HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 31 October 1991

The SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson) took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

EXOTIC FISH

Notices of Motion: Regulation/Committees, No. 7: Mr Meier to move:

That the regulations under the Fisheries Act 1982 relating to Exotic Fish—Permitted Species, made on 27 June and laid on the Table of this House on 8 August 1991, be disallowed.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I do not wish to proceed with this motion.

Motion lapsed.

Mr MEIER: I move:

That Standing Orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable Notices of Motion: Regulations/Committees Nos 1 to 6, 8 and 9 to be moved and debated cognately.

Motion carried.

Mr MEIER: I move:

That the various regulations referred to in Notices of Motion Nos 1 to 6, 8 and 9 be disallowed.

I was amazed to find these regulations coming before the House at the time they did. Some key points need to be made, and I shall certainly be seeking some answers in relation to these. I refer in the first instance to the regulations as they relate to the scheme of management for the abalone fishery. These regulations were to come into operation on 27 June 1991 and, as members would be aware, that was right in the middle of the select committee inquiry into the abalone industry. Thus we find that those regulations have a direct impact on the abalone industry.

We note that no further licences are to be granted. Reference is made to the western zone, the central zone and the southern zone abalone fisheries, with an indication in each case that no additional or other licence may be granted for the fishery. I am amazed to find that that has come into the regulations. How did the Minister or this Parliament know that the select committee would not make a finding that indicated that additional licences could be granted in the abalone industry? It was not possible to know that that was not a recommendation of the select committee, considering that we only handed down our findings the week before last.

I get a little upset when this Parliament is being dictated to in the way of regulations while a select committee is there to undertake a management analysis of an industry, and in my opinion we were virtually being told, 'Right, there are certain things you need not bother about recommending because regulations are being brought in to do just that.' Secondly, we see in the abalone regulations that abalone quotas are referred to, and also unit values as it related to them at that stage. Likewise, we see conditions as they related to the transport of quotas of abalone. These are all dealt with in the regulations and yet all part and parcel of the select committee's considerations. Are select committees there to have a real input or are regulations taking over in this day and age?

It is not only the abalone select committee that could have been overridden. In relation to the scheme of management for the prawn fisheries, we find that regulations have been made in relation to the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery. Members of course would know that we have had a select committee on the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery over the course of the past few months. In fact, only yesterday did we debate that committee's report. That committee handed down a unanimous finding and certainly has made some very important suggestions, which I believe this Parliament should adopt. However, we see here in the regulations to which I have just referred matters relating to the renewal fee for the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery. We see that the Director may impose a condition on a licence requiring an additional 10 per cent of the amount of any instalment not paid if that does not occur.

Also, they provide that no other licence may be granted in respect of the fishery. How could the Director presuppose whether the select committee was going to recommend additional licences or perhaps a reduction in the number of licences? Again, this was presupposing something that the select committee had the right to consider and to come down with its recommendation. Again we see the Minister, through his department, putting foward regulations that may well have overridden the select committee's findings.

Further, looking at the regulation as it applies to the fisheries general regulations 1984, we see reference again to the Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery and to the fact that a boat in that fishery is not to exceed an overall length of 15.2 metres. Secondly, a main engine is not to exceed a continuous brake horsepower rating of 300. In fact, members would be aware that in relation to that stipulation the select committee has recommended that such limits disappear. Yet, we have before us a counter regulation saying that there should be such limitations. Who is running this State? What is running this State? Parliament has to make sure that what it considers is in the right order of priorities. We cannot have departments coming up with regulations which in some ways tend to make a mockery of any select committee that is sitting at the time.

The area that concerns me more than anything in all of the regulations that I am dealing with now concerns the power given to the Director of Fisheries. In each of these regulations we note reference to the fact that the Director may impose or vary conditions on licences in respect of the various fisheries, be it the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery or those in relation to abalone, rock lobster, marine scale fish, or the scheme of management for the River Murray fisheries.

The Director may impose or vary conditions. Again, in the last 24 hours we have had extensive debate at the second reading stage of the Fisheries (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill. The Bill that we were debating referred to those powers. These regulations give additional powers to the Director because the right to vary conditions is not considered in the Bill. I put forward many of the arguments about the powers of the Director. The Bill states that the Director 'may impose a condition of a licence' and so on; whereas, the regulations before us provide that the Director may impose or vary conditions on licences in respect of the particular fisheries with which I am dealing. Surely, when Parliament is considering whether the Director or, perhaps, the Minister should have such powers, why should there be a regulation that seems to enforce and enhance the powers of the Director? Either we should be dealing with the Bill and get that out of the way, or we should forget about the Bill because the regulations will countermand it anyway.

What disturbs me greatly is that it has been indicated—and you, Mr Speaker, would be aware of it—that the Bill is to be amended so that the power is given to the Minister. The Opposition has indicated that it is not happy with that suggestion and that it wants to go further. We will consider amendments ranging from the gazettal of changes to the licence through to prior discussions with the industry. Of course, that will be dealt with at a later stage. What is going

on? These regulations seek to give the Director similar or, in my opinion, additional powers by allowing him to vary conditions on licences. It is unsatisfactory and I am seeking answers from the Minister, in the first instance, as to why these regulations are before us at this stage.

We also note that conditions are imposed on the rock lobster fishery through regulation, and I am amazed by that. Again, the Director may impose or vary conditions on licences in respect of that fishery as it relates to the rock lobster entitlements. There has been considerable debate in this House and there have been votes of no confidence in the Director of Fisheries because he has sought to reduce the quotas by some 20 per cent or to rid the industry of some of the rock lobster boats. Yet, at the very same time, regulations are before us that give the Director power to do that. The Minister gave an assurance of a kind, that that issue was being considered further. Who is right and who is wrong? Again, in my opinion, these regulations should not be before us at this stage.

I would also like to consider the regulations as they relate to the gulf waters experimental crab fishery. They seek to extend the time by which the experimental crab fishery can continue, simply because insufficient information is available at present. What really upsets me is that I find in an explanation to those regulations that no consultation was undertaken with the recreational fishing sector. The reason? Because the management arrangements for the experimental fishery would have no impact on recreational fishing activities. How divorced from reality are the people who make these regulations? In fact, it was the Director of Fisheries who made that statement and who indicated that it was a deliberate decision not to consult with the recreational fishery as it relates to crabs because it was felt that the experimental fishery was having no impact on recreational activities. I just wonder how many people here have been crab fishing over the past few years and are aware of the fact that crab numbers have deteriorated enormously in parts.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: I have.

Mr MEIER: Good, because the professional crabbers in some areas have taken such large numbers of crabs that there are insufficient for the recreational people. I will not get into arguments on the pluses and minuses of whether there should be a commercial sector. Undoubtedly there is an argument about that, but at the very least, let us ensure that the recreational sector is consulted before regulations such as these are brought into this House. In future, I hope we would find that appropriate consultation has occurred. For the variety of reasons given, I am very disappointed that these regulations are before us. I am happy to listen to an explanation from the Minister to determine whether some of my misgivings are ill founded and I am quite happy to weigh up the advice that he gives but, on my reading of the regulations, for the reasons stated, they should be disallowed.

Mr McKEE secured the adjournment of the debate.

FISHERIES

Notice of motion: Regulations/Committees, No. 10 Mr Meier to move:

That the Regulations under the Fisheries Act 1982 relating to Miscellaneous Fishery—Licences, made on 27 June and laid on the Table of this House on 8 August 1991, be disallowed.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I do not wish to proceed with this motion.

Motion lapsed.

RURAL COMMUNITY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gunn:

That a select committee be established—

(a) to inquire into the reasons why many farmers and small businesses in rural South Australia are having difficulties in raising adequate finance to maintain their operations;

(b) to examine the operations of and funds available to the Rural Industries Assistance Branch of the Department of Agriculture to see if they are being directed toward those who have the best possibility of long-term viability;

(c) to examine the need for the Government to give protection to those facing foreclosure; and

(d) to give those people who believe they have been harshly treated by the financial institutions the ability to advise the select committee of the difficulties they are facing.

(Continued from 24 October. Page 1405).

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): At the outset of this debate I would like to say that I am very sympathetic to the sentiments expressed in the motion moved by the member for Eyre with regard to the farming community. I must agree with many of his comments, because of my own experience in my previous employment where I had a number of contacts with the farming community, particularly on the West Coast and in the Port Pirie area of the State. Over the past six or seven years, prior to coming into Parliament, I was involved in negotiations with farmers in those areas and I am very aware that they have faced some very bad years and, unfortunately, consecutively bad years. This has put farmers behind the eight ball in terms of trying to make their farms economic propositions, often through no fault of their own because of the very bad drought years in those areas.

One of the real problems that they faced, particularly on the West Coast, was a lack of diversification. That was due mainly to the fact that the areas could not diversify into many other areas of farming because of soil conditions and so on. Some of them managed to find other industries in which they could become involved. I am aware that some went into the aquaculture industry near Ceduna, but, by and large, most of those farming communities have found it very difficult to make ends meet.

I am also aware, as the member for Eyre stated, that there is great concern about young people going off farming properties because they cannot earn a living. They are having to go to places like Roxby Downs to get an income in order to send money back to keep the farms going. However, this Government has been working to try to help the farming community to survive because of its real value to South Australia as a whole. No-one would disagree that over the years the farming community has been a big contributor to the economic base of South Australia and the nation as a whole.

I should like to speak about the Rural Adjustment Screening Committee which has been set up by the Government. From time to time, the Rural Finance and Development Division's clients have expressed concern about the rejection of their applications for adjustment funds. This State has worked hard to try to increase the amount of those funds. In order to address any concerns that people who apply for funds from the Rural Adjustment Screening Committee may have, they need to be able to put in a complaint as to whether they believe they have been fairly dealt with. This committee is responsible for handling difficult borderline cases in the farming community.

The role of the Rural Adjustment Screening Committee (RASC) is incorporated with the RAS assessment process. That process is as follows. An initial application is assessed

by the Manager, Lending Services, Rural Finances and Development Division. Appeals against decisions of the Manager, Lending Services, are to be considered by the Manager, Rural Finance. Applicants whose appeals are declined by the Manager, Rural Finance, are to be informed that they can have their application reviewed by the screening committee. Should the applicant seek such a review, the committee's recommendation will be conveyed to the applicant by the Minister.

The membership of the RASC comprises the Chairman, who is the Chairman of the Ministerial Advisory Committee on Rural Finance Policy, the Manager of the Rural Finance Committee and one person selected by the Minister from a panel of four people put forward by the United Farmers and Stockowners and a second selected as deputy. To date the RASC has not met in 1991-92 as the UF&S has not nominated a representative to the committee to replace the UF&S President, who has withdrawn from the committee following completion of his term of office.

The other section about which I should like to speak is the Rural Finance and Development Division. Its proposed lending and grants program for 1991-92 consists of, first, the rural adjustment scheme, as follows: RAS A lending, $15 million; RAS A interest subsidy, $2.7 million; RAS B interest subsidy, $3.5 million; RAS C, $6.6 million; and commercial rural loans, $12 million; secondly, RIADF lending, $1.8 million; and, thirdly, RIADF other, $900 000. The total is $42.5 million, and that has recently been adjusted. Yesterday, the Minister said that some changes had been approved by Federal Cabinet on Monday, which brings good news to South Australia. They followed a meeting, held in Melbourne last week, of Ministers responsible for rural assistance.

As a result of that meeting, some of the decisions to go to Federal Cabinet were modified, including some of the proposed arrangements in terms of cost sharing between the Commonwealth and State Governments. So, there is no change in part A continuing funding, which remains at $6.81 million, but part A new funding, the support we give for lending under part A, has increased by $400 000 to $1.96 million. The Minister did state that the key to remember here is that that helps finance the difference in interest costs which are a very major part of the costs for the farming community on a much larger lending program.

So, it in fact provides a substantial lending capacity. One of the real problems facing a large number of the farming community is the interest that they have to meet on their commitments under the lending programs. Whilst I and the Government are very sympathetic to the sentiments expressed by the member for Eyre in his request for a select committee—and we appreciate the fact that he has brought it up here, to be dealt with by Parliament—I wish to advise that the Government cannot support a select committee. However, it will continue to work to try to make things easier for the farming community in the area of finance, which is one of the major areas of concern at this time.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I am very disappointed to hear from the member for Stuart that the Government will not support the establishment of a select committee. Time after time the Government makes excuses. We hear some very compassionate speeches from members opposite but, when it comes to doing something about it, the Government cannot support it. It cannot deliver. I just wonder how low Australia's key industry will sink before the Government will do at least this minor thing of setting up a select committee to give the rural community a chance to put the case and have some hope of survival.

As you would know, Sir, farmers are caught in a very difficult situation, because they have nowhere to go. The facts are well-known to all members of the Government, and that is why it distresses me so much to hear that the Government will not support this select committee. The problem is due to the low prices in the world market. We know that is caused by the EC and the USA dumping their product against the Australian product. Growers in this country do not want Government assistance—all they want is a fair go, whether from the Government, the banks or the public generally. How can our rural community survive when one looks at this total worldwide nonsense?

All that our Governments, both State and Federal, can do is feel very sorry. The farmers are not looking for a handout. They are asking for a bit of sympathy and a good ear for just a couple of years, and a chance for those in difficulty to be able to survive. Most average farmers will tough this out and live to see another day, but one-third of them are in serious trouble. I would say between 300 and 500 farming families in South Australia are in serious trouble. A select committee is the minimum that this Government should provide to give people an avenue through which to put their case to the Government. These low prices are not the fault of the farmers—they are due to the world situation. In the end, the Federal Government will have to do something about it. That may be through subsidies, at least giving some money back to the farmers so they can compete.

Of course, we know about the high cost of producing grain in this country. There are low overseas prices and a high inbuilt Australian cost, and that has gone on for many years. The unusual seasons, particularly on the West Coast of this State, have made the problem more serious. This is why it is fitting that the member for Eyre should introduce this measure last week. He, more than anyone else in this House, would be fully aware of the heartbreak in the rural community. These are not crocodile tears. However, given the attitude of the Government, one would wonder whether all it does is to feel sorry. All we are asking for is the establishment of a select committee, but it would appear that the Government will refuse that.

Government policies both State and Federal have had a lot to do with the serious problems we are facing. The policy of deregulation, particularly of the banks, is one of the problems. Six, seven or eight years ago when the banks were deregulated, the farmers were urged to spend and buy up. The banks' attitude was, 'We've got the money. Here it is go and buy a bigger farm. Get big: get out.' Because the Government deregulated the banks, the banks were fighting for their market share, and they were doing very reckless business. The banks gave the farmers an unnatural expectation. Farmers set themselves up with new machinery and more acres. What happened two years later? Prices dipped, interest rates went to 22 per cent and there was a dry year. What have we seen since? We have had nothing but disaster year after year.

Interest rates for some are still in excess of 18 per cent. So, given that farmers budgeted for these borrowings at 11 per cent, one can see why they are in trouble. The nub of the problem is the Government's policy of deregulating the banks. Of course, tied up with that is the Government's policy in terms of the value of the Australian dollar. Only this morning I heard on the radio that Pasminco, the Port Pirie smelter, is in trouble because it cannot sell its product overseas as there is a glut of metal. Not only that, but the high price of the Australia dollar makes it hard for Pasminco to sell its product, because it is selling it against an artificially high Australian dollar. Not only is that policy affecting

the farmers in relation to all the wheat and grains they sell but also it is affecting all our industries that sell overseas. I think Government policy—Federal in this case—needs to grab that dollar and pull it down to a degree so that the business people in this country, the farmers, those involved with minerals, and anyone who is exporting at all can have a fair go in exporting their product. That is a very serious problem. That could solve our problems quickly. If we pulled back the dollar to a reasonable level and had a couple of good seasons, this country would get off to a pretty quick start indeed.

I have had much to do with the rural Assistance Branch at which this motion is aimed, particularly with the Coordinator, Mr Graham Broughton. Knowing many applicants who have tried for assistance from the Rural Assistance Branch, I find it difficult to understand the criteria. So many farmers do not fit the criteria: they are either too far gone, which makes them unviable, or they have not exhausted every other avenue of finance. There is a very fine line and a very small gap that allows people to qualify for this money. This is why, as the Minister has said, South Australia has been banking the money coming from the Federal Government, and the interest has been going into the department's so-called work in the same area. The Government should not be banking the money: it should be borrowing more to keep up with the problem. That just indicates to me that the Government does not have the right formula to be able to provide the assistance. I urge the Government to look at that area.

Farmers are the victims, as I have just said. We all know the facts: the farmers are the victims of the squeeze on all sides. As all members would know, if the farmers do well, the States do well, real business does well and State business does well. I am sure that most members opposite would not only know the problem but be affected by it. To hear the member for Stuart indicate a few minutes ago that the Government will not support the establishment of a select committee does not give me any joy. The people involved in these industries need to be positive and they need to have hope, so that comment made me quite cross, to say the least. I fully support the member for Eyre's motion to set up a select committee to assist the rural industry.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I am quite surprised at some of the comments made by the member for Custance about this motion. The plight of people in the rural community—and I am talking not just about the farming community but about all parts of the rural community—has been so well documented, not only in this House but in other State Parliaments and in the Federal Parliament, that I believe this is a classic case for not having a select committee.

I am not saying that I disagree with the points put forward by the member for Eyre and the member for Custance, although I take issue with the member for Custance when he says that on this side of politics all we can do is stand up and say we are sorry. Let me remind the House, you, Sir, and the community of South Australia that over the past five years this side of politics has argued the case for the rural community very well. In particular, the Minister who occupies the relevant portfolio, and the two Ministers prior to him, to my knowledge, have always argued the case for the rural community. So, I thought that remark of the member for Custance was a little unkind.

The member for Eyre, who moved this motion, has one of the best records over the years for standing up in this House and arguing the plight of the rural community in good times and in bad. In good times, the member for Eyre has documented the case for those in the rural community but never at the expense of the urban community. He has always said, 'If you have it in the urban areas, let's have it in the rural communities.' The member for Eyre has also been very fair, and I do not think he would mind my saying that he has a proven record of saying to the rural community, if it demands something, 'You can't have it because the State can't afford it.' He is one of the few politicians, including me, who have gone out to their constituency and said, 'Stop your whingeing; you're doing all right.'

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: That is right. As the Minister on the front bench says, 'A commonsense approach and uncommon courage'. That is what the member for Eyre has shown. Everyone knows that small business is suffering in rural South Australia. The member for Custance cannot just pluck something out of the air and say, 'The Federal Government should drag down the value of the dollar and everything will be okay.'

It will be recalled that I moved a motion based on a statement by the member for Eyre about level playing fields. There is no such thing as a level playing field in the rural community. As the member for Eyre said, 'Give them a level playing field and the South Australian farmers will compete with the best in Europe, North America and the United Kingdom and beat them hands down.' However, we do not live with a level playing field anymore; so, a group of parliamentarians would only go out into the community and find out exactly what they already know.

There may be some ways in which the Rural Industries Assistance Branch could improve its delivery. I am not saying that every Government department is producing a worthwhile service, but we do not need a select committee to find that out. This is not a 10-minute speech congratulating the member for Eyre, but if he is dissatisfied with any Government department he soon lets this House, the department and the Minister know.

Paragraphs *(c)* and *(d)* of the motion refer to the need for the Government to give protection to people facing foreclosure and those people who have received harsh treatment from financial institutions. Sure, the banks have a record of enticing farmers into debt at high rates of interest, and as soon as things get tough—

Mr Ferguson: And foreign debt, too.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The member for Henley Beach says, 'And foreign debt'. Overfriendly bank managers have enticed the rural communities, as members opposite know because they represent those communities, and the first time there is a bit of a squeeze those banks demand their pound of flesh. That has been well documented. The Minister has said it on many occasions. Even the Federal inquiry into the banking system has made some pretty scathing comments on the way in which financial institutions—and that includes all private banks and our State Bank—have treated farmers in South Australia.

I do not think we need a select committee. Regardless of whether or not the select committee is established, I have no difficulty with members opposite standing up and letting the House know the problems in their constituencies. However, if a select committee is established—and I have a pretty even mind about it at the moment; I would like to see the matter explored—and a group of politicians travel to the rural communities and listen to what the people have to say, I think there will be the danger that the community's expectations will be raised. The other day I talked about the massive subsidies being doled out monthly by the United States Government and the European Economic Community. This country and this State cannot do that: we do not

have the money, the population or the tax base. We cannot compete in that regard.

There is a petition circulating among all private businesses in the office block where my electorate office is situated. People are being asked to sign this petition as a protest against what the American Government is doing to wheat farmers in this country, and it is hoped that that petition will be ready for when President Bush comes to Australia. I have signed that petition, and I got my wife to sign it, although she did not need any encouragement from me to do so. I believe that letting the people demand action from these so-called friendly governments is the way to go.

Establishing a select committee is really not the answer. Whilst the member for Eyre will insist on this motion he knows that what I have said is true: the plight of the rural community has been well documented. If a select committee is established and members go out into the rural communities all that will happen is that we will raise their expectations. I support the principles and thrust of the motion, but do not think we need to establish a select committee at this stage.

Mr BLACKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

HIRE AND DRIVE YACHTS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Meier:

That regulations under the Boating Act 1974 relating to hire and drive, made on 26 September and laid on the table of this House on 8 October 1991, be disallowed.

(Continued from 24 October. Page 1407.)

Mr McKEE (Gilles): This matter is currently under review by the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. In this instance we are not talking about hiring a boat with a skipper who is a certified sailor with a number of years experience at sea and who would be responsible for his boat and, therefore, responsible for the people who sail with him on that boat. We are talking about the bare boating industry, which is a charter operation and which does include houseboats and boats in the Lake Alexandrina region and charter bare boating from the Port Lincoln region into the Kangaroo Island and Sir Joseph Banks island group. There seemed to be some contentious questions between the two parties concerned, the bare boat charter operations and the Department of Marine and Harbors, in the area of safety.

Safety is something that concerns not only the Government and the Department of Marine and Harbors but also the bare boat operators and, just as importantly, the people who hire the bare boats from the operators and take them out to sea. The bare boat operators are requesting that the Department of Marine and Harbors take note of the Australian Yachting Federation safety regulations. The Department of Marine and Harbors, on the other hand, is setting its own standards of safety, based also on bare boat charter operations in Queensland, which are long and well established because of the Great Barrier Reef, the Airlie Beach and Whitsunday Passage area. The Department of Marine and Harbors has taken note of the standards of the bare boat charter operators in Queensland and has sought to apply them, by regulation, in South Australia. The bare boat charter operators' organisation in South Australia has put submissions to the Subordinate Legislation Committee, suggesting that the Australian Yachting Federation safety standards should be the ones adopted in this boating legislation as regards hire and drive.

Some of the arguments put forward have dealt with yachting all around the world and in one case in particular both parties made a reference to the Fastnet race in the early 1980s, which resulted in the deaths of about 18 sailors. The charter operators are suggesting that if the Yachting Federation standards of safety were applied, as a result of the Fastnet disaster, then the safety standards on boats in South Australia would be uniform with those around the world and with those in other States. On the other hand, the Department of Marine and Harbours also raised the question of the Fastnet operation and said that, had certain safety precautions been taken, had certain sails been used in particular weather and had the crews been of more professional standard, then perhaps the deaths that occurred in that tragedy could have been prevented.

The Subordinate Legislation Committee still has to take further evidence. We are continuing to negotiate on this particular matter. I have done a little bit of sailing myself, and I know that you, Mr Speaker, have also done some sailing, and I often wonder what safety equipment Joshua Slocum would have had on his boat in 1986. However, Government must concern itself with people's safety. That is the bottom line. At sea, all sorts of things can go wrong, and in some cases more than one back-up is needed. Sometimes two are required in order to be adequately and properly safe. If the Government is going to be concerned about human safety at sea it must take its time in constructing these regulations and must make sure that it gets this matter absolutely correct.

Mr BLACKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE LAW AND PRACTICE RELATING TO DEATH AND DYING

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier) brought up the interim report of the select committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Interim report received.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the select committee be extended until Thursday 28 November.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I move:

That Standing Order No. 339 be so far suspended as to enable the select committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it thinks fit, of any evidence presented to the committee prior to such evidence being reported to the House.

Motion carried.

KESAB

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I move:

That this House congratulates KESAB for 25 wonderful years of keeping South Australia beautiful.

As members of Parliament over the years, we receive through the mail, either here at Parliament House or out there in our electorate offices, hundreds of reports not only from Government agencies and statutory authorities but also from other organisations that feel it necessary to keep us informed of what has happened within those organisations over the past year. I think it would be fair to say that, of those hundreds of reports, most of them are given only a cursory glance, because in most cases, with our heavy workload and the huge volume of mail that we receive anyway, apart from

those reports, the endless telephone calls and the number of constituents who come to see us, we cannot deal with anything more. That is not a criticism of other members of the House, because I level it at myself as well.

However, every now and again a report comes over our desk which makes us sit up, take notice and read it thoroughly. I recently received one such report, as I am sure did everyone else. When my colleague the member for Henley Beach congratulated me on putting this motion forward, he said I had just pipped him at the post, because he had intended to move a similar motion in the House. This report, entitled '25: 1966 to 1991—celebrating the first 25 years', prompted this motion to which I am now speaking.

When I contacted KESAB for background information on that organisation, one of the people there (and I will not mention any names because I do not want to embarrass the person concerned) said to me, 'How nice; we at KESAB are always thanking the people of South Australia for being litter conscious and supporting our programs, yet this is the first time someone has said, "Thank you" to us.' I am sure that all members will join me in saying, 'Well done' to KESAB. We support what it is doing in keeping our great State beautiful and litter-free. Perhaps it is easy to say those words, but the facts bear out the reason why we should thank KESAB.

Let me outline to the House the background and history of KESAB. During the mid-1960s roadsides and beach foreshores in South Australia were literally being used as mini rubbish dumps. I well recall that when I came over here as a fresh faced migrant in 1964 with a young family I was appalled, when we went out for drives in the countryside, to see bottles (not so many cans then, because they were not popular) and paper bags, etc., littering our roadside. To be quite honest, it sickened me. It was during that time that the RAA, Adelaide Jaycees and concerned community members conducted a clean-up campaign, which was so successful that a permanent anti-litter campaign was formed. KESAB was incorporated in 1966 and it was one of Australia's first environmental organisations to tackle community education and awareness programs, including schools, local government and corporate sectors.

It might be a good idea to mention those founding members way back in 1966. As I said, there was the Adelaide Junior Chamber of Commerce, *Advertiser* Newspapers, the Australian Glass Manufacturing Company, General Motors-Holden's, Royal Automobile Association and South Australian Brewing Company. They were the cornerstone for what eventually has become an institution here in our State. Noise pollution, litter, illegal dumping and recycling were issues that KESAB promoted, and in the early 1970s it produced a schools ecology kit, which contained environmental information and which was way ahead of its time.

I have come to the conclusion that that was because KESAB targeted our younger citizens—it gave us away because it saw us as people who were prone to throw litter all over the place—and concentrated on the kids to ensure that as they grew up they were litter conscious. In the first eight years, litter was reduced by up to 80 per cent throughout South Australia. The State Government—after, I must admit, considerable persuasion—provided a small annual grant, commencing in the mid-1970s, which has been maintained and which plays a vital part in KESAB's annual budget. Corporate and local government sectors provide membership and sponsorship further to fund KESAB. The list of major sponsors of KESAB reads like the *Who's Who* of South Australian commerce and industry.

Time does not permit me to read them all out. Suffice to say, every area of business is represented, especially those companies whose products contribute to the litter stream. It is important that companies which produce containers which can be thrown away have put their full weight not only morally but financially behind supporting KESAB. I urge all members to read the report. They should go through the first few pages and refresh their minds of those manufacturers and corporate bodies which support KESAB.

Research estimates have determined that KESAB returns to the people of South Australia approximately $8 for every $1 of funding. Based on an income during 1990-91 of $630 000, KESAB has provided a minimum of $5 million to South Australia in environmental education and awareness programs. That does not include the many millions of dollars of community service through Tidy Towns and clean-ups. Arguably, KESAB is the foremost organisation of its type in the world, and South Australia is a unique State to have and support such a body. I am pleased to report that the Government is fully involved in and supportive of KESAB, although I am sure that any additional Government funding of KESAB would be most welcome. Perhaps the Minister might take that to Cabinet during its next budget session.

In this year's annual report, the Chief Executive Officer, Mr John Phillips, on page 10, states:

> KESAB enjoys a mutual working relationship with many State Government agencies. The Department of Environment and Planning provides ongoing support and we thank the Minister, the Hon. Susan Lenehan, for the many events which she personally attends. The South Australian Waste Management Commission and KESAB have had a long working association and during the past 12 months have in many instances joined forces to meet the new challenges of recycling and waste minimisation education and awareness.
>
> KESAB remains confident that by maintaining these valuable working relationships the community at large will benefit and, equally important, the best options and direction will be established for future litter, waste reduction and recycling strategies. Many other departments contribute to joint activities and educational resource support which ensures that additional KESAB campaigns are promoted and achieve success.

One such activity is the use by the Department of Correctional Services of community service orders. In 1990-91, these offenders commenced a program, coordinated by KESAB, to remove roadside litter. This program has since been extended and large quantities of unsightly rubbish have been removed from major arterial roads in the north and south of Adelaide. I understand that this program will be extended over the next 12 months. I am sure that you, Mr Deputy Speaker, like me, when travelling down the Main North Road from Elizabeth to Adelaide, have seen that section of the road having litter removed by people on community service orders. It is good to see that, as the years go by, having removed one lot of rubbish, it takes a much longer time before the rubbish reappears.

There have been numerous initiatives over the years to combat litter and to educate people, and one is certainly worth mentioning. The 'Pack it in' anti-litter campaign, aimed at the South Australian dairy and juice beverage industries, has a specific strategy to reduce the unacceptably high level of beverage carton litter in the waste stream. I am pleased to see from the report that the Minister for Environment and Planning, forever getting up and joining in with those people who are trying to do something to reduce litter, has agreed to have the department monitor progress on that campaign.

Current activities again read in an impressive way. This year there have been 266 Tidy Towns entrants; 41 Conservation in Action School entrants; and a paper bank office paper recycling system collects 30 tonnes of waste paper per

month from the central business district alone. Imagine what could happen if we managed to extend that throughout the major towns in this State. There is an Aboriginal homelands program. I joined the Minister and the member for Stuart at the launch of the PALYA clean-up program in the Pitjantjatjara lands earlier this year. I understand that that has been an outstanding success. I understand that on Sunday the Minister will be naming the winner of that competition. People might ask: how can KESAB, in conjunction with a Government department, convince people in the Aboriginal lands and the homelands that it is worth cleaning up the environment in which they live? The record speaks for itself: it has been very successful.

KESAB is conducting numerous community clean-ups, it promotes radio and television anti-litter advertising campaigns and it conducts school and local government environmental seminars. KESAB is a unique community organisation that has the ability to work with State and local government, corporations, community groups and individuals to improve the quality of life and environment in South Australia. I believe that South Australia can hold its head high as the cleanest State in Australia. However, there is still much to be done in changing social attitudes and behaviour, take-away food and packaging, marketing and so on. KESAB has shown us how and it is up to us to continue to get behind KESAB and encourage it in every possible way. I reiterate that KESAB will keep on keeping South Australia beautiful.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEES

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I move:

That this House calls on the Government to require by 31 March 1992 that each Government department justify the existence of each of its committees and that any committee not so justified be dissolved.

The collation of the material supporting this motion goes back to questions that I first placed on notice on 13 November 1990. When I first gave Ministers notice of my intent, I asked a number of them a series of questions, as follows:

How many formal and how many informal committees exist within the department . . . and in relation to each:

(a) what is the name;
(b) what are the terms of reference;
(c) when was it formed;
(d) when is it expected to achieve its objective; and
(e) to whom does it report?

I am sure that all members would agree that those are fair questions to be asked of any responsible Government that understands and knows how its departments are operating and is in full control of the Government's day-to-day functions. In response I received a wide range of answers, with many Ministers seeking to avoid the issue. For example, I should like to quote from a section of the response that I received from the Minister of Transport. In part, he said:

Unfortunately, the member's question is particularly involved to answer in the detail requested, and it is considered that information obtained could not justify the exercise.

An honourable member: Who was that?

Mr MATTHEW: That was the Minister of Transport. I would have thought that was a pretty important question and, accordingly, that that sort of answer is just not good enough. After receiving that answer, I wonder whether the Minister knows what committees he has in his department and whether, indeed, he does have control. I welcome that Minister's participation in this debate at a later stage. At least that Minister had the courtesy to reply to my question, unlike the Minister of Family and Community Services. That Minister required prompting, and I had to ask a follow-up question to get the answer. Indeed, I placed that follow-up question on notice for Tuesday 29 October 1991. Fortunately that follow-up question did the job and that Minister has finally replied, almost 12 months after the original question was asked.

It is interesting to note that that Minister was the one who took the longest to answer, because I am aware that there was a flurry of activity in the Department for Family and Community Services. I am reliably informed that senior management in that department were issued with an instruction which specifically stated that no new committees were to be formed in that department without the approval of the Chief Executive Officer. Indeed, the reply from that Minister was interesting in itself. I am aware from the Budget and its Impact on Women 1991-92, which is financial information paper No. 5, that in fact there were 25 committees in the Department for Family and Community Services as at 30 June 1991, comprising 140 female and 132 male members. The Minister's reply to me of this week advised that there are only 18 committees. So quite clearly we are already seeing some activity: seven committees have been abolished—assuming that the Minister's reply is accurate—and I have no reason to doubt that.

Other Ministers replied in considerably more detail than the Minister of Transport, and I am please to say in a much shorter timeframe than the Minister of Family and Community Services. From replies received, and from the budget document that I mentioned earlier, my office has been able to establish that a minimum of 550 Government committees exist, comprising at least 4 629 representatives—an average of more than eight people per committee. Leading the list of committees is the Department of Agriculture, which has a grand total of 109 committees, comprising 569 male and 82 female representatives. Even more staggering is the fact that, as at 30 June 1991, that department had only 738 full-time employees. Almost every full-time employee in that department was probably on a committee. It looks as though the job has been shared around. The attitude is that, if someone is not on a committee, perhaps a new one should be formed. I will be interested to hear that Minister participate in this debate at a later stage.

It is interesting to look at the number of committees in existence in some departments as against the number that were in existence 12 months ago. Some interesting figures come up. Leading the list on this occasion is the Minister for Environment and Planning. From the budget documents, I have been able to establish that the Minister for Environment and Planning, in just 12 months, has created a grand total of 67 committees in that department. The figures are contained in the budget documents. The Minister cannot deny that and, if she does, she would be misleading the Parliament through the budget documents. I state again: 67 committees in just 12 months. The Department of Mines and Energy has done reasonably well, too. That department has created another 22 committees in the past 12 months.

I will not stand here and say that there is not a need for some Government committees: of course there is a need for some committees to enable constructive debate, exchange of information and collation and research of material. However, how many committees do we need? Do we need the number of people we presently have on them, and do some of them really need to exist? I am aware that there are committees such as the Buildings and Accommodation Strategic Plan Committee, the Advisory Committee on the Banning of Persons from Precious Stones Fields, the Fishing

Havens Advisory Panel, the State Manning Committee, the Berth and Terminal Productivity Committee, the Climate Change Committee, the Roadside Vegetation Committee, the Biologoical Survey Coordinating Committee, the Stormwater Drainage Subsidy Scheme Advisory Committee, the State Management Committee for the Review of Residential Standards, the Urban Development Coordinating Committee and so on. It may well be that some of those committees in themselves are justified, but their existence needs to be justified and controlled. It is perfectly reasonable to expect them to have an aim, an objective, a starting date, a finishing date, and someone to report to and a constant examination of the continuing need for their existence.

The other aspect that I considered was the actual cost of these committees. From the replies from some of the Ministers, I have been able to establish that these committees must be costing taxpayers at least $8 million per annum. To illustrate that point, I will focus, as an example, on the Department of Environment and Planning. At the time the Minister replied to me at the end of 1990, it had 56 committees—indeed, it had more than that as at 30 June with a total of 520 members. The cost of these committees, as admitted to me by the Minister in writing, is at least $785 000, plus the cost of the salaries of Government members who serve on them.

Some specific examples of committees within that department are: the Climate Change Committee, which I mentioned earlier, which meets monthly and which has 27 members and a budgeted servicing cost of $90 000 per annum; the Roadside Vegetation Committee, which meets every two months, comprises five members and costs $5 022 per annum; the Aboriginal Heritage Committee, which meets four times a year, has five members and costs $6 000 per annum. The Native Vegetation Authority, which meets monthly, has five members and costs $26 300 per annum and the Northern Gateway Committee, which meets as needed, has 14 members and costs in excess of $40 000 per annum. The costs of these committees include administrative support, salaries and also session fees to some members. For example, the Chairman of the Native Vegetation Authority is paid $121 per four hour session, with other members being paid $101 per session.

It is important that each committee has strict guidelines, including a reporting date and a date on which their work will be completed. However, the Bannon Government in this State has failed to make decisions during its term of office. I contend that it has simply been deferring those decisions to committees, which continue to run around in circles. It is all too easy to avoid making a decision and to handball it to a committee in an attempt to bury the issue or look for consensus of opinion. Committees might run around in circles for years on end, absorbing taxpayers' money like a sponge, but in the end not necessarily achieving anything.

Mr Venning: It's all too hard.

Mr MATTHEW: As the member for Custance says, perhaps it is all too hard. Certainly, it has all been too hard for many of the Ministers to respond to me in the detail I requested. Certainly, it was all too hard for the Minister of Family and Community Services to reply to me within a reasonable time-frame. Two questions and almost 12 months later, I finally extracted a response. It is perfectly reasonable for South Australians to want an accountable Government, and this Government must start with accountability in respect of its committees while at the same time reducing them to a more realistic number.

I look forward to hearing contributions from other members in this debate. The member for Napier may well think it is all a big yawn, but I can assure him that the taxpayer does not. This is an important issue that needs to be debated and exposed. I apologise to the member for Napier if he was yawning because of the late hour that we kept last night, but this is a very important issue that needs to be pursued. I look forward to his participation in this debate later.

In closing, I repeat that South Australia wants an accountable Government. This Government can start with its committees and demonstrate to South Australians that it is prepared to cut back, to be constructive in its approach to Government and to ensure that we have an efficient, cost-effective Government. I welcome the continued debate of this motion, and I commend it to the House.

Mr FERGUSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

LANDCARE AUSTRALIA LIMITED

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I move:

That this House records its appreciation to the numerous rural community groups who have wholeheartedly supported Landcare in South Australia.

I am not telling the House anything new when I say that the concept of the need to care for land has been an integral part of land management in South Australia for over 50 years. That is a pretty conservative figure; those who come from the land could argue that land management has been followed in South Australia since the days of the first settlement. But it was not until 1989 that the concept of land care was introduced with the establishment of the community land care subprogram of the National Soil Conservation Program and the declaration of 1990 as the Year of Landcare to commence the Decade of Landcare. Those programs and declarations were designed to increase community awareness of the concept and need for a land care ethic. Landcare Australia Limited was established in 1990 with complementary national and State management committees to raise awareness during the decade.

I will now outline to the House my reason for moving this motion. I have high regard for the member for Custance, a successful farmer and well-known member of the rural community. He did not get his farm and his millions from an inheritance; he worked for it, and he is a proven farmer. However, the member for Custance made a comment during the Estimates Committee concerning land care that I found to be rather strange. He said:

> There is too little assistance with capital costs associated with soil conservation works—for example, contour banking, building dams and, generally, any earthworks. That is what I thought soil conservation was all about. We should be putting the money into the projects to save the soil. It must not be lost on the way in administration costs. We should not be putting out glossy brochures just to tell the voting population in the cities what a grand job the Federal and State Governments are doing in relation to soil conservation. The money needs to be spent on the ground, in the ground. I was very heartened at the comments that the Minister made.

I was rather rude at that time and interjected by saying, 'There has to be an education process, though', and the member for Custance confirmed the need for that process. If that is what a prominent farmer in this State thinks land care is all about—capital works and a minor education process—he has it all wrong. Land care is not a vehicle designed to win votes in urban cities for this State Government and the Federal Government: that is not what it is all about.

Mr Lewis: Not much!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I will ignore the member for Murray-Mallee, because he is obviously one of those people who are paranoid about State Labor Governments. He is also paranoid about anything environmental; he is very paranoid about the Minister for Environment and Planning, but that is his problem, not mine. Education is a basic part of land care and community support of land care. After three years, approximately 180 soil conservation boards have been established together with land care groups, tree planting groups and communities of common concern throughout Australia, not only in country areas but in city areas as well.

In 1991-92, a total of 41 land care group projects will be supported by grants worth approximately $434 000. Additional funding will be provided under Billion Trees, Save the Bush and the Natural Resources Management Strategy for the Murray-Darling Basin. Are the member for Custance and the member for Murray-Mallee saying that all of those organisations are stacked with left wing radicals from the Labor Party? Of course they are not: they are serviced by genuine South Australians who want to do something about our soil in order to preserve it and to get the best from it.

Projects that will be undertaken include: the surveying and monitoring of land degradation problems; demonstrations of preventive or remedial works; and field days and workshops on issues such as dry land salinity, water and wind erosion, and farm planning. On practically every field day an officer from Landcare is out there telling the farmers—and working in conjunction with them—the best way to go about things. The Landcare magazine comes out on a regular basis and publishes reports from ordinary farmers about what is happening in their community. If they want assistance, Landcare Australia provides it.

To support land care groups, 10 Landcare officers have been appointed to all regions of the State. They are not fifth columnists spreading the Labor Party's message in the rural community; they are people who are concerned about land care. Soil conservation boards have been encouraged to form in order to provide a structure for the land care program. Final negotiations are under way for the formation of a board in the Lower South-East that will provide coverage of all the agricultural and pastoral regions of this State, and the State Government will provide $245 000 for the operation of the Soil Conservation Council and boards during 1991-92.

I ask members opposite to look at the formation of the State management committee, which is headed by Mrs Barbara Hardy, AO, not exactly a left wing radical Labor Party member—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: A great citizen.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: —but a great South Australian citizen, as the Minister says. So, it is not a front for the Labor Party as the member for Murray-Mallee says. I think Mrs Barbara Hardy would object totally to being tied up as a fellow traveller with the Labor Party.

The State management committee is supported by seven sub-committees covering the areas of communications and promotions, education and schools, government departments, local government, primary industry, commerce and industry, and community resource groups. In other words, the committee is getting everyone involved so they can play their part in preserving the land on which we live and which provides us with a major source of food and income—and those two things go very much together.

The State management committee has prepared a guide for potential land care groups to bring in more people; compiled a register of land care groups and projects, which currently number 188 in this State; and produced a personal action guide to assist urban people to adopt the land care ethic. Too often we hear, 'You city folk don't know what it's like out here in the country.' I have no problem with that whatsoever. This is why it is all there—to make the city people understand the problems of soil erosion and conservation in country areas. Projects are under way just south of my electorate, in the Cobblers Creek area where soil erosion has been severe over the years. The management committee has produced a booklet to assist groups to deal with the media and gain effective media publicity—to sell the message, to get it across. It has also established and administered a seed fund of $30 000 which was set up by the Minister of Agriculture and which provides $200 to assist groups to become established. This is not a vast amount of money but gives them something to put in the kitty to get them up and running. The management committee also runs the South Australian section of the National Landcare Awards.

The Kids for Landcare program, to get young children involved, was commenced in June 1990 and is now a cooperative program between the Department of Education and the Department of Agriculture. Already there are achievements in the area, such as the establishment of 26 centres of excellence. These schools serve as bankers for schools in their districts providing direction and funding for Landcare projects. The funds injected by the Education Department in this regard total $715 000, again to get youngsters in city schools involved. There was the production of a Kids for Landcare curriculum support kit which was distributed to all Government and non-government schools in South Australia and which was also sought by many interstate organisations.

Once again, South Australia is showing how it can be done. We have a proven record in our farming techniques (to which I referred earlier this morning) and in letting people know. That curriculum support kit is currently being expanded and will go who knows where—we might be able to assist overseas people. The program has also attained levels in land care as an integral part of the environment curriculum and the integration of Landcare issues into all new syllabuses. Again, that is part of the education program and something that should be supported and encouraged in this House. There is a register of Landcare schools and Landcare network which provides information on Landcare activities in over 300 schools. So, in three years 300 schools have become actively involved in Landcare. There is also saltwatch, which involved 110 schools participating in the collection and mapping of salinity information. Again, that is a very important part of Landcare.

I do not claim to be an expert in this area, and I do not think that members opposite would expect me to be. However, I do know the problems in our State caused by salinity. The achievement of getting youngsters involved in this can only be congratulated. The program has provided information to teachers and students and a resource and contact list for teachers in the classroom. Also, widespread media attention on Landcare activities across the State has been achieved through these programs.

Promotional literature, which I mentioned earlier, includes the *Landcare News*, a bi-monthly eight-page newsletter with a mailing list already in excess of 5 000 people. That publication is not propaganda but provides information from ordinary people in different regions who say what they are doing in the hope that others can learn from it. The member for Custance, by nodding, agrees with what I have said about Landcare.

Promotion support activities also include the production of four major display units and other displays to meet

specific needs for Landcare groups; the production of brochures on Landcare, dry land salinity and property planning; and displays at that great event of the year which you, Sir, and I attend—the Royal Show—and at major field days, country shows, conferences, seminars and other relevant community venues. At such functions there is always a display by Landcare telling the community what it is doing, that its activities are good for the State and asking people to join in. I hope that this motion will see a speedy resolution, and I urge all members to support it.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I congratulate the member for Napier on moving this very interesting, delicate and topical motion which concerns Landcare. I appreciate his bipartisan approach to this issue but point out that he did take me to task in relation to comments I made during the Estimates Committee. There is only so much money to go around, and all those promotion support activities such as *Landcare News* and brochures involving advertising and PR, that were mentioned by the member for Napier in his final comments, soak up valuable dollars that could be used for capital works.

The member for Napier raised many interesting facts and figures, but the people on the land do not need to be reminded of their obligations in relation to land care. I cannot see the point in producing glossy brochures and other papers that cost a lot of money—the razzamatazz extravaganzas. The Prime Minister visited the Riverland for the planting of a million trees just to promote Landcare, but the people involved already know of their obligations. In many ways we led the world in the 1930s, particularly in terms of soil conservation, contour banks—

Mr Blacker interjecting:

Mr VENNING: As the member for Flinders says, I was not around in the 1930s. But I am aware of what happened, because I know those who were heavily involved with the Department of Agriculture at that time, and I have read the history books. I pay tribute to the many soil scientists of years gone by and to what they did.

The people of South Australia do not need to be reminded of their serious obligation to the soil. There are only so many dollars to go around and, if we spend that money on promotion, capital works will be sacrificed. We can do many more things in relation to land care; there is a very wide sphere. The progress that has been made since the 1960s has been tremendous. I cite a couple of projects that have been very good value for money in the Mid North, one being the Narridy Creek scheme funded by the Government. All the farmers in the area were involved. A plan was drawn up and the scheme was brought together under the Department of Agriculture for the soil, water and erosion management of that area. Ten years ago, because of water run-off, roads would be cut every time it rained, but today we are keeping the water on the properties and not experiencing the problems of the past.

The Pissant Creek project near Gladstone had similar success. It involved major earth works to the flat areas to the north and north-east of Gladstone which were subject to flooding. By digging channels to move the water into certain areas, we solved this very serious erosion problem. These were up-front and unashamedly Government projects. Through its advisers the Government sought out the projects. It consulted with people on the ground, found out where the priorities were and then said to the farmers that they would have a meeting and be told what to do. There are always two or three in a group who are reticent about becoming involved, as was the case with the Pissant Creek scheme. The Government, through its advisers, got the whole thing rolling.

Debate adjourned.

YOUTH DETENTION CENTRE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Oswald:

That this House expresses its dissatisfaction with the reply by the Minister of Family and Community Services which was given to the member for Morphett on Tuesday 8 October when he required a deferral of the plans for the proposed Youth Detention Centre at Cavan until after the Select Committee on Juvenile Justice has had an opportunity to address the subject and calls on the Government to withdraw the plans from the Public Works Standing Committee so as not to pre-empt any deliberations by the select committee.

(Continued from 10 October. Page 1073.)

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): A couple of weeks ago I spent some minutes explaining the background to my motion, but unfortunately 12 o'clock came and I was unable to complete my remarks. I shall conclude my remarks today and I am sure that someone on the Government side of the Chamber will then secure the adjournment of the debate. To refresh the memories of members as to the importance of this motion, I shall highlight a couple of major parts of it. There is public concern, and certainly concern amongst members on both sides of the House and members in another place, that the final plans for the new replacement facility for the youth detention centre at Magill (SAYTC) that is being planned for Cavan should be referred to the Select Committee on Juvenile Justice.

The matter was referred to the Public Works Standing Committee and the committee is considering the plans at the moment. My motion seeks the referral of those plans also to the Select Committee on Juvenile Justice. If the Government does not do so, one has to question the motives of the Government in setting up the select committee. I do not want to be uncharitable about the Government's motives for setting up the committee. There is bipartisan support for the committee and we hope it succeeds and comes down with a new model for juvenile justice in this State, a model that can be used across the Commonwealth. However, to have a $14 million project about to commence, a project that was put together under the old philosophies in relation to juvenile justice, and for the Government to set up a select committee on juvenile justice but then not refer those plans to that committee rings of the Government setting up the select committee for political purposes and of not trying to get to the root cause of the problem.

It is my desire, and I know it is the desire of many members, that the Select Committee on Juvenile Justice have the opportunity to look at the plans for the Cavan youth detention centre. At the end of the day members of the committee might be in total agreement with the plans and say that they are excellently thought out plans, that the philosophies that are now linked with the treatment of children who have offended fit comfortably with the plans. That might be the final result, but we have to be given the opportunity. I believe that the Minister displayed a level of arrogance when he responded to a question that I asked in this House some weeks ago. He scoffed at the question, as if to say how dare anyone in the House even question the plans that were being put forward for the Cavan centre, and how dare anyone from the Opposition ask that the plans be referred to the Select Committee on Juvenile Justice.

Some members may have difficulties with the form of words that I have used in my motion, but I would have no difficulty if that form of words was changed, provided that

at the end of the day the end result was that the report of the Public Works Standing Committee was referred to the select committee for its consideration before any capital works actually begin and we see the bricks and mortar work begin. It is not an unreasonable request. I hope that all members in the Chamber support the motion, to ensure that the committee does have an opportunity to comment on those plans.

I ask members to consider the motives behind my motion. This should not be treated as a political exercise. I believe that some members of the Government and the Cabinet perhaps consider that this has been a political exercise. Indeed, some members of the department might think it is a political exercise. However, that is not so. This is a public recognition that the Select Committee on Juvenile Justice is there for a specific task. If we are going to back the select committee and its work we must give it an opportunity to comment on the plans. For the Government not to do this would be to ignore the select committee, and the public could quite rightly question why the select committee is there at all and why the Government is about to embark on a $14 million project to build the institution but is not interested in the views of the select committee. I ask all members to support the motion and/or amendment that might come forward which will ensure that the select committee does have an opportunity to comment on the report from the Public Works Standing Committee.

Mr M.J. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

COUNTER RECESSIONARY PACKAGE

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.H. Hemmings:

That this House calls on the Federal Government to implement a counter recessionary package aimed at providing employment and training opportunities bringing forward major infrastructure programs and expanding initiatives announced in the March Industry Statement.

(Continued from 10 October. Page 1074.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I want to make a few comments on this motion put forward by the member for Napier (Mr Hemmings), and to comment in particular on his lack of success—which really is not surprising. I note that in his presentation he talked about the need for the March Industry Statement to be implemented as quickly as possible. He also spent a considerable time saying that the Minister of Employment and Further Education's 12-point plan was the main issue and that he was disappointed that that 12-point plan was not taken up by the Federal Government.

One of the major problems with the March Industry Statement was that it did not look at the real issue. We need to have a total reform package economically, which includes all of the issues that were put forward in that statement. Further, we need to recognise that there has to be significant labour market reform. As has been demonstrated by the Keating method over the last nine years, we cannot purely and simply deregulate the financial market and expect all the other parts involved in the total economic package to work as separate identities. In any reform package we need to ensure that there is financial market reform, that there is labour market reform and that any such package is positive.

The tragedy of the March Industry Statement is the fact that tariff policy has become the major implementation part of the package. Because there are no other reform packages going along with it at the same time, we have ended up putting at jeopardy the automotive industry in this State, and in Australia generally. Almost certainly we have set in train the demise of the textile, clothing and footwear industry in this State and nationally.

As far as our State is concerned, the two important industries affected by this industry statement are the automotive industry and the textile and clothing industry. I find it quite amazing that a Government that historically has been arguing that the rights of workers and the protection and general welfare of workers constituted its main platform should advocate a tariff policy program which will almost certainly guarantee that a majority of its supporters will be put out of work. There has been no attempt at all to recognise that tariff policy and labour market reform go hand in hand. There is this absolute, blind obsession among members opposite and the Government, at both State and Federal levels, who believe that we need to deregulate all the markets, except that we cannot have labour market reform.

Only in the past few days has there been an inkling that the Labor Party might now recognise that enterprise bargaining, or some type of move away from the industry-type bargaining and decision making we have had historically, might be the way to go. It is only just poking its head through the surface on the other side of the House. Liberal Party members have been saying for the past 15 years that we need to reform the total economic picture. It has been said by members opposite that we are interested in tariff reform and that our policies are very similar to those of the Labor Party. Yes; we are very similar in the tariff area, but the big difference between the two Parties is that we recognise that we cannot have part economic reform: it must be a total package.

We must make sure that, if we are to reduce tariffs at the rapid rate that Government currently wants, we must have flexibility in the labour market. We cannot insist on manufacturers, now and in the future, continuing all the old hat ways of bargaining and on retaining all the old hat agreements built into current cost structures at the same time as telling those manufacturers that they must bring down their costs, because we will let all the competition come in from overseas. We just cannot do one without the other.

If we are to compete, we must recognise that people on both sides of the equation—the ownership side, which invests and gets profit, and the labour side, which invests its work and involvement in the marketplace—must give and take. We cannot say to the ownership and investment side that it will have to become more competitive and put in money but tell the other side that it is all take and there is no give. So we must make sure that award conditions and agreements become more flexible. There will be some winners and some losers in that program and in certain industries the current labour costs will be too high and will have to come down. However, on the other side of the coin, there will be some significant winners, and we must make sure that the marketplace can actually work as a marketplace and not purely and simply as a controlled system that we currently have. We believe on this side that the motion moved by the member for Napier is only a half-hearted attempt to correct the position. We believe that it should not be supported and, as a consequence, I believe that the motion should be opposed.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I am amazed by the member for Bragg's comments, and I am surprised that he should try to turn this matter into a union bashing exercise. This is a bipartisan proposition and should be supported by every person in this House. Employees in this city are being put off daily. This is a proposition that needs to be addressed by the Federal Government, and I am surprised

that the member for Bragg, who is supposed to support small business, has used this debate to introduce his policies on industrial relations, rather than getting behind the member for Napier's proposal to put to the Federal Government a package that will get this State up and running.

We have already heard this morning the member for Custance talking about the problems in the rural industry. Surely, the member for Custance will support this proposition, which will help get country towns, which are suffering from recession and depression, up and running. For example, I would have thought that the member for Napier's motion about decreasing interest rates would be supported by every person in this Parliament. Of course, we want to decrease interest rates, but what do we hear from the member for Bragg? He advances theories about what ought to be happening in the labour market.

Those theories are already in practice in New Zealand, where the economy has been absolutely put through the floor. The proposition put forward by the business people in New Zealand was on exactly the same lines as those the member for Bragg referred to a few moments ago, and has that brought prosperity to that country? It has not. All it has done is cause misery in some areas of New Zealand and that is the sort of thing that the very rich, the right wing and people who support the H.R. Nichols Society want to do to this State. They want to get out and exploit those people in industry who are unable to support themselves, by introducing enterprise bargaining, following the theory that those people are on a level playing field with the employers. I have never heard of anything so ridiculous. Employers, whether they own a chemist shop or whether they are in control of a very large business, have all the power that they need over their own employees. They have the right to hire and fire at will; they have the right to promote and demote; they have the right to increase or decrease wages; they have the right to provide bonuses and additional holidays; in fact, they can do almost anything they like with an employee.

So, if an employer starts bargaining with employees as to whether or not they should lose their lunch hour, what do we think the employees will do? Employees want to take the unions out of that equation. They want to take out the protection that the unions have delivered for well over 100 years in this country, and they want to be able to reduce those employees to serfdom. We are going backwards with the proposals suggested by the member for Bragg. Fortuitously, I have been given a contract of employment that is apparently being negotiated in Adelaide at present under the present set of industrial conditions. It is a contract that has been drawn up for a group called 'Caterquip Pty Ltd', of 14-16 Commercial Street, Marleston, South Australia 5023.

Apparently this contract has been given to the employees of that organisation. This is the sort of system that the member for Bragg wants to introduce in South Australia. I will read some of the conditions of the contract. The employee has to supply a medical history. I consider that some of the information that this organisation wants employees to give is private and personal. It reads as follows:

1. Are you being treated by a doctor for any illness?
   YES/NO .....
2. Are you taking regular medication from any doctor?
   YES/NO .....
3. Have you had any operations?
   YES/NO .....
4. Have you ever suffered from:
   (a) Wheezing or Bronchitis?
   (b) Diabetes (Sugar)?
   YES/NO .....
   (c) Blood pressure or Heart disease?
   YES/NO .....
   (d) Stomach pains or Ulcers?
   YES/NO .....
   (e) Excessive noise exposure?
   YES/NO .....
   (f) Skin disorders?
   YES/NO .....
   (g) Chronic ear infections?
   YES/NO .....
   (h) Fits or blackouts?
   YES/NO .....
   (i) Head injuries/Concusssion?
   YES/NO .....
   (j) Hernia?
   YES/NO .....
   (k) Allergies?
   YES/NO .....
5. Have you any trouble with your:
   (a) Back?
   YES/NO .....
   (b) Wrists/Elbows?
   YES/NO .....
   (c) Ankles/Knees?
   YES/NO .....
6. Have you had an industrial accident or disease?
   YES/NO .....
7. Have you ever claimed or received workers compensation?
   YES/NO .....
   If yes, state:
   (a) The date of the claim or payment:

So it goes on. With these contracts we are making it virtually impossible for anybody who has had an injury or is disabled in any way to obtain employment. That will be part and parcel of the introduction of the contracts that the member for Bragg—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I know this will upset the Opposition, but this is the sort of proposition that South Australia will face if the member for Bragg has his way and introduces these contracts and the sort of negotiation that will have to go on with an all-powerful employer. Imagine the proprietor of a chemist shop dealing with a 16 year old who is just about to be employed as a shop assistant. He comes from school, merely wanting a job and having no knowledge of the previous conditions of that industry. What will he do against a big and powerful employer with unemployment now stretching towards 11 per cent? He will sign on the dotted line a contract which has all these features in it. We are talking about not only personal, intimate medical records but also conditions that insist, for example, that any staff member who drives a motor vehicle negligently or not in accordance with company rules will be responsible for the cost of the repair of that vehicle. I doubt whether an employee starting with such an organisation would know what the company rules were regarding the use of motor vehicles. If, as part of the contract of employment, the employee has to drive a motor vehicle around, that is a most unfair proposition. People are exploiting the fact that we have 11 per cent unemployment in South Australia.

The member for Napier has put forward this motion in an attempt to relieve the unemployment situation. I should have thought that members opposite would be glad to support this motion, particularly if they come from small business. The motion that the member for Napier has put before the House is receiving serious consideration. This matter has been taken up by the ACTU. I understand that the ACTU charter includes locking in inflation at low levels

with sustainable lower interest rates, creating a national industry and infrastructure development, and investment funds for all institutional investors involved. This is for both the private and public sectors.

I would find it very strange if anybody from the private sector did not support this motion. I understand that Federal Cabinet is now looking at this proposal. Any pressure that can be applied by the States will be of assistance in providing employment for South Australia and for other States. Therefore, it ought to be supported. The ACTU wants to establish clear and consistent environmental guidelines to enable development projects to proceed. We need standardisation of the railway line between Adelaide and Melbourne and we need to start it tomorrow.

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

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

ENTERPRISE BARGAINING

Adjourned debate on motion of Mrs Hutchison:

That this House applauds moves by the Government to ensure that trade unions are involved in the development of enterprise bargaining arrangements and declares its opposition to any attempt to implement legislation similar to the Employment Contracts Act recently introduced in New Zealand and, further, this House calls on the Federal Parliament to resist any moves to implement such legislation at the national level.

(Continued from 10 October. Page 1076).

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): This is a two part motion. The first part of the motion deals with the need for the union movement to be involved in industrial agreements. We support that action. The second part refers to the rejection of employers' agreements as introduced in New Zealand. As a matter of principle, we oppose that on the ground that we need to look at all options available to us as a developing community. The inference from the first part of the motion is that the Opposition is opposed to the union movement being involved in negotiations at industrial level.

The Opposition is not opposed to that. We are opposed to the union movement's domination as the only logical negotiator for a workplace in which a number of employees are involved. Experience around the world and in this State is that large numbers of contracts between employers and employees do not involve the union movement as negotiators, nor do they need it to be involved. The view put forward by the member for Stuart clearly argues that the union movement should be involved in negotiations. We oppose that proposition. We believe that that sort of attitude is outdated and should be replaced by an arrangement in which employees at enterprise level get together with employers and work out conditions which suit them.

There have been many examples of that in small business for years. The award conditions affecting small business have in the majority of instances come about as a result of flow-on agreements in other industries. Very few award conditions that apply to most small businesses have been negotiated, and that is one of the biggest problems in this country today. Small business needs flexibility to negotiate up and down as profitability rises and falls. It is a fact of business life that there are seasonal and yearly changes with increases and decreases in profitability. Small business in particular needs minimum award conditions relating to salaries, holiday, sick pay and everything else up for grabs, depending on the profitability and success of the business. There is no point in arguing for conditions that guarantee small business does not expand.

As the member for Coles has said many times in this place, if we put one more employee in every small business around this country, we will virtually have no unemployment problem. Every time we shackle small business with award conditions which prevent it from negotiating within a framework of success in its own business, we make it more difficult for it to become the larger business of tomorrow which ought to be encouraged.

The union movement has a role to play in advising employees of small businesses how they should negotiate their contract. That has always been Liberal Party policy. If those who have looked at the New Zealand Employment Contracts Act are honest, instead of bringing back stories, they will say that the union movement, if it gets off its backside and becomes part of the modern employment system, will still have an important role to play in both small and large business.

The second part of the motion is a direct criticism of employment contracts in New Zealand. I wish that a few more Government members would go to New Zealand to look at the employment contract system, so that they could come back and place on record the real position. The New Zealand legislation provides that there should be minimum conditions of pay, minimum holiday and sick pay and other standard requirements below which no industry can go. Unions can become involved in contract negotiations if they can get the support of the employees within that enterprise. There is no restriction on the union movement's becoming involved. The legislation says that, if members of the union movement want to get off their bronze and sell their expertise to the workers, they are quite able to do it. Any group of individuals can sell their expertise to the employees in the development of these contracts. The New Zealand legislation does not say that the union movement cannot or should not be involved. The paranoia of a few union leaders who will lose the coziness of directing industry from their office is causing all the concern.

The New Zealand unions that have decided to accept the employment contracts system are in the marketplace today offering the professional services that they are so good at, that is, the ability to negotiate on behalf of employees. That is a fact of life in New Zealand today. If union leaders want to get off their bronze and do something about it, the opportunity is there for them to do so. If they decide that they want to become involved, they are able to do so. However, the lazy union leaders do not want to get involved because it is too hard, and they are concerned that they might actually have to work for the money they are paid by the employee members. The union leaders might have to do a decent day's work, instead of creating the strikes and manipulating the system from the office. They should get out into the workplace and do a good job, which is what the better union leaders have been doing in this country for years.

The manipulators of the employee movement, who have been pulling the strings, have been operating it from their office instead of getting out into the workplace. They are in that comfort zone, which is no longer available under the New Zealand legislation. That comfort zone should be removed from this country as well. There is no reason why employer and employee associations should not earn the dollars they take from their member as their representative. There is an opportunity in New Zealand for every union to become involved in the enterprise contracts, if they so desire. It is up to the unions to get into each enterprise and convince the employees that they are the best representative.

If they cannot do that, they should not be in business, in any case. If they can do it, it is in the best interests of the employees and the employers.

Mrs Hutchison interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: It is: it is in the best interests of both. It is interesting that the member opposite wanted to particularly note that I said that it was in the interests of employers. Perhaps we ought to recognise that unless there are employers there will be no employees, and unless there is a decent relationship between employers and employees, there will be no business. We cannot have one side dominating and the other side not receiving a fair go: both sides must have a fair go. In this country, and in New Zealand prior to this Act, there was not a fair go.

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

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I would be disappointed if the member for Bragg got up and did not give a union bashing speech. Ever since he has been in this House, his speeches have been sprinkled with what one might call a 'union-bashing' tone. I would like to see, when a speech is made to the House, the full facts put to members.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: Get back in your straitjacket. The member for Bragg has suggested that the new New Zealand legislation has been introduced with all due fairness to unions and that unions can be involved in the formation of the new contracts in relation to New Zealand. Obviously, when the member for Bragg went to New Zealand to look at the system, he walked around with his eyes shut. Every impediment is put in the way of unions in their attempt to look after their members under this new system in New Zealand. For example, all unions have lost their right of entry into the workplace. How can a union consult with its members if its representatives—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I would just like to illuminate for the member for Bragg what the New Zealand legislation means. Even if the workers ask for a union official to come into the workplace, under the New Zealand legislation he can be excluded from doing so. He or she has no right of entry into the workplace in New Zealand. So, to piously stand up in this House and say that this is not anti-union legislation is something I find hard to understand.

Members interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I wish the member for Murray-Mallee would take his medicine.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Murray-Mallee is out of order. Also, the member for Napier was out of order when he made those noises.

Mr FERGUSON: It is not only the trade union movement that is concerned about the legislation that now applies to the industrial scene in New Zealand. I refer to what I consider to be an independent body that has actually made a statement in relation to this proposition. The New Zealand Catholic Bishops' Conference said, in relation to this legislation:

> This is an economistic approach which the church views with grave concern, because it puts capital and resources alone at the centre of economic activity, and considers human labour solely according to its economic purpose.

That sums up the proposition that the Liberal Party is trying to introduce into this State. It is the sort of legislation that does away with human consideration and refers solely to the economic purposes of the people concerned. They go on to say:

> This legislative change is not simply a technical issue. It involves ethics and morality. The question must be asked what the new legislation does to people and society, to human dignity and the common good. As Bishops of New Zealand, we must speak against this proposed legislation as its underlying ideology is contrary to the social doctrines of the church.

This body of people is not involved with industrial regulation or the day-to-day issues of industry and how it should be regulated, but it has cast a judgment on this proposed legislation because it realises that its introduction will merely mean the exploitation of labour. We now have in this country an unemployment rate of 11 per cent.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: We cannot even get support from the member for Bragg when we try to introduce proposals to do something about this problem. One of the greatest adversaries of this legislation in New Zealand has been schoolteachers. Schoolteachers have led the labour movement in New Zealand in opposition to this particular legislation. That is unusual because, in the past, schoolteachers to a certain extent have been very conservative, but now they are in the forefront of the labour movement, particularly in New Zealand where schoolteachers supported a 24-hour stoppage to protest about this legislation. More than 250 000 people showed their opposition to this legislation on the streets of Wellington. New Zealand is a small country, so to have 250 000 people on the streets is amazing. This demonstration was bigger than the one against the Vietnam War. There were more people on the streets of Wellington demonstrating against this legislation than demonstrated against the Vietnam War. That is how bad the situation is.

If this legislation is introduced into this country, we will see the deliberate exploitation of women in particular. I was extremely pleased to hear the interjection from the member for Coles who corrected me about trade union officials being both men and women; so, this proposed legislation from her own Party must concern her, because more than anyone else it exploits women who are in the weakest position to bargain. Women take on most of the part-time jobs.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FERGUSON: Women are employed in clerical and service areas. Recently, I was able to listen in to a contract that was being negotiated by a young lady seeking employment in a hotel. It was made very clear to her that the employer wanted her there at the times he stipulated. There was no reference to an award, and if he wanted her there for 12 hours a day she would have to do that. What is more, she would be paid at normal hourly rates. If that is not exploitation of women, I do not know what is.

Surely, the member for Coles would not support that proposition if that is what is intended to be introduced into this country. The Liberal Party wants employers to be able to negotiate with their staff on a one-to-one basis, which is most unfair. The employer has all the power. Can you imagine the manager of a department store talking on an equal basis with a young lady requesting employment as a shop assistant? Of course, it would not be equal, because the manager would have all the power. Under the system, he would have the right to hire and fire and to pay her what he liked. Provided they came to an agreement, he could pay her what he liked with no regard to an award or anything else. Make no mistake: that is what is happening right now in New Zealand. If the member for Bragg does not believe me, he should hop on a plane and go over there to see the results of what has happened in the past six months. Whole areas of unemployment have been created because of the lack of spending power by those people who have the ability to buy goods even from small businessmen such as the member for Bragg. If he had a chemist shop in New Zealand—

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

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

UNITED STATES WHEAT SUBSIDIES

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.H. Hemmings:

That this House supports the action by the Australian Government over its strong criticism of the United States Government's decision to further undermine the viability of Australian wheat farmers by subsidising that country's wheat exports to China and the Yemen.

which Mr Lewis has moved to amend by leaving out all words after 'supports the action' and inserting the words:

of the Australian Government in advocating a 'fairer playing field' in world trade in the Uruguay Round of GATT negotiations, and regrets the consequences of the trade war now being waged by the United States Government against the European Economic Community and other subsidised agricultural export producers which has had a detrimental effect on the viability of Australian farmers by weakening the markets for their products, and calls on the Australian Government to abandon the 'high relative interest rate/high dollar' fiscal policy, allowing the Australian dollar to fall to its natural lower exchange rate, thereby restoring higher farm gate prices and viability to our farmers.

(Continued from 10 October. Page 1077.)

Mr LEWIS (Murray Mallee): The motion as it is worded after my amendment is negative, destructive and unconstructive. It is negative because it does not state anything positive. It is destructive because it attacks an otherwise essential international relationship between us as a nation and our most powerful ally. It is an inappropriate proposition for this Parliament to consider simply because it does not really say anything helpful or positive. Having understood the sentiments that the member for Napier conveyed when I heard his speech supporting this proposition, I believed that it would be better to restate the opinion of the House to incorporate things that are constructive and positive and will contribute to a better understanding of how we should proceed in the future.

I hope that I have made it plain to members that the solution to our problems in relation to trade, especially wheat, relies on our being able to get a fairer playing field in world trade in the Uruguay Round. That is what is important. We do not need to antagonise our natural allies in that process and the people who have been mischievous, miscreant and misdirected in their policies to date, but to encourage them to see the positive benefits of adopting a stance in their advocacy of and involvement in international trade, which will provide a fairer playing field for all people who live on this earth. That will take us in the direction of peace and greatest efficiency and, accordingly, will ensure the greatest rate of development of the third world countries using not only resources which would then become available from our own national economies but which would also arise in consequence of third world countries being able to participate on that fairer playing field in world trade and to expand their economies by their own efforts.

Simply condemning the United States of America will achieve nothing. However, we also need to draw attention to the unfortunate consequences of the trade war that is going on between the United States Government and the European Community's quasi-Government, and to the stupidity of it and the policies that are being pursued by other expert producers of agricultural commodities that engage in the kinds of practices that have caused the problems underlying the trade war between the United States and Europe. It has a detrimental effect on our wheat farmers, and I agree with the sentiments of the member for Napier in that regard. Moreover, we need to do something positive in this country towards restructuring the inadequacies of our own policy approach. Clearly, with members of the Labor Party in the Federal Parliament saying that high interest rates have affected our dollar and our trade adversely, we need to do that. I urge members in this place to support the proposition.

Debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

STAMP DUTIES (ASSESSMENTS AND FORMS) AMENDMENT BILL

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

PETITION: CHILD ABUSE

A petition signed by 63 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to increase penalties for offenders convicted of child abuse was presented by Mrs Kotz.

Petition received.

PETITION: FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS DUTY

A petition signed by 34 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to remove the financial institutions duty on credit transactions was presented by Mrs Kotz.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

Tourism South Australia—Report, 1990-91.

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

South Australian Meat Corporation—Report, 1990-91.

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—

History Trust of South Australia—Report, 1990-91.

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—

Commissioner for Public Employment and the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations—Report, 1990-91.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MEAT CORPORATION

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Agriculture): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Today I have tabled the annual report for 1990-91 of the South Australian Meat Corporation. Just over a year ago, I announced a major reorganisation of that corporation. The reorganisation followed a review of SAMCOR's operations which was released

last year. At that time SAMCOR had recorded losses close to $1.7 million during the previous financial year. The triennial review of SAMCOR's operation was highly critical of existing management, and it was clear that a new, strongly commercial emphasis was necessary to turn the company around. I believed that a new board of management with the right commercial skills needed to be appointed. I am now pleased to report that the action taken last July is beginning to show results.

This year, SAMCOR has recorded a profit of $350 000 with an accumulated profit of $786 000 after special and non-recurring items have been taken into account. The Chairman of the board, Mr Ken Dingwell, believes this profit can and will be improved next year. It must be acknowledged that major work force restructuring is being undertaken and the role of SAMCOR's employees has been an important element in this turnaround. Although SAMCOR has much hard work in front of it, it is clear that its new direction is one of sensible and profitable commercial management. I believe that SAMCOR provides an excellent example of a business being turned around by the employment of a competent management team, willing and keen to run an organisation that brings real profit back to South Australia.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE HOUSING

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Housing and Construction): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Recently there has been discussion and some criticism from the Opposition regarding vacancy rates for Government employee housing. I believe it is important to set the record straight. As at 15 October, the Office of Government Employee Housing had a total housing stock of 3 067, of which 88 houses were in the metropolitan area and 2 976 were in the country. Since 1987, when the OGEH was formed, a great deal has been done to rationalise and improve employee housing management, with the number of houses being reduced from 3 825 to 3 067.

The number of full vacancies totals 287 and partial vacancies total 21. This correlates to a vacancy rate of 9.7 per cent. Of those vacancies, 68 are on depots and reserves and 56 are in the process of being sold. In such cases it is difficult or impossible to rent the building to the public. It is important to examine the background to these vacancies. The majority of houses are vacant for a very short time—two weeks to two months. For example, the vacancy rate on 15 October was slightly higher because of school holidays. I am told that a number of those vacancies have been taken up with the resumption of the school term.

The number of houses vacant in excess of 12 months is 27, and in excess of six months is 67. However, 40 of those longer-term vacancies are due to houses being on depots or reserves. That leaves just 54 houses vacant for any significant length of time—a vacancy rate of just 1.7 per cent. Government employee housing is allocated to 23 departments for housing staff. The major ones are the Departments of Education and Police and, to a lesser extent, Agriculture and the E&WS Department. When the houses are allocated to the departments, the Office of Government Employee Housing has no say over their allocation. Most departments are currently holding houses pending the filling of staff vacancies.

The Office of Government Employee Housing is looking at whether the system might be more efficient and simpler to operate if all houses were issued from a central pool, instead of being allocated to each department. It should be noted that the prospect of sales and external tenancies is not strong. Of the houses being offered for sale, many are in areas of low demand. The Office of Government Employee Housing has a list of houses in the process of disposal. The list, time and again, contains such comments as:

Depressed market, private tenants not available.

Market very poor, private tenants not interested.

Market depressed, glut of cheap accommodation available.

The Office of Government Employee Housing is striving to keep the number of vacancies as low as possible. However, it is impossible to have no vacancies because of staff movements within departments at any given time. People move around in jobs and change postings all the time. Houses are tenanted, vacant and tenanted again, usually within a short space of time. It is easy to level criticism at figures on paper, but examining the facts beyond the figures reveals the true picture and the hard work which has been put into rationalising the Government employee housing system.

QUESTION TIME

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Treasurer. As Minister responsible for SGIC, can the Treasurer advise how much the Heard committee has recommended that taxpayers, through the Government, pay into SGIC as a capital injection and to compensate for its illegal inter-fund transactions?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That was a pretty loaded question—part of the ongoing attack on SGIC, which I do not think does the Leader credit at all. First, 'illegal' was a word that he used. It was not a finding that it was illegal. There is in fact a conflict of legal advice on the matter. I happen to have chosen one particular interpretation, as did the Auditor-General.

Mr Ingerson: The easiest one.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The member for Bragg, who knows nothing about it, interjects 'the easiest way out'. On the contrary, it is the hardest way out. It is the most rigorous interpretation. That shows how much he would know, with that fatuous interjection; it is as stupid as his pencil. However, to pick it up again: first, that question of legality is one that was in issue, and there is dispute, but we have chosen a particular course to take on that matter, which is a rigorous interpretation, and therefore an analysis was necessary, as I already announced, to see what, using that rigorous interpretation, would be the outcome. That was one of the issues that the working party addressed.

In addition, it also addressed possible amendments, changes to the SGIC Act. I have only just received the report, and when I have had a chance to fully consider it and follow it up, when I have had the opportunity to present to the House the proposed legislation, then indeed the matter that the honourable member has asked about can be discussed. But I will make the following point. The working group has not given any estimate of what it believes would be the appropriate capitalisation of SGIC. That is a matter that we are considering. It has made some calculations and given some estimates on the inter-fund implications, using

a particular interpretation, and I am grateful for that. It certainly gives us a basis.

There has been this suggestion, promulgated perhaps by the media, and certainly by the Opposition, that there is something wrong about capitalising SGIC. That is nonsense. The fact is that over the years SGIC would have been helped greatly if it had had a capital base. The Government of the day, in setting it up in 1970, did not provide any capital for that institution. It gave it a loan which it paid back shortly. In retrospect, it probably should have, and that certainly would have been an advantage to SGIC over the years. But it did not. Year after year SGIC has been able to manage its affairs without that capitalisation, and indeed to return profits in recent years. In the current environment, when SGIC, like everybody else around the country, is in a loss situation, suddenly members opposite home in. Now they go for the jugular. They have hated SGIC all along—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —and their private insurance companies are a friend, which they protected as vigorously as they could in the 1970s from the establishment of a community owned insurance company, from which South Australia has derived enormous benefits. They have remained quiet about all their friends in private insurance, because the company was successful and because it was clearly well accepted by our local community. As it moved into areas like health, no doubt members opposite were being lobbied furiously, 'Why don't you stop this dreadful social octopus getting into our particular area?' The Opposition said nothing, not a word. Now, of course, with SGIC experiencing the effects of the downturn it has decided to go for the jugular and create as much mayhem as possible to try to get SGIC out of the place, out of the market, away from that private enterprise competition. I do not believe that is good for the State nor indeed good for our community and I do not see any justification for it.

It is legitimate for SGIC to say that it would be in a much better position to perform and deliver profits if it had capital. It is legitimate for the working group which investigated SGIC to say that it believes that is a desirable outcome. It is legitimate for the Government of the day to consider whether and to what extent that should be done. The implication from the Leader of the Opposition, from his colleagues and from those in the media who want to put the boot into SGIC, that in some way this is a bad thing and this is a terrible imposition on taxpayers, is absolute nonsense and ought to be laid to rest at once.

ANANGU PITJANTJATJARA LANDS

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs tell the House what is being done to celebrate the tenth anniversary of the handing back of the Pitjantjatjara lands in the State's north-west? In November 1981 the then Premier, David Tonkin, handed over the title to over 100 000 square kilometres of land to the Pitjantjatjara people. This was the culmination of the efforts of a number of people, starting as far back as 1977 when Don Dunstan was the Premier of this State.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I thank the honourable member for her interest in this area. The transfer of the lands to the traditional owners was an historic occasion and one in which all members of this Parliament and indeed all South Australians can have justifiable pride. The tenth anniversary of the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act is being celebrated this weekend at Itjinpiri, not far from Ernabella. The day will feature the culmination of months of planning and work by the Anangu people, not only in preparing the day's activities but also in producing a photographic exhibition and commemorative booklet to signify the importance of the event. This Parliament will be represented by the member for Eyre, who is the local member for the area and by me as Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, and we are looking forward to sleeping out under the stars at Umuwa Creek on Saturday night.

The highlight of the day is to be a re-enactment of the handover of the title. I should inform the House that I wrote to David Tonkin recently in London informing him—and I am sure that he was delighted to hear the news—that, because he was unable to attend, I had been asked to play his role in the enactment ceremony. The member for Eyre will be closely in support, and will be attending the celebrations, reinforcing the strength of South Australia's bipartisan approach to Aboriginal affairs, and long may that continue.

I am delighted at the generous offer by Toyota to sponsor the celebration with a donation of $10 000, and the State Government similarly has assisted with sponsoring the production of photographs and the booklet. I am particularly pleased that on Sunday the member for Eyre and I will be attending the opening of the Anangu Pitjantjatjara office on the lands at Umuwa. I know that many members of Parliament, and particularly my colleagues the Minister of Education and the member for Napier, both former Ministers of Aboriginal Affairs, were concerned that the administrative and support services based at Alice Springs were being provided from too great a distance.

I think this move to Umuwa symbolises the self-management concepts embodied in the legislation and is a significant achievement. I shall also be announcing the results of the Palya clean community competition, which has been a major effort to improve the environment in the Pitjantjatjara lands, with dozens of the communities being actively involved in cleaning up and planting trees, which has been supervised and judged by KESAB. The initiative leading to this landmark which is to be celebrated came from the determination and vision of the Anangu people themselves and they are to be congratulated on their success, and I am sure all members of this Parliament support former Premiers Dunstan and Tonkin in sending their good wishes for this celebration.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): As the Treasurer seems to claim that he is not responsible for SGIC's $81 million pre-tax loss and repeated illegalities, when will he sack Mr Kean and Mr Gerschwitz, who clearly were responsible? With your leave, Mr Speaker, and the concurrence of the House I will explain the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before granting leave, I draw the honourable member's attention to the matter of refraining from comment and debate in explaining the question.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Under the Westminster system of responsible Government, a Minister should resign if a department or institution over which he has control fails in a major way. The Treasurer has complete power over SGIC, under section 3 (3) and other sections of the Act but so far has broken with tradition and refused to resign. If he claims he is not responsible, at a minimum this implies that SGIC's chief executive and Chairman are, but the Premier has so far refused to dismiss them either. Is no-one to be held responsible?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Deputy Leader, as he unfortunately so often does, trivialises the proceedings of

this House, and I would suggest that, sheltered as he is in here and able as he is, without any kind of responsibility, to make any sort of rash allegations and get them published, he ought to exercise more responsibility than that question suggests. He ought to talk about the issues instead of trying to fling the hatchet at individuals.

Members interjecting:

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

FOUNDATION SA

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Does the Minister of Health support the criticism that 'Foundation SA is supposed to promote health, but it has failed to use its advertising budget imaginatively or effectively.'? An article by Peter Goers in the *Sunday Mail* last week in relation to Foundation SA, justice and smoking criticises Foundation SA, hence my question.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I found this to be a very funny article indeed. It started off something like 'Make my day, light up a cigarette.' I know what the gentleman was getting at—that those who smoke contribute to the revenue rather more than if they did not smoke. But, having said that—and everyone understands that—to criticise the promotional campaigns of the foundation in the way Mr Goers did was rather churlish. I think the foundation has been reasonably imaginative in the way in which it has gone about its task. Let us remember what this Parliament invested it with powers to do, namely, to replace the sponsorship that had previously flowed to sport and the arts from tobacco companies and, in the process, to use that whole issue to get health messages across.

So, the typical arrangement is that, where somebody comes along and gets sponsorship for their particular artistic or sporting function, they carry a health message with them. Then, on top of that, there are the broader health messages that are being used. People who have some standing in the community, who have a following, such as Mr Ken Cunningham (and many people listen to his sports programs), have been enlisted in order to encourage people to 'cut the skin off the chook' and various other things like this, and I think some of these broader messages are important for setting themes in the community.

The other point that was made in the article was that Foundation SA, by its nature, is a self-destructive organisation. What the writer meant by that was that, to the extent it is successful, it is cutting into its base revenue and, hence, its *raison d'etre*. Everybody understands that, and one would hope that success will follow fairly quickly and, indeed, that will fulfil the ambitions of this place when, by legislation, Foundation SA was set up. So, I do not find that self-contradictory and I do not find it at all unusual: I would see it as the obvious carrying through of the high hopes this place had for the foundation when it set it up.

STATE BANK

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): My question is directed to the Treasurer. Did the State Bank take over Bank of New Zealand loans to the Remm group or make any other payments in order to get the Bank of New Zealand to drop its liquidation suit against Remm last June and, if so, what was the cost to the State Bank?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: These are matters that the current royal commission has before it, and I do not think it is appropriate that they should be commented upon in this House. I find it extraordinary that the honourable member, with so many issues to deal with, has managed in successive days to talk about a pencil sent to his electorate office which he claimed he had not ordered but which, in fact, he had, and yesterday he talked about an advertisement which appeared in the *Financial Review* and which showed a wrong fax number. I understand that an error was made in the advertising agency—the copy was not properly proof read—but in fact steps were taken to ensure that, under the system that operates in government at the moment, faxes were diverted from that number to the correct number so that no problems were experienced. Now, today, he gets up and asks this question, which has already been discussed and which is based on—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Now he is trying to say, 'No, it is really later than this.' It is based on what he has read in the newspapers arising from the royal commission.

PLASTIC RECYCLING

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning inform the House whether used plastic is now being recycled in South Australia to produce commercial products and, if so, should local councils and other groups that are developing recycling schemes plan for the collection of plastic items such as juice bottles?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest and commitment to the whole context of recycling. A South Australian manufacturer, Rib Loc, is now producing a product which incorporates new technology and discarded plastic bottles. Rib Loc has led the world in the development of spiral pipe technology and has taken another step forward in the use of recycled plastic in producing a new range of pipe products. These products are indeed called pipes.

Recently, I had the honour and privilege of launching Rib Loc's Series 2000 high performance durable pipe, which was developed for the construction industry and, depending on the application, this pipe can contain up to 100 per cent recycled plastic. Once full production is reached in 1993, Rib Loc will use about 25 000 tonnes of used plastic a year.

This new market is an incentive for groups and local councils to include plastic juice bottles in their collection schemes. Plastics are currently being recycled through the Marion council depot, Northern Yorke Peninsula recycling centres, the Enfield council kerbside scheme and Normetals 'drop-off' bin for members of the public, and it would be beneficial if all local government areas offered a similar scheme.

Yesterday I highlighted the importance of implementing kerbside collection schemes to meet the demands for used materials as resource materials for new products. Today's answer highlights and supports the answer I gave yesterday, and I urge all members to contact their local councils and to request that they move forward with the implementation of appropriate kerbside collection schemes.

EXPIATION NOTICES

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Will the Minister of Emergency Services act immediately—

Members interjecting:

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

Mrs KOTZ: —to ensure that innocent, law-abiding South Australian motorists are not in future issued with expiation notices for speeding offences? A constituent of mine has informed me that his son wrongly received an expiation notice for a speeding offence, making him liable for a $146 fine. When the department refused to cross check the information, the son was forced to take 2½ hours off work at his expense to disprove the allegation.

I have been informed that:

1. The son's car had not left the family home all day.

2. The son's car is a white Daihatsu while the offending car was a brown Corolla.

3. The registration number on the speed camera photograph was blurred. The department indulged in a guessing game and came up with the wrong car, despite the fact that the department has computerised information to compare registration numbers with car models and their colours.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for her question and, if she makes the details available to me, I will be happy to follow it up. But there is some oddity in her asking a question in the kind of general terms she has when she really wants to raise one individual case. It is perfectly reasonable for the honourable member to want to do so. The honourable member is entitled to raise individual cases by seeing me directly or, if she chooses to do so for the publicity value, to raise it in the House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The member for Adelaide chooses to twist my words in a way that I never intended, and I do not particularly want to follow that up. If the honourable member gives me the particulars of the case, I will have it investigated.

PORT GILES

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Will the Minister of Marine advise the House as to the progress of work on the jetty at Port Giles? I understand that work has been done to replace cladding on the grain bulk loading plant at Port Giles while other repair work is being carried out to the jetty following an accident when a ship hit the structure.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The Port Giles jetty is one of our major deep sea exporting jetties. The cladding replacement work is in the second stage and the jetty repairs are proceeding very well. Members will recall that a decision was made to replace the deteriorating cladding covering the plant at Port Giles because it contained asbestos that could have posed a health risk to the workers there. Phase 1 of that recladding was carried out in September to November of last year. Phase 2 is now under way and will be concluded at the end of November this year.

Ship loading operations are scheduled to recommence in December and work will be completed in that time. After the cladding work has been done, workers will return on site to complete the repairs following last year's accident. In August last year an Iranian grain ship struck the jetty, damaging some piles and decking. Eight piles have now been replaced, along with the associated steel work, and the damaged decking has also been replaced. All that remains to be done is to bituminise the decking and fit timber kerbing. This will be done in December.

HOME DETENTION SUPERVISORS

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): My question is directed to the Minister of Correctional Services. Are all home detention supervisors senior prison officers, and can the Minister give an assurance that resources for this area are both adequate and consistent with the intent and spirit of legislation and past statements made to this House? Following the recent murder committed while a prisoner was on home detention, it has been put to me that resources for this scheme have been inadequate. In 1986 the House was told that the home detention unit would have up to 10 staff and that home detention supervisors would be senior prison officers because they are the best and would give the program some teeth. For a weekly prisoner caseload of 80, the House was told that 10 supervisors would be required. However, it has been put to me that current caseloads are more than double that number.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: With regard to the caseload of the home detention scheme, I understand that for this week it is about 63. I am not quite sure from where the honourable member has got his information. The matter to which he referred is before the court, so I would be reluctant to comment on that part of the question, except that I understand that the person who was in charge of that home detainee was a very experienced prison officer who is known to all members opposite. That is my information. If it is wrong, we will see when the full report comes out and after the police have finished their inquiries.

I have heard of no problems with resourcing for the home detention unit. I will have the Department of Correctional Services look at the question to see whether there are any problems in that regard. I have not heard of any from any of the workers in the home detention unit or from the union that represents those workers. As far as I am aware, it is an efficient and well-regarded unit of the department under a very experienced prison administrator. The supervision is by prison officers and qualified social workers. It is not an area with which we have any great problem. It has been very successful. This last incident is unfortunate, but the matter is before the court. I suggest to the member for Bright and to everybody else, before they start building defences around the place for people, that they wait until the court has deliberated on it.

ON-COURSE BETTING

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport inform the House on the latest developments in regard to on-course betting with bookmakers? In 1988, a report on the viability of bookmakers was conducted. I understand that several recommendations were made with regard to bookmakers and that one has now been implemented. Will the Minister inform the House of this development?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am delighted to be able to do so. I thank the member for Albert Park for his question and interest. I am sure that the member for Morphett will also be interested in the answer. The Bookmakers' Licensing Board has now put in place the mechanism, from 1 November, to allow place betting. I am informed that it will be writing next week to all bookmakers inviting applications from those interested in offering exotic bets. Given the time that it will take for bookmakers to institute their own arrangements—and I guess with exotic bets, talking of quinellas and so on, they will need computer power to operate that system—I expect that offering to be made to the inves-

tor in the racing industry in the new year. I hope that, as of 1 November, we shall see place betting offered, and then the exotic forms of betting will be introduced in the new year. Hopefully, they will be well in place by the time we have the Adelaide Cup carnival.

It is important to acknowledge that this will increase turnover. Two main factors will be open to bookmakers to take up the extra options, and I believe that it will be well received by the investor as well. It will be an alternative for the investing public on race courses. I believe that the interest already expressed by the investor in quinellas, trifectas, trebles and fourtrellas will be an additional service to support our racing industry. We are now on the way to seeing these other options offered to bookmakers, and I think that those broader betting options will assist the bookmakers and the industry.

PRIVATISATION OF PRISONS

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): My question is directed to the Minister of Correctional Services. Notwithstanding his statement to the House on 7 November that the Government had no intention of privatising prisons, has his department made any investigations into the substantial savings that could be made from the privatisation of prisons?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am not quite sure to which statement the member for Coles is referring on 7 November last year.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: There is no doubt that throughout a number of countries, particularly—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: On 7 November 1990.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Off the top of my head, I cannot remember precisely what I was doing on 7 November, let alone what I was talking about. However, I am very pleased to answer the question in general terms. There is no doubt that there is a significant move in certain parts of the world towards the privatisation of prisons, particularly in Australia. Overseas there have been many moves, and I think there are private prisons in Queensland. I understand that tenders have been called in New South Wales and likewise in the Northern Territory. The savings involved, on the information that we have, are about 10 per cent of payroll compared to the present cost in the public sector. For South Australia, that would mean a saving of about $5 million, so it is not insignificant. Obviously, that work has been done by the Department of Correctional Services.

However, it is not our intention to privatise our prisons, as we do not believe that is necessary. First, a philosophical position has to be sorted out, and the Government believes that, if the State takes away a person's liberty, quite properly and lawfully the State has an obligation to take care of that person in detention. That philosophical position is very sound. However, I am not quite sure that the community would hold the philosophical position as strongly as the Government. It may well be that the community feels that 10 per cent far outweighs any philosophical sensitivities the Government may have. That is a decision that the community can make.

I believe that the public sector can run prisons in this State as well as if not better than—and as economically as—the private sector. The challenge is there for the employees and for the unions to ensure that work practices in the prisons, flexibility and so on, are efficient to ensure that no financial gain can be made by switching prison management from the public to private sector. At the end of the debate, the cost factor will be the critical factor. If the prison employees can not demonstrate to the community that they can run the prisons as efficiently, safely and economically as the private sector, I believe that the public sector will lose the prison services throughout Australia, including South Australia. That would be a very sad day. I think it is utterly unnecessary.

The Public Service Association and most employees of the Department of Correctional Services are aware of this. They are aware of this from their own knowledge and also because I constantly tell them that that is the position. I believe they are working very hard to bring down the costs in the prisons service to match the costs in the private sector. It is not as though it is a huge difference. With goodwill and cooperation—and we are certainly getting that from the PSA—they can achieve this.

LIGHTHOUSE RESERVES

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning report on the progress of negotiations to transfer a number of lighthouse reserves along the South Australian coast from Commonwealth to State control?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Approval has been gained from the Commonwealth Government for the transfer of two lighthouses—Cape Banks in the South-East and Cape Borda at the other end of the Flinders Chase National Park—across to South Australian Government control. However, regrettably, negotiations have not yet proceeded very far on the Cape du Couedic lighthouse reserve. Negotiations are still continuing for the South Neptune Island transfer.

I understand that the Australian Maritime Safety Authority has offered to sell Althorpe Island to the National Parks and Wildlife Service for addition to the Althorpe Island Conservation Park. I have no doubt—and I feel extremely optimistic today—that, as differences are sorted out between the Federal Department of Transport and Communications, the Australian Maritime Safety Authority and other agencies, additional lighthouse reserves will be handed over to the State Government and in due course that will no doubt include Cape du Couedic.

I believe the reason that the honourable member has asked me this question is that the member for Albert Park and he accompanied me to Cape du Couedic on Friday last week for the Kangaroo Island celebrations of 100 years of national park existence in this State. One of the pleasures of that celebration was that we were able to get to the top of the Cape du Couedic lighthouse, from which we had an incredibly spectacular view of both the coastline and the park. One of the concerns that we have is that, while we do not have the control of all the lighthouses in the Kangaroo Island area, it prohibits us from moving forward with a tourism plan to ensure that we can promote visitation to lighthouses, particularly within Kangaroo Island, as part of the promotion of the island and visitor experience. Many people in the community find lighthouses extremely fascinating places because of the history and mystery that often surrounds them. I look forward to working with my colleague the Minister of Tourism to ensure that we can add yet another dimension to the tourism experience within South Australia.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

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

RECREATIONAL FISHING

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Why did the Minister of Fisheries involve his department in an extensive year-long survey of recreational fishing if he holds the view expressed on radio earlier this year, after the release of the supplementary green paper, that figures from the survey would not necessarily be reliable? From 1 September 1990 to 30 August 1991, an extensive survey of boating ramps from St Kilda to O'Sullivan Beach was undertaken voluntarily by recreational fishers in conjunction with the Department of Fisheries. Many thousands of fishers were surveyed on such factors as: the number of fish caught, type of fish, hours of fishing, area fished, number of persons per boat and so on. I have been advised that the statistics gathered provide invaluable information for determining the fishing effort and catch details of recreational fishers, but that the industry is disappointed that after so much effort and inconvenience the Minister has given little or no credence to the survey results, as indicated by his remarks on the radio.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The survey has to be put in the context of the various sources of information that are available on various forms of fishing. The survey undertaken is certainly useful. It is indicative, but obviously by its very nature it will not be absolutely authoritative. A survey that is, first, voluntary and, secondly, taken at certain points in time of people at certain areas over a certain period will not be able to definitively prove that that is what recreational fishers throughout the State have done, even over that same period. Indeed, anyone who studies sampling or polling methods will know that the pollsters and the samplers have to acknowledge that there is a margin of error even in the most scientifically conducted of surveys.

In this situation, this data must be used alongside other data that has been available from other sources and, in marrying all that information together, we must try to get the best guess at what is happening in the recreational fishery. It must be acknowledged that perhaps the most effective way of getting information out of the recreational fishery would be to follow methods that this Government is not prepared to follow: for example, follow the method of licensing of recreational fishers, not just net fishers but also linefishers, and then having them lodge returns, as required of commercial fishers. Of course, even that would be subject to a margin of error in terms of how much information was reported.

I assure members that this Government is not about to introduce licences for recreational fishers. That is the sort of thing that might be necessary in order to take the survey data to a much smaller margin of error. I am saying not that that survey was not a worthwhile exercise—it was a worthwhile exercise—but that it must be put in the context of the information that was obtained; how it was obtained and where it was obtained from, and then it must be interpreted as indicative, not definitive, as to exactly what happens. In the current marine scale supplementary green paper process, it is being taken into account along with other information that we have available and other research data on the actual biomass of the fish in the ocean. At the end of the day, decisions will be made.

SCHOOL SKIN CARE PROGRAMS

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Education advise what action schools are taking to make children aware of the risks of skin cancer and to promote skin care programs? The onset of hot weather reminds us once again of the importance of encouraging children to protect themselves from the dangers associated with over exposure to the sun.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for her question; indeed, she has previously asked me questions on this subject. The Education Department has a substantial commitment in the health and welfare of the children of South Australia in its care. Programs have been developed in collaboration with the appropriate medical and health authorities in this State. In the case of preventable cancers, including the prevalence of skin cancer in our community, the department works closely with the Anti-Cancer Foundation and, through that organisation, the universities in South Australia to develop appropriate policies and practices in schools that are part of both national and State community education campaigns in this area.

I think all members will know that there is a rapidly changing attitude in Australian society away from the traditional bronzed Aussie to one of some understanding of the effects of exposure to the sun and the need for protection of the skin from ultra-violet light, and also an understanding that this is a complex issue that requires simply more information than can be provided by the flow of information through schools. However, school programs play an important role as part of a comprehensive community program to change prevailing community attitudes and behaviour patterns. Several programs have been developed by the Anti-Cancer Foundation and promoted in school communities with the major focus targeting at this stage on early childhood centres and primary schools. Understandably, the focus is to develop healthy behaviour while children are young so that it is firmly established and will contribute to the prevention of skin cancer throughout their lives.

Some recent programs include the Cancer-Free-Kids project and the Sun Smart advice for early childhood centres. The results of these programs and policies were evaluated in a survey of primary schools this year. The survey showed promising results with 28 per cent of schools having a policy on sun protective behaviour, and nearly all of these schools indicating that the policy was being actively implemented.

The honourable member may also wish to know that National Skin Cancer Awareness Week will be held between 25 and 30 November this year. It will be supported by television and radio advertising. Schools will have the opportunity to benefit from the high profile focus on preventing skin cancer, as they have from other campaigns such as 'Slip, Slop, Slap' and 'Wear a Hat Day'. In this way school based education is well supported by both public and community programs.

MAGILL YOUTH DETENTION CENTRE

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Will the Minister of Family and Community Services inform the House of the reasons for the dramatic increase in workers compensation claims at the youth detention centre at Magill over the past 12 months, particulary those that relate to physical injuries as against those that are stress related? I have been contacted by two officers in the Deparment for Family and Community Services who have told me that their department is having serious offending inmates released early to prevent the institution from erupting into a riot. According to my informants, despite this practice of early release, staff are still being assaulted, creating a large increase in workers compensation claims that are injury related.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

CEDUNA TAFE

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education say whether the new Ceduna TAFE campus will provide education courses for Aboriginal people who live in Ceduna and adjacent areas and in the more isolated communities?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The member for Playford was involved in this project through his work on the Public Works Standing Committee. I am pleased to be able to inform the House that the $2.8 million Ceduna campus of the Eyre Peninsula College of TAFE has recently been completed and will be officially opened tomorrow when I will join Senator Graham Maguire who will represent the Commonwealth Minister, John Dawkins. I know that the member for Flinders will attend the opening as a member of the council of the Eyre Peninsula College of TAFE and the local member, the member for Eyre, will be in attendance also.

The Ceduna campus is characterised by its remoteness from the main population centres of Port Lincoln and Adelaide. The campus will certainly provide services for Aboriginal people from communities at places such as Yalata and Koonibba and for the urban Aboriginal population of Ceduna. It will also cater for the education and training needs of the non-Aboriginal urban and rural populations of the surrounding areas. The new facility will provide training and education with emphasis upon vocational courses. The Aboriginal Educational Program will include courses such as an introduction to vocational education; an introduction to technical trades; commercial studies and management; and horticultural techniques reflecting the Government's commitment to improving the employment prospects of Aboriginal people.

There will also be opportunities for other rural young people to be trained in agricultural industries. An increased range of courses will be available in the vocational areas of engineering, business and commerce, community services and horticulture. The campus workshop, which, I understand, is particularly splendid, will provide instruction in welding, automotive studies, machinery maintenance, metal fabrication and agricultural mechanics. Ceduna TAFE students will have instant access to the resources of other TAFE colleges through a telephone hook-up facility and fax machines in each learning space.

All teaching at the new facility will be based on the principle of open learning. The technological developments taking place in TAFE—and you, Mr Speaker, will be aware of this from your involvement with the Port Adelaide TAFE—will certainly enable the improved provision of education to remote and isolated areas and communities and will improve those people's access to education and training courses. So, I think every member will look forward to the opening tomorrow.

MOUNT LOFTY RANGES REGIONAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Planning. Is it the intention of the Government to establish a Mount Lofty Ranges regional planning authority prior to an opportunity being provided for the community to assess the need for such an authority, how it should be administered and at what cost, particularly to local government? Can the Minister give an assurance to the House that duplication and waste will be avoided in the establishment of such an authority, and is it intended that powers and responsibilities be delegated to the authority without first being exposed to the parliamentary process?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: As the honourable member well knows, we have had a very long and extensive consultation process to establish the best long-term management of the Mount Lofty Ranges. Indeed, I do not think that anyone in the community has not been made aware of this extensive process.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I did not interrupt the honourable member's question; in fact, I indicated my pleasure and delight that he was asking me a question, and I maintain that attitude. This is a very serious and important matter because, as members well know, the Mount Lofty Ranges are not only vitally important in terms of providing the catchment area for Adelaide's water supply but they also provide an area of quite extensive beauty and biological diversity as well as housing large numbers of South Australians. Indeed, the Mount Lofty Ranges probably encompass our most fertile area of agricultural lands with respect to providing food and other products for the Adelaide community.

Therefore, it is vitally important that the decisions we take as a Government and as a Parliament are the right long-term decisions in respect of the appropriate planning for the Mount Lofty Ranges in the future. We are at a critical point in our history. We can either be part of the destruction of the environment in the Mount Lofty Ranges and the degradation of our water supplies or we can take collective, courageous and far-sighted decisions to ensure for future generations of South Australians that the Mount Lofty Ranges are preserved and protected and, indeed, the conflicting interests of various groups within the ranges as well as people living on the plains of Adelaide can be reconciled. I have gone to great lengths to ensure that people have access to the consultative process. I assure the honourable member that I will look very closely at the recommendations that the committee provides to me, and I will ensure that I not only make the decisions myself but also use—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am about to get to that. I will be using the collective experience and wisdom of my Cabinet colleagues when we arrive at a decision about the best form of management.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: If that is in the form of a regional authority, because it is determined that that will be the most effective way of managing and controlling the Mount Lofty Ranges, that is the path Cabinet will take.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Mr Speaker, I think I have been extremely tolerant of the interjections, but I have to say—

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Minister resume her seat. It is not up to the Minister to be tolerant. The Chair has been extremely tolerant and is reaching the end of that tolerance. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I do not intend to pre-empt the decision of Cabinet about the most appropriate way in which we will proceed to ensure

the ongoing protection of the Mount Lofty Ranges. We will make the fairest and best decisions that will ensure our collective objectives. I hope that this is one area where we will have some degree of bipartisan support, because it is bigger than the present members who sit in this Parliament and, indeed, this generation. What we decide will affect future generations of South Australians. I look forward to the support of the member for Heysen, as indeed I look forward to the support of all members in helping to ensure that we make the very best decision. I assure the honourable member that my Cabinet colleagues and I take this matter very seriously and we will be giving it a great deal of attention in arriving at a decision.

PRAWN CATCH

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Will the Minister of Fisheries obtain information about the volume, value and recording mechanisms of prawns taken by fishers operating in conjunction with departmental vessels during prefishing season surveys in both Gulf St Vincent and Spencer Gulf?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, I will provide a report to the House.

BICYCLE HELMETS

Mr SUCH (Fisher): Does the Minister of Transport agree with the view expressed in the current edition of *Australian Cyclist* that helmet laws have discouraged cycling and that riding numbers have plummeted as a result—a view also contained in a recent letter to me from the proprietor of Cumberland Cycles? If so, what steps is the Minister taking to actively encourage cycling in this State? The article in *Australian Cyclist* states:

> Although promoting bicycle helmets is commendable, the enforcement of a helmet law has been a disincentive to bicycle riding. We need to change Government emphasis from cycling as a safety problem to cycling as part of the solution to traffic congestion and alienation in Australian cities.

The letter from Cumberland Cycles states:

> Our retail cycle business has been established for 11 years. Our business, although seasonal, had been progressing well until September (when helmet wearing became compulsory). During September our sales dropped to almost half of the turnover compared to the previous September. At this stage, October looks as bad as September. Sales of parts (such as tyres and tubes) and new bike sales, have reduced by a similar percentage.

Cumberland Cycles also indicated to me that more needs to be done to provide safe cycleways and on-road cycle lanes throughout the State, particularly in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have some difficulty with that particular article, which I have actually seen. Personally I did not think it was all that good. The question of whether helmets have caused a drop in the sales of bicycles I would think is not proven at all. If the honourable member is using relatively recent figures, as were contained in the article, I can assure him that there has been a drop in the sales of cars and other products. So, I would not give those kinds of figures any great credence at all. I believe that the compulsory wearing of bicycle helmets is absolutely essential. I am surprised that, even by way of quoting somebody else, the member for Fisher appears to be not 100 per cent sure about that.

In his explanation the member for Fisher did not give unqualified support to the Government's action, and I think that that is a great pity. I suggest that the member for Fisher consult the member for Adelaide who, I am sure, will explain to him how absolutely essential it is that people wear bicycle helmets. The Government has a bicycle committee which promotes the use of bicycles and organises some very complex arrangements with local councils for bicycle lanes throughout the metropolitan area and in the larger provincial cities, and I am delighted that that is the case.

In the Adelaide City Council area we do not have a great deal of influence for a whole range of reasons, although I know that the Adelaide City Council is itself producing a bicycle plan so that it can join up with bicycle lanes which have been established by this Government and which lead into the City of Adelaide. Modestly I say that, with the wisdom of Solomon, I have just solved the problem in the electorate of the Minister of Education where there was conflict involving the local council, bicycle users, traders who wanted parking, motorists and so on. If the member for Fisher is into bike riding, I suggest he go down the new bike track that goes through, I think, the electorate of the member for Morphett.

Mr Becker: No, it's in mine.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am sorry; it goes through the member for Hanson's electorate. I think that that bike track cost the taxpayers of this State close to $250 000.

Mr Becker: It is brilliant.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: So, they don't come cheap, but it is, as the honourable member says, brilliant. We will be examining many of the routes that will be suitable for bike lanes, including Port Road, which is a road that may lend itself to a bike lane and, I think, Anzac Highway, which used to have a very significant bike track on it. It is a pity that several years ago it was removed because of the alleged lack of use. I think bicycles will become one of the great transport modes of the future for city commuters because they are cheap, economical and reasonably safe, particularly if riders wear a helmet. Whilst I did read the article, I did not agree with it 100 per cent. I think what the Government is doing in this area is all that you could expect from any Government, and we are doing that in cooperation with the various local councils.

HOUSING NEEDS

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction advise the house what initiatives this Government is taking to meet the special housing needs of women and children? A recent paper commissioned by the National Housing Strategy noted that the number of single parent families as a percentage of the population had increased from 10.4 per cent in 1966 to 15.2 per cent in 1990. Of those sole parents, 68 per cent are headed by women. As many of them are involved in unpaid household and caring work, they do not have the income to get into home ownership like the majority of earning Australians. How is the Government ensuring their needs are being met?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for his question, which is an important one, particularly having regard to the spread of tenant applications for public housing over the past few years, which highlights the number of single parents. In the past year alone, for the traditional two parent households, 64 per cent were in fact headed by women. That is a staggering statistic which our public housing authority has to accommodate, to ensure a proper social mix and to ensure employment and opportunities for both the head of the household and the children. The fact that we have such a strong public housing base is important in

that it allows us the opportunity to achieve that mix within the community.

In addition, the South Australian Government is now participating in a review of the housing needs of women and children, including the one to which the honourable member has referred, namely, the recent paper released by Bettina Cass. The Australian Housing Ministers' Council appointed a women's housing issues working party in 1985 to provide a national focus for women's housing policy. That group has been very productively engaged. South Australia is represented by a senior employee of the South Australian Housing Trust. Over the past five years the group has done considerable work in regard to policy. It has undertaken work in the area of housing and domestic violence, housing and child care, women's access to home purchase assistance, urban consolidation and housing design issues, all of which are very relevant in providing support for women, particularly when they are bringing up children as a sole parent.

Further, I was recently approached by the South Australian Women's Housing Caucus, seeking assistance to hold an information day to discuss the recommendations of the Bettina Cass report and to provide some input. I am pleased to say that the Government has been able to assist with a financial contribution, and on 21 November women from all around South Australia will meet to discuss and promote women's housing issues. I certainly look forward to the opportunity of being involved in that. I particularly look forward to the outcome of that forum, and I am sure that it will add to the further information and assistance we can offer to women who are sole parents bringing up children.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: I pose the question that the House note grievances.

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): Today I wish to address briefly an issue which I think goes to the heart of journalistic ethics and indeed the standard of behaviour of members of Parliament. Goodness knows, we are poorly enough thought of without incidents such as that which occurred on page 2 of the *Advertiser* today, and I quote the article, entitled 'Gribbles mixes tests: MP', in which there was reference to Mr Elliott, Australian Democrat member in another place, bringing a number of allegations to the Parliament in relation to a large pathology firm well known in South Australia by the name of Gribbles.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw to the honourable member's attention the fact that Standing Orders prevent members from referring to debates in another place.

Dr ARMITAGE: I thank you, Sir, but I am referring to a press report here. The allegations were made that the State Government ought to investigate an independent testing and licensing authority, that there are no special procedures for the disposal of blood, urine and other human waste, that it is collected by the council. I ask on what authority these statements were made. The honourable member says that past and present workers in this multi-million dollar industry had raised concerns. We all know exactly what motives past employees can have in relation to their previous employers.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Especially if they were dismissed.

Dr ARMITAGE: Yes, especially if they have been dismissed, as the honourable member says. I suggest that the member of the Legislative Council who made these allegations may well like to tell us who these people are and what evidence he has, and what proof. Let us deal with these matters. First, I refer to the allegation that there ought to be an investigation into the introduction of an independent licensing procedure which guarantees regular, independent inspections. Perhaps the Hon. Mr Elliott was trying to fulfil his desire for publicity but, unfortunately, he clearly did not know the facts.

When a pathology laboratory wishes to set up it has to apply to the Health Insurance Commission to get what is termed an approved pathology authority. Is Mr Elliott indicating that the Health Insurance Commission is not independent, that it ought not to issue licences? Surely he is not. Once the approved pathology authority has been granted, one must then have at least one member of the staff as an approved pathology provider. This authority comes from the Health Insurance Commission. Is the honourable member suggesting that the Health Insurance Commission is also not independent? If so, he is wrong. Lastly, one must then have an authority as an approved pathology laboratory, again, issued under the Health Insurance Commission.

Before those three authorities have been obtained one is not entitled to any Medicare rebates and so, clearly, all pathology laboratories need those three different, independent assessments from the Health Insurance Commission. Once they have been obtained, the laboratory then has to be tested by the National Association of Testing Authorities. Just in case the honourable member from another place thinks that that is not independent, I shall read out a number of the registrations which the National Association of Testing Authorities approved between 1 May and 31 July this year.

Amongst other things, they look at accoustic and vibration measurements and biological measurements, amongst which is included the Alligator River Region Research Institute. They look at chemical laboratories, including the ACT Government Asbestos Testing Laboratory. They look at construction materials laboratories. They look at electrical standards. They look at engineering materials, heat and temperature measurements, and medical laboratories, as we clearly know. Further, there are metrology, quality systems and wool laboratories. For the member in the other House to say that this is a non-independent body is just absolutely crazy and it goes against all good behaviour.

There are 500 employees in this South Australian company who are devastated by this report. All the patients who have had tests done at Gribbles are probably devastated. They are almost certainly going back to their doctors today in a state of high anxiety—all because of poor journalistic standards and outrageous allegations, with no proof, from a member in the other place. If the honourable member in the other House wishes to bring forward those allegations and the people who are making them, and prove them, we will all be better off.

Mr McKEE (Gilles): For the past 12 months we have been hearing from the Opposition questions and ridicule concerning the State Bank of South Australia—to such a degree that business people are actually telling me in my electorate office that they are sick and tired of the attacks by the Opposition on the State Bank, because they still have to do business in this State. These people want to do business with the State Bank, and all the criticism of the past 12 months from the Opposition in relation to the State Bank is doing is damaging their chances. We have had to put up with this every week for the past 12 months during Question Time in this House. Today, I was reading the

Financial Review and I saw the headline 'State Bank problem loans make it $1.72 billion'. Naturally, one is entitled to ask to which bank that referred, so I read the article a little further. It said that the State Bank of New South Wales was expected to announce a $1 billion blowout in problem loans, to $1.72 billion, for the 12 months to September and that it had begun a program of staff cuts and branch closures.

It is interesting that the only remaining Liberal Government in Australia is the State Government of New South Wales and its bank is in nearly $2 billion-worth of debt. This is the same Government that has been held up by other Liberal Oppositions around the country as leading the way in economic recovery, and in other types of policy directions in which this country should be going. Well, one has to say that the wheel always turns, and it has well and truly turned in New South Wales. The article goes on to say that the increase in problem loans is detailed in unaudited results. That this means that this could blowout even further than that, to $2 billion or $3 billion.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: To $3 billion or $4 billion.

Mr McKEE: Yes, the worst is yet to come. Further on in the article we are told that the $1.7 billion problem loan figure is about $500 million above analysts' expectations. In other words, the people working in the bank themselves had no idea until quite recently that the figure was $500 million worse than expected. I wonder whether Mr Greiner actually knew. The article goes on further to state:

> Sources say the bank plans to cut its 7 000-strong staff by as many as 700, which would represent about 10 per cent of total employees, by Christmas.

Mr Turner, one of the bank's senior officers, said:

> We are in the middle of a recession and suffering from a decrease in business volumes . . . What are we supposed to do—carry them?

That has been the attitude of the senior bank management of the State Bank of New South Wales. Just to add to the problems, earlier in the week, I understand that Moody's Investors Service had unexpectedly put the State's 'Aaa' rating for Australian dollar debt under review for possible downgrading. What that means is that the Moody's review was prompted by the deterioration in the New South Wales revenue base. The ratings agency also cited:

> . . . concern over the large degree of political uncertainty confronting the present coalition Government, which will ultimately effect the direction of the State's economic policy.

That is the shining light of the only remaining conservative Government in this country, and we have been hearing ridicule for the past 12 months about the State Bank's problems in South Australia. All members of the Opposition need to do is to look into their own back yard, because this recession that we are experiencing is not only Australia-wide but America-wide. This week's *Newsweek* magazine indicates that the Americans are also suffering from a recession that has been going on for decades. If anyone believed the Opposition in this State, they would believe that this was the only State in recession. Now we see that the Nick Greiner led Liberal Government in New South Wales has a bank with almost $2 billion worth of debts.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Earlier today I asked a question of the Minister for Environment and Planning regarding the Government's intention to establish the Mount Lofty Ranges Regional Planning Authority. I wanted to ask the question (and may I say I was extremely disappointed in the Minister's response) because there is a considerable amount of concern throughout the Mount Lofty Ranges in regard to the establishment of this authority. Personally, I would support the setting up of an authority, but it is important that the community have the opportunity to have its say and to seek information about the establishment of the authority. Questions are being asked about how it should be administered and at what cost, particularly to local government.

There is a rumour that local government may be asked to pay for up to 50 per cent of the cost of this authority; that is an attitude that has been put forward. Local government is understandably very concerned about that, because we have no idea of the overall cost of the authority, if it is to be established and, therefore, we are not able to indicate what 50 per cent of that cost would be. We are particularly keen to ensure that, if the Regional Planning Authority is to be established, duplication and waste will be avoided. There is also concern that it is intended that powers and responsibilities are to be delegated to that authority without their first being exposed to the parliamentary process. That is of particular concern to me and should be of particular concern to all members of this House.

On 8 November last year the Minister introduced an interim SDP for the Mount Lofty Ranges review—an interim review for six to 12 months. That SDP runs out in a few days and, obviously, we are anxious to know what is to take its place. The review was originally intended to go for two years; it has now taken four. It has been a pretty rocky process. Several different officers have been in charge and there has been a considerable amount of concern, particularly in local government circles. I would have hoped that the Minister may take this question seriously. There are concerns which people have and which need to be answered in the community. Whilst recognising that an extensive public consultation process has been carried out, in the matter of the establishment of an authority there has been no consultation with the general public at all. For the Minister to say that we must all sit back and wait for Cabinet to make a decision on this vital issue is totally inappropriate, and I would express that concern on behalf of the people of the Mount Lofty Ranges.

The other matter that I want to speak about in this brief grievance debate relates to the answers provided by the Minister today regarding the establishment of a plastics recycling program in South Australia. In her press release at the time of her launching of that new program, the Minister said that the South Australian Waste Management Commission introduced Rib Loc to the Victorian supplier. She said it was an excellent example of how Governments could best assist the development of the recycling industry. She went on to say that the new market was an incentive for groups and local councils. In the local Hills paper today I was interested to see an article under the heading 'Recycling initiative but not for South Australia' which stated:

> Used plastic is being recycled in Adelaide and exported as high performance industrial piping—but it's not South Australian plastic. All plastic used in the scheme is transported from Melbourne—a distance of more than 700 km—while the same type of SA plastic, including much from the Hills, is being stockpiled or simply thrown out.

Those who have commented on this issue, particularly some officers of council, have expressed considerable concern. One of the councils has indicated the following:

> Council has taken the initiative and is trying to do the right thing, and then finds it is being basically undermined by interstate imports. SA plastics are filling up our dumps [says one officer] and we're bringing others in . . . I can't understand it.

With that in mind, I believe that the Minister owes this House an explanation in regard to the advice she provided in reply to that question, and it is a matter that I will be taking further in this House.

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): My colleague, the member for Gilles, talked earlier about Liberal management of the economy. I would like to address a similar topic, but it is about our Leader of the Opposition and what he plans to do in relation to Commonwealth-State financial relations. As I am sure members will know, we have a very important Premiers Conference coming up next month when this whole issue of Commonwealth-State financial relations will be discussed, and one thing we can be sure of is that the Premier of this State will be doing his best to protect the interests of South Australia. I am not so sure that, if the policies of the Leader of the Opposition were put into effect, that would be good for South Australia. Indeed, it would be quite the opposite.

The Leader of the Opposition appears to misunderstand the whole problem of Commonwealth-State financial relations. It has been a vexed problem ever since Federation. Of course, the problem is that most of the revenue-raising power now lies with the Commonwealth; the States are dependent on money from the Commonwealth for many of their programs. As I have pointed out to this House on a previous occasion, basically there are four ways that that matter can be addressed: the expenditure powers can be transferred between various levels of government; taxation powers can be transferred between various levels of government; inter-governmental transfers can occur between one level of government to another, that is, financial assistance grants; or guaranteed revenue sharing can be brought in. What the Leader of the Opposition is saying is that we should have our own income tax and, indeed, he has also been talking about our own consumption tax.

The Premier rightly pointed out in answer to a question this week that what this State needs is a guaranteed share of total Commonwealth revenue. What the Leader of the Opposition is talking about is our just having a State income tax, and that is really a re-run of the Fraser Government's policy in 1976. The Fraser Government, in its so-called new federalism, proposed handing taxation powers to the States. That policy failed in 1976 and it deserved to fail. I am sure that, if it is put up again, it will fail yet again.

The Leader of the Opposition does not seem to understand that income tax is not the only revenue that the Commonwealth gets. In fact, about two-thirds of Commonwealth revenue comes from income tax and the rest comes from other sources, such as customs tax, sales tax, the petrol levy and so on. We would be sold a pup if we went down the Leader of the Opposition's line and agreed to take up a State income tax, only to find, if a Federal Liberal Government introduced a consumption tax, that the whole revenue base would fade away. That seems to be the point that the Leader of the Opposition missed in his address earlier this week. It is a case of history repeating itself—a history of Liberal failure. The Leader of the Opposition should get behind the Premier and support measures which will benefit South Australia and not pursue this ideological claptrap of free market policies which he seems to be getting from New South Wales.

If we agree with the sort of policies which Greiner is pushing in New South Wales, and which, to a lesser extent, are being pursued in Victoria, we could find outselves in great trouble. This State receives horizontal equalisation grants from the Commonwealth. If we were to lock ourselves into some income tax formula, what would happen to those equalisation grants? We could very easily find ourselves at a great disadvantage relative to the other States.

Another matter which also needs to be taken into account, if we go down the Leader of the Opposition's track, is that to rely on one form of tax as our revenue base could easily see it bartered away, as has happened with other forms of State taxation. When the States had revenue from death duties, Queensland decided to remove them. With a movable tax base, such as applied in the case of death duties, we saw those taxes evaporate until all the other States were forced to remove what was one of the few genuinely equitable taxes that we had applied. The policies being offered by the Leader of the Opposition in relation to income tax would be a disaster for South Australia. I believe that he should give up this stupid line of thought about State income and consumption taxes.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I bring to the Chamber the fifth edition and progress report on the bushfire on Kangaroo Island, which is now 12 days old. I remind the House that shortly after it started, following a lightning strike the week before last, I reported the sort of long-term episode we were in for if that fire were not treated properly and responsibly, as recommended by local people. As was feared at the time, the National Parks and Wildlife Service policy of trying to put it out by expensive water bombing and other like methods was adopted, so we still have a fire in the Chase and we still have expensive publicly funded personnel seething around the place like ants adopting practices that are further aggravating the local community.

I have been receiving progress reports during the period of the fire from my agents on Kangaroo Island given my absence from that community to attend this House. This morning I received further disturbing news of more public expenditure: confirmation that the local CFS crews were no longer in attendance at the fire. Whilst they were on standby and in readiness to assist in the event of dire emergency—that is, where personal property or human life were endangered—they were back on their respective farms and properties going about their daily work. The extra disturbing information that was faxed to me this morning from Kangaroo Island was that CFS trucks based on Kangaroo Island were presently being manned by mainland crews and that that activity was, to say the least, frowned upon by the local volunteers.

The situation on Kangaroo Island has got to the stage where the them and us attitude between National Parks and Wildlife Service officers and local people and local CFS officers is so bad that I cannot recall local people being so antagonistic towards one another as is being witnessed and reported to me on a daily basis. I have raised the matter of this antagonism with the Minister privately today, and I hope that it will be addressed as a matter of urgency.

The latest saga of public expenditure of which I am aware was the airlifting of liquid fuel—Avgas—from the mainland to Kangaroo Island yesterday almost throughout the day by a hired helicopter. Because the *Island Seaway*, for one reason or another, was unable to or did not take the required Avgas to Kangaroo Island on its last special fuel voyage, fixed-wing aircraft had to be fuelled at that local level, so the authorities flew the fuel over, four or five cans at a time, on a hired helicopter at a cost of between $1 000 and $2 000 per return trip.

As I indicated the other day, local people are absolutely furious with this sort of wastage. The fire is still burning at Flinders Chase and it is burning today in a direction away from the only structural improvements on the reserve. As reported on the radio throughout this morning, the fire is heading towards the Playford Highway and farms with green grass on them, presenting no dangers whatsoever. Yet, these officers are running around the place like cut cats trying to put the damn thing out—with no hope of doing so. About 12 000 hectares have been burnt and are still partly or very

much alight at the moment. To try to put it out with water bombs, bags, bushes, knapsacks, fire trucks, or whatever other mechanical or personal device is a pipedream. I hope that this Blue Hills type episode might be a lesson for us all so that this type of stupidity does not recur.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): I should like to share a few whimsical thoughts with my colleagues at the end of a tiring week on the subject of the corporate linkages that members opposite might appropriately be asked to encourage for the sake of the Grand Prix. My thoughts are partly inspired by a remark which was made yesterday by the member for Henley Beach in another debate regarding invitations to the Tobacco Institute's corporate box at the Grand Prix and which came to mind when the member for Bright rose to his feet in Question Time. Why the member for Bright inspired me to recall that remark from yesterday will become clear in a moment.

The Grand Prix has been a great success, once again. Public sales are proceeding satisfactorily but, unfortunately, because of the state of the economy, the corporate boxes are not being taken up to quite the same extent as in previous years. Today's *News* (page 3) carries an article that states that Senator Olsen was very critical of a corporate box being taken out by the SGIC. That article refers to the Premier's response to Senator Olsen as follows:

> Mr Bannon said South Australia's corporate bodies should be supporting the Grand Prix 100 per cent. 'It's very difficult for us to induce interstate and international companies to be involved if our own local companies with a major stake in this community aren't being involved,', he said. Somebody ought to fix Senator Olsen with an invitation and I think he will be all right.

Members opposite could well encourage quite a few corporate bodies to join in, and no doubt some may already be attending as guests. Yesterday, the member for Henley Beach, in the debate on the Parliament (Joint Services—Prohibition on Smoking) Amendment Bill, said there was a possibility that some members who did not publicly oppose smoking and who in fact supported smokers—whom I believe are a dying breed—would be invited to be guests of the Tobacco Institute.

I have no interest in any such invite; neither has the member for Henley Beach. Nevertheless, the proposal brought to mind other possibilities that could be related to interests shown here by particular members. The converse is: what corporations could be encouraged by members to take out corporate boxes and support the Grand Prix?

One could also consider which MPs would be the automatic choice of guests of a particular corporation and which bodies might, perhaps at a later stage, sponsor particular MPs in various endeavours, such as a charity drive or a rally. The first person who came to mind was not the member for Bright, whom I will come to in a moment, but the Leader, who obviously could approach the Jacobs Hams or perhaps the South Australian Police Association. If they turn him back, he could always resort to a small firm, which I noticed in the *Yellow Pages*, that goes under the title of 'Magarey Refrigeration'.

Then there is the Deputy Leader opposite, who would obviously be able to form close corporate linkages with Anthony Squires. A couple of members opposite would probably get on well with Ashley and Martin. Of course, the member for Bright would warmly be welcomed by Telecom in its corporate box for his services to the profit margins of Telecom in his position as secret agent 0055.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I am getting lots of suggestions here relating to Quarry Industries, Jenny Craig and Booze Brothers, which I will ignore, but I am sure that the member for Alexandra would proudly encourage the Adelaide Casino to strongly support the GP for its corporate box.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker and seek your ruling on a matter. I heard the member for Walsh suggest that Senator Olsen's vote could be bought. I realise that Senator Olsen is not a member of this place, but I think that is a most—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair does not uphold the point of order. The honourable member for Walsh.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Obviously, from the great deal of interest that he has shown, the member for Adelaide would be warmly welcomed by Medicare, and the member for Bragg, otherwise known as Mr Squiggle, would be warmly welcomed by Wigg's office supplies. I could not understand the suggestion put to me by someone that the member for Goyder would be sponsored or welcomed by Link Introductions, but I would strongly agree with the proposition, in view of the campaign in her favour to supplant the current Leader with someone referred to in some circumstances as 'Salvation Jane', that the member for Coles would obviously be sponsored by the *Advertiser*.

Then there is the possibility of the member for Fisher spending time in the corporate box of either Crown Forklifts or the Royal Commonwealth Society. The member for Hayward might be welcomed by the Real Estate Insititute, by Mercantile Collection Services or by Supertreat Septic Waste Water Services. Possibly, one member opposite might be welcomed by the Child Adolescent Mental Health Services, but kindness precludes me from mentioning that member. A variety of talents and interests could thus be brought to bear in encouraging corporate sponsors in assisting the Grand Prix.

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

FLINDERS UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA (JOINT AWARDS) BILL

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Employment and Further Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Flinders University of South Australia Act 1966. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this Bill is to amend The Flinders University of South Australia Act 1966 to allow the university to award degrees or other awards jointly with any other university. Members may be aware that, since the beginning of 1990, Flinders University has enrolled students in engineering courses who would complete their studies at The Levels campus of the University of South Australia (the South Australian Institute of Technology in 1990). The ultimate intent with this innovation is for these institutions to cooperate fully in their engineering programs offering joint awards through a joint faculty. Engineering courses at Flinders University are important in expanding the range of educational opportunities at the tertiary level for people in the southern suburbs.

Unfortunately, advice has been given that the university's Act might not permit it to confer awards jointly with other institutions. Certainly, it could confer its own awards giving full credit for any work undertaken at the University of South Australia. The converse could also occur, but none of this would be consistent with the agreement between the two institutions. The intent is that the conferring of an award under this scheme be an act taken by the institutions in partnership. This Bill is intended to facilitate that process. At the same time the Bill makes a number of minor amendments to recognise that the university is in the business of offering awards other than degrees.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 makes it clear that the university may make statutes for the conferral of diplomas and other awards as well as degrees. Clause 3 clarifies that the power of the university to confer degrees, diplomas or other awards includes the power to do so jointly with any other university. Other consequential amendments are made.

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

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST (PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE AND BUSINESS ADVISORY PANEL) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act 1966. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Aboriginal Lands Trust was established 25 years ago, with the proclamation of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act on 8 December 1966. The Aboriginal Lands Trust Act was the first land rights Act passed by an Australian Parliament, and since that time the Aboriginal Lands Trust has been able to provide some security of tenure to Aboriginal people by leasing out the land to Aboriginal Communities and individuals.

Since the passage of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act, two other land rights Acts have been passed by the South Australian Parliament, the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act (1981) and the Maralinga Tjarutja Land Rights Act (1984). The Maralinga Tjarutja Land Rights Act included provision for the establishment of a Parliamentary Committee to review and monitor the operations of the Act. Following the effectiveness of this Parliamentary Committee, the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Council later sought the amendment of the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act to incorporate a similar provision. This Bill to amend the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act seeks to establish a similar Parliamentary Committee to work with the Aboriginal Lands Trust on the operation of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act and the matters which affect the interests of the Aboriginal people living on Aboriginal Lands Trust land.

It is intended that the Aboriginal Lands Trust Parliamentary Committee would work in a similar way to the other two Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Committees, and have the same membership, powers and functions. The establishment of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Parliamentary Committee will provide an opportunity for the Parliament to become as informed about matters which affect Aboriginal people on Aboriginal Lands Trust lands as they are about issues which affect Aboriginal people on other Aboriginal lands in South Australia.

In establishing the Aboriginal Lands Trust, provision was made in the legislation to provide technical assistance for the development of the lands held by the Trust. This Bill proposes a mechanism for providing such assistance with the establishment of a Business Advisory Panel. Members of the Business Advisory Panel would work with lessees of Trust land on the management and development of business enterprises which are carried out on Trust land.

Reviews of economic development programs both in Australia and overseas have consistently shown that a major cause of business failure is the lack of effective business advice to a manager once the business has been established. Members of the Business Advisory Panel will work with Communities and individuals who either have a business proposal or are managing a business on Trust land. Panel members will provide their time at no cost, and be available on the phone or in person to discuss ongoing management issues with managers.

The Bill provides for a seven member panel, including the Chairperson of the Aboriginal Lands Trust, the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education, and five other persons with experience in business areas, such as tourism, marketing, manufacturing, administration, and agriculture. The purpose of the panel is to be available to advise enterprise managers on trust land, and it is not intended that the panel would meet formally on a regular basis, but rather use their time directly with enterprise managers.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the measure to be brought into operation by proclamation. Clause 3 inserts new sections 20a and 20b providing for business advisory panels and a parliamentary committee respectively. Proposed new section 20a provides for the establishment of an Aboriginal Lands Business Advisory Panel. Under the proposed new section, the panel is to have the functions of advising and assisting Aboriginal committees and Aboriginal persons ordinarily residing on the lands in the establishment and management of business or community enterprises and in the development of skills required for the effective operation of such enterprises. The panel is to consist of seven members. One of the members must be the chairman of the Aboriginal Lands Trust; five must be persons appointed by the Governor on the nomination of the Minister as persons with business knowledge and experience that will, in the Minister's opinion, contribute to the effective performance by the panel of its functions; and one must be the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Technical and Further Education or his or her nominee. The members appointed by the Governor are to be appointed for a term of office and on terms and conditions determined by the Governor. The panel is to conduct its business in such manner as it determines from time to time subject to any directions of the Minister.

Proposed new section 20b provides for the establishment of an Aboriginal Lands Trust Parliamentary Committee. The proposed new section provides for the duties and the constitution of the committee in terms that correspond to the provisions of the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act 1981 and the Maralinga Tjarutja Land Rights Act 1984 establishing parliamentary committees for the purposes of those Acts. The duties of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Parliamentary Committee will be—

(a) to take an interest in—

(i) the operation of the Act;

(ii) matters that affect the interests of the Aboriginal persons who ordinarily reside on the lands;

and

(iii) the manner in which the lands are being managed, used and controlled;

(b) to consider any other matters referred to the committee by the Minister;

and

(c) to provide, on or before 31 December in each year, an annual report to Parliament on the work of the committee during the preceding financial year.

The committee is to consist of the Minister and four members of the House of Assembly appointed by the Minister (of whom two must be appointed from the group led by the Leader of the Opposition). The remaining provisions provide for the term of office of members and the procedures of the committee and are the same as the provisions governing those matters for the committees established under the other land rights Acts.

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

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I move:

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 12 November at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND BANKING GROUP LIMITED (NMRB) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 October. Page 1559.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the second reading of this Bill to allow it to be considered by a select committee. However, we have extreme reservations about the haste with which this matter must be processed by the Parliament. Our ultimate position on the Bill will be reserved depending on the findings of the select committee. On first reading, the matter seems to be reasonably straightforward.

Bill read a second time and referred to a select committee consisting of Messrs S.J. Baker, Blevins, De Laine, Holloway and Such; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on Tuesday 12 November.

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 October. Page 1163.)

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): The Liberal Party supports this Bill, which seeks to establish the Office of Director of Public Prosecutions. Indeed, in our recently released discussion paper on public safety, we advocated the establishment of such an office. The Bill also provides that any legal practitioner of at least seven years standing is eligible to be appointed by the Governor as Director for a period of seven years on terms and conditions determined by the Governor. At the expiration of a term of office, the Director will be eligible for reappointment.

We note that the Governor may terminate the appointment if the Director is guilty of misbehaviour, becomes physically or mentally incapacitated, becomes bankrupt, is absent without leave of the Attorney-General for 14 consecutive days, or for 28 days in any period of 12 months, engages without the consent of the Attorney-General in any remunerated employment or has a direct or indirect pecuniary interest that has not been notified to the Attorney-General. The powers of the Director of Public Prosecutions are effectively to lay charges of indictable or summary offences against the law of the State, to prosecute them, to enforce civil remedies arising out of prosecutions, take proceedings in relation to the confiscation of profits of crime, to grant immunity from prosecution and to exercise appellate rights as well as enter a *nolle prosequi* or otherwise terminate a prosecution and carry out any other functions assigned to the Director by regulation.

While the Opposition is pleased to see these measures included in the Bill by and large, we do have some differences with the Government as to how the office itself should be managed. We would like the office to have a more independent role and be accountable itself to the Parliament. This matter and others have been raised during the debate on this Bill in the other place, and the Opposition is pleased with the passage of a number of amendments. Despite these amendments I am inclined to move further amendments to try to ensure the greater independence of the Office of Director of Public Prosecutions. However, I can see that there is no point in doing so as further amendments will not attract the necessary Government support to ensure their successful passage. Hence, the Opposition is left with concerns about the independence of the office from the Attorney-General, and it will watch the position with very close interest indeed.

While the Director is to be independent of directional control by the Crown or any Minister or officer of the Crown, the Attorney-General may give directions and furnish guidelines that must be published in the Director's annual report. The Director may give directions or furnish guidelines to the Commissioner of Police or other persons investigating or prosecuting offences on behalf of the Crown, and such directions or guidelines must be published in the Director's annual report. The Office of Director of Public Prosecutions has been established in a number of jurisdictions. In each jurisdiction, the objective is to provide an office that coordinates crime prosecutions and is relatively free of political interference. I note that in Victoria this office was established in 1982. In that State, the Director prepares, institutes and conducts all criminal proceedings on behalf of the Crown in the High Court, the Supreme Court and the County Court, and has the authority to take over proceedings in relation to any summary offence.

The Director is responsible to the Attorney-General for the due performance of his functions under the Act, but the responsibility does not affect or derogate from the authority of the Director in respect of the preparation, institution and conduct of proceedings under the Victorian Act. The Victorian Director of Public Prosecutions has virtually complete structural independence and the Director selects staff and controls the budget of the office. I also note that until the age of 65 years the office-holder receives a salary and pension benefits of a puisne judge of a Supreme Court and is not subject to the provisions of the Victorian Public Service Act. The Director in that State may be suspended by the Governor but if suspended a full statement of the grounds must be presented by the Attorney-General

to the Victorian Parliament within seven days or, if the House is not sitting, within seven days of the start of the next session. If Parliament does not within seven days from the report pass a resolution for the removal of the Director then the suspension is lifted. This is the only mechanism for the removal of an incumbent Director in that State.

The independence of individual prosecutions is protected by restrictions on the Director's involvement at that level. The Director is entitled to furnish general guidelines to prosecutors, police or other persons but the Director is not entitled to furnish guidelines in relation to a particular case. Guidelines so given must be published in the Victorian *Government Gazette*. A review of Offices of Director of Public Prosecutions in various jurisdictions leads the Opposition to the conclusion that the Victorian model is at the extreme end of independence in the prosecution of criminal offences. One could argue that little room has been left for political accountability, because it is open to the Government and the Attorney-General to disavow responsibility for any unpopular or unwise decisions. The Attorney-General has no power to influence particular prosecutions for proper or improper motives.

I note that in England and Wales the Office of Director of Public Prosecutions is created by statute. The Director is appointed by the Attorney-General and paid a salary determined by the Attorney-General with the approval of the respective treasurers and pension benefits arranged individually with the Treasury. The Director of Public Prosecutions is head of the Crown Prosecution Service. The Director is appointed not for a specific term but until retirement, but the Director is subject to the normal terms and conditions governing civil servants in those countries and so can be removed from office for inefficiency or for falling foul of the law or normal rules of conduct. While the Director has a certain measure of independence with regard to staffing because the Director makes the appointment, the approval of the Treasury must be obtained in respect of the numbers. The Director is to discharge the functions of office under the superintendence of the Attorney-General.

In England and Wales the independence of Crown counsel from political influence is protected significantly by tradition. However, the South Australian legislation is based upon the Commonwealth model which allows the Attorney-General to be involved in the prosecution service either through general guidelines or in dealing with individual cases. In this respect, the Attorney-General remains publicly accountable for actions taken with regard to the prosecution service. In the scale of things the Opposition suggests that the Director of Public Prosecutions ought to be at or just below the status of the Solicitor-General. There ought to be significant independence but ultimate accountability for the performance of his or her functions. There is no point establishing the Office of Director of Public Prosecutions where the Attorney-General of the day can give specific directions but can, generally speaking, hide behind the Director of Public Prosecutions who is always accountable to the Attorney-General but in public might be regarded as being relatively independent.

As I said from the outset of my brief speech today, the Liberal Party supports this Bill but expresses some regret that this office will not have a more independent role and be more accountable to Parliament. A number of amendments have been agreed to outside this place that will be put forward shortly. While disappointed that we will not see the type of accountability or control that we would like to see, the Opposition will, nevertheless, sit back and watch the conduct of this office with interest. In general, we are happy to support this Bill.

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I do not share the enthusiasm of the Opposition or the Government for this Bill. It is my view as a member of this place that the holders of the office of Attorney-General have from time to time exercised the powers that this Bill seeks to grant to someone who is not elected and who is not accountable in that way to the Parliament. They are very substantial powers: in fact, they comprise all the normal powers of the Attorney-General with respect to the administration of justice in this State.

Personally, I do not believe that it is in the long-term interests of the administration of justice that powers such as these should be granted to someone who is, in effect, an unelected public servant. I do not believe that we will necessarily obtain in any way the degree of independence and separation from Government in the exercise of these powers that this Bill seeks to grant. I accept that the Bill is drafted for a legitimate, genuine and sincere purpose and that the Opposition's support of it is based on exactly the same motives. However, I do not necessarily believe that the Bill will provide that result.

I do not believe that by creating a separate position of Director of Public Prosecutions we will obtain for ourselves any higher standard of the administration of justice than we now enjoy from an elected Attorney-General. By continually delegating these significant and substantial powers that have been entrusted to elected officials for generations to people who are simply on the public payroll, we will not guarantee for ourselves that the standards will in any way improve. I accept that there are many qualified legal practitioners in the Public Service who have the highest standards of personal integrity and ethics, and I am sure that the person who will be selected to fill this position, should it become law, will certainly be such a person. However, I do not believe that this in any way guarantees an improvement of the present position.

These persons selected to hold the office of Attorney-General usually possess substantial legal qualifications and experience and, of course, they naturally enjoy the confidence of this Parliament while they continue to hold that office by definition. Quite clearly, the Attorney-General is subject to day-to-day control and constraint by the public office that he holds and day-to-day scrutiny of the way in which he administers that office. We have seen unfortunate and stressful examples of how that day-to-day accountability can be used against an Attorney. Unfortunately, I doubt that quite the same standards of accountability will apply with respect to a non-elected public official who will simply hold office permanently.

Although the person is subject to appointment every seven years, the reality is that they are eligible for reappointment and it would be a brave Government that decided not to reappoint that person. I suspect that this Bill will not achieve any significant improvement over the present position, and I think it further derogates from the power of the elected Parliament of the people of South Australia that we continually hand over these functions to people who are not elected.

The Bill as drafted contains a number of matters about which I would like further explanation from the Minister. My main area of concern relates to the issue of delegations by the Director. The Director has a number of very substantial powers, including that of laying charges for indictable or summary offences against the law of the State; the right to grant immunity from prosecution; the right to take

action to confiscate the profits of crime; and, the right to exercise appellate rights arising from any of these proceedings and, indeed, to terminate any case that is before the courts.

Those are very substantial powers, and they are appropriate to the Office of Director. In my view, they should be with the Attorney-General, but the Bill assigns them to the Director. The Bill also gives the Director the power to delegate any of these powers to any other member of his office staff. That person does not have to be legally qualified or have any experience in that area. The delegation does not have to be in writing or reported to anyone including the Attorney-General or this Parliament, and it does not have to be included in the annual report. I hope that the Minister will be able to clarify those issues, because I believe powers as substantial as this should be exercised only by the Director or his deputy, or perhaps by some other member of the office who is at least legally qualified. However, there is no such constraint in the Bill.

While I am sure that the Director will act responsibly, very few constraints are placed on the Office of Director. His independence is guaranteed by the Bill, and therefore it is essential that such matters as delegation of all these important powers are very tightly controlled. I also question whether or not any person who is granted these powers by delegation, be it verbal delegation or otherwise, will receive the benefit of the independence that the Director has in the execution of his duties. While the Director is guaranteed independence, it is not the case that the Director's staff are guaranteed independence because some members of the Director's staff will be employees and subject to the Government Management and Employment Act in relation to their duties. So, while the legislation may well seek to guarantee the independence of the Director, I wonder whether it will equally guarantee the independence of an employee of the Office of Director who is granted these powers by delegation from the Director.

I believe that that series of questions in relation to the operation and exercise of those powers is very significant, and I hope that the Government will be able to clarify the situation in the course of the debate. I also hope that the Minister will be able to explain the costing of this proposal, because I am a concerned that the cost of this operation could grow in future years as a bureaucracy evolves around the Office of Director, and that in the name of independence we will be asked to further fund this office. I am all in favour of independence—it is something I think there should be more of—but I am really not certain that in the context of this Bill that will necessarily mean a better administration of justice or even a more cost-effective administration of justice. I do not necessarily know that the appropriate safeguards have been established in the document we have before us. I hope that the Minister will be able to allay the fears that I have expressed to the House, and I look forward to his response accordingly.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I thank the Opposition for its support of the Bill and I note the comments of the member for Elizabeth in relation to it. The Bill is an important measure, which has been the subject of discussion in South Australia for many years. I guess that that discussion has been mostly centred within the legal profession, particularly within criminal justice agencies within South Australia, but it is a debate that has ensued in many other jurisdictions thoughout the Western world over many years. There has been a trend to move away from the more traditional role performed by the Attorney-General and the accountability that the Attorney-General has within the checks and balances provided in the Westminster system for those traditional functions vested in the Attorney-General and his responsibilities for the laying of prosecutions and dealing with matters, particularly in the criminal courts.

In recent times it has been seen as desirable to move away from that more traditional role and from the traditional forms of accountability that are provided within our parliamentary system to enable these decisions to be taken by an officer of the Crown pursuant to statute and to remove that traditional role from the Attorney-General. I think that that debate will continue in the community at large. However, it has been the experience in other jurisdictions that such a model has proved to be successful in the sense that the community has an enhanced respect for that criminal justice process and it is seen to be beyond the influence of any political process, although I am not aware of an allegation in this State that that has been so.

This Bill puts that beyond doubt and in a sense provides for the administrative arrangements that will now apply with respect to public prosecutions in South Australia. We have the benefit of developments in recent years in England, Commonwealth countries and in a number of States of Australia—New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and the Australian Capital Territory. I think we have learned from the experience in those places in relation to the Bill that is before us.

The matters raised by the member for Elizabeth are of interest to the Government, and I will seek further instructions on them to see whether it is possible to allay the honourable member's fears without having to amend the legislation. I will seek to provide that information during the Committee stage of the Bill. I very much appreciate the interest of the honourable member in this matter and the study he has made of the Bill in order to ensure that it serves the purpose for which it is intended, and there is also the public accountability concern that he raised in his speech this afternoon. I commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—'Powers of Director.'

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:

Page 3, line 19—Leave out ', or any power to consent to a prosecution,'.

These words are deleted and a new subsection, dealing generally with consents to prosecutions, is inserted by means of the next amendment. So, this amendment is procedural on the next amendment that I shall move.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:

Page 3—

After line 20—Insert new subclauses as follows:

(2a) A person who has power to consent to a prosecution, or to allow an extension of the period for commencing a prosecution, for an offence of a particular kind under the law of the State may, by notice in the *Gazette* delegate that power to the Director.

(2b) A delegation under subsection (2a)—

(a) is revocable by subsequent notice in the *Gazette*; and

(b) does not prevent the person from acting personally in a matter,

but, once a decision on a particular matter has been made by the Director in pursuance of a delegation, the delegator is bound by that decision.

(2c) A document apparently signed by the Director and stating that the Director consents to a particular prosecution or that the Director allows a specified extension of the period for commencing a particular prosecution is to be accepted, in the absence of proof to the contrary, as proof of the fact so stated.

After line 24—Insert new subclauses as follows:

(4) In any legal proceedings, the Director may appear personally or may be represented by a member of the staff of the office who is a legal practitioner or by counsel or solicitor (including the Crown Solicitor or the Solicitor-General).

(5) Details of any notices published under this section must be included in the Director's annual report.

The amendments insert a series of new subclauses. The Government considers that, generally, the Director of Public Prosecutions should be responsible for all consents to prosecutions. However, there are some consents under specific Acts which remain with the Minister responsible for that Act. An example of such a consent is under section 33 of the Summary Offences Act, which requires the Minister's consent to a prosecution for an offence relating to the publication of indecent matter, and another example is under section 101 of the Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act, which requires a person to have the consent of the Minister to commence a prosecution. The amendment inserts a new provision enabling a person who has power to consent to the prosecution of offences to delegate that power to the Director of Public Prosecutions. It also makes clear that a decision of the Director cannot be overturned by the delegator removing the allegation and then acting personally. Of course, that would be an abuse of process. This provision, sprinkled throughout various Acts of Parliament, is thus dealt with in this way.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 8 and 9 passed.

Clause 10—'Police Report.'

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:

Page 4, lines 9 to 13—Omit this clause and insert:

Investigation and report

10. The Commissioner of Police must, so far as it is practicable to do so, comply with any request from the Director to investigate, or report on the investigation of any matter.

This amendment was requested by the Commissioner of Police, in discussions with the Government on this measure. He is concerned to bring the South Australian provision into line with similar interstate legislation. This proposed new provision requires the Commissioner of Police to comply with requests from the Director of Public Prosecutions so far as it is practicable to do so. It is considered that this amendment will enable a consultative management between the Police Commissioner and the Director of Public Prosecutions. I think it can be seen from a reading of this measure that this is an important practical consideration.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 11 and 12 passed.

New clause 12a—'Saving Provision.'

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:

Page 4, after line 32—Insert new clause as follows:

12a. This Act does not derogate from the right of the Attorney-General to appear personally in any proceedings on behalf of the Crown.

This provision is designed to ensure that the Attorney-General may appear personally in any proceedings on behalf of the Crown, that is, as counsel on behalf of the Crown. There may be occasions on which the Attorney-General may wish to appear as counsel and this provision allows that to occur. It has been a traditional role of Attorneys-General over the years. There have been eminent counsel, and it has been appropriate for the argument on behalf of the Crown to be advanced by the Attorney-General in matters, particularly before superior courts. So, it is important that that traditional function of the Attorney be preserved—although I think it is used less frequently these days than in the past.

New clause inserted.

Clause 13 passed.

New schedule 1.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:

Page 4, after line 35—Insert the following schedule:

Schedule 1

Transitional Provisions

Retrospectivity

1. (1) This Act applies in relation to proceedings commenced before the commencement of this Act.

(2) This Act applies in relation to offences committed before the commencement of this Act.

Director to take over from Attorney-General

2. Where, before the commencement of this Act, the Attorney-General had exercised, in relation to particular proceedings, a power or function of a kind vested in the Director under this Act, the Director may assume and continue to exercise that power or function as if it had been exercised by the Director from the inception of the proceedings.

This schedule includes transitional arrangements to ensure that the provisions of the Act will apply to proceedings commenced and offences committed before the commencement of this Act. The second schedule that I shall move to insert makes consequential amendments to a range of other Acts affected by this measure, in essence, when appropriate statutory reference to the Attorney-General has been changed to reference to the Director of Public Prosecutions.

New schedule inserted.

New schedule 2.

The CHAIRMAN: Before the Minister moves to insert new schedule 2, I draw to the attention of the Committee the proposed amendment on the second sheet of amendments, which varies schedule 2 by leaving out the amendment to section 3 (1) of the Crimes (Confiscation of Profits) Act 1986.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Accordingly, I move:

Page 4, after schedule 1—Insert the following schedule:

Schedule 2

Consequential Amendments

Provision Amended	How Amended
Bail Act 1985	
Section 21a	Strike out paragraphs *(a)* and *(b)* and 'or' between those paragraphs and substitute: *(a)* the Director of Public Prosecutions; *(b)* a person acting on the instructions of the Crown; or *(c)* any member of the police force.
Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act 1979	
Section 46 (2) *(a)*	Strike out 'made by the Attorney-General'.
Section 46 (2) *(b)*	Strike out 'by the Attorney-General'.
Section 47 (1)	Strike out 'Attorney-General' first occurring and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'. Strike out 'Attorney-General' second occurring and substitute 'Director'.
Section 47 (2)-(5)	Strike out 'Attorney-General' wherever occurring and substitute, in each case, 'Director'.
Controlled Substances Act 1984	
Section 45a	Strike out paragraphs *(a)* and *(b)* and 'or' between those paragraphs and substitute; *(a)* the Director of Public Prosecutions; *(b)* a member of the police force; or *(c)* a person authorised in writing by the Director of Public Prosecution to commence the prosecution.

Provision Amended	How Amended
Crimes (Confiscation of Profits) Act 1986	
Section 5 (1)	Strike out 'Attorney-General' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 6 (1)	Strike out 'Attorney-General' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 6 (8)	Strike out 'Attorney-General' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 9a (1)	Strike out 'Attorney-General' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935	
Section 57a (2)	Strike out 'Attorney-General' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 57a (3)	Strike out 'Attorney-General' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 275 (1)	Strike out 'Attorney-General' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 276 (1)	Strike out 'Attorney-General' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 276 (2)	Strike out 'Attorney-General' twice occurring and substitute, in each case, 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 281a (1)	Strike out 'Attorney-General' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 281a (3)	Strike out 'Attorney-General' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 285c (3) *(d)*	Strike out 'Crown Prosecutor' twice occurring and substitute, in each case, 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 285c (7)	Strike out 'Crown Prosecutor' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 348a	Strike out this section.
Section 350 (1a)	Insert 'or the Director of Public Prosecutions' after 'Attorney-General'.
Section 351 (2b)	Insert 'or if the Director of Public Prosecutions made the application, the Director' after 'Attorney-General' first occurring. Insert 'or the Director of Public Prosecutions (as the case may require)' after 'Attorney-General' second occurring.
Section 352 (2)	Strike out 'Attorney-General' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 353 (5)	Strike out 'Attorney-General' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 362	Strike out 'Attorney-General' first occurring and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'. Strike out 'Attorney-General' second occurring and substitute 'Director'.
Section 365 (2)	Insert 'or Director of Public Prosecutions' after 'Attorney-General'.
Section 366 (3)	Strike out 'or by the Attorney-General' and substitute, 'Attorney-General or Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 369	Strike out 'Chief Secretary' first occurring and substitute 'Attorney-General'. Strike out 'with the concurrence of the Attorney-General,'. Strike out 'Chief Secretary' second occurring and substitute 'Attorney-General'.
Schedule 1	Strike out 'Attorney-General' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Schedule 2	Strike out 'Attorney-General' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Schedule 3	Strike out 'Attorney-General' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988	
Section 22 (2)	Strike out 'Crown' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 22 (7)	Strike out 'Crown' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 23 (11)	Strike out 'Crown' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 24 (1)	Strike out 'Crown' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 24 (5) *(a)*	Strike out 'Crown' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 24 (5) *(b)*	Strike out 'Crown' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 24 (11)	Strike out 'Crown' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 26	Strike out 'Crown' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 27a (1) *(c)*	Strike out 'Crown' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 27a (2)	Strike out 'Crown' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 27a (5) *(a)* (iii)	Strike out 'Crown' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 27a (5) *(b)*	Strike out 'Crown' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 27a (6)	Strike out 'Crown' first occurring and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'. Strike out 'Crown' second and third occurring and substitute, in each case, 'Director'.
Section 32 (6)	Strike out 'Crown' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 32 (7) *(b)*	Strike out 'Crown' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 32 (10) *(b)*	Strike out 'Crown' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Evidence Act 1929	
Section 56 (2)	Insert 'the Director of Public Prosecutions,' after 'the Crown Solicitor,'.
Freedom of Information Act 1991	
Schedule 2, paragraph *(k)*	Strike out 'Crown Prosecutor' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Juries Act 1927	
Section 31 (2)	Strike out 'Crown Solicitor' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Justices Act 1921	
Section 141 (1)	Strike out 'Attorney-General' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 141 (3)	Strike out 'Attorney-General' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 155 (5)	Strike out 'Attorney-General' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 155 (6)	Strike out 'Attorney-General' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 188 (3)	Strike out 'Crown Solicitor' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Legal Practitioners Act 1981	
Section 21 (3) *(w)*	Insert 'or the Director of Public Prosecutions' after 'Australian Government Solicitor'.
Section 51 (1) *(a)*	Insert 'and the Director of Public Prosecutions' after 'Australian Government Solicitor'.
Section 51 (1) *(b)*	Strike out this paragraph and substitute: *(b)* a legal practitioner acting on the instructions of—

Provision Amended	How Amended
	(i) The Attorney-General of the State; (ii) the Attorney-General of the Commonwealth; (iii) the Crown Solicitor; (iv) the Australian Government Solicitor; or (v) the Director of Public Prosecutions:
Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1927	
Section 327 (1)	Strike out 'Attorney-General' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 337 (1)	Strike out 'Attorney-General or, in his absence, on the Solictor-General,' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'. Strike out 'Attorney-General' second occurring and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 339	Strike out 'Attorney-General' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 340 (1)	Strike out 'Attorney-General' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 340 (2)	Strike out 'Attorney-General' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 340 (3)	Strike out 'Attorney-General' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Section 340a	Strike out this section.
National Crime Authority (State Provisions) Act 1984	
Section 19 (5)	Strike out 'Crown Prosecutor, or a similar office' and substitute 'Director of Public Prosecutions'.
Supreme Court Act 1935	
Section 118a	Strike out this section.

I have indicated the reasons for this schedule. Section 3 (1) of the Crimes (Confiscation of Profits) Act 1986 defines 'the administrator' as being the person nominated by the Attorney-General to administer forfeited and restrained property. The schedule as proposed originally changed this reference to the Director of Public Prosecutions. On reflection, and taking into consideration the views expressed by the shadow Attorney-General in the other place during debate on this matter, it has been decided that this reference will remain, referring to the Attorney-General and not to the Director of Public Prosecutions.

New schedule inserted.

Long title.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:

Page 1, line 6—Insert the following words after 'Prosecutions', ', to make consequential amendments to certain Acts'.

This amendment alters the long title of the Bill to include reference to the consequential amendments to other Acts, which will be made by the addition of the schedules to the Bill which the Committee has just considered.

Amendment carried; long title as amended passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE (IMMUNITY FOR MEMBERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 October. Page 1241.)

Mr MEIER (Goyder): The Opposition is pleased to support this Bill, and I acknowledge that it has been introduced to provide the State Emergency Service with sufficient authority when dealing with emergency situations and to provide accompanying immunity from criminal and civil liability in the exercise of its duties. The Bill also repeals section 18, now obsolete, in view of the replacement provisions relating to workers under the Workers Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 1986. I think it needs to be acknowledged that there are presently some 66 registered State emergency units in South Australia, with approximately 130 of the 2 700 members being emergency officers. I would take this opportunity to compliment these many volunteers on the excellent work they do throughout this State. I see it personally in my own electorate where those people give hours and hours of volunteer time to help their community in case an emergency should arise.

I know that some funding comes to them, but they would not be anywhere near where they are today if it had not been for their own initiatives for their own voluntary work. I believe they stand out, as do CFS and St John Ambulance volunteers, as groups of people that our community and our society cannot do without. Therefore, it is pleasing that this amendment Bill seeks to aid the volunteers under legislation that has been with us for some years now.

Under the present Act, voluntary members and volunteers assisting in an emergency call may have been operating outside the Act. Presently an emergency officer is empowered to act only when an emergency order is in force or when assisting certain authorities when dealing with an emergency. It has been sound normal practice for many years for the SES to respond to calls from members of the public, even though they may not constitute an emergency.

The Bill now gives the SES sufficient authority and immunity for this type of call-out. I will be seeking a little further information from the Minister when we are in Committee on just why we must have such regulations. In other words, I would have thought that storm damage or a tree across the road or similar things would be an emergency, and it is amazing that our legal eagles seem to say there has not been sufficient authority for these people to go out voluntarily. As I said a little earlier, I agree, and the Opposition agrees, with the Bill. If this amendment must be made, fine, but I sometimes wonder where our legal system is going if there has been a wrong interpretation somewhere in the past.

It also needs to be acknowledged that, prior to the proclamation of the public liability legislation, an insurance policy was in place to cover volunteer members of the service. The Government now self insures and it is questionable whether complete indemnity can be provided, given that the Act does not provide complete authority and immunity in respect of all activities undertaken by the SES. Again, I will check a little more on that in Committee. As I indicated, the Opposition supports this Bill.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I would not like the occasion to go past without recording my appreciation of the emergency services. I have the Mitcham SES in my area. It is a very fine service; it is a dedicated body of men and women who do a lot of community service; they come to rescue situations that are not normally covered by the definition of emergency services. There have been many cases where there have been problems with animals, roofs being blown off, drains being blocked and situations that would not come under the umbrella of the State Emergency Service.

The volunteers are a great body of people. They put in their services free of charge. They want to be there; they want to provide service to the community and they should be encouraged at every opportunity. They raise their money through various means and spend a lot of time just financing their operations—at least some of their recurrent expenditure—through various fundraising avenues, because sufficient money is not available through Government sources to provide the equipment that is necessary to sustain these units in an operational form. That is not a criticism—that just happens to be the fact with many voluntary services.

On one or two occasions I have raised with the Government the role of the SES *vis-a-vis* fire services and the police in respect of the delineation of areas of responsibility. On a number of occasions, if there is not much around, the other services want to provide that level of service which would perhaps normally be provided by the SES. The SES has quite often been involved in fixing up trees which have been across roads or blocking buildings and which have caused danger. We have had the Electricity Trust working in conjunction with the SES when trees have brought down powerlines. So, there are a number of occasions when the SES has seen an opportunity to maintain its skill levels, to provide that form of assistance to householders, motorists and the community at large and the fire brigade has rolled up at the same place and taken over, but sometimes there are conflicts. On just a few occasions I know that the volunteers feel that they would have provided the service that was necessary. They were keen to do it, yet the fire brigade may have intervened and taken their place.

So, occasional frictions arise under such circumstances. However, let me put on record, because I think it is important, the appreciation of all members of Parliament—for the unsung heroes, because they are not necessarily involved in fighting fires as is the CFS; and they are not at the forefront like St John volunteers who had a presence on ovals and drove ambulances. The SES is called out only in emergencies, often at hours when people are firmly tucked in bed with the sheets pulled over their head. We rarely see them; we only know they exist occasionally when someone says, 'They were terrific; we called up the SES and they responded immediately and saved our house from being flooded.' The SES responds to a whole range of matters on which we cannot necessarily put a dollar value. I believe it is a wonderful service; I believe the people involved with it should be praised at every opportunity. This Bill assists the cause of people who are involved in that service, and I also commend the Bill to members.

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I want to take a couple of minutes to support the fact that the State Emergency Service, particularly in rural areas such as my own, has a vast area to cover. As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said, the officers of the State Emergency Service are the unsung heroes. They work voluntarily most of the time because they want to assist their communities. In country areas they are very much a part of the community. They work with communities in their fund-raising programs and ensure that people in those areas are quite safe. I know that from time to time, paticularly recently, they have been called out to some rather bad road accidents where their services are required. They spend hours and hours at those accident scenes helping people who have been injured, cleaning up the roads after an accident and generally making South Australia a safer place.

Although this Bill may be termed rats and mice legislation, as I have heard it described, it is very important because it gives immunity to these workers who are called out individually and not by other services. The member for Goyder commented that he did not think it should be necessary to do this, but obviously it is, or the Minister would not have brought in the Bill. There is a need for this legislation to ensure the safety of these people.

The member for Napier told me that he was going to speak on the Bill, because he has a real interest in the State Emergency Service in his electorate, but he agreed to give way so that I could make a short contribution. I put on record the interest in the service of the member for Napier and his support for this legislation.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Emergency Services): I thank members opposite for their support for this measure. Like them, I think it is important that from time to time we express in Parliament the appreciation of the community for the work that is done by this organisation. One thing that always impresses me when I look at some of their bases or some of their work is the tremendous spirit of enthusiasm that is clearly shown. I guess that is one of the side effects of doing things for other people: that one can throw one's energy into it and know one is doing something for the benefit of the community and people generally.

Like the member for Goyder, I think it is a pity that we have to take steps of this nature. I am fairly sure that there has been no case of anyone suing an officer of the SES, but we live in uncertain times and it is unreasonable to leave people who are volunteers in exposed positions of this nature. Therefore, it is reasonable for us to take such steps as we can to reduce the uncertainty and the risk that they might run in a legal sense.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that there is often almost a sense of competition between the various emergency services to deal with emergencies that crop up. Most of the time that is a healthy competition which I would not want to discourage. If I were injured or had an emergency of some kind, I would rather have too many people there than not enough. In that sense, I think we all agree that that kind of healthy competition is not necessarily bad. However, it needs to be curbed, and discussions are going on between the emergency services with a view to avoiding an overduplication of effort, because that can lead to ridiculous situations if it is allowed to go too far. I thank members for supporting this measure.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Functions of the service.'

Mr MEIER: Why has a fallen tree or storm damage not been classed as an emergency and why do those situations need to be specifically covered in the Bill?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: We are talking not so much about an emergency, which has a wide definition, depending virtually on the person who is defining it, but about an emergency order, which would take into account a whole region of the State as distinct from a single house or a very large emergency. Consequently, to bring it into effect for each accident or emergency in a particular household, or whatever, would require an enormous amount of paper work. That really is not reasonable. We want people to be able to respond to individual situations, and the emergency order did not cover that at that level. As it turns out, people respond at that level, so we need to protect them.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6—'Immunity from liability.'

Mr MEIER: Can the Minister give an example of a situation under new subsection (1) where an emergency officer would be liable for a criminal activity?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The only situation I can think of in those circumstances would be where an emergency officer deliberately set out not to act in good faith. New subsection (1) is very little different from the subsection in the principal Act. What has been added is 'assistant emergency officer'. Not much has changed. If the honourable member wants to know what would make an emergency service officer liable for a criminal or civil act, it would be if he failed in the discharge or performance of his duty against this subsection. In other words, it would have to be not in good faith. It would not stop an emergency service officer from being dealt with according to law if he stole something during the performance of his duties, because that would not be acting in good faith.

Mr MEIER: I still need further explanation of an act by an SES person that could be construed as being criminal but, because he is acting in good faith, would not cause him to be liable for it. Is the Minister able to provide me with an example of a criminal act?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Perhaps I could give the example of an emergency service officer who had good cause to believe that someone was in a locked house and in severe danger for some reason or another. If that person were to break into that house, but for such a clause as this, he could be charged with breaking and entering; but he would not be charged with breaking and entering if he had reasonable cause to believe that, in the performance of his duties, he needed to get into that house to rescue somebody.

Mr MEIER: Could the Minister give me an example of a civil act for which such a person would not be liable?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: To take the same example, I suppose it would be possible for a householder, but for the existence of this subsection, to bring a civil action against an emergency service officer for the damage caused by him breaking into the house.

Clause passed.

Clause 7—'Repeal of s.18.'

Mr MEIER: The Minister, in his second reading explanation, said:

> The Government now self-insures and it is questionable that complete indemnity can be provided, given that the Act does not provide complete authority and immunity, in respect of all activities undertaken by the State Emergency Service.

The phrase, 'it is questionable that complete indemnity can be provided' concerns me. Why cannot complete indemnity be provided?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am having some difficulty with the meaning of the honourable member's question. There were some doubts whether we were able to provide complete coverage under the existing situation where an officer took an action completely outside the Act. By amending the Act in this way, there will no longer be a doubt; the officer will be covered completely.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.42 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 12 November at 2 p.m.