LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 16 August 1988

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

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

DEATH OF MR J.A. HEASLIP

The PRESIDENT: It is with deep regret that I have to draw the attention of honourable members to the death of Mr J.A. Heaslip, who was a member of the House of Assembly from 1949 to 1968. I understand that he died a couple of days ago. As President of the Council, I will express the deepest sympathy of the Council and all its members to his family in their bereavement. I ask honourable members to stand in silence as a tribute to his memory and his services to this Parliament.

Honourable members stood in their places in silence.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner):

Pursuant to Statute—

Director-General of Technical and Further Education—Report, 1987.

National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972—Reprint.

Shop Trading Hours Act 1977—Reprint—Schedules of Alterations.

Regulations under the following Acts—

Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935—Abortion Prescribed Hospitals.

Highways Act 1926—Goolwa-Hindmarsh Island Ferry.

Workers Liens Act 1893—Fees and Forms.

QUESTION ON NOTICE

The PRESIDENT: I direct that the written answer to the following Question on Notice, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard:* No. 6.

Ms LINDA MATTHEWS

6. **The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** (on notice) asked the Attorney-General: In relation to the appointment of Ms Linda Matthews as Coordinator of the Women's Information Switchboard:

1. How many applications were received for the position?
2. Who was interviewed for the position?
3. What were the qualities that gained Ms Matthews selection?
4. What are the terms and conditions of her appointment?
5. Who was represented on the selection panel?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The replies are as follows:

1. Forty-nine applications were received for the position of Coordinator, Women's Information Switchboard.

2. Seven interviews were conducted for the position. As applications are made for positions on a confidential basis it is not appropriate to disclose the names of the unsuccessful interviewees.

3. Ms Matthews was appointed on the basis of her wide experience in the community sector, particularly as Director of The Parks Community Legal Centre, her expertise in matters such as family law and social security law, her outstanding leadership and personal skills and management experience, and her clear, practical understanding of the issues facing women in the community today.

4. Ms Matthews was appointed to the public service at the AO-1 salary range, as advertised. Usual 12 months probation conditions apply.

5. The selection panel comprised:

Carol Treloar, Women's Adviser to the Premier;

Merle Tonkin, representing switchboard volunteers;

Elizabeth Ahern, representing switchboard's paid staff; and

Laurann Yen, Administrator, Adelaide Women's Community Health Centre.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ANTI-CORRUPTION STRATEGY

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: During 1986 and 1987, the National Crime Authority (NCA), as part of one of its general references, carried out certain investigations in South Australia. This resulted in certain charges being laid which have now been dealt with by the courts. In particular, a senior South Australian police officer, Mr Barry Moyse, has pleaded guilty to serious drug offences. In the course of the NCA investigations, certain other matters came to light, many of which were referred to the authority by the Police Commissioner. Those matters are now the subject of a report prepared by the National Crime Authority and referred to the South Australian Government on 29 July 1988.

The NCA report can be broadly divided into two parts. The first suggests procedures and mechanisms for identifying and dealing with police corruption and raises concerns about the inadequacy of previous investigations and existing measures to identify corrupt practices and to investigate allegations of corruption within the South Australian Police Force. The second identifies a number of operational matters and specific allegations relating to certain individuals. The NCA indicated in the report, that:

> The report contains material, the disclosure of which to members of the public could prejudice the safety or reputation of persons or the operations of law enforcement agencies.

Accordingly, for the reasons stated by the NCA, it is not, in the Government's view, desirable to release all of the NCA report publicly and in particular those parts of the report which deal with operational matters and specific individuals and allegations.

However, it is necessary for the Parliament and the public to be informed on the general recommendations made by the NCA. With the approval of the NCA, I seek leave to table chapter 12 of its report dealing with its general recommendations.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: At this point I quote directly from those general recommendations:

> It is the authority's view that the allegations canvassed in this report, if true—

and I emphasis to the Chamber those words, 'if true'—

> demonstrate that an unacceptable level of unethical practice has been in existence in the South Australian police for a considerable time and that, without the authority's investigations, these allegations might not have come to light. It seems to the authority there has also been a lack of resolve and perhaps even a reluctance to take effective measures to enable these types of allegations to

be brought to the attention of a permanent and independent investigatory unit.

The report further finds:

> The authority, as noted in this report, is aware of past investigations into allegations of improper conduct by South Australian police officers. Those investigations did not create a positive environment to ensure that the risk of unethical practices was minimised and those responsible for corrupt activities were identified and properly dealt with.

However, despite the findings, the NCA concludes that an independent inquiry into the South Australian Police Force is not needed. The authority's conclusions state:

> The authority however does not recommend an independent inquiry into the South Australian police such as or similar to a royal commission.

The authority does, however, recommend the establishment of an Anti-Corruption Unit to identify and investigate corruption within the South Australian Police Force. With respect to the second category of recommendations, identifying a number of specific operational matters and individual allegations, these will be the subject of thorough further investigation.

The NCA report has been referred to the Commissioner of Police. He will examine, in conjunction with the authority, how the outstanding matters and allegations will be dealt with. Those which should be dealt with urgently will be attended to immediately by the Commissioner of Police and others will be the subject of consideration by the Anti-Corruption Unit when established. This course of action has the support of the National Crime Authority.

In response to the report, the Government has decided to establish a ministerial committee comprising the Minister of Emergency Services (Dr Hopgood) and the Attorney-General, who, together with the Police Commissioner (Mr Hunt), will formulate recommendations on an anti-corruption strategy for South Australia incorporating recommendations on an Anti-Corruption Unit, for consideration by State Cabinet as soon as possible.

This committee will be serviced by a committee of officers headed by Mr Kym Kelly, Deputy Crown Solicitor, Attorney-General's Department, a representative of the Police Department and an officer from the office of the Minister of Emergency Services. In developing its proposals, the ministerial committee is expected to hold further discussions with the NCA, examine all available reports and evidence obtained during recent criminal cases, and consult with the Fitzgerald inquiry in Queensland. The committee will also consider a paper, 'A proposal for an anti-corruption strategy', prepared for the Police Commissioner prior to the receipt of the NCA report. I seek leave to table this paper.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: However, I indicate that, as it was prepared before the availability of the NCA report, it provides only one of a number of matters to be considered by the ministerial committee. The Government believes that this proposal contains a number of valuable suggestions to deal with corruption. However, there are some issues which need further consideration and refinement.

While the Government accepts that any general anti-corruption strategy must deal with corruption and the potential for it in the community generally, the Government does not have before it evidence to indicate any widespread organised corruption within the South Australian Public Service or local government authorities.

It should be noted that the paper prepared for the Commissioner of Police outlines anti-corruption initiatives already taken by the Police Department. Further anti-corruption initiatives have been implemented in consultation with the NCA during the inquiries in this State. I seek leave to table a document outlining these further anti-corruption initiatives.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: In summary, key measures already taken to deal with corruption include:

- new measures for dealing with informants, including witness protection measures;
- increased security for handling drug exhibits and drug disposal; and
- a reorganisation of Crime Command.

The Government accepts the recommendations of the NCA that an Anti-Corruption Unit be established. The formation of such a body had already been canvassed in discussion papers prepared for the Commissioner of Police (and forming part of his paper, 'A proposal for an anti-corruption strategy').

The ministerial committee will be charged with the task of preparing recommendations for the consideration of State Cabinet concerning the composition and structure of the unit, its relationship to the police and Government, how it will operate and its terms of reference. The Government will seek, through the committee's recommendations, practical and effective strategies for dealing with corruption.

At this point I would like to reaffirm the Government's support for the operations of the NCA. The Government has already announced that legislation will be introduced to ensure that the Act under which the authority operates in this State is extended beyond 30 June 1989. It is vital that the NCA obtain Government and community support if it is to be effective in attacking organised crime.

There has been some criticism of the NCA and its operations from some quarters. However, the Government believes that these criticisms are largely unwarranted. It is important for the community to understand how the NCA operates and how it is organised.

The National Crime Authority was established by the National Crime Authority Act 1984. It consists of a chairman (who must be a judge or a legal practitioner enrolled for not less than five years) and two other members. The members are not eligible for reappointment. Section 11 of the Act in essence confers on the authority four functions:

(i) to collect and analyse criminal information and intelligence relating to 'relevant criminal activities' [that is, serious organised crime] and to disseminate that information and intelligence to law enforcement agencies;

(ii) to investigate, otherwise than pursuant to a reference granted by a Commonwealth or State Minister, matters relating to 'relevant criminal activities';

(iii) to arrange for the establishment of task forces for the purpose of investigating matters relating to 'relevant criminal activities'; and

(iv) to investigate a matter relating to a 'relevant criminal activity' in respect of which there is in force a reference granted by the Commonwealth Minister (in so far as the relevant offence is an offence against Commonwealth law) or a State Minister (in so far as the relevant offence is an offence against a law of the State concerned). When a formal reference has been given special investigatory powers relating to it may apply.

Currently, the authority is headed by Mr Justice Stewart, a former judge of the New South Wales Supreme Court, who has the equivalent status to a judge of the Supreme Court of the ACT. He is assisted by Mr Peter Clark (of the Victorian bar) and Mr Lionel Robberds Q.C., (of the New South Wales bar).

On references they are usually assisted by senior counsel. For example, in relation to one South Australian investigation, the NCA was assisted by Mr Graham Morrish Q.C., also of the Victorian bar. Clearly, its members are highly qualified.

The authority is also overseen by the Federal Attorney-General, Mr Bowen, and an intergovernmental committee

comprising Ministers representing all participating jurisdictions, that is, by representatives of the Governments of the Commonwealth, all States and the Northern Territory. In addition, an all-Party joint committee of the Federal Parliament has been established to oversee its operations.

Earlier this year the joint parliamentary committee handed down a report—'The National Crime Authority-An Initial Evaluation'—and I would commend it to members who require more detail of the authority's operations. In its report the committee recommended that the authority be retained and a sunset clause which would otherwise have terminated the authority's life be lifted. I have already indicated that this will be done in South Australia. The report concluded in part:

> Looking back on the debate leading up to the establishment of the National Crime Authority, the committee considers that there was a clear expectation that the authority would get results. The primary objective for which the authority was established was, the committee believes, to put significant criminals behind bars. In those terms the authority is beginning to demonstrate success. It has put the Cornwell/Bull drug trafficking syndicate out of business and it has obtained convictions of significant figures under two of its other references. The terms of imprisonment imposed on Cornwell and Bull—23 years and 18 years respectively—indicate the gravity with which the courts viewed their activities. Terms of imprisonment of 24 years and 20 years have been imposed on principals under another reference, and the maximum term of imprisonment available for the offence concerned, three years, has been imposed on the principal under a third reference. Numerous other matters are before the courts at the moment . . .The committee believes that Mr Justice Stewart, the members and senior staff of the authority deserve credit for having turned this experiment into a successful working reality.

Further, the effectiveness of the authority has been demonstrated most recently in the successful prosecution of former senior police officer, Barry Moyse. The very fact that Moyse was identified, charged and convicted should raise public confidence in the operations of both the authority and the South Australian police. There is a good and effective working relationship between the authority and the Police Commissioner.

I might add that earlier this year when the joint parliamentary committee report was tabled there were some who demanded a full royal commission into corruption in South Australia, claiming that corruption was widespread both within the Police Force and indeed in the public sector.

At that time the Government indicated that there was insufficient evidence to justify such a commission—a decision supported by the recent report of the NCA—but offered to listen to any person who came forward with any evidence of corruption so that it could be examined thoroughly. In fact, both the Police Commissioner and the Attorney-General wrote in these terms to several persons, including the Hon. Ian Gilfillan and Senators McGauran and Hill, of the Federal Parliament. Indeed, in the letters, both the Police Commissioner and the Attorney-General offered to meet with those making the allegations. It was also indicated that the Crown Prosecutor would be available should they feel reluctant to come forward. And, if this were still unsatisfactory, the Government indicated that it would agree, in principle, to pay the reasonable legal costs of any person who wished to come forward, to enable him or her to consult private legal practitioners so as to determine the best way to put his or her allegation before the appropriate authorities. Yet despite these offers no new evidence has been brought forward.

While it is obvious from the Moyse matter and from information contained in the NCA report that there has been some corruption in the South Australian Police Force, no evidence has been produced of corruption in the public sector generally. The Government and the Police Commissioner are more than willing, however, to reaffirm the offers already made to ensure that those who may have some information are able to come forward. When the work of the ministerial committee which has been established is completed an announcement will be made to the Parliament on the structure of the Anti-Corruption Unit and the nature of the additional anti-corruption measures that will be taken.

In conclusion, let me make perfectly clear that the Government wil not shirk its duty to the community to fight organised crime and to attack corruption, wherever it may be. Today the Government will also introduce a significant measure to attack the drug trade and organised crime, namely, the Telecommunications (Interception) Bill. This Bill will allow State police to seek Federal judicial warrants for phone taps and it will ensure that warrants for taps—to be conducted by authorised Federal police—will be issued in relation to serious offences such as drug trafficking, murder and kidnapping.

Telecommunications interception is a most important means of combating serious crime and it is crucial to have strict safeguards that cover the use of this investigative tool which will be outlined in the legislation. We will continue to cooperate fully with the Federal Government in fighting organised crime and, in particular, fighting drug trafficking.

Before concluding, Madam President, I would like to place on record the Government's confidence that, in co-operation with the Commissioner of Police, these matters will be resolved in the public interest. I would also like to affirm the Government's confidence in the Commissioner of Police and the men and women of the South Australian Police Force who, incidentally, command the highest level of community respect of any mainland Police Force. The statement I have given the Council today provides the initial key step in the development of an anti-corruption strategy for South Australia. With the assistance of the National Crime Authority, the various reports already available, and other inquiries such as the Fitzgerald inquiry, this strategy will be developed as soon as possible. When completed a full announcement of the Government's intentions will be made.

QUESTIONS

LYELL McEWIN HOSPITAL

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a statement before asking whichever of the surviving Ministers in this place represents the Minister of Health in another place a question about the Lyell McEwin Hospital.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Madam President, members in this Chamber may well be aware of the ongoing problems at the Lyell McEwin Hospital, Elizabeth, which has been the subject of recent work bans by trainee doctors over unacceptably long work shifts and poor working amenities. The problems have been compounded by several resignations, of both senior and junior medical staff, and many of those vacancies have not been filled. Last week, I understand, restrictions were placed on patient access to casualty, paediatric and medical services at the hospital because of staff shortages, the bans by these doctors having been lifted earlier. Yesterday afternoon, however, I learnt of a more disturbing development: the hospital's intensive care section was shut down, and one ward had its beds reduced from 24 to 20.

I am told by several constituents that the closure of the intensive care section caused an uproar at the hospital. One woman, sick with a heart ailment, who I am told had been

waiting in casualty for six hours on Sunday night—because the hospital said they had no beds—was transferred from intensive care to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Three other people in the unit were either transferred to other hospitals or other wards within the hospital.

The frequent comment from angry constituents ringing my office yesterday (and they were numerous, might I assure the Minister), was, 'Why has the Government always got money to build a Convention Centre or a sporting complex yet it cannot find money to replace just seven doctors at Lyell McEwin?' It appears to me that they have a right to be angry. If something is not done it seems that people in the Elizabeth and Salisbury area will soon have one of the most modern hospitals around, but no doctors to staff it.

Not only is the Lyell McEwin short on young doctors but also it has had no orthopaedic surgeons for several months: there are growing waiting lists for paediatrics (which will only be exacerbated by the latest restrictions); and there is at least a four month wait for physiotherapy treatment. The lack of orthopaedic surgeons, I am informed, means that people are being referred to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The RAH itself is short of orthopaedic surgeons, so that hospital's already large waiting lists are growing markedly as northern residents join the queues. Madam President, the backbench on the other side is a bit unruly.

The PRESIDENT: On both sides, I would point out.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Two months ago Lyell McEwin's Chief Executive Officer, Dr David Reynolds, called on local parents to lobby for more paediatric therapists in the north. Dr Reynolds said:

> All Lyell McEwin Health Service's attempts to secure funding from the Health Commission had failed.

In the hospital's last annual report Dr Reynolds also blamed constraints on Government funding for a wide range of deficiencies in specialty areas. In conclusion he stated:

> Low staffing levels in anaesthetics and insufficient funding to replace old and obsolete equipment are also causes for concern and will clearly have to be addressed in the near future.

Insufficient funding appears to be the root cause, according to information that I have received, of most problems at Lyell McEwin. Last financial year the hospitals had a $2 million cut in real terms funding. Funding cuts, I am informed, are the underlying cause of why trainee doctors have to work up to 36 hours in one shift. It also appears to be the reason for the paucity of amenities for junior staff and why young doctors are resigning so early and so frequently. It is also apparently behind the resignations of senior doctors who simply do not have the backup of junior doctors. That is the information that has been provided to my office.

Registered medical officers, I am informed, met with a senior member of the Health Commission last week in an effort to resolve their dispute over long shifts and poor conditions. They were so taken aback by his arrogant attitude, I am informed, that they almost walked out of the meeting. The Health Commission, for its part, says that it is advertising nationally for doctors. That is all well and good, but it appears that some of the problems at Lyell McEwin might be of the commission's own doing. My questions to the Minister, representing the new Minister of Health, are as follows:

1. What was the reasoning behind closing the intensive care unit at the Lyell McEwin Hospital, and how long is it expected to be shut?

2. What other ward closures have taken place apart from those already mentioned and how long are these closures likely to last?

3. What steps are being taken to attract both senior and junior doctors to the Lyell McEwin to replace the many medical staff who have resigned in recent months?

4. Has the Minister or the Health Commission examined the idea of seconding junior doctors from other public hospitals to temporarily fill the acute staff shortages at Lyell McEwin?

5. Will the Minister, in the forthcoming budget, allocate sufficient funds to the Lyell McEwin to redress the cuts which have caused many of the current problems at the hospital?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will have to refer those questions to my colleague in another place, and I will bring down a reply as soon as possible. However, I remind the honourable member that the Lyell McEwin Hospital, along with many other health establishments in South Australia, has been the recipient of large sums of Government money during the past few years. In fact, during the past three years some $25 million has been spent at the Lyell McEwin Hospital alone. So it is not reasonable for either the honourable member or some of his constituents to make these sorts of complaints about lack of expenditure—

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: —at the Lyell McEwin Hospital or in other areas of the health service.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: However, with respect to the specific questions asked by the honourable member, I will be happy to refer them to my colleague in another place and bring down a reply.

ORGAN TRANSPLANTS

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: —before asking the Attorney-General a question about organ transplants.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Federal Minister of Health said yesterday that he favoured legislation by the States to provide that unless a citizen opted out any organ can be taken from a dead person for the purpose of transplants—in other words, reverse the present position where a person can approve the taking of organs from his or her body on death and relatives can confirm that approval.

Dr Blewett handballed the issue back to the States by saying that it is for the States to deal with this by way of legislation. I understand that the now State Minister of Health, Mr Blevins, in response to questions on this subject has indicated his support for the proposal. Others, such as the Australian Medical Association, the New South Wales Privacy Committee and Father John Fleming have said that it is preferable to educate the public about the options available to them in relation to organ donations and persuade people to exercise their right of choice to donate.

The observation has been made that any legislation doing what Dr Blewett wants, and which Mr Blevins favours, would result in the inescapable conclusion that a person's body after death belongs to the State and that the desirability of requiring informed consent (as is required in relation to so many other decisions affecting a person's life and affairs) would be ignored. The other point which has been made to me is that any legislation by the State as proposed

would take to absurd lengths the principle that 'ignorance of the law is no excuse', remembering that most citizens would in fact be ignorant of that legislation and the consequences in respect of their own bodies. They could not, in so sensitive and personal a matter, be presumed to know the law. My questions to the Minister are as follows:

1. Does the Attorney-General share the new Minister of Health's support for Dr Blewett's proposal?

2. Does the Government propose introducing any legislation which will allow organs to be taken from a body without any person consenting to that action unless the person has formally refused to allow that action?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The only thing I have seen in relation to this matter is some press reports of the Federal Minister of Health, Dr Blewett, musing about whether or not this proposal should be considered in Australia. If my memory of the press report is correct, I think he based his comments on a law which apparently exists in Belgium.

I have not seen any statement from the State Minister of Health, Mr Blevins, in relation to the matter, so I am not in a position to comment on what he has said. However, I certainly think that it is drawing a long bow for the Hon. Mr Griffin to say that if legislation of this kind was introduced it would therefore logically mean that after death the body of someone belonged to the State.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It does not mean that. As I said, that is quite clearly drawing a long bow in relation to the matter. It is quite clearly an over statement of the effect of the legislation. Suffice to say that I have not considered the matter; the Government has not considered the matter; and, therefore, I am not in a position to respond to the honourable member's question by giving a 'Yes' or 'No' to either of the questions that he has asked.

TOURISM SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Tourism a question about Tourism South Australia and the tourism logo.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Late last year, in announcing the new name 'Tourism South Australia', the Minister indicated that a new marketing logo and slogan would be developed and released within a couple of months, that is, January/February 1988. However, eight months later at the 1988 State Tourism Conference the Minister announced that there was still no logo or slogan, even though it had been promised several months earlier. My questions to the Minister are as follows:

1. Is it the Government's intention to continue to use the phrase 'Tourism South Australia' and, if not, why not?

2. When does the Minister expect to announce the logo and slogan which she promised would be announced in early 1988?

3. Is South Australia now the only State without a specifically developed tourism logo?

4. Will a major TV campaign, planned to promote South Australia interstate, still proceed in the absence of a logo and slogan?

5. How much money has been spent to date on the development of a logo and slogan?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The honourable member seems to be getting a number of issues confused. First, I will deal with the question of the name of the organisation—Tourism South Australia—which was adopted as a result of the review committee report. I established that committee some time ago to review the roles, functions and operations of the old Department of Tourism. One of the recommendations of that review was that the name of the organisation should be changed. That has taken place. The organisation is now called Tourism South Australia and the Government intends to continue with that name.

That is a completely separate issue from the development of a logo or slogan for tourism for the State. Last year, when we embarked upon our campaign to seek out a suitable logo and slogan to present an umbrella image for tourism in the State, we had high hopes that we would be successful in achieving either one or both. It was hoped that it would capture those things that make South Australia different or unique and that it could be used effectively in the marketplace; that it would be identified immediately by people who know something about South Australia as encapsulating the State's qualities as a tourism destination or experience. It was also hoped that it would inspire those people who do not have as much knowledge about the State.

As I said at the tourism conference, when I addressed this and other issues, that has proved to be an enormously difficult task. The reason is that South Australia is a tourism destination with largely intangible qualities to sell. The things that people find interesting and different about the State are the natural and heritage experiences and the warmth and friendliness of its people, rather than any one natural or built feature within the State. That means that it is much more difficult for South Australia to capture in a drawing or slogan the sorts of things that can be captured in Queensland, which uses a palm tree for its logo, or the Northern Territory, which displays a bird flying through a sunset. Those logos capture very well the sorts of experience that people will go there to enjoy.

We embarked on the process of seeking out designers who would be able to capture South Australia, based on the results of our market research. Unfortunately, the designs that came forward from designers in South Australia and other parts of Australia tested inadequately in the marketplace and amongst members of the tourism industry. I could not feel confident about recommending them to the industry as a suitable logo to be used on tourism promotional material. I make no apologies for that because it would be quite inappropriate for me as Minister of Tourism in this State to suggest to the industry that it use a logo or slogan that was not appropriate and would fail to attract the interest of visitors to this State or of South Australians travelling within their own State. As we were quite clear that the results would not be successful, at this point it is not our intention to pursue the matter further.

In the absence of a slogan, the department has continued with the production of new literature, brochures, posters and other promotional material but a new signature, if I may use that terminology, has been used on a couple of those posters and will probably be used on other brochures as well. That is the direction that will be taken. I have indicated to the tourism industry that it might like to take up the challenge to seek out a logo that may be suitable for the State and, since an article to that effect appeared in the newspaper, a number of ideas have come forward from graphic designers and others in South Australia who feel that they would like to have a go. Until such time as the right thing comes along, this is not a matter on which Tourism South Australia will spend any more time or effort, but I do not think that that will detract in any way from our tourism marketing promotion. We will continue to pursue our media advertising campaign during the coming 12 months. I do not think that the absence of a logo will make any difference to that process because it will be the

imagery of the State and its attractions that will interest people, not a logo or a slogan.

With respect to the question relating to the amount that has been spent to date, I advise that that has not been finalised because the department has not received accounts for the most recent designs that were created. I cannot answer that question at this point but I shall be happy to provide that information when it becomes available.

COMPUTER STUDIES

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Education, a question in relation to year 12 PES computer studies.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: Over the past couple of years, there has been quite an explosion in year 12 specialist subjects and, while there has been some argument about whether year 12 should be more generalist, particularly in the face of staffing cuts, I have been aware that there have been proposals for year 12 PES computer studies. In fact, when I was last teaching three years ago and managing the computer network at Renmark High School, we considered it imminent. Many schools across the State have gone to great trouble assembling the physical resources, and teachers have spent a great deal of time gathering the skills necessary to teach the year 12 PES computer studies course. The course exists but it has not been presented to the joint Matriculation Board. At this stage it seems to have been shelved while many students and schools appear to be missing out. I now ask: when is a decision to be made on the course?

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

PARLIAMENT HOUSE TOILETS

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking you, Ms President, a question on the subject of toilets and what you are doing to them.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: As you would well know, Ms President, about April or May this year, work commenced on the conversion of three toilets in Parliament House into what we were told were two new offices and one extra toilet. The one new office on the lower ground floor was to measure some three metres by three metres, the one new office on the ground floor was to be somewhat bigger, and there was to be another toilet on the first floor. Indeed, as you well know, Ms President, that was despite objections from the Liberal Party in this Chamber to such work going ahead without consultation. Indeed, the Parliamentary Leader (the Hon. Martin Cameron) wrote to the Attorney-General expressing concern about the work proceeding without consultation, and I understand that the Attorney referred that question back to you. As you also know, there was some publicity earlier this year about the matter.

We were told two or three weeks ago that the total project, the two offices and the new toilet, would be finished by about the end of this month. I have now been informed that the cost of the Presidential loo project has now blown a whole through the roof of the budget, and I understand that the budget has now gone way over $100 000 and is heading closer to $150 000—

The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: We could have got Legh Davis to do it for less than that, I am sure. The cost of the total project is still rising. I am also told today that the carpenters have said that they are not returning tomorrow because, to quote, 'they have run out of money again.'

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: The job is not finished?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Well, the job is not finished. My questions to you, Ms President, are first: what was the original total estimated cost when you approved the total project? Secondly, how much have you and the Department of Housing and Construction expended so far on the total project? Thirdly, what is now the estimated total cost of the Presidential loo project in Parliament House? Fourthly, when will the project now be completed? Finally, do you personally accept responsibility for the gross mismanagement of this total project?

The PRESIDENT: In response to the honourable member, I would first reject his proposition that there was no consultation with the Liberal Party and that objections were raised in this Chamber. As far as I am aware, no objections have been raised in this Chamber at any time. There was consultation with members of the Liberal Party. In fact, a copy of the plans was provided to the Liberal Party with an invitation for any member thereof to come to speak with me about them, and nobody did so.

As regards the blowout of the costs, I have no information on that whatsoever. I cannot remember offhand what the cost of the original proposal was. I will need to check on the figures, but I think it was about $80 000, and that was a rough estimate and not in 1988 dollars. It obviously would have had to be indexed to take account of changes in values from the time it was originally talked about. At the time the project started, which was in late May of this year, my information was that the budget in 1988 dollars was about $100 000. I would not want to be held to that precisely, not having the information in front of me, but it was of that order, which I think was just an indexed amount.

I do not know what the expenditure has been so far. I have not inquired for specific cost details recently. I was told at one stage that the cost would be raised somewhat because the drilling required was through 18 inch and 24 inch thick walls, and that was proving far more difficult than had originally been anticipated in terms of cutting the new doors. There were certainly numerous comments about the solidity of buildings in the nineteenth century.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: This was not built in the nineteenth century. It was completed in 1939—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think it most unfair to interject on the President, who not only has to keep order but also has to try to provide an answer to a question which has been raised. I ask for consideration for someone who is trying to fulfil a dual role. I am not aware of any new estimated total. As to when the work will be completed, I was informed some time ago that the downstairs room would be available on 2 August and the other two would be completed on 2 September. Quite obviously, the work is running behind schedule, as the downstairs room is not yet available, though I understand that it is getting very close to being available. So, I cannot indicate when work will be completed, either for the downstairs room or for the two rooms on the other floors. I certainly hope they will be completed soon.

The organisation and supervision of the work is carried out by the Department of Housing and Construction, but I understand that a great deal of the work has been contracted out in the hope that this might speed up matters; obviously it has not done so. I will make inquiries as to what is the estimated cost now although, as the work is nearing com-

pletion, it might well be better to wait until it is completed and then determine what is the final cost. I have certainly not been informed that the work is being held up due to cost and, as far as I am aware, it is proceeding as rapidly as possible so that members can have the benefit of the space which will be made available.

DEPARTMENT FOR COMMUNITY WELFARE

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Community Welfare, a question on the subject of low morale in the Department for Community Welfare.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Staff morale within the Department for Community Welfare is at a low ebb and is compromising the former high standards—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Is that expressing an opinion?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: No, a fact.

The PRESIDENT: Can you document that fact?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Yes. It has been referred to in the recent articles in the paper quoting sources within the DCW. It is also included, as I understand it, in this child welfare report that the Government is suppressing, and it has been commented on—

The PRESIDENT: I doubt if the newspaper can necessarily be taken as a reliable source of information.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: If you are taking exception, Madam President, I shall reword it and say that members will be concerned about expressions of low morale within the Department for Community Welfare which is understood—and certainly is suggested to me by DCW staff—to be compromising the former high standards of service for which the department has been renowned.

I make the point that concern about this matter has been expressed in this place, in the media and, as I say, in suppressed reports. This concern relates not only to high staff turnover but also to absentee rates, the loss of experienced senior social workers, and recruitment difficulties (I am trying to remember all the instances that in the past have been raised without challenge in this Parliament).

Today I raise this morale issue again because last week I was saddened to receive a copy of a letter dated 4 August that was adressed to the Chief Executive Officer (Ms Vardon) and signed by 10 former members of the Maintenance Branch of the Department for Community Welfare. Members will recall that the Maintenance Branch was, for many years, responsible for the collection and distribution of child maintenance payments from non-custodial parents, and that the record of that branch in relation to such collections and payments was excellent, particularly when compared with interstate services.

The former Minister of Community Welfare used to note that the record of the Maintenance Branch was 70 per cent compared to about 27 per cent interstate. The dismal interstate record prompted the Federal Government to establish a new child maintenance authority based at Treasury in the middle of this year. The letter states:

> Due to the passing of new legislation, 10 people from Maintenance Branch, cashiers and ledgers left the Department for Community Welfare in May of this year. *In toto*, the number of years worked between those 10 persons amounted to over 100 years, one person over 20 years and five persons over 10 years! It has been a traumatic time for all of us, and the total absence of any recognition of our departure or years of service has added nothing to our memories of this department.
>
> Whilst our concern for the client has been of the utmost care and consideration, we would have thought those same fundamental principles would have been reciprocated by our employer.
>
> We are not looking for accolades, but best wishes for our future would have been appreciated. Instead, we are left with a feeling of sadness that a 'caring' department doesn't care for its own!

Will the Minister ask the new Minister of Community Welfare to ascertain why no recognition was extended by the former Minister and senior DCW management to the officers of the Maintenance Branch when they left the employment of the department last May? In the interests of staff morale and the department's service to clients, will the Minister ascertain what action, if any, the new Minister will take to ensure that relationships between her office, senior management and staff in the department improve in the immediate and long term, because this jeopardises service delivery?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I know that the new Minister of Community Welfare is working with great haste to inform herself about the Department for Community Welfare and the work that it has been undertaking. I am sure that, should she find that the honourable member's allegations are correct, she will take action on it. I should say that, as people are expressing opinions, in the past few days I have learnt that the Hon. Ms Laidlaw is held with decreasing regard within the Department for Community Welfare. People in the department initially felt that she had a genuine concern about a number of welfare issues, but the approach that she has taken on a number of matters recently has meant that many people in the department now view her as being most unhelpful and, in fact, quite destructive in the process that they are going through in providing an appropriate range of welfare services to the people of South Australia. I will refer those questions to the Minister and bring back a reply.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BOARDS

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Community Welfare, a question about departmental representation on community development boards.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: The concept of community development boards operating through local government areas was promoted by an earlier Labor Government when the present Premier was the Minister for Community Development. Since then, some of the boards have continued and others have been abandoned. The membership of the Tea Tree Gully Community Development Board includes (according to its constitution) one member representing welfare who is appointed by the Regional Director, Central Northern Welfare Region. The person appointed, who was a district manager, has recently resigned (by letter). The letter, which was made available at a recent board meeting that was open to the public, states:

> It is with regret that I tender my resignation as a member of the Tea Tree Gully Community Development Board. I have been a member on a continuing basis since 1981 and feel that much has been achieved by the board during that time.
>
> For example, the council has an active and very effective community services department, the CES and the Department of Social Security have both, even though initially reluctantly, moved into the centre of the area. We have a very effective youth service and now have an information service for which the board can take credit for perseverance over a long period of time.
>
> These are but a few of the activities for which I believe the board can be duly proud. I am resigning because our local office has limited resources and must constantly prioritise our work. It does not mean that we do not think the work of the board is

important, but rather that there is only so much we can do without adversely affecting the health of our workers.

I regret that at this point in time we are unable to nominate another person to become a member of the board. You can be sure that we will keep in touch with the work of the board and feed in any suggestions that we may feel the board is in a position to respond to.

Board meetings are held one night a month only and additional involvement is not a necessary aspect of membership. My questions are:

1. Does the Minister approve of the concept of community development boards?

2. Has the Minister or her predecessor given any direction or made any suggestion in regard to the involvement of DCW officers in community development boards, or have senior officers of the department done so?

3. In view of the fact that another member of the board (according to the constitution) represents health and is appointed by the Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission, has the possible future impact of amalgamation any impact on the attitude towards membership of community boards by DCW officers?

4. Is it a fact that staff resources are so limited at the Tea Tree Gully Community Welfare Centre that staff cannot take part in this kind of activity?

5. Have officers of other DCW offices in this State been restrained from taking office on community development boards?

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

ARID LANDS BOTANIC GARDEN

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Tourism a question about the Arid Lands Botanic Garden at Port Augusta.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: Ms President, within a matter of a couple of days I received some correspondence from the Arid Lands Botanic Garden. It involved a complaint not about the Government itself but about a lack of money and an inability to get on with its plans at Port Augusta. At about the same time I received a copy of the publication *Great State*, which talks about a particular glass dome. I know that our Minister has talked about glass domes in the past. This one, which is going up in the Botanic Gardens at the moment, namely, our tropical conservatory, will house something like 15 to 20 medium sized rainforest trees and several thousand smaller plants. It has cost the State Government (and I imagine, probably the Federal Government as well) approximately $6.85 million. I ask the Minister three questions:

1. How does she see the tourist potential of our 15 to 20 tropical rainforest trees as against the forests of Queensland in the natural state?

2. How does she compare the tourist potential of that conservatory with the potential of the Arid Lands Botanic Garden in Port Augusta which is of course using predominantly plants native to the area?

3. How much money has the State Government expended on the Arid Lands Botanic Garden?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The Arid Lands Botanic Garden project comes within the purview of my colleague, the Minister for Environment and Planning, so I am not able to provide information about moneys, if any, that have been spent on that project by the Government. However, I will certainly seek to get that information from my colleague for the honourable member.

With respect to the relative tourism potential of the three features that the honourable member has discussed, it seems to me to be inappropriate to look at these projects in those terms.

Although the tourism potential of each of those projects is of some interest to the Government, my own view would be that, if I were grading those three areas of interest, the forests in Queensland would have to rank higher than the other two projects, to which the honourable member referred as a tourist attraction, drawing people in its own right. I say that, because the rainforests of Queensland are of international significance to environmentalists as well as to those who may not consider themselves environmentalists but who simply wish to see unique and different things at various places in the world and who wish to experience things that they cannot experience in other parts of the world. So, going on all the available market research that we have about the trends that are emerging in tourism, a natural experience will certainly be a bigger drawcard than a created experience.

When it comes down to making a decision as to whether the tropical conservatory in a city or the Arid Lands Botanic Garden at Port Augusta will be a greater or lesser drawcard, one compared with the other, I think it becomes a much more difficult issue to adjudicate on, because the fact is that more people will visit Adelaide than will visit Port Augusta. I doubt whether a significant proportion of people will visit Adelaide specifically to visit the tropical conservatory, but it will probably be one of the things that a person will want to see when visiting Adelaide. I think the same would apply to the Arid Lands Botanic Garden if that project gets off the ground. There will be specialist groups in the community that will wish to visit the Arid Lands Botanic Garden, just as there will be specialist groups that will want to visit the tropical conservatory. However, as to ordinary tourists, I would say that the Arid Lands Botanic Garden is likely to be one of those attractions that people visit if they happen to be in the area, rather than an attraction that people make a special trip to see.

So, whilst it would have some tourism potential, I do not think that the Arid Lands Botanic Garden would be one of the most significant drawcards in South Australia. I do not know whether that assists the honourable member, and I am not sure what point he is trying to make. However, certainly I believe that both projects are desirable if the State can afford them. We have already as a State committed funds to the tropical conservatory, and that project is proceeding. At this point the Minister of Environment and Planning has recommended to the Government that we not proceed with funding for the Arid Lands Botanic Garden because we simply cannot afford it at this stage.

MINISTERIAL COMMITTEE

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I ask the Attorney-General:

1. How long does he expect that the ministerial committee comprising himself, the Minister of Emergency Services and the Police Commissioner will take to formulate recommendations on an anti-corruption strategy for South Australia and on the structure of the Anti-Corruption Unit?

2. In relation to his ministerial statement that the National Crime Authority has identified a number of operational matters and specific allegations relating to certain individuals, is the Attorney-General able to say who will investigate those allegations; how long does he expect those investigations to take; and is it possible without prejudicing the safety or reputation of persons or the operations of law

enforcement agencies to indicate the areas of current police operations which are to be investigated as a result of the National Crime Authority's report in so far as it relates to those operational matters?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Madam President, I indicated in my statement that the ministerial committee would seek to conclude its task as soon as possible. It will be given a high priority, and while it is difficult to put time limits on these things—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: This year?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I would certainly hope and expect that the matter would be resolved before the end of this year. As I said, it is not possible to put a precise time on it, but we will do it as soon as possible, and certainly it will be given a very high priority. I would expect that the outside limit as far as its completion is concerned would be the end of this year. However, I am hopeful that the matter could be concluded well before that. As to the outstanding matters that are referred to in the NCA report, I can state that the report as a whole has been referred to the Police Commissioner. Some of the matters mentioned in the report will be dealt with immediately by the Police Commissioner and others may need to await the establishment of an Anti-Corruption Unit.

However, the Police Commissioner intends to consult with the National Crime Authority on these allegations and between them they will determine the best course of action. In consultations with the Police Commissioner, the National Crime Authority indicated that it is happy for some of these matters to be dealt with immediately, and for others to perhaps await the formation of an Anti-Corruption Unit. I cannot answer the honourable member's final question at the moment, but I will consider it and, if it is possible to answer more specifically, I will bring down a reply.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN EXPO STAND

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism a question about South Australia's World Expo stand.

Leave granted.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: In view of the Minister's response to an earlier question today that there is some difficulty in selling South Australia, I would like her view on South Australia's stand at the World Expo. I point out that some 13 million people are expected to visit Expo in Brisbane this year, 7 million already having done so. Between 60 000 and 80 000 people visit Expo per day, and that can go as high as 120 000, yet we have a very small stand. I was fortunate enough to view the stand and talk to people there when I was in Brisbane. Mr Maloney, the manager of the stand, has done a very good job with the resources that were made available and the short time that he had to put the stand together. In fact, if I remember correctly, the Minister allowed only a very short time for the stand to be organised.

The front of South Australia's stand has a very small video display showing part of the Grand Prix and there is a Mondiale car, which is very popular, in one corner. There is also a display of South Australian wildflowers, including a kangaroo-paw. I have never seen that wildflower growing in South Australia other than in a garden—it is a Western Australian wildflower. The stand also has wine sampling, but it is open only for some hours during the day. I point out that the Victorian wine sampling is open all day and that that stand promotes 'The Wine State'.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: And they sell it, too.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: Yes. I believe that much more could have been put into the stand, and I will provide some examples. The Flinders Ranges could have been displayed more clearly; there is nothing about the biggest jade deposit in the world; and there is nothing about our fishing industry and the fact that we have the biggest fishing port in Australia at Port Lincoln. The stand has a tiny exhibition of opals. I point out that New South Wales is calling itself 'The Opal State', yet South Australia has the two biggest opal mines in the world—Coober Pedy and Mintabie.

I spoke to visitors to the stand who said they were dismayed at its size. In fact, the Northern Territory and Tasmanian stands, which are next door to our stand, are far better than ours. That is not only my opinion but that of a number of people. Most of the other States and Territories have spent more than $1 million on their stands, while Queensland spent about $6 million. My questions to the Minister are as follows:

1. What was the original budget for South Australia's Expo stand?

2. In view of the fact that it is estimated that another 6 million to 7 million people will pass by our stand during World Expo, will the Minister make some attempt to sell South Australia by approving a lump sum grant to upgrade our stand?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I am very pleased that the honourable member has asked this question because I think that the decision taken by the State Government some months ago with respect to our participation at the World Expo and our budget for participation there has proved to be correct. Our stand at Expo has certainly provided us with value for money. Our original budget was $450 000; to date about $300 000 has been spent. I think that what we have achieved at Expo with that sort of expenditure is quite extraordinary and, in fact, it has been value for money in the very best possible sense because we have managed to attract between—

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: —4 000 and 8 000 people a day.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: There was no-one there—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: That was one day out of three months.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Gee, you're a genius! As I have said, between 4 000 and 8 000 people a day visit our stand, which is an average of 6 000 people a day, and on peak days we have managed to attract about 10 000 people. The various things promoted at the stand have proved to be very popular—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: —with the people visiting it.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I have called for order.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The stand receives about 200 inquiries per week from people who intend to visit our State soon, and a significant number of bookings have been made for people who are visiting this State. The decision to concentrate on a tourism promotional thrust with our stand has proved to be the most appropriate way for us to promote this State. Indeed, people from other States who made different decisions with respect to their own stands have indicated to us that they believe that our approach was the most appropriate approach. In fact, Sir Lew Edwards

said exactly that yesterday, and there is no-one more in touch with Expo than he.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: He said exactly that: that the South Australian Government decision to concentrate its thrust on tourism promotion at its Expo stand has proved to be the best way to go.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: What radio station was that?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: It was on the ABC yesterday morning. In fact, while I am talking about yesterday morning's ABC program—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: —it is significant to remember that Keith Conlon, who had been something of a critic of our Expo stand (like so many other South Australians who were critical of it without seeing what they were criticising), was invited to travel to World Expo at Brisbane to make comparisons between the South Australian stand and those from other States, and he also had an opportunity to talk with various visitors to Expo.

In fact, the vast majority of people to whom he spoke during the course of the weekend and in yesterday's program believed that the Expo stand for South Australia was, indeed, a very good one, giving them the sort of information in which they were interested. One of the things that distinguishes the South Australian stand from the other Australian stands is that we have a large number of friendly staff who are all trained in tourism promotion and who can give information about the State. People enjoy the experience of being able to go and talk to somebody, and that service is not provided in many other areas of Expo, as I found when I was there.

The whinging and carping over the past few months about our Expo stand by members of the Opposition has been very damaging to this State and to our reputation nationally. Other people who visited the Expo stand cannot understand what all the fuss is about. They wonder why members of the Liberal Party take every opportunity they can to knock this State and to knock the attempts made by various people in this State to lift our reputation, to boost our image and to promote the State and its industries.

Ms President, the staff of Expo became so distressed about the constant whinging and carping of members of the Opposition, and others who were encouraged to do so by newspaper reports of this criticism that they felt moved to write to the *Advertiser* to say to South Australians, 'Leave us alone; get off our backs', because it was only South Australians coming into the stand who were in any way critical of what there was to offer.

They told me that they could see the South Australians coming. They were the ones who stood at the front of the stall and looked for things to criticise, and they have been encouraged to do so by members of the Opposition. These South Australians have been encouraged to criticise the efforts of their own State, and I think that is absolutely disgraceful. It is time members opposite got off their band wagons and started promoting this State instead of constantly putting it down.

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY (STATE PROVISIONS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. Barbara Wiese, for the **Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General)**, obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the National Crime Authority (State Provisions) Act 1984. Read a first time.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Commonwealth National Crime Authority Act 1984 established the National Crime Authority. The National Crime Authority (State Provisions) Act 1984 gives the authority power to investigate offences against State laws.

In 1987, section 31 of the Commonwealth Act was amended to give the authority power to apply to a judge of the Federal Court for a warrant to arrest a person, in relation to whom a summons has been issued to appear before the authority, where there are reasonable grounds to believe that the witness has absconded or is likely to abscond, or is attempting or likely to attempt to evade service of the summons. The amendment also provides that a warrant may be executed notwithstanding that the warrant is not at the time in the possession of the person executing it.

Before this amendment, the authority had identical powers under the Commonwealth and State Acts. It is desirable that this situation should continue in order to avoid confusion where the authority is undertaking a joint Commonwealth/State investigation. The power to arrest an absconding witness is, in any event, a desirable one.

At the time the National Crime Authority was established, concerns were expressed about its likely effectiveness as well as about its coercive powers. It was accordingly decided that the authority should be established for an initial period of five years when its operation could be reassessed. There can be no doubt that the authority has been an effective force in the investigation and prosecution of serious crime, and legislation was introduced into the Federal Parliament on 24 February 1988 to repeal the sunset provision in the Federal Act. To ensure that the authority can continue to investigate offences against State law, section 35, the sunset provision, needs to be repealed.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 amends section 20 of the principal Act. It extends the power of a judge of the Federal Court to the issuing of a warrant for the apprehension of a person who has been summoned under section 17 (1) to appear before the authority to give evidence where the judge is satisfied by evidence given on oath that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the person has absconded, is likely to abscond or otherwise attempts, or is otherwise likely to attempt, to evade service of the summons. A new subsection (2a) provides that a warrant can be executed notwithstanding that it is not, at the time of its execution, in the possession of the person executing it.

Clause 3 repeals section 35 of the principal Act which is a sunset clause.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS (INTERCEPTION) BILL

The Hon. Barbara Wiese, for the **Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General)**, obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act for enabling the South Australia Police Force to be declared an agency for the purposes of the Telecommuni-

cations (Interception) Act 1979 of the Commonwealth; and for other related purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In 1987, the Commonwealth Parliament enacted the Telecommunications (Interception) Act Amendment Act which, *inter alia*, contains provisions enabling State Police Forces to apply for the issue of warrants authorising telecommunications interception. The Act provides that the power to obtain interception warrants is available only to State agencies which have been 'declared' by the Commonwealth Minister on the basis that the Minister is satisfied that the State has legislation making satisfactory provision regarding matters set out in section 35 of the Act.

This Bill makes provision for the matters set out in section 35 of the Commonwealth Act. These matters relate to:

- the retention of warrants and instruments of revocation by the Commissioner of Police;
- the keeping and retention of proper records relating to interceptions, the use of intercepted information and the communication and destruction of intercepted information;
- the regular inspection of records by an independent authority (the Police Complaints Authority) and for the reporting by that authority to the Attorney-General of the results of each inspection;
- the furnishing of reports by the Attorney-General to the Commonwealth Minister of all reports by the independent authority;
- the furnishing by the Commissioner of Police to the Attorney-General of copies of all warrants and instruments of revocation and the reporting to the Attorney-General within three months after the expiration or revocation of a warrant on the use made of intercepted information and the communication of that information;
- the furnishing by the Attorney-General to the Commonwealth Minister of copies of all warrants and instruments of revocation; and
- for the destruction of irrelevant records and copies of intercepted communications.

The Commonwealth Telecommunications (Interception) Act 1979 provides the framework for intercepting telecommunications. It establishes the offences for which interception warrants may be obtained, the grounds on which warrants will be issued by a Federal Court judge and the use that may be made of information obtained as a result of an interception.

The offences for which warrants may be obtained are repeated in clause 3 of this Bill. There are two classes of offence. Class 1 offences are murder and kidnapping and class 2 offences are those punishable by imprisonment for life or a maximum period of at least seven years involving loss of life or serious personal injury or the serious risk of such loss or injury; serious damage to property in circumstances endangering a person's safety; trafficking in narcotic drugs; and serious fraud or serious loss to the revenue of the State. In addition, aiding, abetting, counselling, procuring or conspiring in relation to any of the above.

In determining whether to issue a warrant in relation to a class 1 offence the judge must take into consideration, *inter alia*, the extent to which other methods of investigation have been used, how much information would be likely to be obtained by such methods and how such methods would be likely to prejudice the investigation. In relation to a class 2 offence, the judge must also have regard to, *inter alia*, the privacy of persons likely to be interfered with by the interception, the gravity of the conduct constituting the offence being investigated.

Information obtained as a result of an interception can only be used in court proceedings or passed on to another eligible agency if it relates to an offence under the law of the State of that eligible agency, or relates to proceedings for confiscation or forfeiture of property, or may give rise to police disciplinary proceedings or involves misbehaviour or improper conduct of an officer of the State. Intercepted material is inadmissible in court proceedings if it is not obtained in accordance with the provisions of the Commonwealth Act.

Under the provisions of the Commonwealth Act, State police are to obtain their own warrants from a Federal Court judge. All interception warrants are to be executed by the Telecommunications Interception Division of the Australian Federal Police and all interceptions are to be conducted through Telecom except where a judge specifically authorises the AFP to intercept independently of Telecom on being satisfied that Telecom cannot assist for technical reasons, because its facilities are not available, or its assistance might jeopardise the security of the operation.

The Government believes that telecommunication interception is a cost effective means of combating serious crime. It also recognises that telecommunication interception is a particularly intrusive form of investigation and should be used only in special circumstances where other less intrusive methods would be ineffective. By restricting the authority to make use of interceptions to serious crimes, by requiring judicial authorisation for warrants, by providing for ministerial review of all warrants issued and by providing for independent inspection of police records, the Government is satisfied that the proper balance has been obtained between the protection of the community against criminal activity and criminal injury on the one hand and the privacy of the individual on the other.

This Government has already done much to further its resolve to protect the community against criminal activity and injury. Some measures already taken include the National Crime Authority legislation, the revision of drug offence penalties and the confiscation of profits of crime legislation. The present measure will further enhance the community's protection against criminal activity.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for commencement on proclamation.

Clause 3 provides a series of definitions, the majority of which are, of necessity, straight copies of definitions in the Commonwealth Act. The definitions of 'ancillary offence', 'Class 1 offence', 'Class 2 offence', 'prescribed offence' and 'serious offence' are all required for the purposes of clause 6 of the Bill which obliges the Commissioner of Police to give very detailed reports to the Attorney-General. Subclause (3) provides that any expression not defined in this Act has the same meaning as in the Commonwealth Act.

Clause 4 requires the Commissioner of Police to keep copies of all interception warrants issued to the Police Force of this State, copies of each notification given to the Federal Police Commissioner as to the issue of a warrant pursuant to a telephone application, copies of all revocations of warrants, copies of certain evidentiary certificates that the Commissioner of Police is empowered to give under the Commonwealth Act, copies of written authorities given by

the Commissioner to police officers authorising them to receive information obtained by interceptions, and copies of all records made under clause 5 of the Bill.

Clause 5 requires the Commissioner of Police to make written records of a wide range of matters relating to warrants and their revocation or refusal under the Commonwealth Act, to the movement of records of interceptions into and out of the hands of the Police Force and to the use made of information obtained through interceptions.

Clause 6 requires the Commissioner to give the Attorney-General a copy of each warrant or revocation of a warrant as soon as possible after its issue. The Commissioner must also report to the Attorney-General, not later than three months after a warrant ceases to be in force, on the use made and communication of any information obtained pursuant to the warrant. An annual report must also be given to the Attorney-General setting out detailed information and statistics generally relating to the whole area of warrants, arrests and convictions made on the basis of information obtained through interceptions and the types of offences involved in such proceedings.

Clause 7 requires the Commissioner of Police to keep restricted records (i.e. records, whether audio or transcripts, of interceptions) in a secure place that is not accessible to persons other than those who have lawful access to them. The Commissioner is also obliged to destroy such records once they are no longer needed.

Clause 8 requires the Police Complaints Authority to inspect the records of the Police Commissioner at least twice a year in order to ascertain whether or not the requirements of this Act as to the keeping and making of records (sections 4 and 5) and the security and destruction of restricted records (section 7) are being complied with. Not later than two months after completing such an inspection the authority must give a written report of the results of the inspection to the Attorney-General. If certain other offences come to light during such an inspection, the authority may include that information in any such written report.

Clause 9 gives the authority and any authorised officer of the authority powers of entry onto Police Force premises and the right to inspect all police records and require any member of the Police Force to give information relevant to the inspection. A person is not excused from giving such information on the ground of self-incrimination, but any such information is not admissible in evidence against the person (except in proceedings for an offence against section 10).

Clause 10 establishes the offences of refusing or failing to comply with requirements made under section 9 and of hindering an inspection or giving false or misleading information.

Clause 11 prohibits the Police Complaints Authority and its officers from divulging information obtained pursuant to this Act except, of course, as may be required or authorised by this Act.

Clause 12 provides that the above offences are summary offences.

Clause 13 gives immunity to the Police Complaints Authority, and to such of its officers as may be acting under its direction or with its authority, when acting in good faith under this Act.

Clause 14 obliges the Attorney-General to give a copy of all warrants, revocations and reports received under this Act to the relevant Commonwealth Minister.

Clause 15 is a regulation-making power.

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 11 August. Page 145.)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I rise to support the motion that the Address in Reply as read be adopted. In doing so, I will address some remarks to the topic of recent interest: multiculturalism and immigration policy. As most members would be aware, in recent weeks there has been a little debate about these issues and the climate has warmed up a little over the past couple of weeks. Prior to the statements made by John Howard on 31 July this year, in my view there were already some worrying signs on the national scene about the whole multiculturalism/immigration debate going off the rails. On 15 July, some two weeks before that particular statement, I spoke at a national Vietnamese conference on language and culture. I want to place on record something of what I said on that occasion, as follows:

> However, on the national scene, there are worrying signs that the debate on multiculturalism, muticultural education and immigration policy is going off the rails, with recent comment based on prejudice, bigotry and racism. In recent weeks there have been a number of examples of people trying to outdo even the infamous Bruce Ruxton. For example, the comments made by Nancy Wake deserve outright condemnation. Whilst there should always be room for genuine disagreement over the direction of these policies, it is imperative that the debate be kept rational and moderate.

I interpose at that stage and add that I am equally critical of those who tend automatically to label as racist anyone who questions any aspect of immigration policy as that does not in any way help to keep the current debate rational and moderate. I continued as follows:

> Untold damage could be done to our Australian community if we allow the Bruce Ruxtons of this world to dictate the flavour of the debate—

The Hon. T.G. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will get to them later—

> as emotive, irrational and inflammatory. In this respect there is additional responsibility on national conservative politicians and members of the media to consider the future stability and cohesiveness of Australia in their actions as well as short term concerns such as attracting votes or readers or viewers. This will certainly be the view I will put to my interstate and Federal colleagues when I meet them in Melbourne this weekend.

That was referring to a meeting of Federal and State shadow Ministers and Ministers of Education. Suffice to say that the weight or significance of Rob Lucas's views have been proved in the passing of time and have not counted for much at all, not that I expected them to. They nevertheless remain my strongly held views, and I am concerned that the uncontrolled nature of the debate that we have in Australia at the moment might do more harm for the long-term social cohesion and harmony of Australia than any particular composition of our immigration intake at any particular time.

The attitude of the South Australian State Liberal Party has been and remains quite clear. It was stated publicly in this Chamber at the swearing in of my new colleague, the Hon. Julian Stefani, and I take the opportunity to welcome Julian to this Chamber. I know that his contribution in his work in this Chamber will be significant for all South Australians. John Olsen, my parliamentary Leader, has also taken the opportunity in a speech in the public arena as recently as last Friday evening to place on the record the State Liberal Party's view. On that occasion he said:

> I believe that South Australia is very much richer for the variety and diversity provided by the active presence and involvement of our migrant communities. We have, in South Australia, a stable multiculturalism which I want to do all I can to maintain and foster.

Further on in the speech, he said:

> But it is a mark of a caring, concerned, civilised and cohesive society that it can and will tolerate diversity and it will insist that in the selection of migrants, there will be no discrimination whatsoever on the basis of race or colour of skin. Such a non-discriminatory policy not only must be maintained, it must be seen to be maintained.
>
> If there is latent racism within our community, we as Liberals must not seek to exploit it for political gain. Rather, we must continue to act on the much higher ground cultivated by our past record in this matter.

I say with much personal conviction that I support John Olsen on this matter 100 per cent, as indeed I do on virtually every other matter, in relation to his very strong and very brave comments, particularly in the present climate that we have on this issue. Even if I did not have that strong personal conviction to support John Olsen's views on this matter, I, as a member of the State Liberal Party, would be bound to support a multicultural society for South Australia and Australia. The first plank in the State platform of the Liberal Party, a document which is still obviously current and relevant for all of us, states, 'The Liberal Party believes in a multi-cultural society.' The State platform is quite different from State policies.

Policies are fairly ephemeral: they come and go with the passage and flavour of various Leaders and parliamentary Parties. They change, perhaps frequently, and perhaps not so frequently. The platform of any political Party, and that of my Party, is a statement of the basic principles that we believe. When we sign our nomination forms as parliamentary candidates, we sign a four-page document, which states:

> I agree to contest the election, to be bound by the constitution of the division and to uphold the platform of the division.

That is, we agree to uphold the basic principles of our Party. We are not bound as a parliamentary Party to follow slavishly the policy dictates of our State Council or our organisation, but we are required to uphold the platform of the State Liberal Party. As I indicate in relation to support for a multicultural society, that is the first and pre-eminent plank in our State platform.

In relation to multicultural education, I again place on record, as I have done on many occasions, the fact that its history in South Australia has been one of bipartisan support over the years between the two major Parties. The Liberal Party, in this Chamber and elsewhere, has supported State Labor Government policies such as the new language policy for primary schools which will offer a language to every student in primary school by 1995. The Liberal Party has supported policies which provide assistance to our magnificent Ethnic Schools Association within South Australia. The Liberal Party supported the establishment last year of the South Australian Institute of Languages, which will help coordinate the delivery of languages in our higher education institutions in South Australia. Indeed, we have also supported many other policies which serve to maintain the languages and cultures of all our ethnic communities.

I have said publicly, and I say again, that this bipartisan support in South Australia in multicultural education will continue, and I congratulate Ministers such as Lynn Arnold and his successor, Greg Crafter, and the Bannon Government, for their approach in this important area of multicultural education. I know that the Hon. Mr Crothers would not want me to extend those congratulations too widely, but certainly, in that area of multicultural education, I am quite happy to place on the record my congratulations for the policies of this Government, its Ministers and previous Ministers in relation to multicultural education.

The Hon. T. Crothers: The Hon. Mr Crothers thus far is in absolute agreement with the honourable member.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: We might diverge a little later on. I now want to look at this concept of one Australia. I quote from the *Advertiser* of Monday 1 August. When John Howard was asked to define the 'one Australia' concept, he said:

> Very simply, that you're Australian before anything else.

He then went on to say:

> I do believe the concept of 'one Australia'—of having an approach to immigration, ethnic affairs and that elevates commitment to Australia and loyalty to Australian values and Australian attitudes above everything else—is something I think the community wants. It's something I believe in.

I agree completely with that statement of the Hon. John Howard. I believe that most, but perhaps not everyone, in the community could accept a policy or policies directed towards a 'one Australia' concept where we do place pre-eminent importance on the notion of 'one Australia', Australian values and attitudes, etc. My concern is when people extend this argument to say that in some way the 'one Australia' concept and multiculturalism are in some way mutually exclusive or incompatible. I do not believe that that is so or need be so, and I do not agree that that is the way in which we ought to view the concepts of multiculturalism and the 'one Australia' policy.

In extending this argument I refer to page 31 of the Fitzgerald report, where probably the most succinct definition of multiculturalism that I have seen is quoted. The Fitzgerald report, from a definition from the Office of Multicultural Affairs, notes:

> Multiculturalism is not about institutionalisation of difference, rather it is an approach which seeks to reinforce social harmony by encouraging all Australians to recognise the reality of cultural diversity in our society, promoting tolerance and equality and particularly by helping ensure effective use of all the nation's human resources.

The inference is clear that, if properly understood and defined in the first instance there is nothing incompatible between the concept of multiculturalism and the concept of the 'one Australia' policy as originally announced by John Howard.

The Fitzgerald report, contrary to some media and political commentators, did not oppose multiculturalism. However, it did make some strident criticism of multicultural policies in Australia that exist at the moment. In particular, it said that there were major concerns in the Australian community about multiculturalism. I take the view—and again I agree with my State Leader in his speech of last Friday evening, to which I have already referred—that, if there are problems in understanding multiculturalism and what it is about, what we need to do is not to throw everything out but to clear up—

The Hon. M.S. Feleppa: Like he did already?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Who, Olsen?

The Hon. M.S. Feleppa: No. You are speaking about your Federal Leader.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, I am speaking about John Olsen. I will recount that. I am agreeing with John Olsen in his speech last Friday when he said that if there are problems in understanding multiculturalism then what we need to do is not throw everything out but clear up the confusion that exists in the community about the concept and the effects of multiculturalism. I am pleased to be able to clarify that for the Hon. Mr Feleppa.

I now turn to the controversial subject of Asian immigration. First, I will look at Asian immigration and the related matters of market research. In the past privately, and sometimes publicly, I have been critical of my Party's organisational heavies—the Secretariat—in their understanding and use of market research in a whole range of areas that are quite unrelated to the current debate that I will address. I have no doubt that the Australian Labor

Party, with Rod Cameron, has very effectively outgunned the Federal Liberal Party over many years in relation to the professional use of market research.

I have had a view for some time that federally we have had a tendency to place too much of an advertising agency driven bias to our market research in the Federal arena. What I am saying is that I believe there has been too much of a concentration or a commitment to what I call qualitative research as opposed to quantitative research (or number crunching). Qualitative research is small group research, eight to 10 voters in a room with a moderator, and you might have four, six or eight such groups, totalling 40 to 60 voters. It is in-depth research which feeds off the lead and attitudes of the moderator but also off other members in that small group during that evening.

Although qualitative research has some major advantages one of the major problems is that one can never tell whether the attitudes of the 40 to 60 people are properly representative of all Australians. One needs to sample some 2 000 voters throughout the whole of Australia to be confident, within a range of about 2 per cent, that the views one is being given are relatively accurate of the views of the Australian community as a whole. In no way should one use the results of small group or qualitative research to indicate the views of the vast majority of Australians.

One can use it quite effectively to flesh out opinions on a range of issues, but that ought to be pursued in larger quantitative surveys. I will quote from an article that was written by Michelle Grattan, one of the more respected Federal political journalists, in an opinion piece she wrote in the Melbourne *Age* of 6 August, some five days after this controversy hit the headlines. It states:

> Qualitative research by the Liberals last March showed people were worried about the rate of migration, concentrations of migrants and criteria for selection. They resented migrants bringing out families who, they said, went on to welfare. Working-class people were critical of migrant ghettos; move up the income scale, and people were talking about the Japanese investors.
>
> Although Party people claim Howard is not 'research driven', the evidence showed him this was a potentially fertile issue. Morgan Gallop research backs up the point.

I happen to know, from my contacts in the Federal arena, that Michelle Grattan is pretty close to the mark in the comments that she made on 6 August. It would appear that, as with many other issues the result of qualitative research, pursued by some quantitative research, has been one of the reasons—but not the only reason—for taking up this issue on the national scene.

As I have said, one has to remember that, when one has a group of eight people in a room and one of the eight raises the issue of immigration and then everyone feeds off the particular view of that person, it may well not have been a matter of immediate concern to the other seven people in that research group. However, once the issue is raised they then feed their opinion to the moderator who reports back to the particular political Party.

I wish to compare the results of that Federal Liberal Party research to the results of some quantitative or large sample research done by the Morgan company. This research is quoted in some of the attachments to the Fitzgerald report. In the period February 1982 to February 1984, in response to a question along the lines of 'Thinking about Australia as a whole, what are the three most important things the Federal Government should be doing something about?', only 1 per cent or 2 per cent of some 2 000-odd voters mentioned immigration or immigrant problems. Even when pressed further about what else the Federal Government should be doing something about, only 1 per cent or 2 per cent of people thought immigration or immigrant problems during that period were of some significance as one of the three most important issues.

The Blainey debate in mid 1984 took off and in June of 1984 that was measured by the results of the same question showing the figure had moved up to 4 per cent. It stayed at 3 per cent in September before dropping back to 2 per cent in February 1985 and since February 1985, to when the Fitzgerald report was published this year, the response to that question has remained at 1 or 2 per cent. So basically for the whole period since 1982 to now, when voters have been asked what are the three most important issues, 1 or 2 per cent of them have felt that immigration and immigration problems are so significant that they believe they are one of the three most important issues the Federal Government should do something about. When there was some controversy, it jumped to 4 per cent and I have no doubt that, in the next survey that Morgan takes, it will again jump but certainly, in my view, it will not jump to anywhere near the levels of the most significant issues, such as taxes and jobs, etc., that are pre-eminent as problems that the Federal Government or Federal Opposition ought to be addressing at the moment in Australia.

I summarise this part of my speech by saying we have to distinguish between quantitative and qualitative research and also between issues which may or may not be (from the political Party's viewpoint) a vote-switching issue. By that I mean there are many issues where there may well be majority support for an issue, but it will not be an issue which will change in any way a significant number of the intentions of voters. For example, it may well be that 80 per cent of people believe that Bill Hayden should not be the Governor-General but in my view that is not likely to be an issue that will make one scrap of difference in relation to the way electors vote in 1989 or 1990 when they face up to the choice between Hawke and Howard.

The Hon. T. Crothers: Howard is desperate for an issue, isn't he?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: He has plenty of issues, as I indicated. There are taxes, jobs, unemployment, and a whole range of things that are issues at the moment that we can and should be addressing.

I want to address what has become a focus at present—a Newspoll published in the *Australian* last week—and that question asked:

> Do you agree or disagree with the recent statement by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Howard) that Asian immigration to Australia should be slowed down?

The result, as all members will know, was that 77 per cent agreed with Mr Howard, 18 per cent disagreed and 5 per cent did not know. There have been a number of other surveys, another one conducted by channel 9 yesterday, which reflects very much the fact that 70 per cent or 80 per cent of Australians support, when it is put in that way, the view that John Howard is putting in relation to this issue. In commenting on that Newspoll result I want to note some research done by the respected national company Saulwick. The Saulwick polls carried out for the Melbourne *Age* and for the *Sydney Morning Herald* over 17 years (and this is quoted from the *Age* of 10 August) have consistently shown public resistance to immigration from all sources, and not just Asia. The article on 10 August states:

> This in no way invalidates the Newspoll but inferences drawn from it that Asians are especially unwelcome ignore the wider context. This context is illustrated by the results of the two Saulwick *Age* polls done in February and June of this year. Both of these national polls showed that about two-thirds of the respondents (that is, somewhere between 60 and 70 per cent of respondents) wanted either a cut in immigration or no immigration at all.

So, in response to a question as to levels of overall immigration, forgetting about the racial composition, between 60 and 70 per cent of Australians wanted either no immigration at all into Australia or a cut in immigration to Australia.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: How do you get growth in a saturated society with static population?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The honourable member asks a very good question. With static population we cannot have growth especially if we cut immigration completely. Few in the national debate are arguing for a reduction in immigration levels. John Howard and the Federal Government are both going down the path of suggesting, in overall terms, an increase in the numbers coming into Australia from some 130 000 this year to between 140 000 and 150 000 next year.

The Hon. T. Crothers: He wants to do it in a discriminatory way, doesn't he?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will address that in a minute, and I thank the honourable member for his assistance.

I want to refer now to a consultant's report on market research, commissioned by the Fitzgerald inquiry. The report states:

> For the past 20 years or more, surveys have shown overwhelming opposition to a policy that would only allow Europeans to enter or that would prohibit the immigration of Asians. Beyond that, however, no clear consensus. This reflects less on the inadequacies of the polls and more on the divided, even contradictory, state of public opinion.
>
> In recent years opposition to the level of Asian immigration, including the entry of Indo-Chinese refugees, has been no greater than opposition to the level of immigration generally. People who oppose the one have generally opposed the other.

What the consultant's report, based on a study of 20 years research, is saying is exactly the same as that quote of 10 August from the *Age* in relation to the Saulwick polls. The report continues:

> It might be argued, of course, that opposition to immigration in general simply reflects opposition to Asian immigration in particular. This, however, seems unlikely; attitudes to immigrants from Vietnam, for example, are not very different to attitudes to immigrants from Greece or Italy—not 20 yers ago but now. It seems more likely that opposition to Asian immigration reflects, at least in part, opposition to immigration in general. This interpretation also fits with what we know of ethnocentism.

I also note from that report a 1946 survey quoted by the consultants which asked a question of Australians as to which races we should allow into Australia and it gave a check list. I have some results for the Hon. Trevor Crothers which are not too flattering, but I will address them later in relation to attitudes to Irish immigration.

In 1946, when the survey question was asked, only 10 per cent of Australians wanted Italians let into Australia. That may be a matter of some interest to the Hon. Mario Feleppa and the Hon. Julian Stefani. In 1946 only just over 25 per cent of Australians wanted Greeks, Germans or Poles. The flavour of the day in 1946 were the Dutch and the Swedes because over 67 per cent of Australians in that poll were quite prepared to accept Dutch and Swedish immigrants. The attitudes of 1946 to the wave of immigration from Italy, Greece, Germany, and Poland, were very much opposed to allowing those ethnic communities into Australia. Indeed, from those other quotations that I have given, the situation obviously has not changed too much.

The second thing in relation to immigration that I want to do is to put some facts on the record. Some people in this debate on Asian immigration take the attitude: 'Don't let facts get in the way of a good story.' I would like to place on the record some factual information from the Bureau of Statistics as to the level and definition of Asian immigration in Australia.

First, let us look at what the Bureau of Statistics defines as Asian, or as immigrants coming from Asia. The definition that the Bureau of Statistics uses covers East and South-East Asia, and I think most Australians would understand, the Philippines, China, Indonesia, Japan, Kampuchea, Korea, etc., being included in the definition of East and South-East Asia. There is then South Central Asia, including India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, and I understand also Afghanistan, although it is not separately listed there. Then there is Western Asia or the Middle East.

All Middle Eastern countries such as Israel and Lebanon, and countries like Cyprus and Turkey, and so on, are included in the definition of 'Asian immigration'. In fact, I have been told a very humorous story—although it is not a very humorous issue—about this by a colleague who was contacted by members of the Lebanese community in his area (and I point out that they were not official representatives of that community). They indicated that they were quite relaxed about this debate because it did not affect the Lebanese community in any way and it would keep out some of the Asians. They did not realise that, under the definition of 'Asian immigration' used by the Bureau of Statistics and all the other commentators who talk about the explosion of Asian immigration, Lebanon is a significant ethnic group. For example, with respect to Lebanon, in 1979 there were 1 070 Lebanese immigrants into Australia, and in 1987 that figure had more than trebled to 3 870. I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* a purely statistical table from the Bureau of Statistics showing permanent movement settler arrivals into Australia and country of birth from 1979 to 1987.

The PRESIDENT: Is it purely statistical?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Yes, with no graphs.

Leave granted.

TABLE 1. PERMANENT MOVEMENT—SETTLER ARRIVALS: COUNTRY OF BIRTH(*a*), AUSTRALIA
1979 to 1987

	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987
ASIA									
East and South East Asia—									
China	1 110	1 460	1 370	1 070	1 300	2 600	3 210	2 680	3 090
Hong Kong	910	720	1 000	1 350	1 510	3 070	2 940	3 260	4 260
Indonesia	730	660	1 900	1 070	940	1 090	1 320	1 150	1 350
Japan	120	190	260	200	210	190	200	320	540
Kampuchea	310	1 350	1 740	2 260	4 440	880	1 020	880	1 560
Korea (*b*)	500	220	410	740	560	570	850	1 430	1 790
Malaysia	1 490	1 770	2 160	2 120	1 870	1 870	2 370	2 830	5 070
Philippines	1 580	2 590	2 970	3 090	2 660	2 950	3 750	4 850	8 960
Singapore	490	560	640	710	590	670	760	1 080	1 910
Taiwan	50	80	110	140	110	180	230	670	970
Thailand	190	220	210	300	230	330	660	810	960
Vietnam	12 800	12 460	12 290	8 380	9 370	9 900	7 270	7 310	6 270

TABLE 1. PERMANENT MOVEMENT—SETTLER ARRIVALS: COUNTRY OF BIRTH(*a*), AUSTRALIA
1979 to 1987

	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987
Other	1 330	1 580	820	610	570	790	470	990	1 240
Total E and SE Asia	21 610	23 850	25 860	22 050	24 350	25 090	25 030	28 260	37 970
Percentage of Total	29.9	25.2	21.8	20.6	36.1	34.3	30.5	27.3	29.6
South Central Asia—									
India	840	880	1 220	1 620	1 710	1 730	2 030	2 140	2 870
Pakistan	90	150	240	160	180	160	230	300	380
Sri Lanka	330	290	440	540	740	2 570	1 600	2 080	2 970
Other	230	410	440	570	650	890	1 400	1 500	1 680
Total	1 490	1 740	2 340	2 900	3 270	5 350	5 270	6 030	7 900
Western Asia (Middle East)—									
Cyprus	310	290	510	340	270	280	280	430	490
Israel	170	230	210	200	110	190	250	410	330
Lebanon	1 070	790	820	830	740	2 440	2 190	2 830	3 870
Turkey	710	990	980	550	560	740	870	1 080	1 250
Other	290	480	780	310	400	650	580	740	1 060
Total	3 550	2 770	3 310	2 220	2 080	4 300	4 170	5 480	7 000
Total Asia	25 650	28 370	31 500	27 170	29 700	34 750	34 470	39 770	52 870
Percentage of Total Settler Arrivals	35.5	30.0	26.5	25.4	37.9	47.5	42.0	38.5	41.2

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Those members who are interested will be able to refer to the table in some detail, but I will highlight one or two matters. In 1987 we see that our total immigration intake from Asia was 41 per cent. That is the most often quoted figure and it is exact, although some refer to the figure for that group as being almost 50 per cent. If one uses that definition to include Western Asia, South Central Asia, and East and South East Asia, that is correct. If one looks at the proportion from just East and South East Asia, instead of 41.2 per cent the figure is 29.6 per cent.

The Hon. T. Crothers: Are you differentiating between Mongoloid and Caucasoid?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am not sure if I am making that difference at all. However, the Bureau of Statistics classifies them in three sections: East and South East Asia, which accounted for 29 per cent of our migrant intake in 1987; South Central Asia, which includes India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka; and Western Asia, which includes all the Middle East. When those three sections are added together, the 29 per cent migrant intake from Asia increases to 41 per cent.

The Hon. T. Crothers: Is that done on a racial basis?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Yes. I indicated earlier the breakdown for Lebanon, for example. All the other countries are broken down in the table that I have incorporated in *Hansard*. The Hon. Mr Crothers might be interested to look at breakdowns for particular groups in which he may be interested.

The Hon. T. Crothers interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The honourable member is just one step ahead of me. I understand his interpretation of the definitions of 'Mongoloid' and 'Caucasoid', but that is not explained in the ABS figures. Perhaps the Hon. Mr Crothers might like to look at the ABS definition and decide for himself.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: He can join the debate later.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am sure he will. I have some comments on the Irish later. The other matter that I wish to mention with respect to this table is that in 1979—some eight or nine years ago—the East and South East Asian component of our migrant intake was 29.9 per cent. In 1987 the figure was 29.6 per cent. So, between 1979 and 1987, the percentage of migrant intake from East and South East Asia has remained virtually static. It certainly increased during the early 1980s but, if one compares 1979 and 1987, it is virtually the same level. There has been an increase in the total Asian proportion of the migrant intake due to the increase from South Central Asia—India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka—in particular from India and Sri Lanka. There has also been significant growth in Middle Eastern immigration, and I have already referred to the explosion in Lebanese immigrants. There has also been a significant jump in migration from a number of other areas of Western Asia.

If one looks at the total Asian percentage, including that from those extra classifications, the increase is 35.5 per cent to 41.2 per cent. Indeed, over the past eight or nine years there has been a significant growth in that percentage of the migrant intake. The Fitzgerald inquiry found that the ABS definition of 'Asia' does not in any way match the Australian community's understanding of what is an Asian. The Fitzgerald inquiry has recommended that the bureau change its definition to, at the very least, exclude Western Asia (or the Middle East). I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* a purely statistical table which looks at the permanent movement—settler arrivals by country of birth, between the March quarter 1984 and the March quarter 1988 (the most recent figures available).

Leave granted.

Permanent Movement—Settler Arrivals by Country of Birth, March Quarter 1984 to March Quarter 1988

	March Quarter				
	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988
East and South East Asia (% of Total)	35.7	33.4	28.2	28.9	29.4
Total Asia (% of Total)	46.5	44.2	38.7	39.8	39.9

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: If one looks at the figures for the March quarter 1988 (as opposed to the 1987 figures) and compares them with the figures for 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987 and 1988, it can be seen that in 1984 for the March quarters the East and South East Asian percentage of the total was 35.7 per cent; it is now 29.4 per cent. So there has been a drop of some 6 per cent when one compares the most recent figure with equivalent March quarters over the past five years. If one looks at the total Asian percentage of migrant intake, the figure of 46.5 per cent in the March quarter 1984 has now dropped away to 39.9 per cent in the March quarter 1988.

I now turn to the concern being expressed about Asian immigration in relation to social cohesion and social harmony in Australia and, indeed, South Australia. I will cite three statements. I refer to an article of 2 August from John Howard, as follows:

'It would be in our immediate term interests and supportive of social cohesion if it (Asian immigration) was slowed down a

little so that the capacity of the community to absorb (it) were greater,' he said.

'I'm not saying that I would end Asian immigration. I would never do that. But what I am saying is that it is a legitimate concern of any community and any government to say that the rate of migration from one particular area is so great that it is imposing social tensions and that it is imposing a lack of social cohesion,' he said.

On 12 August John Howard issued a statement to clarify his 'one Australia' concept, he said:

The program will, however, be subject to the undeniable right of the Australian Government, in the name of the Australian people, to alter the level and composition of the program to ensure the maintenance of social harmony and cohesion.

Finally, John Stone and Ian Sinclair made statements last week and were rapped over the knuckles by John Howard. John Stone made another statement on the weekend which was reported in yesterday's *Age*, as follows:

The Opposition has determined a policy that will go to the backbench committee and the Party room. It contains no specific reference to any racial group. I've said—and I don't withdraw—that what the Opposition has been talking about, and what John Howard has been talking about, is to bring the composition of the immigration stream back into better balance. And that will require a reduction in what has become the excessively high proportion of immigrants from Asia in that stream.

A lot of people have been expressing many concerns, which are reflected in the polls which were referred to earlier, about the level of Asian immigration and the perceived problems that it will have on social cohesion and social harmony in Australia. Indeed, 'social cohesion' and 'social harmony' appear to be the buzz words of the moment.

As yet, no-one that I have seen in the public arena has given any factual evidence of how the immigration intake, from Asia in particular as compared with the total migrant intake, is affecting social cohesion and social harmony in Australia and, indeed, in South Australia. I have evidence that supports a contrary argument.

I refer, first, to the Fitzgerald report, because I want to examine the general question of migrant communities—not just the Asian communities—and crime. That issue is a fairly good indicator of social cohesion and harmony. If we had—for example as Nancy Wake indicated with respect to the Vietnamese and as some have indicated about the Italian community in the past in relation to the Mafia—a migrant community running rampant committing greater pro rata crime than the rest of the Australian population, I would have to concede that that would be a matter for genuine debate and concern within the community. A summary of crime statistics appears on page 66 of the Fitzgerald report, as follows:

The crime statistics of Asian born are among the lowest of any group of overseas-born people in Australia.

They are among the lowest of any group of overseas-born people in Australia! Indeed, when I look at some other information, which I will put on the record, I see that migrants generally have a lower instance of crime than does the Australian-born population.

The Australian Institute of Criminology produced a report by Kayleen Hazelhurst entitled 'Migration, Ethnicity and Crime in Australian Society'. Published in September 1987, this document states:

Studies have consistently shown that persons from the general migrant population commit fewer offences and are less likely to be in prison than persons from the Australian-born population. For example, overseas-born prisoner rates (75.46 per 100 000 of the population) were significantly lower than Australian-born prisoner rates (107.53 per 100 000) in 1985.

Offending rates among migrants tend to increase with the duration of residence in Australia—

I suppose they take on the Australian culture—

that is to say, migrant offending trends become more like those among the general population over time.

Further on the report states:

Between 1982-85, next to the Australian-born, persons from the United Kingdom and from New Zealand comprised the largest numbers in prison. But in relation to the size of the resident population in Australia, a disproportionate representation was most noticeable among New Zealand and other Oceanic, Lebanese and other Middle East and Yugoslavian migrant groups. New Zealand/Oceania and Middle East rates have consistently surpassed Australian-born rates for some years. Yugoslavia has either equalled or has just surpassed Australian rates with America (North and South) coming close to doing this. Lower rates among Africa, Greece and Italy, and to a lesser extent Asia and UK/Eire, have kept overall migrant prisoner rates lower than Australian-born rates.

Both of those quotes indicate that, on the factual evidence available, no-one can argue that our migrant communities are committing offences and ending up in prison at any greater rate than the Australian-born population. Indeed, some are significantly better. On the present figures, Asians are doing better than other overseas-born people in relation to offences committed and number of persons in prison.

I now refer to some further information from the consultants' report to the Fitzgerald inquiry based on research over recent years about how our migrant communities, particularly Asians, Greeks and Italians, fit into Australian society. On page 25, the report notes some Reark research from 1985 conducted amongst 555 native-born Australians plus 125 Asian/Middle East Australians. The survey was conducted in Sydney and Adelaide, in areas of high migrant concentration. In response to a question, 54 per cent of that sample said that Asians will fit in like the Greeks and Italians have in the past. A 1984 McNair Anderson survey asked a series of questions. Various migrant groups were named and respondents were asked whether they thought those groups had not tried to adapt to the Australian way. In response, 30 per cent of people felt that the Greeks had not tried to adapt to the Australian way, while 33 per cent felt that the Italians had not tried to adapt.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: That was the researcher's question. In the same survey, 36 per cent said that of the Vietnamese community. So, within 5 per cent of each other, Greeks, Italians and Vietnamese were felt by the Australian community not to have tried to adapt to the Australian way. When it was put to them whether these groups had un-Australian customs—whatever that meant to the respondents—49 per cent—

The Hon. R.J. Ritson interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Dr Ritson said, 'Eating rice.' Perhaps the same could be said of eating spaghetti. Of this survey, 49 per cent said that Italians and Greeks had un-Australian customs, while 50 per cent said that Vietnamese had un-Australian customs.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Barbara Wiese said that they do not eat pies or barrack for West Adelaide but follow soccer instead. Whatever their definition of Australian customs, there was no differentiation in the attitude of the Australian community between Vietnamese, Greeks and Italians. Another question asked in the McNair Anderson survey was whether these communities tended to stick together too much and do not mix together with the Australian community. How often have we heard this: the ghetto mentality? Of the people surveyed, 38 per cent thought that the Vietnamese stuck together and did not mix; 44 per cent felt that the Greeks stuck together and did not mix; and 63 per cent felt that the Italians stuck together too much and did not mix with the Australian community.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: What of the Australians in London?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will not address that question. There is no evidence from those surveys that Australians believe that the Vietnamese—given the definition used by this research company as to whether they have tried to adapt to Australian ways, whether they have un-Australian customs or whether they stick together too much—are any worse than our more traditional ethnic communities, the Greeks and Italians. The 1985 Reark research showed that the views of many Australians changed quite significantly for the better after they had met Asians in their close neighbourhood. I am sure that would have happened with many of the other migrant communities in the past.

Finally, I will quote from page 66 of the Fitzgerald report. In his conclusions, Fitzgerald notes:

> This issue [Asian migration] must also be addressed against the historical background in which the largest national groups of immigrants have been the least popular, and in which much of what is now said of Asians was once said of Italians and Greeks and Maltese, and also of Irish.

The Hon. Trevor Crothers has left the Chamber, so I had better remind him of that.

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles: What about the Poms?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will get to the Poms in a minute. Fitzgerald continues:

> Surveys indicate that attitudes to Asian immigrants are in many respects more positive than to other European and non-European groups. There is strong evidence that the community worries about the idea of these immigrants but accepts them on personal acquaintance in a neighbourhood context.
>
> Australians have always expressed their reaction to newcomers irreverently and disparagingly, to the 'Pommie bastards', 'Wogs' and 'Dagoes' who formed the successive waves of immigration, while welcoming the benefits they brought. The committee's research suggests that anti-immigrant sentiments—

this was written before more recent events—

> may have been more hostile and more boisterously expressed in earlier times than in the past decade.
>
> Some of the media exposure which Asian immigration is receiving is distorting informed and responsible public debate on immigration itself. But the call to dismantle our non-discriminatory immigration policy has been limited and not persuasive. Surveys show that most Australians believe that policy discrimination, directed at Asians or anyone else, is not acceptable.
>
> The real test is the test of social acceptance. Ten years of substantial immigration from Asia suggest very strongly that it is working. The commitment is apparent on both sides, and the harmony of outcomes is already evident. Government must not be complacent about this harmony, but work hard to ensure that it endures.

Before concluding, I must say that that is a powerful quotation from Fitzgerald and, as everyone seems to be quoting Fitzgerald for their own end, let me do so as well. Another aspect to which I will refer briefly concerns citizenship. According to Fitzgerald, approximately 43 per cent of our overseas-born population, or 1 million Australian residents, have not taken up citizenship. A very large percentage of that—60 per cent—according to Fitzgerald, are people born in the United Kingdom. As the Hon. Murray Hill and many others who have attended citizenship ceremonies would know, many of our Asian migrants, particularly refugees, queue up on the doorstep for citizenship as soon as they qualify because they have a commitment to Australia. They have a commitment to Australian citizenship even though they want to retain their cultures, traditions and some essence of the language of their native country. It is not the Asians who are not taking up Australian citizenship. It is our traditional migrant base from the United Kingdom, for a whole range of reasons.

The Hon. M.S. Feleppa: Are you aware of reasons why they do not take up citizenship?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: There is a whole range of reasons. When talking about social cohesion and putting Australia first, it cannot be said that the Asian community is not prepared to do so or to take up Australian citizenship. The facts do not bear that out. It is time for rational, informed debate on this whole issue. As I said at the outset, I do not accept the view that anyone who raises questions about bipartisanship or shared views in this area should be labelled automatically as racist. If they can present evidence and informed, rational argument, let us debate it sensibly and rationally, but let us do so on the basis of facts, not on the basis of racism, bigotry or prejudice.

I do not think that anyone in this Chamber or anyone in the community would begrudge a genuine debate on immigration and multiculturalism if it is done on the basis of facts and evidence. If we are to talk about social cohesion and social harmony, let us talk not in terms of these buzz words but in terms of the evidence: of crime rates, of not being accepted in the Australian community, of not taking citizenship.

There is a range of other indicators. If we want to have a rational debate on this issue, various views could be put. At the moment as a community and a Parliament, we are much the worse for what is an irrational, ill informed debate thus far. If we can get it back on the rails and into a sensible, rational, informed debate, we as a community would be much the better for it. I support the motion.

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

OMBUDSMAN ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 August. Page 42.)

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Opposition supports the Bill which seeks to do two things. The first is to increase penalties from $500 maximum to $2 000 maximum for offences under the Act. Those penalties have not been increased since 1972, so the proposed increase in the Bill is in accordance with other increases that have taken place over the past year or two. The Bill also seeks to introduce a new section creating an offence where a person prevents another person from making a complaint to the Ombudsman or hinders or obstructs another person in making a complaint. I had some discussions with the Ombudsman about this and I am satisfied that it is an appropriate provision to include in the principal Act.

In his second reading explanation, the Attorney-General draws attention to the fact that a similar provision is in the Police Complaints Authority legislation and other legislation. One of the concerns would be the extent to which this new section might be used, and I was hoping that the Attorney-General might be able to let me know what evidence there is of instances where a person has been prevented from making a complaint under the Act. I would like the Attorney-General also to tell me what evidence there is of a person hindering or obstructing another person in making a complaint and what sort of persons have behaved in that way. Are they public officials in a Government department or a statutory authority, or are they persons involved in local government? Further, what constitutes the offence?

Some people might say to a constituent, for example, that there is no point in going to the Ombudsman because the Ombudsman cannot help them in a particular instance—maybe because of questions of jurisdiction or for some other reasons. In those circumstances, I would not think there was any hindering or obstructing of the constituent in mak-

ing a complaint to the Ombudsman. On the other hand, it may be that some person—a public official or a local government officer—has indicated that, if the complainant goes to the Ombudsman, it may result in the council or a Government department or a statutory authority giving less than good service to that person in the future.

They are the only questions I raise on the Bill. I am happy, though, for the new section to go into the legislation but, before it goes through the Committee stage, I hope that the Attorney-General can give some clarification of the instances which may have prompted it, in addition to the request from the Ombudsman. On that basis, therefore, we support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

ACTS INTERPRETATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 August. Page 42.)

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Opposition supports this Bill also. At present, an Act comes into operation when it is assented to by the Governor if there is no provision in the Act which would require it to be brought into operation on a date to be proclaimed. This Bill does not in any way affect that position. Presently, an Act can come into effect on a date to be fixed by proclamation, or there can be a longer provision which allows the Government of the day, by proclamation, to determine the date upon which the legislation will come into effect but suspend the operation of some parts of the Act. That would ordinarily require a special provision to be included and it would then be subject to questioning in the Chamber. That sort of question has been raised by me and others in the Parliament on a number of occasions in the Committee stage consideration of a Bill.

This Bill seeks to provide, as a matter of course, when there is a provision that an Act shall come into operation on a date to be proclaimed, that the Government of the day can suspend the operation of part of the Bill and bring other parts into operation on particular dates so that there can be progressive implementation.

These days that seems to be more the rule than the exception. So, to the extent that it will save some legislative time—drafting and inclusion in the Bill—I am prepared to support that being the usual course rather than the exception. What it will mean is that, probably during the Committee stages of Bills, where there is a provision that the Act shall come into operation on a date to be proclaimed, questions will be raised as to whether or not the Government intends to suspend the operation of any particular section and the rate at which it will be brought into operation.

That is relevant because the Hon. Dr Ritson raised with me the possibility of the Legislative Council moving an amendment to a Bill that was accepted by the House of Assembly or at a conference and, if that amendment did not impinge on the operation of other parts of the legislation, its operation might be suspended so that the Government of the day could effectively defer the coming into effect of an amendment or a section which it did not like for one reason or another.

I would be most disappointed if that was the way in which any Government used this provision, but we have to recognise that it could occur. For that reason I think that there will probably now be more questions about the program of bringing particular legislation into operation. There may well now be a specific provision, moved by one House and agreed by the other, that a particular section cannot be deferred and that it must be brought into operation in conjunction with other provisions. We will have to see how that works in practice, but I would be comfortable with this Bill on the basis that it would deal with the matter in a practical way and, provided that the Government acted in good faith in bringing legislation into operation, I would see no difficulty with that course of action. On that basis we are prepared to support the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: I support the second reading of the Bill and will make a few brief comments on the matter with which the Hon. Mr Griffin concluded his speech. Different sorts of legislation pass through this Chamber. Legislation which, for example, alters penalties or changes the speed limit creates no difficulty coming into force when given assent by His Excellency. The types of Bills that are brought into operation by proclamation tend to be Bills concerning matters which require a substantial administrative infrastructure, which cannot begin to be put together until the legislative power is given and which cannot come to completion until a very lengthy period of time has elapsed, during which time perhaps applications for key jobs can be called, buildings leased and computers purchased.

Governments have to try to anticipate, from time to time, which sorts of Bills can be brought into operation immediately and which sorts of Bills cannot; and they must try to anticipate the need or otherwise to insert into an Act the provision for proclamation in stages, because it may be that one needs to have the statutory authority to pay a director of a new instrumentality that is created by an Act of Parliament but not bring other sections into operation until it is feasible administratively to do so.

I understand the practical need and reasons for this Parliament to be asked to give its approval to this Bill, but that will mean, as my colleague the Hon. Mr Griffin pointed out, that we will see more Bills now which, on the face of them, are to come into operation on a date to be proclaimed but which will not be declared to be Bills to be proclaimed in stages because, after the passing of this Bill, all Bills to be brought into operation by proclamation will be capable of being proclaimed in stages. Of course, that means that there is the potential for the sort of abuse that was referred to by my colleague, namely, the potential perhaps for the Government of the day, using its Executive power, to *de facto* alter legislation passed by the Parliament simply by declining to ever, perhaps, proclaim a particular section that it did not like.

Today, we are offering the Government, in trust, an opportunity to thumb its nose at this Parliament and to abuse its powers if it wishes. However, for the good of South Australia we believe that we should offer the Government that trust in the interests of giving the administrative wing of Government the practical flexibility to bring laws into operation in the way that is best for South Australia. So, the Opposition supports the second reading of the Bill but, as my colleague pointed out, we will be watching and asking the Government from time to time to place on record in relation to particular Bills its intention as to how it might or might not use its discretionary powers in particular cases.

Bill read a second time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.9 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 17 August at 2.15 p.m.