HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 28 February 1990

The SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

RATES AND LAND TAX REMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

PETITION: STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS

A petition signed by 56 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to actively address the environmental problems of the State was presented by the Hon. D.C. Wotton.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: WEST BEACH TRUST

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In a ministerial statement to the House last week I indicated that I had asked my colleague in another place to request the West Beach Trust to provide documents relevant to the Marineland redevelopment and the terms of reference of a select committee proposed for another place.

I now have those documents and I table them. On reading them I identified that three letters in the West Beach Trust files were also in files of my department, but had not been included in the documents I released last week. This prompted a recheck of my department's files. That recheck of what is a large number of files against the documents I released last week has brought to light a number of additional documents, which I am now pleased to table for members in addition to the documents provided to my colleague, the Minister of Local Government, by the West Beach Trust.

For the benefit of members, I am also tabling the original development proposal put up by Tribond which can be cross-referenced against the updated proposal included in the documents tabled last week as well as the correspondence interchange between the Leader of the Opposition and myself following last week's tabling.

As I am sure members would understand, Marineland has involved substantial paperwork around many themes and involving many different groups and people and therefore has generated many different files. It has therefore been a massive commitment and undertaking by the Government to make these files available in a comprehensive, chronological form.

At all stages my office and the department have endeavoured to be as thorough as possible in gathering the documents. The previous oversight of the documents which I table today occurred solely through happenstance which we are now correcting. I can inform the House that since his appointment the new Director of Industry, Trade and Technology has initiated a review of the department's filing system which he anticipates will simplify any future similar task.

EL 076 WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

The EL 076 water supply distribution system—Salisbury to St Kilda: additional works.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

ETSA TARIFFS

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister of Mines and Energy ask Cabinet at its meeting next Monday to reconsider its decision to reject an Electricity Trust of South Australia recommendation for a 3.5 per cent reduction in tariffs for industrial, general purpose and farm consumers and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The Leader of the Opposition must know that whatever goes on in Cabinet is not going to be discussed outside Cabinet. Whatever I take or do not take to Cabinet I do not discuss outside Cabinet. Under the circumstances, the honourable member must be fully aware that the response he will get from me is a negative one. If, in fact, he were sitting on the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Negative in the sense that I will not answer that question. If the honourable member were sitting on the Treasury benches, he would be doing exactly the same as I am. He is, therefore, playing games—and I do not feel like playing games.

STANDARD CHARTERED BANK

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Will the Premier supply the House with any further information about the Standard Chartered Bank and its activities in Adelaide? In a report on the Channel 10 news last night, the Opposition Treasury spokesperson expressed some dissatisfaction at the answer given by the Premier to my question during Question Time yesterday.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank the honourable member for his question. The House will recall that it was the member for Walsh who asked the question yesterday, based on reports that had appeared in an article in Monday's *Sydney Morning Herald* about Standard Chartered Bank which contained a number of inaccuracies and some quite outrageous conclusions. The bank has suitably responded to it, and I thought it appropriate, in response to the honourable member, that the situation be set straight here in the House.

I was, therefore, very surprised to see from the news coverage, by Channel 10 in this instance (although I think it was also picked up elsewhere), as the honourable member has mentioned, a report concerning this topic which suggested that in some way the Government was embarrassed by the Standard Chartered situation. First, I refute that because, on the contrary, there is nothing for us to be embarrassed about. Even more extraordinary, having reported this and given my response—which was quite legit-

imate—the Deputy Leader of the Opposition jumped up—as large as life and looking as vacuous as he is sometimes wont to do—and said that the Opposition was not satisfied. The dissatisfied Deputy Leader quoted me as saying that I had total confidence in everyone concerned. I do not know where he got that quote from.

The Deputy Leader also said, 'Given the number of big crashes that are taking place around this country, we really want some answers. We want a little bit more than the Premier is giving us at the moment.' What an extraordinary statement! I have already outlined the situation quite fully. I would like to ask, as did the member for Walsh in his question, what further information can be provided? Do we want Standard Chartered to stay in Adelaide? The answer to that is 'Yes'. Would we, in retrospect, lobby as strongly as we did to get Standard Chartered to establish its headquarters here? Clearly, the answer is 'Yes'. I thought the Opposition at the time was fully supportive. I remember that a previous Minister in the Tonkin Government tried to get a French bank to establish here in South Australia. It was something that we supported very strongly indeed. As it turned out, that bank closed down its operation and moved out of Adelaide. That is to be regretted. When Standard Chartered established here I thought it was with some support from the Opposition.

Does the Government still intend to continue with its effort to attract international companies to Adelaide? Is that one of the extra questions that the Deputy Leader wants to ask? The answer is: 'Of course we do.' The Department of Industry, Trade and Technology and other elements will be so doing. Did we give tax free holidays or free accommodation as was reported? Is that the question that the Deputy Leader thought I should answer? I covered that yesterday and I say again, the answer is 'No, we did not.' Did we give other forms of assistance to attract Standard Chartered? Yes we did—assistance under the State Development Fund, properly provided for in the normal way to a new business establishing at that time.

Does the Government support the investment of SGIC and Sagasco in Standard Chartered? Again, I would suggest, that was covered. There is no further information that I would have thought the Opposition would want in relation to that. We have consistently maintained that SGIC and any other State instrumentality, such as SASFIC, that have money to invest should, wherever possible, invest it in this State—in those who are prepared to work in this State and in those who are based in this State. They certainly have to have a commercial charter and a commercial interest in mind—that is important, and that is the situation in this case.

The same principle applied to the investment of other South Australian companies in similar projects. Indeed, as I mentioned yesterday, Advertiser Newspapers was involved in the initial investment in Standard Chartered's establishment and, as a private sector company, it took up equity on those grounds. One gets to the point of asking what other answers are wanted by the Opposition and what other questions are to be asked? If the honourable member needs further answers, he can get them from Standard Chartered Bank itself. The Group Managing Director, Mr Knox, has written to the Editor of the *Sydney Morning Herald*, which published the article leading to the question yesterday. In his letter yesterday he expressed his concern about the way in which the story was reported. I do not know whether his letter will be or has been published, but I think it is reasonable for me to quote some of it. Mr Knox states:

> I was most disturbed to see that a story which had been represented to me by Mr Ellis [the journalist concerned] as a piece on Standard Chartered Bank's strategy and future direction under my leadership was 'twisted' into what amounts to sensationalist political story.

On that question of incentives, Mr Knox states:

> Mr Ellis then goes on to speculate about how Standard Chartered Bank obtained its banking licence and writes totally unsubstantiated and nonsensical information such as, 'Standard Chartered's application, Bannon enthused, would be supported not only with Government equity but with such incentives as tax holidays and free accommodation.' This seems merely to be an attempt at discrediting Standard Chartered Bank's application for a banking licence.

Why the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is lending himself to this little exercise, I do not know. All I can say is that it can only be calculated perhaps to damage business in South Australia, although I doubt it, because I think business in South Australia will treat him with the same degree of confidence as it treated his predecessor as spokesperson for the Opposition on these matters and simply dismiss the negative critical approach that has been taken.

ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): My question is to the Minister of Mines and Energy. Does Cabinet's rejection of his submission on electricity tariffs mean not only that industrial, general purpose and farm consumers will not get a 3.5 per cent reduction from tomorrow, but that other ETSA recommendations for a real reduction of 4 per cent in each of the next three years for all consumers are also being opposed by Cabinet? If not, is the Minister prepared to give an unequivocal guarantee here and now that ETSA's recommendations will be implemented?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The honourable member places quite a heavy load on me. Yesterday, during four separate questions, the Premier indicated to Opposition members that things which went on in Cabinet were not discussed. If the Premier, in four separate answers, cannot drive that through to the Opposition in a form that it understands, why would the honourable member expect me to do so in two answers so far?

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr De LAINE (Price): Can the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs outline to the House what long-term program is to be put in place to cope with Aboriginal drinking problems in the Port Adelaide area? With the declaration of a 'dry zone' in the Port Mall on 21 December last year, the immediate highly visible problem has been largely eliminated. The second long-term part of the resolution of the problem needs to be implemented as soon as possible to help these people to live with dignity.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: As with other areas in the State, problems relating to excessive drinking in Port Adelaide are not limited to the Aboriginal section of the community, as the member will be aware. But in Port Adelaide the Liquor Licensing Commissioner declared two areas dry under section 132 of the Liquor Licensing Act: part of the Semaphore foreshore and the Port Adelaide Mall. In declaring these areas dry, the Commisioner included the following:

> Within the 12 month period, facilities, services and other appropriate measures are to be put in place, developed in consultation with the Director, Office of Aboriginal Affairs, to ensure that no continuation of the provisions is necessary.

The State Government will be assisting in a number of ways: first, provision of funding through the Health Commission to the Aboriginal Sobriety Group to provide a mobile assistance patrol for intoxicated persons throughout

the metropolitan area, including Port Adelaide (and I have mentioned these matters to the House before); secondly, work by the Aboriginal Coordinating Unit of DCW to protect the welfare of children; and, thirdly, State Aboriginal Affairs will consult with the local community and State agencies to monitor progress.

The local community of course must also share responsibility with the State Government. The Port Adelaide council will be urged to continue discussions with community representatives to provide appropriate services to address this issue. I am sure that the honourable member will be able to help to facilitate these meetings and discussions. In addition, I am sure that the House would be interested to know that this week further discussions have occurred with the council of the Aboriginal Sobriety Group in relation to the establishment of a detoxification centre for Adelaide. Currently, two sites are being examined.

HEART SURGERY

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister of Health. What is the waiting period for heart surgery at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and will the proposed opening of a new cardiac unit at Ashford Community Hospital alleviate this pressure? Since the opposition of the Royal Adelaide Hospital to the proposed new cardiac unit for Ashford became known last week, I have been contacted by a resident of Black Forest who believes her husband died last year because he was not able to undergo heart surgery at the Royal Adelaide due to lack of beds.

I am informed that the man was admitted to Ashford Community Hospital in March last year with severe angina, which was diagnosed as being caused by three narrowed arteries. He then suffered a severe heart attack in May and open-heart surgery was recommended. In June, his cardiologist told him that because of the urgency of his case he would be called in for surgery within four weeks. Subsequently, he was advised that because insufficient beds were available he would be admitted on 29 August, subject to a bed being free. The man died on 25 August.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: In relation to that very specific matter, I would suggest that the honourable member may like to contact the Administrator of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, where he may well get a rather different version of the story. The judgment is always in the hands of the physicians and the surgeons to determine the most urgent cases.

However, to turn to the gravamen of the honourable member's question, what on earth does he mean by 'heart surgery', because the present proposition distinguishes between various forms of heart surgery? Is he talking about bypass surgery, or, for example, is he talking about angioplasty. As I understand it, the argument from the Royal Adelaide Hospital is that there are a number of forms of heart surgery which are already being performed in private hospitals around Adelaide and that to allow another hospital to get into by pass surgery would be to dilute the expertise that is available at a centre of excellence which is second to none in Australia.

The Government and the hospitals will not be subject to political pressure so far as this particular decision is concerned. The decision will be made on the basis of what is best for medical practice and the health of South Australians. Of course, there are those who would argue that the opening up of a second facility would be better for the health of our citizens. Some people would argue that, no matter how many facilities there are (and there is a third private hospital that wants to get into the act, which I will not name but which is serious about that), there are only a given number of surgeons who have the skills to undertake this surgery, and it is to be preferred that there is this concentration of skill and information at the one health unit.

I think we are getting some idea of where the Opposition stands in this matter. I note that the honourable member was a little careful in the way in which he framed his question, but the interjections from members behind him certainly would suggest that they know exactly where they stand on this matter. It is a decision that they have taken simply on a gut reaction without proper advice as to what should best be done for people who need this form of very specialised surgery in this State. All I can say is that, when the decision is taken, it will be taken on that proper advice and not on political pressures or gut reactions.

ELIZABETH WEST HIGH SCHOOL CRECHE

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): Will the Minister of Education give the House an unequivocal assurance that a permanent allocation of funds will be made to the Elizabeth West High School creche so that the school can make long-term arrangements for the proper administration of this important facility?

As the Minister will be aware, the school has been successful in attracting adult re-entry students. Many of the students have small children, and the school has advised me that long-term funding arrangements for the creche are a vital part of its total program. Although the creche has been operational for two years, it has yet to receive an establishment grant. As long ago as February 1988, the school wrote to the Government seeking a commitment on long-term funding and, despite numerous assurances of support over the years, the interim board of the secondary college and the Elizabeth West Re-entry School Council are becoming concerned at the delay in relation to the provision for the creche. The Minister advised the interim board by letter dated 4 December 1989 that an urgent meeting of Commonwealth and State officials had been arranged, but to date no further advice as to the results of this meeting has been notified to the school council or the board.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question, and indeed his interest and support for the important programs that are being conducted at the Elizabeth West Re-entry School. I cannot give the honourable member the ironclad guarantee he wants, because I would be speaking on behalf of another Government. I note that the honourable member referred to representations to Government, but I should point out to him and to the House that, as is the case across this country, the primary responsibility for recurrent child-care funding in South Australia is vested in the Commonwealth Government.

We have been negotiating with the Commonwealth Government on this unique program for some time now and, I must say, without success. In the interim period we have been providing funding for this program and we will continue to do so—I can give the honourable member that undertaking on the part of this Government. We regard the provision of child-care within the context of that school as integral to its success. We will continue to provide the support in the form in which we have provided it in the past.

Indeed, I can also say that we have assessed the need for additional capital works for the child-care centre, which is

in a converted home economics centre at that school. It is estimated that $100 000 is required to upgrade those facilities to an appropriate standard and that work will be carried out during this year so that those facilities can cater for the very large number of children who use that program and so that their parents can enter the programs of education provided at Elizabeth West.

To that extent, I can satisfy the honourable member's request, but I must say that I will continue to pursue this matter with the Commonwealth Government: we are pursuing it with the Department of Employment, Education and Training, the Commonwealth Department of Community Services and Health and the Department of Social Security. Because it is such a unique program, it does not fit squarely into any of the many and varied Commonwealth programs that provide assistance for people to re-enter education and training and for the care of the children of those people. However, we will pursue this matter with all the vigour we can, because it does establish a very important precedent and I believe it is a program that deserves all the help possible from all levels of Government.

YOUTH ESCAPEE

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): My question is addressed to the Minister of Family and Community Services. What steps can the Government take to ensure that a 17-year-old youth, who recently absconded from a youth remand and training centre, is not released only eight days after his recapture in circumstances that indicate that he is dangerous and a threat to the community?

The question I asked about this matter yesterday indicated that the release of the youth is imminent. The Minister did not address this point in his reply, but it has now been reported that the youth is to be released on Sunday and that nothing can be done to detain him further following the absconding. His release on Sunday would come only eight days after the police had to mount a large operation to recapture him.

I am advised that a large number of police cars descended on the area in which the youth was thought to be last Saturday. The Dog Squad also was involved in the operation and the residents of streets surrounding the house in which the youth was found were door-knocked by police to advise that the offender was extremely dangerous and that they should keep their doors locked and their homes secure. The police response to this situation indicates their belief that this youth is a threat to society and that he should not be released.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: If the honourable member can remember the text of his original question, my short answer would be 'long ones'. The long steps we will take relate to a court hearing—and I guess I have to be a little careful about Standing Orders, Sir, therefore I will talk slowly so that you can pull me up, if necessary—which will be held on Thursday morning.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am just trying to assist the Chair and members.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: He doesn't need your assistance: get on with it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will make that decision.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: On a number of occasions I have heard people gabble something very quickly in order to try to get it past the Chair in this place—I have seen that occur over a period of 20 years now. I am trying to ensure that I do not breach Standing Orders in any way. There is to be a court hearing on Thursday morning, of which possibly Mr Jory, who wrote that article in the *Advertiser*, was not aware. There are two issues here. The first issue is about whether charges can be brought in relation to the youth's absconding from the South Australian Youth Training Centre.

My understanding is that the present state of the legislation is such that they probably cannot be, and I will be inviting members to address themselves to that matter by way of an amendment to the relevant Act at the appropriate time. However, the youth is facing other charges. The other charges were heard in a preliminary way a day or so ago and bail was awarded. That bail will be opposed at a court hearing on Thursday morning. The Government will try to resolve this matter by way of an instruction to those who represent the Crown to vigorously push for an overturning of the decision whereby he was granted bail. In any event, those further charges will in due course be heard in court which may, of course, result in a further period of incarceration.

MEXICAN WAVE PROBLEM

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Is the Minister of Recreation and Sport concerned about the Mexican wave problem that appears to have fallen out of favour with the New South Wales Liberal Government, and does he intend to try to curb the exuberance of the spectators in a like manner?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am not sure why the poor old Mexicans are blamed for this, by the way, although I guess it originated in South America somewhere. I will have the matter referred to my colleague. I would have thought that the publicity which is now attendant upon some of the problems relating to the Mexican wave is probably sufficient to ensure that the problem is largely resolved. There has been a bit of yahoo behaviour. Most sensible people would, once the matter is drawn to their attention, understand that, if they are going to participate in what, after all, is a pleasant piece of ritual at a sporting event, they should not disturb other people's pleasure by irresponsible behaviour. One would hope that, the problem having been identified and attention having been drawn to it, that is the last we hear of it.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Will the Treasurer say whether SGIC sought his approval before increasing the equity and exposure to Standard Chartered Bank to over 8 per cent of the bank's shares? What are the commercial reasons which the Premier believes justify increasing public enterprise shareholdings in the bank at this time of increased losses by the bank? I draw the Premier's attention to section 16 of the appropriate Act.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not sure that the extent to which the State Bank has increased its equity requires my approval. I cannot recall specifically doing so but it may well have been referred past me. However, I think the trigger is 9 or 10 per cent, and at a total of 8 per cent they are below that amount. They have a right, and that is one thing that the Government is concerned to protect, of making commercial judgments in these matters. I would imagine that what motivated SGIC in purchasing further shares was

the price at which it could purchase those shares. In relation to the asset backing of those shares, they are very good value, and presumably it was that commercial interest that resulted in the purchase.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Not that I recall and I do not know that I was required to do so. If SGIC felt there was commercial value, it was perfectly entitled to exercise that judgment and that purchase. As far as Standard Chartered is concerned, I make the point that, whilst Mr Knox has declared or foreshadowed losses that will be made this year, the performance of Standard Chartered, as I outlined yesterday, in the period in which it has been offered has, in fact, been very good in terms of the foreign banks. I refer the honourable member to the chart in the *Australian Financial Review* yesterday to which I referred, showing that Standard Chartered has a middle ranking; it is still positive in terms of its overall return in the period it has been operating; and Mr Knox, the current Group Managing Director, believes that Standard Chartered will be trading successfully. So, for all those reasons, I suggest it makes a lot of sense for SGIC to hang in there, and I would certainly encourage it to do so.

DISTRICT COURT JUDGMENTS

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I direct my question to the Minister representing the Attorney-General. Has the Attorney-General's attention been drawn to the fact that interest rates on money owing under District Court judgments is still taxed in the District Court at an interest rate of 10 per cent? This appears to be an encouragement for firms to hold onto money for which judgment has been made against them because they can obtain rates of 18 per cent elsewhere. One of my constituents received a judgment for workers compensation in the Adelaide District Court for $70 899 on 28 November 1989 against a very prominent Adelaide manufacturing company. He was unable to receive payment for quite some time. It has been put to me by his solicitor that one of the factors holding up payment of money is that the penalty payment for that money involves interest at a rate of only 10 per cent.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for raising this issue. Very clearly, the court has supervisory jurisdiction over this matter of the settlements of court decisions. I will refer the matter to the Attorney-General so that he can investigate the actual situation.

YOUTH ESCAPEE

Mr SUCH (Fisher): My question is directed to the Premier. Are the circumstances in which a 17-year-old youth considered by police to be extremely dangerous and scheduled for release on Sunday, only eight days after his recapture for absconding from a youth training centre, an example of what the Federal member for Kingston, Mr Bilney, is calling 'softness towards crime and criminals'? This youth was recaptured in the electorate of Kingston, at O'Halloran Hill in fact, and I am advised that many residents in the locality are now seriously concerned about his imminent release. He has served nine months on charges arising from a hit and run accident in which a 17-year-old girl was killed.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think that this question is mirroring a question that was asked previously. I would ask the honourable member to be careful as to how he phrases his question. If it mirrors the other question, it will be a repetitious question and out of order.

Mr SUCH: I will just continue the explanation, Sir. At the time of this person's latest crime, the Crown had the opportunity to seek to have the matter tried in an adult court but did not do so. The member for Kingston, Mr Bilney, is currently writing to his constituents complaining about 'softness towards crime and criminals'. His letter makes direct criticism of State Government policies by referring to a recent case when, to use Mr Bilney's words:

> I was shocked recently when a child rapist got just four years gaol—which with parole and remittances means he'll be out in 14 months.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I thank the honourable member for his support for my Federal colleague, and I hope that it will continue over the next three or four weeks.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Whether or not the question is identical to the earlier question, I am afraid the answer has to be. The honourable member, like his colleague, was asking me, in effect, whether the Crown has a remedy in this case, and I have already explained to the House the remedy being undertaken. Government does not control the courts—nor should it. If Government ever controls the courts, that is the time when a few people around here will be wanting to have very serious concerns.

The Government, through the Crown, is taking the remedy that is available to it in this case. I have had drawn to my attention what seems to me to be an anomaly in the legislation which apparently does not seem to have been picked up by whoever opposite may have been the Minister for Community Welfare when the Liberals were in Government. I have said that we will be inviting the Parliament to consider what amendments might be appropriate to this particular matter. In any event, if the honourable member is concerned that this youth is likely to be out next weekend, that is by no means certain, because of the action that will be sought to be undertaken in the courts on Thursday.

RECYCLING SYSTEMS

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I direct my question to the Minister for Environment and Planning. What role can local government expect to play in any recycling systems which might be established following the recommendations of the Recycling Advisory Committee? The Northern Adelaide Development Board is currently researching various methods of disposal and management of its member councils' refuse. It has been put to me by some elected members of those councils that any decision by the Minister in relation to the recommendations of the committee would be beneficial to that research.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I believe that local government has a major role to play in this question of recycling, particularly in the successful implementation of any recycling schemes developed and implemented through the Recycling Advisory Committee. In giving some background to my answer it is important to state clearly that South Australians have, in fact, achieved very good returns with respect to the rates at which glass, scrap metals, textiles and paper have been returned over the years. It must be acknowledged that this is due largely to the voluntary collection and delivery efforts of charitable organisations and individuals.

In addition, it would be quite remiss of me not to refer to our unique beverage container legislation which, of course, not only supports the active recycling industry in beverage

glass and aluminium but also provides very high return rates for these commodities. To improve our recycling efforts in other materials, more organised collection systems will be required in future. Since local government already has a very well established household collection system, it seems to me logical to work with local government and build on that experience and expertise.

Some councils have already initiated collection systems in their areas in addition to their regular domestic rubbish collection, and it is felt that some coordination of effort across councils would help the effectiveness and efficiency of collections. To this end, the Waste Management Commission has offered to provide temporary funding for the employment of a coordinator by the Local Government Association. I should be pleased if the honourable member would pass on that information to his regional councils.

In addition, funds have been provided and KESAB has been contracted to produce a recycling manual for use by councils contemplating such recycling schemes. The manual will include resource and promotional material and guidelines for financial and physical planning for recycling schemes. Separation at the source and subsequent collection are important elements of any successful recycling scheme, but let me remind the honourable member and the House that the markets for materials collected and cost recovery are also essential and that the Recycling Advisory Committee is in the process of providing to Government a submission by which we may well be able to move down this path very quickly and very effectively.

WATER QUALITY

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): My question is addressed to the Minister of Water Resources. In view of the continuing problems with the quality of Murray River water, why did the South Australian Government not oppose the axing of the Hawke Government's $640 million bicentennial water resources program which addressed salinity, pollution and, I believe, land degradation and other problems, and is the Minister aware that the Federal Government will not meet the Prime Minister's funding commitment for the national resources management strategy, there being a shortfall in that commitment at present of about $2 million?

I suppose the gravamen of this question is: is the Minister satisfied with the Federal Government's current level of funding to deal with South Australia's crisis in water resource management and, if not, will the Minister explain to the House what action she has taken to stress the problem to the Federal Government and to obtain the necessary funds?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: That is a fairly long question, but the short answer is that I do not believe that any Minister of Water Resources in any of the States would say that he or she was ever completely happy with the amount of money allocated by the Federal Government. Therefore, I guess the short answer is, 'No', and neither would a Minister of a different political persuasion be happy, irrespective of which Party is in power in the Federal sphere. Like any loyal South Australian Minister of Water Resources, I have made continuous representation to the Federal Government to ensure that South Australia receives adequate funding for a whole range of issues that come under the loose heading of water resources management and the management of the whole natural resource area, and particularly within the Murray-Darling Basin.

On a number of occasions I have, both personally and in correspondence, raised some of these issues with the Federal Minister, Senator Peter Cook. Senator Cook has made funds available on a number of occasions and that has allowed me to do such things as commence the investigatory work for the provision of a filtration plant or scheme for the Barossa Valley. I am sure that the honourable member would be aware—the local member is certainly aware—of those commitments and the funding commitment from the Federal Government.

However, this Government is never one to rest on its laurels and I intend to take up the issue very strongly and vigorously at the coming ministerial council meeting of the Murray-Darling Basin. I will be advocating very strongly on behalf of South Australia and South Australians for a greater proportion of Federal funding. This Government has proudly matched that funding and contributed our share to address the whole question of improving water quality for South Australians. I am very proud to say that I will continue to do that in the future.

THIRD PARTY APPEALS

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning advise the House the reasons for:

1. The delay in introducing third party rights of appeal provisions for West Lakes residents; and

2. The delay in the timetabling for the introduction of such provisions?

On 17 August 1989, following considerable agitation by local residents and Lakespeace Incorporated, I asked the Minister of Marine a question about this matter (*Hansard*, page 401). The Minister replied:

> I anticipate an announcement shortly about changes to the regulations.

Again last week residents approached me on this matter and indicated their considerable concern about when third party rights of appeal provisions will become available to them.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. There is probably no other member in this Parliament who so vigorously represents the interests of his constituency. He does so without fear or favour to any Minister and, for that, I think we should all congratulate him. Again, he is taking up this cause on behalf of his constituents. Of course, the Government is determined to introduce third party rights of appeal for West Lakes residents. In answer to some of the specific parts of the question, of course, this will entail the preparation of an amendment to the development plan pursuant to section 42 (1) of the Planning Act. The new amendment will replace procedures under the present West Lakes regulations to bring planning procedures at West Lakes into line with those elsewhere in the State. An amendment to the development plan is now necessary because of recent development patterns and because major new development at West Lakes has now ceased.

The honourable member will be very pleased to note—and I hope that he will convey this information to his constituents—that negotiations with Henley and Grange council have been completed satisfactorily and ongoing consultations with Woodville council are expected to be finalised in the very near future. When these negotiations are completed, West Lakes will be incorporated into the development plan in such a way that normal third party appeal rights will then apply for the residents of that area.

GOVERNMENT IRRIGATION AREAS

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): Will the Minister of Water Resources say why she has not sought additional funding from the Federal Government in order to complete rehabilitation of remaining Government irrigation areas in South Australia? I have received information from an industry leader in the Riverland who met with the Federal Minister for Primary Industries and Energy (Mr Kerin), on board the *Murray Princess* during a visit by the Murray-Darling Basin Commission last year. He has told me that Mr Kerin indicated to him that the necessary funding would be made available to complete the rehabilitation, which is an essential ingredient in the strategy to control salinity and improve water quality, if the South Australian Minister of Water Resources presented a good enough argument to the Federal Government for funding.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am delighted to answer the honourable member's question. In fact, I have raised this matter with my Federal colleagues. In raising it with my Federal colleagues, I have made very clear to the irrigators within the Riverland and to the Federal Government that the sort of scheme that we should be looking at embarking upon is one in which there is shared responsibility to the beneficiaries. By that I mean that we should be looking at a scheme which would ensure that the South Australian Government contributed a third of the ongoing costs, the Federal Government contributed a third and, indeed, the beneficiaries, who are the irrigators, should also contribute.

I understand that there are ongoing negotiations within the Riverland with the irrigators themselves. Through the Engineering and Water Supply Department, we have commissioned a consultancy, and I understand that the report, which is very soon to be released, clearly identifies the economic benefits of a rehabilitation program within the Riverland. Obviously, we have to get our figures right, and that is exactly what I am doing. We will have a very detailed and well substantiated case. However, I have not waited for that to happen; I have approached my ministerial counterparts.

In fact, Mr Kerin is not the appropriate Minister who funds the water resource allocation to South Australia. That is done through two areas. One is through the Minister for Resources, Senator Peter Cook, and the other is through the Environment Minister, Senator Graham Richardson. I have had discussions with both Ministers. They are aware of the importance of the Riverland to South Australia. They are also aware of the importance of a rehabilitation program to the irrigation channels not just to the economic benefit of the irrigators but to the very sensitive environment in the Riverland and to the ongoing preservation and protection of the Murray River.

AGED PENSIONERS

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Can the Minister of Health advise the House first, whether he is aware that patients on the age pension who are resident in country areas and who require treatment in Adelaide do not have any mechanism to access prepayment of fares as do clients claiming under the PAT scheme; and, secondly whether anything is being done or can be done to assist such people.

A Port Pirie constituent came to see me who had been receiving an invalid pension. He was frequently visiting Adelaide for treatment at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Whilst on the invalid pension he was able to obtain prepayment for his travel under the PAT scheme at the Port Pirie Hospital. At 65 years of age he was automatically transferred to the age pension and received a pensioner health benefits card which entitled him to free health benefits. When he applied for prepayment as an age pensioner he was told he was not eligible and there was no provision for prepayment for persons on age pensions who had the pensioner health benefit card.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: This is a complicated matter, involving, as it does, assistance from both the Commonwealth and the States. As the honourable member warned me in advance that she would be asking this question, I have been able to obtain some information which may be of assistance to her constituent and also to members. The current pensioner concession fares are as follows:

Port Pirie-Adelaide (return)	$17.20
Port Augusta-Adelaide (return)	$21.60
Whyalla-Adelaide (return)	$24.60

PATS provides assistance to patients travelling from these cities, but the scheme requires each patient to make a personal contribution of $30 per return journey. Thus, a pensioner eligible for concession fares, travelling alone and not incurring accommodation expenses, does not qualify for PATS benefits. However, a pensioner with an approved escort, or one who incurs accommodation expenses bringing the total expenses for the journey to $30 or more, would qualify for PATS.

A lone pensioner does, however, qualify for a reimbursement of the total concession fare if they are attending an outpatient clinic of a public hospital. They simply present their bus/train ticket to the hospital cashier with their pensioner health benefit card and proof of their appointment.

Whilst both PATS and the pensioner reimbursement scheme operate on a reimbursement basis, there is provision for assistance in advance for persons of insufficient means. Eligible PATS patients may apply to a PATS agent in each of the three iron triangle cities, and those not eligible for PATS may apply to the Department for Community Welfare for emergency financial assistance, although, I should add that DCW may require the advance to be repaid in due course. If that does not assist the honourable member she may like to discuss the matter with me further.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE AUTHORITY

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): My question is directed to the Treasurer. Will he confirm that the Local Government Finance Authority has refused an application from the Stirling council for loan funds due to the continuing uncertainty of the council's financial position and also that over a month ago the council advised the Government that it was 'approaching a position of cash crisis' because of this uncertainty? Why is the Government refusing to make a decision on how much of a $14.3 million loan to cover the cost of the 1980 bushfires it will require the council to pay, and, bearing in mind that the council will be required to pay $200 000 per month in interest after March, when will that decision now be made?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will have to refer the honourable member's question for a report to provide—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: But you're the Treasurer.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member asked me about the Local Government Finance Authority's activities—and he parrots, 'You're the Treasurer.' Quite extraordinary! You are the member for Heysen.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Opposition will come to order, and the Premier will direct his remarks through the Chair.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am sorry; I got a bit carried away. That is as relevant as the interjection of the honourable member. In relation to the question, I take it that the honourable member is, of course, a supporter for the State—that is, the taxpayers of South Australia—picking up the Stirling council's bill. In that, I do not think he will find much support, either throughout the State of South Australia or, indeed, among the local government community. Indeed, if he sees his brief as so narrow, I think he is actually letting down his constituents. I thought that, as a member of the Parliament, he would have a broader brief than that.

As he well knows, what is at issue is the extent to which the Stirling council is able to contribute to the payment of the liability of that council. Everyone concedes it is a big liability and a major problem. We have been working hard to ensure that a fair and equitable solution is arrived at. In that, the Local Government Association itself has had a role—and a very constructive role, I might say—and ultimately financial arrangements will involve the Local Government Finance Authority and others. However, it is a whole of State and local government issue and not just the narrow interests of the immediate problems of the Stirling council that have to be looked at.

Intensive work is being done on that matter. The important point is that it must be seen—I think in all equity—that the Stirling council is paying to the extent that it is possible to pay in discharging its obligation. If that is satisfied, other types of assistance can be brought to bear, as has already been the case to date.

CHINESE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr GROOM (Hartley): My question is to the Minister of Ethnic Affairs. What recent State Government support and assistance has been given to the South Australian Chinese speaking community to promote trade development for the benefit of South Australia? I understand there are proposals to establish a Chinese Chamber of Commerce in South Australia. The establishment of such a Chamber of Commerce quite clearly would be of great benefit and act as a catalyst to further expanding trade links with China and South-East Asian countries.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The short answer to the honourable member's question with respect to the proposed Chinese Chamber of Commerce is that support has not yet been given to that organisation, because it is still in the process of formation.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It is in the embryonic stage, as the Minister inappropriately but correctly interjects. First, once that organisation has formalised its constitution and structure, it will be eligible to apply to the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission for grants under its grants scheme. Secondly, under an arrangement, which I will detail in a moment, it will also be eligible to make approaches to the Department of Industry, Technology and Commerce.

At present, a number of organisations are relevant to trade relations between South Australia and areas such as China, Hong Kong, Taiwan and other areas where Chinese business interests are significant. First, there is the Hong Kong-Australia Business Council which was established, I think, about two years ago, and the Department of Industry, Technology and Commerce has membership of that association—it is open to bodies such as the department. That body has recently established a South Australian chapter which has regular meetings to encourage further understanding of Hong Kong-Australian business opportunities.

Secondly, the Australia-China Chamber of Commerce, which is supported by the Department of Industry, Technology and Commerce, has been in existence for some years and, likewise, that body meets on frequent occasions. Its focus is primarily trade with the People's Republic of China. I think that the impending formalisation of formation of the Chinese Chamber of Commerce brings a new focus to future trade opportunities. I recall that the member for Walsh brought the formation of this group to my attention and introduced to me Mr E. Chow, who I understand is to be a leading officer within that association.

That association will comprise a number of people in South Australia who have come to this State as a result of the business migration program. That program has been a very real boon for investment in South Australia. It has not only brought investment capital into this State but also, as a result of that investment capital, it has created real job and trade opportunities and a real increase in manufacturing in South Australia. As I say, we will have to wait and see what happens when that organisation is formalised and what approaches it may make—and, of course, we will have to judge it against competing applications.

Other organisations are relevant in terms of relations with other parts of the world. The Italian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ICCI), headed by Mr Paolo Nocella, is an organisation which has actively promoted bilateral trade and investment between Italy and South Australia. I am looking forward to supporting, for the second year running, the participation of that group in the Milan Trade Fair. That group is the very first group to be a recipient under a program whereby we are starting to offer some seeding financial support to such Chambers of Commerce to have them act as resource agencies for Australian businesses that might seek to establish trade and investment contact with other countries. We have given them a small seeding grant to that effect. I hope that that grant to ICCI is followed up by other organisations if they put in submissions that meet the criteria we have set.

Likewise, other organisations such as the Australian Mid-East Chamber of Commerce all help ultimately to improve economic opportunities in South Australia, because they open doors to other countries and, therefore, such organisations are to be supported.

AL MUKAIRISH AUSTRALIA

Mr MEIER (Goyder): My question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Following the recent revelation that Al Mukairish Australia may now have its licence cancelled rather than just suspended, meaning that South Australia will lose a $30 million-plus industry, has the Minister or his department initiated discussions with the Federal Government and the Australian Meat and Livestock Corporation in an effort to resolve this matter and, if so, what is the outcome of those discussions? If not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Since the honourable member last raised this matter in the House, I have not been further advised by the department. I will obtain a report and provide information to the honourable member.

CENTENNIAL PARK CEMETERY

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I address my question to the Minister representing the Minister of Local Govern-

ment. Can the Minister assure the House that people living near the Centennial Park Cemetery will be consulted before the law on mausoleums and aboveground interment is changed?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am aware of the honourable member's adjournment debate speech on this issue and the interest of his local constituents in this matter and, of course, the petition he presented to this House last week from 1 500 residents. I will seek a report from my colleague in another place.

AUSTRALIAN WHEAT BOARD

Mr GUNN (Eyre): Have the Minister of Agriculture and the South Australian Government taken steps to ensure that the South Australian wheat industry is properly represented on the Australian Wheat Board? The Minister would be aware that since 1948 South Australia has always had a grower member representative on the Australian Wheat Board, but when Mr Kerin altered the membership of the Australian Wheat Board some months ago South Australia no longer had a representative on that important body. Up until a few months ago South Australia had the Deputy Chairman of the Australian Wheat Board, Mr Michael Shanahan.

In view of this organisation's significance not only to the wheat industry but to the economy of South Australia, it is important that the growers of this State are adequately represented to ensure that shipping arrangements and other details are provided to South Australia in an orderly manner. Until a few years ago each State elected two grower members. Unfortunately, Mr Kerin altered that arrangement; a selection panel now appoints the membership of that board, and obviously it has been somewhat deficient, because South Australia is no longer represented.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I was concerned that South Australia was losing a voice on the Australian Wheat Board and had intended to raise this matter directly with the Federal Minister at the Agricultural Council meeting in Hobart but that meeting was scheduled for 8 February which, as members will know, was the opening day of Parliament and my obligations were to be in this House so that I could be affirmed in my seat; otherwise I would not even be eligible to be a Minister. As a result, I asked my department to prepare correspondence for me to send to the Federal Minister to indicate the very concern that I intended to verbally communicate to him, and I have also asked not only the Department of Agriculture but all departments under my portfolio of responsibilities to find out how many national committees there are and how many South Australian representatives are on those national committees so that we can determine whether or not South Australia is getting a fair voice in matters of national interest.

ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): As it has been reported that a recommendation from ETSA for profits to be passed on to consumers by a reduction in tariffs has been rejected by Cabinet, will the Minister of Mines and Energy and Government now consider recommending to ETSA the subsidising of the cost of extensions to rural users to ensure that the basic commodity of electricity is available to all citizens of the State at an affordable price? The cost of rural electricity extensions has been prohibitive for many constituents in the outlying areas: in many cases it is several thousand dollars per pole, meaning that anyone more than a few hundred metres from an existing service is prevented, through cost, from having electricity connected. In New South Wales the Government has implemented a scheme in which the capital cost of rural extensions is subsidised 50c in the dollar up to a maximum subsidy of $20 000 per consumer.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: It is a pity that the honourable member chose to ask the question in such a way as to link it up with the questions asked yesterday and today of both the Premier and myself. Under the circumstances, all I can do is refer the honourable member to variations of the six previous answers.

RATES AND LAND TAX REMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Rates and Land Tax Remission Act 1986. Read a first time.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Rates and Land Tax Remission Act 1986 provides for a remission of various Government rates and taxes. It provides for a maximum remission of 60 per cent of the charge, subject to a ceiling. This Bill permits the Government to give effect to a commitment made prior to the election to give further assistance to eligible pensioners paying water and sewerage rates. The parameters for remission are fixed in the Act and must be amended each time a modification is required. This Bill provides for these parameters to be set by proclamation by the Governor in Executive Council. This will allow Governments to respond quickly to future needs of the elderly in the area of rates remission.

Following the legislation's passage through Parliament it is proposed that a proclamation will be made to provide all pensioners eligible for a 60 per cent concession with an increase in their remissions of $10 for water and $10 for sewerage, subject to a maximum monetary level. In addition the maximum monetary level of remissions for water and sewerage rates will be increased from $75 each to $85 each. In some cases eligible pensioners are not entitled to a full 60 per cent remission but, rather, some proportion of that percentage. The proclamation will formalise the continuance of that current practice and provide for pensioners who receive a proportional percentage of the 60 per cent remission to also receive the relevant portion of the $10 increases. The effective date of this increase will be 1 January 1990. Adjustments to eligible pensioners' remissions will be incorporated in the fourth quarter's water and sewerage rates accounts of this financial year.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to be taken to have come into operation on 1 January 1990. Clause 3 removes the definition of the prescribed sum which fixes the ceilings for remissions of the various rates. This amendment is consequential to the amendment proposed for section 4. Clause 4 amends section 4 of the principal Act which sets out the method of calculating the amount

of remissions. The clause strikes out subsections (2) and (3). Subsection (2) currently fixes the amount of the remission as the least of—

(a) three-fifths of the rates otherwise payable by the ratepayer in respect of his or her principal place of residence;

(b) where the ratepayer is liable for payment of such rates jointly with another person who is not his or her spouse and is not entitled to a remission in respect of the rates—such lesser proportion as the Minister thinks fit; or

(c) in relation to certain rates (basically water and sewerage rates), $75, or, in relation to land tax or general and separate rates under the Local Government Act, $150.

The clause replaces this provision with a provision under which the amount, or method of determining the amount, of remission in relation to specified rates is to be fixed by the Governor by proclamation. A further provision (a proposed new subsection (3)) provides that any such proclamation, or a notice under subsection (1) declaring the criteria for entitlement to remission, may leave a matter to be determined at the discretion of the Minister and may fix the date the proclamation or notice has effect which may include an earlier or later date than the date on which it is published in the *Gazette*. The clause inserts a further new provision providing for the entitlement to remission by reference to the criteria fixed by notice and the amount, or method of determining the amount, of remission fixed by proclamation. Clause 5 removes schedules 2 and 3 to the principal Act. These schedules are not required in view of the scheme for fixing the amount of remission by proclamation.

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

Adjourned debate on the question:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for consideration of the Bill.

(Continued from 27 February. Page 433.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I thank the House—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will members please take their seats or leave the Chamber.

Mr S.J. BAKER: This Bill normally allows all members of the House to participate in a grievance debate. One of the fascinating aspects of this process is that only five Government members have taken up the opportunity. It is a rather sad reflection on the quality of members opposite that they do not have the wit or the will to use this opportunity to express a point of view. It has been a tradition of this House that everyone expresses a point of view. It may well be on the state of the economy or the State itself—and I know that the member for Albert Park never misses an opportunity, so he is not one to whom I am referring—or it may be something affecting local residents. In any event, it is an opportunity to expose a point of view. One can only assume that, because of the Government's program and its desire to get the Supply Bill passed, a number of members opposite were told, 'We don't want to hear from you.' I would find that very sad if that approach has been adopted.

I wish to address two matters in this grievance debate: first, I will refer to a further analysis of the problems occurring with interest rates and, indeed, the lack of action on behalf of the Premier; and, secondly, I will refer to intellectually disabled people, a subject that my colleague the member for Hayward covered extremely well in his contribution. The problem with respect to high interest rates needs to be urgently addressed. Today we heard that a number of real estate firms will go into receivership and close down because people are not buying houses. I made the point during the second reading debate on this Bill that consumer confidence and consumer demand are sinking very quickly. The impact of that on small businesses will be quite dramatic. The fact that real estate firms are not able to sell houses is but the tip of the iceberg.

As every member in this place would be aware, the building industry is one of the best indicators of economic demand. It has been that way for 50 years and may well remain that way for the next 50 years. Certain other indicators have been important, but house building and general building construction have certainly been the key indicators. Confidence has fallen through the floor because no-one can afford the high interest rate regime of the Hawke Federal Government, and the House should remember that this Premier, as Federal President of the ALP and as State Premier, had an opportunity to put a point of view to Canberra on this matter. He had an opportunity to say to the Treasurer and to the Prime Minister, 'We believe in South Australia that your strategy is wrong. We wish to see changes. We must get interest rates under control. We must get inflation under control. We must get the overseas deficit under control.' The Premier said none of these things, and we all know that the result will be a lot of heartache, a lot of broken businesses and rapidly increasing unemployment as we go further into the 1990s. That is not a doomsday prophecy: it is a fact of life. South Australia will suffer quite dramatically. There are many other examples of the Premier's complete inability to put a point of view to Canberra.

The Premier is supposed to be leading this State. He is supposed to be taking this State's views to Canberra, but he does not do it. We can remember such instances as the Northern Territory rail link. When we wanted the Premier up there fighting for South Australia, fighting for the increased opportunities that a rail link would provide—including general freight, tourism and vital supplies—the Premier refused to put that point of view strongly to the Prime Minister. He refused to put a strong point of view on the matter of the wine excise. So often he has failed this State. In the second reading debate, and over the seven years that I have been in this Parliament, I have mentioned that I am very disappointed, as are most members of this House, with the performance of the Premier who fails to stand up as a person of stature, as a person of ideas, as a person of strength.

I also wish to refer to the problem facing intellectually disabled people. I mentioned that the member for Hayward approached this topic exceptionally well only last night. A number of intellectually disabled people live in my area, and that is the case in most electorates, but has anyone considered the breadth of the problems they face? I had contact from a lady from a country area—I think she was from the electorate of the member for Murray-Mallee—who said, 'Mr Baker, what are we going to do? We have a very large number of intellectually disabled children in our community. We are not getting any support and we are getting older. What are we going to do when we are too old to look after our children?' The Government has put forward a policy of normalisation.

Mr Lewis: Whatever that means!

Mr S.J. BAKER: Whatever that means. We have seen children being taken out of institutions and put into a more open environment. There has certainly been some hostel unit accommodation and a return to more family-type living, but that is where the action has been. How many other thousands of people—and I mean thousands of people—are in this situation with no help on offer? There are parents who battle, year after year, under awfully trying circumstances, with no relief, 24 hours a day, and the Government says, 'We support the rights of the intellectually disabled.' It does not support the rights of the parents of those people who have to go through that trauma.

I have had a number of representations from my own area, but I know that, compared to the representations I have had, the numbers and the problems in country areas are far greater. The lady said to me, 'Mr Baker, shouldn't it be possible for the Government to set up a small unit in the areas affected?' I thought that was an extremely good idea because, in country areas, thousands of kids are in this situation. I will not explain the circumstances but just ask members to note that many people in country areas are in this situation.

It would be nice if the Government obtained a farm, provided a health care worker or a support service, and then allowed people in these circumstances to live on that farm. It will not be very long—I would say in the next 10 years—before we face that problem, and we will face it because the kids will have nowhere to go, and they will not have the support. The proposition is a good idea and worthy of attention. It is an idea that could be accomplished at minimal cost compared to what happens in the city, and it is an idea which will give country folk a little better quality of life than they are presently experiencing.

Motion carried.

Bill taken through its remaining stages.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 February. Page 218.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition generally supports this proposition, although we have an amendment on file to which we hope the Minister will agree. This Bill clarifies the situation which has presented some vexed problems over a period. There has been a question as to whether stamp duty should be paid on the execution of an instrument or when that instrument actually comes into force. Basic common law would recognise that until the instrument actually comes into operation it is not effective and, if it is not then effective, stamp duty should not be applied.

In this proposition the Government is saying that it will bring forward its revenue collection. I believe that, if there were a major challenge in the courts as to at which point the Commissioner of Stamps could apply stamp duty, under the existing legislation he would be told by the courts that he was able to collect stamp duty only at the time at which the instrument came into force.

The most common instruments we can talk about are property deeds. This matter is treated differently, and I note a reference to the position prevailing in Victoria and in the United Kingdom. I quote from a judgment of a Mr G. Hill on stamp duties as follows:

The liability for duty of a deed delivered in escrow for the purposes of the Stamp Act 1891 (U.K.) was considered in *Terrapin International Ltd v. I.R.C.* [1976] 2 All E.R. 461 where it was determined that such an instrument became liable for duty when the delivery became unconditional and at the rates then current on the basis that at the time the instrument was executed and delivered in escrow it did nothing and 'was not one of whatever class of document it was sought to tax it as'.

However in *Alan Estates Ltd v. W.G. Stores Ltd* [1982] 1 Ch. 511 the Court of Appeal in England by a majority declined to follow Terrapin's case so far as the latter case depended upon the approval law of delivery of deeds in escrow and Tadgell J. in *Ansett Transport Industries (Operations) Pty Ltd v. Comptroller of Stamps (Vic.) (No. 3)* (1984) 84 A.T.C. 4103 also declined to follow *Terrapin's* case in the context of the Stamps Act (1958) (Vic.) and held that a deed delivered in escrow in Victoria conditional upon execution by the Commonwealth in the ACT was an instrument 'executed' in Victoria because when the condition was fulfilled so that the instrument became an immediately operative deed it took effect as between the parties to it as from its delivery in escrow.

What it really means is that the Victorians decided to impose the stamp duty at the point at which the document was delivered for stamping. I refer to a judgment by our own Mr Justice King in the case of the *Superannuation Fund Investment Trust v. Commissioner of Stamps* (S.A.) (No. 2) (1980), A.T.C. 4392, as follows:

It seems to me, moreover, that the duty on a memorandum of transfer becomes chargeable at the point at which the instrument becomes the property of the transferee. The duty is charged upon the instrument as a 'conveyance or transfer' as appears from the second schedule to the Act. The instrument becomes effective as a conveyance or transfer when it is delivered to the transferee for use as a transfer.

I do not think that the mere signing of a document in preparation for use attracts liability for stamp duty. The document is not chargeable with stamp duty until it becomes an instrument which is legally effective to affect legal rights. In the case of a memorandum of transfer this occurs when it is delivered to the transferee or when some other act occurs which indicates unequivocally that the transfer is available to the transferee so that he may procure its registration as a transfer of the property to him. When such delivery or other act occurs the instrument, if it is not already the property of the transferee, becomes the property of the transferee. It follows, in my opinion, that stamp duty, being a tax on a memorandum of transfer which has become effective as a transfer, is a tax on an instrument which is the property of the transferee.

Again, quite clearly, the determination in those circumstances is that until the instrument is actually transferred to the second party it is not effective, and therefore it should not attract stamp duty. There have been some problems with the way in which the Act is interpreted, and the Commissioner of Stamps has tended to adopt the opinion that when an instrument is delivered and executed stamp duty should then be charged. We appreciate the problems and the lengths to which the Commissioner must go when, after that being executed and his not having asked for the stamp duty, the follow-up could be quite a considerable time later and the collection process might well be delayed.

There may well be people who will avoid stamp duty for a whole range of reasons by ensuring that the conditions of the transfer are not met for some time. Under the conditions operating in this State, where the Commissioner of Stamps generally tries to get his cut early in the piece, unless some other evidence suggests that he should not, we somehow must overcome the dilemma of why someone who has not actually received any benefit should have to pay stamp duty. So, this is a compromise, but the compromise is not effective until such time as there is some reimbursement for those instruments for which the stamp duty has been paid but which never come into force. The Opposition generally supports the Bill but is quite firm in its desire to see some element of satisfaction in regard to forgone interest.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Finance): I thank the Deputy Leader for his conditional support for the Bill on behalf of the Opposition. As outlined quite clearly in the second reading explanation, the Bill implements a

recommendation of the Law Reform Commission in its report on the delivery of deeds. I was not so persuaded by the Deputy Leader's argument in regard to the matter of interest forgone, but I am sure that we will not be permitted to debate that at the moment as the amendment is not before the House. When the Deputy Leader's amendment is before the Committee a little later, I will indicate that the Government opposes it. I thank the House for its speedy support of the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Duty payable in respect of instruments conditionally executed.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I move:

Page 1, line 25—After 'paid' insert 'together with interest, at the rate fixed under section 24 (10) in respect of refunds of duty under section 24 (2) or (7), calculated from the date of payment of the duty to the date of the refund'.

I have outlined to the House what I believe to be justice and I have told the Minister that the Opposition will be firm on this matter because it is a matter of principle. I refer to section 24 of the principle Act, because it quite clearly allows for appeals against assessments and provides that interest shall be paid. On the one hand, the Minister has said that the Stamp Duties Act allows that anyone who has overpaid and who proves the overpayment of stamp duty will receive interest on moneys forgone. Yet, if someone executes an instrument and pays stamp duty, forgoing the interest, that person is not entitled to interest. Obviously, there is a conflict and it may well be that, if we consult a QC or a person of great eminence, we would find that there is a conflict to be resolved. If a person formally disputes the stamp duty, I assume they would obtain interest. There are a number of technicalities that neither the Minister nor I would not be aware of, but there should be some consistency.

The Commissioner of Stamps and the Government cannot have it both ways. The Government has stated in this Bill that, when an instrument is executed, stamp duty must be paid irrespective of whether the instrument ever comes into force. The instrument may not come into force for one, two, or three years. Therefore, the Government is bringing forward the taxation process. Section 24 of the Act provides for a refund of interest when there has been an overpayment, and the Minister would have to admit there has been an overpayment in this case. There should then be an allowance for refund of interest. I have put my point of view and I have heard the Minister's opinion. It will be a matter for a division.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I understand that all the Bill is doing is preserving the *status quo.*

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I said, 'I am advised', and by eminent persons. I am advised that that is the case. If the Bill does not go through, there will not be, I understand, any refunds at all, irrespective of whether or not interest is attracted to these refunds. That is the advice I have received. This provision is designed to assist people who, at present, may not get the relief that this Bill will give them. That is the advice I have received. Therefore, it is not the Government's intention to agree to the amendment. However, I am sure the argument will run in another place and that there are members in that place who will enjoy picking over this argument for hours and hours on end. As we cannot deprive them of that pleasure, and would not want to. I see no purpose in going over the argument in great detail here. In essence, my advice is that this Bill helps people rather than hinders them and will ensure that refunds are paid.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (20)—Messrs Allison, Armitage, D. S. Baker, S.J. Baker (teller), Becker, Blacker and Brindal, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Eastick, Goldsworthy, Gunn and Ingerson, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis, Matthew, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Such and Wotton.

Noes (23)—Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Atkinson, Bannon, Blevins (teller), Crafter, De Laine, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Heron, Holloway and Hopgood, Mrs Hutchison, Mr Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McKee, Mayes, Peterson, Quirke, Rann and Trainer.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Will the Minister explain what happens in the case of irretrievable documents? I understand that, unless a person who has had that document stamped returns the original, there is grave difficulty in recovering stamp duty, let alone the interest which we have just discussed. There are circumstances in which original documents do stray. They can be stolen, lost, or handed on to a second or third party who refuses to return them. In those circumstances, the Act is not quite satisfactory as to what mechanisms should be pursued by a person in order to recover what is rightfully his or her own money. Can the Minister clarify how this matter should be dealt with? I understand that a number of people have been put in a very difficult situation because they have not had their original documents.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I understand that those circumstances cannot arise, because the original document is lodged with the Stamp Duties Office. If that has not been done, no stamp duty has been charged. If the party concerned can prove that he has some connection with the original, we have it and there is no difficulty. However, if the honourable member has an example of some difficulties, I would appreciate his letting me know and I will investigate. However, my information is that the circumstances to which he referred cannot occur.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I understand that, as the Minister correctly said, the Stamp Duties Office would have the original, but to get a refund there has to be a copy of the original to allow the Commissioner of Stamps to repay the required moneys. This comes from a legal and real estate source where there have been difficulties as to who should be repaid without the copy of the original document.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am advised that in those circumstances if the person had some evidence that the stamp duty had been paid—a receipt, for example, plus a statutory declaration—that would suffice.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 February. Page 34.)

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): In principle, the Opposition sees no objection to this proposal. However, the mechanics, as outlined in the legislation, could pose some difficulties. The Minister has not been as objective or analytical in her appraisal of the effect of the legislation in her second reading explanation as she could have been had she taken the trouble more carefully and personally to analyse it. We know that for over a decade now there has been

increasing pressure to place all Lands Title Office records—otherwise known as the Torrens Register—on computer file.

The purpose of the Bill is to amend the Act and associated legislation to enable the computerisation of the register. As I have said, I see no objection to the proposal in principle. Its many advantages, if they can be achieved in legislation, are obvious. The existing system, which was introduced in South Australia and established by legislation in 1858 by Robert Richard Torrens (later Sir Robert Richard Torrens), whose portrait adorns the walls of this Chamber, provides for a certificate that guarantees certainty of title. The Torrens system has been introduced into many countries of the world, both West and East—more recently, in the East.

This Bill does not change the existing system, or at least that is the intention. However, it would appear that it simply places the records on a file in digital form, which is then accessible but not alterable, or so it would seem, by phone (that is, through a modem) from automatic data processing terminals elsewhere in the State or, for that matter, anywhere on earth.

The complete transition to the computer system will take up to 10 years, so we are told. On the face of it, it would appear that most of the provisions of the Bill are merely measures designed to facilitate the transfer of the records to a computerised system. However, from my reading of the amendments, I believe there are several clauses on which the Government might have made some errors. I believe that the record is exposed to risk and that, additionally, there have been increases in the discretionary powers of the Director-General.

Two of the claimed advantages of the proposal are that greater security of the register will be achieved and that it will allow remote access to the register by persons wishing to search it. The second point is not in dispute: the first is what I dispute. I do not question that the intention is there. It is just that, as the Minister and members would know, since computers have been introduced into the general management of information in society, at both personal and corporate levels, but particularly at the corporate level, hackers have gained access to computer records, and they were thought to have been inviolable. Substantial damage has been caused to those corporate or personal records where hackers have obtained access, by manipulation of the information stored, by simply scrambling the information or, more seriously, by scrambling the programs themselves. It is a very expensive exercise to try to recover that information, which then needs to be put in order in the program followed by the files. Remote access, therefore, should be available only if the integrity of the register can be absolutely guaranteed.

As I read it at present, the legislation does not give that absolute guarantee of integrity. Nowhere does it say how such guarantee would be provided. In other respects, it is my opinion that some parts of the Bill are poorly expressed; for example, I am sure that Division 1 of Part V is intended to apply only to titles in the existing register book. I refer to new section 51b, with 'register book' including computerised records; that makes Division 1 apply to titles in these records. Another example in new section 51b refers to the Registrar-General being 'required by this or any other Act or any other law to register title to land or record any other information'. The Act requires him to issue certificates of title for land and to make entries in the register book. By contrast, correct terminology is used in new section 51b *(e)* and 516 *(f)*.

There are a number of other aspects, the majority of which involve clause 11. Later, I will seek the indulgence of the House to enable us to consider, one at a time, each of those substantial historical provisions contained in new sections 51b, 51c and 51d. I am also interested in canvassing the desirability, under clause 14, of repealing section 53, which it seems to me should be retained as part of Division 1. Furthermore, I believe that section 189 should not be repealed, although it could be amended by deleting the expression 'alter any entry in the register book' to 'enter in the register book any change or correction'. This would make it more explicit.

For these purposes this section is more appropriate than 'updating' information under the amendment proposed in clause 32. Under clause 32, the proviso to section 220 (4) of the principal Act is no longer appropriate, but it should be amended and not struck out. It is important that the nature of any change made in the register book, and the date the change is made, be on permanent record, otherwise one could not be sure that the record had been in some way mischievously interfered with, whether by deliberate intent from within or by deliberate intent or accident from without.

There are no doubts whatsoever in my mind—having been the first member of this Parliament to ever use a computer in electoral work, programmed for both data and word processing purposes—that records can be quickly and easily destroyed. I have no doubt that my own records on my computer were quickly and deliberately destroyed on more than one occasion, and that annoyed me because it wasted a lot of my time. The same kind of thing could happen inadvertently in any computer system, whereby the environment in which the computer is located is, for some unknown reason, suddenly being subjected to an electromagnetic field sufficient to interfere with records.

That has very serious implications when one contemplates the consequences for people seeking information from the register by remote access through a telephone modem. In fact, it may appear so garbled that the land broker, solicitor or agent who is otherwise legally entitled to have access to the automatic data processing record, would call the Lands Titles Office and advise it of the problem that the records show. However, on other occasions that may not immediately be apparent, as the more recent parts of the record could simply have been excised. Costs would result not just to the Government in correcting the record but also, and more particularly, to either or both the land agent and broker and their clients. That would be very unfortunate.

In my opinion, it is not sufficient response for the Minister to say that it simply cannot happen. She would know—as members would know—that inexplicable electromagnetic interferences occur, as most people these days recognise. Bearing in mind that we have had experience with television for more than three decades, we known how suddenly television transmissions can be interrupted and how the picture may change or disappear altogether, through interference from power lines. They can also interfere with computer record files.

Clause 29, which replaces section 177 of the principal Act, gives the Registrar-General a discretion as to the details that should be recorded when registering transmission to personal representatives of a deceased proprietor. I believe that the current practice is the sensible one. The Registrar-General is required to enter into the register book the date of the will and probate letters of administration under the existing law. Why is this no longer required? It can otherwise become confusing, particularly to solicitors, where wills and applications for probate may be in dispute. One would not know whether or not the information sought has been added

to the file when it was accessed remotely under the proposed arrangements.

Clause 37, dealing with section 233, relates to fraudulent misdemeanours and applies a penalty for interference with records made by the Registrar-General in connection with the electronic, optical or photographic processes involved, such penalty being increased from $1 000 to $12 000. I do not know that $12 000 is an adequate penalty. Indeed, I believe that it is so piddling in some instances as to make it worthwhile for the white collar criminal so tempted to deliberately jigger the record. Therefore, I shall ask the Minister in Committee why the figure of $12 000 was determined when, in fact, it could be worth literally hundreds of millions of dollars to change the record as I have described.

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I rise only briefly to support very strongly the principle of converting the Real Property Act records to on-line computerised form. However, in doing so, I think that one has to consider very carefully many of the various matters which have been raised by the member for Murray-Mallee and by others with experience in the computer area. Quite obviously, the proposed computer systems will greatly increase the productivity of the office and will enhance the ease with which practitioners and members of the public may gain access to the data. When used in combination with other computerised systems as adopted by the E&WS Department and the Department of Lands and, when taken in conjunction with the satellite data provided by the Remote Sensing Bureau, obviously very substantial amounts of information can be collated and made available to the public. I believe that considerable advantages will result to the State from this long-term project.

However, I think that, in recognising those advantages, it is also important to note, as the previous speaker has done, the various problems which can arise. I support the remarks about the penalties in the Act. I think it is important that the Minister give close attention to the construction of the penalty clauses and to the offences actually detailed in the Act to ensure that those penalties are such as to actively discourage anyone—employees of the Lands Titles Office, the Computing Centre or, indeed, outsiders who gain access to the system through the telephone network (which will be an important long-term feature of the project)—who might seek to interfere fraudulently with the process.

One also has to take into account the recent amendments which Parliament enacted in the previous session in the Summary Offences Act with respect to so-called hacking and I think that the way in which those interact with this measure should also be carefully examined. It remains to be seen whether it would be possible to take that into account in our considerations or in consideration in another place. I believe that the measure should be strongly supported but, given the importance and technical nature of it, those precautions should be studied at some length.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I support the Bill. It is really amazing to think that the technology involved in this legislation goes back to the NASA scientists and the original moon program. It is amazing that, through their experimentation, they were able to produce a system which could hold hard copy digitally and which has now been so perfected that it can be and is now being introduced into various Government departments where all the information is held digitally. I imagine that, if I asked them, quite a few members in this House could not explain to me what I meant by 'holding the information digitally'. I do not intend to provide an explanation, but it is marvellous that so much information can be held on a computer chip.

I support the member for Murray-Mallee in his praise of Sir Robert Richard Torrens, who started this system in South Australia. Delegations from all over the world have come to South Australia to look at this system and have taken it back to their own countries to use. It is being utilised by more and more countries as time goes by. I suppose that Sir Robert Richard Torrens would have been one of South Australia's most famous sons. Although he is not mentioned as much as I think he should be in our history books, I take this opportunity of joining with the member for Murray-Mallee in singing his praises.

I would like to express some concern about the need for security with this system. There is no doubt that over a period those people who have pirated and exchanged information throughout the world by using their own skills, sometimes merely for the enjoyment of doing it and not for any gain, have created havoc in Government records, particularly in the United States. I hope that the question of security and risk has been looked at. It stands to reason that it would have been looked at, because we were informed in the second reading explanation that this system is already operating successfully in New South Wales. So, I suppose, the Public Service in New South Wales devised ways and means of overcoming what could be a big security problem.

The member for Elizabeth mentioned the possible increase in productivity with this new system. One would think that this system could increase productivity within the Lands Department by several thousand per cent. We are told that at present both the original and duplicate certificates of title are maintained in a paper form under a computerised system and the original will now go into digital form. Productivity could be increased at a tremendous rate if the mass of paper and information which must be stored in the Lands Department were put onto the computer chip in digital form. I understand (and it stands to reason) that the cost of maintaining the manual system is extremely high, so the changeover will be of great benefit in that area.

I would like to introduce one other cautious note in my remarks and that concerns people like me who left the old technology and adopted new techniques. I was involved with computerisation in the printing industry, but I have been in this House now for seven years and three months. It is well known that the life of a computer is worth only about seven years and then the equipment is thrown out and the new technology is brought in so, if I wanted to use this system, even my understanding of how it will work would be limited. Many people in our society still have had no contact with computerisation; they are computer illiterate and they will need assistance when this new system is introduced. I hope that the department has provided for that fact and will assist them when they search for titles and so forth.

I understand that currently over 2 000 photocopied titles are requested each day, and this necessitates clients physically attending the Lands Title Office. As this system is slowly introduced there will be 600 terminals throughout the State and, of course, this will not only speed up the operations of the internal system of the Lands Department but will also be of great assistance to the customers. I know that time is limited and the introduction of new technology is a subject on which I could spend a lot of time, but in order to make sure that we get this measure through the House in time I close by simply congratulating the Minister and her department on taking this step and I am sure that it will be a great success.

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): In rising to address the House I wish to state from the outset that I do not intend to

oppose the Bill and, in fact, applaud many of the innovations that have occurred within the department in computer technology. I draw to the attention of the House two major areas of concern with the Bill. First, the potential for abuse by computer hackers. As members have already mentioned to some degree, in the past there have been examples of computer hackers breaking into computer equipment, be it Government or private, and playing havoc with the records held therein. I stress that it is absolutely vital that any computer records held are made as hacker-free as possible so that such records cannot be tampered with. However, in saying that, I recognise the benefits to be gained from remote access and the delicate balance which should be carefully weighed between tightening up such access and providing access for those who need it.

The other point I draw to the attention of the House is the storage of the original in digital form. While the storage of documentation is necessary in respect of the purpose of the system—that is, to allow remote access of some sort—the storage of the original in digital form presents some problems. It is my understanding that, under proposed new section 51b, information relating to certificates of titles in the existing register book could be recorded on the computer whilst the existing certificate is retained. This to me seems a little unsatisfactory in that we can have some information in a register book and other information stored on a computer with, from what I can see, little control to ensure that the information reflects the other in both situations.

Therefore, the potential for differences arising between any information stored in paper format and that stored in a digitised format is quite high. I draw to the attention of the House ways in which computer data can be manipulated and changed. An original certificate of title, for example, may be amended by simply adding information to that which exists, or does the computer program allow for information to be deleted or amended without leaving any trace of that which was there before that computer action was taken?

The procedures governing that sort of amendment of computer stored information must be carefully looked at to ensure that existing certificates of titles are not changed drastically in their original intent, for example, the date of transactions, the deletion of caveats on title or the changing of details of such caveats which could severely affect information stored. Without proper controls there would be no record of such action having been taken.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I rise to support the Bill and to say that I have watched with real interest the development of the Lands Title Office over the years that I have been in Parliament. We have seen, under a succession of Ministers, the Lands Title Office emerge from—and I use the phrase very kindly—the quill and parchment era to a very highly efficient organisation. The current Minister deserves credit for the dynamic leadership that she has displayed in encouraging these latest changes.

Since the late 1970s the Lands Title Office has led the way in using the latest technology. In the late 1970s we had the land ownership and tenure system, which then progressed into the automated registration indexing and inquiry system. This natural progression into computerisation will see benefits not only to the South Australian community but to those officers at the Lands Title Office in discharging their duties to the people of this State.

It has been said by previous speakers that these amendments will increase the efficiency of the Lands Title Office and make the job a little bit more rewarding for the officers compared to the old manual method, and in that regard I endorse the comments of my colleague, the member for Henley Beach. Also it has been said—I am not quite sure by whom—that in the past there was only one central location so that if anyone wished to obtain information from the Lands Title Office they had to come into the central business district area of Adelaide to make those inquiries. That will now be completely changed for the benefit of not only the officers concerned but also the general public.

I am pleased to note that in the Minister's second reading explanation reference was made to the assessment of the need for a computer based Torrens system and that over two years research and development has been carried out. That encourages me to think that in this move towards computerisation we have, hopefully, ironed out all the bugs in the system so that we can move with complete ease from manual methods into computerisation. I take the point that the member for Bright made as to whether or not this system will be free from tampering by those people who find it sometimes beneficial to indulge in what is currently termed hacking. I am sure that that matter will be adequately addressed by the Minister in her response later this afternoon.

In her second reading explanation the Minister listed many advantages of this system, and I will dwell on the simplification of titles. As the Minister said, one of the basic principles of the Torrens titles system is to simplify title to land. I am just a very simple property owner—not simple in mind but simple in assets. I am not like some of my colleagues on the other side who own vast tracts of land or other buildings. When I have had to deal with the Lands Title Office I have had to look, sometimes with some degree of confusion, at the way this whole thing is set out. As I grow old I find it very hard to pick up modern technology. I am sure there are many thousands of South Australians, including me, who will find this simplification of how it is set out of benefit to them. Once again, I congratulate the Minister and her officers on this great step forward and look forward to her response in respect of making the system free from hacking.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Lands): I thank members for their contributions, and I will go through some of the points they raised. However, I want to clearly state that the Bill before the House today certainly does not set out to change in any way the Torrens system of land registration; it merely seeks to provide for the computerisation of the records. In one contribution it was stated that it was a pity Mr Torrens had faded from our memory and was no longer part of our culture. I point out to the House that we are carefully watched over by a portrait of Mr Torrens sitting up on the wall—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Well, Sir Richard—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: We do have the River Torrens, but we have Sir Richard right here in the Chamber—I would not say smiling down but certainly he is looking down upon us—to ensure that we do not do anything to change the whole system of land registration. As members who have read the Bill would understand, that is not what we will do at all. The Bill amends the Real Property Act 1886, which is quite some years ago, to overcome the statutory obligation for a manual register.

In acknowledging the contributions, particularly of the member for Murray-Mallee, the lead speaker for the Opposition, and also of the members for Elizabeth, Henley Beach, Bright and Napier, a common thread ran through the points raised in that there is a concern about how we can prevent

hacking. I will go through a number of mechanisms that the department has placed in position to ensure that we will be able to do everything that is humanly possible to minimise this very serious computer crime. First, there will be greater physical security against such things as fire and other forms of physical destruction. That is very important. There is and will be an adequate back up system or systems, with duplicate records of transactions being stored off site. Everyone understands that that is vitally important in case of theft or any kind of natural disaster.

On-line transactions are backed up in case of power failure, and there are automatic re-start procedures—even if there is a major power failure on a weekend. The computer systems in the Lands Title Office have, since 1979, had back-up and security, and this has always been of paramount importance to the department. Access to files is protected through a number of safeguards, including such things as guard files and user codes. I want to make it very clear that no original or permanent records have been destroyed by the department, because I think the member for Murray-Mallee's comment, which was probably unintentional, could be misinterpreted by anyone reading *Hansard*. The only things that are destroyed are duplicates. Everything on the handwritten files—the manual files—will be stored in an historic file, so everything will be preserved in that sense. It is important that members clearly understand that.

With respect to the question of remote access, remote responses will be sent out by fax. We are not sending out original files, as I understand it—they will be sent out by fax. In response to a question from the member for Bright, all access to the system is monitored, so we will know who has accessed the system if it occurs. In respect of amendments to the files, any amendments to the computer files are stringently controlled and can be made only through the existence of a document. That is vitally important in terms of the security of such a system. There must be some documentation before there can be any alterations or amendments. All information recorded will be held for ever. That is also vitally important.

The members for Murray-Mallee and Elizabeth in particular raised the question of penalties. I am happy to deal with that at the appropriate time, but I give the House a commitment that I will be increasing the penalties through an appropriate amendment in the Upper House. At this stage it is my wish to increase the penalties to about $40 000 maximum and 10 years maximum imprisonment.

An honourable member: That is a harsh penalty.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am told by somebody behind me that that is a harsh penalty. The member for Murray-Mallee has raised a very appropriate point: we are talking about the potential for multi-million—

An honourable member: Will you allow community service orders?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I do not think we will be allowing community service orders. However, I do agree with the members for Murray-Mallee and Elizabeth that this is very serious. If somebody is able to break into the system (and I do not think that will happen), the community must be aware that this Parliament views that as a very serious matter. The integrity of our system is paramount and we will do everything possible to ensure that that integrity is maintained. To back that up, we are prepared to increase the penalties to what I think is something quite substantial.

I understand that the member for Murray-Mallee is keen to have the Bill dealt with clause by clause. I was prepared to move to suspend Standing Orders but I now understand, under the new Standing Orders, that that is not required and that we can move to do that in the Committee stage. I will be very pleased to do that at that time.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

Mr LEWIS: This clause strikes out the definition of 'appropriate form' as it has stood in the legislation and substitutes it with the following definition:

'Appropriate form' means a form approved by the Registrar-General.

Does that form have to be placed anywhere on the record under regulation and be so defined? How will we know what form is approved by the Registrar-General from day to day? It is not defined in the legislation if it is deleted.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The Director-General will gazette any changes in terms of the forms under his own name. They will be gazetted and available so that the general community is aware of any changes in terms of the forms. The reason behind this is part of the Government's ongoing commitment for deregulation where we believe it is appropriate and will not in any way jeopardise the good working of particular legislative measures. It is part of a Government principle and philosophy, but I do not believe it will in any way detract from the community's having access to the actions being taken by the Registrar-General.

Mr LEWIS: If I understand the Minister correctly, when changes are made, the appropriate form will be gazetted ahead of the day on which the change is brought into effect. If that is the case, where in legislation is the requirement for the Director-General to do that?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I do not believe that it actually spells that out, but I assure the honourable member that forms are not changed frivolously or at will in the sense that someone gets an idea and changes the forms. There is always extensive consultation with the various professional bodies and organisations that should have some input. I do not share the honourable member's concerns that this in any way is taking away the community's ability to be part of the decision-making process. It is a streamlining process. The forms will be gazetted by the Registrar-General and I can assure the House that, as has been the case in the past, there will be detailed consultation with any relevant professional bodies or organisations upon whom such a change may impact.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 10 passed.

Clause 11—'Insertion of Division II of Part V.'

The CHAIRMAN: Clause 11 proposes to insert new sections 51b, 51c and 51d. It is my intention, under Standing Order 248, to put each proposed new section as a separate question.

Proposed new section 51b.

Mr LEWIS: New section 51b *(a)* is intended to apply only to titles in the existing register book, but the term 'register book' includes computerised records and so the provision applies to titles in these records. Will the Minister explain why it is so expressed?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: This is an interpretive clause which sets out what a computerised title actually is. I am not quite sure that I understand the honourable member's question, as it seems to me that that is very clear. Would the honourable member like to rephrase the question?

Mr LEWIS: We are now putting into law the preamble statement as follows:

Where the Registrar-General is required by this or any other Act or any other law to register title to land or record any other information relating to land, the Registrar-General may register

the title or record the information by an electronic, electromagnetic, optical or photographic process and, in that case, the provisions of this Act or any other relevant Act will be construed so as to apply to, and in relation to, the registration of title or recording of information by that process and in particular—

(a) the term 'Register Book' will be taken to include the records maintained by the Registrar-General pursuant to this section relating to the land.

So, why does the Bill not state more explicitly that it will include those computerised records? I do not see why a separate paragraph *(a)* is required, because that would indicate that it in some way detaches itself from the preamble statement. That, at least, is the opinion of brains that are trained in the law to a far greater extent than mine has been.

Paragraphs *(e)* and *(f)* have the correct terminology, whereas I do not think the terminology is explicit in the initial part. Paragraphs *(e)* and *(f)* spell out how it will be done and what will be taken as the authoritative record.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I understand that this is an interpretive clause—it actually interprets. New section 51b goes on:

. . . and in particular—

(a) the term 'Register Book' will be taken to include the records maintained by the Registrar-General pursuant to this section relating to the land.

That to me seems fairly clear, and I really do not know how to explain what the honourable member is asking. To me that is fairly explicit: it relates to what has gone on beforehand in proposed new section 51b. We may be at cross-purposes.

Mr LEWIS: I will have one last try: I will not make a big deal of this, other than to put down what I understand. If the Registrar-General is required by law to make an entry on the duplicate certificate of title, he should either do this or issue a new duplicate certificate of title. This is not the effect of new section 51b *(f)*, which requires the Registrar-General to cancel the certificate and issue a new one only if he thinks it necessary or desirable.

It does not require him to make an entry on the duplicate certificate if he does not issue a new duplicate. This provision could be deleted, because the Registrar-General has the power to issue a new duplicate certificate under the next provision. It is confusing to have new sections 51b *(e)* and 51b *(f)* stating more explicitly what is alluded to in new section 51b *(a)* when the provision could be deleted because of the effect of ensuing new section 51c (2). However, we will leave it at that. Perhaps the honourable gentlemen and ladies in the other place will exercise their minds on this point as and when this Bill arrives in their care.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I think I might have the explanation. It seems that what the honourable member is doing is comparing the two systems. The original system provided for an original title and a duplicate, so there were actually two pieces of paper. With this system, in a sense the original is an electronic image and not a tangible thing such as a piece of paper, so what is being referred to in this section is the certificate which, I guess, could be seen as a duplicate, since what comes from the computer is, in a sense, an original, as it is the first hard copy.

I think that that is the confusion. We are changing from an old system that we are all used to, a system incorporating a slight change in terminology. To me, that is clear. If there are any other points that have not been clarified for the honourable member, I am sure that my officers will be prepared to make an explanation which can be considered in the Upper House, if that is the wish of the honourable member.

Mr HAMILTON: I note that the second reading explanation (page 33 of *Hansard* of 8 February) under the heading 'Remote access to title register' states, in part:

The Department of Lands data communication network, which now encompasses over 600 terminals throughout the State, can in the future be utilised to deliver this title data.

One would think that the implementation of such a network, using electronic equipment, would involve a cost saving, otherwise it would not be introduced. What are the cost savings in relation to this system, not only in monetary terms but also in terms of manpower?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It is not just a matter of what the Government will save. The whole *raison d'etre* for our introducing this type of computerised title is also to provide the consumers, or clients, of the department with a much more professional and accessible service. In fact, that is what the honourable member has highlighted. The fees will be the same under the new system as they were under the old system. We will not introduce new technology and charge the community more. It means that clients will not have to travel to get that information; they will be able to access the information either directly in their own home or through their workplace in remote and country areas. Therefore, the community will benefit enormously, particularly those people who do not live in city areas. The honourable member has regularly raised the point in this House that these people are often forgotten.

To that extent, we are not looking at making huge savings by charging more for the system that we are providing now. However, there will be substantial savings in the longer term when we look at staff requirements for such a system. Obviously, if there is not a manual system there will be staff savings over the longer term. That is something that everyone would welcome. It is part of the move in my three departments to provide a more efficient, effective and relevant service to the community. This is just one of the ways in which the Department of Lands is achieving that goal. Certainly, there will be savings but, more importantly, there will be great benefits to the community, particularly to those in the rural area, in their being able to access the information that they need to proceed with their transactions.

Mr HAMILTON: The Minister would know of my interest in another field: what are the projected savings in relation to the implementation of this system? The Minister may wish to take this question on notice.

An honourable member: Tiny and little.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: No, they will not be tiny and little, they will be quite substantial and I am very happy to provide—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thought we were in the middle of the Committee stage.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I call the member for Kavel to order.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: He was being quite rude, I would have thought. I was actually speaking at the time he was making his comments.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I think it is quite the opposite: he is actually butting into the proper practices of the Parliament, but never mind. In answer to the honourable member's question, I will certainly provide—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Kavel will restrain himself in the Committee stage of the debate, or the Chair will be forced to take action. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I will certainly be able to provide the honourable member with the projected savings.

Quite obviously, the department has done all that, but I am quite pleased to say that there will be substantial savings in the longer term, certainly, when we can reduce the number of staff required to do the manual tasks, which are not exactly the most creative of jobs for our employees. They are very repetitive and time-consuming, and I do not imagine that they provide an enormous amount of job satisfaction. Of course, those employees will be offered retraining and development of other skills. They will be redeployed within the department in other ways. Therefore, there is no problem in terms of an immediate effect on staffing. However, the savings will be considerable and I am only too happy to provide the honourable member with that information.

Proposed new section 51b agreed to.

Proposed new sections 51c and 51d.

Mr LEWIS: The certificate of title to be issued under proposed new section 51c will be the equivalent of the existing duplicate certificate of title, I understand what the Minister has just told the House in relation to the previous provision. Given that that is the case, I would have thought that, throughout the Bill, it should be called a 'duplicate certificate' to avoid confusion. There will be no hard copy of the certificate of title once the Bill comes into effect and the changeover is made. The certificate of title will be an electronic data record.

I am suggesting that, throughout the Bill, it would have been wiser and simpler if that first hard copy was referred to as the 'duplicate' in order to avoid confusion. It would have helped if the Minister had had the legislation drafted in that form. It would have avoided, in some part, the concern that I expressed in relation to the preceding provision. That is a piece of gratuitous advice that I offer to the Minister and suggest again that members in another place may choose to address that matter so that there is no confusion once the Bill becomes an Act, which seems to be highly likely.

If the Registrar-General is required by law to make an entry on the duplicate certificate of title, he or she should either do this or issue a new duplicate certificate of title. That is not the effect of proposed new section 51b *(f)*, which required that the Registrar-General should cancel a certificate and issue a new certificate only if he or she thinks it is necessary or desirable. It does not require him or her to make an entry on the duplicate certificate if he or she does not issue a new duplicate. Therefore, if there is no new duplicate, there is no requirement to enter the new information on the existing duplicate.

This provision could be deleted, because the Registrar-General has the power to issue a new duplicate certificate under proposed new section 51c (2). That provision is unnecessary. I simply put that information to the Minister for her consideration, because I assure her that, as far as I am aware, members in another place will address this question.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I shall try to answer that question in the very best way that I can. As I understand it, the first copy is called 'the certificate'. There will be a computer system and the first copy will be called 'the certificate of title'. Obviously, if there are to be changes to that title, the normal practice is to make the changes and call back and destroy the superceded titles. I am not quite sure what is the honourable member's problem, but if he understands that the first copy is the certificate of title—

Mr Lewis: It is not; you told me that a minute ago.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The first copy that comes out of the computer is the certificate of title; it is the first hard copy. In fact, at that stage it is the only hard copy. Therefore, it is the certificate. If someone buys a property, they are presented with the certificate of title. That is the certificate of title; that is what it is called; that is what it is. The Registrar-General's copy is in a computer.

I do not see what the problem is. There is no potential for any slip-ups. If changes are made to that certificate, that is obviously destroyed. We do not want a number of titles to a particular property floating around. If we want to know what the latest title is, we can call it back and destroy it, and the updated certificate, the new one, is the certificate, and that is the relevant document. It seems to me that that is a fairly straightforward system.

Mr LEWIS: That is at variance with what the Minister told us when we put that question during the debate on the previous clause. The Minister told us that the original, the certificate of title, was a digital record in the department's computer. The first bit of paper that comes out as hard copy from that record is a duplicate. I have explained that I thought that was a problem because the words 'certificate of title' and 'duplicate certificate of title' are used interchangeably, causing some confusion in the legislation. That may not be so at the moment, but in the Bill they are. The Minister has confirmed that that confusion exists.

Given that I took that on board in the discussion on the previous clause, I am now putting the problem that arises where we use the term 'certificate of title' to mean the first hard copy as well as what is in the computer, and that another piece of paper identical to the first hard copy, being the second hard copy, would be the duplicate. To my mind, that is untenable. There has to be clarification of that question, although I do not propose to attempt it here. I know that it can be addressed in the other place. If the Minister and I are at odds about that, we will not delay the Committee now; we will simply leave it that it can be resolved in the other place so that, when the Bill finally becomes an Act, the terms do not produce the confusion which I am sure legal brains better trained than mine will deliberately create, whether in mischief or not.

Under section 51c (1) we find the word 'proprietor' used without it being explicitly stated as being the registered proprietor. My point is that we should have included the word 'registered' in section 51c (1) before the word 'proprietor' and the word 'proprietor's' so that it would read:

> Where title to land is registered under this Division, the Registrar-General must issue a certificate of title to the registered proprietor of the land setting out the registered proprietor's estate or interest in the land and the encumbrances, liens or other interests (if any) to which the estate or interest is subject.

I believe that would make it beyond misinterpretation. In both instances, it is my desire to eliminate ambiguity, and that is what brings me to my feet now.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I will answer the second part of the question first. If the honourable member looks at the Real Property Act, the term 'proprietor' is clearly and carefully defined. As these are amendments to the Real Property Act, we must refer to the parent Act for the definition. Under the definition in the Real Property Act, the proprietor must be registered. Therefore, in a sense, that is a valid point. However, we need to refer back to the Real Property Act, where it is clearly defined.

As regards the first part of the question, the first hard copy that comes out of the computerised titles system is the original. There is no second hard copy. The first hard copy that comes out is the original. I understand that there is not a second hard copy.

Mr Lewis: The duplicate?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The duplicate to which the honourable member refers in section 51d, where it talks about duplicate certificates, is a reference to the present

manual system. One cannot automatically change the whole system; there has to be a changeover period. Therefore, we have to pick up and define what is happening under the present system and, as well as that, in the new amendments we have to make allowances for the new technology, the new terminology, and so on. In my mind, that clarifies the points made by the honourable member. However, I have given an assurance that, either by way of private discussion or through the Upper House, those points can be more clearly spelt out if I have not already done that concisely.

Mr LEWIS: That satisfies me on one aspect, but it worries me on another. How do we know that, under the new records as they go onto the computer, the title is fair dinkum, to use the vernacular? I now understand that these terms, 'original certificate of title' and particularly 'duplicate certificate of title', will apply only to the old copy under the seal, and it would be a crime to forge the seal or to apply it unlawfully. From what the Minister is now saying, there will not be a seal on the copy that comes out of the computer. I am anxious about that aspect in consequence of the Minister's explanation.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am obviously not being very clear. The usual accusations that I get of being a bit of a bossy schoolteacher are not working today.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thought that the Opposition would like that. I am sorry for the small diversion, but this is getting pretty heavy. There will be a seal. I can show the honourable member a copy of what will happen to the certificate of title. There will be a seal on it.

In answer to the other point, it is the legal responsibility of the Registrar-General to ensure that every transaction is, to use the vernacular, fair dinkum. We have trained officers, many of whom are legally trained, who vet every transaction that comes through. That is the role and function of having a Registrar-General's Department and a Registrar-General. There is a seal on the certificate of title, and I shall be delighted to show the honourable member a sample when we have a suitable break.

Proposed new sections 51c and 51d agreed to; clause passed.

Clauses 12 and 13 passed.

Clause 14—'Retention or records.'

Mr LEWIS: This clause repeals section 53 of the principal Act, and I do not believe that should occur. It should be retained as part of Division 1. There is nothing in the Bill that makes it any longer necessary to enter memorials on the duplicates of titles in the existing register. So why do we repeal this clause? To my mind, it will make life more difficult if we repeal it.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The deletion of this clause has been decided in consultation with the legal profession. So, we have sought broader and more general legal opinion to ensure that this is the correct way to go. As I understand, currently the transfer of a mortgage or lease has to be registered on the original title and on the duplicate instrument. Often, it is absolutely unnecessary to do this and it creates an enormous amount of unnecessary work. In consultation with the legal profession and, in fact, with our own officers, it was determined that we needed to have a more streamlined and commonsense approach, but at the same time ensuring that, as the new clause suggests, once information has been recorded it must be retained in the form in which it was originally registered, or in some other form. In other words there is an absolute legal responsibility to retain that information in one form or another. In a sense, it was to remove some unnecessary and tedious duplication existing under the previous clause, and I do not believe that it will in any way lessen the integrity of the system: it will merely ensure the smooth working of the system.

Clause passed.

Clauses 15 to 28 passed.

Clause 29—'Particulars of application to be recorded.'

Mr LEWIS: This clause replaces section 177. The sticking point for me is that it gives a discretion to the Registrar-General, and I do not reflect here on the integrity or performance of the current, or any preceding—or, for that matter, any future—Registrar-General. However, there may be an occasion when an oversight occurs or for some other reason things do not happen. It gives the Registrar-General a discretion as to the details that should be recorded when registering transmission to personal representatives of a deceased proprietor.

Currently, the Registrar-General is required to enter into the register book the date of the will and the probate letters of administration that provide the authority. Why is that requirement being removed? Other people who have some legal, if not pecuniary, interest in the said parcel of land will not be able to discover the authority with which the Registrar-General has or has not acted in making or failing to make an entry there. At present, he or she is required to make an entry: why is discretion being provided?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: There is a simple and reasonable explanation for that. All that information will be retained within the major instrument of the system. The date of death will appear on the certificate. Now we will have a range of other information, such as the date of the will and the date of probate, and it has been found that this information, while it is sometimes accessed, is not accessed very frequently. Rather than put this information on as a matter of course, we are saying to people, 'You can have access to it, so if you wish to have access to that information you can have it through the major system.' It will not as a standard condition appear on the title, but the date of death will appear on every title where appropriate.

Clause passed.

Clause 30 passed.

Clause 31—'Repeal of s. 189.'

Mr LEWIS: Again, I hold the view that section 189, which this clause proposes to repeal, should not be repealed, although it could be amended by deleting the expression, 'alter any entry in the register book' and inserting 'enter in the register book any change or correction'. The existing section is more appropriate for these purposes and is a lot less cumbersome, and I think it provides the information desired by the proposed change.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The reason for the deletion is that the upgrading of section 220 (4), in fact, picks up the intent of section 189. In the whole upgrading of this Act it did not seem appropriate to have two sections which said the same thing. So, as I understand it, the upgraded section 220 (4) says what is contained in the current section 189.

Clause passed.

Clause 32—'Powers of Registrar-General.'

Mr LEWIS: The proviso to section 220 (4) is no longer appropriate as it stands, but it should be amended, not struck out. It is important that the nature of any change made in the register book and the date of that change be on permanent record. The Minister was referring to section 224 in dealing with my previous stated concern when I was talking about section 189 not needing to be repealed, and I think she did not understand what I was saying. I am not proposing an amendment: I am simply asking the Minister

to explain why she has the amendment before us in this form.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: There is an explanation for this. When we actually make a change, we will be able to put that back into the historical file.

Mr LEWIS: I believe that the proviso to section 220 (4) is no longer appropriate, but that it should be amended and not struck out. It is important that the nature of any change made in the register book, and the date the change is made, be on the permanent record. It is not required to be there now. In the second reading explanation, the Minister claims that this clause of the Bill expressly empowers the Registrar-General to keep the register book up to date but does not require him to do so. In my judgment, where the requirement has existed in the past, it is now being deleted.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I think that the new clause covers those queries, but I clearly spell out that the section is amended to remove obligations as to how a title shall be amended and to give the Registrar-General a discretion in this regard. Provisions of the present section would be impossible to apply in a computerised system and I think the honourable member accepts that fact. The limitations to amendments of lineal data in the register are removed as they are archaic and unrealistic in this era of high technology surveying.

Mr Lewis: It will take us 10 years to change over.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I think it is important that we have an Act that covers the next 10 years. We have an Act which goes right back to 1886 and which has been in operation since then. We are now looking at an Act to take us into this decade and the next century.

Mr Lewis: Hopefully, it doesn't confuse us while it's happening.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I don't think it will.

Mr LEWIS: I will rest the case on this point: I do not believe that the Minister has understood either this or the other concerns I have raised about this matter. I have not sought to put amendments before the Committee, but I am certain that a careful examination of the *Hansard* record in respect of the new Act—if it passes in its present form—will demonstrate my concern that this 10-year period will be compounded with ambiguities and uncertainties and, accordingly, will make millions of dollars for many lawyers. Those ambiguities and uncertainties could have been more effectively dealt with. I have said it before and I will say it again: I will not attempt to amend these clauses. However, if members in another place share my concerns, I will leave it to them to do so.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I hope that this is the last occasion on which I have to speak on this topic, also. The original section 220 (4) actually gives certain directions to the Registrar-General, one of which is that errors in any entry in the register book or a certificate must be corrected. We will not have a register book, so that should be removed. The amended section 220 (4) includes an all-embracing section, which picks up what should be done under a computerised system but does not throw away what should be done under a manual system during this changeover period.

I think the point the honourable member raised is valid if the new section somehow applied only to the computerised system. However, because of its encompassing nature, the new section embraces what should be done under the old section 220 (4), which is a direction to the Registrar-General to go about manually changing this in the register book. We do not have a register book in the new system, but we will have one in the transition period.

As I understand it, new section 220 will ensure that both the old and the new systems are dealt with adequately and that the onus of responsibility is on the Registrar-General to do those things. However, I suppose this could be further developed if members on the other side do not see it in quite the same way when it goes to the other place.

Mr LEWIS: Why did the Minister, in drafting the legislation, not use the word 'require' but, instead, used the word 'empower'. 'Empower' does not require anybody to do anything; they have the authority to do it, but they are not compelled to do so. 'Require' means that they are compelled to do something.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Which line are we referring to? I cannot find the line where the word 'empower' is written.

Mr LEWIS: I have not noted the line, Mr Chairman.

Clause passed.

Clauses 33 to 36 passed.

Clause 37—'Fraudulent misdemeanours.'

Mr LEWIS: On behalf of the Opposition I commend the Minister for having an afterthought about penalties. We do not think that $12 000 is anywhere near enough. If a white-collar crook is caught fiddling the records, it could cost the State millions of dollars or, alternatively, and more likely, it might benefit the person who does it—and attempts to get away with it—by millions of dollars. In her response to the second reading debate the Minister nominated the figure of $40 000 and I ask her to explain why $40 000 and not some other figure.

The Opposition does not know of a precedent in our existing law that prescribes an appropriate penalty for such a fraudulent misdemeanour, because our law, as it relates to computer crime, is very limited. I think this is the first occasion upon which we have explicitly included a penalty for a major white-collar crime, which this kind of fraudulent misdemeanour would or could represent. The Opposition does not know how the Government has arrived at the proposed figure of $40 000, so would the Minister explain how that equates to something else which the Government has in mind?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: In looking at increasing this penalty, it seemed to me that we also had to look at some of the other existing penalties. As I understand it, some perjury and felony penalties are higher than this penalty. Therefore, it seemed appropriate that we should keep the penalty below that level but, at the same time, indicate to the community that we view the type of crime associated with such an important part of the good working of our everyday system as very serious. Therefore, I am looking at a fine not exceeding $40 000 and a term of imprisonment not exceeding 10 years. I think we have to look very carefully at this matter, but it seems that that would look at picking up an appropriate level. This would be a Division 2 fine and Division 2 imprisonment and the one above that is Division 1 imprisonment, which is a term not exceeding 15 years and a Division 2 fine of $60 000.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: No, because I think that that penalty is for the sort of things that we have talked about in terms of some of the other much more serious crimes.

Clause passed.

Clauses 38 to 42, schedule and title passed.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): The Opposition is not happy with the explanations we have received from the Government about the interpretation which can be placed upon a

number of the clauses. Accordingly, with those reservations we expect that members in another place will give the matter their best attention and almost certainly the Minister can look forward to having the Bill returned with some changes to it. I am the new boy on the block. I would not have presumed, on this first occasion of handling a piece of legislation of this kind in this place, to have moved amendments. I merely express my reservations.

As my understanding of this and other laws relevant to the way in which we conduct business in lands in this State improves, my confidence to make objective assessments of the integrated effects of clauses or of a proposal to change the law will ensure that I, if no-one else, can give the House the benefit of that better understanding and the opportunity to debate any such amendments. In the meantime, it is a bicameral Parliament, and that will ensure that no faulty legislation gets through. I thank the House for its attention and the Minister for her consideration of our best endeavours to this point.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I draw the attention of the House to an error in the division list during the Committee stage of the Bill, on which occasion the Leader of the Opposition voted for the 'Ayes'. The votes and proceedings will be corrected accordingly.

MAGISTRATES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 February. Page 363.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Under the Magistrates Act the Chief Justice may direct a magistrate to perform special duties. The Act also allows for the appointment of supervising magistrates, but there is no provision for the appointment of assistant supervising magistrates in this substantive position. As I understand it, the Chief Magistrate, the Chief Justice and the Government believe there is a need for a supervising magistrate and an assistant supervising magistrate in the Adelaide Magistrates Court so that the existing workload and other administrative matters can be more equitably shared and the court run more efficiently.

The main point that I would like to make is that the Bill clearly suggests that this substantive appointment is to apply only to the Adelaide Magistrates Court, but the Bill itself is very broad. I ask the Minister to explain to the House why, in the second reading explanation, there is specific mention of the Adelaide Magistrates Court and not other courts where these positions may also be applicable. The Bill allows for the appointment of an assistant supervising magistrate. It will be a substantive appointment for which the Remuneration Tribunal will be requested to fix an appropriate level of salary. The amendment allows for the appointment of assistant supervising magistrates other than at the Adelaide Magistrates Court. As I mentioned, the Attorney-General and, in this case, the Minister, have indicated that it is not envisaged that any provision in the legislation would be invoked to make such an appointment in other courts at this stage.

Of course, there is a concern that, on the one hand, any substantive position will further increase the administration costs of the courts; on the other hand, if a magistrate is given additional responsibilities beyond those which one would ordinarily require of a magistrate, it is probably reasonable that he or she be appropriately remunerated. Therefore one cannot raise any significant argument against this proposal. If the Minister can explain satisfactorily the reason for the restriction to the Adelaide Magistrates Court, the Opposition is prepared to support the Bill.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I thank the honourable member for his indication of support on behalf of the Opposition. It is an administrative matter that will improve the ability of the Adelaide Magistrates Court, indeed our magistrates courts generally, to provide the services required by the community. It has been found, by means of a temporary arrangement, that the appointment of a supervising magistrate has provided a substantial fillip to the administrative processes of the courts. It is intended that those arrangements should continue. It was discovered that that could not be achieved on a permanent basis without amending the Magistrates Act.

The ultimate benefit that will flow to the administration of justice in this State will be the significant reduction in delays in matters coming on before that jurisdiction and that is in the interest of us all. So it is for the simple reason that administrative structures which have been established and have proven themselves on a trial basis to be successful that it is now sought to achieve that on a permanent basis by way of this appointment.

As the member for Bragg has indicated to the House, in due course this position will be referred to the Remuneration Tribunal for the establishment of an appropriate salary level and conditions of employment, it being a new position in the judicial hierarchy; and, of course, it will be the province of the Chief Justice to direct that person to perform certain duties within the administration of our magistrates courts.

I do not have an answer for the honourable member with respect to why it is not being done in the District Court. I can only suggest that the need for an appointment of this type to a single bench has not been evident. District Court work, of course, is predominantly in Adelaide, whereas the magistrates courts cover the whole of the State in terms of sittings, and certainly a much larger number of magistrates is involved. Therefore, in terms of administrative structure it is necessary in the magistrates courts to have a supervising magistrate with these functions, whereas that is not the case in the District Court.

The honourable member will recall that some years ago amendments to the legislation provided for the allocation of duties to District Court judges, and there is now much greater flexibility for the senior judge to allocate duties to judges in that jurisdiction. That has proved to be very beneficial in the District Court jurisdiction. Also, there have been changes in the jurisdictions of the District Court and magistrates courts in recent years, with consequential changes to the Supreme Court jurisdiction. We are now well served in the State, although we would all realise that our court lists have the potential to blow out from time to time. Certainly, the Supreme Court and District Court lists are regarded as being very short. Our concern has been the magistrates court level but, hopefully, this appointment and the passage of this legislation will help to remedy that situation. That is all I can add as to why this appointment has been restricted to the level of the magistrates courts.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I take the opportunity this afternoon to hail the establishment of South Australia's third university and to wish the university well. I have a special interest—as obviously we all do, but in my case a special personal interest—in the new university because one of the campuses of the South Australian College of Advanced Education which, with the institute, is to become part of the new university of South Australia, is in my electorate. I was certainly very angry and upset last year when the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide announced, apparently without consultation, that in subsuming the South Australian College, as the University of Adelaide at that stage hoped to do, it proposed to sell off the Magill campus. I am very pleased that that short-lived proposition has been put to rest.

I noted with some amazement that the new university rated only page 10 of this morning's *Advertiser*. I noted with pleasure that the new university was to receive a $28 million Federal boost. That was the headline. However, a detailed examination of the article indicated that that $28 million Federal boost in fact does not amount to very much when it is spread over three years and when $2.8 million of it only is provided as an establishment grant to the new university to meet merger costs.

The fact that the remaining $25 million will be provided between 1991 and 1993, when the whole budget is analysed, simply means that the Federal Government is not quite making up—in fact, substantially not making up—the funds that South Australian tertiary institutions have lost as a result of Minister Dawkins' holding the gun at the head of the institutions, saying, 'You will get no money until you amalgamate.' So, there is really nothing to rejoice about in the announcement of the $28 million, timely though it is on the eve of a Federal election.

However, as I said, my special personal interest comes from the fact that the Magill campus is in my electorate. It also comes from a brief but pleasant and somewhat frustrating, as well as rewarding, association with the Institute of Technology as a member of its Centenary Commission Ethics Committee in 1989, the centenary year of the institute.

I want to make some points about the proposed establishment of the university in terms of equity of the merging institutions. It seems to me to be immensely important to stress that there will be a new title for the institution which does not presume on the role or function of either of the existing institutions being pre-eminent in the role of the new university. The title, University of Technology of South Australia, has been suggested. I believe that it would be preferable to select a title which did not define a function to any greater degree than do the existing titles of the universities. The University of Adelaide and Flinders University have no specific role defined in their titles. The choice of the name 'Flinders' for South Australia's second university has, I believe, proved to be a wise one. The university has earned a well-deserved reputation and it has made the name of Flinders readily associated with, among other things, a very fine medical school, but the name 'Flinders' did not pre-empt anything.

Rather than choosing a name associated with the word 'technology', it would be preferable for the university, with the encouragement of the Minister, to select a name associated either with a pre-eminent South Australian or with someone very much bound up with our history. It would be worth considering the names of distinguished South Australian women when choosing a name for this university. In any event, a new title is important. Obviously, a new Act is essential because the two Acts establishing the existing institutions will have to be repealed.

A new mission statement is regarded by some associated with both institutions as important, and certainly the Act, in so far as it defines the goals of the new university, will in effect provide a mission statement. A new council is obviously required, and one presumes that a newly appointed chief executive officer, who will have the title of Vice-Chancellor, will be inevitable, and that that position will be called. I note from this morning's paper that Dr Robert Segall is resigning as Principal of the South Australian college. The present head of the institute presumably is not resigning. In any event, it is imperative in respect of equity that a new position be created and advertised, that applicants be sought, and that there be no assumption on anyone's part that anyone who holds an existing position will automatically hold it in the new institution.

In making reference to the desirability of choosing a name that does not identify any function, I point out that the South Australian College of Advanced Education and its functions do not necessarily sit easily with the word 'technology'. In 1990 the Magill campus of the South Australian college in my electorate has 2 500 equivalent full-time students, with over 300 academic and general staff of one kind or another. It has a number of schools, including a School of Business Studies and a School of Journalism, which provides a Bachelor of Communication award and will soon be moving to a Masters degree level. This School of Journalism is among the finest, if not the finest, in Australia, and certainly could not be classified as awarding a technological degree.

Magill also has a School of Cultural Studies covering areas such as arts, drama, history, Australian studies, languages, music and literary studies. It has a School of Human and Environmental Studies; a School of Learning and Teaching Studies; and the De Lissa Institute of Early Childhood and Family Studies, and I will be watching very carefully indeed to make sure that the role and function of that institute is preserved, protected and, if possible, enhanced in the new university.

It also has a School of Studies in Education. The other campuses that will become part of the new institute, namely, Underdale and Salisbury, also provide schools that are not necessarily related to technology. All nurse education in this State (whilst having some technological nature, although not being predominantly technological) will be provided by the new institution, other than that which is provided by Sturt College, which is to amalgamate with Flinders University. Underdale, of course, has a well-known School of Art as well as of nursing. It provides physical education teachers as well as a School of Industrial Design and Interior Design, together with the fine art and commercial art areas embodied in its School of Art. The Salisbury college has a School of Nursing, a School of General Teacher Training and a School of Communication.

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

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I should like to refer briefly to a successful pilot program that began almost two years ago in Port Augusta, a program to counteract the high incidence of deaths from cervical cancer in the Spencer Gulf region and as far away as Port Lincoln. The incidence of death was much higher than the national average, whereas the number of cases reported was about the same, and it was obvious from this that a large number of women in the northern and western parts of the State were not attending for screening tests until it was too late.

I must point out that, if regular screenings are carried out, the risks of cervical cancer death are minimal, since there is a very good success rate with treatment. That, really,

is the sad irony: had there been more education and encouragement for women to attend for screenings, that number of deaths need not have occurred.

One of the great difficulties that had to be faced and overcome was the provision of services for outback women, particularly Aboriginal women, ethnic women and, perhaps, older women. There was a very good response from doctors, who participated by promoting the Pap smears to their clients and encouraging them to have regular follow-up smears, which is a vital part of the process of screening. For women who were reluctant to attend the local doctors there was an alternative: a registered nurse under the supervision of a woman doctor was available from a number of areas—the Pika Wiya Health Service premises, the Child, Adolescent and Family Health Service (CAFHS) clinic and the Port Augusta Hospital outpatients clinic. Part of that service was a postal reminder to women who had normal results as to when their next smear was due to be carried out.

The initial results of the program as assessed show that, whilst there was a very good response in some age groups, there was only minimal response in others. There was a concerted effort to do additional work to encourage those other age groups to participate, particularly the ethnic and Aboriginal women who were, unfortunately, still not presenting for testing. This was all in the Port Augusta area, I might add, which was the first area in the pilot project. There has been a real degree of success in the promotional and educational programs that were adopted, and all of those involved in the program, particularly Maree Keogh (the Program Director), must be congratulated on the work that has been done and the significant achievements in terms of women in rural areas. After 12 months the scheme started in Whyalla, and there was a quite different approach in a number of respects in comparison with the Port Augusta project.

First, there was a community education and promotion program where nurses went out into the community to talk to women and encourage them to present for screening, and to go first to their general practitioners. In the second stage, a very interesting strategy was adopted whereby six of the Whyalla general practitioners actually had the nurses working in their surgeries to conduct the screenings. I believe that that is really something quite different that has not been done before anywhere else, so all of those involved must be congratulated on what has been achieved.

Whyalla also has an ethnic project officer who goes into the community to talk to ethnic groups or to women in their homes or wherever it is necessary for that officer to go to explain, promote and encourage the women to present for screenings. It is always a great difficulty for women from different backgrounds to cope with these sorts of things. They sometimes find it very hard to talk to male doctors, and it is easier for them to relate to a woman. So, that has been a very good part of this project which has allowed them some alternatives. The program in Whyalla is definitely alive and well and having a positive impact.

The Port Pirie project has been going for about six months with a three-pronged attack. The first part of the project started in surgeries, again, with general practitioners, and consisted of seminars, promotions and other strategies in which the doctors participated, and who were very helpful. The second stage was community education and promotion. There was a very public campaign in Port Pirie, with the local radio stations, television and community groups being encouraged to participate. The third stage, which began only recently offered an additional service with nurses being stationed at centres in strategic parts of the city. It was much easier for those women who were reluctant to present to their medical practitioners to go to those centres and have the screenings done there. In that part of the program there has been overwhelming support in Port Pirie, and my latest information indicates that the promoters of the project have been extremely gratified at the response they have had.

I am optimistic that, as a result of the joint Federal and State Government funding which resulted in this pilot program being set up, there will be a marked decrease in the number of cervical cancer deaths in the north and west of the State. Surveys showed that a fairly large proportion of women were unaware of the dangers inherent in not presenting for regular screenings, thus there is an educating role for the people involved. That is why such a lot of emphasis was placed on education and promotion—and with very good results. Many of those women felt that it simply was not necessary to present for screenings, and that is probably one of the reasons for the high mortality rates.

The amount of information presented through various media has, I feel sure, been able to correct many of these wrong assumptions. The Pap smear test has been available in South Australia, I believe, for 20 to 30 years, but it is believed that only 47 per cent of 20-year-old to 69-year-old women are screened during a three-year period. It is therefore encouraging that, as a result of the Spencer Gulf pilot project, data shows us that, for the three-year period to October 1989, 71 per cent of women aged 20 to 69 years were screened.

This is a substantial increase and attests to the initial success of this program. I believe that, because of the vital importance to women in country and rural areas—the ones shown in the national survey to be most at risk—this has been a great success as a pilot project. It is the reason why I will be following up with the Minister to ensure that the funding is continued for such a successful project. It has ramifications also for mammography screening in country areas, and that is another area that will, I believe, receive funding from the Federal Government, funding which is essential to assist women in rural areas to make sure that they look after their health. Preventive health measures are always extremely important for people in outback areas who do not have ready access to general practitioners and specialist services.

I should like to cite a draft interim report in regard to the 71% of women who were screened, as follows:

> While these figures were only approximations they indicated a much higher level of screening than was evident prior to the promotional program. The greatest remaining deficiencies in screening coverage appear to relate to older women. Among women who have not had a hysterectomy, it is estimated that about one in three in the 50-59-year-old age range and one in two 60-69-year-olds would not have received a cervical screen in the three years to October 1989.
>
> Aboriginal women and women who have had a hysterectomy are less likely than other women to have a positive screening history after adjusting for age. However, since commencement of the promotion, evaluation of screening activity among Aboriginal women in one major town indicated that these women had participated in the screening program in numbers equivalent to their proportion in the community. It is likely therefore that deficiencies in screening among Aboriginal women would have been reduced.

That has to be a very positive step for Port Augusta, which I represent, where there is a very high percentage of Aboriginal women. The report continues:

> A pluralistic approach to service provision appears to have been beneficial. In one major town where this was studied, 82 per cent of screens were performed by medical practitioners—the great majority in private practice—and 18 per cent by nurses. Substantial contributions were made by a special screening clinic in reaching older women and those with a self-reported history of little screening, whereas a community health centre made a disproportionate contribution to screening Aboriginal women.

That shows the various methods used.

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): This evening I wish to speak to the House on the concept of emu farming in this State. Emu farming is very much in its infancy in Australia generally. However, Western Australia has beaten South Australia to the gun by several years. It is high time we took stock of the situation and made sure that we get in on the act as soon as possible so that at least our agricultural community can benefit as a result.

Emu farming officially commenced in Western Australia in 1987, when the Government decided to allow the collection of some birds. In fact, I think there were about 500 at that stage. It appears that that figure will reach about 10 000 by 1991.

An honourable member: Whereabouts?

Mr MEIER: In various sections of Western Australia, but I do not intend to identify the specific areas at this stage. We need to consider a few things in relation to emu farming. Apart from its commercial viability, with which I will deal a little later, the emu is a particularly good unit in its suitability for large-scale farming. It has evolved as an animal that feeds on high quality food and grows and develops quickly to maturity. On the basis of proportion of breeding stock needed to produce a unit increment, emus are better than farm animals, for example, sheep. (These are not my words: they are from a paper identifying industry benefits of emu farming.) In free range breeding, emus have no difficulty in raising five to seven chicks from a nest.

Allowing for the need to keep the male and female birds, and discounting the need to keep (in the case of sheep) rams—one ram can serve 40-plus ewes—emus are still more productive than sheep in number proportion. So, from that point of view, they are very good value for money. It is interesting to note that the Australian Trade Commission, in July 1987, did a full export market assessment for emu products. This comprehensive report stated that an emu industry could be sustained based on leather and skins alone, and 'other products would be an added advantage'. I will deal with the other products a little later. The benefits of an emu farming industry would include income diversification for existing primary producers, development of new processing and support industries, generation of export income and the possible creating of further tourist attractions and souvenir trade.

I will take up those points in turn. First, I refer to income diversification. I think we would all be aware of how much of the agricultural sector of this State has experienced hard times during the past few years. It was very heartening that in the past year things made a turn for the better in most areas of this State; there were very few areas that missed out. Emu farming could well provide another economic pursuit in many areas of the State. It is interesting, in the case of the emu, that land that is basically unproductive for stocking or cropping can be utilised and, as the emu is ideally suited and adapted to the Australian environment, no flora ecological damage is sustained. When our environment is all important, as I think that all people from all walks of life recognise, it is important to note that the damage that emus do to flora is minimal.

I had the privilege of looking at a video tape provided by a gentleman who is interested in getting into emu farming. The video, which ran for over two hours, showed very clearly the minimal effect that emus have on the land. Therefore, we have income diversification with an animal that does not cause unneccessary damage to the land. Of course, with proper management, other animals would not cause undue damage, anyway.

Secondly, I refer to new industries. For many years both State and Federal Governments have encouraged development of new industries, as they offer job opportunities. Here again, the development of emu farming and emu products can only assist in both primary industry and in new secondary industries. Indeed, with the balance of payments figure that we have at this time, we should look at this matter seriously. Export income is the third key point. There appears to be a great potential for export income. The fourth key area is tourism. We well know that South Australia has encouraged more tourism and that we have been making some progress. However, a lot more progress needs to be made. From the experiments conducted in Western Australia, it appears that emu farms are a great tourist attraction, and they are certainly being developed more and more in this particular way.

In fact, it was interesting to see an article in a Western Australian newspaper indicating that emus on a particular farm were all very friendly towards humans. One male nearly lost his wallet—the emu apparently was able to grab the wallet and almost took it away. Members opposite can smile if they wish, but we are losing out on a very important industry and the sooner we get in on it the better it will be for this State.

In relation to the specifics of the marketing of products, it is estimated that there is a market for over 100 000 skins per annum. In itself, that gives some idea of the scope just in terms of skins alone. The skins are used primarily for leather for women's garments, and the leg leather is used for ornaments. The meat has been tried by many people, and a chef at the Kwinana Motor Inn is reported in an article as saying that he was mightily impressed with the emu meat he was given to cook for the emu industry field day held in the area at that time.

The chef, Mr Barry Bedford said that the meat had a 'bright future'. He indicated that he would be blending it with quite a few sauces normally used with beef, pork and lamb. He saw emu meat as being served up quite well as steaks, mince and kebabs. Therefore, the meat apparently has a great future as well. Emu oil is another item that can be used. Apparently, it is very good in cosmetic creams as a moisturiser. Research also indicates that the oil could be helpful in treating arthritis. However, I will not make any unfounded claims in that area. It is interesting to note that the going price for a litre of emu oil is about $75, but it is believed that once production is fully under way that price could drop to nearer $40.

There is also a significant demand for emu eggs. Carved eggs, properly done, can bring up to $600 each, which would mean a great attraction for the home industry sector. The feathers are also used for craft work. At present, people cannot meet the demand for feathers.

We need to look at this industry much more. It is a tragedy that apparently in one national park 100 emus are slaughtered annually because the numbers have to be kept down. I ask the Minister of Agriculture and possibly the Minister overseeing national parks and wildlife to get their act together quick smart and not allow Western Australia to get way ahead of us. We have time to get emu farming started in South Australia now. There are farmers who are interested and ready to commence immediately. The sooner legislation comes in to allow the slaughtering of emus, the better.

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

Motion carried.

At 6.1 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 1 March at 11 a.m.