

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday 10 August 1994

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. Peter Dunn)** took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I bring up the interim report of the committee on citizens' initiated referenda and move:

That the report be printed.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I bring up the third report 1994-95 of the committee and move:

That it be read.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I bring up the fourth report 1994-95 of the committee.

ELECTRICITY TRUST

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I seek leave to table a copy of a ministerial statement made in another place today by the Minister for Infrastructure on the subject of ETSA end of financial year performance.

Leave granted.

QUESTION TIME

SCHOOL SPORTS

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: My question is directed to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. Does the school sports policy recently announced by the Minister, together with the joint statement with the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing, involve compulsory sport for school students and, if so, what is the basis of that policy?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The junior sport policy was in effect a combination release State and national, in that it was the new Australian junior sport policy which had been released in Sydney the previous Friday and which was subsequently released here in South Australia. It has now been adopted by the South Australian Government as our new junior sport policy. I raise two aspects in responding to the question from the Leader of the Opposition: the first is that some two years ago the previous Labor Government, all the other State Governments and the Commonwealth Government agreed to what was then called National Curriculum Profiles and Statements.

The new Government has followed those through but it is making some changes to some aspects of them and they will be implemented in schools starting from next year. A part of that national agreement was an understanding that there be eight key learning areas: one was the health and physical education area, and within that was an understanding that sport and physical education would be a required part of learning in all States, Territories and the Commonwealth. The genesis of the launch of the new policy dates back some two or three years to the agreement between various States, Territories and the Commonwealth Government and, in part anyway, the agreement of the previous Labor Government in

relation to the adoption of the National Curriculum Profiles and Statements.

As I said, the Government has made some changes to those National Curriculum Profiles and Statements, so you cannot technically say they are national, although the framework remains the same. But in this area no significant changes have been made at all.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It is a required part of learning, yes. In relation to how it will be implemented—

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It is a difficult issue, and the Hon. Ron Roberts, I am sure, would support the notion that our young people ought to be involved in more phys ed and sport during their school years.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: What happens if they do not want to be?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It is the same if they do not want to study a language. It is now a required part of the curriculum, a policy, as I said, supported by the previous Labor Government in relation to language, in relation to art and drama, also in relation to—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:—health and physical education. As I said, as part of that national agreement sport and physical education was included.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: They have to do it?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Let me move to that. It is a required part of their learning. As to how that translates into practice, we will try to be as flexible as we can within our schools in South Australia. For example, in some small country communities young people are already actively involved in sport, whether it be after hours or Saturday morning sport, and the difficulty of organising, in a small school of 30 or 40 students, any organised sporting competition when the nearest school is 50 or 60 miles away would be evident to the Leader of the Opposition and, of course, to the Hon. Ron Roberts, who at least in part purports to represent part of the country constituency in this Chamber.

We will have to be flexible in relation to that. The department is working through the detail of how to implement this national agreement, and our policy will have to be relatively flexible in some areas. In some areas SAPSASA (South Australian Primary Schools' Amateur Sports Association) organises interschool sport or, if the school is big enough, intraschool where you have enough students in the team or in the school to have organised football, netball, cricket, or whatever the sport might be. In other cases it might be interschool sport. In other cases it might well be the development of sporting skills.

Up to 17 sports have junior development officers who travel around to schools organising, in effect, sporting skill development, which certainly can be incorporated within the general notion of sport. For example, the South Australian National Football League and the Crows have a number of junior development officers who visit schools organising sports development, skills development, and we believe that our interpretation of what sport will be will be flexible enough to incorporate some of those elements of those programs within the required areas of learning.

So, our general view is that there will have to be a compulsory physical education and sport component; that is, there needs to be compulsory physical education, whether it be health hustles, which has been the common theme for most primary schools for the past 10 years or so, a variety of other

organised physical education activities within schools, or sport or sport/skill development. We will need to be flexible in the way in which we implement that. We will need to incorporate and implement some reasonably significant policy changes in relation to training and development for classroom teachers, and the department is already working on this aspect.

Before the end of the year, there are likely to be some reasonably significant announcements in relation to how the department will implement the broad details regarding physical education and sport (as I have defined it, and that will be a fairly flexible definition) as a required part of learning for all our students from reception to year 10.

SHACKS

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport, representing the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, a question about the Shack Site Freeholding Committee.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: On 30 March the Minister announced that a Shack Site Freeholding Committee had been established to advise the Government on the best method for freeholding shacks. In his press release, the Minister stated:

The committee has been instructed to report on the best method of freeholding shacks on Crown land wherever possible, provided that they meet appropriate environmental and health standards.

He went on to say:

Not every shack site will be able to be freeholded but the committee is to recommend solutions to problems rather than obstruct the process of freeholding. The establishment of this committee fulfils an important pre-election promise, and the freeholding of appropriate shacks will be done on a user pays system in accordance with our policy.

My questions to the Minister are:

1. What is the timetable for the committee to report to the Government?
2. Can the owners of shack sites now apply for their properties to be converted to freeholding and, if so, how should this be done?
3. What does the Minister mean when he says that shacks will '...meet appropriate environmental and health standards'?
4. What is meant by a 'user pays system'?
5. How many shack owners have already applied for their properties to be converted to freehold?
6. What is the status of these applications?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I will refer the honourable member's questions to the Minister and bring back a reply.

RURAL FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Primary Industries, a question about the operations of the Rural Finance and Development Division.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I received correspondence recently from the Rural Action Group on Kangaroo Island. I have been informed that there are growing concerns within South Australia's farming community in relation to the

operations of the Rural Finance and Development Division of the Primary Industries Department of South Australia. I believe that the rural finance section has compiled a list of external consultants approved for evaluating the viability of family farms.

I am further informed that this list of approved consultants is made up mainly from former Government officers and that some consultants have been removed from the approved list because they refused to write farm viability reports that suited the Rural Finance and Development Division's views. Given these quite serious allegations, my questions are as follows:

1. How many consultants have been accredited or approved to conduct farm viability studies?
2. How many of these consultants are former employees of the South Australian Government?
3. How many consultants have been removed from the list of accredited or approved consultants and what were the reasons for their removal?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

TEACHER NUMBERS

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services a question about teacher numbers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: A recent report by the Australian Council of Deans of Education has revealed a very substantial upturn in demand for teachers in Australia and that that will continue over the next couple of years. The report found that there was an extremely urgent need to increase the number of teachers trained to meet the teaching demand in Australian schools. The report indicated that nationally demand for both primary and secondary teachers will exceed supply in 1996 and that the gap will continue to widen over the next five years.

The report further found that between 1994 and the year 2001 the total number of graduates required to meet expected demand will increase by 118 per cent overall from 7 957 to 17 381. At the same time there is a sharp reduction in the number of students commencing teaching studies. The report indicated that its figures are conservative. It assumes that 75 per cent of graduates who apply are suitable whereas the New South Wales experience, as I understand it, indicates a figure of 50 per cent.

This report did not anticipate the exit of existing teachers from the system, as is currently happening in South Australia. In the 1970s a teacher shortage created enormous chaos and resulted in increased expenses for the Government as it had to bring in people from other countries because of the local teacher shortage. By the time South Australia is faced—

The Hon. Anne Levy: That occurred in the 1960s.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: It happened in the 1970s as well; I was out working in the schools at the time. By the time South Australia is faced with the teacher shortage, which is predicted to be 4 per cent, and much higher in other States, many people who are now leaving the industry will be entrenched in different careers and will not be enticed back. Considering their recent experiences that is no wonder.

We are seeing many teachers leave the system, with the South Australia Institute of Teachers indicating that, from May 1993 to June 1994, between 750 and 800 teachers took separation packages. For every two offers made there were seven inquiries of interest.

The New South Wales Government has recently announced its intention to employ an additional 1 500 teachers. Nevertheless, the Audit Commission has recommended teacher cuts in South Australia based on a national average, which clearly is about to change. Considering such factors as ageing teachers and a predicted reduction in the number of new graduates, we will not be able to handle the predicted demand. This may produce significant costs for the Government, as it did in the 1970s. My questions are:

1. Is the Minister aware of this report by the Australian Council of Deans of Education, and has he read it?

2. What are the ramifications of the report in South Australia for teacher training?

3. Can South Australia afford to reduce its pool of experienced teachers at a time when a shortage of qualified teachers is imminent?

4. Can South Australia afford to abandon teacher registration at a time when a shortage of teachers will lead to a lower standard of applicant being considered for employment, as happened in the 1960s and 1970s?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I have seen some extracts of what has become known as the Adey report and have had an opportunity to skim read it. I am planning to meet in the not too distant future with Mr Adey and one of the other authors of that report to look at the ramifications of what was a national report for the South Australian education system. Clearly the department is already considering the possible ramifications of that report. Obviously we need to check the assumptions that are made therein—

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: Why are you still paying out packages if you cannot get the numbers right?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Do you want an answer or do you want to keep talking?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister will answer the question, and the questioner will cease interjecting.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Thank you, Mr President. The officers in my department are currently investigating the assumptions made in the report to see whether indeed they are fair, valid and accurate assumptions in relation to potential surpluses or shortages and in relation to the particular time frame. I do not think even the Hon. Mr Elliott would suggest that we need to accept word for word every report that is produced by an academic or a number of distinguished academics from any of our universities in South Australia or other States and Territories.

We would certainly like to check the assumptions to see whether we agree with those sorts of projections. I would agree with the Hon. Mr Elliott, and he and other members would know that this question of when you turn off the tap in relation to teacher institutions and with what time lags has been a vexed question for the past 30 or 40 years. Inevitably, the Federal Government through its funding and also teacher training institutions turns off the tap too late and then fails to turn it on early enough in relation to potential future shortages. If this is an accurate report, it highlights to all governments in Australia as an early warning sign that teacher training institutions may well have to turn on the tap earlier than they otherwise might have anticipated in relation to teacher shortages. One of the essential features of that report is that the major demand for teachers will be not in South Australia but in the rapidly developing population—

The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Mr Elliott ought to look at the report. It states that there will be demand in all States. I am saying that the greatest demand will be in

Queensland and New South Wales in relation to the absolute numbers of teachers that will be required over the coming period. All States and Territories will have to plan for this, and that is acknowledged, but it will be something that will be especially important, particularly in the short term, for Queensland, which in population terms is developing very rapidly, and already there are shortages in Queensland in relation to teacher numbers. One of the aspects we will have to look at here in South Australia is increasing the mobility of our teacher graduates. Clearly, we will need to be able to employ some of those in the South Australian system as teachers grow older, retire or die. We will need to replace them with new graduates, but equally there needs to be increased mobility and some of our graduates will need to be prepared to move, not only to the Northern Territory as they are at the moment, but also to other States, such as Queensland in particular, where there will be increased numbers.

The second point is that the potential shortages and areas of concern to South Australia are not immediate, as the Hon. Mr Elliott has suggested. The problem of numbers will occur towards the end of this decade, in particular the last few years of this decade, and certainly in the early part of the next century. We have some time. It is an important issue, and the department is working on it. I will be meeting with Kym Adey and others in relation to the report as we seek to plan for the future. In relation to teacher numbers—the third and fourth aspects of the honourable member's question—as I said, the potential problems, if any, will occur in the latter part of this decade and the early part of the next century. At the moment we have almost 4 000 unemployed teacher-trained persons here in South Australia, so certainly no-one can suggest that in the South Australian context now or for the immediate future we have a teacher shortage.

This potential problem is an issue that the governments of the latter part of this decade and early next century will clearly have to address. Clearly there is a responsibility for this Government to enter into discussions with Mr Adey and others in relation to planning for the latter part of the decade and the early part of the next century. With respect to the fourth and final part of the question in relation to teacher registration and the Teacher Registration Board, the Government will be announcing its position in relation to that in the coming two weeks prior to the COAG meeting which the Premier will be attending, and I am not in a position today to indicate the Government's position on that matter.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: As a supplementary question: if the Minister looks at this matter and finds that the shortage is earlier than he expected, will he acknowledge that in those circumstances laying off experienced teachers at this time is not a wise move?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will not answer hypothetical questions. The position that the Hon. Mr Elliott is putting to me is that this report is a reputable report, produced by reputable persons within the teacher education community. We will have a look at it and, as I said, make a judgment whether or not we agree with those assumptions and then we will make our decision about what we intend to do in relation to what might be a teacher shortage at some time before the end of the decade.

EWS PACKAGES

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education

and Children's Services, representing the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development, a question about the EWS.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: When the Liberal Government took power in this State it offered packages to EWS personnel. According to what the workers told me, when they went to their managers to find out what was going to happen to their department, about how radically it was going to be reduced, they were given no information whatsoever. Even today, management cannot advise workers about what is happening in the EWS, just that these packages have been targeted to certain people. Many people have grabbed packages and run with them because they believed they would not have a job in the future and felt that they had better start looking after their future.

The EWS has kept certain people on, yet people who applied for a package have not been able to get one, and I refer to district watermen. The EWS has got rid of all emergency watermen and has no day shift, afternoon shift or night shift. Some of the district watermen who remain did want a package but have been refused it. The people on the service trucks have been classed as the best people in the department and they have been refused a package. Also, sewer operations people are unlicensed. Many years ago they applied for licences because the work they carried out was covered by plumbers but, because the work was done by a State Government department, sewer operations workers were allowed to carry out such work unlicensed within the department and could not work outside the department and they could not go moonlighting. Certainly, that is one reason they were refused a licence many years ago.

In offering packages, the EWS did not go into the department or at least it was not concerned about the people to whom it offered packages. Workers in the sewer operations area have been doing the job for about 30 years. If the Government offers this work to private enterprise, as it has been talking about doing, such work would obviously go to plumbers, although it would probably cost much more. These workers cannot transfer from the department to the contract plumbing area because they do not have a licence. Some payouts have been offered to people whom the department really needs until it gets contractors in but they have been told that, because they did not get a package in the first place, which they were refused, they will get about \$5 000 less than the people the department did not want and paid off first. My questions to the Minister are as follows:

1. Will the Minister reinstate the package to these workers at the same level it was prior to 27 July?
2. Will he also investigate the position concerning the sewer operations team and see whether it is possible to give these people a licence, which I believe they are entitled to because they have more expertise than people who are licensed plumbers?
3. Will the Minister also look into the area of service trucks and the type of work they carry out?
4. Will he also consider the different watermen who are the first workers that people speak to when they have a problem in the department?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am aware that the Government has been giving some consideration to the question of separation packages, not just in the EWS but across the whole public sector. I will refer the honourable member's questions to the Minister and bring back an early reply.

DISORDERLY BEHAVIOUR

The PRESIDENT: I have an answer to a question that was asked by the Hon. George Weatherill on 22 February. I apologise for the slowness of the response, but we did have to go through a number of organisations and the city council to come to this conclusion. My response is: further to my reply to a question asked by the Hon. Mr Weatherill on 22 February last about people being accosted outside Parliament House, I am able to advise that arrangements are in hand to improve the lighting in the area. A flood lamp will be mounted on a pole at the front of the Parliament House building to illuminate the south-west corner and a bright light will be affixed above the south-west members' door at the basement of Parliament House.

ENERGY SUPPLIES

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Leader of the Government, representing the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development, a question about future energy plans.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: At least five members of this Chamber are aware of the fact that the Statutory Authorities Review Committee is undertaking an examination of ETSA. There may be many others who are equally aware of this committee's work. Part of the terms of reference include the future role of Leigh Creek mine for electricity generation and alternative options for future electricity supply in South Australia, including total benefits to South Australia, and to examine past and possible future electricity demand growth scenarios with respect to generation and fuel supply strategies. The Conservation Council has drawn to my attention that prior to the last election the Liberal Party policy stated that it would ensure that within 10 years 20 per cent of the State's energy would be derived from renewable energy resources—a huge proportion of our energy requirements to come from renewable energy sources.

Does the Liberal Party still hold with this policy and, if so, can the Minister give the timetable for achieving that 20 per cent derived from renewable energy sources, as I presume that not all of it will happen in the tenth year, but that it will be staged over the 10 years? Such information will be necessary for the Statutory Authorities Review Committee to examine energy and fuel requirements for South Australia and will, of course, be of equal relevance to ETSA and the working party set up by the Premier and Cabinet to look into ETSA. They would certainly need to take account of the fact that only 80 per cent of the State's energy requirements would be coming from non-renewable energy sources if such was to occur, plus the staging in of this huge proportion coming from renewable energy sources. I hope the Minister can give a definitive answer in this area, or is this to be merely regarded as another election promise which will be broken and which the various inquiries into ETSA should ignore completely?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I shall be pleased to refer that question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

VIETNAMESE LANGUAGE STUDIES

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services, representing the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, a question about Vietnamese language studies.

Leave granted.

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: It has been brought to my attention that the Vietnamese language course at the University of Adelaide is under threat of termination. In 1993 we note that for Chinese studies there were six full-time equivalent staff and the student/staff ratio was 13.4. For Japanese studies we note that there were 11 full-time equivalent staff and a student/staff ratio of 11.3. However, Vietnamese studies has only one full-time equivalent staff with a student/staff ratio of 16.6.

In 1994 we note that for Chinese studies the full-time equivalent was seven and the student/staff ratio was 11.5. That is an increase of one staff member and an accompanying decrease in the student/staff ratio from 13.4 to 11.5. For Japanese studies the staffing and student/staff ratio were similar to 1993; that is, 11 full-time equivalent staff and a student/staff ratio of 11.5. However, for Vietnamese studies we have the same one full-time equivalent staff with the student/staff ratio increasing from 16.6 to 17.

We also note that Vietnamese subjects offered in the Centre for Asian Studies are taught on a rotational basis; that is, there are three levels of Vietnamese classes which have Vietnamese 1 for beginners, Vietnamese 2, which follows on from Vietnamese 1, and is also for matriculation students, and Vietnamese 3, which follows from Vietnamese 2, for honours secondary students.

The pattern of rotation, therefore, for 1993 would be Vietnamese 2 and 3; for 1994 Vietnamese 1 and 3; and for 1994-95 Vietnamese 1 and 2, and so on. Thus, for any particular year there is one level missing. If anyone wants to take that particular level of Vietnamese in that year, it is just too bad. Further, if that one full-time equivalent is ill or goes on study leave—and I quote in part a letter from the head of the Centre for Asian Studies, Mr A. Watson—'the Vietnamese program for that year will not be taught.'

Further, I have another memo from Mr Watson, the head of the Centre for Asian Studies, with regard to the strategic directions working party's proposals for faculty restructuring. In point 9, regarding possible units for a configuration of this new interdisciplinary model—and the departments mentioned are anthropology and, in particular, Chinese, English, French, German and Japanese languages—Vietnamese seems to be missing.

We also note that in the *Advertiser* of 18 December 1992, entitled 'Federal funding boosts university places,' the Minister for Higher Education and Employment Services said:

South Australian universities will receive \$16.7 million in 1994 and \$18.5 million in 1995 to boost an addition of 390 university places.

The funding was to go to Flinders University for migrant bridging projects and the University of Adelaide would receive funding for Vietnamese language courses.

Further, our Premier has also emphasised the importance of trade with Asia, and Vietnam in particular is one of the fastest growing economies. We also note that Vietnamese migrants represent one of our largest and most industrious of recent groups of arrivals. Therefore, the teaching of the

Vietnamese language on all counts must be a priority. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Why is the teaching of Vietnamese at the University of Adelaide accorded such a low priority?
2. Is there an agenda to cut out the Vietnamese language course completely?
3. If not, why has the course been allocated such a low status that there is only one full-time equivalent staff with no reliever for illness or study leave, and why are only two out of the three levels of the Vietnamese language course being made available in one academic year?
4. Will the Minister look into the consolidation of the Vietnamese language course with security for the one full-time equivalent staff and the addition of an extra full-time staff so that the Vietnamese language course can at least be guaranteed credibility and not just be a token course?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply. As the honourable member would know, universities in South Australia and nationally are largely laws unto themselves in relation to their own governance and practice. Nevertheless, I am sure that the Minister will have an interest in this matter, and I will bring back a reply as soon as possible.

RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport, representing the Minister for Health, a question on radioactive cartage.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: Current signage for the cartage of radioactive materials is fairly obvious to members of the public and emergency services when called upon to deal with any clean-up of dangerous or hazardous waste associated with radioactive material. I sincerely hope that there will be more integration of State legislation into Federal legislation so that it does not have to have sign changes at borders, and I think such discussions are taking place. My concern is that currently there are applications for exemption to the State's laws in relation to radioactive cartage. Is the Health Commission currently considering an application for exemption for vehicles carrying radioactive materials from displaying outside signage in this State, and, if so, what are the grounds for the application?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I will refer that question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

RADIO COMMUNICATIONS

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Emergency Services, a question about radio communications facilities for South Australian waters.

Leave granted.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: On a recent visit to Port Lincoln, a number of locals raised with me their concerns about the inadequacy of radio communications with commercial and recreational boats and planes in and over South Australian waters. They pointed out that since the closure early in 1993 of the Federal Government run radio communications base at McLaren Vale there had been seven deaths, including most recently that of a Ceduna tuna fisherman, Mr

Tom Holder, as a result of air and sea accidents in their region.

An article in the *Advertiser* of 27 July 1994 reported comments of Mr Tony Holder, son of Mr Tom Holder, on the closure of the Adelaide communications base. Among other things, Mr Holder said that emergency radio communications organisations in Perth and Melbourne were not familiar with local conditions. In the case of Tom Holder, the radio call went from the boat to Perth, which sent a message to Canberra, and a plane was sent out from Melbourne.

I am told that boats are now only contactable for about four hours per day: two hours early in the morning and two hours late in the evening. Outside these times, many are forced to operate radio communications systems illegally in order to ensure that any problems experienced by boats and planes off the South Australian coast can be ascertained as soon as they occur. A number of husbands and wives involved in the tuna fishing industry have pirate transmitters and prearranged contact times. In addition, there are a few 'pirate' radio operators keeping their own watching brief. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Has the Minister raised any of these concerns with the Federal Minister for Communications and, if not, why not? If he has, what was the outcome?

2. Will the Minister give an undertaking to establish more satisfactory communication facilities or arrangements with boats and planes in or over South Australian waters? 3. Will the Minister provide any assistance to those people who are informally operating radio communications facilities for the protection of these boats and planes until more satisfactory radio communications arrangements can be made?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

MABO

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the Mabo legislation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: In an answer the Attorney-General gave to a question asked of him by the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber last week, the Attorney indicated on behalf of the South Australian Government that his Government had decided to join with Western Australia in appealing certain sections of the Act in question. He further indicated that the South Australian case would be a limited one, which would go to challenging only a very few aspects of the Act. In a supplementary question asked by me, the Attorney indicated that he did not understand the nature of my question, and subsequently that appeared to be the case.

In order to obtain an answer to the question and in fairness to him, I now direct the following question to the Attorney. Can he indicate to the Council whether or not his Government will address the many elements of Mabo which are not under challenge by the South Australian Government with a view to introducing necessary complementary legislation to those State Acts over which the South Australian Parliament has legislative responsibility and which impinge on or are at cross-purposes with Mabo in order to ensure the effectiveness and good working of those sections of the Federal Act that are not currently under challenge in the courts by the South Australian Government?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I thought I had answered that last week. I have indicated that in the last session three Bills

were introduced in the House of Assembly: a mining Act native title amendment Bill; one relating to land acquisition; and one relating to the Environment, Resources and Development Court. The background to those Acts was to ensure that in those areas our legislation was not inconsistent with the Racial Discrimination Act and, where necessary, not inconsistent with the Native Title Act.

I thought I also indicated last week—but if I did not then I do so now—that Parliamentary Counsel and officers in the Crown Solicitor's office have been through something like 75 Acts of the State Parliament, and more are in the pipeline. There are amendments of a technical nature to about 33 of those so far, and those amendments again follow the same theme of the amendments which have been proposed in the legislation introduced in the House of Assembly in the last session; that is, to ensure that our legislation is not inconsistent with the Racial Discrimination Act and, where appropriate, not inconsistent with the Commonwealth Native Title Act. That legislation will be brought in, I would expect, in at least a few weeks' time for consideration by the Parliament.

We are seeking to put in place a framework which will enable native title to be recognised and claims to be dealt with consistently with the Commonwealth legislation. The legislation we are introducing is not in any way adversely affected by either the intervention in the High Court, the Commonwealth Native Title Act or any other piece of legislation. We are acknowledging that there is a framework there for the resolution of native title claims or for making orders that there are no native title claims in respect of a particular piece of land within the framework of State law, as well as the Commonwealth Native Title Act. That is the framework within which we are operating. In respect of the Native Title Act, a number of provisions do not need so-called 'complementary' State legislation. States are given some options—for example, in relation to whether or not they establish a separate State native title tribunal. We have said that we believe that the Environment, Resources and Development Court, in conjunction with the Supreme Court, are the best forums for dealing with those issues at a State level. But, because of the Native Title Act there is a great deal of uncertainty about the effectiveness of that, and that is one of the areas on which we have made representations to the Commonwealth and others for amendment to the Commonwealth Act, to ensure that there is a final decision which can be taken either on the Commonwealth Native Title Act or in the Environment, Resources and Development Court and which subsequently puts beyond doubt the issue of whether or not native title exists in respect of a particular piece of land.

A number of other issues arise under the Commonwealth Native Title Act on which we have said there should be amendments. However, they are not the subject of the intervention in the High Court but they are the subject of comment. Representations have been made to the Commonwealth to identify the nature of the complexity of the Commonwealth Act, the nature of the difficulty in making the thing work, and the long time delays which will arise as a result of the complicated processes that have been set in place by the Commonwealth Native Title Act. That is the framework. I hope that now adequately addresses (although I think I did adequately address them before) the issues which the honourable member raised.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I have a supplementary question. Is the Attorney's answer to my question 'Yes,' 'No' or 'Maybe'?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: It is not possible to give a 'Yes' or 'No' answer to it. I put it in—

The Hon. T. Crothers interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Well, maybe. I have put it into a context which I think accurately reflects the position of the State Government.

TRADING HOURS

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Leader of the Council, representing the Premier, a question about shop trading hours.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I was reading *Hansard* dated 1 November 1977, when the Premier—although he was not then the Premier—made a contribution. I will quote directly from that debate. He said—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: What year was that?

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: 1977, November 1: Mr Dean Brown.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: That's 17 years ago.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: But I think the issue is a fairly clear one, so I do not think it is something that would have dated.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: You are getting touchy already. I am quoting Dean Brown—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: You probably wrote the speech.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: If I did it would be a very good speech.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Were you a Liberal? I didn't know that.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: The Liberals do not want to know about this one. I quote:

Our insistence that Parliament have a say is now proving to be most worthwhile. The Minister has attacked the Liberal Party previously for not allowing the matter to be dealt with entirely by the Industrial Commission. In fact, recommendations were made in the report of the Royal Commission, but the final decision is still in the hands of this Parliament, and that is where it should be. At no stage has the Minister, or anyone from the back-bench, adequately denied that Parliament should determine shopping hours.

The member for Ross Smith took a quote of mine totally out of context, in which I said that the hours and working conditions of people employed within the shopping industry should be determined by the Industrial Commission. True, I made that statement, but I also referred to wages and working conditions, and I went on to point out that the issue of the hours in which a shop should be allowed to open or shut should be made here in Parliament.

He made that statement three times in his contribution to that Bill.

An honourable member: Who is that?

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: That is Dean Brown, the current Premier. I ask the Leader, representing the Premier in this place: is the Premier now in conflict with the Minister for Industrial Affairs as a consequence of the announcement made by the Minister for Industrial Affairs yesterday, or has in fact the Premier now changed his mind about whether or not Parliament should be the body that decides shop trading hours? And has he also therefore recanted his promise before the election to bring much greater accountability of the Government to the Parliament?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It might surprise the Hon. Mr Elliott and the Australian Democrats but the whole world has

moved on a little bit since 1977. As I indicated by way of an interjection, 17 years ago is a pretty long bow to be stretching in relation to decisions and attitudes. As I indicated, the whole world in relation to shop trading hours has moved on. I have been in this Parliament for only some 12 years, but I can remember that the sky was going to fall in when we allowed red meat sales to be moved away from 9 to 5 or whatever it was, and then—

An honourable member: That's what the previous Government did.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: That was the previous Government. We were not going to have butchers left in South Australia as a result of that decision. Secondly, in another debate (although I cannot remember how long ago it was) with regard to Saturday trading, again the whole world was going to fall in as a result of that decision. The point I make to the honourable member is that it is a long bow to be stretching to go back nearly two decades. As I have said, I am sure that the Hon. Mr Elliott has moved on from some of the views he held at that time. Indeed, in 1976 or 1977—I cannot remember the exact year—he was actually a research officer with the Liberal Party.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Well, either 1975 or 1976, when he was one of the leading lights in the Unley or Mitcham Young Liberal set, through the southern suburbs of Adelaide. So, the Hon. Mr Elliott has moved on in his own political thinking and, as I said, it is therefore a very long bow to be going back to 1977. The point that I would make with respect to that part of the question asked by the Hon. Mr Elliott as to whether the Premier was in conflict with the Minister, Mr Ingerson, the simple answer is 'No.' The decision that was taken and announced by the Minister yesterday had the full support of the Premier. However, I will refer the honourable member's questions, even though I did make some general comments, to the Premier to see whether he would like to make some further comments over and above those that I have made on his behalf.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: As a supplementary question, the issue was not shop trading hours: it was whether or not the Premier still held the same views about the important role that Parliament plays in making decisions, and whether he will address that question.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I do not know whether that was a statement or a question, but I have indicated that I will refer the honourable member's question to the Premier and bring back a reply.

WOMEN'S BUDGET

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I direct my question to the Minister for the Status of Women. Will there be a women's budget this year? If not, why not?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: We will have to wait and see.

DISORDERLY BEHAVIOUR

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I direct my question to you, Mr President. In your reply to a question asked by the Hon. Mr Weatherill in relation to persons being accosted in front of Parliament House, you stated that extra lighting would be provided. Do you, Sir, think the lighting will prevent the accostings? If not, do you think the accostings will become more public?

The PRESIDENT: I thank the honourable member for his question. I will research the matter and give him a private answer.

YANKALILLA SIGNS

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I move:

That District Council of Yankalilla by-law No. 34 concerning movable signs, made on 23 June 1994 and laid on the table of this Council on 2 August 1994, be disallowed.

This by-law, as its name suggests, relates to movable signs on streets and footpaths. It includes provisions for the issuing by the District Council of Yankalilla of licences for movable signs, and the by-law deals with other matters relating to such signs.

Section 370 of the Local Government Act permits and empowers councils to prohibit and regulate movable signs, and many South Australian councils have exercised that power. However, section 370 does not specifically authorise the issue of licences or the charging of licensing fees for movable signs. In this respect, section 370 can be contrasted with other provisions that do specifically authorise licensing of certain other matters.

This matter was considered by the Legislative Review Committee, which took the view that the by-law is not authorised by section 370 of the Local Government Act. This is a view which accords with a legal opinion obtained by the Local Government Association of South Australia. If Parliament considers that the licensing of movable signs is an appropriate response to the undoubted problems created by this form of advertising, the committee considered that the Local Government Act itself should be amended to make specific provision for such licensing. In the meantime, if this motion is carried, the District Council of Yankalilla will be free to adopt the measures which many other councils have adopted in relation to movable signs, but without the offensive provisions relating to licensing. I commend the motion to the House.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY secured the adjournment of the debate.

AUSTRALIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION PROGRAMS

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I move:

That this Parliament deplores the reported proposals concerning the changes to the production of local current affairs and news programs of the Australian Broadcasting Corporation and further calls on the ABC not to reduce local production of current affairs and news programs in any way.

In rising to speak to the motion, I draw members' attention to an article that appeared in the *Sydney Morning Herald* last Thursday in which it was reported that the ABC would scrap all State-based 7 o'clock television news and 7.30 Report programs next year and replace them with new national programs. It was reported that the proposal would be dealt with by the ABC board on Friday of this week.

The proposals are nothing more than a relegation and a denigration of local news and an indication of the degree of arrogance that the centralised Eastern State-based ABC holds

for local news. As I understand the proposal, each State will have its own State-based news and current affairs program to be shown at 6.30, followed by a national news program at 7 p.m., and that is to be followed by a new national current affairs program at 7.30 p.m. It has been further reported that the ABC Managing Director indicated that there was already 'in principle' board approval. He is reported as saying that three critical board members had approved, in principle, the proposed changes. I have been advised that the proposal was initiated by the national head of television and radio news, Chris Anderson, who is also based in Sydney. I also understand that the proposal was supported by the head of the 7.30 Report program, Philip Chubb, and the national editor of *TV News*, Peter Monkton. Indeed, David Hill, the Managing Director, has also been strong in his support.

As I understand it, there are two reasons why this proposal has been put forward. First, the proposals have been driven by poor ratings in Sydney in relation to the *ABC News* and the 7.30 Report, and in Melbourne in relation to the 7.30 Report. There has also been a slight decrease in ratings in relation to the 7.30 Report in other States. Secondly, it is the view of the ABC management that it should have a national news program as its flagship. It would appear that this proposal has not been properly thought out and, certainly whilst suiting the high fliers in Sydney, it does nothing but diminish the status of local news and as a consequence diminishes the role and responsibility of ordinary people working in local areas throughout South Australia and Australia.

There has been little consultation with staff and, indeed, a 10-day period between the time of announcing the proposal and the time of decision is simply not enough for proper consultative processes to take place. One cannot help but think that the ABC is revisiting the past disaster of the failed *National* program, which was a one hour mix of news and current affairs starting at 6.30 p.m., introduced in 1985.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: It absolutely bombed. That ill-fated program demonstrated beyond doubt that the sort of program mix that has been suggested by Mr Hill will be an absolute disaster and will inevitably fail. Members will remember that the nationally-based program had the effect of nearly losing the entire ABC audience that it had managed to accumulate over its then 29-year history. It took approximately five years following the scrapping of that program for the ABC to regain its former share of the audience. That experiment on the part of the ABC can be described as nothing less than a disaster, both from the ABC's point of view and also from the viewing public's point of view.

Mr Hill has also gone on record as saying that there will be no loss of jobs. That may well be the case. However, one does not need to be a Rhodes scholar to work out that you do not need two local presenters for one local program and that you do not need two local producers for one local program. What is to happen to these people? There has been no detailed advice forthcoming from the leadership of the ABC as to where they are to go. Which one are we to lose—Leigh McClusky or Shane Dannatt? Will they take on a reporting role, or perhaps be relocated to Sydney? Are we to see night after night two presenters who have absolutely no local knowledge of what occurs in South Australia?

I am also somewhat astounded by the approach of the ABC concerning this hellbent desire to have national programs. It already has national programs. It has a national news program and a national current affairs program in the

form of *Lateline* on most evenings throughout the week. They are also a ratings disaster.

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles: It's a good program.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: It's a good program but no-one watches it, and that is the tragedy. But the ABC is going to adopt exactly the same model at 7 o'clock so that it can have two disasters on the same night. It is not as though there is a lack of current affairs programs on television. Night after night we have the two nationally based ABC programs late in the evening, and we also have national news programs on Channel 7 and Channel 10. But what does Mr Hill propose? Yet another nationally-based current affairs and news program. It might well fit in with his numbers, and it might well increase the status of various people involved at the top of the ABC triangle, but it does nothing for South Australia. One only has to look at the *7.30 Report Summer Edition*, which is a nationally-based product. It is clear that the ratings for that program are significantly lower than those which currently prevail for the *7.30 Report*, which contains local content.

Media concentration is another issue. It is important for the ABC to note that there has been a substantial concentration of media controls throughout Australia. In only two cities are there newspapers not owned and controlled by News Corporation. We have a one-paper town. The concentration of current affairs and news in the hands of a centralised office has a real risk of reducing broad coverage of current affairs in this country.

I am concerned also at the 6.30 time slot. It is an extraordinarily poor time slot so far as the ABC is concerned. I very rarely arrive home before 7 p.m. and therefore the only local news that I see on television is at 7 p.m. on the ABC. Under the proposals promulgated by Mr Hill I will be denied any local television news, and I am sure I am not alone in that. Many professional people, business leaders and farmers work long hours, and the ABC news is about the only opportunity that they get to have local content. The same applies to the *7.30 Report*. It might well be that the ratings are low. However, as I understand it there has been very little qualitative study on who watches what programs. In my view, it would be extremely wrong for opinion-makers and leaders of this community to be denied a local news program simply because they work long hours and are unable to arrive at their homes to watch television prior to the 7 p.m. news.

The question also arises as to what the local news program will be up against. It will be up against *A Current Affair* and *Real Life*. Traditionally, it has always been a difficult time to be filled by the ABC. I understand that not since *Bellbird* has there been a program which has rated highly prior to the 7 p.m. news bulletin.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: I used to watch *Bellbird*.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: So did I, with Charlie Cousins and all of those. There are many reasons for this. Mr Hill wants local news to be relegated to what ordinarily in ABC news terms is a dead time slot. That underlines the arrogance of the proposal and demonstrates the arrogance and contempt that is held by Sydney-based bosses for local news and current affairs. I remind members of the sad demise of the Susan Mitchell program. The justification for that demise was poor ratings. What I am concerned about is that, if we get poor ratings in our local news program at 6.30, is that going to be the end of local news so far as the ABC is concerned? Is this the thin end of the wedge? Is the ABC merely purporting to set up local news for its ultimate demise, which

will result in the loss of jobs for the people who are involved in presenting local news to the people of South Australia?

There is also the issue of the deadline. As a politician one is always conscious of the deadlines of the media and one also knows that the *ABC News* and the *7.30 Report*, simply because of their time slots, have a later deadline. Half an hour can make an extraordinary difference in the production of news and current affairs. One only has to compare the current quality of the reporting of local news on the *ABC News* and with its commercial competitors.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Do you think that is the only reason?

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I think that is a substantial reason. I think also they have a longer time slot to fill. But it gives a greater opportunity for the ABC to explore the issues, and quite often when you watch *ABC News* you get a broader coverage, and I would suspect that one of the reasons for that is that the ABC has had more time to get its news together.

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles: They do not get to the football until about 20 past 7.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: Yes, of course, I am back on *Sale of the Century* by 20 past 7; you can learn about the Crows by reading the *Advertiser*. In my view, there are many occasions where the ABC is advantaged by that, and if these proposals are adopted that advantage will disappear. Another issue is that Mr Hill has reported that some local news will be reported nationally. I have to say that I treat that with some degree of suspicion. I can say, from the reports of many people who are involved in reporting of national news from this State, that their Sydney colleagues are not interested unless the story demonstrates that South Australia is either a wacky State, a crime State or, alternatively, there is a story of monumental proportion such as the NCA bombing.

Not even the royal commission was properly and regularly reported on a national basis, particularly when one has regard to the extraordinary local interest in that topic. A comparison of today's *Advertiser* with today's *Sydney Morning Herald* will probably give the nearest hint as to what we will get if this proposal proceeds.

The Hon. Anne Levy: *Lateline* never mentions South Australia.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: It never mentions South Australia. Yesterday we made a decision which affects the daily lives of ordinary South Australians; I refer to shopping hours. There was not one mention of shopping hours in the *Sydney Morning Herald*. There was no news of the amalgamation of Glenelg and South Adelaide football teams. There was no news on the extraordinary revelations in the Coroner's Court with regard to the treatment of those very unfortunate children.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: Or the upgrading of the Mount McIntyre Road.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: No stories on the upgrading of the Mount McIntyre Road, as the Hon. Mr Roberts points out. In the *Sydney Morning Herald* we have a story on the Pope getting stuck into Iran's war on abortion; a story on growing fears in relation to inflation; and, interestingly enough, a story on the increase in Australian content in programs on television. We also had a story on *Priscilla, Queen of the Desert* in the United States. Quite frankly, ordinary South Australians took a back seat—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: And not so ordinary.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: And not so ordinary—took a back seat to a very important issue, shopping hours.

The Hon. Anne Levy interjecting:

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: They may well be, but the *Advertiser* does perform an important role, albeit that it performs that role on its own. I do not criticise the *Sydney Morning Herald*; it has a Sydney market. It is a good paper and it is aimed at a Sydney market. It is certainly not interested in what—

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles: And good journalists.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: Yes. It is not interested in what South Australians have, and I think that that is a precursor of what may happen in the future. What will happen with local announcements? We often get Ministers or Leaders of the Opposition making announcements on matters such as shopping hours or the Hindmarsh Island bridge. What will happen to news on those issues? The Hindmarsh Island bridge did not become a national issue until three or four years after the issue was first raised. One cannot criticise the Eastern States for showing a lack of interest in it, but the fact is that South Australians have the right to have these issues raised and to be informed, and this will make it much more difficult for the leaders of the State to have access to news.

I would also point out that Mr Hill appears to have been strangely silent on the fact that, if there is an increase in the total time devoted to local news and current affairs, there has not been any suggestion of an equivalent increase in resources in that area. One has to suspect the genuineness of Mr Hill's statements in the absence of an announcement of an increase in resources to the ABC staff to enable them to fill a half-hour time slot. If one accepts what Mr Hill says—and I think he said that we get only seven or eight minutes of local material per night—there has to be a threefold increase in resources, based on simple arithmetic, and yet there has been no announcement of those increased resources.

I am also concerned about the way in which the ABC management has dealt with the issue. As members here would be aware, the ABC has a staff-based representative. In this case, the staff-based representative, Quentin Dempster, was the presenter of the New South Wales *7.30 Report* until last week. He resigned. He has now been offered a plum job, heading a five member investigative team, which is expected to be part of the new national current affairs program. This may be seen to be a transparent move by the ABC management to silence Quentin Dempster.

The Hon. Anne Levy: How often will he come to South Australia?

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: Absolutely. The point I am really making is whether Mr Dempster, having regard to this major promotion that he has been offered, is really acting in the interests of the employees who elected him to the board to make decisions in relation to the ABC. Another issue is that, if one looks at Kerry O'Brien's *Lateline* (and I must say that I do; I think that in some cases it is a reasonable program, raising reasonable Eastern States issues), one sees that it is a poor rater, but Mr Hill's response to that issue is to put in another national program.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Most people are in bed.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: That is true. One also has to look at the fact that two other commercial stations present national news broadcasts and current affairs programs on a regular basis late in the evening, so why do we need another national-based product, taking up an hour of prime time on ABC TV? It is ridiculous. Mr Hill has been pretty silent on that topic. One must also be concerned about some of the technical issues that arise in relation to these changes. I will summarise them briefly.

First, there is less flexibility in the presentation of news and current affairs. Ordinary South Australians have different priorities as far as their news needs are concerned compared with people in Queensland or Western Australia. We have local producers to determine what order of priority news items should be issued to South Australians and also whether some are even relevant to South Australians. There will also be a loss of control in relation to the presentation of programs and less local control in relation to local priorities and what is important. It is my view that local people should determine priorities both in programming and in news value for all the news we get. This will run counter to the increasing trend in western democracies of people becoming more active in their own local communities and in seeing and controlling the destiny of their own local communities. This certainly runs counter to that. It is also important to consider that the *ABC News* is the only news program in my view that has not adopted a tabloid format. By and large, the *ABC News* is the only true news program in this State. It is not fair on South Australians to adopt a tabloid approach—

The Hon. T. Crothers: What about SBS?

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I accept the Hon. Mr Crothers' interjection that SBS has a news program. That is true. In my view it does no justice to the ABC to look at ratings and approach a tabloid type process in the presentation of news and current affairs. The ABC has a greater responsibility than that which is applied to commercial stations. Finally, this is yet another occasion where Sydney, Melbourne or Canberra believes that the centralisation of decision making and production is the way to go. For many years now we have seen business going in precisely the opposite direction, giving control and responsibility to local people. Yet, in this country we see an increasing trend towards the centralisation of decision making, production and consumption, and this is yet another instance of that.

Recently there were widespread criticisms throughout the community on the appointment of the former Premier of this State, Mr John Bannon, to the ABC board. Mr Bannon, rightly or wrongly, has had a cloud over his head and has borne much of the responsibility for the State Bank. Whether or not we agree that the responsibility has been rightly placed, and this is not the appropriate place to do it, Mr Bannon has a great opportunity to assist and support the State which he represented for so long. I would call on Mr Bannon to put a stop to the sort of nonsense that has been promulgated by Mr Hill. When Mr Hill said in the media that he had spoken to three key board representatives, he did not mention Mr Bannon, so I can only assume that Mr Bannon has not been consulted on this process. Again, this demonstrates the sort of arrogance that Mr Hill is displaying on this topic. He has consulted three Eastern States representatives, bought off the employee representative and totally ignored the representative from South Australia. One would hope that Mr Bannon can lift his stocks in the public eyes by putting a stop to Mr Hill's suggestion.

At the end of the day, it has been disclosed by Mr Chris Anderson, national head of Television and Radio News, that there has been absolutely no market research conducted into these proposals whatsoever. Can members imagine channels 7, 9 and 10 making a major change to their programming without any market research whatsoever? Can we imagine that occurring, yet the ABC, which is publicly funded and paid for by you, Sir, me, and the rest of the Australian taxpayers, has undertaken no market research whatsoever.

The degree of arrogance in that approach and the lack of consultation is absolutely astounding. In closing, I urge all members to support my motion and contact Mr Bannon and advise him of our concerns about these proposals. At the very least, the ABC should give the community time to absorb and comment on the proposals. There is absolutely no need to rush headlong into these proposals and no need to trample on the rights and expectations of ordinary local citizens concerned about local issues, especially when these people pay the wages of ABC employees.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY secured the adjournment of the debate.

WOMEN'S HEALTH CENTRES

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. Carolyn Pickles:

That this Council—

1. Supports the retention of stand-alone Women's Health Centres at Noarlunga, Elizabeth, Adelaide and Port Adelaide; and
2. Opposes any move by the Liberal Government to integrate these existing facilities into the mainstream health services.

(Continued from 3 August. Page 27.)

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I wish to summarise some of the points I made when I last spoke to the motion. The women of South Australia have been successful in establishing and maintaining women's services for nearly 20 years. It is important to note that women's health centres are allocated only .15 per cent of the total health budget for South Australia. They provide a clinical and preventive health service to women. In addition, they provide an educative and preventive health service to groups of women.

Women's health centres also provide an advocacy on behalf of women's health interests at policy and planning levels within the broader health system and monitor and respond to policy documents to ensure a proper inclusion for women's health interests. The high level of demand for clinical and one-to-one services indicates the relevance of women's health centres to the local community. In fact, demand for medical, nursing and counselling appointments far exceeds what can be offered. Women's health centres recognise that health status is linked to socio-economic status and that women are disadvantaged in terms of access to economic, political and social resources.

Women are the major users and providers of health care and need information in order to make appropriate decisions. The full and informed participation of women in all aspects of decision making about health and health care is one of the principal means by which their health is improved and maintained. This type of primary health care promotes the health of women and, therefore, also their families, so it is cost effective in the long run. It is clear that, if women can take more responsibility for their own health and that of their family, the burden on the health system will be minimised in the long term.

The Friends of the Elizabeth Women's Health Centre arose out of concern for the centre's future. It conducted a survey in June 1994. It was not a large survey: it was a survey of 81 women who attended the centre during June and who bothered to complete the survey form. For the information of the Council I will highlight some of the outcomes of that survey. The services for which women attended the centre were as follows:

Smears, regular checks, breast examinations, blood pressure, sickness, queries on medical conditions, depression, cholesterol, women's medical problems, women's complaints, women's troubles, inquiries about HRT, issues relating to reproductive health, advice, contraception, morning after pill and personal problems.

The centre also provides counselling services and one respondent commented:

I have benefited greatly with one-to-one counselling considering my circumstances, both from boosting my confidence and obtaining urgent information I've needed.

As to groups, one respondent stated:

This has been a real challenge, just to turn up and face my fears and life in general. I feel welcomed very warmly and not as a statistic which seems to be the case at most of the places I have been before.

In response to 'What did you like about the service?', of the many comments made, I will just quote the following:

The way things are explained, and that it is a women only centre. . . The choices given in treatment. The personal one-to-one basis and it's a much more comfortable and understanding surroundings than a doctor's office. . . The workers are genuinely concerned, caring people, who really help! The people who attend groups are understanding and friendly. . . Quick (following up on medical queries), friendly, kind, considerate staff. . . Friendly, professional. . . Their warm and caring services in all aspects in life. Very positive. Very comfortable atmosphere. Good information for dealing with legal, medical and personal issues. Never made to feel unacceptable. . . Tolerance, understanding and compassion. Women who are at the centre are able to relate to other women's issues. . . Fantastic. . . Being treated as a person, not a number and at 60 years of age this means a great deal to me. I feel comfortable and wanted. Also, if I need help or a chat I can now just drop into the centre—I don't have to travel miles and catch a bus. It's nice to know I have all this in my district. . . Good for general health and friendship. Very different place. . . I like the fact that it is a women only place where I can be given time to be listened to and be assured that my needs are met and questions answered.

In response to the question 'What do you dislike or want changed?', a large number of responses said 'Nothing', and other minor responses were about changing days and classes. In response to the question 'Does the centre change your quality of life?', some of the respondents stated:

Given me a better understanding about myself. . . It encourages me. It makes me feel a better person. . . Healthy feeling. I like meeting the girls and it keeps us healthy. Puts me in touch with life. . . Feeling fitter, meeting friends. . . Feel fitter, look forward to meeting people. Gives me a purpose in life and also has helped my health. . . I feel more comfortable with women at the centre. I can ask about anything and not feel inadequate. . . I feel better about myself. Fitter and a little more confident. . . Caring for women's health—my health. . . Gives me self-esteem, helps me with my arthritis. Confidence to face the stresses of life.

In response to the question 'What difference would it make to you or your health if the centre closed or changed its way of working?', some respondents stated:

I would be devastated. . . Would have to find somewhere else that dealt with women as women, and they are few and far between. . . I would be very upset as it is part of my life. . . There are things that I feel I can approach the centre about that I would not otherwise with another doctor. I would slip back to my own self, the centre helps me to feel safe. I would probably have ignored my symptoms longer rather than talk to my GP about them. . . [It] would make a big difference mentally and health wise. . . [I] would miss it terribly. . . Words fail me. . . Lost and unhappy. . . Loss of contact, enjoyment of groups. I would not feel confident or trust a GP or practitioner the same as I trust these women staff.

In response to the question 'Is there anything else you would like to say about the centre?', some respondents stated:

I love the centre—I don't want it closed. . . Women deserve to have women's space to feel free to meet others, enjoy and learn from groups, feel as though they are in control of their own lives. . . It is excellent. We need this centre and more like them.

Clearly, the women who use the Elizabeth Women's Community Health Centre feel very positive towards the centre as an excellent place. Perhaps it would be interesting to know if a questionnaire put out about some of the other health services in South Australia would have the same overwhelming, positive response. That overwhelming feeling about the adequacy and appropriateness of the women's health centres was reinforced on Saturday at a meeting held by people who are concerned about the future of the centres, at which, I have been told, over 500 women attended.

The Hon. Anne Levy: The ABC said a thousand.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I am not sure. I have been told by a couple of reliable people that it was about 500, but if you want to say it was a thousand I would be happy to say that.

The Hon. Anne Levy: You don't think the ABC is reliable?

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: It just depends. Unfortunately, I was not able to attend that meeting as I was a delegate to the Australian Labor Party's conference on that weekend and had some motions which I needed to deal with in that afternoon, but some other members of the Labor Party, women members of Parliament, were able to attend—Ms Annette Hurley, the member for Napier, and Ms Lea Stevens, the member for Elizabeth. They have given me a report of that meeting.

The Minister for Health, Dr Armitage, indicated in answer to some questions that he had no problem with women's health centres as such, but a whole range of services across the community had to bear the brunt of cuts. He has recommended that cuts be in the non-service area. However, the Minister indicated to the four women's health centres on Saturday afternoon that what he wanted from them was a paper by Tuesday evening—yesterday evening. So, in two working days, in effect, the Minister wanted to have a paper from the women's health centres on how they were going to achieve cuts and with no indication to them of how much he was envisaging they needed to be cut. So it is a bit difficult to do something constructive in such a short period of time. Clearly, the Minister will, I hope, make public the deliberations following the delivery of that paper, which, I understand, was forwarded to the Minister last night.

I feel it has been made very clear to the Government that the women of South Australia do not want to see the women's health service centres change in any way. I guess that we are all realistic as members of Parliament in difficult times that Governments, from time to time, have to make certain changes to their policies, but I would hope and urge the Government not to change the ethos of the women's health centres and not to overturn what I consider, and I am sure other members in this place will consider, to be 20 years of very valuable health service to the women of South Australia.

In conclusion, I would just like to insert into *Hansard* the response by one of the respondents in that questionnaire when asked the question:

What difference would it make to you or your health if the centre closed or changed its way of working?

The respondent said:

Heaven forbid if it should close. It is a much needed service. It does not need change.

I concur with those remarks and I ask members to support the motion, which urges the Government not to change the ethos

or the functioning of the women's health centres in South Australia.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW secured the adjournment of the debate.

GAMING MACHINES

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I move:

That this Council—

1. notes that the then shadow Minister for Transport moved to amend the Gaming Machines Bill on 7 May 1992 to require that at least 1.5 per cent of gaming machines turnover be set aside in a fund to assist welfare agencies dealing with gambling addiction and to make payments to other community organisations disadvantaged by gambling in their fundraising;
2. notes that members on both sides of Parliament, and in both Houses, said that their support for the Gaming Machines Bill was subject to promises of additional Government support for agencies dealing with gambling addiction;
3. calls on the Government to honour the commitment given by the previous Government, at the time gaming machines legislation was introduced, to make up to \$2 million in the first instance available from the Government's gaming machines revenue to welfare agencies to deal with the social problems associated with gambling.

I think that the terms of the motion largely speak for themselves. It is a matter of record that on 7 May 1992, in the early hours of the morning—but not part of a 24-hour sitting because the House rose at 6 a.m. and did not continue until the afternoon of the next day—when we were debating the gaming machines legislation, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw moved an amendment to the Bill which sought to establish a gaming tax fund which was to be financed by an amount of at least 1.5 per cent of the gross gaming turnover of all businesses conducted pursuant to gaming machine licences.

Two-thirds of this gaming fund was to go to such organisations as the Minister thought appropriate, being organisations that assist persons addicted to gambling or that assist the families of such persons, and also to organisations that have, in the opinion of the Minister, been adversely affected in their fundraising activities as a result of the operation of gaming machines; and the remaining third was to be devoted to the promotion of tourism, but that is not a matter with which I am concerned today.

The honourable member, in debating her motion, made quite clear that she expected the gross gaming turnover to be returned to the Government to be between \$25 million and \$50 million a year and that 1.5 per cent of that would mean that a pool of between \$9 million and \$15 million would be available for the purposes that she was defining. If two-thirds of that pool were to go to the community organisations in the two categories that I have indicated, it would mean that between \$6 million and \$12 million would be available for these purposes. According to *Hansard* of that day, the honourable member was seriously suggesting that between \$6 million and \$12 million a year should go for these purposes.

I presume that the honourable member still holds those views: they are only two years old, not 17 years old. If her views have changed in that time, she should be honest enough to admit it and to indicate why they have changed. As there has been no indication of that, we can take it that the Minister still feels that it is appropriate that between \$6 million and \$12 million a year should be devoted to those purposes.

In the debate in the Legislative Council there was a long discussion about the honourable member's amendment. It was supported by the Hon. Mr Elliott, who said:

It was my original proposal that there be a levy of 2 per cent of the gross gaming turnover and that that money be split evenly between organisations which were assisting people addicted by gambling, and also their families and those organisations that had had their fundraising significantly hampered by gaming machines.

In the light of the Hon. Ms Laidlaw's amendment, the Hon. Mr Elliott did not pursue his amendment but instead supported hers.

The Hon. Ms Laidlaw, referring to her amendment, said:

It ensures that we can see what the Government is doing honestly about its commitment to those community purposes, and how much it is applying to those purposes from year to year. The issue of people addicted to gambling was discussed earlier by the Hon. Mr Lucas, who foreshadowed a possible motion for a select committee or a reference to the Social Development Committee. Figures produced in 1982 when the select committee looked at the Casino Act suggested that .7 per cent of the population could be deemed to be compulsive gamblers. That figure may have increased or decreased since 1982, but it is hard to know.

Many of the organisations and people who have written to me about this matter are concerned about people who are compulsive gamblers. Whilst I cannot accommodate all they have asked of me in respect of this Bill, we as a Parliament should recognise their agitation about this Bill and their predictions that their scarce resources will be stretched even further as a result of this Bill.

I do not want to take up too much of the time of the Council regurgitating debates which, after all, are recorded in *Hansard*, but it is clear that if people re-read those debates, which are only two years old, they will find that there was a great deal of sympathy from many members about the problems of people who would be affected by the introduction of gaming machines and who might become gambling addicts. In particular, there was much compassion for the families of such people and how they would be affected. For this reason, there was sympathy for the amendment moved by the Hon. Ms Laidlaw from many members on both sides of the Chamber, as is clearly indicated in *Hansard*.

As the Minister in charge of the Bill at the time, I made a commitment to the Parliament on behalf of the Government that the Government was aware of these concerns, was not insensitive to them, and that it was prepared to make a commitment to provide up to \$2 million. Perhaps I should quote myself. I quote from page 4863 of the *Hansard*, as follows:

I have been authorised to indicate to the Parliament and to the people of South Australia that, should this legislation pass and poker machines be introduced into South Australia, the Government is happy to make a commitment, in the first full year of operation of poker machines, to provide extra funds to the Family and Community Development Fund to counter the effects of their introduction. For those who do not know, the Family and Community Development Fund is distributed according to the recommendations of the Family and Community Development Advisory Committee, chaired by the Rev. George Martin. . . . The Government will commit itself to providing up to \$2 million, if necessary, to the Family and Community Development Fund to be distributed on the advice of the Family and Community Development Advisory Committee to all organisations which have an extra workload or extra demands put upon them as a result of the introduction of poker machines.

There was then further debate as to whether or not this was a one-off promise but, later in the debate, at page 4864 of the *Hansard*, I stated:

It would be ongoing funding. When I suggested a review I meant that it is a question of reviewing the amount that is shown to be necessary. The Government is committed to providing up to \$2 million, if necessary, in the first year. The provision would be

ongoing but the amount would need to be reviewed in light of the need that was demonstrated by the experience of the first year.

In other words, the then Government made a commitment to provide up to \$2 million in the first year and to review that amount to see whether it was adequate. The Government committed itself to providing money on an ongoing basis with the sum determined by the need demonstrated in the first year. In other words, it could have been double that amount in subsequent years, if the need was shown to be there. I am sure you, Mr Acting President, and all those who were present in the Council during that debate, will agree that the Government's commitment was extremely important in determining the attitudes of many members towards that legislation.

Mr Acting President, you were certainly reassured by this commitment from the Government, and I am sure that it very much strengthened your support for certain aspects of the Bill which were then before the Council. You, Sir, were not alone in this. Members on both sides of this Chamber and members on both sides in another place referred frequently to this commitment from the Government in their contributions to the debate on this Bill. I am sure that it was very influential in the passing of this legislation.

While there were many people who favoured the introduction of poker machines in this State they were, and quite rightly, concerned about the effect that this could have on some individuals and some families in the community. The commitment by the Government to see that resources would be found and applied to help these people reassured many members of Parliament who might otherwise have opposed the passing of the legislation. I need not quote further names but I am sure anyone who reads *Hansard* will see how reassuring this commitment was to many people. Indeed, those of us who were present on that long night will recall numerous members of both Houses expressing their reassurance about that Government commitment.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw's amendment was not passed at the time, so that the provision for applying money from gaming machine revenue was not included as part of the law of this State. However, I am sure nobody doubted the commitment which the Government had made: that it would apply up to \$2 million a year to these purposes as necessary. No-one will doubt that that would have occurred had the previous Government remained the Government of this State.

I cannot think of any occasion where a Minister of the Crown in the previous Government gave a commitment to Parliament which was not honoured. We were never accused of not honouring our commitments and, as far as I am aware, there has never been an occasion when a Minister has made a commitment to Parliament which has not been honoured. This commitment would equally have been honoured had the previous Government remained in office.

This motion is now suggesting that the new Government honour the commitment which was given by the previous Government, particularly as it is very clear that Ministers in this House and in the other House were perfectly happy with the idea that between \$6 million and \$12 million a year from gaming revenue should be applied to these purposes.

It was not only the Hon. Ms Laidlaw who moved this amendment: the present Deputy Premier (Hon. Stephen Baker) also moved in another place a very similar amendment to the legislation which also received a good deal of support from many members but which was not passed in the House

of Assembly because of the commitment which the then Government had made.

It now seems to me that it is supremely hypocritical for this Government not to honour the commitment made by the previous Government when in fact in Opposition it had been prepared to devote far more than this amount for this purpose. When in Opposition the present Government felt that the figure should be between \$6 million and \$12 million a year.

The then Government made a commitment to provide up to \$2 million a year. That commitment is not being honoured by the present Government. This, to me, is supreme hypocrisy, and it should honour the commitment given by the previous Government. I know that the Minister, in response to a question, indicated that she was not successful with her amendment. The record clearly shows she is correct in that, but her amendment was to make the giving of between \$6 million and \$12 million part of the law of this State.

That was not achieved, but she is now a member of the Government which, when in Opposition, felt that between \$6 million and \$12 million should be given to these purposes. It would seem to me that, unless this new Government honours the commitment given by a previous Government, it is short-changing the people of this State, and it is showing extreme bad faith by not honouring this commitment which, apart from being influential in passing the gaming machines legislation, was only a fraction of the amount which it felt at the time should be devoted to these important purposes.

There is no indication that the need may have changed, or that there is no longer any danger of people becoming addicted to gaming machines. There is no indication that there is no further need for help for these individuals and their families. My sympathies in particular go to the family members of people who are addicted to gambling. They are the innocent ones who are suffering. One could say that those addicted to gambling have brought it on themselves, but I certainly feel that they need help and, in any caring community, help is provided to people who are afflicted with conditions such as compulsive gambling.

In particular, my compassion goes out to the family members of such individuals who will suffer enormous consequences financially through no fault or action of their own. It is the women and children largely in this situation for whom I feel sympathy and who the Government has a moral responsibility to assist. I know that members opposite will say, 'But the Independent Gaming Corporation will give \$1 million.' I do not feel that that is a response. In the first place, the Independent Gaming Commission is not the Government. It was the then Government that made that commitment; it is the Government which has a responsibility to ensure that compulsive gamblers and their families are assisted, and the Government cannot duck that responsibility by saying that the Independent Gaming Corporation will provide \$1 million. I point out that it is only \$1 million. The previous Government had committed up to \$2 million in the first instance, and members opposite supported between \$6 million and \$12 million for this purpose.

So, I trust that all members of this Council will join with me in calling on the Government to honour this commitment which was given in all sincerity in this Chamber at the time the gaming machines legislation was being debated, and that in the first instance they will make available up to \$2 million from revenue to welfare agencies to deal with the social problems associated with gambling. If they do not, one can only suggest that they show enormous bad faith and lack of compassion for the people so afflicted in South Australia.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS secured the adjournment of the debate.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON LIVING RESOURCES

The House of Assembly transmitted the following resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council:

That the Joint Committee on Living Resources be authorised to disclose or publish, as it thinks fit, any evidence and documents presented to the joint committee prior to such evidence and documents being reported to the Parliament.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport): I move:

That the resolution be agreed to.

This is a formality that is necessary in this instance. It enables the committee to conduct hearings in public and for documents to be reported to Parliament and for evidence to be heard, disclosed and published.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 9 August. Page 78.)

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I note in the Governor's speech that the Government has promised a more responsive health system. The question to be asked is: more responsive to whom or what? At a number of public meetings and events on health issues that I have attended, the Minister for Health has proudly stated that he was primarily responsible for the Liberal Party's health policy, 'Better health for South Australians.' I have to say there is nothing in the policy that concerns me significantly. In fact, there is much that is quite admirable. The allocation of an additional \$6 million annually to public hospitals, the halving of hospital waiting lists, an increased role for women's health centres, scholarships for nurses, etc., is all great stuff.

At these meetings, having stated his involvement in formulating the pre-election health policy, the Minister's script then refers to the Audit Commission's report which recommends a massive cut to the health budget. He tells his audience that he believes that his Party has a mandate to radically change his pre-election stance on health because his Party's landslide victory reflects the electorate's desire for his Party to address the financial problems caused by the State Bank. Whilst there is no doubt that the former Government did fail the people of South Australia, the new Liberal Government's direction is certainly not one guaranteed to succeed, and in health as with many other areas, the direction is one without vision.

In June this year, the Coalition for Better Health was formed. The coalition is made up of a number of key health organisations in the State. There are now 14 health and health-related organisations making up the coalition, with the four largest and most vocal organisations being the Australian Medical Association, the Australian Nursing Federation, South Australian Community Health Association and the South Australian Council of Social Service. The people in these organisations are headed by the State's most experienced and knowledgeable personnel in health.

The coalition was formed out of necessity because of their concerns that the Minister for Health was not receiving appropriate advice and therefore was not in a position to

advise Cabinet on the impact of many of its decisions on the health of the community. It is somewhat ironic that the Governor's speech refers to the Government's 'continuing with its plan to provide a health system more responsive to community needs', when the Minister has chosen to ignore the State's key players in health.

As a result, this Government has now managed to distance, if not politically alienate, a broad and useful source of expertise in health in this State; a source of people who are not simply another lobby group arguing for the *status quo* but who are willing to work with the Minister and the Health Commission to provide the best health outcome for the people of South Australia.

The slashing of \$65 million from the health budget following years of smaller progressive cuts can only have a disastrous impact on the community. It is totally irresponsible for a Government to radically cut the health budget, given the increasing demands placed on our health system due to an ageing population and increasing unemployment. The only vision for health held by the Minister is that of a reduced public health service. The only direction is one guided by his fundamental question: where am I going to make the cuts?

At a public meeting at the Parks Community Centre last Friday, which was attended by the local volunteers and by the community, the Minister requested that these people provide him with details of the cost efficiencies of the services they provide, and that such information was to be given to him by the following Tuesday—a period of just four days later, which included a Saturday and a Sunday. In particular, he requested information and data on how the centre keeps people out of hospital; suggested ways in which other savings could be made, such as, would you believe it, taking note of un-utilised computer space; and innovative solutions to cut administrative costs.

Such a request would have been taxing for a full-time team of paid workers who had no other demands on their time. But he was asking this essentially of volunteers. In response to this ridiculous request a person from the floor asked the Minister why this type of research had not been carried out by the trained people at the Health Commission, and they reminded him that many of the people running the community health centre were volunteers and not trained to carry out such a request. His response to this was that it had nothing to do with the Health Commission as any decisions on health were his.

The following day at another public meeting, this time on women's health centres, the Minister sought similar advice from those attending, in particular on how duplication could be avoided. In seeking this information from the supporters of women's health centres he said, 'I appeal to you so I can fight your cause.' So, where is the Minister's vision? If he has one he is not telling anyone about it. He clearly has no substantive data on the real cost savings and social effectiveness that community health centres and women's health centres have in society. Why does he not have that data? He has been the Minister for Health for nine months now. Instead, he makes a final plea to a group of people extremely nervous about losing their much needed health services, knowing full well that, given the short time and their lack of expertise, they will probably not be able to provide the necessary information. If the Minister were eager to receive such information he should have made the request for input from key health players many months ago.

Given that the only promise the Minister has made to date is that \$65 million is to be cut in the area of health in the

forthcoming budget it is obvious that the only people with whom he is consulting are those from Treasury and most certainly not those from the health sector. From what I have heard at public meetings and from visiting a number of health centres, there are only two points guaranteed: first and foremost, that there is going to be a \$65 million cut in the health budget and, secondly, that regionalisation is going to be implemented and how and what shape this will take, no-one in the health system really knows. It is of interest to note that the Audit Commission's review of health services states:

The process of implementation of regionalisation will not be effective if unduly delayed or unduly rushed without consultation to gain commitment from key stakeholders. The change process must be managed and this will include education of stakeholders, including the general community, to share understanding and contain expectations.

The Minister has promised consultation but his actions give the lie to his words. The current Health Commission Act enables each community health centre to be established as a separate, autonomous, legally incorporated entity with its own board of directors. On each board there is at least one community representative who is involved in the decision-making of that particular health centre. Therefore, under the current system there is already local input into decisions about health priorities and service needs. However, the Audit Commission's 'Review of Health Services' views the existence of separate units as a negative, and it recommends replacing these with one central board. It states:

Due to shortcomings of its enabling legislation the South Australian Health Commission operates with limited effectiveness and lack of clarity in its relationship with individual health units. Each health unit is established as a separate autonomous legally incorporated entity with its own board of directors. South Australian Health Commission powers of direction are limited to persuasion.

All I can say to that is: tut, tut! It goes on to say:

The Health Minister's only sanction is removal of the board.

I would say that is a pretty powerful sanction. That document continues:

The review has therefore recommended that, although the Health Commission Act should remain as the legislative framework for the central authority, amendment should be made to provide structural change to enable effective system integration and the ability to develop and implement State health strategies.

In other words, the review is recommending that local boards be dismantled. In fact, it is very likely that the promised shift to regionalisation means that these local boards would be replaced by one central board, thereby reducing the overall number of community representatives in this State and probably making it more difficult for public comment. It appears that once again the Government's rhetoric does not match reality. Of course we do not know the exact intention of the Minister and his Government other than that regionalisation is to take place. Indeed, it appears that the Minister, himself, may not even know, given the pleas for information from community health centres only last week.

When responding to a question from a concerned community health worker about the reduction of local boards, the Minister diverted to say something about hospital boards. His comment was that currently hospital boards do not have paid members, whereas other boards with similar monetary and management responsibilities pay their members a fee of at least \$5 000 to \$10 000 annually. The Minister was rather concerned that hospitals the size of Royal Adelaide, with a budget of \$150 million, and the Flinders Medical Centre, with a budget of \$125 million did not have paid directors. He believes that we need to have 'high-powered people to run

these boards', implying that these board services will now be paid for. I believe that paying high board fees does not necessarily guarantee a desired outcome. For instance, the dozen or so 'high-powered' State Bank board members were all paid a fee of \$10 000 annually for their efforts.

I find it ridiculous and unintelligible that a Minister is willing to pay out money for board members who do not have health expertise, whilst at the same time he is not listening to the State's key health players of the Coalition for Better Health, who are willing to provide advice and consultation at no cost. Furthermore, in relation to the board appointees for the Flinders Medical Centre I have been told that it is likely that the two ministerial appointments to the board, yet to be filled, are either people living interstate or are people yet to arrive and live in South Australia. Once again, the Minister's rhetoric of having local input into our health system is not matched by his own actions.

I applaud the announcement in the Governor's speech that the Government will be implementing a citizen's charter for health but, sadly, it may well be a case of closing the stable door after the horse has bolted. Once all the decisions about cuts have been imposed what is the value of then setting up a charter? For instance, at this time it is still not clear what is going to happen to women's health centres. The Minister did not guarantee to those present at the public meeting on Saturday that women's health centres would continue to exist. He once again trotted out his plea to the audience for further information to take to a Cabinet meeting the following Tuesday, seeming to suggest that nothing was guaranteed. Moreover, in response to a question seeking a guarantee that women's health centres will remain, the Minister intimated that one alternative could be that these centres be attached to community health centres.

Separate women's health centres were established some 14 years ago because women demanded their rights to have health centres for women run by women. Given that the basic philosophy of the women's health centres is that they are a place where women can feel safe and comfortable in obtaining counselling or seeking advice on their health needs, any suggestion of amalgamating these centres with community health centres displays a surprising ignorance of women's health needs. There is no point in developing a citizen's charter for health when it is obvious that the Government has no intention of giving these rights to people.

I note with interest that the Government intends to develop a policy to assist health service planning into the next decade in relation to older people. To date there appears to have been no planning with respect to health services but rather only a number of ill-conceived, short-term money saving devices to somehow survive a \$65 million budget cut in health over the next financial year. There is no doubt that it is mostly the older people in the community who draw on health services. Of course, when the baby boom demographic bubble moves up into the higher age bracket, the Government can be assured of an increase in demand for health services generally. However, it is totally irresponsible for any Government to shift the responsibility of health to the private sector. Such a shift does not decrease overall spending on health. Rather, it increases the total expenditure on health by the community as opposed to the Government.

Moreover, it reduces equitable access to adequate health care. A brief look at the statistics provided by the Evatt Foundation, comparing the costs of the American and Australian systems, shows that a public system is fairer and cheaper for the community. For example, the cost of provid-

ing hospitals in the United States in 1987 was \$802 *per capita*, compared with only \$495 for Australia. Furthermore, every Australian has access to hospital care, which is not the case in the United States, where some 35 million people do not have access to hospitals at all. A further 60 million people are not adequately covered by health insurance; therefore, should they contract a long term illness such as cancer, they risk losing their home to pay the hospital bill.

Finally, whilst I am of the belief that casemix funding is not bad in itself if it is used in the context for which it was designed, that is, as a tool, I am concerned that casemix is being used incorrectly as a health funding system. If not checked, this system will have a disastrous effect on the overall health system. There is much concern that casemix funding is being used simply as a way to reduce the amount being spent on health. The saving generated by the implementation of casemix is supposed to be put into less expensive alternative health facilities, thereby freeing up the more expensive hospital beds so that the unacceptably long waiting list can be reduced. Instead, this Government will make the savings which casemix can deliver, but there is no evidence that it will be putting those savings back into other areas of health care.

Using casemix as a model of funding is potentially damaging to country hospitals in particular. For instance, I have been informed that, before the implementation of this new model of funding for the health system, the Gumeracha Hospital was considered to be very efficient; indeed, it was regarded as a model hospital. Both the Gumeracha and the Mount Pleasant Hospitals worked together in providing health services to the people of their shared region. Gumeracha provided services for the older patients and the Mount Pleasant Hospital took on the acute care. However, under the casemix funding model, which gives financial rewards according to the throughput of patients, because the Gumeracha Hospital happens to have taken on the provision of health care for the elderly, it is now deemed to be an inefficient hospital. It is strange that a hospital which one month is highly efficient becomes inefficient the next month just by a change in the funding system.

The Democrats would be only too delighted to hear from the Government what framework our health system fits into. What is occurring does not fit the Government's election promises in any way. At the moment, both the service providers and the users do not know from day to day what it is they are responding to. Even if this Government does not have a vision, it does at the very least have a responsibility to the community at large to describe the sort of health system it wants to see operating in this State in three years. Only then will the service providers and consumers be able to provide input and assist the Government in providing ideas to improve the system. I support the motion.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Mr President, I draw your attention to the state of the Council.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Governor, Her Excellency Dame Roma Mitchell, who continues to discharge her duties and functions with a vim and vigour that never cease to amaze me. I am sure I am saying only what the vast majority of South Australians also recognise, and may she long continue to do so. Talking further of matters both vice and regal, with no reference whatsoever to our own Governor, I would now like to place on the record my own beliefs about how Australia

should proceed as to who should be this nation's head of State in future. From the outset let me say that I am in favour of this nation's becoming a republic, but I would like to take this opportunity to say how my conclusion has been reached. I had reached that conclusion before the present Prime Minister made the matter an issue for public debate. Before that time, I had been a supporter of the present monarchical system and, contrary to the belief of many of my colleagues, my conclusion had not been based on the reason that in my formative years I had been brought up in strife-torn Northern Ireland. No, Sir; it was simply because I had the view that, if a nation had to have a titular head of State, then the monarchy as it operated was less capable of being corrupted than have been some of the republican systems which have operated and which continue to operate.

Secondly, I would particularly like to mention the United States of America and the Republic of France, both of whose Presidents, irrespective of Party creed, are always prepared to host \$10 000 and \$20 000 a plate dinners during election contests in order to fund their election campaigns. They do this whatever their philosophical or political creed. This always begs the question as to what the attendees at such dinners expect to achieve for their \$10 000 or \$20 000. I have come to the conclusion, as I believe would any rational minded person, that they expect something in return for their \$10 000 or \$20 000.

This fact says much for the proposition that the State should publicly fund the electoral process rather than having it funded privately. At that time I believed that with the hereditary monarch such things as that to which I have just referred could not happen and, because of that fact, there was much to be said in support of our present head of State system. But alas, I was wrong you see, Mr President, because there were and are other evils which can attach themselves to the monarchical system and which in my view make it even worse than the worst republican system that one could currently envisage.

I refer, of course, to the series of sagas involving the present two princes of the blood royal and their respective spouses. It fairly galled me to see how they were off at the drop of a hat on overseas holidays buying designer-made clothes which in total cost many millions of dollars, while tens if not hundreds of thousands of their fellow countrymen and women were being forced because of unemployment and dire poverty to sleep in the most severe climatic conditions in cardboard boxes and streets covered with snow in British cities which, even to the most non-discerning eye, can be described only as being clapped out. Therefore, I say in all earnestness that we should bring on the debate on the republic: the sooner the better so far as I am concerned.

I, for one, know that that which I have put on record is at least in part why so many of our citizens, and indeed citizens of Great Britain, numbered by their millions, have changed their thoughts as to how they believe we should be governed, at least in so far as to who should be our head of state. Mr President, you will note that I do not even touch upon the saga surrounding our former Governor-General, Sir John Kerr. It might well be said the monarchy is dead, long live the republic!

Turning now to the question of unemployment, I would like to resurrect a reply given to me by the Leader of the Government in this Council on behalf of Minister Olsen in another place in respect to a series of questions I asked about unemployment in South Australia. In one of his answers to my questions, the Minister stated:

No, I do not believe that unemployment is global by nature. Furthermore, any argument that suggests unemployment is caused by technological progress ignores the fact that technology also promotes economic growth. While technological progress may lead to short-term unemployment, if the product and factor markets are too inflexible to adjust to such changes, in the medium term there will be a shift of employment in the service sector.

As I read and reread the Minister's reply, I just shook my head in total disbelief. Let us consider the facts as they really are. The Minister says that 'technological progress may lead to short-term unemployment'. May lead? Let me tell the Minister, if he does not already know, that our nation's unemployment stands at between 10 and 11 per cent and has done so for the past number of years with no sign of getting any better either now or futuristically, with our home State of South Australia being affected more badly than just about every other State bar Tasmania.

In addition, the European Community now has 30 million, or about 10 per cent, of its total population unemployed. That is causing the governments of those nations that make up the European union much heartache and many sleepless nights as they wrestle with this problem. The same as applies in respect to unemployment in Australia and the European Community applies equally everywhere else in the old industrialised world and one would have to be almost totally blind not to see that. Yet the Minister in his answer to my question states:

No, I do not believe that unemployment is global by nature.

Truly, in the land of the blind the one-eyed man is king. The Minister also stated:

Furthermore, any argument that suggests that unemployment is caused by technological progress ignores the fact that technology also promotes economic growth.

I for one would never deny that. That statement is true in so far as it goes but unfortunately in present day terms it has not, it cannot and never will promote new jobs to the extent that they have been and are being lost forever. The facts are that the new technologies that are being so rapidly developed and introduced into the work place—and I speak mainly of computerisation—are not designed to create any new employment. Millions of jobs have been lost and continue to be lost as a result of twentieth century technology being introduced at a pace that can best be described as breakneck.

The facts are, and they speak for themselves, that the direction of the present system is aimed at maximising profitability irrespective of the havoc caused by the unemployment that that carries with it in its wake. I repeat for those who will listen that the jobs lost recently in our economy will never, as the Minister asserts, ever be replaced by the economic growth brought about by new technologies. No doubt some new jobs do emerge, but—and I repeat—most certainly not to the extent necessary to solve current unemployment. It is sad to say that there will be no change to the current situation and there will be no change to the horrendous numbers of unemployed, irrespective of what the Minister thinks or says, under our present system.

If he cannot understand this, then there can never be any chance of his providing South Australia with the answers to its present catastrophic unemployment problems. Truly, this global recession is entirely different from any that preceded it. If we continue in the same vein as before, it will have to be entirely new industries and entirely new ways of thinking that will provide the employment growth so necessary if the fabric of our society is to hold together at all and not be totally destroyed.

I turn now to the question of inflation, that other evil of the twentieth century, but by no means only to be found in that time. I pay tribute to the manner in which the Federal Government has grappled with the problem in Australia. To me, it is most commendable. However, I feel too much is being said about ongoing inflation and I fear that, because of this, projections are being made and decisions taken to address future inflation when any subjective analysis of all the indicators would seem to show that inflation will not be our future problem. It seems to me that, when one looks at all the global indicators, deflation is much more likely to be the problem of governments rather than inflation. I say that for the following reasons:

First, the global price for foodstuffs has markedly declined. Secondly, the global price of the world's mineral commodities has of recent times severely declined. Thirdly, the level of global wages paid to workers, in spite of what we hear to the contrary from vested interests, has also sharply declined. The decline of these three major indicators in respect to world pricing is surely not an indicator of future inflation but rather the opposite, and by that I mean deflation. If I am right, this will bring with it other problems for governments to grapple with which are just as serious in nature as those problems that are aligned with its opposite, that is, inflation. Failure by governments to assess this risk will lead to them being caught as unprepared as they were for the recent vicious spiral of inflation and all of the attendant evils which flowed in its wake.

I further believe that the price levels of the three indicators I have spoken of will not rise and indeed there is a strong chance of further declines owing to the oversupply of all three commodities in question. In my view this is due to the way that the so-called third world nations factor has come into play in the world's economic calculations, and that is the way in which they are growing cash crops in order to try to achieve foreign exchange to try desperately to lift their appalling standards of living.

We see the opening up everywhere of new mines in third world nations in order again to get some foreign exchange flowing into their desperate economies. The third factor is the arrival en masse onto the world scene of economic refugees—people who are in despair of their own and their children's future in the land of their birth.

The conjunction of these events will, I believe, ensure that in the non-event of a fairer and equal distribution of the world's wealth and resources it will mean that world commodity prices will continue to fall and, therefore, a trend to deflation rather than inflation will occur, opposite to what many of the world's economic gurus are predicting. I am frightened to think what the consequences will be if we fail to understand this. Those consequences, in my view, would be beyond the wildest imaginings of the human race.

I stress here, as I have done on other occasions, that I am generally not a believer of the big economic conspiracy theory, although I must confess that events most recently have made me almost become a believer in it, and I will come to the reason for that later on. However, there are, I believe, an elite few who have already decided that the world is headed for deflationary times, and I offer as proof the difficulty being experienced both here in Australia and elsewhere in attracting investment into manufacturing and other related industries.

Is this perhaps being caused by future deflation, according to the peregrinations of a few, which if it happens surely must mean that as prices of products continue to decline then so

will the percentage profit margins of certain investments? Is deflation the reason why recently there was a concerted international effort to lift bank interest rates by the mechanism of forcing up the price of Government bonds, particularly in the United States, thus forcing reserve banks in the United States and elsewhere, including South Australia, to lift their bank interest rates so that, if we do face deflationary times ahead, the few people (and I am not talking about the ordinary investor here) who control mammoth amounts of the world's investment capital can ensure that their obscene wealth does not lose its real value by keeping it in bank vaults, where levels of interest rates will in the main ensure that real values of their capital are maintained?

Alternatively, because of falsely induced bank interest rates, the cycle of deflation will be reversed to one of inflation, again ensuring that those mammoth amounts of wealth which are controlled by these few not only maintain their real value but indeed increase in value. Clearly, if this scenario is correct, then Governments of whatever persuasion, whatever philosophy, will have to act quickly in order to stem the tide where the greed and avarice of a few will almost certainly lead to the mutually assured destruction of the whole.

I conclude by saying the following. I am sure that many listening to what I have to say here today will be saying, 'Poor old Trevor—he is talking pure fantasy.' Well, let me say this: I believe that the recent urgently summoned meeting of the G7 nations was called together because at long last some of those seven nations have realised that they, the Governments of the people elected by democratic vote, no longer can control their own economies, and that their economies are at this moment controlled by forces which are answerable, unlike Governments, to no-one. One notes with dismay that for the most part there seems to be very little agreement emerging from that meeting about how to deal with the current global economic position.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: Turn the computers off.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I wish they would turn the honourable member off. On that note, I conclude my remarks by paraphrasing my fellow Irishman, Edmund Burke, who said, 'The only way for evil to succeed is for good men to do nothing.' Let us hope, Mr President—

The Hon. Anne Levy: He was a bit sexist.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: Was he really? Do you think I have any of his genes in my system? Mr President, let us hope that we are not about to see history repeat itself.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: In supporting the motion, I make want to make a few remarks about the status of women in this State and then about the state of the arts. The Minister for Education and Children's Services has recently said on several occasions that the women's suffrage centenary celebrations are bipartisan and that political interests do not enter into this matter. I would agree with him up to 11 December last year. The Women's Suffrage Centenary Committee was certainly established with bipartisan support, membership of political Parties, a broad spectrum of membership and considerable financial support from the then Government to achieve its aims.

However, I think that the new Government has broken that spirit of bipartisanship on several occasions, the first being the sacking of the Chair of the Women's Suffrage Centenary Committee, which was done on purely political grounds, and comments of this nature have never been denied by the Government. This has been mentioned previously in this

Chamber, but to pretend that the unwarranted sacking of Jean Blackburn as Chair of the committee on 28 December last year, three days before the suffrage year was to begin, was not a political act is totally erroneous.

In more recent times we have seen the sacking of two key officers in the office for the suffrage centenary which was established by the previous Government. The leader of that office was a public servant who was chosen with full Public Service procedures, with applications being called for, a panel of public servants set up to interview the applicants and the position being awarded on merit.

The office had a staff of six at the beginning of the year, with financial resources allocated in the budget passed by this Parliament last year to maintain that office with its complement of six officers until 30 June this year. We now know that the present Government is to cut resources to that office so that it can function only as originally intended for the first six months of this year. Its resources have been cut by at least a third for the remainder of this year, and that will mean that it cannot fulfil its functions for the second half of the suffrage centenary as had been originally planned.

It is incredibly mean spirited of the Government to cut the budget for the suffrage centenary office. It would not have had any long-term implications. The suffrage centenary celebrations are obviously a one off. To enable the office adequately to complete its work throughout the whole of the suffrage centenary would have had no implications for future budgets which this Government will be considering.

As I said, two officers from that office were sacked at the beginning of June on the ground that resources to the office were being cut, despite the fact that the money had been allocated for the office to continue as it was until 30 June. There was no reason to say that the money was not available for those individuals until the end of June. The money had been voted by this Parliament and was available until the end of June. The mean-spiritedness of this Government would have cut the funds by over a third beginning on 1 July. However, those two officers, including the chief officer in the suffrage centenary office, were sacked at the beginning of June with only 24 hours' notice to leave their posts. This is not the spirit of bipartisanship that the Leader keeps proclaiming without any evidence to support him.

It was extremely small minded of the Government to do that. As I have indicated, the head of the office was not a political appointment, whoever she may have worked for in the past. She was selected with the proper Public Service procedures involving a Public Service selection panel which included the then Deputy Chair of the Women's Suffrage Centenary Committee as a member, that person being a senior public servant.

So, let us not have any more nonsense about this Government's maintaining a bipartisan approach to the Women's Suffrage Centenary. On at least two occasions—and probably more of which I am not aware—it has demonstrated considerable political partiality and treated in a most disreputable way individuals who had been appointed in a perfectly proper manner.

One of the events which is still to occur for the suffrage centenary celebrations is the extremely important 'Women, Power and Politics' conference, which is to be held over four days in early October. Brochures for this were produced some considerable time ago. I took a number of them with me when I went overseas at the end of May. I was extremely embarrassed to find, many weeks after the brochures had been produced, that women members of Parliament in other States

had not received them. I should have thought they would be the most obvious people to whom to send them, as they would be very likely to come to the conference and would certainly have a great interest in it and in what was happening.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: They may have them now, but it took a long time to get to them. When I was interstate it was most embarrassing to find that some women politicians of all Parties had only vaguely heard that there was to be such a conference in South Australia but that they had no information about it.

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles: They should read their mail.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: It was not that they did not read their mail. All the women members of Parliament in Queensland to whom I spoke, from at least three different Parties, had received nothing in their mail.

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Well, they hadn't when I was there.

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: That gave no details about the conference at all. They wanted information and registration sheets so that they could consider whether they would attend. On matters other than the suffrage centenary celebrations, considerable concern is being expressed around this State regarding women's services. The Hon. Ms Pickles has spoken about the women's health centres and the grave dangers in which they are placed at the moment. There is great apprehension that they are to be closed, as they are at present; that they may be amalgamated with some other centre or hospital, but that they will lose their individual existence and in consequence the individuality of the service which they provide.

They have done so to the great benefit of women in South Australia for many years now. Their service is highly regarded and very valued by all women who attend them, as the large rally last Saturday and the considerable response from other people has indicated. The Hon. Ms Pickles has detailed the results of a questionnaire which was sent to a number of women who used just one of these health centres. I, too, received a copy of the results of that questionnaire, and could not but be struck as to the extremely high regard which all these women held for their women's health centre, for the considerable help it had given them, for the value which they had, and an indication that these women would not attend other sites.

They attended this women's health centre because it was near them, because it was staffed only by women, because it took women's matters seriously and treated the women as human beings. They felt if they had to go elsewhere they would not receive the same attention with their health problems. They would be reluctant to take these health problems to a GP who was likely to be dismissive and not take them seriously. I was particularly struck by the emphasis on finding the place friendly, welcoming and taking the women seriously. I am sure I am not the only person who has, on occasion, felt that institutions in our society do not take some women seriously, do not treat their concerns as being important ones, will trivialise their worries and dismiss them without proper consideration.

The women's health centres have more than proved their worth. It will be a sad loss for the women of South Australia and an enormous indictment on the lack of consideration on the part of this Government if it should abolish or amalga-

mate them. Another women's service, which is obviously under threat is the women's centre at St Peters. This, likewise, has existed for many years now, has filled an incredible need and has been extremely well patronised, not just by the women in St Peters but women from a much wider geographical area. It is a women only centre.

It has found, for example, that women of non-English speaking backgrounds will use the centre and will not go anywhere else. They come from cultures where their husbands do not wish them to go alone to places where they might encounter other men. But they are permitted by their husbands to attend the women's centre at St Peters because it is known to be a women only environment. If the existence of such a centre is to be threatened, this will remove from this important section of the community any chance of obtaining the services which this place offers. They cover a very wide range of women's needs: anything from companionship to classes in cooking or sewing, or fitness and Tai Chi. It conducts health sessions with medical advice. It has legal sessions where women lawyers come to give legal assistance where it is required and advise on legal matters. It provides a great range of activity. Child care is always provided so that women are not prevented from benefiting from it by lack of child care.

For many years since its inception the women's centre at St Peters has received generous funding through the Department for Family and Community Services. It was last year that new arrangements were made whereby the contribution from Family and Community Services was to be reduced, with the Women's Unit responsible to the Minister for the Status of Women supplying the bulk of the funding for the women's centre to continue. What is the situation now? The women's centre has received two cheques: one very much later than the other. The first cheque gave no indication that a second cheque was coming, so they were most apprehensive that there would not be a second cheque. These two cheques together have provided their funding only until 31 December. There has been no indication at all as to what funding basis will apply as from 1 January, and that date is not very far away.

It is most unfair on people to give them no indication as to what their funding situation will be when it is only three or four months away. Staff have to be paid. If the centre is to be closed down, as rumour has it, the staff will surely need time to try to find other jobs. It is most inconsiderate not to give the people at the centre information as to what will happen come 1 January. They have had indications that their funding will be returned to Family and Community Services, yet the Family and Community Services funding has been considerably curtailed and is now only 20 per cent or so of the money required to provide the very valuable services which the centre currently provides.

I ask the Government: is the Women's Community Centre at St Peters to close as from 1 January? Is any announcement on this matter being delayed until the suffrage centenary has been completed? I can certainly appreciate that the Government would not like to indicate that it had had to close women's services during the suffrage centenary year. It will be shocking if indeed women's services are to close and even more hypocritical if that is to occur during the suffrage celebrations.

The Women's Community Centre at St Peters has further told me that they have been trying, ever since last December, to have a meeting with the Minister for the Status of Women but have been unable to do so. They did have a meeting set

down for May of this year, but at the last minute that was cancelled, and no other time has been suggested as a replacement. Here we are, eight months later, and despite numerous requests, they have been unable to have even a ten minute meeting with their Minister to be able to discuss whether they have a future. This again shows a great lack of consideration for people who are not being treated as anybody deserves to be treated.

I hope an answer might be provided with respect to the next matter I wish to raise. Earlier in the year I asked the Minister for the Status of Women whether or not this Government would continue the policy of the former Government of refusing to sign contracts, accept tenders or do business with any company which had been named in the Federal Parliament as not complying with the law of the land; in other words, those who had been named for not complying with the affirmative action legislation passed by the Commonwealth Government. Months after I asked the question, I received a response stating that no decision had been taken on this matter, but 'a decision was expected soon'. That was in mid April, four months ago. I ask: has a decision been taken on this matter by this Government? If so, why has it not been announced? If it has not yet been taken, when will it be taken? Four months ago, the Government said it was expected soon, so one would hope such a decision has been taken. Is it ashamed to announce the decision which has been made? Is this yet another example of the secrecy of this Government that it does not tell us what is going on? Again, this may be an announcement that it does not want to make during the suffrage centenary year because, if it does not continue the policy of the previous Government, it will indicate a lack of commitment to matters affecting women and which are important to women.

I turn now to several matters in the arts of this State which concern me and many people in the arts community very deeply indeed. The Minister for the Arts, when in Opposition, made great play of her support for the peer group assessment policy which had been established and followed by the previous Government. We stood firmly by our peer group assessment policy when it came to allocating sums of money, be it to small groups, individuals or large arts organisations. We did not make decisions purely at the bureaucratic level. In this way, the arts community could trust the decisions on allocations which were made, felt they were part of them, and had confidence in the whole procedure. It would now seem that the Arts Minister is throwing away the whole policy of peer group assessment.

The art form advisory committees which were established by the previous Government still exist, but when it comes to allocation of resources these advisory committees do not handle the large sums but look at the small grants, the project grants to small groups and individuals. But the major allocations used to be made by the Arts Finance Advisory Committee which had representatives from the arts community who were not part of the bureaucratic structure of government. Apparently this group has now been abolished. The terms of appointment of all the then existing members have terminated and no-one has been appointed to take their place. Instead, major funding decisions are being made purely bureaucratically by the gang of four in the Department for the Arts.

I am quite happy to admit that two of that gang of four do have knowledge and experience in the arts: the other two do not. They have no background whatsoever in the arts. They may be financial gurus; they may be learning fast, but no-one

could pretend in any way that they are peers of the artistic community. Yet, this gang of four is determining the resources which will go to our major arts companies, such as the State Theatre Company, the State Opera of South Australia, the South Australian Youth Arts Board, and so on. These major financial allocations no longer have any component of peer group assessment to them. The decisions are being made entirely by bureaucrats. This is an indictment on this Government which, when in Opposition, claimed to uphold the principle of peer group assessment. This is another example of tight control, ministerial direction in the arts rather than the arts community being given their head, being involved in decision making, and being trusted to make sensible decisions for the benefit of the arts development in this State.

Not long ago the Minister for the Arts released the report on the future structure for the festival. This happened several months ago, and there does seem to be an inordinate time lag before anything occurs as a result of this report. I quite agree with the Minister that it was time the festival board structure was changed. I had long thought this myself and, had I remained Minister, intended to do so as soon as the 1994 festival was over. I felt it undesirable to undertake major action in the weeks and months leading up to our festival, but I certainly had intended doing so as soon as the festival was over earlier this year. If the Minister doubts my intentions in this regard, I can indicate that I did discuss the matter with Tim Lloyd, the Arts Editor of the *Advertiser*. One can check with him that I did this last year. I told him the reasons for my not doing so last year and that I was waiting until the festival was over.

I have considerable sympathy with the basic structure which the committee has proposed and which I understand the Minister has accepted, though it seems to me that a committee appointed to choose a committee is a rather cumbersome and unnecessary structure. We do not have committees formed to choose committees for any other boards and committees in the arts area. I know that the Festival Board is an extremely important one, but it is not the only important one by any means. It seems to be a fairly cumbersome structure, and it may be that that structure is the reason why nothing has happened for several months since the report on the Festival Board was released.

Could the Minister indicate when the committee to choose a committee will be appointed, or whether it has been appointed and the membership not announced? It may be that, given the tendency to secrecy shown by this Government, that that committee has in fact been chosen but its membership has been kept from us. If it has not been chosen, it seems to me that the Minister is dragging the chain very badly and one would hope that this matter can be settled before long. After all, our last Festival took place in March this year (even though the Parliament had to sit during the Festival) and we are now in the month of August, many months later, and still we do not have a Festival Board, which could be busy working towards the important Adelaide Festival in 1996. Time is passing and matters should be cleared up in this regard as soon as possible. I hope that the Minister can at least put our minds at rest in this regard very quickly.

Another matter arising out of the report was a recommendation that the Chair of the Festival Board be remunerated, as indeed I feel all members of the Festival Board should be. Many members of Government boards and committees receive remuneration which is often fairly trivial but which nevertheless establishes the principle that valuable work is

being done and that it should be remunerated. Will the remuneration for the members of the Festival Board be determined in the same way as the remuneration for all other boards and committees, and that is by the Public Service Commissioner and people in his office? This enables a relativity to exist between boards and committees appointed right across Government.

I am sure that the Ministers know, though other members of Parliament may not know, that the Public Service Commissioner categorises all boards and committees into one of four categories. The remuneration for the members of those boards and committees depends into which category they fall, category 1 being those with the greatest remuneration and category 4 those with the least. Some do not receive an annual sum but receive a sitting fee only. I ask the Minister: has the remuneration for the Chair of the Festival Board been determined and, if so, what is the amount involved? Which category does the Festival Board fall into? I think it important that this information be made public. Perhaps it has been determined but, through secrecy, the Government does not wish to inform us of the results. If it has been determined, the public has a right to know. If it has not been determined, why on earth is it taking so long? It is important that that information be made public and, in particular, we need to see how it compares with the remuneration for the Chair of the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust.

Most people will agree that boards of arts bodies are usually fairly poorly remunerated as compared with other Government boards and committees. The Public Service Commissioner and his staff obviously do not value these boards very highly, and most of them end up in category 4, with some making category 3. However, in determining the remuneration for the Chair of the Festival, relativities between arts bodies need to be considered. If the new Chair, as yet unannounced, is to receive considerable remuneration for an onerous job as Chair of the Festival Board, it will probably be necessary to reconsider the level of remuneration for all other arts boards and committees, in particular that of the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, which arguably has a much greater responsibility than the Festival Board.

According to Basil Arty, the new Chair of the Festival Board is to be Keith Smith, who is the recently retired Chair of the State Opera Board of South Australia. However, I know from experience that Basil Arty is not always to be trusted. Sometimes he has very good sources of information; other times those sources are completely wrong, and I do not wish to place too much credence on any suggestions made in Basil Arty. Nevertheless, when will the Chair of the Festival Board be appointed?

A very serious question arising from the report into the restructuring of the Festival concerns a recommendation that was made that the subsidy from the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust to the Adelaide Festival should be made clear and explicit. That subsidy has never been documented previously; it has been provided very largely in kind in supplying staff and facilities for the Festival.

I recall that at one time a nominal figure of close to \$250 000 was placed on the value of this work, but it has certainly never appeared formally in the accounts of either the Festival or the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. The report said that this subsidy should now become explicit but, while I do not disagree with this recommendation, it seems to me that it raises further questions. If such a subsidy is to be part of the Government grant to the Festival, does that mean that the Government grant to the Festival Centre Trust will be

reduced accordingly? Alternatively, if it is to be an explicit grant from the Festival Centre Trust to the Festival, thereby appearing in the accounts of both organisations, we will have a slightly anomalous situation, it seems to me, where one Government subsidised body is making a grant to another Government subsidised body. It may keep the accountants busy doing the paperwork on this, but it seems to be a slightly anomalous situation, which could be made clearer simply by having the Government alter its grant to the Festival accordingly.

In mentioning the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust I would like to pay tribute to Tim McFarlane, the General Manager of the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, who is to leave South Australia within a few days, if he has not already done so. I know that no-one is irreplaceable, but I can assure members that Tim McFarlane will be sorely missed in the Festival Centre Trust and in the arts community in general. It will be very difficult for anyone else to step into his shoes. He has done wonders for the Festival Centre Trust. He has made it the most successful such centre in Australia, both financially and artistically. The Festival Centre Trust requires only 23 per cent of its overall budget as a Government grant, whereas its counterparts in other States require up to 60 per cent of their budgets in Government grants. It is thanks to Tim McFarlane's efficiency that the Festival Centre Trust works so well. The workshops for the Festival Centre Trust out at Dry Creek are clearly of international standard, and are making sets for shows which are travelling all around Australia and which are now set to travel internationally to Hong Kong, Bangkok and maybe even New York. Tim's efforts in developing these workshops alone would have made him an outstanding General Manager for the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. I ask the Minister when a replacement for Tim will be sought and appointed, and I hope that the next appointment will be equally successful from the point of view of the Festival Centre Trust.

I have a further query in relation to Carrick Hill. Carrick Hill has been without a director for over two months now. The previous director took a TSP and has left the Public Service. However, her contract as director of Carrick Hill was due to expire. Her taking a TSP does not mean that the directorship of Carrick Hill has ceased to exist; her general position within the department will have ceased to exist. Can we take it that there will be another director of Carrick Hill and, if so, when will one be appointed? How long does Carrick Hill have to struggle along without a director in charge of the place? Just what is happening to Carrick Hill? There has been a suggestion that it will be run by the Art Gallery again, as it was when it first came into Government ownership. That was found not to be satisfactory back in the early 1980s and I do not see it being satisfactory now, either. I feel that this would be most inappropriate. In recent times the direction of Carrick Hill has been very much towards developing the garden and the facilities for the public outside the house rather than those inside. In this respect Carrick Hill is far more aligned to the Botanic Gardens than it is to the Art Gallery.

Incidentally, I might comment that not long ago the current Minister was vociferous about the review of Carrick Hill not having been published. I made public all reviews which were undertaken of different sections of the Department for the Arts and Cultural Heritage, as it was then, but I did not release the review of Carrick Hill, at the request of the board of Carrick Hill. It did not wish it to be released. The then shadow Minister complained bitterly about this, and I

recall she castigated me considerably for not releasing it. She has been Minister for eight months now, and she has not released it either. Perhaps now that she is Minister she is prepared to listen to the board of Carrick Hill and accede to its request. Perhaps at some stage she could tell us whether she will release it, as she insisted should be done, or whether she also will adhere to the request of the board of Carrick Hill and not release it.

In this regard also one might ask about the report from the task force which the Minister set up early in her term as Minister. I understand that the task force has presented its report to her; when will she make that public? Very many people in the arts community in South Australia are waiting most anxiously for that report. I hope it will be released very soon and that there will not be another attempt to keep such reports secret; it is very much in the interests of South Australia to have them made public. I understand that there has also been a review of corporate services in the department. I do not know whether that has been completed; no report has been released. I ask the Minister whether it will be released, as I released the review of corporate services that took place when I was Minister. When is such a report to be released and, if it is not to be released, why not? Is this another indication of the secrecy she is undertaking?

I know that the budget will be brought down in a few days. I understand that many in the arts community are very concerned as to what the budget will contain. There are many rumours around. The budget cuts in the arts are rumoured to be about \$1.6 million this year, with more in the pipeline for next year and the year after. The rumour further states that large lumps of the \$1.6 million is to come by cutting grants to the institutions along North Terrace: the Art Gallery, the Museum, ArtLab, the History Trust and the State Library are rumoured to have cuts of at least \$50 000 each, and for some of them perhaps more. That would not make up \$1.6 million.

Of course, this is despite the fact that both the Minister and the now Premier indicated very clearly last year that there would be no cuts in the arts budget and that they would maintain real term funding for the arts. The rumours further state that the small companies will not get cuts in their budgets this year, that they will wait until next year and that next year we will get the savage cuts that will completely destroy small groups such as the Red Shed Theatre Company, Vital Statistix, Junction Theatre Company, the Experimental Art Foundation, Mainstreet Theatre Company, the CAC, Doppio and so on.

I know these are rumours only, but I wish the Minister would either confirm or deny these rumours and save the many members of the arts community the enormous anxiety they are now suffering. We know that members of the arts community are leaving South Australia. Performers are moving to Sydney and leaving here where they feel that, with the coming cuts, no work will be available for them. Visual artists are moving also. They believe there is no support for them here so they may as well leave. People are depressed and anxious, convinced that the pre-election commitments are about to be broken. I share their concern. We have been told there will be huge cuts to education and health, and these draw a great deal of public attention, but the arts survive on a small budget as a proportion of the total budget of this State.

To maintain the pre-election promise of maintaining real term funding for the arts would not cost the Government much and, while \$1.6 million may not sound a great deal when one considers the total health or education budget, the

effects of such cuts can be devastating to the arts community and the whole arts scene in this State. Certainly, I hope that the rumours are wrong but I fear that they are not.

Finally, I wish to mention the conference which I was privileged to attend in Jakarta in the early part of June this year and which was put on by the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, a body of the United Nations, which organised the Ministerial Conference on Women in Development. This conference is one of five that are being held in five regions of the world prior to the large conference in Beijing next year, the United Nations Conference on Women, to be held in September next year. It was the preparatory conference for the Asia and Pacific region. Between now and the end of this year the equivalent conferences will be held for Europe, Latin America, Africa and the Middle East which, together with Asia and the Pacific, make up the five regions of the world that the United Nations considers separately.

The conference was attended by more than 700 delegates representing governments and many non-government organisations from 53 different countries. They stretched from China and North Korea in the north to New Zealand in the south, eastwards to Tuvalu and Samoa, and westwards as far as Iran. The conference considered, first, what changes there have been in the status of women in different countries of the region since the 1985 Nairobi declaration on what should be done to improve the status of women throughout the world.

The conference then drew up a plan of action about what should happen, not just stating goals for women's development but establishing timetables, strategies and actions to be undertaken to implement these goals established in Nairobi. This is a detailed document and I would love to incorporate much of into *Hansard*, but it is a 48-page document and it would be impractical to do so. However, I seek leave to table the document so that it will be available for all members of Parliament to read if they wish to do so.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I obtained the report at the end of the conference, but the final editing and correction of typos and so on has not occurred. Doubtless it has been done by now, but I do not have the final edited version. However, I am sure that its content will be no different from this one. In the plan of action for the future the document picks 10 critical areas of concern. It discusses the background to those areas of concern and then sets out plans for remedying the situation in those 10 areas, the titles of which I will mention.

There was great concern over the growing feminisation of poverty; there was concern about inequality in women's access to and participation in economic activities. The third aspect is inadequate recognition of women's role and concerns in environmental and natural resource management.

The fourth concern is inequitable access to power and decision making. The fifth concern is the violation of women's human rights. This covers domestic violence, along with many other situations where women's rights are denied. The sixth concern is inequalities and lack of access to health. The seventh is inequality and lack of access to education and literacy. There is then the negative portrayal of women in the media. It is interesting that the concerns regarding the portrayal of women in the media are not limited to developed countries such as Australia and New Zealand. Women from throughout Asia and the Pacific region were equally concerned and believed that something needed to be done about that.

Another critical area of concern is the inadequate mechanism for promoting the advancement of women. Finally, there was the inadequate recognition of women's role in peace building and in making our world a better place.

The conference was fascinating. The document is an extremely valuable one and an indication that, whether countries are poor and under-developed or rich and well developed, the relative inequalities between men and women are found throughout the region and probably throughout the world. The concerns of women in these countries may have a slightly different emphasis in some matters, but in general they are the same concerns for their status as women and for what needs to be done to improve their status, and to improve their lives and thereby improve the whole world.

These concerns are common to all 53 countries, whatever their stage of development and whatever their religious or political affiliations. This remarkable unanimity, which was far, far greater than any disagreements, which certainly occurred in some areas, across such diverse countries, brought home to me very strongly indeed the importance of the struggle by women for better recognition and better status in all countries of the world and, of course, my particular concern: what occurs in South Australia. I thank members and hope that this very important Jakarta declaration for the advancement of women in Asia and the Pacific and the attached plan of action will be taken note of by many in South Australia. It is of relevance to us and could have a very important influence on our future as a community in this part of the world.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (FELONIES AND MISDEMEANOURS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 4 August. Page 50.)

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports this Bill. Essentially it is a procedural change which will make the law more comprehensible. The proposal emanates from a process, which was started when I was Attorney-General, to review the criminal law. A number of Bills have been introduced as a part of that process and a number of discussion papers on various issues prepared by Mr Matthew Goode. This Bill gives effect to one of the recommendations made as part of that review of the criminal law which I assume will be an ongoing one. The Attorney-General might like to tell me whether he does intend to continue that process which was started a couple of years ago when I was Attorney-General.

There have been no objections to this Bill as far as I can ascertain, except that some members of the legal profession, the Law Society and, I think, the Criminal Lawyers Association think that the opportunity should be taken in the context of this Bill to abolish the felony murder rule which is referred to in the Attorney-General's second reading explanation.

The Opposition's view is that if this matter is to be examined—and we do not say that it should not be—it should be examined in the context of the review of the criminal law generally and not be caught up in this Bill, which is of reasonably simple compass.

As the Attorney-General pointed out, the felony murder rule was abolished in the United Kingdom, or at least in

England, in 1957, it has been abolished in Australia in the Australian Capital Territory, and its abolition has been recommended by numerous law reform bodies over the years. For the moment at least the Government has decided not to move on this issue, and I do not want to delay the progress of this Bill by debating the issue in the context of it at this time.

The Attorney-General might like to advise the Council whether this issue will be addressed by the Criminal Law Officers Committee (CLOC), which is comprised of officers of Attorneys-General departments around Australia and which has been looking at a project that was commenced by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General (SCAG) to

examine the possibility of getting a uniform criminal law around Australia. CLOC has produced a number of discussion papers which have been circulated widely and which will eventually form the basis of its recommendations. I should like to know whether this issue is still active and whether it will be considered by the Criminal Law Officers Committee as part of the uniformity exercise.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.7 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday 11 August at 2.15 p.m.