HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 6 December 1990

The SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson) took the Chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1985. Read a first time.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In so moving, I realise that the time for private members' business is limited and that we are coming to the end of the session. There is a lot on the notice paper, so I will not say all that I had intended to say on this subject. First, I know that the practice of tail docking has taken place since the fifteenth century and no doubt many dog breeders believe that it is an important part of the process of showing dogs. However, other breeders take the view that there is no need to continue the practice. In saying that, I will refer to one or two articles that have come to my attention both before and since I made public my intentions. A letter appeared in the Veterinary Associations' publication earlier this year, written by Mr Chris Andrews from Victoria, and I will read part of it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. The House is being highly discourteous to the honourable member. It is private members' time and everyone is chatting in groups. I ask all members to show respect to the member who has the floor. The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr S.G. EVANS: The letter states:

> The Kennel Control Council in January 1990 released a new code of practice for the tail-docking of puppies. In this new code tail-docking of puppies is optional. The decision not to dock 'will not disqualify a dog from exhibition', and judges are advised that they 'shall judge all dogs presented on their merits, regardless of being docked or undocked'.

That is a very important move for the Kennel Control Council to make; it is a half way house. Chris Andrews went on to say:

> First, a large number of puppies already are routinely docked by the breeder. The profession docks only a proportion of the total. The aim is to have the profession's contribution fall to zero. From here, it is a short step to having routine docking of pups declared illegal... The KCC has taken a big step in the right direction. Now that docking is optional, breeders can no longer say that if the puppies aren't docked they won't be able to sell them. And more breeders are deciding to leave tails on these days.
>
> And what of the veterinary profession? In terms of animal welfare, the profession has yet to enter the twentieth century when it comes to tail-docking.
>
> Why? Because of the gulf that exists between the policy-making arm of the AVA and the rest of the profession. AVA policy in Victoria is right on target. Tail-docking is unnecessary and barbaric, and the profession should have nothing to do with it.
>
> How to achieve this end? It's time that the AVA sent a strong message to its members urging those who still tail-dock to cease forthwith, to put aside thoughts of professional jealousy, to ignore, for once, the financial factor, and to think of the puppies. State Governments should continue to be lobbied, in view of the new KCC ruling on docking, with a view to having docking declared an illegal act under the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act.

I refer also to a letter I received on 27 September from the RSPCA, thanking me for my letter informing the society of my intentions. The letter states:

> The society's opinion of the practice is that it is an unnecessary cosmetic mutilation of an animal, bearing a degree of pain, and risk to its well being. As such the practice should be banned. Enclosed is a copy of the *RSPCA Journal* Spring 1990, which considers the matter in greater detail. The society would wish to commend the intent of your Bill thoroughly, but we have some difficulty with it procedurally. The society's view is that the ban should be achieved by a change to the regulations to the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, appropriately under section 6, rather than to open the principal Act to amendment, thereby endangering other valuable provisions, the loss or variation of which could reduce the Act's effectiveness. A further difficulty is seen in the ability to police the proposed Bill. Ideally, the ban should be imposed throughout the Commonwealth or, at least, South Australia and the Eastern States.

I do not necessarily disagree with the content of that letter. I am well aware that this Bill will not pass Parliament in this session. Indeed, even if it gets to a vote, it will be voted out. The Hon. Jack Jennings fought to have gin traps banned in the urban part of Adelaide and other municipalities, and it took him eight years to achieve that. Like him, I am prepared to keep fighting this cause in that vein, because I know that it will eventually come about.

The RSPCA's letter agrees with the principle but the society feels that it should be done by regulation, and it should not take place until at least the Eastern States take the same action. For that reason, and although my Bill does not carry that clause at the moment, if it gets through the second reading, I am prepared to amend it so that, if we vote for it here, it will not apply until at least two of the Eastern States have passed the same provisions. That is in fairness to the Canine Association and people who show dogs. It also respects the views of the RSPCA, in which I have a lot of faith. Because of the time factor, I will not read from the society's journal, and I have distributed copies of it to all members.

I will refer briefly to an article in a boy scouts' publication called *Scouting for Boys* (1930 edition), under the heading 'Woodcraft', as follows:

> And when you harness a horse, I hope you will show more knowledge of the animal and more kindness towards him than do half the carriage coachmen in London—by not putting bearing-reins on him.

Those reins create pain for an animal if they are used in extreme circumstances. The article continues:

> HRH the Prince of Wales is reported to have said, 'When I am king, I shall make three laws'.

I will refer to two of them, as follows:

> 1. That no-one shall cut puppies' tails, because it must hurt them so...
>
> 3. That nobody shall use bearing-reins, because they hurt the horses.
>
> These laws not only show us that King Edward VIII will be a kind and humane monarch, but that he is far-seeing, for the last one, at any rate, might well be a law of the country now. It is much needed.

That boy scouts' publication went on to point out to the lads that the dog is a great companion, with or without a tail, and that there is no need to take the tail off as a cosmetic operation. Because I have received the vibes and know that the Bill will not pass, I do not wish to use up the time of the House by doing other than referring to the Bill itself. The Bill is a proposition to amend the Act so that it would be illegal to dock dogs' tails except in the case of a mutilation or for health and hygiene reasons. Provision was made for regulations to exempt certain breeds that would fall into a category of needing to be exempted because of health or hygiene reasons.

As an example, I point to the Old English Sheepdog, which could be exempted on the basis of health and hygiene for the same reason as we might dock the tails of sheep in the rural sector; it is important for health and hygiene reasons. Most of the letters I have received on this subject were from people who were breeders of dogs in that or

similar categories. I knew of that before I introduced the Bill, which is why I included that provision.

Mr Venning: What about horses?

Mr S.G. EVANS: The comment from the member for Custance suggests that perhaps he should move a Bill in that direction himself. He might find that it also gets short shrift—shorter shrift than this will get. I support in the strongest possible terms the proposition that I put to the House.

I did not appreciate the blackmail that was implied in the Canine Association's journal in relation to veterinary surgeons, nor, I believe, would any other member of Parliament. We should say to the Canine Association that there is a better way to approach the situation than that used in the journal, where the association indicated that it would write to each and every member of the veterinary profession and, if they indicated that they supported my proposition—a proposition many people in the community support—breeders should ban those veterinary surgeons, and their names would be published.

That is a horrendous proposition. I note also that many of the breeders do their own work, anyway, and try to avoid the vet, for financial reasons perhaps; some of them perhaps carry out acts that are more cruel, under worse conditions, than they should, and put the health of the dogs or other animals at risk, as a result of their trying to avoid veterinary surgeons.

That is something the House may like to consider later, since the Canine Association makes such threats. I am appreciative of those members of that association who contacted me (for and against), particularly those who said that they disagreed with the association's point of view and indeed were distressed by the association's method of attack.

It is interesting that there were no letters to the newspapers on the subject. The Canine Association made sure that its members did not do that, because that would stir up feelings in the community in relation to the pain and suffering animals go through. I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr QUIRKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

FREE STUDENT TRAVEL

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That this House calls on the Government to restrict the hours of student free STA travel to those hours which cover legitimate school activities of an educational, sporting and cultural nature.

I decided to move this motion, which has been standing in my name for some time now. In doing so, I am mindful that the Government in Cabinet on Monday last made some alterations to the scheme to the extent that these young people will no longer be able to have free use of STA services during the evening. I think I can speak on behalf of many South Australians in saying that we are pleased that this has happened.

There is no doubt that over the past 12 months, since the last election campaign, certainly since the dying hours of that campaign when the Labor Party knew that it was going to lose and it put together a couple of schemes, this being one of them and the low interest home loan package being another, it has been recognised that those schemes were ill-conceived and not thought through properly at the time. None of the ALP advisers at the time foresaw that we would create a highly mobile group of youngsters who would use free STA travel all over Adelaide and cause difficulties, particularly along the western seaboard.

If we talk to the police and bus and tram operators, we find there is little doubt that highly mobile youngsters travel all over town, in many cases with their parents having no idea where they are. For the Government to prohibit free travel in the hours of darkness is a move about which we are pleased and for which we thank the Government. We are pleased that the Government has seen the error of its ways.

However, I believe that the Government's action has not gone quite far enough. My motion requires that free travel should be restricted to legitimate school activities only, and school holidays do not fall into that area. However, I am willing to look at the operation of the scheme during the school holiday period. It is important that we keep a close watch on what will happen in the school holidays and then make a final decision in February in this place next year.

Members will be aware that over the past three or four years there has been a slow decline in the number of children going before the Children's Court and children's aid panels in respect of vandalism. However, over the past 12 months there has been a 50 per cent increase in the number of children going before aid panels and the Children's Court. My reference is the reports of both those authorities this year. Academics could argue about why there is a 50 per cent blip in the graph, which had been slowly declining over the past four years, but the experts who have spoken to me attribute some of that blip to the high mobility that we created through the STA passes being available.

I am pleased to note that the Government has restricted free travel to daylight hours, although 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. might have been more realistic in the case of children who have to travel home after playing sport; they would have an extra hour to get home, rather than complying with the 6 o'clock deadline, but the Government has made a decision and I will not argue about that.

As I know that other members would like to look at the situation over the school holidays, make an assessment and reconsider the matter in February, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

DRINKING AGE

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I move:

That in the opinion of this House the minimum age for the consumption of alcohol on licensed premises and in a public place should be increased to 21 years.

In moving this motion at such a late stage in private members' business, I know that we are unlikely to debate the matter fully or to obtain a conclusive or satisfactory decision on the motion, but at least the matter will be aired and there will be an opportunity for us as a Parliament to start thinking about the drinking age. When the Hall Government moved to reduce the drinking age from 21 to 18 years in 1969 the provision had a taxing measure attached to it. I opposed it in the strongest terms. All my life I have been and even now I am still president of many youth organisations and sporting clubs, or involved as a participant either socially or competitively. I have no doubt that the concerns I expressed in 1969 have been realised.

At the time my own Party, my Leader and the then Attorney-General (Hon. Robin Millhouse), now Justice Millhouse (and I would like to ascertain his current views on the issue), all suggested that I was a fool to think that people aged 18 years could not handle alcohol and the other responsibilities associated with it, and that there would be people under 18 years of age drinking in licensed premises.

I forced my Party to split the Bill into two—a taxing measure and a social conscience measure. The then Attorney-General told me that I could not do it but as a new

member of Parliament, having been here approximately 12 months, I was grateful to the Clerk of the House at the time who advised me that it had been done before in the 1930s. If my Party had not agreed to split the Bill, the Government would have fallen, because I would not have supported the original measure. The Party numbers were 19 all with a so-called Independent, like yourself, Sir. I was strong in that conviction.

Eventually the Bill came before the Parliament and, with the support of others, I amended it and we won by one vote to make the minimum age for drinking alcohol in licensed premises 20 years. I believe that that was a compromise position. I was told then by those who had a better education than I, and who claimed that they knew more about the world than I, that people were more mature those days because they had received a better education. I argued that if one of a set of twins chose to leave school at 15 and the other chose to attend university and graduate at age 21 or 22, if they both took a responsible approach to life, the 15 year old would be just as worldly, knowledgeable and mature, if not more so, than the one who went on to undertake further studies. I still believe that. At the time I said that, if the age was reduced to 18, a male who entered a hotel would almost invariably be accompanied by a female two years younger; and, if the male was 17, the female companion would be 15, and so on, and that has been the case.

At the same time we extended the hours of trading from 10 p.m. until 5 a.m., for discos and nightclubs to operate, and we wonder why we have trouble with some young people. Admittedly, it is a minority involved, but it is a minority that causes problems. As time will not permit, I will not be able to use all the information I intended to use but at a later date I will show that there is a concern in our community about under age drinking. Parliament and previous Governments have refused to accept my argument that the law did not stop people under the age of 18 from drinking in a public place, and that they could do it openly. I was told by the Minister of Education that my philosophy would not work. I was told by the Attorney-General in the other place, by way of a response in the press, that it would not work. I was told by others that the law already covered this situation, but eventually the Government took the hint and amended the law to make it illegal for young people under 18 years of age to drink in a public place or licensed premises.

If the age limit reverted to 21 years, there would still be people aged 19 or 20 sneaking into hotels, but at least we would cut out those 14 and 15 year olds who currently do so. We would be giving young people the opportunity to socialise without alcohol. That is the current problem, that they cannot have a party without alcohol, either with or without parental consent. If one parent consents, quite often other parents do not know until it is too late that their own young people have been involved in that practice.

There is no doubt that lives lost on the road, and some of the suicides occurring (four times as many males as females are committing suicide), are associated with drugs, and alcohol is one of the major drugs. I ask members to think about how young people will learn to socialise if alcohol has to be the basis of their socialising from the time they are 14 or 15 years of age. I drink some alcohol, although not a lot. I am not saying that we should be wowsers and ban it. If parents want to give it to their children, that is their decision. Do not let anyone use the argument about Russia, France or Italy where this has been the practice for centuries. They have now learnt their lesson. People drank wines that were not fortified. Those people worked hard physically, many as peasant farmers; their bodies developed more tolerance and they never became alcoholics. The fact that nearly 12 million French people are considered to be alcoholics, and that Russia is in a similar category proportionately, demonstrates that this is a problem, causing not only loss of production and rising costs in industry but, more particularly, hospitalisation.

The death of young people is a responsibility that should be taken up by this Parliament. I reluctantly seek leave at this stage to conclude my remarks later. I know that the debate will not be completed this session and that it will be continued next session. I seek leave to continue my remarks so that I may be able to discuss this subject further at a later date.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PRAWN COLOURING

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I move:

That the regulations under the Food Act 1985 relating to prawn colouring, made on 20 September and laid on the table of this House on 10 October 1990, be disallowed.

I move this motion with some reluctance, as a member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, because this issue has been canvassed at great length before that committee, and unfortunately I was unable to persuade my colleagues to share my view. However, the committee was taking a somewhat limited view of the topic, because it does not normally choose to intervene entirely on matters of policy, but rather limits itself to issues relating strictly to the consideration of subordinate legislation. In that respect the committee has probably not considered, quite properly, all the issues which may be canvassed in a debate in this place instead.

Much evidence was taken by the committee on this matter, and of course that is available to all members to consult. I believe that the witnesses who appeared before the committee all held genuine and sincere views and all presented their case very well. In particular, the Health Commission officials who attended were able to present very clear and cogent views and to explain their viewpoint that this colouring additive would not of itself warrant intervention in that. While some reported problems had been experienced with some individuals, the quantities of the colouring agent to be found in prawns were not such, when taken across the board, as to constitute a health risk, and that individual colouring agents should not be taken in isolation. That is a perfectly reasonable point of view, but I stress that these agents must be looked at individually when individual regulations come before the House. We have no alternative but to deal with them in this way, and I think a very important matter of principle is involved as well. I will go on to detail that shortly.

The representatives of the prawn fishermen put to the committee a powerful economic case, and I think that that must be taken into account when deciding this matter. They put the viewpoint that the interstate market, particularly that in Melbourne and Sydney, has a very strong preference for prawns of a particular colour, and that that coloured prawn does not happen to be available in great numbers from South Australian waters; therefore, our fishermen were at a disadvantage when marketing their product interstate. That may be so, but I ask the House to keep in mind that, as was presented in evidence to the committee by all parties concerned, the sale of prawns on the interstate market with the addition of tartrazine dye is illegal in those States. There is no way that prawns, with the addition of the compound

proposed by these regulations, may lawfully be sold interstate.

If the whole purpose of this exercise is to provide an economic and a legal basis for our prawns to be exported interstate, that cannot be achieved by this measure, because at this time that dye is an illegal substance in prawns on the interstate market. Therefore, the regulation cannot possibly achieve the desired effect. I do not believe that this State should be a party to assisting in a process whereby the reasonable and lawful regulations of other States in Australia can be circumvented in a way that we clearly know will occur if these prawns are exported.

We have also received evidence that the South Australian consuming public does not exhibit the same consumer preferences as its interstate counterparts. South Australian consumers have no such preference for prawns with that dye added. In fact, there will be very little, if any, economic advantage as a result of the addition of this dye on the South Australian market.

Therefore, we are faced with a logical conundrum that the prawns so coloured will be illegal interstate and there is no requirement for them in this State, even though they are now legal. I am therefore forced to ask what is the purpose of adding a colouring agent that serves no scientific or technological purpose—that was admitted by all concerned—which serves a cosmetic purpose, but one which is not required in this State by our consumers and which is illegal interstate and, therefore, can have no possible benefit either. We now find ourselves in the situation of authorising the addition to a primary foodstuff of a man-made chemical for which there is no lawful, economic or cosmetic purpose at all.

This is the very point that I wish to make. It is true that to isolate this dye as an individual chemical is irrational: certainly the Health Commission makes that point strongly, and I agree with it. There is no point in taking this one dye in isolation: its effects alone are not sufficiently adverse to warrant it being singled out for special regulatory prohibition.

However, we remain with the point that we are now authorising the addition of this chemical substance, which certainly can cause harm and which sets us down a track of adding substances to—adulterating—our primary foodstuffs for no lawful or economic purpose or no lawful technological and scientific purpose and, certainly, for no logical or lawful consumer purpose. For all of those reasons, I believe that we should set the example to our primary producers and to our Health Commission officials and disallow these regulations so that they will receive very strongly a message that this Parliament is not in favour of adulteration of primary foodstuffs unless some clear benefit can be shown to accrue from that.

If in the future it is decided nationally that the substance may be added lawfully to prawns throughout the country, it would be quite reasonable for us at that point to reconsider the addition of this substance to our prawns in order to make them more acceptable on the interstate market. While the substance remains illegal on the interstate market, there can be no rational purpose in our authorising it. The matter must be considered on a national basis and for us to attempt to use this as a lever I believe is quite wrong. I do not seek to single out this substance for any strict medical purpose, although I believe there are significant and quite justifiable concerns, not only here but internationally, about the medical effects of this substance. However, that is not the sole reason that I address this issue today. Rather, I think the whole issue must be taken in its totality, considered in context and, when people do consider the implications of the whole matter, I think it is quite clear that these regulations should be disallowed to ensure that the message goes very clearly out to the community that this is not what we are about.

If at some point in the future national consensus is reached on this issue, it would be entirely appropriate, for economic and consumer reasons, to consider the matter, not necessarily to approve it but certainly to reconsider it. However, while it remains illegal, this is indeed a foolish path for us to follow and, indeed, one that is in bad faith with those interstate authorities and Parliaments of this country that are attempting to protect consumers from the addition of adulterating chemical substances. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

DYING WITH DIGNITY

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Before I move my motion, I seek leave to amend it by leaving out the word 'joint' from the first line.

Leave granted.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Accordingly, I move:

That a select committee be established to examine:

(a) the extent to which both the health services and the present law provide adequate options for dying with dignity;

(b) whether there is sufficient public and professional awareness of existing law and, if not, what measures should be taken to overcome any deficiency; and

(c) to what extent, if any, community attitudes towards death and dying may be changing and to what extent, if any, the law relating to dying needs to be clarified or amended.

The law covering death and dying in South Australia is embodied in two statutes: the 1983 Natural Death Act and section 13a of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, and also the common law. The 1983 Death Act provides for and gives legal effect to directions against artificial prolongation of the dying process. It enables a person of sound mind and over the age of 18 years to sign a notice of direction that he or she does not wish extraordinary measures to prolong life if remission or recovery is impossible. Under that Act there is no provision for an agent to act on behalf of a patient. Section 13a of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act makes it an offence to aid or abet suicide. Suicide, as an offence, was abolished in 1983.

I want to make it clear at the outset that I believe that, if any legislative reforms result from the recommendations of this committee—if it is to be established—they will be reforms of a minor nature designed to clarify the position for both patients and health professionals. I refer to the Parliamentary committee established by the Parliament of Victoria, which took that step earlier this year and also in 1988, and to a discussion paper circulated by the New South Wales Government, which did so on advice from the Crown Solicitor. That discussion paper clearly indicated that there was a problem with existing laws dealing with health professionals who mark a patient's record chart 'not for resuscitation'. The Crown Law advice to the New South Wales Government said that such action by a doctor or other health worker could be interpreted as negligence. Both the New South Wales Government and the Victorian Parliament outlawed any suggestion of voluntary euthanasia.

The background to this resolution lies to a large extent in demography and medical technology. There has been a substantial increase in the number of aged people in our community. To demonstrate the extent to which the number

of aging people is increasing, I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* a table of the demographic indicators for South Australia from 1980 to 2000, demonstrating that the number of deaths of South Australians aged 65 or over was 6 559 in 1980, while in 1990 the figure was 8 640 and the forecast is considerably higher for the year 2000. The information in the table is purely statistical.

Leave granted.

DEMOGRAPHIC INDICATORS, SOUTH AUSTRALIA, 1980-2000

	1980	1990	2000 (proj.)
Total South Australian Population (persons)	1 309 000	1 439 000	1 582 000
Median age, South Australian population	30.0 years	32.9 yrs *(a)*	36.7 years
% of South Australian population aged			
65 or over	10.3	12.6	13.8
75 or over	3.6	5.1	6.4
85 or over	n.a.	1.0	1.5
% of age group who are women			
65 or over	58.1%	57.6%	58.2%
75 or over	64.7%	63.0%	63.0%
85 or over	n.a.	72.4%	n.a.
Further life expectancy *(c)* at age			
65—women	17.9 years	18.7 years	n.a.
65—men	13.7 years	14.7 years	n.a.
75—women	10.9 years	11.4 years	n.a.
75—men	8.3 years	8.8 years	n.a.
85—women	5.6 years	5.9 years	n.a.
85—men	4.7 years	4.8 years	n.a.
Deaths of South Australians of all ages	9 580	11 348 *(b)*	13 236
Deaths of South Australians aged 65 or over	6 559	8 640 *(b)*	n.a.

n.a. Not available.
(a) Projections are the median series from Department of Environment and Planning for 2000 where available or 2001 if not.
(b) 1989 figures.
(c) Life expectancy figures relate to Australia as a whole.

Source: ABS 3101.0 Australian Demographic Statistics.
3201.0 Estimated Resident Population by sex and age: States and Territories of Australia.
3302.0 Deaths, Australia.
3303.0 Causes of Death, Australia.
3306.4 Causes of Death, South Australia.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: In view of the increasing ability of medicine to prolong life and in view of greater longevity through higher standards of living, it is inevitable that more and more people are becoming justifiably anxious about the prospect of dying slowly, painfully or both. Through family and close friends, more and more people are being touched by this situation and are becoming aware that each one of them—of us—could be faced with the same problem.

I propose now to address specifically the terms of the motion. Paragraph *(a)* concerns the extent to which both the health services and the present law provide adequate options for dying with dignity. Parliament must be made aware that South Australia is ahead of Australia in the provision of palliative or hospice care. The services in our State are regarded as models by other States and the structure which has been established to serve the metropolitan area and country areas is also regarded as a model.

In general, hospice services are based on the provision of 50 beds per million population. Hospice services in Adelaide are based on the northern, southern, eastern and western regions of the city. Each is based on a teaching hospital, on a hospice for the dying and on an outreach service. It is good to be able to report that many country centres have some form of hospice service, but the demand has been enormous and is growing. In the southern metropolitan area alone, the number of referrals has doubled in the past three years, and I have no reason to believe that the situation is different in any of the other regions.

Another important point to bear in mind is that the focus of these hospice services is on treating terminal cancer. The needs of non-cancer patients, stroke patients, and patients with dementia are simply not being addressed. It is important also to recognise that the Commonwealth Government's emphasis on community care places very little emphasis on the important medical needs of dying patients. That aspect should be addressed by the select committee, because it influences public health policy, and will continue to influence public health policy well into the twenty-first century.

The second term of reference asks whether there is sufficient public and professional awareness of existing law, and I believe that an amendment may be moved to incorporate existing practice. If that is not the case, the reference asks what measures should be taken to overcome any deficiency. Health professionals are in general agreement that there is a widespread lack of awareness, even among doctors and nurses, of the provisions of the Natural Death Act. There is no legal obligation on health professionals to inform patients of their rights or of the provisions of the Act, and there is no means at present of ensuring a general high level of public awareness of patient rights in this regard.

Some hospitals give an outline of patient rights upon admission, many do not. In direct treatment, there is no recognised procedure for outlining rights, either at the initiation or at various stages of continuation of treatment. I stress that, there is a contrasting policy in palliative care units, and staff in those units go to extreme pains to make patients aware of their right to refuse treatment. If this committee is established, as I believe it will be, I regard it as essential that there should be a properly funded and scientifically credible evaluation of the operation of and attitude to the Natural Death Act.

I will indicate just one example, one of hundreds, regarding the operation of this Act. It concerns the very sad and tragic case of an elderly frail woman who had signed a certificate under the Natural Death Act stating that she did not wish to be resuscitated in case of heart failure or any other serious failure of bodily function. She was admitted to hospital as a result of a heart attack. She was resuscitated and has lived for the past several years in a vegetative state, to the heartbreak of her family and friends. All this possibly could have been avoided if her legally expressed wishes had been recognised in procedures that gave them the maximum possible chance of being put into effect. As I said, that is but one of many examples which I could give.

In addressing this term of reference, I stress that I recognise fully the limitations of the law in any discussion on ethical matters. There is no doubt that there is a perceived increase in awareness of ethical issues, not only in South Australian society but nationally and on an international basis. The World Health Organisation has urged all Governments to develop public policies for palliative care. Few have done so and I believe that South Australia, for a whole variety of reasons, could have a pioneering role in this area if this select committee is set up. We are fortunate in so many respects.

We have a history of a very high standard of medical and nursing education, clinical practice and ethical approach. There is an excellent relationship between the health professions and the public, between the private and voluntary sectors in the health field, between churches and within churches, and between churches and Government bodies. We are ideally placed to examine this issue dispassionately and compassionately and set an example to others of the

way we can proceed to make dying with dignity a reality for those in society who seek that, as I believe all of us do.

We should also acknowledge that there are considerable death denying attitudes which derive from unrealistic expectations of modern medical technologies and the institutionalisation of death. Progress has been made in these areas in South Australia but I believe that a great deal more progress can still be made. An indication of the positive strength of feeling in the community about examination of these issues comes from the support already indicated for the establishment of this committee by important religious and professional bodies in South Australia. I advise the House that, in response to a letter that I sent widely throughout the State advising of my intention to move this motion, I have received indications of support for the establishment of a select committee from the Synod of the Anglican Diocese, which suggested some amendment to the terms of reference, from the Baptist Union and from the Uniting Church Synod of South Australia.

I have also received letters of support from several hospitals and nursing homes—and not all have had the chance to reply at this stage. The President of the Australian Medical Association (South Australian Branch) and the President of the AMA working party on voluntary euthanasia have both indicated that they would welcome the establishment of such a committee. Representatives of the nursing profession have expressed gratitude and relief that the issue that is causing them so much difficulty in terms of ethical problems with which they are confronted on an almost daily basis could be addressed by a parliamentary committee, and that society could help health professionals to come to terms with the issues that need to be examined and help them to be resolved. The Pharmaceutical Society has expressed support. However, severe reservations have been expressed by the Catholic Archbishop of Adelaide and the Lutheran Church.

I address now the third paragraph of the motion, which concerns the extent, if any, to which community attitudes towards death and dying may be changing and to what extent, if any, the law relating to death and dying needs to be clarified or amended. As I have already made clear, there is a much more vigorous and open level of public debate about death and dying expressed through the media, through the legislatures of the other States and in 1983 in South Australia, and by the increasing number of people who have direct contact, either professionally or through family circumstances, with people who are dying slowly and painfully from either chronic or acute conditions.

The establishment of palliative care units, to which I have referred, is another indicator. There is the realisation that decisions about dying are, in fact, being taken but not by individuals; they are being taken by States and nations all over the world through the rationing process of health services forced upon Governments by economic constraints. Already in this State the waiting lists that are, in effect, a form of rationing for medical procedures such as cardiac surgery, coronary matters, angioplasty and treatment of various forms of cancer are such that delays are contributing to death.

That is a reality we have to live with. We have to address it and see how it can be overcome. There is increasing political awareness questioning the high cost of procedures that prolong life. As I have said, some churches and the AMA have established working parties to look at attitudes to euthanasia. Medical attitudes to euthanasia, expressed in scientific journals, are changing. Membership of and activity in voluntary euthanasia societies is increasing, and opinion polls indicate that an increasing number of Australians support that option. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* the Morgan gallup public opinion poll published in the *Bulletin* of 31 July 1990. The table is purely statistical and indicates that 77 per cent of Australians believe that a doctor should be allowed to give a lethal dose if a patient requests it.

Leave granted.

WHAT SHOULD DOCTORS DO?

	1962 %	1978 %	Sept 1983 %	Apr 1986 %	Apr 1987 %	Apr 1989 %	July 1990 %
Let patient die .	54	60	65	68	67	66	71
Try to keep alive	32	23	18	16	21	20	19
Undecided	14	17	17	16	12	14	10

SHOULD DOCTORS BE ABLE TO GIVE LETHAL DOSES?

	1962 %	1978 %	Sept 1983 %	Apr 1986 %	Apr 1987 %	Apr 1989 %	July 1990 %
Give lethal dose	47	67	67	66	75	71	77
No lethal dose . .	39	22	21	21	18	20	17
Undecided	14	11	12	13	7	9	6

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: That brings me to the critical issue which has caused, is causing and will cause such public debate and heartache. I want to state at the outset that I have always been, and still am, opposed to the concept of voluntary euthanasia. It has been suggested to me that the consideration of voluntary euthanasia should be excluded specifically from the terms of reference of this committee. I would be most reluctant for that to occur.

Are we such a death denying society that we cannot listen to the strongly held and well argued views of people who believe that they should have some right of self determination over the nature of their end? However abhorrent the concept may be to me, it is even more abhorrent that we should exclude consideration of ideas which might not suit us, which might arouse fear and which might be terribly difficult to tackle, and I do deny that that is the case. I believe that the committee should address the question not whether or not voluntary euthanasia is acceptable but why such a solution is considered by some as an acceptable option.

We should not be seeking apparently easy legislative solutions: we should be asking deeper questions. We should be asking why so many people dread the prospect of pain, of being a burden, of being in a vegetative or demented state, and dread the loss of identity and dignity that goes with that. We should be asking how society can care more adequately for these people and relieve their suffering and loneliness, and we should be asking how we can help health professionals to achieve that goal. These are the questions that I hope the committee will address, and I urge the support of the House for the motion.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Health): I support the motion. In doing so, I want to commend to the House the great deal of hard work and sensitive consultation that the member for Coles has carried out in bringing us to this point. She has left us in no doubt as to the genuineness and sincerity of her intentions in what, after all, is a very sensitive area. Indeed, I guess potentially it is the most sensitive of all the motions that have been on our Notice Paper for some time, and that includes a matter that almost certainly will be further debated during this morning's sitting.

It is interesting to note the reactions that have already come from the mainline churches on this matter. I imagine that in this process there may be some modification of viewpoint from those churches, once they have had the opportunity to be involved in what, after all, will be a pretty public sort of process through the select committee. One can well understand why there should be some degree of misgiving and why there should be concerns whenever this sort of topic is opened up.

After all, our species, alone amongst zoological species, is conscious of its mortality. It is something that little children have difficulty in handling. It is something that everyone has some difficulty in handling, I imagine. There may be those few tough-minded individuals amongst us who say that the fact that in the year 3000 the planets will be spinning in their orbits and the human race may still be carrying on, loving and hating, going to war, raising crops, inventing new technologies and so on, and that they will not be around to have any part in that, is really no concern whatever to them.

However, I think that most people rebel against that concept. What people are left with is the consolation of religion, on the one hand, or what might be called a selective consciousness—simply putting it out of the mind for most of the time. It is also related to the survival instinct which evolution has planted in all of us. People simply accept in a theoretical way that, one of these days, they are going to die, but not now. It seems to me that for the most part that is a source of strength for the individual.

Doctors have often commented on the fact that, even in the light of all the evidence available, people in hospital simply refuse to accept that death is imminent. It seems to me that God and/or nature in its own way has implanted that sort of attitude in us as a source of strength and as a survival technique. That is why sometimes I question the 'let it all hang out' attitude we have these days, whereby the medical profession usually insists that the person who shortly will die shall be told of his or her condition by close relatives, sometimes against family wishes.

It seems to me that there are those individuals who would want to know in those circumstances, and there are those for whom that is the last thing they want to know and, should they know, that may even hasten what is, nonetheless, an inevitable end. I do not criticise the profession in that respect; it is a very difficult position in which to be placed. The Government, having examined this matter, believes that a good deal is to be gained from the proper examination of these issues by a select committee, and shortly I will seek to continue my remarks later so that next week I can join with the honourable member in moving whatever mechanisms are required to set up a select committee, to determine its membership and the chairing of that committee.

We would simply like a little loner to determine one or two of these matters. We enter the exercise with some degree of enthusiasm and we fully support the general thrust of what the honourable member is urging upon this Chamber. We commend her for amending the motion to establish a select committee of this House—not that members of the other place are irrelevant to the process, or anything like that, but it seems to me that, given the density of the traffic in that other place in relation to select committees, it will be a far more manageable exercise if, at least at this stage, it can be confined to members of this House.

I reject any suggestion that delays in treatment in public hospitals necessarily lead to an exacerbation of a condition. A proper examination will show that the doctors in the hospitals, in determining the scheduling of surgical procedures, would be very sensitive to this matter. As the House would well know, in any emergency situation there is no waiting list as such: people get immediate treatment. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

COUNTRY HOSPITALS

Adjourned debate on motion of Dr Armitage:

That this House recognises the right and need for all South Australians to have access to acute medical care and condemns moves to curtail such services at the Elliston Hospital in particular and in country areas in general.

(Continued from 11 October. Page 958.)

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): When I addressed this motion previously, I referred to rural health care in general and indicated that health care these days seems, unfortunately, to be now a matter of economics rather than health itself. I made the point that this is particularly dangerous and, as an example, I drew the attention of the House to the fact that the fee for service component of country hospitals has now been made part of the global budget, which means that the hospital is completely unable to predict exactly what its budgetary requirement will be. This leads to no security for the hospital, for patients, for doctors or for the local community.

I made the point that it is particularly dangerous to use health statistics while sitting in air-conditioned offices in Adelaide. We all know about those lovely new air-conditioned offices for the Health Commission and I could not help but think, when considering this topic, that some of the country hospitals would love to have the $1 million spent on prime, unused, central business district accommodation by the Health Commission. I indicate how dangerous it is to use statistics when making predictions for health care, because the statistics do not indicate the true usage of the health areas.

For instance, statistical analysis is taken on post code areas. In the country, because of the large geographical areas involved it often means that people in town A, which is in a certain post code area, go to a hospital in a different post code area. Secondly, what makes it so difficult and also dangerous to use statistics is that the Health Commission has a concentration on the cost per head of population. In the case of the Elliston Hospital, in particular, there is absolutely no recognition of the fact that at least 25 per cent of the services are provided for tourists. Statistical analysis is often dangerous. I believe that local people know best what is required for their community, and I referred previously to the innovative ideas advanced by the Elliston community, in particular.

It appears to me that the Government does not understand the tyranny of distance when health care is considered, for example, Elliston is 105 kilometres from Wudinna and 170 kilometres from Streaky Bay. I also indicated that if a community is deprived of acute health care, there is an effect on the total community, as teachers do not wish to go to areas where there is no acute care, just as people in small business will not go there and so on. Country sport is affected. In fact, there is a dramatic long-term affect on the whole country community.

Before previously seeking leave to continue my remarks, I asked where is this much vaunted social justice espoused by of my opponents, who in fact are providing lower quality and a lower level of funded care in the country than they are providing to the people in the city.

I refer to the situation in Coober Pedy where at one stage there was one doctor for 3 500 people. The Family Planning Association representative travels to Coober Pedy three or four times a year. If anyone is to have a baby delivered, they must leave the area four weeks before confinement, which involves the long-term and social costs to the community and to families. Whyalla is the nearest centre where specialist services are available for people living in Coober Pedy, so those people must go there, although three or four hours later they could be in Adelaide. And because of the bus services, people must often wait for three or four hours for a connecting service in Port Augusta, when they could be in Adelaide instead. Certainly, this is an unsympathetic way of treating patients.

The vocation of the rural general practitioner is particularly special and it is to be encouraged. There are great rewards that come from it, but it should not be that specifically greater financial rewards only draw people to the country, although this is one way of encouraging people to make a career as a country general practitioner. There is a new general practice training facility at Modbury, which goes some of the way towards training young people to become general practitioners, but that will not answer the need specifically. I refer to an *Advertiser* article of Saturday 11 August (page 4) under the title 'Health body blamed for rural GP drought', which states:

The South Australian Health Commission undermines the practice of medicine in country areas with its constant threat to close hospitals and general practices according to general practitioners in the State's Mid North . . . but four Mid North GPs who spoke to the *Advertiser* yesterday said threats of closures deterred doctors from working in remote regions.

It is all very well to provide a general practice training facility but, if we do not provide acute care facilities in the country, once doctors have been trained, they will not go to such areas. We often hear the line that hospitals are not being utilised to their fullest and that therefore they ought to be closed. I put to the Government that this is a completely illusory saving, because of the cost of transporting patients to other areas and because of the long-term social costs that communities have to bear.

The other factor is that, if we close country hospitals or cut the services they provide, it is inevitable that people will gravitate to the city. This will mean that there will be increased waiting lists in the city. How appropriate that this debate should arise today, given that yesterday I highlighted the appalling situation at Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

Mr Meier: Have you got a list with you?

Dr ARMITAGE: I do not have a list here now, but I did refer to it yesterday. Indeed, I would like to make particular mention of one of the cases on the list to which I referred yesterday. It involves a person who requires a left femoro-peroneal bypass graft. For the sake of members who do not understand what that is, I can explain that it is a bypass of a blocked artery. Someone who needs a femoro-peroneal bypass graft has claudication, that is, pain of the lower leg on exercise. Thus, their lifestyle is deprived because of the pain on exercise. They cannot walk from here to the bus stop without having to stop; they cannot exercise by playing bowls and they cannot bushwalk—all those sorts of things which affect their quality of life.

Mr Becker: Are you giving me a diagnosis?

Dr ARMITAGE: If the member for Hansen wishes to take it to heart, so be it. That is the first thing that happens when people need a femoro-peroneal bypass graft. If the complaint is not treated, eventually the blood supply to the lower leg is compromised to such an extent that gangrene commences and people end up with gangrene of the toes and gangrene further up the legs, perhaps even requiring amputation.

What does this mean for people on the waiting list? It means that they need the operation with a degree of urgency. I put to the House that there is a much greater degree of urgency than this Government appears to acknowledge given that one of the patients on the waiting list to which I referred yesterday has been waiting and has had those symptoms since 13 November 1986. What will happen because of closures in country hospitals is that the city waiting lists will get even longer. To emphasise that, I will quote from a letter I received from an orthopaedic surgeon who used to practise at Gumeracha Hospital, which has been unfortunately changed in function. The letter states:

One of the small advantages of using Gumeracha is that its relative proximity to the metropolitan area meant that some unused theatre time at Gumeracha could be used for minor cases from public hospital waiting lists. I should point out that these were my own patients from my own lists and they were not being allocated to me by some bureaucrat from the Health Commission. This did allow the waiting lists to be shortened to some extent, and you will be aware that there are quite considerable waiting lists at all public hospitals.

I put to the Government that cutting down country health acute care services is cutting one's nose off to spite one's face. As well as the cutting down of acute medical care, there is also a more insidious disease extant in the country, and that is in relation to the large amounts of deferred maintenance—deferred for cost reasons. Since I have been in the shadow health portfolio, I have made a point of visiting many hospitals around the State.

One particular hospital told me with some glee that, as part of its maintenance program, it had recently replaced its steriliser. I must confess that I thought this was very good, and I spoke to the staff about how keen I was to see everything made sterile and how nice it was for them to be able to buy a new machine. Then they told me that they needed one because their previous unit was 38 years old. Given that we are referring to a steriliser, one of the most important things in any degree of surgery, it is appalling that they had to wait 38 years to replace one of the older machines. The replacement of infrastructure in South Australia is a real dilemma and it is increasingly so within the health portfolio. It must be addressed, particularly in country areas, or the whole system will grind unfortunately to a dreadful halt. I have some letters from various hospitals giving examples of where they feel that maintenance programs are not up to speed. One letter states:

The galvanised iron on this portion of the roof is original and would be approximately 67 years old; the roof also developed several leaks this winter making replacement essential.

How ghastly, that there are leaks in the roofs of our country hospitals. Some of the systems that this particular hospital would like to improve to 1990 standards include the supply of oxygen to the rooms. For God's sake, oxygen to the rooms! They want a completion of the call bell system to all rooms. What happens if someone has an acute bleed? Some rooms do not have bells. The letter continues:

Our current X-ray machine and autoclave, although working okay at present, need to be updated in the near future to stay in line with the Health Commission's asset register requirements.

This means that the Health Commission sets requirements but it will not provide enough maintenance funds so that those requirements can be met. Another hospital tells me that it needs a replacement of the nurse call system and the provision of oxygen/suction to patient wards, physiotherapy equipment and an upgrade in the geriatric wing. Another hospital wrote to me in the following terms:

Each year we are requested by the SAHC (Country Health Services) to submit 'wish lists' with our budget for urgent ongoing maintenance. For the past four years no finance has been made

available and they are working on the premise that if it 'breaks down' then funding may be available from an emergency fund. This is not a satisfactory method, and my board would prefer to continue their preventative maintenance program.

Finally, another letter states:

The board is concerned, however, that the replacement of assets on a five-year planned program is not being met, with a consequence that items originally scheduled for replacement in years one and two now all appear in our plan as overdue for replacement.

Country health is in a parlous state. It is unfair that the residents of South Australia do not receive equal health care. I believe that country people deserve the best health care possible, and I believe that this is provided not by economists but by professionals in the field who know exactly what is required. I believe that the Government ought to indicate for all South Australians a real commitment to acute health care.

Mr BLACKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Lewis:

That this House deplores and condemns the cavalier way in which the Minister for Environment and Planning has abused the privileges she enjoys in this building by booking facilities in this building (ostensibly for her own use) and when arranging for people who are not members of Parliament to take over control and occupancy of those facilities, to the exclusion and abuse of other members' rights of access.

(Continued from 8 November. Page 1674.)

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Mininister for Environment and Planning): I rise to oppose the motion. In doing so, I will be as brief as possible as I am aware that the House wants to move the business forward. I draw the attention of the House to the words of the motion in which the member for Murray-Mallee suggests that the House should deplore and condemn the cavalier way in which I have abused the privileges that I enjoy in booking facilities in this building ostensibly for my own use (which implies a degree of dishonesty, I would have thought) and arranging for people who are not members of Parliament to take over control and occupancy to the exclusion and abuse of other members' rights of access; I will make some comment a little later about what I consider to be the excessive use of language. I will go through the two cases that the honourable member lists.

First, he refers to the fact that I booked the second floor conference room and failed to turn up. I will explain the circumstances surrounding this particular event. The day in question was the day on which I introduced the Wilpena legislation in this Parliament. A press conference had been arranged for the Premier and me to attend at 3.30 p.m. The conference room was booked by me for 1 p.m. for a press briefing. That room was needed because of TV lights and to make use of the visuals that were available. The press secretary was not using the room ostensibly for her own use, and I was certainly not using it ostensibly for my own use. The room had been booked through the appropriate and correct procedure for a very genuine purpose to brief the press on what I believe every member would agree was an important matter that would be before the Parliament.

The other people referred to in the motion include my own press secretary, the press secretary of the Minister of Tourism and the Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, people for whom I have direct responsibility. It had been my intention to attend that press briefing, but I had forgotten that I had an optician's appointment and I was attending that appointment at the same time. If the member for Murray-Mallee had been genuine, I would have thought that he would ask me what were the circumstances surrounding the fact that I actually had a booking in the conference room but was unable to attend. That would have seemed a perfectly reasonable approach from any member of this Chamber, and certainly from one with whom I have worked for eight years.

I now turn to the second instance, concerning which the suggestion is, again, quite incorrect. I certainly did not tell any organisation to send a circular to Liberal members inviting them to attend a briefing at Parliament House. When I spoke with them, I had intended that I would be inviting members on this side of the Parliament. There may well have been some misunderstanding, and members of the Liberal Party were invited to attend a briefing.

As the honourable member himself goes on to say, the briefing was quite productive. I wonder whether the shadow Minister for the Environment would have the same degree of outrage and hostility towards me because of that genuine mistake, which I am pleased to say will not occur again. What have been my sins? What exactly has precipitated this onslaught and this outrage? Those two particular incidents. Not only are the words of the motion ill tempered and ill judged but they actually reflect what I as a member of Parliament have had to put up with for eight years. However, let me say how I have responded to that treatment.

Since I have been a Minister for two years and four months, on every occasion that the member for Murray-Mallee has approached me, my staff or officers of my department requesting help or information about a constituent problem, I can say before this Parliament that I have not left a stone unturned in providing that information. I have consistently tried to work with Opposition members in terms of being reasonable, accessible, providing information and answering questions. If members of the Opposition thought about that (perhaps with the exception of the member for Kavel at the moment because I am not able to solve a problem for him in terms of one constituent) they might realise that no Minister can solve every problem for every member of Parliament. We would be deluding ourselves if we thought we could.

What I believe I have done—and believe very strongly—is offer the member for Murray-Mallee every courtesy. I have provided him with information and I have met his requests. One has only to read *Hansard* to see what I get in return. Every day I stand up to answer a question, the member for Murray-Mallee interjects, and that goes back from the day I first entered this Parliament as a backbench member. In fact, it has happened to the extent that the staff in my electorate office have asked me why it is that the member for Murray-Mallee continually interjects because it is recorded in *Hansard*. I have turned the other cheek.

But I have no intention of turning the other cheek with this outrageous, rude, ill considered motion, the substance of which the honourable member could have walked five or six paces across the House and asked me to explain. I would have been delighted to explain that to him, and if he wanted an apology—as you, Mr Acting Speaker, would know—I would have been more than willing and prepared to provide him with one. But the member for Murray-Mallee somehow sees that he will score some amazing political coup. No doubt this will become the issue of the decade. So, he moves this motion condemning me, imputing motives to me which I totally reject and which are quite wrong and could have been cleared up if people wanted to behave in a rational, mature and adult-like way.

I can inform the House that, notwithstanding the kind of trivialising that has gone on in this motion, I intend to relate towards members of the Opposition as I have done in the past. I intend to behave in a reasonable and open way. I will provide information, and I will provide answers to questions. I would hope that some Opposition members might speak to their colleague and explain to him that there are proper ways of relating to members of this House. Whether or not the member for Murray-Mallee likes me as a human being is quite irrelevant: we are quite professional people in what I think is an honourable and professional occupation. I think it behoves us to treat each other in a professional way, and I will continue to do that. I can only ask the member for Murray-Mallee to treat me in the same way as I have always treated him, and I urge the House to reject this absolutely nonsensical motion and get on with the real items of private members' business.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Me thinks the lady protests too much, and I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

WOOL INDUSTRY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Blacker:

That this House—

(a) expresses its grave concern with circumstances now prejudicing the survival of many wool growers;

(b) expresses its unqualified support for the maintenance of the Minimum Reserve Price Scheme (MRP) for the marketing of Australian wool;

(c) requests the Prime Minister to confirm the 700 cent MRP for 1990-91, 1991-92 and 1992-93 wool selling seasons;

(d) seeks the introduction of a positive package of measures to stimulate demand on the auction floor; and

(e) calls on the Federal Government to change its economic and industrial relations policies where they adversely affect Australian exporters.

(Continued from 15 November. Page 1926.)

Mr MEIER (Goyder): This is an important motion, moved by the member for Flinders.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Gunn): Order! The member for Napier is carrying on a conversation.

Mr MEIER: There is no doubt that the wool industry needs every bit of support it can get. Certainly, among other things, this motion calls on the Federal Government to change its economic and industrial relations policies (that is as obvious a need as anything) as they affect Australian exporters, and the rest of the motion refers to problems in the wool industry. It is interesting to note that, since the member for Flinders moved this motion, certain developments have occurred which I believe have tended to have an adverse effect on the wool industry as a whole.

I refer particularly to the theme of the report 'Wool into the 21st Century', which was released on 26 November, compiled by the Canberra based Centre for International Economics. In that report the centre's Director (Mr Andrew Stoeckel) put forward various suggestions about the wool industry. With this report coming out of Canberra, I think we are seeing another classic case where people who are supposedly experts often live in their own ivory tower.

Among other things, Mr Stoeckel said that the floor price should be removed. That is diametrically opposed to what this motion is all about. It is diametrically oppossed to what the Federal Government has sought to achieve, namely, to retain the minimum floor price of 700c. It is diametrically opposed to what the industry as a whole has gone through a lot of heartache to achieve. Just at a time when we wanted stability in the wool industry and people to pull together and ride out the hard times for the next few months; just when we should have been saying that we were not going to raise the price for the next two years (it is in place for two years, but it will probably rise after that), we get this report saying, 'Lower it'. Among other things, Mr Stoeckel said:

> ... there were only two ways known to mankind to increase product demand. One was promotion and marketing and the other was competitive pricing. As current promotion campaigns were achieving little, competitive pricing was the only way to get wool moving.

How short sighted! Only a week or two before, the person who has had so much to do with the wool industry, the former Australian Wool Board Chairman, Sir William Gunn, said that another $200 million should be spent on international wool promotion. Right! Acknowledged! If enough is not being done to market wool, one has to look at ways of increasing and improving the market situation, but not as Mr Stoeckel is doing when he says, 'We can't do much about marketing; therefore drop the price' Worse than that, he has actually called on the Federal Government to take over the stockpile, once the floor price has been removed, and to buy it out—or 75 per cent of it—involving millions and millions of dollars.

I am absolutely amazed that he is asking not only for the removal of the floor price but also for the Federal Government to step in and increase propping up. There is no doubt that orderly marketing in this country is essential. Too often we have gone away from it at our own peril. I will refer to a classic case, namely that of eggs—and we well remember how this State sought to do away with the Egg Board. That move was vigorously opposed by the Opposition and we still have that organisation together with the orderly marketing of eggs.

Last year in New South Wales we saw deregulation of the egg industry entirely. They said that that would fix all the problems. Time does not permit me to go into what happened, but certainly there was an immediate price drop. The prices have gone up and now the call in New South Wales is to re-regulate the egg industry. That occurred within a year or so. That shows that moves have been made—

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: The Government in this State attacked us for trying to retain orderly marketing of eggs. We could also look at moves proposed to deregulate part of the milk industry. In New Zealand, when milk prices were deregulated they increased sharply. It also meant the demise of the door-to-door resellers who provide milk at the doorstep first thing in the morning. We must be very careful. The citrus industry provides another classic example where we want orderly marketing, and minimum prices, but we do not want the situation to be destabilised.

Here we see this Stoeckel report suggesting just that. The report has been attacked by many people, and rightly so. It comes at a most inopportune time. In today's *Stock Journal* we see the wool firm of Michells suggesting similar action: the removal of the floor price. I am concerned to see that, and I reiterate that, at a time when we want stability, this is not the way to go. Likewise in today's *Stock Journal*, an article deals with the Japanese not being prepared to start buying new wool. The key reason for their not buying is uncertainty about whether the price would fall further. They have allowed their mill stocks to drop to a minimum level.

Another interesting article, appearing in the *Stock Journal* of 29 November, was headed '"Stop Fighting" says US Processor'. It hits the key point and perhaps reinforces the need for support of this motion. It states:

One-third of Australia's wool stockpile can be sold within two months if the Australian wool industry stops its bickering, says the world's leading wool processor. Arthur Spiro, chairman of the United States group, Carlton Woollen Mills, says that if Australia wishes to solve its wool problems it must begin thinking like its competitors in the man-made fibre industries.

'The strength of the man-made fibres is in price stability' he said. 'Apart from the supply problems, you should be thinking of demand, and that means you should be thinking as a fibre producer—not as a bunch of woolgrowers, politicians and economists'.

Mr Spiro classes his Carlton Woollen Mills as the second largest wool processor in the United States and the world's largest processor of fine woollen fabric.

He regards Australia as his main source of wool. Mr Spiro is furious with the damage being caused by the likes of the Stoeckel plan to the confidence in the wool trade. He has no criticism with the current price of wool but believes people will not buy wool if they think that raw wool price may fall.

How accurate, well stated and well said. This motion should be given full support and everything should be done to ensure that the wool industry of this country is helped to maintain the strength that has allowed Australia, traditionally, to ride on the sheep's back.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Agriculture): I do not intend to take a long time in debating this because it is urgent that we bring the substance of this motion to a vote today. I have an amendment that I wish to move, but the issue of this House resolving that we support maintenance of the price of 700c per kilogram is important, and it is essential that we get that message across as quickly as possible. While I could argue a great many things in relation to some of the comments made by other members, I do not intend to do so today.

However, as things have changed a bit since this motion was first moved and we now have the question of quotas, I think there are some concerns for South Australian wool producers. Indeed, I have been in contact with my Federal colleague John Kerin, about the time of production over which quotas will be determined, because I think there is danger that South Australia will be disadvantaged and I would be very concerned about that happening. Perhaps to best explain that, without going into too much detail, I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them two purely statistical tables.

Leave granted.

Table 1. Total wool production by States in Australia (million kg greasy)

Year	NSW	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	Total
1985-86	281	171	66	112	176	25	830
1986-87	287	197	75	116	189	26	890
1987-88	308	195	78	122	188	24	916
1988-89	339	198	76	119	203	22	959
1989-90	398	222	88	130	233	27	1 099

Table 2. Total wool production by States as a percentage of national production.

Year	NSW	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS
Last year (89-90)	36.4	20.5	8.0	11.8	21.2	2.4
Last 2 years (88-90)	35.8	20.4	7.9	12.1	21.1	2.3
Last 3 years (87-90)	35.1	20.7	8.1	12.5	20.9	2.4
Last 4 years (86-90)	34.5	21.0	8.2	12.6	21.0	2.6
Last 5 years (85-90)	34.4	20.9	8.2	12.7	21.7	2.6

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The first table covers total Australian wool production by States and the second is total wool production by States as a percentage of national production. Over a five-year period, production in New South Wales has grown by 2 per cent as a share of Australian production, whilst South Australia's share has decreased by 1 per cent. If the time frame over which quotas are assessed does not take account of that fact, we would be disadvantaged in the setting of new quotas. All sorts of other problems come with quotas and they can quickly be identified. They have the potential in equity of including potentially efficient new entrants to the wool industry who will be unable to establish a base production and will therefore be ineligible for quotas. The costs of purchasing a quota if a base line cannot be established, and the inflexibility in quota size, will increase farm costs. Seasonal conditions and chance events in the base year will produce inequities, even within States.

Specialist woolgrowers will not necessarily be treated the same as sideline growers who move between farming enterprises, for example, cereal growers and prime lamb producers. A quota base on greasy wool production will have quite different revenue effects between producers of finer and stronger wool, depending on the relative profitability per unit of quota; this may encourage increased production of finer wool to the detriment of some South Australian ram breeders. They are the sorts of things that need to be taken into account in this quota debate.

In relation to the floor price, members must recall that 700c is in itself not a figure that every wool producer is getting, because it is a figure gross of the levy—and I spoke yesterday about just how much is being paid back by producers in terms of the levy. The levy over this current period of time is a non-refundable, so it is a permanent loss of income. Producers are getting substantially less than 700c. In any event, 700c refers to a particular quality of wool; wools of a lesser quality are bringing less than that. For example, wool producers on Eyre Peninsula may be getting as low as 300c or 400c per kilogram. So, those who are under the impression that 700c is not a bad return are mistaken, because that is not what is happening in terms of growers.

However, I can only endorse other comments in relation to the destabilisation of the floor price. Any buyer internationally who does not pull back from buying is a bit of a commercial fool, because if they believe that there is any prospect at all of that floor price being broken up, naturally they will wait for the floor price to be broken up and, hopefully, for the market price to drop. Therefore, the comments of Dr Stoeckel and others are very damaging and I would have hoped that they would want to pull behind the wool industry in this country and resist the temptation to get a quick headline that is doing more damage than good. Therefore, it is for this House to pursue this matter on a bipartisan basis.

Finally, in the context of the fifth paragraph of the motion, I believe that the Federal Government has taken many of the hard economic decisions that needed to be taken but were not taken by its predecessor, the Fraser Government. Issues of the waterfront reform are being addressed now. The Federal Minister has given the time line for those issues to be addressed. Other issues of award restructuring and the export competitiveness of this country have been addressed and, while we can argue about some of the ways in which they have been addressed—and certainly this State Government does have some arguments with some of the things that have happened—broadly, the Federal Government has taken on issues to improve this country's competitiveness where the previous Government refused to do so.

I would rather that paragraph *(e)* reads that the House calls on the Federal Government to pursue economic and industrial relations policies which promote Australian

exporters, because I am sure that all members could gather together and support that amendment and the resultant motion in a multi-partisan way. Therefore, I move:

Paragraph *(e)*—leave out 'change its' and insert 'pursue' and leave out 'where they adversely affect' and insert 'which promote'.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I thank the shadow Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Agriculture for their comments on this motion. I note the Minister's amendment, which I will not oppose. It would be pedantic to play around with words because the real import of the motion relates to the floor price. It is also important that this House convey the message to the Federal Minister for Primary Industries and Energy that we are adamant that the floor price be retained at 700c and not be reduced. If the Prime Minister could give that commitment for two or three years in advance, it would reintroduce stability into the market and buyers would be able to proceed with confidence in the knowledge that they will not be subject to competition from other buyers who may in the future get their wool at a cheaper price.

Comments were made about the unfortunate remarks of Mr Andy Stoeckel. In my view, they were very damaging, and such comments at this most crucial time are tantamount to undermining the industry. Last Monday, I attended the hearings of the wool inquiry chaired by Sir William Vines. It was attended by processors and other people with an interest in doing away with the 700c floor price. There is no doubt from the evidence given by the wool producers that we must get confidence back into the industry and make sure that that confidence is backed up by Government assurance.

I hope that the House will unanimously support this motion as amended, and that a message can be conveyed to the Federal Government. Hopefully, it will react on that. If we can get similar support from around Australia, the message will become loud and clear to all concerned that we are serious about the 700c floor price. If the Government were prepared to allow an escalation factor of 5 per cent or 10 per cent a year, it would make clear that it is serious about the industry, but that point can be pursued later. That suggestion has been put to the Wool Review Committee, but I do not know how seriously it will be considered. At least it means that the Government could set a benchmark and could only work up from that point, providing there is sufficient evidence to support it. In the meantime, if this House supports the motion, I am sure that the wool industry will benefit.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 November. Page 1935.)

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): When I spoke on this matter previously, I took exception to the comments of the member for Hayward in regard to the term 'the Son of Heaven'. I place on record that I accept the personal explanation that the member for Hayward made immediately I sat down. In his second reading explanation, the honourable member spoke about this Bill being all about conscience. He said:

I have heard suggestions that the Party opposite is looking for options that would allow it to deny its members a conscience vote on this issue. I have every confidence that some members will argue that the measure introduced today will not change the law and that this Bill may be regarded as a machinery motion.

He went on further to say that he demanded that this Bill be treated as a conscience matter. We all know what this Bill is about. It is a clumsy attempt to try to trap some of us on this side of the House because of our concerns—and those concerns are various—about some aspects of abortion. Speaking for myself, it is a clumsy attempt to embarrass me.

As I understand it, every member opposite will vote for this Bill. I find that very hard to believe. There are 47 members in this House. Members opposite, like those of us on this side, come from diverse backgrounds. However, although we come from the opposite sides of the political fence, some of us share the same faith and have a lot in common in other aspects of our private life. I find it very hard to come to terms with the fact that we on this side of the House are expected to struggle with our conscience, while members opposite, as I understand it—and I may be wrong—will vote as one.

I make perfectly clear that I will oppose the Bill and I assure the member for Hayward that I do so with a clear conscience—and I can live with that decision within my own faith and my own church. Although some members on this side of the House might disagree with me on some aspects of abortion, they might come to the same conclusion as I have drawn about this clumsy attempt.

On this Bill, like many Bills of this nature, a motion moved and debated earlier by the member for Coles generated many letters to all members of Parliament. However, on this Bill, of all the letters that I have received from organisations and individuals, not one has urged me, as an individual member of this Parliament, to support it. Even Right to Life Australia has urged me and all other members to vote against it.

I imagine that it is a bitter blow for the member for Hayward to have not one organisation or individual urge the 47 members in this House to support the Bill. The people understand what the Bill is about. The member for Hayward tries to sell it as a strengthening of the original intention of the 1969 Parliament, but this, like his claim to be concerned about the safety of patients, is a sham.

The current law places a lot of responsibility on doctors—responsibility that they are well equipped to handle. The Parliament of 1969 was concerned that unscrupulous doctors, motivated entirely by profit, might set up clinics and perform abortions outside the intention of the law. They worried that South Australia might become the abortion capital of Australia. I advised the member for Hayward and other members to read the *Hansard* reports of that debate in this House in 1969. They will then understand why section 82A (4) was enacted. It ensures that there is adequate reporting and control through the Health Commission and that hospitals are prescribed to do terminations of pregnancy through regulation. All abortions performed in South Australia are notified and reported to the Parliament through the Cox Committee, the committee appointed to examine and report on abortions notified in South Australia. This very thorough reporting is designed to ensure that monitoring is done and is seen to be done.

It is absurd, for two reasons, to attempt to represent this concern about private clinics operating outside the system as applying to the proposed pregnancy advisory centre. First, the pregnancy advisory centre will not be a private operation, as the member for Hayward well knows. It will be under the control of a board of management and will provide full reports to the Health Commission and the staff will be salaried or sessional. In other words, there will be no profit motive and all the appropriate controls, standards and monitoring will be in place.

Secondly, it must be remembered that the Parliament of the day was dealing with this issue at a time when most abortions in South Australia were illegal. Unfortunate women who faced an unwanted or unhealthy pregnancy in those days resorted to travelling interstate, if they had the money and the contacts, or they aborted themselves or placed their lives in the hands of backyard operators. Some of these people provided reasonable care; some were butchers—but all operated in primitive conditions.

If one looks back through those old *Hansard* reports, one notes a case quoted in the Parliament of a woman who had been aborted in a bath tub and who died there. Another member reported on the funeral of a 42 year old woman from the western suburbs who had died following an illegal abortion at the very time that this House was debating the issue. There were two deaths each year in the six years prior to the passing of the 1969 Act, and a regular stream of casualities was admitted to the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

It was this stream of women, infected and bleeding from their desperate attempts to terminate pregnancy, whose plight motivated the doctors of both the Royal Adelaide Hospital and Queen Elizabeth Hospital to support abortion law reform in 1969. Their petitions were influential in the debate at the time. It was the back-room style of abortion clinic that the Parliament sought to prevent. Members feared that unsavoury abortion clinics would be set up by doctors who would move to South Australia for the sole purpose of carrying out abortions.

This Bill has nothing to do with the proposed pregnancy advisory centre and it is misleading to suggest that it has. I say again that this Bill is a sham, carried on in utter disregard for either the intention of the original Act or the health of women, and I urge all members to oppose it.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I do not intend to go over the ground that my colleague so aptly covered, but I want to put my view to the House and other people. This clumsy Bill is unworkable—it is unworkable legislation that is ill conceived and I will be blunt about it: it is a political Bill, designed to try to embarrass members on this side of the Parliament. It is a gutless display by a man who, in my opinion, is not prepared to come out and say what the Bill is all about.

I can accept that any member in this House has strong convictions on the matter, but to hide behind a Bill that is designed to impact on a clinic proposed for the western suburbs is grossly untruthful, in my view. Clearly, the Bill seeks to jeopardise the existing service provided in hospitals. I was hoping for an interjection—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON: I will come back to that in a moment. I would have thought that a member of the calibre and qualifications of the member for Hayward would have known better.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON: I am advised along those lines by people who, I believe, should know what they are talking about *vis a vis* the member for Hayward. The effect of the Bill appears to make many terminations unavailable in South Australia. It is designed clearly to put at risk and jeopardise the health of many women in South Australia. These are women on whom I will not sit in judgment on whether or not they want a termination. As I have indicated to many people, abortion, like many other matters, is something one prefers not to hear about, but I hasten to add that I am a realist, living in the real world.

I do not live in some fairy land and I do not dream up some concoction and attempt to put it into legislation to try to embarrass members on one side of the Parliament. All members, including you, Sir, know only too well that I call a spade a spade. Well may the member for Hayward smile and grin—but it is a sickly grin, in my view. I have been around the traps for too long to be conned or snowed by someone who can put a wry grin on his or her face to push me aside. Like many other members in this Parliament, I have received correspondence from members and chairpersons of hospital boards condemning the proposition. I oppose the Bill and I oppose it on behalf of all those women in the community who give such strong support to the Pregnancy Advisory Unit.

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

PSYCHOLOGISTS BILL

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

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard.*

ULTRA LIGHT AIRCRAFT

In reply to **Mr OSWALD (Morphett)** 17 October.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: On advice available to me, I understand that there has been considerable disputation throughout the project between Mr Puddifoot and the investor concerned. This has caused irreconcilable differences to develop between these two partners to the point where the project is now considered to be unworkable and it has been agreed that the project will be sold. The future will depend on normal commercial practice.

In addition, this project would require considerable investment to start up production. Given the present economic climate, investment in this high risk venture has not been forthcoming.

STATE BANK

In reply to **Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel)** 4 December.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Fifty-eight off balance sheet companies exist within the State Bank group; 53 are controlled by Beneficial Finance and five by the State Bank.

Of those controlled by Beneficial Finance, 38 form part of four holding companies namely, Kabani Pty Ltd, Malary Pty Ltd, Lagan Pty Ltd and Fortina Pty Ltd.

Details are as under:

	Companies
Holding Companies	4
Companies	37
Trusts	10
Partnerships	2
	53

Total assets of all off balance sheet companies of the State Bank group as at 30 June 1990 was $408 million with liabilities of $439 million. Total assets of Beneficial's off

balance sheet companies as at 30 June 1990 was $381 million with liabilities of $398 million.

The difference of $17 million results from trading losses by the off balance sheet entities. BFCL has recognised part of those losses through specific provisioning within BFCL's accounts. Where not recognised, the losses:

- are adequately covered by the security value of the underlying project(s), or
- the client is bearing the liability.

Of the $398 million total liabilities relating to the 53 off balance sheet entities, $304 million are funded by SBSA group and are therefore consolidated into SBSA group's result. The balance is funded by external parties. SBSA group's equity in these entities is $28 million.

Within the State Bank there are five off balance sheet companies, viz Ollago Pty Ltd, Bulwark Pty Ltd, Gallian Pty Ltd, 91 King William Street (No. 1) Pty Ltd and 91 King William Street (No. 2) Pty Ltd, having total assets of $27 million and total liabilities of $41 million.

The trust deed is not being bypassed to the disadvantage of investors. The current accounting policy requires that where losses are incurred in off balance sheet entities and where the value of security does not support the loan, then a provision will be created in Beneficial Finance Corporation Ltd. This policy was strictly followed in the audited 30 June 1990 accounts.

Even if all off balance sheet entities were consolidated in accordance with the accounting standard AAS24, the additional borrowings would not be material in terms of the total Beneficial Finance Corporation Ltd Group (only 3 per cent additional borrowings would be required).

Taxation obligations and liabilities of off balance sheet companies are being met in accordance with the requirements of the Income Tax Assessment Act.

In reply to **Mr INGERSON (Bragg)** 4 December.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is incorrect to say that Kabani Pty Ltd is the original and current proprietor of the State Bank Centre building. Kabani Pty Ltd itself has no financial interest in the State Bank Centre building or land.

The State Bank Centre building is owned by a consortium of three financiers. Beneficial Finance Corporation Ltd is a minor participant in this consortium which also comprises two major Australian banks. The owners of the State Bank Centre have appointed Kabani Pty Ltd as their nominee to manage their interests in the building. The obligations of Kabani Pty Ltd include the collection of rentals and to enter into various transaction documents on behalf of the owners. The building site is owned by 91 King William Street (No. 1) Pty Ltd, 91 King William Street (No. 2) Pty Ltd and Bulwark Pty Ltd. These companies are registered on the title of the land. The above companies are owned by Ollago Pty Ltd as trustee for the Ollago Unit Trust.

The building site is owned by these companies because it was in the State Bank's interests to acquire the land by purchasing the companies (viz Ollago Pty Ltd) which previously owned the three parcels of land for the site. Consequently, the State Bank purchased those companies and re-named them accordingly.

These companies and their directors are not listed in the annual reports of the State Bank group because their ownership falls outside the legal definition of a subsidiary as defined in the Companies (South Australia) Code and, therefore, there is no requirement for them to be disclosed in the annual report.

I am satisfied that there is nothing untoward about these financial arrangements and have been assured that they are a normal practice in the banking and corporate community.

In reply to **Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen)** 4 December.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In light of the interest in relation to the establishment and use of the off balance sheet company Kabani Pty Ltd, I wish to provide the following supplementary information to the answer I provided in the House.

Until July 1989 Beneficial's involvement in client projects, joint ventures and special purpose companies, was restricted by the fact that it was bound to its 1960 trust deed, so long as there were outstanding debenture holders under that deed.

It was not until July 1989 that the last debenture under the 1960 deed was redeemed. In the meantime, Beneficial had taken the opportunity to 'modernise' its public borrowing instrument, to maintain the same high level of protection for its secured lenders, but keep pace with the rapid changes affecting the finance industry.

The 1985 trust deed was designed to meet that criteria, to allow Beneficial to remain competitive, but it could not become effective until 1989. The introduction of Kabani allowed a Beneficial managed and *de facto* controlled company to meet client demands for innovative, profitable transactions, without disadvantaging current or future debenture holders, or other Beneficial creditors.

In most of the client driven transactions in which Kabani was involved, it was necessary for assets to be pledged and other commitments made which would have been a breach of Beneficial's outmoded and unduly restrictive 1960 trust deed.

Because Beneficial has effectively reflected Kabani's results in its books, there is no additional risk to Beneficial debenture holders, creditors or shareholder/s.

Without Beneficial's presence in the market via Kabani, the Beneficial group would have been denied access to some very considerable profit-earning transactions between 1985 and 1989 which contributed to a cumulative net profit after tax in excess of $65 million during this period.

I am satisfied that there is nothing untoward about the use of such off balance sheet companies and have been assured that they are a normal practice in the banking and corporate community.

In reply to **Mr BECKER (Hanson)** 4 December.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I refer the honourable member to my answer provided to the member for Kavel.

In reply to **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)** 4 December.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have sighted the relevant documentation relating to the acquisition of the United Building Society group by the State Bank and can confirm that I provided my written approval to this acquisition on 9 May 1990. Such an approval was provided with the following points in mind:

(1) Strategically the acquisition permitted the bank access to the full spread of banking business in New Zealand including access to a retail deposit base.

(2) A very significant turnaround in the profitability of the core building society/retail banking operations of the bank was projected. This has been borne out by the return to profitability following the State Bank's acquisition in June 1990.

(3) The acquisition cost was very attractive and reflected the poor profitability of United to date.

In relation to Southstate Corporate Finance it should be noted that the trust deed only applies to subsidiaries of Beneficial Finance. As Southstate Finance was not a subsidiary the trust deed did not apply.

Beneficial Finance's investment in Southstate was done at a time when the New Zealand economy was particularly depressed and it provided the State Bank group with an opportunity to make a sound long-term investment. This strategy has already borne fruit as at 30 June 1990 Southstate assets were $250 million and in that year a pre tax profit of $3 million was made.

In light of the above comments I am comfortable that both investments in New Zealand were appropriate decisions by the State Bank group.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr HAMILTON brought up the 62nd report of the Public Accounts Committee, on long service leave.

Ordered that report be printed.

PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGE

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I rise on a matter of privilege. I allege that the Minister of Correctional Services breached privilege in this House yesterday. He interfered with my rights and privileges by obtaining a typed transcript of statements that I made to police. The Minister stated in this House:

> The member for Bright gave a statement to a Detective Sergeant at 5.30 yesterday evening. The statement is here and, if anyone wishes to see it, it is available.

Not only did the Minister obtain my statement from the police but he also offered to make it available to anyone who wished to see it. By this interference with my personal communication with officers of the South Australian Police Force, the Minister has interfered with my ability to operate as a member of Parliament. He has interfered with my ability to liaise with police on behalf of my constituents. Such interference would not have occurred in relation to information given to help solve a crime by any other member of the public. Mr Speaker, I ask you to rule that privilege has been breached.

The SPEAKER: I will consider the allegations made by the honourable member and give a ruling, probably on Tuesday, on whether a *prima facie* case has been made. If it has, I will give precedence to a motion in relation to it.

QUESTION TIME

STATE BANK

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Treasurer. Is the State Bank group—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Is the State Bank group forecasting a loss this financial year and, if so, what is the likely result that may have to be faced by taxpayers? Since 1984 the Treasurer has met six-weekly with the Chairman and Managing Director of the State Bank to discuss all major issues concerning the bank and its performance and profit.

The *Business Review Weekly* of 23 November includes a feature interview with the State Bank's General Manager for Group Finance and Administration. Mr Kevin Copley, who says that one of his proudest achievements at the bank is that the finance and administration group can produce an estimate of the previous week's profit or loss for each division within two days. As well as weekly accounts, a monthly operating review is prepared soon after the end of each month which Mr Copley says is 'quite comprehensive', providing data on income margins, expenses, return on shareholders' funds, market share, capital adequacy and return on assets.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would refer the Leader to statements which have already been made by the General Manager of the State Bank and reported in the press a week or so ago in which he answered the question, 'When do you expect the State Bank to make a profit?' by saying, 'In the financial year 1991-92.' There is no question that banks all around Australia, and the banking system, are under severe pressure at the moment, as results announced by the private banks recently have indicated, and it is a very hard climate in which to achieve a profit. Therefore, I think that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: They have just managed to scrape one together.

Mr D.S. Baker: Considerably—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would refer the honourable member to the reports of those results. In terms of predicting, which is what the Leader is asking me to do, in the current climate it would be very foolish indeed to make predictions. No matter how sophisticated a bank's internal accounting information may be in this period, I do not believe that one can rely on either an assessment of the monthly budget or indeed anything other than the penned-down audited results when we get to the end of the year. My answer to the question is that I cannot put any figure before the House. I suggest it would be wrong for me to try to do so, particularly at this stage of the financial year. All I can say is that my advice from the bank is the same as that which the bank has publicly declared. It will be very hard for the bank to make a profit this year.

JUNIOR SPORTS POLICY

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport advise the House what plans are being drawn up to promote community understanding of the junior sports policy announced by the Premier yesterday?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question. I believe that this is a very good policy, which is being drawn up with the—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The Deputy Leader laughs. That is typical. He knows as much about sport as he knows about finance, and that becomes more and more obvious every day. What a joke! You ought to worry about your numbers.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has no intention of letting the Question Time in this House fall away as it has done in the past few days, and I think everybody should take notice of this.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The policy announced by the Premier yesterday is important and, indeed, significant in the sense that it is the first of this type of policy that has been developed nationally.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I will ignore the interjections in order to meet your direction, Mr Speaker. Obviously, the Opposition's ignorance is again showing. The consultation has been comprehensive, and it is with the support of the sporting associations that this policy has been drawn up. The member for Bragg knows that, and that is why he is being very quiet about it all. He does not want to put his foot in his mouth again. It is important to note that the sporting associations, the Education Department, the Department of Recreation and Sport and the Sports Insti-

tute have worked over three years to develop this policy. This is the first of its type in this country and we believe it is a world leader.

Let me provide the Opposition with some statistics which, with some luck, they might understand. We have found that, in those countries where there is a high emphasis on elite athletes such as the East Germans, Russians and Soviets, there is a high burn-out factor in developing a pressured sports program for young people. In fact, at the last Olympics the Soviets undertook a test program that had two streams of development for children. The Soviets found that two-thirds of their representatives at the Seoul Olympics were from the slow stream development section of the program. The facts stand alone, and I ask members of the Opposition to listen for a change to what is being conveyed to them. For example, with young boys playing football (and I know the member for Davenport has been a keen supporter of that), it is important to consider what has happened in terms of football development.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Of all the young boys who go through and end up playing football, only 1.5 per cent end up playing at the elite level, which is quite tragic. The fact is that—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Mount Gambier seems to be an expert in this area as well. I would worry about your rail services and not about this matter at this stage. You have enough on your plate. It is important to consider carefully what is happening in the sports environment. If one considers what has been happening in relation to this program, one will see a careful skills development. The children have been given the opportunity to develop their skills in an environment which is positive and supportive, which then gives them the opportunity to develop in a competitive environment. We know that intellectual development in sport is significant, and that children have to be tough mentally to deal with league sport. Members of the Opposition have never experienced that, and they are on that side of the House because of that. However, we must consider carefully what has been proposed in this policy.

The department is developing a policy for children from the age of 11 years through to a stage where after 13 years of age they can go interstate. In this policy, we are saying that we can put three times the number of children between the ages of 11 and 13 years through skills development by using those funds. The same result as that predicted by Opposition members will not be achieved, because more children will be playing sport. One of the factors that drew my attention to this issue was an ongoing concern of parents who raised with me, as side issues in relation to the development of sport, issues such as young women dropping out of netball and tennis at 15 and 16 years of age. If the children are put in a competitive situation the mental and psychological pressure put on them forces them eventually to burn out, and the evidence supports that. What we have done is work with over 60 sporting associations to develop a policy which will allow the encouragement, development and enjoyment of sport for the benefit of the whole community.

I am convinced that this is the way to go. We are getting many inquiries from interstate sporting organisations and other departments as to how we have achieved this, given the experience that they have had interstate with education authorities. There has been a major change in thinking with regard to education authorities, and we believe that the coming together of the Education Department, the Department of Recreation and Sport, SASI, and the sporting community has produced a policy that will be of benefit to all our children.

In order to support it in our community, I propose that first-hand contact be established with people who have been involved in this process—those who have developed it and have worked at the quarry face, not those sitting here and raising prejudiced views that they have held over the years. There will be an opportunity for those people to go out and talk to the community throughout the State. I propose that a series of State-wide information meetings, supported by people such as Michael Nunan and Wendy Ey, be conducted in relation to the program to be followed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, is this a ministerial statement masquerading as an answer?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. It is an answer to a question. However, it was the intention of the Chair to again suggest the completion of the answer. Provision is made in Standing Orders for ministerial statements, but I ask the Minister to quickly bring the answer to a close.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It is a very important issue. Obviously, members opposite have raised this today both through the media and through other channels. It is important to highlight how we intend to provide the opportunity for the community to have first-hand information as to how the policy will operate. I have said that we will work throughout the State by providing an opportunity, through public meetings and through private contact with those experts, to discuss the whole policy and how it will affect people so that their children and, in particular, country children, can be made aware of the opportunities that they have and how they can benefit from them in the future.

STATE BANK

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Does the Treasurer stand by his answer to this House that the State Bank group's reporting and use of off balance sheet companies is totally justified and acceptable? On Tuesday the Treasurer told the House, among other things:

> The problem that was created by the 1960 debenture trust deed was overcome through the technique of the off balance sheet company . . . It is not a mystery . . . It is not a case of hiding losses or assets: Beneficial Finance is the ultimate beneficiary of Kabani. Even if it were to take over some of the bad debts of Beneficial Finance, that would be ultimately reflected in the financial performance of the company.

Today on the Keith Conlon ABC radio program, Dr Graeme Scott, Deputy Director of the Centre for South Australian Economic Studies, described the use of off balance sheet companies as 'deplorable' and said that 'its principal justification is . . . to prevent disclosure of information . . . usually to shareholders or to lenders. In the case of the State Bank I suppose you could say it is to the South Australian taxpayers'.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think that Mr Scott said several other relevant things about it as well. I have not seen a full report of his remarks, but I know that whatever is his particular view about off balance sheet companies in that context, if he were dealing thoroughly with this subject, he would also have made several other points about the role of off balance sheet companies.

The situation in relation to Beneficial Finance has been fully detailed and further information is being provided. I am reminded of a question that was asked by a member of the interstate media about this controversy in South Australia. Apparently, when told that the issue was off balance sheet companies, the response was considerable surprise, because they are just so much a part of standard operational methods of every financial institution in this country. I think—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, he apparently said that he was surprised that this was being raised in this way.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This is the statement of the particular individual, as reported to me. It was said that it is part of normal practice. If one goes to any of the major banks, one finds off balance sheet companies operating. What is important is where that occurs. I have already said to this House that in relation to this area the State Bank has not done anything, as far as I am informed, that is contrary to general financial practice. While that situation exists, I do not believe that it need be called into question in this place, and it is unreasonable to do so. That is the position as it stands at the moment.

Those facts have been laid out and, really, I think that all we are seeing, in a milder form, is a continuation of the little campaign that has been running for most of this week, and was promised last week. It is time it was stopped because, although politicking around this issue creates a nice furore and excitement in this House, it is no way to handle the important financial affairs of this State.

MIGRANT SKILLS

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): My question is directed to the Minister of Ethnic Affairs.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister advise the House what action the State Government has taken to recognise the qualifications, skills and abilities of migrants in this State? A recent interstate newspaper report stated:

> Australia is wasting the skills and abilities of many workers by not recognising their overseas qualifications, according to a Federal Government report . . . Migrant groups have long been critical of the difficulty in getting overseas qualifications recognised here. The report was based on interviews with more than 1 000 immigrants from non-English speaking countries.

The article stated that the report provided evidence that some Australian employers had little understanding or discounted the value of overseas acquired training.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I noticed the report referring to comments made by my colleague in the Federal arena, the Hon. Gerry Hand. South Australia's record in this area is very good. We were the first State to establish an overseas qualifications unit. Indeed, I thought that we were the second; I thought New South Wales might have beaten us. However, recently at a national conference, when I had the chance to talk with Nick Greiner, he confirmed that New South Wales has had such a unit for only 18 months. We established our unit in 1987.

Last year, we established the Overseas Qualifications Board, and that has been operational this year, and it is the first of its kind. Its job is to examine the best ways in which we can take advantage of the talents that new settlers bring to this country so that their skills can be used to best effect and they are not discriminated against when unfair judgments are made about their skills. Secondly, it means that this country does not discriminate against itself by virtue of not taking advantage of the skills that people have the opportunity to offer.

The South Australian Parliament was the first Parliament in the country to legislate on this matter and, earlier this year, both Houses approved an amendment which provides that it is not proper for any accrediting or certifying authority to issue a determination on someone's ability to practise a trade or profession on any ground other than education. That legislation is still to be proclaimed because of the administrative matters needed to support it. The advice I have is that it should happen within this financial year. I believe that we have taken responsible action in this regard.

We are at the national forefront in the work that is being done, and we have done that work for the two key reasons of social justice, namely, to avoid the acts of discrimination that have taken place in the past, and, secondly, for sound commercial reasons so that this country can take advantage of the opportunity of the skills that migrants bring to this country. We do not want to cut off our nose to spite our face by denying them the chance to practise in their trade or profession skills which are adequate to Australian standards and requirements. I can only concur with what Gerry Hand is saying. Skills are wasted in this country. This State is doing what it can to minimise and eliminate the wastage of such skills in South Australia.

STATE BANK

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Can the Treasurer give an assurance that the State Bank Group has not used off balance sheet companies to avoid Federal taxation, to avoid paying stamp duty, to skirt the Reserve Bank's capital adequacy requirements, or to conceal the true debt, non-performing loan and asset position of the group?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is an omnibus question. I am just contemplating whether a more detailed or considered reply is necessary. In the circumstances, I can only say what I said a moment ago to the honourable member who asked about off balance sheet companies and, in fact, in doing so, simply repeated questions that have already been asked. I will use the formula that I think is appropriate in these cases. If the honourable member knew anything about these things he would understand it. I am satisfied that there is nothing untoward about these financial arrangements.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Wait a minute! Financial practices of all kinds operate in a number of arenas. What about the issue of family trusts and private companies?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If we really want to try to explore how financial affairs are arranged, perhaps we ought to ask some questions about that, but we are not likely to because the answer is that there is nothing untoward about these financial arrangements. I have been assured that they are normal practice in the banking and corporate community. I do not believe that this House or the public should require any of the State financial institutions, if they are given a commercial charter, not to operate in a commercial way. If that is the proposal the honourable member makes, let him say it and then we will have no complaint about low profits or anything like that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No complaint at all. Provided these things are—

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Of course it is not. If it is complying with the law, if it is complying with the taxation law, it is not. If it is not complying, presumably the Taxation Commissioner would have something to say about that. I am simply saying that these are normal commercial practices and, if we want to get into the questioning of the way in which the financial market conducts itself, the way in which information is apparently hidden, there are many other areas, including the way in which private affairs are conducted, which are exactly the same. If those matters were raised in the same way with the same innuendo, it could cause considerable embarrassment to people who would regard themselves as simply following normal commercial practice.

PLANNING AWARD

Mr De LAINE (Price): My question is directed to the Minister of Housing and Construction. I understand that the Housing Trust was recently presented with a planning award by the Royal Australian Planning Insitute. Can the Minister explain the reason for and the background to the award?

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the Minister, I remind him of the previous caution. The Minister of Housing and Construction.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Thank you, Mr Speaker, I always take on board your directions in that regard. The South Australian Housing Trust has won a prestigious award from the Institute of Architects. The award was the Royal Australian Planning Institute Metropolitan Planning Award, awarded on 5 November 1990. The award is great recognition for those people who have been involved in all the planning work that the trust has performed over the years.

The structure by which the award was presented related to new groups of dwellings on vacant or derelict sites in inner metropolitan areas; modifying older style dwellings and properties to create new medium density residential projects; and creating extra land sites in neighbourhood developments in existing residential areas, including renewal of public housing estates.

We can be proud of the achievements of the trust in being granted a national award recognising the significance of its planning role. In presenting the award, the Planning Institute made a clear statement about that and the jury of the Metropolitan Planning Award spoke of the trust's 'outstanding planning endeavour, consistency of performance, innovation and continuing provision for changing human needs and demands.' It is important to recognise what we have got with the planning skills that are with the trust and the credit that we enjoy as a community as a consequence of all of those resources being put together. It is also important in recognising what the trust has achieved over the years, because in the past there has been a view about the trust's planning which, I believe, has not recognised the reality of what has occurred.

There has been some prejudice within the community. Now, if members take their constituents—talking collectively—to areas within their electorate, and look at the planning areas that are being developed, comparing some of the public development with the private development, they can see for themselves at first hand the aesthetic quality and physical improvements that the trust's developments offer.

This recognition is an important fillip for our Housing Trust and for those people involved in the planning within the trust. I am delighted to acknowledge publicly what they have received and I am very pleased that the member for Price raised it so that I could acknowledge what is being done.

STATE BANK

Mr INGERSON: Can the Treasurer say what proportion of the State Bank group's non-housing loans are in respect of businesses and properties outside South Australia, and how does he justify risking a large proportion of taxpayers' $920 million equity in the bank in loans and financial arrangements interstate and overseas?

The Treasurer has told the Parliament that since the State Bank's creation in 1984 he has had regular six-weekly meetings with the Chairman and Managing Director of the group during which all of the major policy issues concerning the group are discussed.

The Treasurer has therefore been integrally involved in the State Bank group's policy decision to expand outside of its traditional lending role in South Australia into property lending interstate and into large scale operations overseas, in New Zealand in particular.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Whilst any policies of any bank—and the State Bank in particular—have to be kept under review, to restrict the bank to doing business only in South Australia could put it at a considerable—

Mr Ingerson: Answer the question.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, the honourable member has asked why the State Bank is investing outside this State.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Let me answer the question. I suggest that the honourable member remain patient while I answer the question.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I did. I listened to the question and to the explanation. If the explanation had no relevance to the question, I am not sure why the explanation was made. If the honourable member wants me to ignore the explanation that was meant to explain why the question was asked, to answer that and simply go back to some other aspect, he does not hear what I say.

To restrict the bank to doing business only in South Australia could put it at a competitive disadvantage. In the long run that is not in our best interests. Its operations outside in the past have certainly made a contribution to its profits. The bank also raises funds outside the State because in certain instances that is the best source of funds at a given time. If its activities were restricted here, many of the bank's borrowers in this State would not have access to funds, because it may not have been able in a particular time and circumstance to raise sufficient funds here.

Of course, the State Bank clearly has a preference and desire to invest in South Australia. Indeed, I have said in this House on a number of occasions that it is my interest and desire that it should and that I heartily resent any need for the bank to finance projects outside of the State in order to make profits when there are projects within the State. The bank's response to that is that it takes up every opportunity that it can commercially find.

The bank's reward for that is to be criticised in this place by the Opposition. How many times have we heard the Remm financing—a major project in this State—criticised by members of the Opposition? If the State Bank had not been a participant I would ask why. If I were Leader of the

Opposition I would not deplore that it was doing it and ask loaded questions about that. I would be getting up and asking why our State Bank is not involved in this major project, alongside a number of others. That is the background to the honourable member's question, and the answer to the explanation part of his question. In relation to the proportionate figure that he wants, I will refer that to the bank and see what information can be obtained.

Members interjecting:

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

ELECTORATE OFFICES

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): What extra measures is the Minister of Housing and Construction taking to ensure the security of electorate offices of members of Parliament? Recently my office was broken into, essential equipment was stolen and, above all else, confidential files were disturbed, presumably read or lost. As I have heard about similar experiences from other members on both sides of this House, what measures is the Minister taking with respect to this very important issue?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for bringing this matter to my attention and to the attention of the House because, in particular, this year there has been a series of break-ins to electorate offices. Approximately six offices have been broken into, including my own to the extent of three times in the past five weeks. It is becoming increasingly evident that electorate offices are being targeted for a number of reasons, either for cash or for some of the property that is located within them. I have asked SACON to undertake a security review to ascertain what can be done to upgrade the security.

If we look at the matter long term, obviously we will have to provide some sort of security monitoring. That would be reasonably expensive. The cost of installing movement detectors in each of the electorate offices would be approximately $2 000 per office, so we have to look at phasing that in through the budget. Given the break-ins over the past few months, we will have to consider seriously upgrading our security and upgrading the quality of locks and lighting.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: The security of this place needs to be looked at also.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: That is a matter for the Parliament. In response to the honourable member's question, a review of the current facilities available in terms of security in each electorate office is required. In the near future I hope to have a full report on the sort of program that needs to be undertaken, taking into account the budget over the next year or so. I am aware of the security needs and I appreciate the inconvenience that the honourable member and his staff suffered, because it obviously caused a great deal of disruption and distress to the staff when they—

Mr Hamilton: And his constituents.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES:—and his constituents, as the member for Albert Park has reminded me. It causes disruption and distress when they find the office furniture and facilities scattered outside the office, and hours are lost in reorganising files and so on—that can be very frustrating indeed. I appreciate the honourable member's question and I assure him that the matter will be addressed.

STATE BANK

Mr MEIER (Goyder): My question is directed to the Treasurer. To what extent do recent professional valuations support the State Bank directors' 86 per cent revaluation of the group's freehold land and buildings at the end of June 1990—when the property market was depressed—which increased their value to $322 million; what properties were involved; and is the Treasurer confident that the group's assets have not been overstated by this in-house revaluation?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will refer that question to the bank and obtain from it such information as can be provided for the honourable member, first, as to the veracity of the statements he has made and, secondly, as to any details in relation to them.

MURRAY RIVER NATIONAL PARK

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Can the Minister for Environment and Planning advise the House of the Government's plans to rededicate the Katarapko Game Reserve as the first part of the planned Murray River National Park, which will include areas in South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: In fact, this is the first inclusion in what could be termed as Australia's first truly national park to run along the Murray. Therefore, it has great significance. As members of this House may be aware, South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales are coming together to form a joint approach to a riverine conservation park along the Murray. This park will be called the Murray River National Park. I will be asking the Parliament, as a first step, to redesignate the Katarapko Game Reserve, which will require a resolution of both Houses of the Parliament.

The area I am talking about is some 8 900 hectares of Murray River wetlands which contain one of the largest and most significant river red gum forests anywhere in South Australia. This game reserve is currently located five kilometres downstream of Berri. It is interesting to note that another possible area for inclusion in the new Murray River National Park is part of the Chowilla lands on the State border. This will join areas in New South Wales and Victoria that are to be included in the park. I point out to the House that this proposal is not only historic in terms of conservation on the Murray River but it is a national landmark in Australian conservation history.

STATE BANK

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): My question is directed to the Premier. Were any of his ministerial or departmental officers, and in particular a very senior member of his ministerial staff, consulted about or involved in drafting a letter from the Managing Director of the State Bank read by the Premier to the House yesterday?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No. As the letter indicated, it was in response to a letter from the Leader of the Opposition, who sent copies to me and to the Editor of the *Advertiser*. The reply from the Managing Director of the State Bank was all his own work. I did not even know he was going to reply to the letter until I received a copy probably at the same time as the Editor of the *Advertiser* got his. The answer is 'No.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

WOMEN'S HEALTH UNIT

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Health advise the current position regarding the women's health

unit for country areas in the north of the State? When is it anticipated that the centre will be operating, and under what terms?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I will obtain details for the honourable member. However, I would like to take this opportunity to say that, in this very important thrust in primary health care for women, we must recognise a couple of points. First, the whole concept of women's health arises from the fact that there is a perception that the general health system has not always served women's health particularly well, otherwise why would we be targeting women's health in this way. However, by the same token, one would hope that, when one is dealing with a specific population like that, one would eventually be able to do away with the necessity for such a program. We are not yet at that happy stage, but I hope that eventually we will get to it.

Secondly, in making this thrust, the Government and the Health Commission would be concerned to ensure that we cooperate as fully as we possibly can with general practitioners, and particularly general practitioners in the country. I make that point because I think there is some sort of feeling around the place, particularly in country areas, that women's health is some sort of weapon aimed at the soft under-belly of private general practice. Nothing could be further from the truth. I hope it certainly could proceed in cooperation with those GPs and indeed with their full support. In any event, we are working hard to obtain that, and I will get the details for the honourable member and for the House.

AYERS FINNISS LIMITED

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): My question is directed to the Premier. How much longer is Ayers Finniss, a subsidiary of the State Bank, going to take to answer the question referred to it by the Premier on 23 August? When is the Premier going to advise the House why Ayers Finniss found it necessary to create a holding company in order to create Ayers Finniss Limited from a company called Cayuga Pty Ltd? What benefits accrued, and to whom, from that arrangement?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am delighted that the honourable member is maintaining her record of being part of the show. I will certainly follow up the matter and attempt to ascertain that information.

ORANGE SALES

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): In line with my interest in matters agricultural, can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the direct selling of oranges by growers to the public of South Australia has been a success?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: This is a very important question because we now have had about three months of the scheme.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I have been asked by interjection whether the answer is 'Yes' or 'No'. In fact, the answer cannot be clearly either 'Yes' or 'No', because there are some pluses and minuses in the operation. Before going into detail, I have a statistical table that I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard.*

Leave granted.

ORANGE SALES

												Totals
No of permits per grower	1	2	3	4	5	6	8	9	10	11	15	189
No. of growers	17	13	4	4	3	4	2	3	1	1	1	53
No. of days	65	119	78	96	58	116	37	108	38	48	38	801
Average No. of days	3.8	9.2	19.5	24	19.3	29	18.5	36	38	48	38	
Production Hectares	209.5	60.7	27.3	13	37	11.4	13	17	8	22	9	428
Tonnes sold	79	96	58.5	105.5	45	67.5	30	68.5	59	91.5	115	816
Average total sales per grower—tonnes	4.6	7.4	14.6	26.4	15	16.9	15	22.8	59	91.5	115	
Average sales/average days tonnes	1.2	.8	.75	1.1	.78	.58	.8	.63	1.55	1.91	3.03	

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: This table will show members who read it how many permits have been issued and how many individual growers have one or multiple permits. It also identifies that, in the 90 days since direct selling commenced, 816 tonnes of fruit has been sold, which represents an average of 9 tonnes a day. This appears to represent a clear increase in output of growers of fruit for the Adelaide market. There have been some pluses and minuses in this whole exercise, and I need to identify some of them. On the negative side, it needs to be said that the board has received many complaints about the quality of fruit: it has ranged from good to very poor. Indeed, the member for Hanson has previously identified this issue. Also, some of the administrative arrangements have not been adhered to with the strictness that one would have hoped. There have also been some examples of incorrect labelling and insufficient detail about selling location on the application forms and about not adhering, necessarily, to the details of the permit.

In some cases there has been understating on the application of the volume of fruit to be sold, and in other cases there have been problems regarding the street location. One grower has been reported to date—there may be more, I am not sure—for selling underweight bags. Those negative aspects will result in the board having to examine how well the scheme is operating, and doing that in consultation with growers, to determine that the credibility of the scheme is not undermined.

On the positive side, growers have had an opportunity to be exposed directly to consumers and their preferences, and they have had an opportunity to optimise their returns by having direct access to the market place, perhaps resulting in a higher proportion of the final price of the oranges to the consumer going to the grower. In other words, some retail margins may well have been eased back by the direct access of growers to the public. Growers have also been attracted by the prospect of cash returns, although we do not know the costs that they have incurred in terms of bringing their produce to the market place in Adelaide.

Increased sales have undoubtedly been achieved. Comments have been made that packers, wholesalers and retailers have complained that direct selling has disrupted their business and the ability of packers to fill orders has, in some instances, been hampered. The board will need to examine whether or not that has hampered the capacity of the citrus industry to sell its product interstate or overseas. I have not yet had that conclusion drawn by the board, but I will certainly ask it to comment on that.

There has been downward pressure on wholesale prices, with everyone wanting to match the prices set by roadside

sellers. It was anticipated that that would happen. There has also been a suggestion that there may be an increase in fruit coming into the area from the Sunraysia area. One volume retailer, who is apparently importing large quantities of Valencia oranges from Griffith in New South Wales—to quote in the words of the board—beat the roadside sellers.

I think all this means that we do not have an easy 'Yes' or 'No' answer to the success of the direct selling program. However, it is something that is worth further investigation and I will ask the board to pursue it especially in consultation with growers to see whether there can be an elimination of the negative aspects that we have seen while seeking to obtain the positive returns of the direct selling program.

JUNIOR SPORTS POLICY

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport agree to a moratorium on the implementation of that part of his junior sports policy which refers to SAPSASA interstate competition and the future role of SAPSASA until it is clear how the proposed sports camps, talent squads and other coaches will be funded? It appears from the new policy that these sports camps are intended to replace SAPSASA interstate competition. Since the policy was released, it has become apparent that there has not been wide-spread input from many of the major sporting associations as claimed, and I have been informed that some large sporting organisations have not been consulted.

The general feedback I am receiving from sporting associations, teachers and parents is that, whilst it does contain some new initiatives favourable to the future of junior sport, many teachers have expressed their concern at having been gagged from commenting to the media because they are employees of the Education Department and, because of this, they have been unable to publicise deficiencies as they see them.

I have also been informed that the private school system was not consulted, and that the first meeting took place at the request of private schools only a couple of weeks ago. It has been put to me by parents heavily involved in junior sport that there is still no strategy in place that can be explained to parents on how the camps and talent squads will work; that the policy makes many statements which cannot be substantiated or costed in terms of both money and manpower; and that a moratorium should be placed in position until these legitimate questions are answered.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I have a point of order. Could you, Sir, give a ruling as to the length of the question asked by the member for Morphett?

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member withdrawing leave?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I am just asking for your ruling, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The honourable member will resume his seat. I call the Minister.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am delighted to respond, but the answer is 'No'. I do not know where the shadow spokesman has been over the past few years. To suggest that the independent schools have not been involved in this is a joke. The Chairperson of the Independent Schools Board was on the committee that structured the policy. Mrs Avis Miller was present at meetings and part of the development of the policy. What an extraordinary statement to make: it highlights the ignorance on the part of the Opposition in regard to this policy.

I refer to the associations that are part of it, and the list touches on all those sports mentioned by the honourable member. The list is as follows:

Archery
Athletics—Track and Field
Athletics—Road and Country
Athletics—Little Athletics
Australian Football
Badminton
Baseball
Basketball
Canoeing
Cricket—Men
Cricket—Women
Cycling
Fencing
Golf—Men
Golf—Women
Gymnastics—Women's Artistic
Gymnastics—Men's Artistic
Gymnastics—Rhythmic Sportive
Handball
Hockey
Korfball
Lacrosse
Lawn Bowls—Men
Lawn Bowls—Women
Netball
Orienteering
Rowing
Rugby League
Rugby Union
Soccer—Men
Soccer—Women
Softball
Sports/Intellectual Disability
Springboard Diving
Squash
Surf Life Saving
Surfriding
Swimming
Table Tennis
Tennis
Touch
Trampoline Sports
Triathlon
Volleyball
Wheelchair Sports
Weightlifting
Wrestling

I ask the honourable member to do his homework; go and talk to the people. I have invited him to be briefed by the people who have developed the policy, because it might be an enlightening experience for him. I ask him to do as others have done, and learn what the policy is about before he starts enunciating misleading and erroneous statements about the policy. It is quite obvious that he has not done his homework.

Instead of carping criticism from the sidelines, the Opposition should look at what has been presented by these eminent people who considered this matter for three years and worked with the sporting associations to develop this policy. Regarding talent development—

Mr Ingerson: You stood over them.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I resent that comment. The member for Bragg said that I stood over the sports. I did not. I had nothing to do with it. I stood back and allowed the sports and the organisers to go through that process. It is typical of the member for Bragg to make that sort of snide remark from the sidelines. He has not given up the portfolio, and that is bad news for the member for Morphett.

It is important to note that talent development will occur, and the camp process will offer three times as many children the opportunity to compete interstate and undertake skill development. If people are to go on to elite levels in sport, a high degree of psychological development is required, and

that will be part of this process. The sporting associations have been part and parcel of this whole development, and they have agreed to these policies.

Each one is in the brochure provided; the junior sports policy is signed by the Chairman and authorised by a representative of that sport. I rest my case: the work has been done, and we are now going out to talk to the ordinary person in the street about how the whole program will be implemented.

Members interjecting:

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

OFFICE OF ROAD SAFETY

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Transport advise the House of the cost of producing the latest Office of Road Safety anti drink driving advertisement? It was reported in the *News* of Tuesday last that an anti drink driving advertisement made for the Office of Road Safety will cost $166 000 to produce, a figure described by the Public Service Association Assistant General Secretary as being way out of the ball park.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I was surprised when I saw this article in the paper—most surprised: it appeared to be something of an in-house squabble involving members of the Office of Road Safety.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Speaker, I am trying to be nice today: it is difficult when I am offered such an opportunity. It seemed like some kind of in-house domestic squabble and I was surprised to see the PSA taking sides. The article and the comments attributed to the Assistant General Secretary of the PSA were somewhat critical of the cost of the production of this advertisement, and some allegations were made that the Office of Road Safety had lost 20 per cent of its staff. Of course, the facts are quite different.

The total fee payable for the production of the advertisement is $140 913. This figure does not include screening costs. The previous deterrent 'Cardsharp' advertisement, which the new advertisement is designed to replace, was made in 1986-87 at a production cost of more than $80 000 at that time. This advertisement was made by a local South Australian production company in a controlled studio environment filmed over a period of one day. By comparison, the new production was filmed over three full nights and involved the closing of Hindley Street, City, and Main Road at Blackwood.

The production cost of some $140 000 for the new advertisement is quite reasonable when allowance is made for content and three years inflation. Initial quotes for the advertisement were in the order of $200 000 and were subsequently reduced after rejection by the department. Three quotations were sought for this production. The production was placed with an Adelaide firm and, with the exception of some technical editing work, the bulk of the production will be done in Adelaide. The technical editing done in Melbourne will be supervised by staff from the Adelaide agency. A continuing debate exists on the respective weight to be given to content, exposure and life of an advertisement. Of the several drink-driving advertisements produced in recent years, the 'Cardsharp' advertisement is widely recognised as having been particularly successful in road safety terms. To achieve corresponding success in the future, a similar level of investment was judged to be necessary.

Referring to the second matter quoted in the newspaper concerning staff reductions in the Office of Road Safety, there has been no 20 per cent cut in Office of Road Safety staff in the past year, and six workers jobs have not been lost. Staff performing certain support service functions have been transferred elsewhere within the department (that is to say, public relations and computing services) without loss of the service concerned. Like other areas of the Department of Road Transport and the Public Service as a whole, the Office of Road Safety is having to identify opportunities for future reductions of staff through attrition as part of a Government-wide review.

RAILWAY UNION PROVISIONS

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I direct my question to the Minister of Transport. In view of the huge inconvenience being caused to rail commuters through recent industrial action by the Australian Railways Union, will the Minister consult with the ARU urging it to implement provisions in its award similar to those which exist in Victoria, where strikes cannot be called without at least 24 hours notice, and hence prevent commuters being hijacked and left stranded at work?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will certainly consider that proposal, but I do not know that it will help much. The facts in this dispute are that there has been in the past a requirement to have assistant guards or ticket collectors on trains of more than a certain number of carriages. What is happening—and I am very pleased—is that more and more people are buying multi-trip tickets. We have vastly increased the number of outlets where tickets can be purchased—for example, delis and other outlets which are close to bus stops and which are open for long hours.

So, the requirement for this service on trains is diminishing quickly. Also, the price disparity between a single ticket purchased on the train and a multi-trip ticket purchased off the trains is wide. That is deliberate, in order to ensure that more and more people buy the multi-trip ticket and use that system. It is very effective.

It comes to the stage where the STA—I would expect and hope with the full support of members opposite—has said to ticket collectors, 'We are phasing out on trains of certain size this additional function.' I stress 'additional function'. That will obviously save costs, which was what the multi-trip system was designed to do.

The ARU does not agree with this. It believes that its membership ought not to be reduced in that way, and is taking industrial action in support of its views. Whilst I think that its action in this instance is utterly misguided, I hasten to add that I support its right to take such action.

The action was further complicated by an occupational health and safety delegate with the union, who saw fit to use the provisions of that Act to suggest that trains were unsafe if they did not have this ticket collector aboard, and a defect notice was issued to that effect. That immediately took the dispute out of the hands of the Industrial Relations Commission and put it into the hands of the Department of Labour's occupational health and safety inspector. My information from journalists is that the Federal office of the ARU has opposed that action. The South Australian branch of the union is attempting to have that defect notice lifted to enable the dispute to go back to the Industrial Relations Commission. All these issues ought to be settled in the Industrial Relations Commission if they come within the jurisdiction of that tribunal.

The question as to whether 24 hours, 48 hours or whatever notice has to be given is something that the union

ought to contemplate for its own benefit. Irrespective of the rights and the wrongs of the dispute, the ARU has done significant damage to itself as a union and to its members as a whole by leaving people stranded in the way that it has. The union's members will have to contemplate that, because the travelling public will not hold that union in very high regard, and that is a pity.

I hope that the action that has been taken will be resolved very quickly so that we can get the STA back to its normal efficient running because the authority, contrary to some of the statements made from time to time, has a very low level of industrial disputes indeed. It is a great shame that its fine record of not having industrial disputes over the past five years has been besmirched to some extent by the present action.

MARINE RESEARCH

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Can the Minister of Mines and Energy give the House any information on the contribution made by the Electricity Trust of South Australia to marine research, particularly in relation to the effects of power station operation on the marine environment? I ask this question as the result of a comment made by the member for Hanson during the debate on the Marine Environment Protection Bill. The honourable member said that the Torrens Island power station pumps hot water into the sea, and went on to say:

We do not know what the power station is doing, as ETSA will never admit to anything.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the member for Playford—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: —for his question, because it provides me with an opportunity to demonstrate once again the shallowness of so much of the Opposition's rhetoric when it comes to environmental matters. Throwaway lines like the one used by the member for Hanson are becoming the hallmark of this Opposition. Never mind whether or not it is true; just pick up a quick brownie point—or in this case a greenie point—with a quick, shallow reference just designed to impress some of the people some of the time. If the member for Hanson had done even—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: —the minimum of research, or had even asked the Parliamentary Library to look up some of these things for him, he would have found that large quantities of high quality research have been done both by ETSA and by marine scientists into the marine biology of both the Torrens Island and Port Augusta power stations marine environment. ETSA has supported and funded research in this area for almost 20 years. Research has been subject to considerable public, academic and Government scrutiny. The research findings have been made available in various forms from scientific papers to public documents, and have been presented and discussed at numerous seminars. The comment of the member for Hanson was offensive, both to ETSA's professional scientific staff and to the external scientists who have done so much work in this area. To help the honourable member overcome his lack of knowledge in this area, I will undertake to provide him over the next couple of days with a short list of research projects that have been undertaken. It will not be an exhaustive list but it may be enough to convince the honourable member of the error of his ways with that particular comment.

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Walsh is out of order.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEMBER'S REMARKS

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Correctional Services): I seek leave to make an explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yesterday in a personal explanation the member for Bright made some comments that were incorrect. Quoting from *Hansard*, the member for Bright said:

Further, I was aggrieved today when the Minister read from a typed document purported to have been signed by me when, in fact, I signed a written statement. I have not yet been provided with a typed version by the police, therefore the accuracy of the typed document is open to question.

I stated quite clearly—and I am sure that the member for Bright on reflection and after a thorough perusal of *Hansard* will see—that I did not quote from the document that he stated at all. I said:

I have been advised through the Minister of Emergency Services by the Commissioner of Police of the following—

and I then quoted the minute and stated quite clearly that it was signed by D. Hunt, Commissioner of Police.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SELF DEFENCE

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the select committee be extended until Thursday 13 September.

Motion carried.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 November. Page 1853.)

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): The Opposition supports this small Bill, which approves amendments to the Murray-Darling Basin agreement. These amendments will enable the ministerial council to make decisions otherwise than at meetings. The council has concluded that some issues for which it has responsibility should be resolved without a full meeting of the council. It has been suggested to me that this amendment would provide for quicker decisions without the expense of the interstate members having to travel to a common meeting venue. The procedures set down in the present agreement do not allow out-of-session resolutions, and the move before the House at present seems sensible.

The council comprises up to 12 Ministers, three from each Government. It maintains general oversight and control over major policy issues of common interest to those Governments concerning the effective management of natural resources within the Murray-Darling Basin. Significant matters, including funding approval for major projects, require council endorsement. I understand that there have been extensive negotiations between the parties, and an amending agreement has been executed by the Prime Min-

ister and the Premiers of New South Wales, South Australia and Victoria to allow these out-of-session resolutions. I support that move.

From the Bill, I note that a decision of the ministerial council may be made other than at a meeting of the ministerial council if made in accordance with the new third schedule which provides:

If—

(a) the text of a proposed resolution is sent or given in writing by facsimile or other transmission by an officer of the commission authorised by the ministerial council to a Minister nominated under clause 7G or if that Minister is unavailable a Minister for the same contracting Government authorised for the purpose by the Minister so nominated; and

(b) such Minister approves the proposed resolution and notifies that officer in writing sent or given by facsimile or other transmission.

I would like the Minister to clarify that, because I am not sure whether or not the minutes of the ministerial council are made public. A question was asked of me and the Minister may be able to indicate that at a later stage. Also, I would be interested to have an update from the Minister in regard to the involvement of Queensland in the ministerial council. I note that the Queensland Government has consented to join the council. I also note that the Federal, New South Wales, Victorian and South Australian Governments were at one stage questioning how much funding Queensland would be prepared to contribute to the Murray-Darling Basin Commission.

Apparently the Queensland funding commitments were to be thrashed out at a meeting of the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council in August and I would be interested if the Minister could bring the House up to date on that issue. All members would realise the extreme importance of this basin, as it provides more than 50 per cent of Australia's agricultural output. It is important that Queensland has a strong input into the workings of the council and of the commission. I understand that about one-quarter of the basin's area is in Queensland, and I regret that previous Governments of that State have not seen it necessary to embrace the comprehensive environmental, conservation, and rural resource strategies that have been referred to from time to time in that State. I would be interested to learn about that from the Minister.

One other matter that has been brought to my attention recently relates to the community advisory committee. It has been suggested to me that that committee is not working as effectively as it might; that there are problems associated with it. I am interested to know who is actually on that committee. I recognise that the Minister may need to take on notice a question about the costs associated with that committee. It has been suggested to me that the cost of administering that committee would outweigh its effectiveness. It has also been put to me that the advisory committee is somewhat remote from the community and that it is not being seen to be responsible; that there are no grass roots that would seem to be essential if such a committee were to work effectively.

The Opposition supports the legislation. I hope that the result of this amendment to the agreement will be that decisions will be made at a lot less cost to the taxpayers of this State, because I can imagine what that would be with all the Minster, their entourages and observers attending meetings. Also, I would appreciate the Minister providing on notice a list of the observers, because I understand that there are quite a few, and I am interested to know what organisations they represent. With those questions—if the Minister is able to provide that information—the Opposition supports the legislation.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I have no differences of opinion whatsoever with the remarks that have been made on behalf of the Opposition by the member for Heysen, who is our spokesman on such matters. My only wish is to commend the contracting Governments and, presumably, the Parliaments of the four States in which they are established for this yet further commonsense change in the way in which, as contracting Governments, they agreed to conduct their business—speeding it up; using modern technology—so that things can be resolved without great cost and time wasting.

Like the member for Heysen, I am anxious to discover how long it will be before Queensland is also a participating Government. It is not appropriate for us to allow the river system to be seen as divided by State borders. The existing three State Governments of Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia, and the respective Parliaments in which they are formed, acknowledge this point. Of course, the Commonwealth takes great interest in this issue and has a commitment to the same approach. Our desire, for the purposes of administrative convenience, to draw lines on maps that represent land masses to give us a definition of where the responsibilities begin and end, is inappropriate when applied to situations that have to be addressed, such as this.

The drainage of rainwater and other precipitations, such as snow and hail, or whatever, from the topography in one-seventh of the land mass of Australia into the channels, streams, tributaries and, ultimately, the Murray itself, cannot be segmented, fragmented or otherwise divided for our purposes and be expected to be effective in the way in which we manage that phenomena for our benefit and that of our children. That we recognise this point has already been well established. However, there is no argument about it right now. There used to be an argument not only between contending political interests but also between contending Parliaments in the States which they were established to govern. Queensland remains out of it and that is a pity because it has a significant part of the Darling catchment within its borders.

It is like saying that a right hand, of its own accord, can continue to survive free of water, and dry, whilst the swimmer to which the right hand belongs is in distress and needs the right hand to do its part in supporting that swimmer. For if the swimmer dies by drowning, the right hand dies with it. Accordingly, Queensland needs to recognise that it cannot be left out of the system of management of the total catchment. If it is, the destruction that will be, or could be, reaped in consequence of it, will no doubt jeopardise the national economy to such an extent that it will equally destroy Queensland's own prosperity. Queensland cannot imagine that it can sit out high and dry when the rest of the system is in distress.

Other aspects of the analogy are relevant. The most important of those is that Queensland, by the way in which it chooses to manage (albeit more likely mismanaged, and innocently, perhaps at that) its part of the catchment area coming through the Darling into the Murray itself, can do great damage, not only to the irrigation along the main channel of the Darling, the communities that live along that main channel and the economics communities that depend on it, but also, and more importantly, it will jeopardise the very survival of the State of South Australia.

At present, nothing of great significance is being done in Queensland that is immediately and apparently detrimental to South Australia, but that is not to say that it could not be and that it will never be. Indeed, there is a risk that it could be and will be, because the electors in the parts of

the Darling catchment which are in Queensland do not see themselves as having any need to be concerned about the consequences downstream of any activity or industry in which they engage. They say that is not their problem. It is clear, too, that they think that way, otherwise they would have accepted the overtures that have already been made and joined in.

It would not hurt them to accept a responsible position and do so forthwith. It would not hurt and it will not hurt. It will not hurt them or their taxpaying public, and it will enhance the commonweal of all Australians, including Queenslanders, when they do it. It is not a matter of 'if' but 'when', and the sooner they do it the less will be the public odour they attract by delaying. I know that all members share the views that I am expressing in this regard, to some degree at least.

My last point concerns the way in which, during the past decade, we have moved rapidly to achieve the position which we now have and which is relevant to the measure we are debating here today. Happily, and with some measure of personal satisfaction, I place on record my recognition of the successful efforts of the Murray Valley League in getting a more cooperative approach to the management of the affairs of the Murray-Darling Basin between the three States and the Commonwealth. Had it not been for the persistence of the league and its members, it could not have achieved that, and it would not have brought us to where we are now. There is no doubt about that.

There was a time in the recent past when ordinary citizens—and I do not seek any self-congratulation by saying this because others have been far more involved than I have—staked a great deal of their own funds to ensure that the league could survive and continue to argue for the course of action which has occurred, particularly during the past five years, to bring us to this point today. Had they not done so, I doubt that we would have arrived at this point anywhere near as quickly as has been the case, nor would we have been able to secure the concept and the responsible management approach that has been taken for a multiple user resource of the Murray and all tributaries, including the Darling.

I conclude by making one other point. It is not now appropriate for the New South Wales Government or, more particularly, the bureaucrats serving the New South Wales Government in the Western Plains area, which is in the watershed of the Darling River and the Lachlan River, to tell the Murray Valley League to get out of the way and not complicate the approach which it is taking in managing that catchment area, or to try to prevent public involvement in the development of policy and public scrutiny of the implementation of that policy and of the bureaucrats to make them accountable for the way in which the policy is implemented.

At recent meetings of the league, I did not approve of the way in which bureaucrats from that region of New South Wales attempted to discredit the league and, more particularly, prevent the league and other public bodies that have demonstrated a continuing interest in and commitment to the common welfare of all people who use and rely on the tributaries and the Murray from being involved. I did not appreciate that. I did not approve of it and I still do not approve. I think it is fair for us to let them know of the extent and strength of our feelings in that regard.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Water Resources): I thank the shadow Minister (the member for Heysen) for his contribution. I will be pleased to answer his specific questions and I will also refer to the remarks made by the member for Murray-Mallee. The member for Heysen asked whether the minutes of the Murray-Darling Ministerial Council meetings are made public. As far as I am aware, they are not released publicly, but I will thoroughly check that answer.

The honourable member also sought an update on when or whether Queensland will be entering into the ministerial council. I understand that, since the Labor Government came to power in Queensland, there has been a heightening of interest and a degree of willingness to be part of the council. Historically, Queensland has always sent a departmental officer as an observer, and that answers part of another question about who are the observers at council meetings. Queensland has been present as an observer.

Amendments will have to be made to the legislation in the various States to open up the membership to Queensland and just as importantly, if not more so, the ACT, which now has self-government. I note that the member for Murray-Mallee did not touch on this in his speech, but I point out that the biggest city in the catchment area is Canberra. I acknowledge that the member for Mitchell brought this to my attention because, as members might be aware, he was one of the driving forces behind the establishment of the ministerial council and commission. He reminded me that, now that the ACT has self-government, it may well be appropriate to look at amendments to open up the membership of the council so that the ACT can become a member. I will encourage the ACT to become a full participating member because it is now making its own decisions about water quality issues, natural resource management, etc.

I cannot tell the honourable member more than that. These things seem to take an inordinate amount of time because, generally speaking, we have to reach agreement, and legislation or amending legislation must be drawn up for the four legislatures, and that seems to take a while. With respect to this Bill, we are the last of the four Parliaments to enact it, so I am delighted that we can get this through Parliament speedily. I do not want us to be seen to be dragging the chain. I would welcome Queensland's involvement, and point out that representatives of the Queensland Government attended the last ministerial council meeting.

As to the role and function of the Community Advisory Committee, I have to say that I am happy to get a report on that. I have met with those members of the committee from South Australia and I believe that they are very representative. Just to name a couple of them off the top of my head, Tony Robinson, Mayor of Murray Bridge, is on the committee and so is Graham Camac. Both of those people are highly respected in this State and have a good understanding of what the communities want. I am happy to get a full list of who is on the council and the advisory committee.

It is my understanding that, particularly in South Australia, it is working very well. They have travelled up and down the Murray and met with, for example, the community in the Riverland and communities all along the river. Again, I am happy to provide the honourable member with that kind of detail, but I was—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: What about the costs?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Yes, I will get to that, too. I was very impressed, in my meeting with them, with the way in which they wished to consult and the enthusiasm and genuine concern that these members have for preserving, protecting and enhancing not just the Murray River but the whole catchment area of the river. They are very supportive of the natural resources management strategy

which I believe is the only way we can proceed in terms of the long-term solutions and goals.

As to the costs in respect of the committee, I shall be happy to provide that information as well. The other question related to who were the observers. One observer who is always present and who is certainly always welcome by me is the Murray Valley League. It always attends. As I said earlier, Queensland has representatives, and a number of interested bodies attend. As lead Minister for South Australia, I welcome that, because those organisations can take away the information and be part of spreading the word about the importance of the commission and the council in the work that is done.

In concluding, I am happy to inform the House that on Monday I will be taking part in a joint opening with the Federal Minister, the lead Minister for the Commonwealth, John Kerin, in the official opening of the Woolpunda Salinity Interception Scheme, which is the first major salt interception engineering scheme—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: I did not—

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am not organising the invitations, but I can ensure that the honourable member does get an invitation. That would have been an oversight on the part of the people organising it. It is highly important to publicise this salt interception program because so much salt is actually being prevented from entering the river. We are now looking at moving to the next of these interception schemes.

While I am the first to acknowledge that they are not solutions in the long term, but solutions to past bad practices, degradation of land, massive clearing, particularly in the Mallee areas, they are necessary in the short term. We must not lose sight of the major goal, which is long-term rehabilitation and proper management right across the whole basin.

I believe that that covers the extent of the honourable member's questions, and as to anything that has not been fully answered by me, I shall be happy to provide those answers in greater detail. I commend the Bill to the House.

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

TRUSTEE COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 24 October. Page 1360.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): The Opposition supports the Bill, the purpose of which is to amend the schedule of the Trustee Companies Act by including two further trustee companies. However, I note that a further amendment will be before the Committee to include another two trustee companies, one new one and another involved in a change of ownership. I intend to ask the Minister to give the Committee a general assurance as to the ownership of the companies and the reason why these amendments have been brought forward. In principle, we support the move. Obviously, these amendments will significantly increase the number of trustee companies available to the community. They will offer a much wider range of community benefit and competition, and we believe that any expansion of competition is in the best interest of the community.

The Opposition believes that the trustee company industry should not be a closed shop and, as I said, we support any new groups that come into the industry. We understand that the major reason for the introduction of the Bill is that the Government has seen some significant changes in this area and, because there is no great controversy as far as the Opposition is concerned, we are prepared to support this short Bill.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I thank the honourable member for his indication of support. I apologise for the fact that the rapid collapse of the previous debate caught me out of the House and I missed his first few comments. I understand that the honourable member is looking for an assurance, but I will ask him to repeat his request when we get to the appropriate clause in the Committee stage. A Government amendment has been circulated in respect of the change of name of the companies involved, but I will take that up at the appropriate time.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Amendment of schedule 1.'

Mr INGERSON: Mr Chairman, I draw your attention to the state of the Committee.

A quorum having been formed:

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

Page 1, after line 15— Insert paragraphs as follows:

(aa) by inserting after the item—

ANZ Executors and Trustee Company (South Australia) Limited

the item—

Austrust Limited;

(aaa) by striking out the items—

Elder's Trustee and Agency Company of South Australia Limited

Executor, Trustee, and Agency Company of South Australia Limited

and substituting the item—

Executor Trustee Australia Limited.

Members will understand why the Government was keen to ensure that this legislation, having already been in another place, should clear the Assembly before we rose for Christmas. Recently Austrust Limited requested that its change of name from Elders Trustee & Executor Company Ltd to Austrust Limited be reflected in Schedule 1 to the Trustee Companies Act. In addition, the Corporate Affairs Commission was aware that Executor Trustee Australia Ltd had changed its name from Executor Trustee & Agency Company Ltd. It seemed that the appropriate procedure was to amend the Act to take account of the changes during the passage of the Bill. I am assured that they are the only implications that my amendment has, and I urge the amendment on the Committee.

Mr INGERSON: I thank the Minister for his explanation. That was my major concern in my second reading speech. We support the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PIPELINES AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): I want to set the record straight concerning the State Bank. First, I completely resent the implication that we have sought to destabilise or politicise the bank. That has been claimed by the Premier and by his close confidante (although, from one's observations of this week's parliamentary sessions, most definitely not his close adviser in view of the way in which the Premier has not been able to answer any questions).

If we cannot ask in the people's House questions about the people's bank, there is something very fragile about that bank. Of course, this is the place in which those questions should be asked. That is admitted by the Managing Director of the bank and by all commonsense-thinking people around South Australia. I challenge anyone inside or outside this House to point to any question that we have asked and to say that it was improper.

The Managing Director of the bank and the Premier are trying to frighten us by the innuendo and the publicity that this matter is receiving and are saying that we do not have the right to ask sensible and prudent questions about the bank. The questions that we have been asking pertain to off balance sheet companies which are hiding the true performance of the bank and which have not been brought on to the bank's records.

I have taken the liberty to document all the questions that we have asked during this session of Parliament. They are available to anyone who wants to go through them. I challenge anyone on the Government side to say that those questions have not been fair and reasonable. It would do a lot for the education of most members on the Government's side to go back through *Hansard* and check those questions we have asked. It is an outrage for the Premier to claim that the questions we have been asking have destabilised the bank or that we have been politicising the matter.

Look at the letter that all members on this side of the House received yesterday from the Managing Director of the bank. It was written to 'all Liberal members in the House of Assembly and the Upper House'. If that letter was not politicising this whole matter, nothing was. It does not say a lot for those tactics, and I totally reject them and believe that they should be withdrawn. I would not like those sorts of tactics to continue. We join with the Premier wholeheartedly in saying that we need a strong State Bank in this State.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr D.S. BAKER: It is for the benefit of all South Australians that we have a strong State Bank. However, we need a bank that is totally accountable to the taxpayers of South Australia and to this Parliament. Until we get that, the Opposition will not in any way stop its questioning of the running of the bank, in the same way that any shareholder can ask questions at any annual meeting of any of the other major banks. Any person with any experience who sits in on those meetings—and very few on the other side would be shareholders—would know that this intense questioning goes on. That is especially needed in the case of the State Bank of South Australia, the performance of which has been less than adequate over the past 12 months. It is admitted by the Managing Director that the profit will be zilch in the next 12 months.

Of course questions should be asked. The taxpayers of South Australia, who have $920 million equity in the State Bank of South Australia, want a return on their capital and have the right to demand that. Only in the last budget, the Premier of this State put up taxes by $200 million. The Managing Director of the State Bank says that that bank should return $140 million to the coffers of the South Australian Treasury, but it is not doing that. The taxpayers have the right to have those questions answered.

The Premier should be asking those questions in his regular briefings with the Managing Director and the board of the bank. He should be fully briefed. It is outrageous that when we asked questions this week, after he had had a briefing—we know that—the Premier failed to answer many of the questions at all. We are now getting blue sheets of paper, some of them being received today from Tuesday's questioning, trying to explain his way out of it and saying, 'I didn't know, but I've the information.' That is not good enough. We have to have a strong, accountable bank because we do not want what happened in Victoria happening in this State.

The Premier is trying to draw the thread across the border. It happened there because the State Bank of Victoria was not accountable and because questions were not asked in Parliament about the performance of that bank. When those questions were asked it was too late. I want any member on the other side of the House who disagrees that the State Bank should be accountable to stand up in this House and say so. If we make the bank accountable it will be a strong State Bank and will be good for South Australians.

At the end of the day, in the Premier's briefing he might look into the State Bank of South Australia and ask it to start looking after South Australians and South Australian companies and to stop investing willy-nilly in other States and overseas, because it is our bank. We want it to work. We will make sure that it works for South Australians. At present it is not doing that and is not returning any money to the taxpayers.

Secondly, I completely reject claims made by both the Premier and the State Bank's Managing Director that we are abusing privilege following a confidential briefing held this week. We disclosed in Monday morning's *Advertiser* exactly what we would do, and indicated that we would question the State Bank about its performance this week. We gave notice to the Premier that we would do that and we even outlined some of the questions that we would ask.

It was not until Monday afternoon that the State Bank Managing Director and the Chairman came to see us. They requested that meeting on Monday and we were very happy that they wanted to come to see us. We know—and the Premier probably admits—that he had his briefing on Tuesday morning, and we were very thankful for that because we wanted the Premier, as Treasurer of this State, to be adequately briefed before we asked very pertinent questions about the State Bank in Question Time this week.

But, what did we get on Tuesday? 'Sorry, I will bring back an answer': 'sorry, no, I won't answer that'—and this went on all during Question Time. Quite frankly, it is not good enough. If the Treasurer of this State is not more abreast of the financial management of our State and what is going on with our bank, it does not say much for his ability.

It has been claimed by the Premier and the Managing Director of the State Bank that that was a confidential briefing. It was made very clear at the start of the meeting that we would not accept a confidential briefing because it would obviate our right as an Opposition to ask questions of the bank. However, what we did say, and I still say, is that we would never reveal commercially confidential matters that were discussed during those briefings because that would reveal the names of people involved, amounts of money and other commercially confidential arrangements that go on. No professional person would reveal that—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: And you haven't.

Mr D.S. BAKER: We have not and never will, because that is what it is all about if you are a professional person. However, what we were most concerned about was that, at a briefing we had with the bank on 9 October, we were given information that there were only four off balance sheet companies. We were not going to disclose any of that information because, when we went to that briefing, we knew that there were a lot more. However, that is what the bank said and we were prepared to accept what they said, although we knew it to be wrong. The Managing Director, yesterday in his letter, put on the public record everything that was said during that confidential briefing. It is not the Opposition that has breached anything. The Managing Director of the State Bank has done so, and that is his right. In a debate in this House, or in a question, we will never use anything that is commercially confidential.

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

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Just over a year has passed—in fact, 54 weeks—since the election that saw several new members come into this House. The new members from this side have been looking with some dismay at the conduct of the Opposition and the development of debates in that time. One of the best examples in recent times in fact occurred this week in the questioning, or supposed questioning—some would say the scare campaign—concerning the State Bank. In fact, the Opposition has elevated the whole procedure to a new level. In my time before this place and since I have been here, I understood that the role of an Opposition was to be a constructive one. In fact, we are elected to look after the interests of South Australians. We are elected to see the economic development of this State proceed to the point at which we can guarantee a lifestyle no worse—and I stress 'no worse'—than the one we inherited when we were elected.

In fact, this Government wishes to see that improve. However, what we have is a two bob each way approach by the Opposition. They go out to the front steps and promise the world with free enterprise, but they come in here and fight every level of deregulation from the smallest measure to the largest. They go out and tell their constituents—and I have no problem with this—that we need adequate measures against the dumping of products from overseas on to our markets; that the citrus growers are being hurt; that a whole range of primary producers are feeling the pinch. One gets somewhat cynical about the whole question of the rural crisis because it develops about every three years.

In fact, the rural crisis is largely opposite us, and it needs to be made quite clear that the greatest crisis most of the rural areas have is some of the members they have elected who have come in here and run the line from one end to the other and have then gone out and told their constituents, 'Well, of course, we have difficulties and problems.' Where this is concerned, I do not mind the Opposition having two bob each way, but when it comes down to the absolute vandalism of the South Australian economy—and that is the only description for the vitriolic campaign against the State Bank that has been run by members opposite in recent weeks particularly the past three days in Question Time in this place—the people of South Australia (and I include the constituents of members opposite) want to start taking a very close look at their record.

What we see is a deliberate policy to destroy one of the principal financial pillars of this State. One of the principal financial pillars of this State is under a cloud, and the Opposition has caused that situation. Before they come back here next Tuesday, Opposition members should take some time to reflect on the damage that is likely to be done if they should continue along this path. I note with interest that the Leader of the Opposition has spoken in this grievances debate. He came in here and told us that what we are doing is just the normal course of events, and that this is the way the parliamentary process should run. Well, Mr Speaker, it is not, and one does not have to be here very long at all to know that.

My forebear, after whom my electorate was named, established a reputation in this State which is respected more, I suspect, on this side of politics than on the other side. He knew that the role of Government and Opposition was to develop a better standard of living for the people of this State and not to take the cheap or quick way out that the Opposition is now taking to try to wreck the economy for their own short-term political gain.

In fact, people who are much more eloquent than I about this process have been quoted in the two papers in South Australia today. In an article in tonight's paper, we start to see a little backpeddling from the Opposition. Under the heading 'State Bank "secure" ', the article states:

> During one of the rowdiest Question Times for years, it was revealed the State Bank had told the Opposition it was losing depositors as a result of the continued attacks.

Nothing the Opposition (or the Opposition Leader) has said in here this afternoon has denied that fact. The article continues:

> In a letter read to State Parliament by Mr Bannon, the State Bank's Group General Manager, Tim Marcus Clark, said 'uncertainty in the community would be exacerbated by the Opposition's campaign.' He said a continued program to destabilise the Government through attacks on the State Bank could harm 'thousands of innocent South Australians and do great damage to the bank.'

I add to that, 'great damage to the economy of South Australia'. There is no doubt that we are seeing Opposition tactics here developed to a point where vandalism is the only way to describe what is happening. We are seeing the vandalism of the South Australian economy for short-term political gain. The Opposition Leader mentioned Victoria. Nothing did more damage to that State this year than the lack of confidence in the financial system, the likes of which members of the Opposition are trying to engender here in South Australia.

The whole process of questioning the State Bank and the whole process of necessary scrutiny that must be done is not what has occurred here this week. Mr Speaker, I put to you that the only interpretation that can be made of the events of this week and, in fact, in recent weeks is that there has been an orchestrated campaign to destroy one of the principal financial pillars upon which this State's economic development depends.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr QUIRKE: Indeed, I think the member for Walsh is quite correct: it should be a matter of shame—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr QUIRKE: —for those members opposite who might not have been here during the Playford years. One of the lessons they should have learnt from that history was the tremendous progress when constructive Opposition and Government get together to build economic fortunes in this State to the benefit of all South Australians. And they bleat now, because they know what they have done this week: they can see the benefits of it. Benefits, indeed! Short-term benefits to them: long-term problems for the South Australian economy. If that bank collapses, it will be on their heads, and that message must be got across. If that fragile

structure is ruined, it will be ruined by members opposite. They alone will stand condemned for it. It must be made clear that what is happening is—in fact, I think we need a biblical understanding of the whole thing—a whole new version of 30 pieces of silver; that is obviously what is going on here. It is a sell out of one of our principal financial institutions for one reason—short-term political gain by the Opposition.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I want to set straight for the record the facts surrounding recent events and statements made by the Nature Conservation Society of South Australia with respect to the Wilpena resort. I have been asked to do so by senior officers of the society, and in particular to clarify assertions and allegations made by the Minister for Environment and Planning during the Committee stage of the debate on the Wilpena Bill.

On 20 November, in Committee the Minister for Environment and Planning claimed that a meeting of the Nature Conservation Society, which reversed an original decision by the executive to give qualified support to the project, had been stacked. The Minister said:

> ... as members would know, there was what can only be described as a stacking of a meeting attended by, I think, 60 members ...

She also claimed that there was intimidation to which officers of the Nature Conservation Society were subjected. She claimed that I misrepresented the position of the Nature Conservation Society. How I could have done that when I was reading a letter signed by an official of the society is hard to sustain, but that was the Minister's claim. She also claimed that the said meeting, which was stacked and which reversed a position at which the council had arrived initially, was not a position from the Nature Conservation Society which could clearly, under any democratic principles, be said to be upheld.

The Minister is claiming under parliamentary privilege that a meeting of the Nature Conservation Society had been unconstitutionally held and had been stacked, and that its members were subject to intimidation. My first question is a rhetorical question: how on earth is it possible to intimidate, and why should anyone want to intimidate, intelligent, mature adults who have, of their own free will, joined a society that is committed to nature conservation? I cannot see how it is possible for intimidation to take place under those circumstances.

A statement prepared and signed by Mr Sibly, President of the Nature Conservation Society of South Australia, and dated 22 November 1990 sets the facts on the record. It states:

> It has become necessary that a statement be made to clarify the events of the last month or so that have received public attention. On 13 September 1990 a press release in the name of the society set out a position of qualified support for the proposed Wilpena Station Resort in what was then its currently amended form. At the general meeting of the society on 5 October 1990 it was made clear that numbers of the membership were unhappy about the statement of policy as expressed in the press release. A special general meeting—

and we all know that special general meetings can be held only under the rules and constitution of an incorporated body—

> was subsequently called for 12 October 1990 for the purpose of reviewing the society's policy on the matter. To ensure members were clear about the nature of current plans for the proposed Wilpena Station Resort, three high ranking Government officials were invited to speak and respond to questions. At the conclusion of the discussions that followed the attached motion was passed by the society.

The motion was:

> The Nature Conservation Society of South Australia Inc. is opposed to the construction of phase one of the proposed Wilpena Station Resort [and that] NCS form a working party to make constructive suggestions about what should be done instead.

The Wilpena Bill was debated on 25 October, and it was on that day, and the following day in the Committee stage, that the Minister chose to include in her debate the original qualified statement of support prepared not after general meetings of the society but, presumably, by individuals who may have been on the executive of the society.

In short, some considerable period after she knew the society had reversed its position, she chose to place on the parliamentary record to support her case a position which was no longer sustainable and which had been rejected by the society. John Sibly's letter continues:

> At the following meeting of the executive committee of the society—

that is, following the special general meeting which passed that resolution—

> resignations were received from both the President and the Vice-President. These were received by the committee with regret.
>
> It has become necessary that the course of events be set out because of the public discussion that has accompanied the events. There have been suggestions of certain improprieties in the conduct of the society's activities outlined above. I therefore wish to put the record straight.
>
> Clearly there have been differences of opinion amongst society members about the issue of how best to conserve the land and biological features of the Flinders Ranges National Park. It is certainly right and proper that there should be full and sometimes vigorous discussions between members about the issues of nature conservation. The discussions on the proposed Wilpena Station resort have essentially been no different from any others of the society. In the course of these discussions, all meetings were properly conducted in accordance with the society's rules.

I want to stress and repeat that all meetings were properly conducted in accordance with the society's rules. I believe that is a direct rebuttal of the Minister's claim that the meeting was stacked, and that members were intimidated, and I believe that no further rebuttal is required. Mr Sibly continues:

> As stated above, the current position adopted by the society has been properly arrived at. My regret is that there has been public confusion and misunderstandings over the matter, particularly for parliamentarians and other environment groups.

I hope that members will take careful note of the sequence of dates, of the fact that the Minister must have been aware when she read the statement of support to Parliament that that statement had been overturned, and of her allegations that the society had not conducted its affairs properly and that there had been intimidation.

I suggest that, in the light of such conduct by a Minister, the House is right and correct to be very wary of what the Minister says when she makes allegations of that nature, which quite clearly cannot be substantiated, which are very damaging to community groups and which are designed for no other purpose than to mislead Parliament.

Motion carried.

At 4.16 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 11 December at 2 p.m.