never intended that it should be anything other than that.

I know that the Opposition has suggested that that was intentional. That was never the case. It is the Government's intention in moving this amendment and further amendments to be able to correct this anomaly and retain the same provisions as is the case with the existing legislation. It was a situation that was beyond our control and I ask that the Committee recognise the wish of the Government in opposing this clause.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to make it clear to the Committee that the Minister has indicated he is opposing clause 9 and it is not an amendment. When I put the clause, I assume that the Minister and the Government will oppose it.

Ms HURLEY: I indicate that the Opposition will also be opposing this clause. As has been outlined previously, the Opposition finds it extraordinary that the clause ever found its way into the original Bill. Subsequent clauses are obviously designed to allow wide ministerial discretion in changing the nature of parks, and we find that totally unacceptable. Although the Minister has said that it was a mistake that it was ever included, it is consistent with what many of the Ministers of this Government have been doing: they are assuming much of the power to make decisions and to determine the directions for their departments, simply by their own decisions.

We consider this practice completely unacceptable. We believe that these major changes, particularly to national parks, which are an important resource for our State, should be brought through the Parliament for decision and should receive a very public airing as part of that process. In fact, the changes that have been made to this Bill indicate how important it is to have public consultations and to receive public feedback on any decisions made by the Government.

I find it difficult to understand that these provisions reached the stage where they were in the Bill in the first place. I find it amazing that the Minister was unaware of the implications of this and other provisions and the Bill was allowed to reach this stage. The Opposition strenuously opposes this provision or anything like it. We agree with and accept the Minister's explanation in this case.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I say again that this was an unintended consequence of drafting. It is important that we correct this anomaly. Because of the opposition to this clause, it is important that we ensure that the current provisions of the Act, which address the constitution of parks and reserves by either statute or proclamation, are retained in their current form. I would always strenuously support the need for both Houses of Parliament to be involved in this matter. I cannot say any more than that, but I repeat that that is the case. As soon as we were made aware of that—regrettably the Bill had been introduced—we contacted the Conservation Council and we stated that we would be seeking to oppose that clause and subsequent clauses in relation to this matter.

Mr LEWIS: I am astonished that the member for Napier can brazenly stand here and say how important an asset national parks are to this State when, whilst in Government, her Party did nothing to develop management plans of a comprehensive nature (the like of which I referred to in the course of my earlier remarks) which should have been developed, providing for us the necessary framework to do the things that must be done in respect of our national parks.

How daft is it that you simply grab land, call it national parks, say you are doing something for conservation and let the feral animals and exotic plans run riot across the land-

scape with no thought whatever for their control, and then just go on taking more and more land. That does nothing for the cause of conservation at all. It was simply the approach of somebody who felt that perceptions were more important than substance, and that is exactly what the Labor Party is about in all of its policies: setting perceptions and not doing anything of substance. In the best Australian idiom and terms that I can think of, they are blatherskites.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Acting Chairman, I draw your attention to the state of the Committee.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am not sure what point the member for Ridley was trying to make on these clauses or about the indication from the Minister that he would be opposing them. I found the answer of the Minister to the member for Napier totally unconvincing. We are not talking about a word that has slipped in here inadvertently. It is possible to overlook a word in a Bill, but we are talking of three pages of amendments to the Bill. It is hard to overlook. For the Minister to suggest that somehow he did not know or did not understand what these clauses meant is an appalling admission. The procedures are very detailed.

The Bill is developed in the department according to the instructions given by the Minister. Departments do occasionally try to slip things through; I will concede that that has happened on the odd occasion, but not three pages of amendments and on a very important principle. I do not believe for one minute that the department has tried to slip this through. Nevertheless, the responsibility is with the Minister. The Minister okays the Bill and takes it to Cabinet, where he goes through it in detail. He gives the pros and cons to Cabinet, noting any opposition that is likely to be raised, the importance of the Bill and how much opposition there is to it. The procedure is quite extensive. So, 13 people in Cabinet, at least, have a look at it, plus all the central agencies—everyone from Cabinet Office to Treasury, and so on.

So, it is hard for everyone to overlook it. Then the Minister introduces it and speaks to the second reading debate, with quite an extensive second reading explanation. So, I do not accept for one minute that the Minister did not know that these particular clauses were in this Bill. It is just inconceivable. If the Minister were to say, 'I knew the clauses were there but I did not know what they meant,' we could understand that. We could relate to that with the Minister: that the Minister perhaps did not know what his own legislation meant. That would be an honest admission and everyone would, I am quite sure, deal with the amendments on that basis; that the Minister did not understand.

But do not tell us that the Minister overlooked three pages of amendments on an enormously important principle, because I cannot wear it. Nevertheless, the pressure that has been applied by the Opposition, by the Conservation Council and, I am sure, by other groups in the community has seen the Minister oppose parts of his own Bill. For that, I suppose we are grateful. It was either that the Minister did it here or it was done in the Upper House, and there may have been consequences from that. So, I am pleased that the member for Napier, on behalf of the Opposition, has said that we will oppose these clauses, but I still find the Minister's explanation totally unconvincing.

Clause negatived.

Clause 10—'Constitution of national parks by proclamation.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I oppose this clause and clauses 11 to 17 for the reasons that have already been indicated.

Clause negatived.

Clauses 11 to 17 negatived.

Clause 18 passed.

Clause 19—'Management plans.'

Ms HURLEY: The role of the South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Council, despite what the Minister has said, has quite substantially changed compared with the recommendations of the National Parks Review, which states:

> The. . . committee should. . . .comprise seven members with the following qualifications:
> - three with knowledge of and experience in at least one of the following (and between them have knowledge of and experience in all of those areas):
> —the conservation of the natural environment;
> —the education and management of members of the public who visit reserves;
> —the relationship of wildlife to its environment;
> —a field of science that is of importance in relation to the environment.
> - one of whom has knowledge of the development and implementation of policy relating to the conservation and management of land;
> - one of whom is a member of a consultative committee or a member of a group established from the community to assist in the management of a reserve;
> - one of whom has experience in agricultural production and a demonstrated interest in conservation; and
> - one of whom has knowledge of and experience with the interests of different types of reserve users.

The National Parks Review obviously recommended that all people on that council have some experience in natural resources and the environment, yet the Minister in his Bill insists that two and, in effect, three, of those persons, if one includes the Director of the council, will have more business administrative experience than experience in the environment and wildlife. In effect, that means that three of the seven people on the council will have a business, financial and marketing orientation rather than an orientation towards the management of reserves and natural resources.

It is obviously useful to have advising on the management plans as many people as possible who have practical and scientific experience of parks rather than business and management plans, and I wonder why the Minister did not have one of his advisory subcommittees providing the advice on marketing and financial management rather than the principal advisory body, the National Parks and Wildlife Council.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I thought I had explained in my second reading speech why it was important. We can argue until the cows come home about where we stand with the recommendations coming out of the review. I still am of the opinion that five of the seven appointments are very much in line with what was suggested through the recommendations in the review. I have also indicated that I believe it is vitally important that this council be able to advise the Minister. Again, I make the point that it is purely advisory—it is not a management board or council. I would have thought it was totally appropriate for at least two members of the council to be able to advise on matters of marketing and on how the Government can work more closely with the corporate sector in encouraging it to assist with the funding of particular facilities in national parks.

I think it is totally appropriate that people have business expertise that they can bring forward in an advisory capacity. I see nothing wrong with that, and that was the decision that

was made. Personally I feel very strongly about that. It is vitally important that we have people who are able to advise us with regard to the conservation responsibilities we have in protecting our ecosystems, and so on. Also, it is vitally important if we are to upgrade our facilities and be able to provide more opportunities for people to enjoy our parks. I have a great opportunity, as I hope do members opposite, to be able to travel around and recognise the potential and spiritual opportunities that are available in our parks. I would have thought that it is totally appropriate to do as much as we can to market those parks and let people know where they are, and we can do that by providing information through pamphlets that may be funded through the corporate sector.

Ms HURLEY: I reiterate what the Leader of the Opposition said, namely, that we in the Opposition have no difficulty with sponsors or anyone from the private sector coming in and helping to fund the parks, but we might have difficulty with those people setting the policy and the management plans of South Australia's parks. That is the difficulty in that case in the formation of the council. Given the Minister's mistake in setting the Bill, it is obvious that he relies quite heavily on his advisers and will probably rely quite heavily on this council. The current make-up of the council does not specifically allow anyone from committed groups such as the Conservation Council to be a member of that committee.

I know the Minister said that they are looking for expertise rather than a person from a particular organisation, but I would say to the Minister that most people whom the Conservation Council might propose would probably have quite a deal of expertise in this area. Would the Minister reconsider that, given that some more independent body might be useful on the council if they were advising on policy and management plans to the Minister?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: As far as those who have the responsibility of looking at management plans are concerned, I would suggest very strongly that, given that under the legislation we will now have the opportunity to establish advisory committees, an advisory committee be established that has the expertise. I have already explained to the Conservation Council that I would be happy to consult and talk with its members about who would be appropriate people to serve on that advisory committee and have the responsibility of looking at and working through management plans. I think that is totally appropriate.

As I said in my second reading contribution, I do not believe it is appropriate to have representative councils. I do not believe that it is appropriate to have people on that council representing organisations. It could become unwieldy. If the Conservation Council was represented, I would want to have someone from the Nature Conservation Society; would we then have to have someone from the Wilderness Society and other organisations? Again, I make the point that it is an advisory council: it is not a management council. I am very keen for it to be a well run council. I do not want it to be unwieldy, and I believe it is totally appropriate as it is.

Ms HURLEY: Given that the Minister has mentioned the advisory committees and intimated that the Conservation Council and others might be involved in setting the management plans, I ask again why the marketing and business people are not relegated to the advisory committee rather than being represented on the council.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I have already explained it at least three times now. If the honourable member will not accept the position I put, I cannot help that. I have explained at least three times now what I see as the importance of having someone on the advisory council who can help me, the Government and the community with regard to marketing and enable us to work more closely with the corporate sector to provide facilities in national parks and some management expertise in their administration, etc. I cannot make it any clearer than that.

Clause passed.

Clauses 20 to 22 passed.

Clause 23—'Permits for commercial purposes.'

Ms HURLEY: I seek clarification from the Minister regarding this clause, which refers to permits for commercial purposes in relation to plant species and so on. I do not think the language of the Bill is quite clear in respect of whether the Government intends to encourage commercial uses of flora in national parks. I would like to clarify how the Minister sees flora being used for commercial purposes and whether that would involve any exploitation of resources in national parks.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It is certainly not envisaged that that should be the case. It is not envisaged that harvesting take place in national parks. I suggest that any such proposal would be unlikely to gain support through the public consultation process to which I have already referred during the preparation of management plans. It is not envisaged or intended that harvesting of plants take place in our parks.

Clause passed.

Clauses 24 to 30 passed.

Clause 31—'Permit for farming protected animals.'

Ms HURLEY: As previously indicated, the Opposition has no ideological problem with the farming of protected animals—indeed, it sees that there might be some good purpose in doing so—however, I query the permit system which enables the farming of protected animals for a period of three years before a draft code of management needs to be drawn up. I query what control the Minister envisages there will be on management practices during those three years given that the effect on individual animals or the environment in which those animals are held could be quite devastating.

Mr LEWIS: Again, that is the kind of idiocy that I would expect to come only from the Labor Party. There are already provisions in law elsewhere which prevent anyone from being cruel to any animal anywhere. It is not possible for us to draw up a code of management as a society and a new industry until we know what that code of management needs to contain because, clearly, when the behaviour of the species in farming circumstances is better understood by those people who discover it under the permit system, it will be possible to establish a code of management and provide adequate time for consultation.

The permit system that the legislation proposes is one which I applaud, because it enables the Minister to restrict the number of people involved in the potential industry in its infancy to a point where that can be properly monitored to ensure that nothing inappropriate is done and, secondly, enables an effective, thorough examination of what needs to be included in that code of management. Any other approach would do it in a half-baked way. It would not give adequate time for the development of domesticated characteristics to become apparent in the species. Nor would it give sufficient time for interest groups to have their say once that is known in the code of management.

I wonder whether the honourable member knows just how much detail there is in a code of management. It strikes me as really quaint, though, that she should think that we or, indeed, any Government in a society like ours would allow

animals to be treated cruelly whilst they are held in domestic circumstances. Even wild animals cannot be treated cruelly by a human being. The law prevents it. If you do it, there are very severe penalties for it. I cannot therefore see that the honourable member has any real cause for concern or complaint unless it is on the basis of some real mischief, and I mean political mischief, that she would want to do to a fledgling industry. Do not forget, may I say to the honourable member, that whilst we are doing this, the rest of the world could not give a fig! They will go into farming any of the animals that we have in this continent as indigenous species wherever it suits them and wherever they can get a market for the product, just as they did in the United States with emu and as they are doing with other species.

It is in our interests as a society of people to get the most rapid possible establishment of a code that will enable the species to be farmed commercially. It is in the interests of those people who are given a permit to get that together quickly, as well as in the interests of any Government and prospective producers. The sooner we can do it, if we are to do it at all, the better, but we have to give ourselves adequate time to get it right the first time, and not have to come back again and again to try to fix up the mess. That is the kind of policy I saw from Lenehan and Mayes. It is not the sort of thing of which I want to be accused of being in any sense guilty, or with which I will ever be associated. So I say to her, let us get on with the job, giving ourselves sufficient elbow room, but do it as expeditiously as possible, as this legislation allows.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: To answer the question that the honourable member has asked specifically, the trial farming of protected animals can be managed by a process of using an advisory committee to recommend on all aspects of trial farming and also by the use of the generic miscellaneous provision, section 69 of the Act, to tailor restrictions, conditions or limitations on permits to address the circumstances under which trial farming may occur.

During my second reading contribution, I gave an assurance that I would refer to the process that will be adopted in regard to the trial farming provisions under the Bill, and I will just refer to that again. It is intended, as I said earlier, to use an advisory committee established under the provisions of this Bill to advise on all aspects of trial farming. In particular, the committee will provide advice on the species of native animals that may be considered for trial farming, the format of the applications, including the information required to assess a trial farming permit, and the conditions, restrictions and limitations which should be applied to trial farming permits for a species of animals or for an individual permit.

As I said earlier, this process will quite adequately ensure that any proposals for trial farming should be given every opportunity to develop into sustainable enterprises whilst also, and importantly, ensuring the standards under which native animals may be farmed and addressing the protection of species in their natural environment.

Clause passed.

Clause 32 passed.

Clause 33—'Insertion of Division 4B in Part 5.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I move:

Page 17, line 25—Leave out all words in this line and insert the following words: 'in order to sell the carcass of the animal or to use it for any other purpose'.

I explained in the second reading debate in some detail the purpose for that amendment. Again, it is the result of the concern that was expressed, particularly by the Conservation Council in the discussions that we had with it prior to the introduction of this legislation when we indicated to it that we would be moving an amendment in this way.

Ms HURLEY: I find it curious more than anything else the use of the word 'harvesting' which in normal terminology would tend to indicate a commercial activity. Why was 'culling' not used or a separate definition of 'culling' not included here?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It is inappropriate. Culling relates only to animals that are culled or killed and left to lie. It is inappropriate. If, for example, kangaroos are killed, their carcasses should not be left lying around in national parks or outside national parks. They should be taken to a zoo or something, rather than having people tripping over rotting carcasses in our national parks. We gave a lot of thought to the appropriate expression, and 'harvesting' indicates quite clearly what we are on about in comparison with the terminology of 'culling'.

Ms HURLEY: It is well understood that culling occurs when animals exceed their desired numbers, for whatever reason. 'Harvesting' tends to imply a more active process of going in and getting animals. What is the Minister's intention with 'harvesting'?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I cannot say any more than I have. I have made quite clear that the Government is not talking about the harvesting of animals in national parks to make a gain from it. We are talking about harvesting of animals outside parks. Both sides of the House have agreed that there is an opportunity for that to happen in an ecologically sustainable way. I have given an assurance that that will not be the case in national parks. That would occur only if it was felt it was necessary to cull kangaroos. Rather than have the carcasses lying around, we could use them—we could take them to a zoo. It would be totally unsatisfactory to have rotting carcasses lying around national parks.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I agree with the Minister's intention. I do not think that there is anything wrong with it at all. The term which is being used—'harvesting' as opposed to 'culling'—is causing some people disquiet. It seems to me that the easiest thing to do would be to revert back to the previous term 'culling' to make everyone happy. I agree completely. I understand that culling happens now in certain parks and reserves, and the dead animals are used—whether it is for the zoo or whatever, I am not quite sure. They are not left hanging around, particularly in the reserves near the metropolitan area. We do not want them there. There is some use made of the carcasses and that is as it should be.

The principal object was not to produce carcasses for the zoo, or anywhere else: the principal object was a culling exercise. The results of the culling were used sensibly and no-one would argue with that. But if the Minister insists on using the term 'harvesting', there will be long arguments. Everyone understands 'culling'. It gives the Minister the result that the Minister wants and it only puts into different words the powers that the Minister already has, as I understand. If the Minister wants to cull in a reserve, a national park, or whatever, he can do it now. If the Minister wants to dispose of the carcasses in a certain way, the Minister can issue a permit for that to occur, although I know there is a bit of a rigmarole to go through such as declaring them a pest and so on. I would prefer it this way. People are using the Minister's terminology against this provision. If the Minister sticks to the word 'culling', which everyone understands, he will not

have an argument. I cannot see why the Minister does not say that he will look at that terminology before it gets to the other place and, if necessary, the Minister will either agree to an amendment, which he can guarantee will come, or propose one himself to cut the argument short.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am happy to look at the situation, but let me explain to the Committee that the words 'harvesting' and 'farming' are nationally recognised terms and a subsequent amendment, which I cannot speak about at this stage, quite clearly indicates why we are using that terminology. I am happy to look at it between now and when it reaches the other place.

Mr LEWIS: Much ado about nothing was something Bill Shakespeare said on one occasion. This is an argument in semantics except for one salient point. Culling implies killing: harvesting does not necessarily so. We have been beneficiary of, if you like, the harvesting process of rare and endangered animals in the Northern Territory in recent time. We now have a breeding program for those animals. They were taken live from their wild habitat and brought into South Australia, where they are now being bred up. They were either at risk where they occurred in the Northern Territory and/or it was not possible to supervise the way for the most rapid recovery of that population.

It is more appropriate to use the term 'harvesting' and, as will become apparent when we move on to subsequent clauses shortly, that is further underlined, as the Minister has pointed out, as an appropriate term. Why does the Opposition have to go nit-picking? It surprises me that the Labor Party wants to be so politically correct when there is not any moral high ground to be occupied, unless it is only to be found in their minds, though others might be forgiven for thinking they were witless.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I move:

Page 18, line 29—After 'to sell' insert 'or use'.

This is a consequential amendment.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I move:

Page 18, after line 30—Insert subsection as follows:

(1a) The Minister must not grant a permit under subsection (1) to take animals on a reserve unless—

(a) the Minister has adopted a plan of management under section 38 in relation to the reserve; and

(b) the plan of management permits the harvesting of animals of that species on the reserve; and

(c) the Minister is of the opinion that the harvesting of animals pursuant to the permit is necessary or desirable to preserve animal or plant habitats or wildlife in accordance with the plan of management.

This is one of the more significant amendments to this clause. It relates to concerns that, where there is a genuine need to cull native animals from a reserve, if applied, the harvesting provisions could result in culling being driven for commercial gain rather than to achieve objectives for managing the reserve. In order to make quite clear that stringent criteria apply to the use of any protected animals culled from a reserve, this amendment is moved.

Ms HURLEY: This addresses some of our concerns in relation to harvesting and the possible development of a market in certain animals that has to be protected. The Opposition supports the amendment.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I move:

Page 19, line 10—Insert ', use' after 'sell'.

This is consequential.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 34 to 37 passed.

Clause 38—'Regulations.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I move:

Page 20, lines 23 and 24—Leave out 'revoke and replace schedule 7, 8, 9 or 10 or may amend any of those schedules' and insert 'amend schedule 7, 8, 9, or 10'.

This matter has been raised by interested groups and, in response to submissions on the Bill, it is proposed that the word 'revoke' be removed from this clause. This will allow the addition or deletion of species to each schedule by regulation. However, the responsibility for revoking any of these schedules will, quite rightly, remain with Parliament. As I say, it is totally appropriate that that should be the case.

Ms HURLEY: I have to say that I am amazed that this got through in the first place in such a sensitive area as the schedules of protected species. It is amazing that it has to be amended at this late stage. Everyone in South Australia would be very concerned if this were left in its current form so that revoking and replacing schedules could be done in such a facile way, and I am pleased to see that the rightful role of Parliament to scrutinise these things in detail is restored by this amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 39 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Today, in Question Time, the Premier of this State made a very half-baked attempt to pour scorn on the policy announced by the Federal Labor Government in relation to health. I will spend the next 10 minutes talking about the issues that he raised. I was very interested to note that he began his speech by making the point that, on average, in South Australia we spend more per person on health than any other State. The Premier used that argument purely on figures and averages and said that therefore we were spending too much and that we obviously must have a much better health system.

That is a fatally flawed argument. The fact is that South Australia spends more money because it needs to, and there are many reasons for this, one of which is that we are the State in Australia which has the most rapidly ageing population. We are the State that has the most elderly people, and that will continue to be the case. We all know, of course, that elderly people have more need to access the health system. So, this issue of averages and working purely on numbers is entirely false and it really portrays the Premier's lack of understanding of the issue at hand.

It is interesting to note that the Premier regurgitated the strange facts that were used the day before by the Minister for Health in talking about Federal funding versus State funding. From the figures we all know that over the last few years Federal funding to South Australia increased by $126 million. We also know that while this has been happening the State Government has pulled out millions and it intends to pull out further millions from this budget. The fact is that the real crisis in our health system is not caused by Federal funding: it is caused by the money which has been pulled out so far

and which will continue to be pulled out by the present State Government.

As we all know, some of these budget cuts have led to closures of wards and beds, increased waiting times for surgery, loss of nurses and other hospital staff, inexperienced agency nurses being in our front line medical services, higher fees and charges and reduced outpatients. I could go on with several more things that we all know about, because they have been in our minds, in the letters and in the protests of our community over the past six months. Just this week there was an article about the recently released Health Commission report which talked about the number of complaints received by the Health Complaints Unit in South Australia. The article stated:

> Discontentment with the services continued an upward spiral during the year 1994-95, with State Government health services attracting 75 per cent of the complaints. . .
>
> Of complaints received about State health services, most were related to waiting for services, particularly elective surgery, pensioner dental treatment and delays in the accident and emergency departments of the major metropolitan hospitals.
>
> A significant number of patients also complained about the required service not being available, the standard of care received and treatment which was either unacceptable or negligent.

Despite what the Premier and the Minister say when they pull out their figures and do their multiplication and division, we know that what I have just said and what has been backed up by the Health Complaints Unit is what has been happening in our community.

The Premier talked about the Federal policy announced yesterday by the Labor Government. I suggest that those in his own Federal Party are shocked at what they have heard. They will be really going some to come up with something that will target health needs in this country as well as that policy has done.

Briefly, I want to outline the points. The first issue relates to private health insurance. Again, we had a misrepresentation of the figures. The decline in private health insurance is estimated to cost South Australian hospitals about $7 million per year. That $7 million is against the extra $126 million put in by the Commonwealth Government over recent years. It is far outweighed by this. The actual reduction in funds from lack of private patients in public hospitals has only a 2 per cent impact on State budgets—far less than the impact of State Government cuts.

The Minister and the Premier like to say that the Opposition is against the private health insurance industry. Let me make our position clear. The Federal Labor Government and Labor Governments generally acknowledge that the private and public systems both have a place in our health care system. However, we differ very much from Liberal members because we believe that this duality should not be at the expense of the public system.

The Federal Labor Government has proposed the new family rebate for child related health costs. This is a very good way of tackling this problem. I wonder whether Liberal members really understand that the fall-out in private health insurance comes mostly from families with young children. Therefore, this health rebate directly targets the very people who have been dropping out of private health insurance. In addition, the health rebate gives people a choice. If they wish to have private health insurance, they can use that rebate and take it up. If they do not wish to have it, they can use the rebate to pay for things not funded by Medicare. I shall be watching with interest to see what the Coalition will do to match that. If they introduce a pure tax rebate, it will not target and bring about the improvements that we need in order to drive down the costs of private health insurance.

The Premier made some disparaging comments about the $150 million for elective surgery. That $150 million is to be spent on patients. It is not to be used by State Governments, such as this one and the Liberal Governments in Victoria and Western Australia, to prop up debt reduction strategies. That money will be tied to patient care. The same applies to the new Medicare agreement. Again, the Federal Government has realised that, over the past two or three years, some State Governments have had no intention of keeping their end of the bargain. Therefore, the Medicare agreement needs to be renegotiated and tightened up to ensure that State Governments, such as this one, cannot use those Federal funds to cover for the fact that they are pulling out their own State funds.

I should like to refer to a couple of other features of the policy. All school leavers with a disability are to get a place in an employment or vocational training program. I wonder whether this State Government is prepared to consider the demands of those involved in Project 141 and do its bit for disabled people and their families and carers. There is an extra $150 million for the HAAC program. I wonder whether this State Government is prepared to match those Federal funds, because it has not matched them to the extent that it could have done in the past. Let us see this State Government show its concern for the old and the frail and the young disabled through the HAAC program by keeping its part of the bargain. Contrary to what the Premier said, I believe that many South Australians would agree that they will be far better off with the health policy that has been put forward by the Federal Labor Government.

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

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I am convinced of one thing after listening to that contribution: if we are again going to have a healthy nation and a healthy State, two things must happen on 2 March: first, we have to get rid of Keating; and, clearly, we have to get rid of the Opposition spokesperson on health. It would be absolutely evident to every South Australian who reads the diatribe that she has gone on with again tonight that if she ever gets a chance at health we will be in a very poor situation.

Let us get a few facts on record for the community. I recently received a letter from a Federal member who cannot run on any federal issues, and I wonder why: the Federal Government is burnt out, is tired, has lost its way and is about to self-destruct. In the letter he said that in South Australia last year the Federal Labor Government put an extra $13.4 million into South Australia's health system, but the Brown Government took out $35 million, and he goes on.

That is not factual at all, and tonight, in the next nine minutes, for my constituents I want to put the facts on the table. Let us look at some of the issues, dealing first with the truth on health services. The Brown Liberal Government has been able to maintain high quality health care with less money. Why is there less money? Because $4 billion was lost by the previous inept Bannon-Arnold Labor Government. The facts of the matter were not brought out tonight by the Opposition spokesperson on health, because she is running that ideology that Keating and the rest of them are on about, believing that they can come up with socialised health medicine only and forgetting that the private sector has a major part to play in general health.

Since 1989 the Commonwealth funding for South Australian public hospitals has increased by $41 million, but during the same period extra patients—most of whom formerly had private health insurance—have now cost the State public hospitals $124 million of additional money. The Federal Government has put in an extra $41 million over that time—a measly $4l million—when one of the primary issues should be for adequate health care to be provided for the States by the Federal Government. Let us remember that only a few weeks ago, when there was a major health conference in South Australia, people who are not involved in politics but who know about the health system said on national radio that the Federal Government had reneged and had not put enough money into the States for health. That is a fact, and I back it up by saying that only $41 million was put in and this State Government has had to inject $124 million. That is a direct result of Labor's mismanagement of private health insurance.

We all know that private health insurance is an essential part of Australia's health system. We know that Medicare will collapse if we do not get people back into private health insurance. Only the Federal Coalition is committed to stem that exodus from private health insurance and thus restore viability of the public hospitals. What Mr Keating and the shadow spokesperson fail to remember is that 92 per cent of people polled say they believe that there has to be an incentive for people to return to private health insurance.

Labor launched its health initiative, pledging that it will do this and that to Medicare, but let us get the facts on the record. Twice it has increased the rate on Medicare. Yet Mr Keating—LAW Keating—said that they would not increase the Medicare rate. What else happened? Three million Australians have had to bail out of health insurance because they could not afford it. After 13 years, does anyone really think that Labor will ever get the health equation right? I would suggest that no way can that happen.

Let us look at what we have achieved. Hospital activity has increased by 4 per cent in this State in the past 18 months. Waiting lists have been cut by 16 per cent and the Government has been announcing major capital works programs, fixing up the neglect we saw under the previous Labor Government in this State and fixing up the neglect I have just illustrated by the lack of funding in real terms that should have come from the Feds.

The shadow spokesperson is leaving the Chamber because she cannot accept the facts on this health debate. Unless she can get her face on television she is not prepared to sit in this Chamber and listen to the facts. She wants to highlight the isolated cases that occur in any medical system, but she never comes in and sings the praises of places like the Flinders Medical Centre which, under our Government, received national acclaim last year for its diligence and expertise and for leading the way in many aspects of health care in Australia. We do not hear her singing those praises.

A constituent who came into my office only the other day had had major health problems recently, and he could not sing loudly enough praises for the Flinders Medical Centre. Having been looked after in a way that one would not believe, he was returned to his home as soon as he was healthy enough and what could have been a major or critical illness was quickly averted because of the good health care at the Flinders Medical Centre. We do not know exactly what the Federal Coalition will put out in its package, but we know that we have to look after people, particularly the battlers and those people on an income of less than $40 000 a year who need to get into private health cover. They say to me time and again, 'Robert, if there is anything you can do with health, encourage them to bring back a tax rebate for private health. If we could write off 30 to 50 per cent of what we are paying, even if it means that we have to forfeit other things for the family, we would be happy with that.'

The dilemma for them under the Keating Government is that health is deteriorating around the nation and Medicare is about to tip over. The Federal Government had a deficit on Medicare alone of more than $10 billion, which means that 10 per cent of the Federal Government's total budget is a deficit in that one area. Irrespective of what Mr Keating and the shadow spokesperson might like to say, we have seen this mass exodus of three million people in 10 years dropping out of private health.

We know that any insurance is about averages and, if you let those averages drop too low, you get to the stage of breaking the camel's back, and that will happen with the Federal Keating Government's health policy. Mark my words! I am not as old as some in this Chamber, but I have been around long enough to know that, whilst there are some good points in the Medicare system which Mr Howard has been happy enough to recognise and commit to, the clear fact remains that, if you are going to give Australians the sort of health care they used to have, you have to get people back onto the private system. But, if you speak to Labor members federally or in this State, or listen to the rhetoric of Mr Keating, you know that Labor wants to see socialised medicine. Mr Keating should stand condemned and be thrown out of office on 101 000 different issues.

One issue alone should throw out Mr Keating, who as Prime Minister of Australia told the people of Australia that he did not have private health insurance and that there was no need to have it. That is all right for Mr Keating on $250 000 a year, but it is not all right for the person in my electorate who is trying to pay off a mortgage with inflated interest rates, resulting from the non-performing economic ability of the Keating Government, and trying to provide for a family while working on the production line at Mitsubishi. It is not all right for those people. They cannot pull thousands of dollars out of their pocket and head into the private health arena. They are the people Howard will look after and the people who will be most appreciative of a package that will address the private health dilemma.

The fact is that the Federal Government clearly has not given the States enough in health, but it is not only in health. If you looked at the tied and untied grants to South Australia over a period, in particular over the past two or three years, we have seen sheer neglect in South Australia from Paul Keating—sheer neglect on every account until it comes to election time. The fact is that he has cut back the tied and untied funding by tens of millions of dollars.

So, South Australians have copped it each way. Notwithstanding that and the overall debacle left to us from the previous Bannon-Arnold Governments, the fact is that we have improved health care in this State. We lead the way in Australia. The proof is there: just pick up the papers and you will see it.

Motion carried.

At 9.15 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 8 February at 10.30 a.m.