

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 25 August 1987

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Anne Levy) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m.

The Clerk (Mr C.H. Mertin) read prayers.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Health, on behalf of The Minister of Consumer Affairs (Hon. C.J. Sumner):

Pursuant to Statute—

Regulations under the following Acts—

Builders Licensing Act 1986—Complaint and Domestic Building Relief.

Commercial Tribunal Act 1982—Constitution, Forms, Service and Hearings.

Consumer Credit Act 1972—Complaint and Non-compliance Fee.

Consumer Transactions Act 1972—Constitution and Power of Register.

Goods Securities Act 1986—Compensation Fee. Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act 1973—Refunds, Complaint Forms and Fee.

Landlord and Tenant Act 1936—Applications Fee and Notices.

Second-hand Goods Act 1985—Complaint Forms and Fee.

Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act 1983—Complaint and Fees.

Travel Agents Act 1986—Form of Complaint and Application.

By the Minister of Health (Hon. J.R. Cornwall):

Pursuant to Statute—

Regulations under the following Acts—

Deer Keepers Act 1987—Registration and Compensation.

Fisheries Act 1982—

Central Zone Abalone Fishery—Licences Fees.

Gulf St. Vincent Prawn Fishery—Licence Fees.

Southern Zone Abalone Fishery—Licence Fees.

Spencer Gulf Prawn Fishery—Licence Fees.

West Coast Prawn Fishery—Licence Fees.

Western Zone Abalone Fishery—Licence Fees.

South Australian Health Commission Act 1976—Linen and Laundry Services

By the Minister of Health, on behalf of the Minister of Tourism (Hon. Barbara Wiese):

Pursuant to Statute—

Mining Act 1971—Regulations—Fees.

By the Minister of Health, on behalf of the Minister of Local Government (Hon. Barbara Wiese):

Pursuant to Statute—

Department of Local Government—Report 1985-86.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: CITY KIDS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The purpose of this statement is to inform the Council and the people of South Australia about problems related to the behaviour and exposure to risk of adolescents frequenting inner-city Adelaide. I also propose to outline the approach being adopted by the Department for Community Welfare, in close co-operation with other agencies and interests, to try to deal with those problems. Before doing so, it is necessary for me to recall the manner in which this subject became a matter of public debate. The community's response to these problems must

be framed on the basis of the actual situation and not on misinformation. Whether we are dealing with questions of prostitution or homelessness, it is essential that our perspective is a correct one.

On 21 May, the Executive Officer of the Children's Interest Bureau, Ms Sally McGregor, submitted to me a memorandum that she prepared following the publication of allegations of child prostitution 'rackets' in Adelaide. Ms McGregor said she had reviewed international and Australian research findings on the subject of juvenile prostitution and had consulted people working closely with young people at risk of being involved in prostitution. She drew a clear distinction between prostitution by young people actively soliciting and providing sexual services for payments and those engaging in sex in return for accommodation, drugs or food. The latter category, sometimes known as 'social prostitution', may also involve providing sexual services in return for affection or approval and, in some cases, for protection. Ms McGregor wrote:

Anyone who has worked with disturbed teenagers (boys and girls) will recognise those whose need for affection leads to indiscriminate sexual contact for minimal returns and/or the need for affection.

Ms McGregor concluded that child prostitution was 'not the organised racket the *Sunday Mail* would have us believe'. She said that there was need to differentiate between youngsters who use sex as a means of survival and those who work for organised agencies such as escort agencies. The anecdotal conclusion was that the former category (what she had described earlier as 'social prostitution') was a more frequent occurrence than the latter. It was very hard to state with any accuracy how many under-18-year-olds were involved in prostitution—however defined—in South Australia.

This assessment conforms to the views contained in a situation report sent to my colleague the Minister of Emergency Services by the Acting Commissioner of Police on 21 May 1987. This followed a meeting of senior officers of the Department for Community Welfare and the police called by me to discuss allegations printed in the *Sunday Mail* on 17 May under the heading 'S.A. Child Vice Racket'. The Deputy Police Commissioner's report said the police perception was that child prostitution does not exist in identified brothels. There was an availability of child prostitutes through some escort agencies. The operators of those agencies were not accepted by the industry generally, and it was believed that children were only available to known and proven clients. The Deputy Police Commissioner also stated:

The police information is that in South Australia there are very few escort agency operators who use children. Information indicates that in this group there may be five to 10 children involved. In addition to this, there is an opportunist prostitution trade. The numbers of children who frequently involve themselves in opportunist prostitution is difficult to assess, but it is believed that any young person who regularly solicited in an area such as Hindley Street, would soon be identified. For this reason any suggestion of organised commercial or openly solicited prostitution in Hindley Street can be questioned.

In view of certain matters which are still subject to investigation, it is not possible for me to canvass all the matters contained in the police report. In general terms, however, I can say that in addressing the following various allegations made in the *Sunday Mail* story the police report made the following points:

An estimated 150 South Australian teenagers are working as child prostitutes. Police intelligence does not support this estimate. On the basis of information available to police, the officer-in-charge of the Vice Squad reports that the numbers, while only an estimate, are believed to be no more than 10.

Accommodation and airfares are provided to some teenagers as part of an interstate vice racket designed to lessen the chances of being caught. The police report said there is no evidence to

support this allegation. Checks with interstate police did not confirm the allegation.

A large part of the industry was being controlled by 'some very heavy duty people' who can organise inter-capital transfers and 'package deals' to kids to help them avoid arrest, or family pressure. There is no evidence available to police which supports this allegation.

A youth worker said he was dealing with up to five cases a week and had 50 reports over the past few months. The allegations appeared to be based on stories told by street kids which were second and third hand and were not substantiated by evidence.

The police report also contained a statement by a chief inspector, who said he had spoken with a *Sunday Mail* journalist in a conversation which centred on the escort agency incidence of juveniles and had no relation to the Hindley Street allegations. It said the journalist had told the officer he was in possession of, or had seen, a DCW paper that stated the figure of 150 juvenile prostitutes working in Hindley Street and sought the officer's response. The officer had replied:

I said I believed the figure to be a ridiculous statement and our intelligence indicated that as a maximum figure only 10 to a dozen juveniles worked regularly on a commercial basis.

Following the publication of further articles in the *Sunday Mail*, I sought an update on the situation from the police. In a memorandum to the Ministers of Emergency Services on 3 August 1987, the Commissioner of Police said that members of the Vice Squad had contacted the *Sunday Mail* and had spoken to a Mr Peter Haran, who was nominated as the spokesman for the newspaper. Mr Haran was invited to assist the police and, in particular, to provide evidence or information on the matters appearing in the articles of 21 May and 28 June. The Police Commissioner's report said:

The members [of the Vice Squad] have reported that Mr Haran obviously had a very limited knowledge of the activities of paedophiles and child prostitutes and his information did not assist police inquiries at all. Arising out of this interview Mr Haran told police that the article (28/6/87) was based upon a document shown to reporters of the *Sunday Mail* by Ms Laidlaw and was seen by them as an attack against Dr Cornwall.

On 2 August, under the heading 'S.A. street kids easy vice prey' the *Sunday Mail* published the statement that interstate police had confirmed the existence of an intercapital child prostitution network. It said reports from Brisbane and Melbourne backed claims made in the *Sunday Mail* more than two months earlier that homeless teenage youths were being lured interstate to service an organised child vice racket. It also said, 'The allegations were strongly criticised as "wild exaggerations" by the Welfare Minister, Dr Cornwall.' In his memorandum of 3 August, the Police Commissioner said South Australian media had asked his department about claims in a Queensland daily newspaper a fortnight earlier that children from South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales were being flown to Brisbane under the pretence of participating in holidays but, in fact, were used in child prostitution activities. The Police Commissioner said Queensland police had advised South Australian police they had no known instances of young people going to that State from South Australia and being offended against in this manner. In fact, the Queensland police claimed that they had been quoted out of context.

As I have stressed, Ms President, it is extremely important that these matters are kept in perspective. It is true that the *Sunday Mail* reports have been greeted with understandable scepticism by professionals in the field. But the fact that the newspaper's claim that 150 children are working as prostitutes in an organised racket has been exposed as a wild exaggeration does not dispel the actual problems. One result of the *Sunday Mail's* first article on this subject was that I called a meeting of agencies and departments, including Housing, Community Welfare, the South Australian

Health Commission and the Children's Interest Bureau, to try to define the problems, to consider the validity of current approaches and to devise responses suitable to the needs of the adolescents concerned.

Following this meeting the Department for Community Welfare mounted a special inner city children's project. A senior departmental officer was assigned to investigate the problem with inner-city children and obtain factual information on the extent of the actual problem. The officer consulted a number of key service agencies, including the Service to Youth Council (which operates the Streetwork Project), the Second Story, the Aboriginal Community Centre and the Hindley Street Project. Consultations were also held with key accommodation services provided by St Johns Shelter, West End Baptist and the Red Cross. The officer has also worked with the South Australian Police Department, Adelaide City Council and the Hindley Street Traders. Agencies willingly cooperated with information and opinion, together with statistics, annual reports and research articles.

The first major conclusion of the officer's report was that there is no evidence of a chronically homeless young adolescent population. Statements suggesting that 150 to 200 young people are frequently homeless, she said, cannot be corroborated. In outlining the results of her work the officer reports:

The reality is that approximately 20 young people may on a single night appear to be homeless. Most of these young people will have a home to go to whether with parents, in a shelter or in other accommodation, but choose not to. The number of young people chronically homeless and bereft of support is negligible. There are times, though, when young people experiencing crises in their lives will need emergency accommodation.

There is evidence to suggest problems in providing emergency accommodation to adolescents in crises. In particular, the report identifies a number of gaps in service provision, particularly for young women. Few services are available to cope with young women who are pregnant, and there are limits on the number of young people with serious behavioural problems able to be accommodated safely.

The officer's second major conclusion is that, while there is no concrete evidence to support the notion of organised prostitution involving young adolescents, 'there is certainly evidence suggesting that adolescents will engage in prostitution activities as a means of attempting to support their individual needs, whether this be a need for income, affection or temporary accommodation'. In framing a sensitive and rational response to this problem we have to recognise the complexity of inherent personal, social and community issues involved. These children are adolescents who are often experiencing crises in terms of their development as young adults. In summarising her report, the officer says:

Rebelliousness, anger, acting-out, challenging authority—whether parents, teachers or the police—are often hallmarks of the adolescent in crisis. Very often these young people will do things without being aware of the risks involved. Our responsibility in this circumstance is to provide as much support as possible; to provide, in a sense, a safety net.

Quite distinct groups of young people are congregating in the inner-city, often trying to cope with a range of psychological, social and emotional needs. The overwhelming majority are not 'street kids', as the term is generally understood in larger cities, both in Australia and overseas, but are probably best described as 'city kids'. Organisations and agencies in the inner-city area have identified nine discrete groups of children and young people frequenting Adelaide's streets:

1. The 'schoolies' constitute about 200 or more children aged between 12 and 16 years, who generally congregate in the vicinity of Rundle Mall, mainly on Friday nights.

2. A group categorised as 'white adolescents' constitutes predominantly Anglo Saxon kids aged between 12 and 18 years who are regularly on the streets, particularly Hindley Street. Between 20 and 50 of them are on the streets every night of the week. They present with multiple problems which can be emotional, psychological, social or behavioural.

3. In the same age bracket there is an 'Aboriginal adolescents' group, also to be found on the streets every night, which shares the same characteristics as the white adolescents. Their problems can be exacerbated by their Aboriginality.

4. Perhaps the most visible group from the community perspective is known as the 'louts'. From 40 to 50 young people in the 15 to 18 age bracket gather on Friday nights, mainly in the Hindley Street area. According to traders, persons in this group include white, Aboriginal and ethnic males and females who deliberately and provocatively 'hassle' members of the community.

5. Another group gathering mainly on Friday nights is the 'Greek-Italian' group, from 200 to 500 young people visiting both Hindley Street and Rundle Mall. Many of these do not pose a problem. They are generally neat in appearance and appear to have financial means. Within this group, however, there are subgroups who have formed themselves into gangs with dress codes and whose behaviour is troublesome.

6. The largest group of Aborigines, known as 'young Aborigines' comprise 50 to 70 people aged between six and 12 years and another 100 to 130 people aged between 12 and 18 years. There are major concerns for the physical safety of the younger age subgroup because they are vulnerable to abuse from older children or adults on the streets. The older children come into the city from outlying suburbs for recreation and social relations. Both subgroups are regular weekend visitors to Adelaide city, though Friday night is the most popular time.

7. Those in the oldest Aboriginal group, the 'Parkies', use the various inner-city parks. There are generally 10 to 15 young males, aged from 16-20 years, who may have had frequent contact with the criminal justice system.

8. One very small group, which appeared to leave the inner-city scene some months ago, has now returned. About half a dozen 'Indo-Chinese' youths, believed to travel from the Elizabeth/Salisbury area, now regularly visit Hindley Street on Friday nights. There are signs of friction with some of the other groups on the streets.

9. The final group, both male and female, are categorised as borderline 'intellectually disabled' and are seen as possibly the most vulnerable of all the street groups. About six young persons in the 16-plus age group have been identified and are known to be at risk, particularly of sexual exploitation.

We must continue to work closely with inner-city service providers, provide them with better information on the needs and issues relevant to young people frequenting the inner-city area, and find more resources to support them. While it would not be appropriate for me to usurp the budget process and projects which attract joint Commonwealth-State funding by providing specific details at this time, I can give an assurance that we are acting constructively to address the issues identified. Through the Inner-City Emergency Accommodation Task Force and the Crisis Accommodation Program, we will boost the number of beds available for emergency accommodation. In her report, the DCW officer says that it is important to note that the proposed increase has been carefully planned. Discussions regarding increased bed capacity and the need for accom-

modation services to take a needs-based approach have been occurring for some months. By planning and providing for more emergency accommodation we will enable agencies to be more flexible in their provision of general accommodation.

For young people genuinely in need of support the result will be better accommodation options including single sex shelters, short-term and long-term shelters and better access to boarding houses. As well as additional accommodation, our commitment will include additional funding for staffing and oncosts. Additional positions which have been recommended include two street workers, one to work with Aboriginal children and another to focus particularly on white adolescents and their emergency accommodation needs, and a youth worker in the area of child protection especially relating to young Aborigines. Funding is also recommended for two or three workers to allow expansion of accommodation services. Finally, because of the need to coordinate emergency accommodation and youth welfare and health services in the inner-city area, it is also proposed that a position of coordinator be created.

Our overall approach is based on the clear principle that responsibility for dealing with these young people and their problems must be shared. It cannot be dealt with by government alone, because this is an issue 'owned' by the community at large. Fortunately, I can confidently report to the Council that non-government agencies and the business community have already demonstrated willingness and goodwill in acknowledging the need to work together and accept shared responsibility. Discussions are continuing with the Hindley Street traders on their involvement in an initiative that will be announced in due course. We have also opened negotiations with the Adelaide City Council, which has indicated its willingness to co-operate on a proposal to assist with one of the fundamental difficulties facing service providers, that is, the lack of co-ordination within the inner-city area.

This problem is also being discussed with the Service to Youth Council and other non-government organisations. The proposal will also help meet the fundamental need for ongoing research and data collection on the background, characteristics and needs of young people frequenting the inner-city area. Funding and other specific details of these co-ordinated and comprehensive programs will be finalised and announced by the end of October.

Finally, I acknowledge to the Council my gratitude to the wide range of agencies and individuals assisting in the framing of our current plans. The Department for Community Welfare has been able to rely on concerned co-operation across the board, from the police to the Children's Interests Bureau and from non-government agencies to business interests. As I have emphasised, we are dealing with problems which demand community-based responses beyond the measures which government alone can make. With goodwill and the continued dedication of those in the field, I am sure we can succeed.

QUESTIONS

HOSPITAL TRANSPORT

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question on the subject of hospital transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I have been approached by a number of people with complaints about hospital trans-

port procedures. Today I would like to outline two cases. The first involves a Mr William Southwood of Aldinga Beach, who was rushed to Flinders Medical Centre because he was coughing blood due to blood clots in his lungs. Mr Southwood, who is 73, was admitted to hospital and stayed there for a week before being sent home on the morning of 6 August.

This man has no family here except for his wife, who is also in her 70s. They have no car and cannot drive because of sight problems. Mr Southwood was initially told that he would be discharged on Friday 7 August, but on the day before, on Thursday, he was told that he could leave. My information is that he asked how he would get home and that he was told by a woman at the hospital, who he thought was in charge of finances, that he would have to make his own way home.

He had about \$5 in his pocket and did not know of anyone who could pick him up. A taxi to Aldinga Beach would have cost him about \$26. In addition, he had nothing to wear except his pyjamas, dressing gown and slippers. The woman told him that St Johns might be able to help him but that he would have to pay a 'big bill'. He told her that he had no alternative but to catch a public bus, to which remark the woman replied, 'I'm sorry' and then walked away. So, Mr Southwood, wearing his pyjamas and dressing gown, was taken to a bus stop near Flinders Medical Centre and he boarded a public bus. He said that people laughed at him when he got on, and he told them that he had just been thrown out of Flinders.

He travelled to Colonnades, arriving at about 4.45 p.m. and went to a taxi rank, hoping the taxi driver would take pity on him. He told one of the drivers what had happened and asked how much it would cost to go to Aldinga Beach. He was told that it would cost about \$16, and the driver simply shrugged his shoulders when Mr Southwood said that he did not have that much money.

He went to a bus stop to wait for another bus to Aldinga. At 6.15 p.m. the bus arrived, by which time, to use his words, he was 'frozen stiff'. Eventually, he arrived home and he was just about exhausted. Clearly, there is something wrong with the patient transport scheme when situations such as this occur. As I mentioned earlier, this is just one of the many complaints that I have received on this subject.

There is another unfortunate example of an elderly person being refused transport, and this matter was raised by the Hon. Dr Eastick in another place. The man was admitted to Hutchinson Hospital on 26 June because of deteriorating health. He was transported by ambulance, on the doctor's orders, to outpatients at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and was admitted immediately. He was discharged on 9 July. He was refused an ambulance to take him home to Gawler and was collected by his daughter in her small car. On the way home he lapsed into unconsciousness, and it took three people to get him out of the back of the car and into bed. He remained in a very confused state and his health further deteriorated after this incident. Unfortunately, he has since passed away. My question is: will the Minister institute an immediate review of the patient transport scheme, both in the metropolitan area and in the country?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: If the story related by Mr Cameron about the patient's discharge from the Flinders Medical Centre is accurate, then it is quite disgraceful and I shall leave no stone unturned to see that the perpetrators of this apparently callous discharge are found and that they are very severely reprimanded.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: It shows what pressure your system is under.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I said that, if the facts related by Mr Cameron are accurate, then it reveals a disgraceful incident and I will leave no stone unturned to see that the perpetrators of this callous business are very severely reprimanded.

In relation to the other story related by the Hon. Bruce Eastick, the member for Light in another place, I have already had that matter exhaustively investigated. I have discussed the incident with the Administrator of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The patient concerned was suffering from cancer and had been an inpatient and an outpatient at the Royal Adelaide Hospital for a long time. He was very well known to medical, nursing and other staff at the hospital. He was a very well liked, loved and respected patient at the hospital. I have to say that the version given by Dr Eastick was very substantially at odds (as so often happens) with the version that was formally recorded by the hospital. I have no reason to doubt that the explanation that was given to me by the Administrator of the Royal Adelaide Hospital was an accurate version of the events. There are always two sides to a story, and these matters need to be investigated. The episode at the Flinders Medical Centre will be investigated.

With regard to hospital transport and patient discharge generally, it is a difficult area. Many times I think that there is an expectation that membership of the St John Ambulance organisation entitles a patient to ambulance or clinic transport on demand. That is not the case and in recent years it has never been the case. Whether the patients are travelling home from outpatients or whether they are being discharged as inpatients, their individual needs are assessed and they are allocated a taxi, a clinic car or an ambulance according to the assessment of their clinical need at the time. I am aware that on occasions this practice has caused some concern, and there have been reports to my office and to electorate offices concerning this matter. There is no doubt that every now and again one springs out of the system which, on the face of it at least, seems to involve a lack of humanity.

As members are well aware, the whole question of patient relations and ensuring that all our hospitals not only are caring institutions but are perceived to be concerned and caring institutions was a matter of such importance to me that about five or six months ago I specifically established a task force chaired by Mr Ian Bidmeade to look at patient relations and this whole area of communication with patients and perceptions by them about caring attitudes within the public hospital area generally.

Indeed, I am meeting with the Chairman of the task force (in my recollection) within the next few days. One of the matters that I intend to pursue with him is the question of transport. In the meantime, it is regularly brought to the attention especially of the administrators of the metropolitan public hospitals. We will continue to make every effort to ensure not only that discharges are handled effectively, efficiently and humanely, but also that the post discharge planning, which includes adequate transport from hospital to home, is made and met on every occasion.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FUNDING

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government a question about local government funding.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: One of the measures introduced in the Federal mini budget in May was that the Federal

Government would pay the South Australian Local Government Grants Commission funds to councils on a quarterly basis during the current financial year and in future financial years rather than as a lump sum in August or September of each financial year. I have calculated that the loss to the 126 councils in South Australia will total at least \$3 million in the 1987-88 financial year.

The South-East Local Government Association at its recent annual general meeting protested strongly about this decision. The Tatiara District Council, for example, said that it would cost the council about \$26 000 in lost interest in the current year. Local government throughout the State is concerned not only that interest will be lost because of the Federal Government's decision to switch from an up-front lump sum payment to quarterly payments but also that overdraft costs will increase and the ability of councils to match Government grants for specific projects will be seriously impaired. All councils in South Australia will be affected, and clearly this will put pressure on the rate dollar. In fact, it is expected that there will have to be an increase of about 1 per cent in council rates in this and in future financial years to compensate for this change in the funding system. In some cases, of course, the figure could be more. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Does the Minister accept the fact that the so-called mini budget cut will only put greater pressure on local government and ratepayers throughout South Australia and that in reality it is no cut at all?
2. Has the Minister done anything to alleviate the difficulties resulting from this change in funding payments to local government?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Ms President, the matter of local government funding and moving to quarterly payments will most definitely affect local government's ability to do a whole range of things and, in fact, the honourable member's calculation of some \$3 million less coming to individual councils as a result of quarterly payments is roughly in line with the calculations that have been made by the Local Government Grants Commission as well.

Certainly, the capacity of local government to invest its money and to gain returns that can be used for the delivery of services and to put into various programs will be affected by the decisions that have been taken by the Federal Government. I think that everyone in the local government community is aware and appreciates the fact that, first, the Federal Government stuck to the original agreement which it had with local government about the funding arrangement. The only change that was made was that the money would be paid quarterly rather than annually.

I acknowledge that in fact the money that is lost as a result of quarterly payments will outweigh the percentage increase that formed the basis of the agreement but, when compared with the funding cuts that State Governments around Australia have had to endure as a result of the national financial circumstances in which we find ourselves, most people in local government recognise that they got off very lightly indeed.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Local government is paying the price for bad housekeeping by the Federal Government.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: No, that is not so at all. What we are saying, and what the Federal Government has said, is that all people in Australia must bear the burden of the current financial situation. State Governments have been asked to bear quite enormous cuts. Local government has not been asked to bear cuts to the same sort of extent, and it is for that reason, Ms President, that the local government community, whilst it is obviously not happy about it, is certainly not protesting too strongly because it realises

that it has not suffered to the same extent as have other levels of government.

HOSPITAL DEATH

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question about a hospital death.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Last week, I asked the Attorney-General a series of questions about a disturbing case which is presently the subject of a wide-ranging suppression order. A man was charged with manslaughter arising out of the death of a young woman in a country hospital. The man elected to be tried by judge alone, and not by a judge and jury. The judge acquitted the man on 4 August 1987, after a trial which commenced on 14 July 1987. Notwithstanding the acquittal there is a high probability of the man being civilly liable. The suppression order prevents disclosure of the man's name, address, occupation, and anything which might tend to identify him, as well as the identity of the dead woman and the judge's remarks made in announcing the acquittal.

It is 2½ years since the death of the young woman, and her family are incensed that no details of the death or the judge's remarks in acquitting the man can be made public. Last week the Attorney-General indicated that he would have his officers review the suppression order with a view to launching an appeal if not for cessation of the suppression order then significantly narrowing it. There are, Madam President, also questions arising out of the circumstances of the young woman's death relating to hospital administration and practice. However, the suppression order means that the hospital cannot be identified publicly, nor can the occupation of the person involved. We are not able to say whether the man was a general practitioner, surgeon, anaesthetist, nurse, nurse's aide, or some other person, whether employee or otherwise engaged within the hospital situation. Obviously that creates a lot of uneasiness among those who do work in hospitals across the State.

The family of the dead woman, among other initiatives, has been in touch with the South Australian Health Commission with a view to having the circumstances of the dead woman's death investigated, and pressing for disciplinary action to be instituted either by the Health Commission or by the Minister of Health. The family has been told that the matter is out of the hands of the Health Commission. I recognise that the Minister does not have the name of either the man who was acquitted or of the dead woman, and I am prepared to give that to him privately so that the terms of the suppression order are not infringed. In the light of that information, my questions to the Minister are:

1. Will the Minister of Health investigate the circumstances of the death of the young woman?
2. Will the Minister do all such things as are necessary to enable disciplinary action to be taken, notwithstanding the acquittal on the criminal charge?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I would have thought that the Hon. Mr Griffin, above all others, would not want to invoke principles of double jeopardy.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: It's not a question of double jeopardy.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: It is a question of double jeopardy. The honourable member says that this person has been tried on a criminal charge in a criminal court in South Australia and has been acquitted. Now he wants me to pursue the matter and to presumably interfere with the

autonomy of the South Australian Medical Board because that is the only way in which there could be discipline against the man if he happens to be a medical practitioner. Is the honourable member seriously suggesting that I should put pressure on the South Australian Medical Board? That is what he is suggesting in practice, and he knows very well that he is.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: I'm not. That's absolute nonsense.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: It is not nonsense at all. The Hon. Mr Griffin knows his law. He comes in here to titillate.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Ask the Attorney-General his response last week. He said he was concerned.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: It is appropriately with the Attorney-General. The Health Commission, as you well know, has no power to discipline in a situation like this.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The honourable member is asking whether I will do everything I can to see that there is disciplinary action. The only course that is open to me—and this is what the honourable member is suggesting—is that I should somehow pursue this with members of the South Australian Medical Board to put quite improper pressure on them to take some sort of action. That is what he is suggesting. He appropriately raised the matter with the Attorney-General and, like the Attorney-General, I too am concerned that there does appear, on the face of it at least, to be an over use, if not an abuse, of suppression orders in this State at this time. This is very important because the matter to which the Hon. Mr Griffin referred was certainly a matter of very considerable public interest locally and at the State level.

It seems inappropriate in the circumstances that the comments of the judge are not available in the public arena; that is a very great pity. I share the Attorney's view and I strongly support it. However, it is certainly not up to me to engage in some sort of action, which could only be regarded as improper and which, at best, could only be regarded as exceeding my authority, to bring pressure on any one of the autonomous bodies, which are involved in the registration of health professionals in this State, to try to force them into adopting disciplinary procedures. The Health Commission does not have the power to discipline health professionals as the Hon. Mr Griffin very well knows.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: I'm not suggesting you discipline them. You can't understand the question.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: One of the Hon. Mr Griffin's questions was quite clearly—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: You can't understand what the question is.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Yes I can. His second question was, to paraphrase, whether I would do whatever I reasonably could to ensure that disciplinary action was taken. He is asking me to do something which, quite obviously, would be improper. I regret that these matters cannot be publicly aired because they are matters of concern, and I share the family's concern that the whole matter cannot be given the appropriate airing. However, I am not about to act improperly with regard to breaking a suppression order on the one hand, or, on the other hand, putting some sort of Ministerial muscle upon a registration board.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I ask a supplementary question: is the Council to conclude from the Minister's answer that he will take no action?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: He really is a little crumb, you know. Don Dunstan was quite right.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: Injurious reflection.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: No, I am simply quoting what a former Premier said about him. He has tried to push me into a circumstance where allegedly I am not prepared to take action—whatever action is possible, as the Hon. Mr Griffin puts it—to ensure that a suppression order is treated with contempt. I am not about to do that.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: I'm not asking you to do that.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Yes, you are; in practice, that is what you are doing. The honourable member is asking me either to treat a suppression order of a senior court in this State with contempt or, alternatively, to bring improper pressure on a registration board in this State. He knows very well that they are the only courses of action open to me. I am not about to act improperly and I am not about to act in contempt of the South Australian legal system. That is the answer to the question. I repeat that I have great sympathy for the family. I regret very strongly that the circumstances and the judgment are not able to be given the full and public airing that I believe they deserve.

PESTICIDES

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Agriculture representing the Minister of Health a question about residual pesticides.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The \$750 million beef export industry in Australia is, at the moment, at grave risk because of residual pesticides being found in overseas meat export containers that are sent to the United States and to Canada. The position in Japan and Taiwan is being reviewed. The residual pesticides originated in three States: Queensland, Western Australia and Victoria. I understand that Japan is currently reviewing its procedures of testing, Taiwan is doing something similar, and Canada is providing for heavy tests. It is difficult to find out whether the problems are real or whether they are perceived problems owing to some of the non tariff barriers that are put in front of export markets. I believe that some of the explanations given would point to the fact that there are real residual pesticide problems. Can the Minister of Agriculture say what is the current situation in relation to our beef export market problems? Are the tests being carried out in South Australia adequate in the eyes of the Minister and, if not, what action is being taken to solve these problems in our export markets?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I will refer that question to the Minister of Agriculture in another place and bring back a reply.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health, in his own right and also representing the Minister of Agriculture, a question on the subject of pesticide residuals.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I was not quite sure how far the Hon. Mr Roberts would go in his questions, but he did not cover some of the matters I wish to cover. He alluded to the problems of our export market, which is, as he said, about \$800 million for beef. There have been residuals of DDT and Heptachlor, at least, found in nine samples recently, and I believe that in one case the levels were 50 per cent above the Australian standard. This is barely above the American standard but a clear 50 per cent over the Australian standard. I would have hoped and expected that the Health Minister in his own right could have answered the first question the Hon. Mr Roberts asked in relation to whether or not the meat we are getting in South Australia is safe.

I wish to touch on the question of the large amount of advertising in agricultural journals from pesticide companies. To the best of my knowledge, the only firm that considers questions of safety or ecological factors in its advertising is Nufarm: the rest tend to ignore the question. When we consider the ill informed status of many consumers—although I think many farmers are realising some implications, at least in terms of export dollars—and the apparently laissez-faire attitude towards the controlled use of agricultural chemicals, the potential for environmental contamination is appalling. I ask the following questions.

First, is the South Australian Government considering legislation to tighten up the use of agricultural chemicals? Secondly, is the Government considering legislation that would have strict requirements on advertising material, which makes it quite clear what the components of particular chemicals are and what are the ramifications of their use? Thirdly, what reports have come to the Health Commission so far, in terms of standards of contamination in meat?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I did not quite catch the third question: it did not seem to make a lot of sense. It is a matter of public record that the Government is now having amendments drafted that will literally ban the whole range of organic chlorines in agriculture. I will refer the second question to my colleague the Minister of Agriculture and bring back a reply. The third question concerns what reports have come to the South Australian Health Commission, I think, concerning residues in foodstuffs. Certainly, the Health Commission has not been involved in the present national problem.

No specific instances of insecticide contamination in recent times have been drawn to my attention, but I am perfectly happy to make further inquiries of the public health authorities and, if there is anything whatsoever to report in terms of insecticide residues in South Australian foodstuffs detected by the public health division, I will be very pleased to bring back the details.

AIDS COUNCIL

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question regarding the AIDS Council of South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I was rather disturbed to read in the media statements purported to have been made by Dr David Plummer, the national President of the Australian Federation of AIDS Organisations, regarding the level of State Government assistance to the AIDS Council of South Australia. Is the Minister aware of any problems of staffing within this organisation, and can he state whether the AIDS Council of South Australia has approached him for more funding?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I believe that a submission was forwarded through Dr Scott Cameron, head of the Communicable Diseases Control Unit, and also Chairman of the South Australian AIDS Committee. Nothing has come across my desk. I was therefore surprised and more than a trifle disappointed to see the comments of Dr David Plummer, the visiting Victorian, on the weekend. He compared us to Queensland. He would have us believe—

An honourable member: You have just been up there.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I have, indeed, and I am able to report at first hand that, if you lived in Queensland and you were rearing children in Queensland, as a responsible parent you would be involved in the great debate as

to whether there ought to be sex education in schools. There is still no sex education in Queensland State schools: it is still a matter of great debate. When Australia is part of a global pandemic with the AIDS virus, that ought to be a matter of very serious concern to everyone. I raised this matter within days of coming back from my overseas trip. It seems to me totally incongruous that we in South Australia, as part of this nation, must contend with a situation where children in secondary schools in Queensland not only are given no AIDS information but are not even given basic sex education.

That ought to be a matter of serious concern to anyone who has any knowledge in the public health area. It ought to be a matter of serious concern to every member of this Parliament who has any regard to see us retain the significantly advantageous position we have at this time in controlling AIDS in South Australia. The reason why the AIDS Council (a voluntary organisation) has to be relatively well funded in Queensland is that there is a very defective State funded formal organisation for the control of AIDS. In fact, that AIDS Council in Queensland is principally funded by the Federal Government in an attempt to at least get some sort of anti-AIDS campaign, anti-AIDS strategy, and anti-AIDS information disseminated around that State.

South Australia, on the other hand, has developed a comprehensive AIDS strategy, which involves the integration of health services. The Health Commission's AIDS unit is responsible for coordinating the strategy for the training of staff in other health services and providing a consultative service both for individual patients and health professionals. The unit also provides initial case assessments, working closely with the Sexually Transmitted Disease Service in the sharing of facilities and expertise. The State Government is advised about AIDS by the AIDS Advisory Committee, the South Australian equivalent of the national AIDS Task Force. The Committee is chaired by Dr Scott Cameron, Senior Medical Advisor of the Health Commission's Communicable Diseases Control Unit, as I have said, and comprises a wide range of scientific and medical expertise. Its task is to act as a clearing house for information about the disease from both interstate and overseas, to assist in the development of Government policy, monitor the progress of the disease and rationalise the management of cases.

The AIDS Advisory Committee includes a representative from the AIDS Council of South Australia, which has been the subject of the recent media attention. The council is a voluntary umbrella organisation, which embraces community groups such as the Gay Counselling Service and the Haemophilia Association. As part of South Australia's comprehensive AIDS strategy, the council has been a major contributor in achieving South Australia's excellent record in AIDS education, and in maintaining a low incidence of the disease.

The volunteer council is associated with the AIDS council and has made and will continue to make an important contribution to the care of infected individuals. Further increased staffing of the Health Commission's AIDS unit has recently been approved, so that more of these volunteers can be trained, together with health professionals from other organisations.

We have a very integrated service, and an integrated approach. South Australia's excellent record indicates the value of this integrated approach to AIDS involving the coordination of all health institutions rather than the establishment of large independent organisations. Because of the different roles and emphases of such organisations, interstate comparisons with allocated staff and funds have little

meaning, for the reasons I explained at the outset. It would be a very backward step at this stage for South Australia to change the emphasis of resource allocation towards isolated units at the expense of strengthening the whole system to fight the AIDS epidemic.

WELFARE WORKERS

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Community Welfare a question about burn-out among community welfare workers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Burn-out among workers is really emotional and physical exhaustion that arises from work undertaken by many community welfare workers, both in the Government and non-government sectors. Currently, welfare work is characterised by a high turnover of staff. This problem has reached alarming proportions in the Department for Community Welfare in recent years. I noted with interest that in his Address in Reply speech the Hon. Mr Elliott made reference to this matter, because it is a fact that the attrition rate in that department over the past four years has been 67.4 per cent.

If one uses the 1985-86 figures it is entirely feasible to assume that the entire staff of the DCW could be turned over within the next four years. The figures relating to DCW workers employed in district offices or out in the field indicate that the entire staff will turn over within three years. In addition, cases of workers compensation due to stress have also been rising alarmingly. I noted that, in the Review of the Management and Administration of Women's Shelters tabled by the Minister two weeks ago, reference was made to this problem of burn-out among welfare staff. That report noted that there is a range of tested strategies for preventing burn-out, and it highlighted a Canadian scheme which has apparently had some success among teachers in that country and which apparently involves staff volunteering to accept three-quarters pay for three years and taking the fourth year off on three-quarters pay. The scheme apparently pays for itself, as it is the person's own earned salary used to pay for the fourth year.

Another advantage of the scheme that has been noted is that it provides more employment, since in that fourth year, when the regular staff member is on leave, another person is given one year's employment, training and experience. Does the Minister concede that problems of stress and staff turnover, high rates of resignation, particularly amongst experienced staff, and escalating levels of workers compensation claims are compounding problems within the DCW in meeting its statutory obligations to individuals and families in need? Also, does he consider that the Canadian scheme could be pursued in the DCW as a valuable strategy to address the burn-out problem amongst staff? If he does not consider that option could be pursued, what other measures are being taken to address this serious problem of occupational stress among DCW workers?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: First, to the extent that there may have been any morale problem in the DCW, or any lack of unity in that department generally, that problem was overcome by Dr Ritson a week ago or thereabouts; nothing could have galvanised the entire staff of the DCW more than Dr Ritson's outrageous allegations against the Chief Executive Officer. Such was the overwhelming reaction that I had to ask my ministerial assistant in the DCW to take positive action to stop literally hundreds of field staff coming to the Legislative Council on the day that I

was to make my ministerial statement in rebuttal. Such was the overwhelming response and support engendered by Dr Ritson's outrageous behaviour that he has welded that department together significantly, and in a way that none of us could otherwise have done. So that is the one—and may I say the only—good thing that came out of Dr Ritson's reprehensible and disgraceful behaviour.

Burn-out is treated very seriously and the pressure on staff is a matter of real concern for me. There is no doubt about that, given all the circumstances of the 1980s, such as pressure for lower taxes and decreased public expenditure, combined with an economy that has been in some difficulty for a long time both nationally and internationally. In addition, last year we saw the collapse of our terms of trade, and a general realisation that in many ways we were living above our means. Put all that together, and combine it with a burgeoning increase in the reported number of cases of child abuse (including child sexual abuse), and there has been much pressure put on field staff within the DCW.

In last year's budget I was successful in obtaining an additional \$800 000 full year funding equivalent allocation for the DCW at a time when every other department and Government agency had to effect productivity savings or cuts, whichever one prefers to call them, ranging between 1 per cent and 2 per cent. I am not about to reveal details of this year's budget, but again I think that the compassion and caring face of the Bannon Government will become very clear when its further action is revealed. We are a caring Government, which recognises the pressures that are on members of the Department for Community Welfare, and on the people with whom it deals.

I am concerned about burn-out; indeed, in the run up to the 1987-88 budget I have met regularly with a group of nominated field staff workers from the coal face. Various officers have been meeting with me as a specially constituted ministerial committee, so that I am constantly appraised of what it is like out there in the real world. If the Opposition spokesperson on welfare lived in the real world, I do not think that she would come in here with suggestions such as community welfare staff should accept a three-quarter salary. I do not know too many people employed by the department who could live very comfortably on three-quarters of their salary. I think that the suggestion made has absolutely no merit at all.

HOSPITALS

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I ask the Minister of Health a question: if a hospital has become incorporated, is it possible for the board to have it unincorporated?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The short answer to that question is that I believe—

The Hon. Peter Dunn: 'I don't know.'

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: When you have all finished I will continue—you are a real barrel of laughs. The short answer to the question is: yes, I believe so. The exact legal procedure that is necessary for that is quite another matter. There would have to be some very good reasons—but it is possible for a hospital to do almost anything. It is possible for a hospital to decide that it wants to be a private hospital, for example, and we would be prepared to listen to or look at any proposition that was put forward. We must always remember, of course, when talking about recognised hospitals around this State, that they are funded by the Health Commission and the Government.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: By the taxpayers.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Yes, by taxpayers; it is public money. If this mythical hospital wished to make some sort of proposition along the lines suggested I would be happy to have the commission have a look at it.

CITY KIDS

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I wish to ask the Minister of Health a question about city kids. Is the Minister of Health willing to supply the full reports of the Executive Officer of the Children's Interests Bureau and also of the Assistant Commissioner of Police on those matters to which he alluded in his ministerial statement?

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: And the memo.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: All the reports contained therein.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I had better go and have a read of them first. I think the answer is probably yes—I cannot recall all the contents. The honourable member referred specifically to the report of the Executive Director of the Children's Interests Bureau, which was a response to the first article in the *Sunday Mail*, and to the report of the Deputy Commissioner of Police. I cannot give an undertaking on the report by the Deputy Commissioner of Police, because it is my recollection that the report was made to my colleague the Minister of Emergency Services, and I am not about to offer to table reports from Police Commissioners and Deputy Police Commissioners made to my colleague. However, I am prepared to consult with him and, in the event that it will not create any awkwardness or precedents, I will see what I can do. I will not give the honourable member an undertaking sight unseen but will go and do a bit of consulting in the meantime.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 20 August. Page 374.)

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I support the motion, and I thank His Excellency the Governor for the speech with which he opened this session of State Parliament. Also, I commend you, Ms President, as well as officers of the Legislative Council and all the other people who were involved in the preparation of this Chamber. I invited my 19-year old second cousin to attend on that occasion and with his fresh eyes and enthusiasm he impressed on me the ability to see the whole ceremony in a quite different perspective. He was really overwhelmed at the grandeur, the excitement and the whole atmosphere of the opening. So, I do convey to you, Ms President, my thoughts that the whole opening of Parliament certainly befitted the traditions of this place, celebrating with considerable style our democratic system.

In respect of His Excellency's speech, I was impressed to note that, in comparison with previous outlines of the program of government for the forthcoming parliamentary session, on this occasion a relatively large section of the speech was devoted to community welfare matters—child abuse, including child sexual abuse, and the establishment of four pilot health and social welfare councils. This attention is most welcome, but that is about the only bouquet that one

can credibly extend to the Government in respect of the state of the community welfare sector in South Australia.

The occasion of His Excellency's speech provided the Government with a long awaited and long overdue opportunity to identify with the debilitating circumstances being endured by an increasing number of individuals and families and to acknowledge the grave problems that are being encountered by organisations and individuals responsible for the delivery of community welfare related services. However, this rare opportunity was not grasped.

I note, by contrast, that the Government was prepared to go to some pains to identify with the industrial and rural sectors of this State, to note concern for the troubled times that both sectors are experiencing and to outline a resolve—although somewhat shallow—to address underlying problems. The Government's heavy concentration on these two sectors to the exclusion of any overview of the community welfare sector or reference to the plight of individuals and families in general serves merely to reinforce anxieties that have been expressed repeatedly to me that the Government does not place a high priority on the wellbeing of individuals and families or, alternatively, that it does not comprehend the crisis that is being experienced in the community welfare sector in this State.

Whatever the reason for the Government's neglect, the alarming reality is that the community welfare sector in this State is in the grip of a crisis, and the Government is standing idly by while the problems multiply each day. I use the word 'crisis' quite deliberately, but not without having done a great deal of careful research and analysis of background developments and having carefully considered the potential ramifications. By implication I am not an alarmist: I raise this matter today out of a very genuine desire to help bring about overdue and urgent improvements to the community welfare sector, a sector which in the not too distant past was respected Australia-wide as being one providing a high standard of committed service, which emphasised prevention, integrity and quality of care in its collective drive to do the very best for the individuals and families in need of extra assistance or special attention.

However, over the past few years we have lost this fine reputation, and, as most honourable members would know, it is very hard to build up a good reputation but, unfortunately, very easy to lose it—and lost it we have. The current situation is not one of which we can be proud. It gives cause for extreme alarm. I believe that this alarm arises from the following facts. First, sky-rocketing numbers of individuals and families are finding it increasingly impossible to cope with diminished household incomes, often to a large extent flowing from the rising cost of basic goods and services. This includes Government services. The emotional and financial resources of these people are being stretched to breaking point. In turn, often through no fault of their own, many South Australians from the vulnerable young to the vulnerable elderly are being forced to resort to the welfare sector for assistance, encouragement, and emotional, moral and financial support.

Secondly, the Department for Community Welfare no longer provides traditional services that focus on reducing or overcoming a broad range of social problems in the community. Since 1985, when the department adopted what is now seen as a narrow philosophy or view of its role, accompanied by a priority rating system that classifies clients according to the nature of their social problem, the department has developed an obsession with child abuse, to the exclusion of all other problems, no matter the severity of that problem. Crisis intervention and rehabilitation rather than remedial or preventative intervention is now the order

of the day, notwithstanding the fact that remedial and preventative interventions are instrumental in overcoming social problems and/or the need for crisis intervention and rehabilitation.

Thirdly, administrative disarray within the higher echelons of the DCW hierarchy and inadequate management policies are reinforcing a rising sense of hopelessness amongst increasing numbers of families and a rising sense of disillusion, heartbreak and stress amongst fieldworkers, whether they be in the Government or non-government sector.

Fourthly, the non-government welfare sector is increasingly unable to meet the growing cries for help. Its resources are stretched to the limit and, generally, they are well beyond its capacity. Paid staff and volunteers are being called upon to do more with less. Many long serving organisations are finding it increasingly difficult and yet more time consuming to attract necessary or essential funds to maintain even a basic service. No longer is it their prime objective to complement the services provided by Government. Today they are being pressured to pick up services that the DCW no longer chooses to provide, yet rarely do they receive the funding resources to do so.

Fifthly, presiding over this catastrophic and depressing mess is a part-time Minister, a Minister whose time and energy increasingly is monopolised by the health portfolio and budget and whose standard response to anyone who raises concerns or criticisms is to hurl abuse, denigrate and/or intimidate that individual. His answer to any problem is to forestall action to redress the problem by establishing yet another ad hoc inquiry. In the meantime the precious few resources available to DCW are being siphoned off to try to make some sense of his grand schemes, such as coalescence and social justice. In the hands of the Hon. Dr Cornwall the DCW has been downgraded; it has lost its direction and, to a large degree, it has lost its sense of purpose. Department for Community Welfare fieldworkers are disillusioned and, together with clerical officers, they feel an acute sense of alienation from management. As with workers in the non-government sector, they are angry, frustrated, overworked and very tired.

In the meantime, anxieties and problems experienced by individuals and families in need of help are being unnecessarily reinforced, because their needs are not being addressed at an early stage. It is my considered view that this litany of woe which I have outlined and on which I intend to elaborate in a few minutes demands the following action from the Bannan Government: first, that the community welfare portfolio be upgraded; and secondly, that a major inquiry be established to determine the means by which DCW once again can realise its fine objectives, which are stated in the Community Welfare Act 1971-1982. Section 10 is as follows:

- (a) To promote the welfare of the community generally and of individuals, families and groups within the community; and
- (b) to promote the dignity of the individual and the welfare of the family as the bases of the welfare of the community.

The full realisation of these objectives requires any such inquiry to focus on, first, the merits of the priority rating system that classifies clients according to the nature of their social problem; secondly, the relationship between DCW policies and trends in social problems in the community; thirdly, the resources required to restore remedial and preventative intervention work rather than crisis intervention and rehabilitation as the overriding priority of the department; fourthly, the most effective management practices and procedures to handle social problems; fifthly, the best means to address problems of low morale, high attrition

rates and increasing workers compensation claims for occupational stress and assault amongst social workers and resident care workers; and, sixthly, the most efficient and effective means of allocating grants to the non-government welfare sector.

In addition, I believe that there is an urgent need for the State Government to establish a mechanism by which the collective impact of Federal and State Government decisions is assessed and appreciated. The repeated and random impact of rises in State Government taxes and charges, the insidious decline in the real value of concessions to pensioners and beneficiaries, coupled with the Federal Government's changes to pension entitlements (and today we learnt of a new initiative on the part of the Federal Government in respect of the payment of pensions), plus the superannuation rules and the constant review of assessment of assets all collectively undermine the capacity of low income individuals and individuals on fixed incomes. It undermines their capacity to cope within their own resources and to manage their own family relationship situations. I cannot stress this point strongly enough. I was most interested to see during the past week that even a retired trade union organisation felt that it had to come to me to get a hearing, because the Government does not listen to the plight of the lower income people and people on fixed incomes. I think that that is a damning indictment on this present Government and proves that it does not care what happens to the people and families on low and fixed incomes.

If these actions are implemented immediately—and I refer to upgrading the community welfare portfolio, the establishment of an inquiry into DCW management and the development of a mechanism to assess the collective impact of Federal and State Government decisions on low income groups—they will go a long way to restoring the status and value of work pursued by DCW. These actions will help also to restore community confidence in the important tasks that DCW is obliged to undertake in promoting the dignity of the individual and the welfare of the family as a basis for promoting the welfare of the community.

In relation to poverty in South Australia, earlier this year the South Australian Council of Social Services (SACOSS) produced an excellent and timely document entitled 'Poverty in South Australia—A Caring State Strategy'. The strategy was compiled in conjunction with the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia (YACSA), the Community and Neighbourhood House and Centres Association, the South Australian Unemployed Groups in Action (SAUGA), the South Australian Council on the Ageing (SACOTA) and the Disabled People's International of South Australia (DPI).

The strategy complements the equally excellent and well researched work undertaken last year by the Australian Catholic Social Welfare Commission entitled 'A Fair Go For Families'. That report highlighted the deteriorating economic position of Australian families. For its part, the SACOSS caring strategy highlights the growing dimensions of poverty in South Australia and notes that one of the leading causes of social distress and disintegration in our community is inadequate income.

As households dependent principally on pensions or benefits form the largest percentage of all low income earners in Australia, it is clear that in South Australia we have an immense problem of growing proportions. South Australia has the highest number of pensioners and beneficiaries as a proportion of the labour force in this country. I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* without my reading it a table that highlights the number and proportion of aged pensioners in this State.

Leave granted.

PENSION BENEFIT RECIPIENTS: AUST. S.A.

Type of Benefit	C		
	A	B	S.A./Aust Percentage
	Aust.	S.A.	
Age	1 345 429	135 440	10.07
Invalid	370 093	38 948	10.52
Widow, Class A	72 310	6 862	9.49
Widow, Class B, C	81 907	7 451	9.10
Supporting Parents	179 843	16 218	9.02
Unemployment	623 079	62 018	9.95
Sickness	97 897	5 923	8.72
Special	19 186	1 338	6.97
F.I.S.	29 021	2 356	8.12
TOTAL (a)	2 788 765	276 554	9.92
WORKFORCE (b)	7 672 600	662 100	8.63
No. of recipients per thousand of workforce	363	418	

Notes: (a) January 1987 DSS.

(b) February 1987 ABS.

(c) Family allowance has been excluded because it is a small payment made to every family with dependant children and does not show which families are in poverty. In the key areas of age pensions and unemployment benefits, South Australia has a higher than average number of recipients, as indicated by the individual figures in column C of table 1, compared to the total work force figures shown above.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: In addition to the figures on the number of pensioners and welfare beneficiaries in this State, it is also a fact that the registered unemployment rate in South Australia, currently 9.9 per cent, has remained consistently at or above the national average since the late 1970s. The current national rate is 9.1 per cent. These figures do not include the hidden unemployed, for example, housewives and unemployed youth under 16 years of age who are not eligible for unemployment benefits and who do not register with the CES.

In South Australia the hidden unemployed figure is increasing each year as more and more people withdraw from the labour market because of lack of jobs or through early retirement. In this context it should be noted that South Australia's growth in total employment since 1965 of 80.4 per cent compares extremely badly with the national average for all States of 94 per cent. Meanwhile, the number of South Australians dependent upon unemployment, sickness and special benefit assistance has increased dramatically over the past 10 years at a rate well above the national average. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a table of a statistical nature (two other tables will follow) without my reading it.

Leave granted.

BENEFITS BY STATE (a)

Stage	30.6.76 30.6.86 Increase 1976-1986 26.12.86				
	Nos	Nos	Nos	% Increase	Nos
N.S.W. ...	95 758	250 747	154 989	161.9	245 000
Vic.	54 626	11 993	65 307	119.6	117 500
Qld.	31 888	125 682	93 794	294.1	125 800
S.A.	15 033	60 464	45 431	302.2	62 300
W.A.	17 379	61 029	43 650	251.2	60 600
Tas.	8 763	20 396	11 633	132.8	20 500
N.T.	917	10 770	9 853	1 074.5	10 600
A.C.T.	1 960	4 620	2 660	135.7	4 600
Aust.	226 324	653 641	427 317	188.8	647 300

(a) Unemployment, sickness and special beneficiaries.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: As well as increasing numbers of unemployed, South Australians are heavily represented amongst the long term unemployed.

DURATION OF UNEMPLOYMENT AUST. S.A.

Average duration of Unemployment (weeks)	Total		
	Females	Males	Total
Australia	33.4	48.7	42.6 (MEAN)
South Australia	43.9	61.2	54.4 (MEAN)
Australia	18	9	15 (MEDIAN)
South Australia	22	31	27 (MEDIAN)

Notes: Aust. figures January 1987

S.A. figures November 1986

In addition, the proportion of the population over 65 years of age is higher than in any other State, with future projections indicating that, by the year 2000, 15 per cent of South Australians will be 65 years and over compared to the national average of 12 per cent.

Australian States and Territories: Percentage of the Total Population Aged 65 years and over 1971 and 1981

State/Territory	1971	1981	Change	No. of persons Aged 65+ in 1981
New South Wales ..	8.5	10.1	+1.6	528 468
Victoria	8.6	10.0	+1.4	393 118
Queensland	8.8	9.7	+0.9	226 711
South Australia	8.5	10.6	+2.1	139 196
Western Australia ..	7.4	8.7	+1.3	112 980
Tasmania	8.1	9.9	+1.8	42 463
Northern Territory ..	2.1	2.2	+0.1	2 727
A.C.T.	2.7	4.2	+1.5	9 571
Australia	8.3	9.8	+1.5	1 145 234

Last but not least, South Australia is experiencing rapid growth in the number of households with children whose income is below the poverty level, to the extent that today 44 per cent of all persons in South Australia living in poverty are children. In June-July last year 26 636 persons were receiving the supporting parents benefit, and 8 789 families were in receipt of unemployment benefits who were supporting children. Also, almost 6 000 children are living in families whose income from employment is so low that they qualify for family income support. Assuming that there are 2.3 children per family, it means that approximately 87 000 children in South Australia are being supported on less than \$3.50 a day.

Mr Acting President, with the consistently high level of unemployment in South Australia, along with the increasing duration of unemployment, the increasing number of children reflected in poverty figures, and the rising and increased proportion of elderly in South Australia, we can be confident that in South Australia the demand for various forms of welfare assistance and social services will remain high in the foreseeable future.

This conclusion is not mine alone: it is the conclusion reached by those umbrella organisations that I mentioned earlier—SACOSS, YACSA, SAUGA, SACOTA and DPI—in their study, 'Poverty in South Australia'. The conclusion is not only sobering but most alarming, considering that welfare assistance measures and social service facilities available in South Australia at present are not coping—I cannot stress that too firmly—with the current demand for assistance and service. As to the non-government welfare sector, it may be of some interest to members that in recent weeks I have spent much time speaking with directors and personnel associated with non-government welfare organisations in South Australia and with church leaders in the metropolitan and country areas alike to update earlier discussions of their caseloads, needs and problems.

Every one of the tens of people with whom I spoke willingly canvassed their woes. They were pleased someone was taking an interest in their experiences. However, few were willing for me to cite their organisations or areas of operation for fear of incurring the Minister's infamous wrath or being victimised when it came to the allocation of scarce

funds through the Department for Community Welfare grants. I indicate those two points mainly out of a sense of sadness, I suppose, because I was really quite alarmed at how fearful these organisations were of coming to the Minister to indicate the extent of their problems, pressures and worries.

The Hon. I. Gilfillan interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Maybe, but I am talking about the Department for Community Welfare and the non-government sector. It is really quite disturbing that they would not wish their organisations or even their field of interest to be named in case they are identified. Also, to my consternation every single person with whom I spoke was in a state of despair or near despair. Upon reflection, it was impossible not to appreciate that non-government welfare agencies in this State are buckling at the knees. Many dedicated and long serving workers of both long established and more recently established agencies are on the brink of collapse, not only because of the weight of numbers of people seeking their help but also because many consider that they are failing their personal philosophy to help others with fewer advantages in life.

Many workers have a personal commitment reinforced by Christian commitment, and the fact that they are unable to help every person or family in need, and in some cases are being forced to turn away people in their hour of need, is a dilemma that they are unable to rationalise. Many people believe that they are failing others and, in doing so, that they themselves have failed. I should add that this is a trait that I have found common amongst many committed DCW workers. All of the welfare agencies reported an escalating demand for a variety of services: affordable housing, emergency shelter, financial assistance, food vouchers, marriage counselling and restraint orders on perpetrators of domestic violence and harassment.

All confirmed that financial crises appeared to be at the root of most of the increases in demand. Most agencies reported a 40 to 60 per cent increase in demand for financial assistance above the previous year. One indicated that it spent nearly \$50 000—double the sum of the previous year—on food vouchers to the value of \$15 to \$30 to supplement the income of pensioners and welfare beneficiaries. Such demand is in addition to the 45 000 approved applicants for emergency financial assistance provided through the DCW itself.

Meanwhile, Adelaide Central Mission's Financial Counselling Service reported a 66 per cent increase in the number of clients, and the DCW Budget Advice Service saw 3 434 new applicants over the past year. The continuing decline in family income was considered also to be the principal cause of increase in the rate of marital tension, domestic violence and sometimes crime.

Voluntary counselling agencies reported an increase of up to about 36 per cent in most instances in the number of couples seeking marriage counselling over the past 12 months. The DCW's Crisis Care Service experienced a 9 per cent increase in crisis calls, while restraint orders under the Justices Act increased by 12.5 per cent over the previous year. Every agency recorded a massive increase in calls for affordable and emergency shelter, most of which were referred to the South Australian Housing Trust or the Emergency Housing Office.

Also, it may be of interest to members to appreciate that last year the trust received 17 484 applications, an increase of about 8 per cent over the previous year, swelling the waiting list to nearly 40 000, a 65 per cent increase since June 1982. In the past year also the number of clients interviewed at the Emergency Housing Office increased by

26.9 per cent, while shelters funded to provide emergency accommodation for women and children or youth were forced to continue the practice of turning people away.

Meanwhile, organisations such as the Catholic Family Welfare, the Anglican Welfare Service, the Salvation Army and St Vincent DePaul have been forced to curtail family support programs due to lack of funds, notwithstanding the fact that each of those organisations received an increased number of referrals. Most agencies expressed concern that the decision of the Federal Government in the May mini budget to erase the Community Employment Program had eliminated one of their last remaining sources of funds for employing extra staff to cope with general demands or extra expertise for particular initiatives.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: In terms of community welfare groups, the Community Employment Program was a particularly valuable initiative. If it could not continue in that form I think there should be some other initiative to help these community groups because there are so few other sources of funding to help them meet their current demands. I do not believe that the Community Employment Program worked extremely efficiently in all fields, but in terms of the support for community welfare organisations I have yet to meet an agency that had not become dependent on the scheme as a means of supplementing staff needs.

Each agency mentioned that it was disturbed by the increase in the number of people presenting with deep problems of stress, which were often compounded by resentment that they were being shoved from pillar to post in search of help. Each agency volunteered that they were troubled by the increasing number of desperate cries for help from people who had been turned away from the DCW. In addition, the majority noted that increasingly their clients had complex inter-related problems that did not fit neatly into the department's simplistic linear priority rating list.

I suppose the most depressing aspect of my discussions in recent weeks has been the fact that, notwithstanding the array of problems and pressures that are being encountered by all the non-government welfare agencies with which I spoke, fear of what the future holds overshadows their present concerns. They fear for their own survival. That fear arises from uncertainty about future levels of grants and their capacity to attract contributions from the public sector and from private sources. They fear for the health and wellbeing of their staff, which is working in an unrelentingly stressful environment. They fear they will not be able to maintain the current range of services, upon which an ever-increasing number of their clients depends. They fear for the fate of those whom they are now turning away and whom they believe they will have to turn away in the future. They fear that in this time of financial constraint the Bannon Government will compound the plight of low income households by further reducing the value of concessions. That concern was raised with me because the Premier has indicated that he is reviewing all pensioner concessions. Some agencies mentioned that they were alarmed at the possibility that the very steep increase in need for emergency financial assistance over the past year may have stretched the State Government's resources to a greater extent and that the South Australian Government, like the New South Wales Government before it, may opt out of further provision of emergency financial assistance.

Other agencies, in particular financial counselling services, believe that financial constraints in this forthcoming budget may well see a shelving of long awaited initiatives to establish financial counselling services across the State.

Moreover, the vast majority of agencies said that they feared that the DCW would continue to contract this range of services, thereby placing the under-equipped services in the non-government sector under even greater pressure than they are experiencing at present.

In February, March and April of this year the DCW welfare workers and clerical officers in the Adelaide central metropolitan region and beyond participated in stop work meetings and mass rallies, implemented selective work bans and pursued other forms of industrial action in support of claims for more staff. These unprecedented actions stemmed from extreme frustration that critical staff shortages were preventing workers from supplying advertised DCW services to needy people. For the community at large the dispute was possibly the first indication that the DCW was not coping and that it was in a state of crisis. For people in need of help, however, the industrial action reinforced their firsthand experience that all was far from well in the DCW. For 18 months at least most DCW offices throughout the State have been turning people away, a process which does not endear workers to prospective clients—in fact, more and more workers are complaining of abusive treatment from clients—and which has repeatedly caused social workers to suffer feelings of enormous guilt.

Over this period, the Public Service Association members of the DCW attempted to gain Government action to rectify the staff shortages. They sought temporary filling of paid vacancies so that clients would not be inconvenienced by staff absences and to ensure that staff did not have double workloads. As the PSA said at the time—and I am sympathetic in this respect—the demands were hardly outrageous.

By February this year, DCW staff could endure the situation no longer. In that month all but a few officers were able to fulfil their statutory obligations to attend to at least all of the cases between one and seven on the DCW priority list of 12 case types. Some officers were not even fulfilling the needs of clients deemed to be in the department's No. 1 priority—child abuse. In the week preceding 21 February one southern office had a greater number of unallocated cases than cases which it was actively managing to service. At the same time, the Adelaide central metropolitan region, stretching from Port Adelaide to Norwood, had 132 cases in the top four listings alone, which had not been attended to. Throughout the State the number of unallocated cases amounted to 1 000 in that week.

By late February, in the belief that the Government had turned its back on its responsibility to its employees and the needy people of South Australia, DCW welfare workers and clerical officers, backed by the Public Service Association, resorted to work bans. Since the implementation of a two series level of work bans, it has been a matter for bitter irony that the insensitive response of the Government and the DCW management did not address the issues of concern, but served merely to inflame the anger, disillusion and frustration harboured by DCW workers and further alienated field workers from management. DCW workers resented the Minister's statement that their actions were ill considered and counter-productive and they resented his accusation that their actions were the politically inspired

work of a few without the backing of the majority. Equally, they resented the fact that the Director-General publicly sided with the Minister instead of supporting her officers.

By mid-March the deteriorating situation prompted the Acting General Secretary of the Public Service Association (Adrian Butterworth) to comment as follows, and I quote from the *Advertiser* of 21 March 1987:

We thought Dr Cornwall and Ms Vardon might work to resolve the concerns. They know the public is suffering from a lack of services the department should be providing, and that is what the dispute is all about. The issues are real. Their actions are not working to resolve the dispute, but will increase hostility and alienation between DCW staff and management.

I have reflected at some length on the Government's insensitive handling of the DCW dispute earlier this year, for I consider it is particularly relevant in the context of the State budget which is to be delivered this Thursday. On occasions throughout the dispute, the Minister sought to appease DCW workers with assurances that he would press their case for extra funding and staff in discussions leading up to the budget. I therefore forewarn the Minister that senior DCW field workers to whom I have spoken in recent days have very high expectations of substantially increased funding to DCW to help ensure that in the forthcoming year they will once again be able to fulfil their statutory obligations and, in turn, the responsibilities which they hold very dear for people in need in South Australia.

I should add that these high expectations are shared by workers in the non-government welfare sector. If these expectations are not met, I believe I am on sound ground in predicting that the anger, disillusion and frustration which led to the work bans earlier this year will be magnified in the present year—and heaven only knows what will unfold as a consequence. Perhaps I should also alert the Minister and other members that, even if the DCW budget lines are increased to accommodate the concerns of DCW workers for extra staff, and their demands involve a doubling of staff social workers, it is doubtful whether, without action to address the present narrow policies being pursued by the department and the priority rating system, the Government will be successful in stemming the resignations of senior social workers and administrative officers, or stemming the excessively high attrition rate amongst staff.

The Department of Community Welfare today no longer provides services aimed at reducing or overcoming social problems in the community, services which were at the cornerstone of the department's fine reputation in the past. Prior to 1985 the focus of the department was remedial and preventive work and all clients experiencing a moderate to serious degree of a broad range of social problems had equal access to the department's services.

In 1985, however, all this changed. In that year, a narrow set of policies was introduced, accompanied by a priority rating system classifying clients according to the nature of their social problems. The difference in the pre-1985 and post-1985 policies and philosophies in regard to DCW service provision is central to the many problems being experienced in DCW at present. As these differences are difficult to explain adequately, I seek leave to insert into *Hansard* two charts which will illustrate the differences in approach.

Leave granted.

DCW SERVICES

Priority	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12			
DCW Service provision Since 1985	Child Abuse—Sexual Abuse	Child Risk of Separation	Adolescent in Crisis	High Profile Young Offender	Domestic Violence Victim	Risk of Neglect/Ongoing Abuse	Adolescent at Chronic Risk	Families in Poverty	Low Profile Children	Individual in Poverty	No other Support Available	Others Seeking Help	Adoptions Budget Advice CAFs. Screenings Family Maintenance, etc.		
Severe	↕	↕	↕	↕											
Moderate															
Minor															
Equal Access to Services															
DCW Service Provision Prior to 1985	Child (Sexual) Abuse/Neglect	Children at Risk of Separation	Community Work/Development	Counselling/Advocacy Liaison	Family Work/Domestic Violence	Foster Care/Family Care	Group Work/Skills Training	Low Profile Children	Priority Housing App's	Office Duty/Financial Assistance	Youth Work/Runaways Truancies	Young Offender Work	Aged Care Budget Advice CAFs. Screenings Family Maintenance Warrants Defaults Adequate, etc.		
Severe	↕											↕			
Moderate															
Minor															

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: If members care to look at these charts, they will notice that prior to 1985 clients had equal access—and those are the operative words—to the following services: child abuse/neglect; children at risk of separation; community work/development; counselling/advocacy liaison; family work/domestic violence; foster care/residential care; group work/skills training; low profile children; priority housing applications; office duty financial assistance; youth work; runaways truancies; and youth offender work.

Since 1985 DCW service has been provided according to whether or not the client fits the following classifications in order of priority, and these are identified in the second of the two charts. They are as follow: 1, child abuse, sexual abuse; 2, children at risk of separation; 3, adolescents at risk; 4, high profile young offenders; 5, domestic violence victims; 6, risk of neglect/ongoing abuse; 7, adolescents at chronic risk; 8, families in poverty; 9, low profile children; 10, individuals in poverty; 11, no other support available; and 12, others seeking help.

Today, clients experiencing a social problem assigned a high priority have access to departmental services over those clients assigned to a lesser priority, irrespective of the degree of severity of their problem. For example, child abuse cases, both severe and minor, have the same priority 1 status. Minor child abuse cases, however, have priority over children at risk of a severe degree of neglect, which has a lesser priority. Children at risk of neglect has a priority rating of only number 6.

In discussions with DCW management on the merits of the priority system, I have been told 'What else can the department do with child abuse increasing the way it is but assign to child abuse number 1 priority.' There is no doubt that child abuse is an increasing phenomenon in South Australia and Australia. However, this response by DCW suggests that child abuse is an inexplicable trend in the community, over which the department has no control. I believe that it is time for the Government to assess this response, and to look closely at the relationship between departmental policies and social problems in the community. Certainly, in the past, Government and departmental policies have had a direct bearing on what happens in the community.

For example, when the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act was introduced in 1979, the total number of children under State guardianship and control reduced by 22 per cent, and the number of first time children under guardianship and control reduced by 97 per cent. Similarly, I believe, the Government's change in policy and practices

for DCW in 1985 to a system of specified priorities has heralded significant changes, the only trouble being that the changes have generally been for the worse.

Since 1985 DCW and its clients have experienced: first, a reduction in the range of quality of services provided; secondly, an increase in crisis intervention and rehabilitation at the expense of remedial and preventative intervention; and, thirdly, greater importance given to procedures at the expense of service. In passing this critical judgment on DCW I acknowledge that the stated aims of the Government's change in policy were to enhance the quality of service and to protect children from abuse and unnecessary separation from their families. These are most laudible aims, and aims which I support.

However, the reality is somewhat different, for the reverse seems to be happening. I readily acknowledge that I, like you and other members of this Parliament, Ms President, am most concerned about the secrecy that surrounds child abuse, and have also been very concerned about the need to encourage improvement in the present system of response to cases of child abuse. There is no doubt that if victims are not identified and assisted early, as older children many have been provoked to try to resolve the situation themselves by running away from home or escaping through the use of drugs, while others have harboured guilt and suffered humiliation throughout their lives.

Certainly with amendments to the Community Welfare Act promoted by the former Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. John Burdett) in 1981, coupled with the constant and possibly even obsessive attention given to child abuse since 1985, a considerable increase has been recorded in the number of child abuse allegations. At present, we have reached a stage where workers are unable to respond to all the allegations—I repeat, 'allegations'—notwithstanding the fact that all the field resources of DCW have been directed to this problem.

Indeed, in the past few weeks the Director-General has issued a memorandum overriding an earlier instruction that all allegations of child abuse must be responded to within 24 hours. However, DCW workers are still required, for example, to canvass school staff meetings and to facilitate awareness and the reporting of child abuse, notwithstanding the fact that child protection measures are not coping in this State. In my discussions with a large number of people who have regular professional contact with children, and who have helped me in the past in my discussions on the subject of child abuse and in policy formulation matters in general, it would appear that the beginnings of increased awareness and mandatory requirements, and the zeal of

some field workers, are prompting some over-enthusiastic people to suspect that every bruise and behavioural problem is a case of child abuse and that it is reported as such, in case—and I repeat—in case child abuse has occurred.

I believe that the Government must address this problem as a matter of urgency, as it is a growing problem. It must also address DCW procedures for gathering evidence, as it is vital in the interests of children that the department is credible in all cases where prosecution is deemed appropriate. In my view, the department cannot afford to make a mistake. The area of child abuse is fraught with emotional and legal problems: it is also a relatively new field, especially in the terms in which it is being addressed at present.

I fear that, if the Government, the Minister, and management of the DCW do not insist that the reporting and response procedures are above reproach, the credibility of the present focus on child abuse will be undermined in the eyes of the general community. It is not, I argue, in the interests of any child that such a backlash be allowed to unfold. In the meantime, increasing numbers of child abuse investigations are required to be undertaken by the DCW field workers. This has eliminated the time available for remedial and preventative work. No longer, for example, are DCW workers developing neighbourhood self-help schemes, or teaching skills to clients to enable them to overcome social problems.

I understand that the department's priorities system does allow some remedial and preventative work to be done provided it relates directly to the top four priorities; for instance, to child abuse, and in that context teaching 'relating' skills to a group of abusing parents. The DCW's priorities allow for such work, but the reality is that such initiatives are few and far between. Also, it is a time honoured fact that, when remedial and preventative intervention modes are not pursued, the demand for crisis intervention and rehabilitation automatically increases.

This regrettable trend is reflected in DCW's child abuse (crisis intervention), guardianship, and control (rehabilitation) statistics. It is disturbing, for instance, that the removal of children from their natural family appears to have become an expedient option. The total number of children under guardianship and control as at 30 June 1986 had increased by 4 per cent. The number of first-time children increased by 36 per cent in one year. By contrast, in all previous years first time increases were offset by a reduction or no change in the total number of children in guardianship. However, this trend has changed since the department's single-minded focus on child abuse began in 1985. I believe that this is a trend that should be of great concern to all members of this Chamber.

Similarly, the number of children placed in emergency foster care increased by 48 per cent in 1985-86 and 91 per cent in 1984-86. In addition, the department's foster care and intensive neighbourhood care schemes have been operating at full capacity since August 1985. One rather over-worked and overstressed social worker told me last week that for some time they have not been able to remove children from their families because of a lack of foster care parents. That in itself provides another problem for the department. However, I believe that these services have been operating at full capacity since August 1986. I understand that the present use of these services is only the tip of the iceberg of what is yet to be revealed in the 1986-87 statistics.

Although the department maintains a philosophy of re-uniting children with their families whenever and wherever possible, the reality is that it is difficult to do so without placing them at risk, if the necessary remedial and preven-

tative work has not been carried out to help their natural parents gain the necessary parenting skills. A further problem that has exasperated welfare workers in the DCW relates to child abuse procedures and, in particular, to report writing and panel review procedures.

It is the view of most welfare workers to whom I have spoken that the core of the problem lies with procedures that are cumbersome and time consuming, leaving little time to provide constructive assistance to victims and their families. The preparation, typing, and reviewing of child abuse reports has been seen by welfare workers as having no apparent utility, yet the procedures have increasingly become the department's major role. I appreciate that procedures may change, and hopefully they will, following the establishment recently of the Child Protection Policy and Planning Unit.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: A very good and timely interjection. However, I have some misgivings about this approach after reading the first newsletter produced by the unit outlining the formation of the proposed Child Protection Council, the seven proposed committees responsible to that council, and the additional five working parties to assist in decision making—12 or 13 bodies in all. This structure seems to be excessively bureaucratic and top heavy, especially when one considers the fact that the number of workers in the field remains conspicuously thin: those with practical experience are thin on the ground when compared to the number of theorists which we are now seeing in policy making positions in comfortable offices in the city well away from the front line work of the social worker.

To sum up my concerns in relation to the DCW, the Minister and management appear, for reasons best known to themselves, to be heading down a very narrow, more prescriptive path; the broad range of services traditionally provided was restricted in 1985 to 12 social welfare problem priorities. Shortly thereafter that number was reduced to the top four priorities. At present it is evident that workers are unable to adequately satisfy even the first priority—child abuse remedial and preventative interventions are not being pursued, yet it is universally recognised that such programs are instrumental in reducing or overcoming social problems including child abuse. Also, the Government should recognise that community development does not occur in simplistic linear associations that relate to the department's priority rating list, although the eventual result may achieve that effect. At this stage, however, crisis intervention is the only option.

I, together with many people concerned about the wellbeing of individual families and other groupings in our community, question to what extent the Government will continue to impose upon the department narrow policies, reduced services, prescriptive procedures or crisis orientated responses to widespread emotional and financial problems in our community—and we question the eventual human cost of pursuing such an approach. If, however, the Government was prepared to question the overall effectiveness of the department's current policies and practices in addressing community ills, I believe that it would see that more positive and flexible policies and procedures are required as a matter of urgency to address the stress and negative impact being experienced currently by staff and clients.

Before concluding, I wish to make a few comments about the Minister of Community Welfare—for it is the Minister of Community Welfare who presides over the crisis that is being experienced in the community welfare sector in this State. When Premier Bannon announced the Minister's

appointment in December 1985, the response of the community welfare sector was, at best, cautious.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Horror, I would have said.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Some expressed horror, but they did not feel brave enough to do so publicly. The former Director of Catholic Family Welfare, Mr Joe O'Neill, was one of the few, however, who was prepared to state their views publicly, and he did so on 21 December. Mr O'Neill noted that having one Minister for the portfolios of community welfare and health was downgrading the importance of community welfare. He went on to say:

For many years community welfare was seen to be an important portfolio meriting the primary attention and responsibility of a Minister. The linking of community welfare with the weighty and time consuming portfolio of health must inevitably mean less ministerial availability to community welfare and would suggest a drop in the status and importance of the portfolio by the Premier.

Not surprisingly, in the same article the Premier sought to defend his actions, noting that he considered Dr Cornwall to be the best man for the job and that community welfare would remain a high priority for the Government. Since December 1985, Mr O'Neill's misgivings and predictions have, regrettably, proven to be sound. I can also but comment in relation to the Premier's thinking that Dr Cornwall is the best person for the job that it is a great tragedy that he is allowing Dr Cornwall to remain in that position, as there is no doubt that he does not have the time to devote to the community welfare portfolio.

The Hon. R.J. Pitson: Even Hemmings might have been better.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Perhaps he would not have been so arrogant in dealing with quite a number of problems and thinking on every occasion that he knew best and what the total answer was. The Minister is certainly not listening. But the department, by the Director-General's own admission, is not fulfilling its statutory responsibility. Staff feel alienated from management. Morale is at a record low, while stress levels and resignations are at an all time high. Of particular concern is the fact that in this most unsatisfactory environment the department is losing a high proportion of its experienced social workers. When these positions are refilled, inexperienced recent graduates are being thrust into the difficult and extraordinarily stressful work pertaining to child abuse—the department's No.1 priority.

All these problems within the department are being compounded, in turn, by the Minister's own actions. I mentioned earlier that his insensitive response to the industrial action taken earlier this year by social workers and clerical staff served only to inflame their anger and frustration about the inadequacies within the department. His very grand scheme for coalescence between the Department of Community Welfare and the Health Commission served only to reinforce alarm that the Government did not place a high value on the Department for Community Welfare or on the work undertaken by DCW social workers and planners. The fact is that, in trying to make head or tail of this grand plan of coalescence, many staff were siphoned off from the precious few staff available within the Department for Community Welfare to service its many responsibilities. Many were siphoned off to make some sense of coalescence, yet we have since seen that the whole saga of coalescence has become rather a farce.

When first envisaged, the timetable was that between January and July this year coalescence between the South Australian Health Commission and the Department for Community Welfare would be finalised. In his wisdom, the Premier noted in the middle of last year that things were

not going too well, that there was a great deal of alarm particularly in the Department for Community Welfare. He thought he might try to head off the Minister of Community Welfare from this grand plan, to encourage him to rethink the merger and to proceed on a trial basis, with only a couple of pilot projects within the department, in order to test the efficiency and administrative functions of the scheme. As I understand, that has not even proceeded. So, while the Minister claims that he is still keen on the idea of coalescence, he alone remains of that view. The community welfare sector in particular has had enough of the plan.

Also, the Minister's plan for a Robin Hood property tax served only to undermine initiatives that had been pursued, on a bipartisan basis, for about five years at least by former Ministers of Community Welfare, the Hons. John Burdett and Greg Crafter. Both had been successful in trying to generate community confidence in the establishment of a community chest fund to assist in augmenting the finances available to voluntary organisations throughout the State. With one king hit with this Robin Hood property tax, the Minister of Community Welfare virtually knocked the whole thing on the head. I suggest that his thoughtlessness will be to the long-term loss of non-government welfare organisations in this State.

Last, but not least, the poverty task force was disbanded when the current Minister of Community Welfare took on his new responsibilities. A very grand social justice consultative committee was established, and repeatedly in this Parliament and during the disputes earlier this year the Minister of Community Welfare said that the release of this grand five year strategy for social justice was imminent. The last time I heard anything about this was when the Minister indicated, in answer to a question, that the strategy would be released last May. Therefore, I was quite amused to note that, in the Address in Reply speech, rather than a grand five year strategy for social justice in this State being referred to there was a rather weak attempt—a rather weak response—to establish four pilot programs for community and health initiatives at the local level. As I said earlier, the Minister sounded grand when referring to his plan; the Minister sounded as if he was on side with the community welfare sector; but the reality is quite the opposite.

I conclude my Address in Reply contribution by repeating what I said at the outset, namely, that there are very few bouquets that one can hand the present Government in respect of the community welfare sector in this State. There is no question that both private and public sectors of the community welfare area in this State are going through a stage of severe crisis. I believe that it is absolutely urgent—indeed imperative—that the Government seek to address these problems before they get totally out of control and we see a once excellent sector totally collapse and even more people suffering because they cannot have their problems addressed at an early stage. I support the motion.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I join with my colleagues in thanking the Governor for his traditional speech to mark the opening of the new session of Parliament. I join also in expressing sympathy to the relatives of former members of Parliament who have died over the past 12 months.

The Government enters this new session at the half way mark of what is now a four year term. I have noted the comments in the Governor's speech about the South Australian economy. In my view, South Australia is standing on an economic trapdoor. The harsh fact is that the Premier, who led his Government to the polls in late 1985 with the slogan 'South Australia up and running' is presiding over

an economy that is in deep trouble. The community has been skilfully manipulated so that it will concentrate on a few projects or events, and it has been asked to overlook the extraordinary continuing and, indeed, worsening condition of the South Australian economy. I have updated a

list of 14 key economic indicators of Australian States. It is a comparative table of a purely statistical nature, and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

KEY ECONOMIC INDICATORS OF AUSTRALIAN STATES
A COMPARISON
24 August 1987

	N.S.W.	Vic.	Qld.	S.A.	W.A.	Tas.	Aust.
Population Growth							
for year 31 December 1986.....	1.3%	1.1%	1.9%	0.8%	2.6%	1.0%	1.5%
Points Score							
(six for best result to one for worst result).....	4	3	5	1	6	2	
Net Migration Gain							
net overseas and interstate migration for year to 31 December 1986.....	0.6%	0.4%	1.0%	0.15%	1.5%	0.19%	0.7%
Points score	4	3	5	1	6	2	
Employment Growth							
for year to 31 July 1987.....	2.3%	4.6%	2.5%	0.9%	2.7%	-0.05%	2.9%
Points score	3	6	4	2	5	1	
Overtime Worked							
Average weekly overtime (in hours) worked per employee working overtime May 1987.....	6.6%	7.4%	6.3%	6.1%	7.0%	6.9%	6.8%
Points score	3	6	2	1	5	4	
Unemployment Rate							
July 1987.....	9.3%	6.0%	9.6%	9.3%	7.9%	9.7%	7.9%
Points score	3.5	6	2	3.5	5	1	
Building Approvals							
Number of dwelling units for year to 30 June 1987 compared with 1985-86.....	-14.6%	-11.9%	-15.7%	-16.6%	-8.7%	-11.4%	-14.1%
Points score	3	4	2	1	6	5	
Home Loan Affordability							
Ratio of average income loan repayments to medium family income for loans approved for March quarter 1987.....	29.8%	28.7%	26.1%	27.9%	20.1%	23.1%	27.4%
Points score	1	2	4	3	6	5	
Retail Sales Growth							
Six months to 30 June 1987 compared with same period in 1985-86.....	9.0%	8.4%	5.0%	3.4%	9.3%	8.5%	7.7%
Points score	5	3	2	1	6	4	
New Motor Vehicle Registrations Growth							
Six months to 30 June 1987 compared with same period in 1985-86.....	-22.4%	-17.4%	-21.8%	-24.6%	-18.4%	-29.5%	-21.1%
Points score	3	6	4	2	5	1	
Bankruptcies							
Increase in year to 30 June 1987 compared with 1985-86.....	26.3%	38.3%	34.1%	46.6%	40.5%	19.8%	34.3%
Points score	5	3	4	1	2	6	
Industrial Disputes							
Working days lost per 1 000 employees—12 months to April 1987.....	255	246	121	91	271	190	215
Points score	2	3	5	6	1	4	
Inflation							
Percentage change in consumer price index (capital cities)—June quarter 1986 to June quarter 1987.....	9.3%	9.3%	8.8%	9.1%	10.5%	9.9%	9.3%
Points score	3.5	3.5	6	5	1	2	
State Taxation							
Increase in State taxation and charges per capita 1982-83 to 1985-86.....	29.6%	26.4%	24.8%	49.1%	40.9%	43.8%	30.3%
Points score	4	5	6	1	3	2	
Private Capital Expenditure							
Increase in private new capital expenditure for year to 31 March 1987 compared with the year to 31 March 1986.....	19.7%	22.6%	-3.7%	6.4%	32.1%	7.4%	16.3%
Points score	4	5	1	2	6	3	

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: This review of key economic indicators of Australian States underlines the worsening trend in the South Australian economy. Of the 14 key economic indicators reviewed, South Australia ranks last in seven and second last in three; in other words, in the six Australian States in 10 of the 14 key economic indicators South Australia is bottom or second bottom. To put another slant on it, South Australia was better than the national average in only two of the 14 key indicators.

I will spend some time analysing those indicators, and I will then extend my comments and look at other aspects of the South Australian economy that are not covered by these key indicators. First, as to population growth, for the year ended 31 December 1986, South Australia had a population increase of only 0.8 per cent; that is little more than half

the national average of 1.5 per cent and barely one third the increase of population in Western Australia.

We all remember only too well how in September 1982 the then Leader of the Opposition (Mr Bannon) actually went to the extent of placing full page advertisements in the *Advertiser* to mark the fact that the Western Australian population had passed that of South Australia. The fact is that Western Australia now has a population of 70 000 more than South Australia, and the differential is increasing every day of every month of every year. Our population growth, which is minimal, is matched also by a very small net migration gain. In fact, for the year ended 31 December 1986 net overseas and interstate migration also saw South Australia ranking last, with only 0.15 per cent net migration gain during that year. That was in sharp contrast with Queensland, which had a full percentage point increase

through migration gain. Western Australia had an increase of 1.5 per cent from net migration gain, which includes overseas and interstate migration. South Australia is attracting very few people from interstate. There is a net outflow in interstate movements and the flow of overseas migration into South Australia is well below the national average.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: What you're really saying is that we're the worst governed State.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I will come to the conclusion in a little while, but the Hon. Dr Ritson, should I say, is very much on the right track, as is usually the case. As a whole, population is something that is important: it is not just an economic indicator to be bandied about but, rather, it is something that should be taken seriously because, if population growth is slow, it means that the demand for goods and services is also slow. Further, it means that there is a smaller group of younger people with skills coming into the workforce. A number of negatives can be associated with slow population growth.

In relation to employment growth, here again South Australia ranks poorly in that it is second last in this area. I suspect that position reflects the lack of opportunities and the lack of real growth in the economy in South Australia, particularly in the Adelaide metropolitan area. It reflects also the continuing shrinkage in many parts of the country because of rural problems.

Overtime worked is another barometer and South Australia ranks last in terms of average weekly overtime worked in hours by employees. Our unemployment rate of 9.3 per cent is certainly a better figure, and in that area we are in the middle range. Building approvals are another fundamental barometer that measure economic prosperity, and the figures show that, with a 16.6 per cent decline in the number of dwelling units for the year ended 30 June 1987, South Australia ranked last.

I am being kind by using that figure, because that is an aggregate of not only private sector but also public sector building, and members know that in South Australia there is a very strong Housing Trust building program that accounts for 2 000 units a year. If we isolate that fact and look at private sector units, we see that the approval level has fallen quite dramatically over the past 12 months. It is said that, for every house built, four jobs are created. It is generally believed that, in the building industry, the long-term trend should see South Australia building in the current year something like 10 500 to 11 000 units as a minimum, but at the moment we are running at less than 9 000 units. Again, that means jobs are being lost in that vital sector, which of course provides so much direct and indirect employment in the community.

Home loan affordability is a curious ratio, because it reflects not only housing prices but also interest rates. Home loan affordability is the ratio of average income loan repayments to medium family income for loans approved in the March 1987 quarter. Again, South Australia ranked in the middle of the pack, but there is no doubt that many South Australians have suffered through the dramatic increase in mortgage interest payments, which over the past two years have been as much as 50 per cent. Although there have been suggestions that there will be a decrease in interest rates, at the moment that has been a very marginal movement, given that there is an element of subsidy in housing interest rates, whether it be through the banks or building societies.

Retail sales are another key economic indicator. For some months South Australia has trailed the States of Australia. In fact, the figures which were released recently indicate that, for the six months to 30 June 1987, compared with

the corresponding period last year, South Australia had a growth in retail sales of only 3.4 per cent.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: What about motor cars?

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: That is the next thing on the list. The Hon. Murray Hill is telepathic, because I will talk about motor vehicle registrations next. In retail sales South Australia has had an increase of only 3.4 per cent over the past 12-month period compared with the national average of 7.7 per cent and, of course, compared with the rate of inflation of 9.3 per cent in that same time. Members should consider the impact of sluggish retail sales on the small business proprietor who, more often than not, will have a rental that is locked into the consumer price index adjustment, whose costs, State taxes and charges are rising at least by the rate of inflation, and who is being squeezed to death not only by higher taxes and charges and other costs but by falling sales. That is a particular problem in South Australia. The retail scene in South Australia is the worst that it has been for years. The fact that growth has been barely one-third of the national average underlines the gravity of the situation.

The Hon. Murray Hill, who has some expertise in regard to motor vehicles, indicates quite properly that motor vehicle registration growth in South Australia has also been sluggish. In fact, South Australia ranks last in retail sales growth and second last in new motor vehicle registration growth over the past 12 months. We had a 24.6 per cent decline in new motor vehicle registrations. It is worth remembering that was brought about by the introduction of the fringe benefits tax, which has meant a substantial adjustment to fleet purchasers and private business operators. It is also a reflection on the two edged nature of the devaluation of the dollar, because prices for imported vehicles have increased by as much as 50 per cent to 60 per cent in the past two to 2½ years.

The next indicator in this sorry saga is bankruptcies, and for the year to 30 June 1987 South Australia had a 46.6 per cent increase in the level of bankruptcies. We topped Australia quite comfortably, as members would expect. The Council would be aware that, if one takes the past two years, we have seen an increase of over 100 per cent in the level of bankruptcies in South Australia. To put it in even graver focus: for the past 17 months there has been a record figure for bankruptcies in each of those months. In July we had the highest figure ever for bankruptcies in South Australia—140. Indeed, putting it another way, at the moment, Madam President, we have four bankruptcies a day in South Australia compared with just two bankruptcies a day in 1985.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: 'SA Great' sounds like false advertising.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: SA Great is a spirited band of people who have South Australia's interests at heart and who band together making donations not only of money but also of time to promote South Australia, to focus attention on South Australia's achievements.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: It's an uphill battle with the present mob in government.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Exactly. Of course, much of the work that they have to do is made so much more difficult by the fact that the rosy glow has been taken from the South Australian economy by the performance of both the Federal and State Labor Governments, which are now in power.

In industrial disputes we see one of the two indices where South Australia ranks ahead of the national average. We had 91 working days lost per 1 000 employees for 12 months to April 1987, and that is well below the national average of 215 working days lost. We have been the national leader in this area for decades. I suspect that our Protestant back-

ground, the work ethic which has perhaps been practised rather more in South Australia, the politics of Tom Playford, and many other factors have led to relative industrial harmony in South Australia. However, even this lead is being steadily whittled away and Queensland is within shouting distance in this area which has been traditionally a strong point for the South Australian economy.

Inflation, the next indicator, is also an indicator where South Australia fared marginally better than the national average, with a 9.1 per cent increase in prices over the past 12 months compared with a national average of 9.3 per cent. In State taxation, South Australia's increase in taxes and charges per capita tops Australia. Admittedly, there is some difficulty in getting accurate data for this and I have resisted the temptation of using 1986-87 data because, until the State budget is presented and until we have up-to-date population estimates, it is not possible to give precise estimates. Nevertheless, for the period 1982-83 to 1985-86 South Australia easily tops all Australian States. Finally, another important ingredient in the economic scenario is private capital expenditure. In measuring the increase in this area for the year to 31 March 1987 (the latest available figures), with the previous corresponding year, again South Australia ranks poorly with a 6.4 per cent increase against an Australian average of 16.3 per cent.

Madam President, it is a dreadful picture. As I have said, it is a table indicating that South Australia ranks last in half of the indicators—in seven of the 14 indicators—and second last in three indicators. I have regularly maintained this review of key economic indicators, and it is apparent from this latest review, which I completed only this morning, that the condition of the South Australian economy is worsening relative to that of other States. That is also reflected by an interesting poll published in the Melbourne *Herald* yesterday afternoon (24 August). I seek leave to have the poll inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it, because it is of a purely statistical nature.

Leave granted.

FINANCIAL SITUATION

Question: Compared to this time last year, do you think that you are better off financially, or worse off, or about the same?

	Better Off %	Worse Off %	About The Same %	Don't Know %
TOTAL	28	31	39	4
MALE	29	29	39	4
FEMALE	24	33	40	3
STATE				
N.S.W.	25	31	39	5
VIC.	26	27	43	4
QLD	32	34	31	3
S.A.	18	39	41	1
W.A.	32	25	42	1
AGE				
18-24	35	22	39	4
25-39	21	35	40	3

AUSTRALIAN PUBLIC OPINION POLLS (GALLUP METHOD)

Margin for error: Plus or minus 2 per cent.

Total face-to-face interviews: 2 117.

Fieldwork conducted on weekends of 1-2 and 8-9 August 1987.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: This poll asked the question of more than 2 100 Australians: 'Compared to this time last year, do you think you are better off financially, or worse off, or about the same?' For some reason Tasmania was not included in the poll, but the results for the five mainland States show that 25 per cent in New South Wales, 26 per cent in Victoria, 32 per cent in Queensland and Western Australia and only 18 per cent of those surveyed in South

Australia believed that they were better off. It is interesting to see, Madam President, that only yesterday the *Herald* poll indicated that of the five mainland States fewer people in South Australia than in any other State believed they were better off. The corollary of that is also reflected in the fact that more people in South Australia believed that they were worse off. Of those surveyed in South Australia 39 per cent believed that they were worse off, a figure higher than that for any other State. That tends to underline the accuracy of the comments that I have made about the current condition of the South Australian economy.

We could look at other aspects of the economy. We could look at the restaurant industry, which is in tatters because of the fringe benefits tax and other costs and charges which continue to make life difficult for the people in that industry. We could look at the tourism industry in South Australia, which is much vaunted as an economic saviour but which has also been very badly managed. There is no doubt that professionalism in the tourism industry in this State has a long way to go, that the leadership in the Government area has a long way to go if tourism is going to flourish in South Australia.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: How do you account for the vastly improved figures over the past two years?

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: In 1986 the figures can be easily justified because we had a sesquicentenary year and the increase came as no surprise. If we look at the growth in the number of hotel beds in South Australia over recent years compared with the growth in other States, I suspect that we would lag some way behind. Not surprisingly the occupancy rates in South Australian hotels and motels have increased relatively well, but I believe that, if we look at participation from international visitors, and interstate visitors, South Australia could be doing a lot better in terms of coordinating visits to areas of South Australia which are of visitor interest, and in terms of better promotion of areas which are obviously attractions, not only for visitors but also for people who live in South Australia. In the past week, as the Minister will be aware, I instanced the example of the North Terrace cultural precinct continuing to suffer because of lack of promotion.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: You're seriously embarrassing the young people whose names you quoted in this place.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Why?

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: I don't know; ask them.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: They were quite happy about it. In fact, they appeared on the Philip Satchell program yesterday talking about their survey, so I would hardly believe that they were embarrassed if they allowed their names to be quoted by Philip Satchell, and they were quite happy to have their names associated with the question which I raised, as I thought, in a very constructive fashion. But let me not digress too much by talking about tourism because I think we could be here forever on that subject.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: You don't produce any facts or figures, but just make wide statements.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I did not produce the facts and figures. It was a very well researched survey that produced the facts and figures. That survey showed that 50 per cent of the people working in the city were unable to name three attractions that they would invite visitors to see.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: You talked about lack of professionalism.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I talked specifically about Government leadership, lack of professionalism and lack of marketing, and I stand by those comments. I will debate the Minister at any time and at any place on the lack of leadership in the tourism industry by this Government

because it is regarded as a joke in tourist circles, not only in this State but also in other States.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: There are many people in the industry who don't agree with you.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: If you want to respond you will have the opportunity to do so in the Address in Reply debate.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: It's good to see you agree with the mixed economy.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I have never denied, and in fact, I have emphasised that there is need for Government leadership in tourism. That is the point I am making and no-one has denied that. My only complaint is that there is no leadership there at the moment.

Let us move on and look at some of the other aspects of the economy. I have reflected on the fact that the Government has sought to focus on some high flying projects and events. No-one would deny that the Grand Prix is a source of State pride and brings people into South Australia, albeit for a relatively short space of time.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: Wasn't that a Labor Government sponsored initiative?

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: No, it was not a Labor Government initiative. It was the initiative initially of two individuals.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: Who managed to get it for the State?

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: If we want to debate about the Grand Prix perhaps we can have a Grand Prix week debate.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: We all support it.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Mr Lucas and I are well known supporters of the Grand Prix and I have never said a word against it. Rather inevitably, the people, whose idea it was to bring the Grand Prix to South Australia, were overwhelmed by the Government moving in.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: That's rubbish. They asked for Government support.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I believe that the people who put the idea together in the first place deserve a lot of credit.

I would like to focus on two more points: first, the ASER project, which was one of those great projects with which the Government was very closely associated. The Premier flew to Japan to sign the contract with Kumagai Gumi, and was closely associated with the opening of the Convention Centre. The Minister of Tourism was down there in her gum boots in the early stages of the project. It was admitted by the Premier that this was a Government project, but when things went sour it suddenly became a private project and the cost of the project was a matter for confidentiality. This is a very good example of the 'Good News Premier', who is there when there is good news, but is nowhere to be seen when there is bad news.

In 1984 the ASER project was originally costed at \$180 million in 1986 dollars. It now appears that the costing has blown out to approximately \$250 million. It is not possible to calculate a precise figure. I suspect that even the people concerned with the project cannot arrive at a precise figure. The Government continually denies all knowledge of what the final cost might be. It is quite improper for it to adopt that attitude because ultimately the taxpayers' money is involved.

Let me run a few figures across members on the Government benches. The Convention Centre was scheduled to cost \$27 million. On my estimate it has cost \$42 million. That is the capitalised cost. The Government was committed under the terms of the agreement to rent the Convention Centre at a cost of 6¼ per cent of the final capitalised cost, which is 6¼ per cent of \$42 million—just over \$2.5 million

a year. That rental is to be adjusted annually in line with the consumer price index. If those figures are correct, the Government is obliged to pay an estimated \$2.5 million rental (adjusted annually for inflation), compared with the original figure, which it would have paid on the original cost of \$27 million. This comparison shows that the Government is paying nearly \$1 million more a year in rent, which is nearly \$20 000 more a week.

That, of course, is of some consequence because that cost will have to be built into rental for the Convention Centre and, if it cannot be built into rental for the Convention Centre because it will make the load too much for commercial considerations, it will then have to be passed onto the taxpayers of South Australia in some way or other. I am not entering into a debate as to the merits of the Convention Centre—that is another matter. But, I am entering into a debate on the costs of the Convention Centre and my very real concerns on that enormous blow-out of well over 50 per cent in the final cost of the Convention Centre.

That is also reflected in the very significant blow-out in the costs of the ASER Hyatt Hotel, which was originally costed at \$50 million and scheduled to finish in June 1986. In fact, it may be finally finished in this financial year, although it is touch and go. The Hyatt Hotel must be one of the few sites in the western world where workers are actually getting a bonus payment for finishing a hotel one year late. It brings a new dimension to the publicity given to fixing work practices in Australia.

That cost has blown out, on my information, from \$50 million to \$85 million, and that, again, is of consequence to the people of South Australia, because Hyatt does not put any money into that hotel. Hyatt just comes in on a contract basis when the hotel is finally finished. So, there are significant cost overruns in the Convention Centre, in the Hyatt Hotel and in the redevelopment of the railway station itself and the plaza area, where the costs have blown out by well over \$10 million.

That, of course, will also be a cost to the taxpayers of South Australia, because the Government has undertaken, again, to pick up portion of the rent on that plaza development and, because the cost is higher, the rent borne by the Government will be higher. What intrigues me most of all is the fact that this is not really a Government project; it is a private project—except when there is an opening, and then it is a Government project.

Finally, I want to talk about Roxby Downs and about State involvement in natural resources. I can well remember sitting where the Hon. Mario Feleppa now sits and listening to the debate on Roxby Downs and seeing the courage of one member of the Labor Party, the Hon. Norm Foster who, of course, paid the price by losing his membership of the Labor Party because he crossed the floor and made Roxby Downs possible. I can remember the speech made by the Hon. Frank Blevins when he said that he did not favour Roxby Downs. I heard the Hon. Frank Blevins in a television interview just two or three weeks ago actually suggest that it was a shame that the State Government had not taken a 51 per cent interest in Roxby Downs.

This was the same Hon. Frank Blevins who had opposed the development of Roxby Downs and was now saying that, really, we should have had a piece of the action. That underlines the hypocrisy of this opportunistic Labor Party which sways in the breeze of pragmatism and which rolls with the punches and comes up smiling, although slightly bruised and battered. For the Hon. Frank Blevins to suggest that the State should become more involved in resource

development exploration and ownership in South Australia, is to roll back the clock to the debates of the 1940s.

It is interesting to see that no-one on the other side has seriously taken up the cudgels on behalf of the Hon. Frank Blevins as they did so enthusiastically when they made their maiden Address in Reply speeches after the 1985 election. There has been a deafening silence. Why is this so? Is it because no one supports what the Hon. Frank Blevins says—that the State should be taking an interest in Roxby Downs or should be becoming more involved in it? Is it that they recognise that a credibility gap must be opening up in the Labor Party, because not more than two months earlier—in May 1987—the State Government announced that it would merge the South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation and the South Australian Gas Company—quite clearly with the object down the line of selling off some of the Government's shares and getting some of the loot back into the Treasury?

In other words, the Government was going to nationalise the Gas Company with a view to, in time, privatising its interest in this new merged group—not exactly the sort of line that the Hon. Frank Blevins would have been running on the *7.30 Report*, if he had had his way. This highlights to me very clearly the fact that there is a deep philosophic division in the Labor Party which, I think, will be reflected this weekend in some of the motions that will be debated between the left wing of the Party, which is still alive and kicking, and those other factions in the Labor Party which are torn between pragmatism and the desire to remain in power and the Labor Party platform which they are supposed to uphold.

One of the matters that they will be debating this weekend will be privatisation. We remember only too well what the Government said about privatisation in 1985. It said, 'How dare the Liberals suggest that we should privatise the very profitable and successful Woods and Forests Department and the South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation', and now their much vaunted Federal Leader (Hon. R.J. Hawke) himself became overnight the king of privatisation in Australia. Where does the Labor Party stand on privatisation?

The Hon. T. Crothers: We'll let you know after the weekend.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: There you are! The Hon. Trevor Crothers has admitted that he does not know. He is an honest man! He has been in politics for only a short while. He will learn over a period of time not to interject so quickly and so truthfully. But there the Labor Party stands, with its legs wide apart: the left leg pointing in one direction, with the Hon. Frank Blevins clinging grimly to it, and the right leg trembling at the kneecap, with Premier John Bannon—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: I think you'd better censor the next bit. I know what's coming! And it's the biggest faction, too.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Unfortunately, I cannot stretch this illuminating verbal picture to the third faction, because it would have to be censored. I just want to concentrate on the left and the right, and I will forget about the centre left. I believe that the Labor Party in this State is very nervous, because it has not only run out of ideas, as is reflected by the distinct lack of any substantial legislation in this session, but it has also run into severe problems of philosophy and direction.

I believe that this weekend will be very productive, and I look forward to the Hon. Trevor Crothers reporting back on Tuesday with a resume of the motions passed. I support the motion.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I rise to support the motion and, in doing so, extend my sympathies to the families of the

Hon. R. Loveday and the Hon. Don Simmons who passed away since the last session of Parliament.

I will address three matters in my Address in Reply speech, the first two of which come under the general theme of South Australia falling behind in the delivery of services, especially when compared to other States. First, I turn to the general area of technical and further education, which has been a matter of controversy in recent times. I refer, first, to the transcript of an interview that Premier Bannon had with Philip Satchell on ABC morning radio recently. In response to a question from a caller named Ruth, Premier Bannon said:

Let's not get too confused about this TAFE situation; it is not aimed at either reducing standards, numbers, courses, or so on.

In the first part of my speech I will give the lie to the statement that this whole dispute with respect to TAFE is not to do with the reduction of standards, numbers, courses and so on.

There has been a concerted campaign in relation to the working conditions of TAFE staff, and I have addressed this matter on other occasions and do not intend to go over it again today. The question of the transfer or the turning of principals of TAFE colleges into public servants by the stroke of the legislative pen is a matter that I will address tomorrow with the introduction of a private member's Bill that is aimed at reversing that decision and protecting the position of primary, secondary and area school principals from similar actions by the Bannon Government.

I turn now to funding and the effects of budget cuts and misplaced priorities within the roughly \$100 million TAFE budget, and the effect that they will have on the delivery of courses and services to students throughout South Australia. Information has been provided to the Opposition which was discussed today in the media and which indicated that on 27 May colleges were asked to look at strategies to cope with a 5 per cent cut in State funds. I have been advised that, having responded to the memorandum from the Director-General of TAFE, in the last two weeks they were told that they should now look at a strategy involving coping with a 3 per cent cut in State funds to TAFE colleges and to examine how they might cope with a reduction in funding of that order in the next financial year.

A number of colleges have responded. I have received details of how students who attend those colleges will be affected. I will place on record the effects of budget cuts and misplaced priorities of the Bannon Government relating to TAFE colleges. I say at the outset that the Opposition makes the point (which I have made publicly on a number of occasions) that, rather than cutting funding to TAFE colleges, the Minister ought to be biting the bullet and insisting on significant cuts to the TAFE central office, which has grown from a staff of approximately 70 people to one of over 300 people in just over a decade. All people in TAFE agree that the central office is over-staffed and duplicates the delivery of services in the college sector.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: Some restructuring is going on now.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: There is, as the Hon. Terry Roberts has just said, an attempted restructuring of that office going on now. On 11 June the Minister wrote to the Director-General of TAFE asking how he could cut \$1 million or \$1.5 million from TAFE central office funding. On 7 August the Acting Director-General of TAFE wrote back to the Minister saying that the best they could achieve was a reduction of \$529 400 by cutting a few base grade clerks, research officers and librarians from the staff. There is no doubt that the Sir Humphreys within the Department of TAFE were not prepared to bite the bullet or to look at

the duplication of the delivery of the services between the central office and the TAFE colleges.

It is clear that the Minister needs to insist not just on a \$1 million cut in the central TAFE office but on cuts of the order of \$2 million to \$2.5 million so that the projected cuts of \$2 million to the college sector can be reduced, and so that the effect of those cuts in courses being delivered to students can also be reduced. Let it not be said that the Opposition is just standing and opposing cuts without offering an alternative strategy that is supportable and, indeed, that was supported in a letter to which I will refer later and which was sent from the Congress of TAFE Principals to the Minister of Further Education.

Let us look at some of the colleges and how they are likely to be affected. The Marlestone College of TAFE wrote to the Minister of Further Education on 7 August 1987 as follows:

In respect to Marlestone, already contract lecturing positions have been lost, and these have resulted in courses not being offered. These losses and that of other contract lecturers later this year will result in the following courses not being held:

1. Adult vocational classes in carpentry and joinery.
2. The associate diploma in building subjects.
3. Courses for handicapped students in wood machining and cabinet making.

Handicapped students will suffer, or be at the forefront of cuts that the Bannan Government is to make in the TAFE sector. The letter continues:

4. Adult vocational classes in cabinet making.
5. Cutting (fabric certificate 1988) one course in that particular area.

There are a range of other cuts in the areas of minor equipment and material costs that will have to be implemented by Marlestone college if it is to meet a budget cut of the order of \$129 090, if the Government proceeds with its cuts in this area. Information provided to me indicates that a proper allowance has not been made for inflation and the effects of the devaluation on the cost of imported materials and goods which the college sector has to absorb in its own budget.

I turn to the effect on the Adelaide College of TAFE, which faces a 3 per cent or \$266 000 cut in State funds to its budget. The Minister of Tourism is present in the Chamber. She would realise that in the early planning stages there was a possibility of significant and severe cuts in tourism and hospitality courses at the Adelaide College of TAFE. However, the most recent information provided to me at the weekend indicated that the department realised the political flak which would have flowed if there were cuts to the tourism and hospitality sector at the Adelaide College of TAFE. The Minister smiles, so she is obviously aware of the possible flak that might have flowed from such cuts. Those cuts, I understand, have been reversed, thankfully. We will find out on Thursday whether my information is correct that all tourism and hospitality courses at the Adelaide college will be able to continue. However, the college will have to increase its output of short courses and raise increased revenue. Also, as with all colleges, it will have to cope with the possibility of reduced rates of pay for part-time instructor/lecturers (PTI lecturers) who deliver courses.

It may well be, as some members of TAFE have said to me, that some people may not be prepared in future to devote their considerable time—as they do presently—to lecturing in the TAFE sector, if the reward for so doing is reduced to the degree indicated by the Government. The specific point I make in relation to the Adelaide college is the effect of these cuts on adult literacy programs. I have been told by students and staff that this is seen as an easy area to cut and that it does not have the political weight or the support of political lobby groups that the tourism and

hospitality sector has at the Adelaide College of TAFE. As a result, it is an area that can be cut fairly easily and quietly.

I suggest to the Bannan Government that it is as equally important an area to the community as are other areas of TAFE, particularly the tourism and hospitality area to which I have referred. Our adult literacy courses should not be slashed, as appears likely under the cuts that the Bannan Government is to implement come Thursday of this week.

The 3 per cent cut in funding for the Gilles Plains college will amount to a reduction of some \$108 300. What are the possible strategies for coping with such a cut? The result of the non-filling of teaching positions at Gilles Plains, such as in carpentry and joinery will be, of course, the cancellation of day release in that area, the cancellation of remedial evening classes, and the cancellation of the advanced certificate program. Other cuts will mean the abandoning of the annual intake into the dental hygiene program, as well as a change from overlapping 16-month courses to end-on courses. What will be the impact of this? It will mean a decrease in the output of graduates, for which there is already unsatisfied demand in the community. Further, the clinical facilities will be under-utilised because of such a cut. All colleges will have to consider other cuts such as those involving economies in fuel and power.

There is a possibility of the cuts in the fire technology programs, a matter that I raised last week. Thankfully, it may be that the cuts will not be as significant as were outlined to me last week. However, it seems that there will not be a first year intake into the fire technology program next year. In the first semester next year, there will be no specialist lecturer for the advanced certificate course in furnishing. All general studies vocational classes, timetabled specifically for new entry students, will be cancelled in the second semester of 1987. There will be cuts in special education courses, remedial education courses and health and care courses. In fact, in health and care courses, sixteen classes will be cut back to 10 classes next year. Other cuts will apply to library materials and learning materials, etc.

Using Gilles Plains as an example of many of the colleges, it is clear that significant cuts will be made in the delivery of services at our TAFE colleges. Today I raised a matter publicly in relation to the Panorama college. An extraordinarily successful business studies program is being delivered at Panorama college, and also at Adelaide. I am told that as a result of cuts of some \$100 000 in its budget next year the Panorama college will be able to offer only 1 800 student positions, as opposed to 2 400 positions offered in 1986—representing a cut of some 600 positions, or 25 per cent, from the offering that was made in 1986. There is great community demand for the graduates from these courses held at Panorama and Adelaide colleges.

The other college that I want to refer to is the Croydon Park college. I refer to representations made to me over the past two weeks from student representatives of the Kilkenny annexe of the Croydon Park college and the students from the commercial art course. They have sent me some documentation. I have indicated that if they can send me further information I shall be happy to take up with the Government and the Minister many of the questions that they have raised in relation to the commercial art course. I shall quote from the letter from the student representatives, which was forwarded to John Olsen, the State Leader of the Liberal Party, as follows:

We [the commercial art students] lack sufficient access to current technology, and even basic equipment is substandard. This has prompted numerous student and staff requests for equipment essential to our needs, yet the TAFE administration has only seen fit to authorise impractical, cosmetic amenities, while furnishing us with their own obsolete surplus equipment. It would seem

that, in the face of the recent Government cutbacks in TAFE funding—

They ain't seen nothing yet, if I can use that colloquialism: come Thursday it is going to be even tougher—

the Croydon Park college can no longer tend to our specific needs. Unlike the Croydon Park campus, we are not an apprenticeship course and therefore do not receive the same benefits.

A specific complaint which the students have made—and which more properly should be lobbied at the college level, as I have indicated to them—is that in the allocation of materials and minor equipment the commercial art students receive some \$2 000, whereas the apprentice classes receive a total of some \$69 000. On various measures, of either student hours at the college, or even student numbers, they have argued—and a fairly persuasive case I might add—that that is not a fair allocation from within the Croydon Park college out of the funding that that college receives. The letter continues:

This has caused us great disadvantages, as the students face an increase in material and school fees of 100 per cent, leaving the majority in serious doubt of completing the course. We feel the merger with the Croydon Park College could be successful if the administration were to accommodate us as originally perceived. To date, however, our efforts in this regard have proven futile and disruptive to our development as a specialist course, leaving us vulnerable and under constant threat of collapse.

This is a most important area of technical and further education. Once these students graduate they are in great demand by industry. They are already spending large amounts of their own money. One of the students who came to me indicated that the only way that she could meet the costs of some hundreds of dollars for materials for her course was to sell her car: in fact, she told me that she had sold the car in recent weeks. As I indicated, I will take up this matter again on a later occasion. However, I believe that my comments demonstrate the effects of these cuts that the Government is making.

It is very easy to look at this matter at the macro-economic level and to say that only some 3 per cent of funding is being cut and that that can be absorbed. However, I think I have demonstrated that at the level of delivery of courses there is not that flexibility and that what is happening is that courses are being cut, students are being disadvantaged, and material costs and fees will surely increase. As a result, some students will be unable to undertake TAFE courses which in previous years they would have been able to do.

There is one final matter in respect of TAFE that I want to address in connection with problems associated with South Australia's falling behind in this area of education, the drop in standards and the drop in the quality of education being offered. I refer to a document headed '1987-88 Budget Review', which was revised by the Policy and Planning Committee, of 4 May 1987. I have a copy; it was an attachment to a confidential letter sent by the Assistant Director-General of Technical and Further Education, Mr Fleming, to college principals on the subject of college budgets.

This document is most informative, as it looks at the possibility of future changes in the delivery of services in TAFE and future cuts. I have indicated how the colleges will possibly cope with the present level of cuts, but there is no doubt that the Government will continue with cuts in TAFE over the coming years. The document illuminates the sorts of things that the central office of TAFE will look at, rather than cutting the excessive spending and the excessive fat that already exist within that office. The report states:

As approximately 15 000 students were not able to enter subjects which they requested at the beginning of 1987, consideration must now be given to the preparation of public priority guidelines for determining entry.

At the start of 1987, 15 000 students were not able to enter courses which they requested. I suggest that, unless many of them give up in despair and do not even bother to reapply, that number, which I believe is at an all time high, is likely to increase as a result of the cuts that this Government is making in TAFE colleges rather than making the cuts in the central office of TAFE.

What other suggestions are made by the central office of TAFE with respect to further cuts in funding for the Department of Technical and Further Education? The document contains a 'For action' column on the side and in relation to this matter, it refers to the Assistant Director-General (College Operations). The report suggests a reduction in the hours of operation of colleges. The report states:

Many issues require clarification and quantification, but to be pursued vigorously. There is support for:

21 December 1986 to 22 January 1987—

and I would presume in following years—

full college shutdowns;
concurrent shutdown central office.

We are looking at shutdowns in colleges perhaps of that order, or perhaps even longer if future cuts become even more significant in TAFE. The report looks at the implication of reducing the length of all courses, at reducing the length of prevocational courses, and at increasing the size of classes. In respect of the latter, I agree that in some areas there is some possibility for manoeuvrability. In relation to the Kensington Park campus the report states that there will be a review of existing property and that a community college is seen as appropriate in the eastern sector. There is some talk about the sale or possible transfer of some properties in relation to the Kensington Park campus. Item 26, which is for action by the Assistant Director-General, states:

Estimate savings through withdrawal from Stream 1000.

— The educational validity of this activity is not questioned, but in the current climate it may be relocated.

The report continues:

27. Reduction in teaching staff to reduce activity.

— An overall 'balancing' objective of the review process.

Sources of Income:

1. Charge materials fees—including for apprentices.

— Agreed in principle. Issues include:

● Average charge for a full-time student.

● Charge for part-time students.

It is recognised that already many students pay of the order of \$100. Materials charges range from \$10-\$1 000.

As I indicated earlier, the commercial art students at Croydon Park indicated to me that many of the students are paying many hundreds of dollars in materials charges for those courses. Point 2 on page 6 of the document states:

Course fees for all non-award courses on basis of total cost recovery where fees are charged.

— Agreed in principle. All exempt categories should be examined.

I list those examples from that confidential departmental working document just to indicate that the type of cuts in funding to the various colleges that we are likely to see announced soon after the budget on Thursday are only the start of cuts in the technical and further education sector. Already the mandarins within the Department of TAFE are looking at other ways to cut the delivery of services, but they are not looking at ways to cut the central office bureaucracy of the Department of TAFE.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: That's not right.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: The Hon. Mr Roberts keeps saying, 'That's not right' but, as I said, the Minister asked for cuts of \$1 million to \$1.5 million and I suggest that that figure ought to be doubled to \$2 million to \$2.5 million, but on 7 August the mandarins within TAFE replied to the Minister and said that it could not achieve those cuts and said the best that they could do was \$529 400.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: That's part of democratic negotiations.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Democratic negotiations? I believe that, if there is a strong Minister who says to his department, 'I want to see strategies to cope with cuts in funding of \$1 million or \$1.5 million,' he or she should not accept a document like this.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: A strong Minister does not accept something from his department that says \$529 000. The department can come back and say, 'Here is \$1 million but, if you do it, you will have all the political flak in the world and the delivery of services will be affected.' That is fair enough. The department can warn the Minister about the political ramifications of those cuts but, at the moment, we do not have a strong Minister. The Minister is painting himself into a corner in relation to the transfer of principals into public servants and in relation to the working conditions dispute. He will find himself in rather hot water concerning the funding of the central office in relation to the college sector. If he were a strong Minister he would insist that not only was that document from his department unacceptable but also that the department should come back with not \$1 million in cuts, but with strategies relating to cuts in funding of \$2 million to \$2.5 million in the sacred cow that is known as the TAFE central office.

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles: What are you going to do with the public servants—get rid of them?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: We indicated that our policy was not to sack public servants but, rather, as was the case in the Tonkin Government, the numbers in the public sector would be reduced through a natural rate of attrition. That is unlike the case with the Bannon Government where some 10 000 extra part and full-time public servants have been added to the payroll in South Australia. Let me not be deflected by these out of order interjections. I now refer to sport in schools.

The PRESIDENT: You certainly do not need to take any notice of any interjections from any member.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I thank you very much, Ms President, for your protection: it is always warmly received. We always give you the due respect which your office entitles you to. Last year the southern area of the Education Department developed a junior sport policy for all schools in that area of the department. I supported many parts of that policy and at the time I said so, and I do so again.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: So did the Liberal Party.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Liberal Party, with me speaking as the shadow Minister, supported the policy at that time and we do so again. I refer to competition in sport, particularly in relation to the rewarding of excellence and achievement in sport. The document, under the heading of 'Acknowledgment awards', at page 4, states:

Trophies should not be given though awards, if given, be distributed equally.

In other areas that policy says that premiership tables should not be kept for competitive sport in primary schools and that there should be no finals; in other words, there should be no football or netball finals in primary school sport in the southern area. That policy is being implemented in schools in the southern area this year and it states that there should be no best player trophy or most improved trophy for football or netball, and that there should not be trophies for the most aggregate runs or total number of wickets in cricket, for example. The policy states that, for a whole range of activities, there can be no trophies that in any way separate students of achievement from those who, whilst they may have worked hard and enjoyed their sport, were

not able to achieve those high levels of achievement in sport.

Those trophies, of course, do not always recognise the very best. Many of them recognise categories such as 'most improved', or 'hardest working at training': they recognise those who might perhaps not have the ability level of the top students in the sport but who have 'put in' and achieved relative to their own ability level sport. So, that policy was saying (and this is being implemented in our schools in the southern metropolitan area) that that is not to occur.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: That's unacceptable.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: As the Hon. Diana Laidlaw says, it is unacceptable: it is something that the Liberal Party will not support, and there will certainly be changes after the 1989-90 election when we take over the reigns. Earlier this year I had a telephone conversation with a parent who, out of his own funds, decided to cap a primary school cricket side. The term 'cap' is familiar to all cricket followers who, like the Hon. Terry Roberts, know that test cricketers are capped when they do well and represent Australia. This parent bought 12 caps for his primary school cricket side. He wanted to please the mandarins within the department and did not want to single out anyone, so he gave and presented 12 caps to the primary school cricket side.

What happened? The department said that that was contrary to the junior sport policy in the southern area, where one cannot, even out of one's own money, give caps to the cricket side. Those kids, who were thrilled at receiving those caps, were devastated that their coach had found himself in hot water with the department because all 12 of them had been capped. What was the reason for this? Ms President, it was that, by capping those 12 students, the coach had set them apart from all the other students in that school. What unadulterated garbage to be masquerading as a junior sport policy in our schools! What unadulterated garbage it is that a coach out of his own funds cannot, because of a junior sport policy in our southern area primary schools, cap his cricket side. Ms President, that is the extent to which the junior sport policy has degenerated in our schools in South Australia at the moment.

Earlier this year I asked the Minister of Education whether he had read this document and whether he supported it. The Minister, on behalf of the Bannon Government, said, 'Yes, I have read the document. Yes, I support it in principle.' So, we have the Minister of Education supporting this sort of garbage and rubbish in junior sport policy in schools in the southern metropolitan area. Since then, Ms President, we have had the Education Department releasing a draft sport policy for the whole of South Australia.

Unbelievably, we did not have a sport policy for schools throughout the whole State. Although that policy expands on some matters, it does not touch on the matter of awards and acknowledgments, and my sources in the southern metropolitan area tell me that, because it does not touch upon those matters, they believe that their sport policy in relation to the non-awarding of trophies will still hold ground and be implemented in the schools in the southern metropolitan area.

This draft sport policy has been taken up by Graham Cornes, our State football coach and a man who has had some success in that area. He has the misfortune of coaching Glenelg Football Club, instead of West Adelaide Football Club. He is also a columnist for the afternoon newspaper, the *News*.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: Almost an endorsed Liberal candidate?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I would welcome him warmly if he chose to become interested in politics and interested in

the Liberal Party. I am not aware of his political affiliations—only of his football allegiances.

An honorable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I think he would be better in a marginal seat in the southern suburbs. I think he would give Derek Robertson, June Appleby or fabulous Phil Tyler a bit of curry in one of the southern metropolitan seats. Anyway, that is his decision and not mine. In relation to the middle primary level, on page 13 of the draft sports policy under 'Conduct of sporting competitions', it states:

Participation should be at intra-school level only. There should be no premierships tables.

Ms President, once again in upper primary level, years 5, 6 and 7, the policy states:

Final rounds should not be included. Match points may be recorded for grading purposes, but premierships tables should not be published.

What a terrible thing for our 11 and 12 year olds in schools to actually see a premierships table which might actually show that their school is coming third out of six schools in football or netball. What a terrible thing for the development of those young students that they might see that they are coming third, first, or even sixth in football or netball. In my view that is unadulterated garbage masquerading as a draft sport policy to be implemented not only in the southern metropolitan area but in all schools in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Is there a program for doing that?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: There is. Let me extend that. The document I referred to in relation to the southern area dealt with junior sport policy—primary schools. However, we now have this draft sport policy spreading its tentacles into the secondary level. Let me read to the Council what it says under 'Secondary level':

It is recognised that the process of progression towards the adult game be continued at secondary level, so that by senior secondary level—

that is year 11 and 12. Some people talk about year 10, but most refer to years 11 and 12—

- (a) There may no longer be any rule modifications;
- (b) There may be premierships tables and knockout draws; and
- (c) Where required, finals matches may be played.

What the department, Minister Crafter and the Government wants us to accept is that, once we get to year 11 and 12, it is all right to have premierships tables and knockout draws in football and netball and, where required, final matches. The inference there, Ms President, is that in the junior secondary grades—grades 8, 9 and 10—premierships tables, knockout draws and finals matches are not going to be recommended by schools for football and netball. The sort of silliness that we see in primary school sport about not upsetting students in seeing a premierships table or having a finals match is now to be extended into the junior secondary grades for football and netball, for example.

What this Minister is trying to tell us is that our 12, 13 and 14 year old boys and girls who are playing competitive football, netball and cricket should not be seeing finals tables, premierships tables or having finals matches, because that instils a terrible competitive spirit within them that will be counterproductive to their personal development.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: An evil thing.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Yes, an evil thing to be used by schools in relation to school sport. That is absolute arrant nonsense, and sensible people like Graham Cornes and many other sporting commentators are seeing it as such and saying so.

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Ms Pickles raises an important point. One other part of this policy which I have supported and which I support again are the codes of ethics for parents, coaches, teachers and competitors. Those codes of ethics are very important, because we are well aware of the ugly parent and the ugly coach syndrome—those people who push the competitive urge to the nth degree and, in so doing, are counter-productive to the development of school sport. However, they are in a minority and are being used as an excuse by the department to implement, for all sport, these sorts of policies which are in no way appropriate for the majority of students involved in school sport in South Australia.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: Have you got the figures on how many kids drop out because they can't handle it?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Terry Roberts raises an important point. The other part of the policy that we all support is the encouragement of participation by girls in sport, in particular, who drop out at greater levels. This is a subject on which the Hon. Diana Laidlaw and I have spoken publicly. It is an important point and it is, and will continue to be, supported by the Liberal Party. There needs to be encouragement of participation by girls and boys in sport to stop this drop out rate. However, there is nothing in support of that policy which prevents students from competing between schools in football, netball and cricket, and there is nothing in the support of that policy which should prevent the reward and acknowledgment of excellence in effort or the achievement from one's own basic skill level. If one has a low skill level and one does well, one could get a most improved trophy or a trophy for the best attendance at football training, netball training or whatever.

There should be nothing in the policies in our schools that prevents reward for effort. The sort of thinking in sport, and in some academic levels within schools, which says that you should not have competition and that you should not be rewarded for effort is counter-productive to the development of those students. Indeed, it will be counter-productive when those students go out into the real world, where, I am afraid, there is competition; where, there are winners and losers; and where, I am afraid, there are people who are slightly better than others. The sooner our students are made aware of those facts and the sooner they realise that if they work hard they can be rewarded, the better it will be for them.

The last matter in relation to school sport to which I wish to refer is some nonsense known as Aussie footy; they talk about Aussie sport. I want to leave honourable members with a thought, especially for those who are football followers, in relation to what the Education Department wants to introduce for football. I accept that for the junior primary grades (for the young ones—the toddlers, five, six and seven year olds, in the junior primary grades), the rules might need this modification. However, the department wants us to accept that 11 and 12 year olds in the upper primary grades will be playing a game called Aussie footy, which comprises not 18 footballers, but 15 footballers. You do not have ruckmen, ruck rovers, or rovers in Aussie footy.

It must have been a South Adelaide supporter within the Education Department who drafted this proposal, because they do not have any rucks, ruck rovers or rovers. What we are being asked to accept is that our 11 and 12 year olds ought to play a version of football that does not have ruckmen, ruck rovers, and rovers. If you want to ball up at some stage, the nearest people to that ball up will have to go for the ruck. So, when they go on to year 8 and want to play secondary school football we will have children who

have been raised on a diet of Aussie footy without ruckmen, ruck rovers and rovers.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: It isn't football.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, it is not. The Hon. Diana Laidlaw says that it is not football. She is a staunch supporter of Sturt, I might add, and a very knowledgeable lady in football matters. She agrees that this sort of nonsense cannot be supported in junior school sport.

The last matter that I wish to address in my Address in Reply speech is the general subject of the State Labor Party. I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* a table relating to the State Labor Party factions.

Leave granted.

Left	Factions in the State Labor Party Centre Left		Right
G. Weatherill	T. Crothers	J. Klunder	T. McRae
A. Levy	B. Wiese	K. Plunkett	
T. Roberts	G. Bruce	J. Slater	
C. Pickles	R. Abbott	J. Trainer	
M. Feleppa	J. Appleby	C. Sumner*	
F. Blevins	L. Arnold	J. Cornwall*	
T. Groom	J. Bannon	M. Rann*	
S. Lenehan	G. Crafter	G. Keneally*	
K. Mayes	D. Ferguson	M. Duigan*	
D. Robertson	D. Gayler	M. De Laine*	
P. Tyler	R. Gregory	R. Payne*	
	K. Hamilton		
	T. Hemmings		
	D. Hopgood		

*Claim a 'non-aligned' status, but generally support centre left.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: This is a matter of some merriment for us. The document is an analysis I have done of the left, the centre left, the *de facto* centre left and the right in the State Labor Party. For the benefit of members present, I point out that the Right is not a very large faction. I am afraid the only member I could find for the right was Terry McRae.

The Hon. T. Crothers: What about the right in your own Party?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: That is why I am raising this matter. There has been a lot of talk in the media about factions, and I am afraid we have got away from where the true factions lie—within the State parliamentary Party of the Labor Party. We will have a look at the left faction.

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am glad that the Hon. Carolyn Pickles is here, a prominent member of the left, and, I think, of the ALP left wing executive, if an article by Kym Tilbrook in the *Advertiser* is correct, together with the Hon. George Weatherill. The Hon. Terry Roberts did not get a guernsey, I note—some skulduggery at the post—but we will not talk about that—the Hon. Carolyn Pickles and the Hon. George Weatherill are members of a 10 person executive. The other members of the left whom I managed to suss out in my discussions over the past few weeks were George Weatherill, of course, Anne Levy, Terry Roberts, Carolyn Pickles, Mario Feleppa (and we will talk about him in a tick), Frank Blevins (a former member of this Chamber) and Susan Lenehan. How are we going so far?

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: Hit and miss.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I include Kym Mayes, Derek Robertson, fabulous Phil Tyler and, of course, Terry Groom, who has been a recent coup for the left—although I do not know whether or not it was a coup, but he had to find himself a faction within the Party. He was not getting too far in the centre left, so he has a new guernsey to wear in the State Labor Party. So we have a nice little faction of 11 members in the State parliamentary Party. It is very inter-

esting that two members holding marginal seats in the southern suburbs, Derek Robertson and Phil Tyler—

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles: Very popular, hardworking members.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Yes, hard working, but it is interesting that Derek Robertson and Phil Tyler are members of the left—and that is a matter which has been kept pretty quiet in those southern suburbs so far. I think it might become a matter of some debate over the coming months and years as we lead up to the 1989-90 election.

Let us have a look at the centre left faction of the Labor Party. Here we have Barbara Wiese and Trevor Crothers, one of the number crunchers in the centre left, I am told; and Gordon Bruce, they tell me. I always thought Gordon Bruce was almost right, but I am told he is centre left, except that he sometimes has a bit of a falling out. There are Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Mr Lynn Arnold, the Premier, of course, Mr Crafter, Mr Ferguson, Ms Gayler, Mr Gregory, Mr Hamilton, Mr Hemmings, Dr Hopgood, Mr Klunder, Mr Plunkett, Jack Slater and John Trainer.

We then come to a little group which claims to be non-aligned. These members claim a non-aligned status but generally support the centre left and the Hon. J.C. Bannon. In that category we have the Hon. John Cornwall, who always maintains that he is factionally non-aligned.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: No-one would align with him; that is the point.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: That might be the point. There is the Hon. C.J. Sumner, who always claims he is factionally non-aligned but, when the numbers are required, seems to be rolled out regularly for the centre left. Mr Rann sort of wanders about all over the place, pretending to be all things to all people, but I am told he is lengthening in the odds for the ministerial reshuffle coming up at the end of the year. Then there is the Hon. F. Blevins—the one the Hon. Carolyn Pickles and I have had a wager of one cup of tea that he will lose the prisons portfolio in the coming reshuffle. But we will discuss that later.

I am told that Ron Payne wanders about between the centre left and the right; the same applies to Murray De Laine, who claims to be non-aligned but who sometimes wanders out of the Chamber and cannot get back for important votes. The Hon. John Cornwall soon sorted him out. Michael Duigan wanders a bit, too; he has a few right tendencies, I am told, but is generally centre left when the numbers are required. I am told that Gavin Keneally is almost centre left/left—he wanders a bit the other way while maintaining that he is independent and non-aligned.

Well, that is the Parliamentary Labor Party Caucus. I would be interested in contributions about this from members at a latter stage. There are 11 members from the left, one from the right and 25 who generally end up in that amorphous mass called the centre left. They do not really believe in anything; they are somewhere in between and do a bit of number crunching. Of that 25 there are seven who sort of wander all over the place, supposedly non-aligned people who think that they are independent, like John Cornwall, but who jump when the numbers are needed or when Premier Bannon orders them to.

These are the factions within the State Parliamentary Labor Party. The left has 11 of the 37 positions and I understand controls about 40 to 45 per cent of convention votes, so it appears to be under-represented in the State Parliamentary Caucus. I see some Labor backbench members nodding. What is going on at the moment with these factions in the Labor Party?

There is a major brawl proceeding between these factions about staffing of the central office. Our old friend Chris

Schacht has gone to loftier climes in the Senate and there is a bit of manoeuvring at the central office as to who will fill various positions. I am told there has been a deal worked out between the centre left and the right and that Mr Cameron from the centre left is likely to be the new Chris Schacht, State Secretary.

There are two positions of Labor Party organiser and because of the centre left and right deal, which is crunching everything at the moment, the poor left is not getting much of a say in anything. The media tell us that the two positions are likely to go to Mr McKee from the centre left and Ms Hurley from the right, although I understand that there has been some discussion about giving the left a guernsey and that they may have to create a position for a third organiser (the candidate being discussed is a Mr Young). I cannot see that coming about, but we can discuss that at another time.

Preselection is, of course, where the real fury of the factions within the Labor Party will be shown. There are five State members and one federal Labor member (Mr Hurford) retiring soon. I understand that the deal that centre left number crunchers like Mr Crothers (although I do not know whether he gets involved in these sorts of matters) and others from the right have organised are three positions on the State ticket for the centre left and two for the right. The names mentioned in despatches are Mick Atkinson, a former *Advertiser* journalist and perceived number cruncher for the right (he sees himself as one, anyway, and thinks he has a guernsey for Spence in this deal), and Mr Holloway from the right who sees himself in Ron Payne's seat of Mitchell. There is a suggestion that Mr McKee from the centre left will get Gilles. Of course, that leaves two other positions, Mr Plunkett's seat and Mr Keneally's seat, which are to be given to the centre left.

The right has extracted one further ounce of blood—the position of replacement for Chris Hurford, and I am told that Don Farrell, the Assistant Secretary of the Shop Assistants Union and a member of the right faction, has the inside running for that position for the Labor Party. This is upsetting the left faction in the Labor Party. We even see the left faction—of all factions—now claiming that there may well have to be federal intervention to try to straighten out these sorts of things.

An article last week by Kym Tilbrook in the *Advertiser* indicates that things are getting so serious in this brawl between the factions that something never seen before in the State Labor Party is being suggested. It has always been the tradition that the State Labor Party re-endorses its sitting members. There was a recent example in Queensland, where I am afraid that did not quite eventuate. However, I am told that in South Australia there has been that history. An article on 21 August this year, by Bruce Hogben and Kym Tilbrook, states:

Proposed retaliatory moves against the left-wing unions are believed to include blocking the re-endorsement of parliamentarians backed by the unions. Legislative Councillor Mr George Weatherill, who is convener of the ALP left and a former organiser with the Federated Miscellaneous Workers' Union, would be one target.

Another MLC from the union movement's Left, former Amalgamated Metal Workers' Union official, Mr Mario Feleppa, also would be opposed in ALP pre-selection of electoral candidates.

This is the level that the brawl between the factions has reached where one of the tenets of the Labor Party, the re-endorsement of its sitting members, is being threatened. That deal went for years under the tutelage of Toohey, followed by people like Combe and Young, and even

Schacht—although it started to get a bit wobbly under Schacht because the left never got on well with Schacht, Nick Bolkus and Schacht used to have a few altercations at executive meetings.

The right, who at least believe in something, and the centre left, who really do not know what they believe in but are somewhere between the two other groups, formed a number crunching group in the middle to crunch numbers for Bannon in South Australia, and they decided, in a cosy little deal, to freeze the left out from the central office and to freeze them out now from the parliamentary pre-selection deal, and even now to threaten endorsement of those people of the left who are members of this Council.

While I would not support the political philosophies of Mr Weatherill and Mr Feleppa, I would personally be very sad to see those members leave the Chamber—in particular Mr Feleppa, who has spoken out articulately on many occasions for the ethnic communities in South Australia. I know from avid readers of *Il Globo* that already a campaign is being mounted within the ethnic newspapers (Mr Feleppa would be aware of it) indicating that the Italian community will be coming out strongly supporting Mr Feleppa within the Labor Party, against the wishes of the right, who at least believe in something, and this amorphous group called the centre left, who are really just number crunching at the moment and believe in nothing.

I conclude on that basis and indicate that, if one wants to talk about organised factions, let the media and the community look not at the Liberal Party but at factions where they really exist, where the left, for example, has its own convening committees, its own letterhead and its own separate meetings, and where this sort of brawling is going on in relation to the filling of positions at the central office and in preselections, not only for seats that are becoming vacant but also for preselections for sitting members. I support the motion.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE secured the adjournment of the debate.

MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

EGG INDUSTRY STABILISATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.17 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 26 August at 2.15 p.m.