LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 18 August 1992

The PRESIDENT (Hon. G.L. Bruce) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

GEDDES, Hon. R.A., DEATH

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): With the leave of the Council, I move:

That the Council expresses its deep regret at the recent death of the Hon. R.A. Geddes, former member of the Legislative Council, and places on record its appreciation of his distinguished public service; and that, as a mark of respect to his memory, the sitting of the Council be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Richard Alexander Geddes was born in Adelaide on 5 November 1921. He was educated at St Peters and Kings Colleges in Adelaide. He served his country with honour and distinction during the Second World War after he joined the 9th Australian Armoured Regiment in 1942. The following year he became a commissioned lieutenant with that regiment and completed active service in Borneo. On returning to Australia he became a farmer, grazier and then company director in the Wirrabara district. He also married and had four children.

In 1963 he became a member of the Stockowners Association of South Australia and later served as an executive member between 1965 and 1979. In 1965 Mr Geddes won Liberal Country League preselection for a Legislative Council seat for the Northern District, and was elected to the Council later that year.

During his 14 years in this Upper House, he was appointed Secretary of the Legislative Council Liberal Country Party and he joined the shadow Cabinet as Opposition spokesperson on mines and energy. Mr Geddes' political career came to an end in 1979, following a decision he had made to cross the floor (with two other Liberal Party members) and vote with the Labor Party on legislation which limited the number of Santos shares allowed to be held by former businessman Alan Bond. At the time he was reported as saying: 'So far as I was concerned the future energy needs of the State were more important than political implications.' Subsequently, he was omitted from the Liberal Party's Upper House ticket for the 15 September election in 1979, and thus ended his political career. He retired from politics and went on to become an executive member of the United Farmers and Stockowners.

Unlike some of the other former members whom we have recognised with condolence motions recently who were not known to me, Dick Geddes was known to me personally, as our time in this Parliament overlapped by some four years. He was prepared to stand up for principles which he saw as important, in this case, in particular, the interests of South Australia and the protection of South Australia's energy resources. He was a gentleman, in the best sense of that word and, I am sure, would have found the current rough-house of Parliaments throughout Australia, with their concentration on character assassination rather than debate about issues of political principle, not to his taste.

Mr Geddes died last Wednesday, aged 70. He will be remembered as a very civic minded, hard working family man with a great desire to work for the betterment of all South Australians. I am sure that all members of all Parties of the Council will join with me in expressing our condolences to his wife Pam, their children and grandchildren.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion on behalf of the Liberal members in this Chamber, although a number of my colleagues who knew the Hon. Dick Geddes better than I will obviously speak in support of the motion also. The Hon. Dick Geddes was a respected member of the Liberal Party and the Liberal Parliamentary Party. He served the Party, the Parliament, his church and the community with distinction. Those members who attended yesterday's memorial service at Parkside got a good indication of the breadth of support and respect for the work of the Hon. Dick Geddes in a whole range of community organisations. The fact that members of Parliament from both political persuasions attended the memorial service is an indication of the respect in which he was held as were the words uttered by the Attorney-General in support of this motion.

One of the interesting aspects in speaking to condolence motions from my point of view as someone who did not share a period in this Parliament is to refer back to some of the earlier contributions of members. In preparation for this speech I looked at the original maiden speech of the Hon. Dick Geddes on 20 May 1965. It is always interesting to see the similarities and, sometimes, the differences that have eventuated or evolved in parliamentary representation and the issues that have concerned members, in this case over 27 years. Some of the issues that would be of interest to members such as the Hon. Ron Roberts that were raised by the Hon. Dick Geddes in his maiden speech included unemployment problems in Port Pirie and some concerns that he had in relation to environmental aspects, particularly in relation to the power plant and other industries at Port Augusta. In particular, he raised the problems that he saw concerning the protection of the heritage of old institute buildings in country communities throughout South Australia. He said:

If it [an institute] should receive more than £500 it receives a grant of two shillings in the pound. Handy as this grant is, it is not sufficient in these days for the maintenance, repair or rebuilding of these institutes.

Amongst a number of other issues, he raised what was to be of continuing interest to the Hon. Dick Geddes during his 14 years or so in Parliament, and that was an interest in educational issues and, given his background, a particular interest in educational opportunities for rural students. He talked about the problems of rural students having to move from rural communities to the big smoke to further their education. Again, with respect to an issue that I think would be of interest of my colleague the Hon. Peter Dunn who has some interest in and knowledge of this area, in 1965 the Hon. Dick Geddes said:

I suggest that the Government provide assistance for building, in strategic places within the State, hostels for children to board in during the school term at places such as Port Augusta, Murray Bridge, Berri and possibly Port Lincoln, run by approved church societies, church organisations or similar types of approved organisations.

As my colleague the Hon. Peter Dunn would know from his experience with the Isolated Children's Parents Association (IPCA) in South Australia, it has really only been in the past two or three years that we have started to tackle this particular issue. Indeed, we are confronting those sorts of problems in providing hostel-type accommodation in places such as Port Lincoln, Port Augusta and some other rural areas in South Australia at the moment. Another perhaps slightly amusing reference to the times of 1965 is illustrated by the following quote from the Hon. Dick Geddes contribution. He was talking about the sorts of books that were of interest to country people in 1965 and the problems of institutes in getting good quality library books from Adelaide to country communities such as Wirrabara. He said:

> However, many books like *Peyton Place* and *Carpetbaggers* go to the country. I was speaking to the Secretary of the Institutes' Association this morning and he said that the people hate to be seen reading them, but they love them.

I think that is a fair indication that perhaps times have not changed too much at all. Perhaps the books have changed, but the attitudes of people in South Australia have not. In conclusion, I join with the Attorney-General in extending my sympathies, and those of Liberal members in this Chamber, to Mrs Geddes and her family.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I support the motion. I have found that, with regard to some of the condolence motions that have been moved in recent times, I have been the only member who has served with the deceased member and it has been an uncomfortable reminder of my own mortality. However, on this occasion I have many companions who did serve with the late Hon. Dick Geddes, so I feel a little more comfortable.

He was a member when I entered Parliament in 1973 and I have the fondest memories of Dick Geddes. A term which I often associated with him long before his death was *noblesse oblige* in the best sense of the phrase, and I continue to consider that that term probably epitomised his life. He had a good mind and he had a lot to contribute, which he did in a good and commonsense sort of a way. He expressed himself very well and he was of the utmost integrity. He did not ever say anything—except in jest—that he did not sincerely believe in. On this point, as his daughter, Prue, said yesterday at his funeral service, he did have a great and sometimes wicked sense of humour, which was quite delightful on occasions, as long as one understood that he was jesting.

As the Attorney said, he was the shadow Minister of Mines and Energy and I always found that, on both sides of the Council, Ministers or shadow Ministers always get very much wrapped up in their portfolio and always think that it is very important—and in its way I expect it usually is. I am sure that it was for that reason that he made his assessment on the Santos Bill to which the Attorney has referred. His assessment was that the Bill was necessary to preserve the integrity of energy resources in South Australia. I remember his speech on that occasion; it was a night on which we sat very late. I also remember meeting the then Leader of the Opposition, David Tonkin, on the steps afterwards. He expressed himself to be very upset with the Hon. Dick Geddes' speech. However, I remember Dick Geddes saying in his speech that, when members of this place left this air-conditioned Chamber and drove home in their air-conditioned cars to their air-conditioned houses, they ought to think about the future energy requirements of South Australia. I did not vote his way on that Bill, but that was just part of his integrity. He was always very enthusiastic about anything he did and said and that was the way he felt about that matter. As the Attorney has said, he paid the supreme political sacrifice in not gaining preselection.

I do pay a great tribute to his love of and service to South Australia and to the Parliament. I certainly join the Attorney and the seconder in extending my sympathy to his widow and family.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY (Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage): I, too, pay tribute to the Hon. Dick Geddes, as I am also one of those who served in this Parliament with him; we were contemporaries for about four years. As has been said by other members, Dick Geddes was a very courteous and pleasant gentlemen in the very true sense of the word. He was a quiet and serious person, and I doubt whether he had an enemy in the place. Although he and I obviously had very different political philosophies, we certainly had an amicable relationship. We would meet in the place traditionally sited behind the President's Chair and discuss various matters whilst having a cigarette, as he shared that habit with me and many other people in the place.

Of course, we differed in many respects, not the least of which was our attitude to the position of women in society. However, our relationship was always very amicable and pleasant. I certainly remember him with a great deal of affection and would like to offer my condolences to his wife and family.

The PRESIDENT: I ask members to stand in their places and carry the motion in silence.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

STATE BANK

The PRESIDENT: Following a request from the Speaker of the House of Assembly to meet with the Ombudsman, I have to advise the Council that we met with him on Friday last and, arising from those discussions, a letter from the Presiding Officers was forwarded to the Ombudsman. I now table that letter, and I am awaiting from him a response which I will table in due course. I also table a letter from Mr I. Kowalick, General Manager, Prudential Management, State Bank, with regard to an article in the *Advertiser* of 15 August.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The PRESIDENT: I direct that written answers to the following questions on notice, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 1 to 3.

CULTURAL PROMOTIONS UNIT

1. **The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** In relation to Ms Suzi Roux's recent appointment to the Cultural Promotions Unit of

the Department for the Arts and Cultural Heritage:

1. Was the position advertised?

2. How many other people were interviewed for the position and what were the selection criteria?

3. What is her job specification?

4. What is Ms Roux's salary and has she been appointed on contract?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY:

1. No position was advertised as the work to be carried out was on a fee for service arrangement (consultant basis).

2. No other individuals were interviewed as it was considered that Ms Roux had the essential credentials to promote specific arts projects, in the time frame desired and within the available budget.

3. As a consultant, Ms Roux did not have a job specification. She was engaged to concentrate on the promotion of specific arts projects. During her three month period of engagement Ms Roux established strong links with Tourism SA including:

- introducing arts information to Tourism SA's regular weekly media package *Fastrack* which is sent to the electronic media weekly.
- introducing arts information to a media package *The World Around Us* which is sent to all tour and travel operators as well as the media in South Australia.
- introducing arts information to a Tourism SA's bi-monthly package *Industry Brief* which is distributed to all national tour and travel operators.
- providing Tourism SA with information on arts events for the coming period.

Other work undertaken by Ms Roux included:

- special arts promotions for Seniors' Week.
- seeking greater arts involvement with the Royal Adelaide Show.
- preparation of arts information for delivery to service and other appropriate clubs.
- providing special promotional briefing for staff of the Arts Division.
- direct media contact which resulted in media exposure for the arts.

4. Ms Roux was appointed for the period March 1992 to June 1992 and her payments (including expenses) totalled $11 000.

CAUST, Ms JO

2. **The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** In relation to the appointment of Ms Jo Caust, Director, Arts Development Division, Department for the Arts and Cultural Heritage:

1. Can the Minister confirm that initially it was understood Ms Caust would be appointed for a contracted number of years?

2. Is it correct that Ms Caust has been engaged as a permanent public servant?

3. If so, what are the reasons for the change in the status of Ms Caust's employment?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The reply is as follows:

1. The position of Director, Arts Programs, is a Government Management and Employment Act senior position and was advertised in the Weekly Notice of Vacancies (Vacancy No. 879/1990) and in the press without any reference to an appointment being made on a contract basis.

2. Ms Caust was appointed to this permanent senior position by the Commissioner for Public Employment and is therefore a permanent public employee.

3. There has been no change in the status of Ms Caust's employment.

3. **The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** In relation to the three weeks' study trip to Japan and Europe undertaken in July-August by Ms Jo Caust, Director, Arts Development Division, Department for the Arts and Cultural Heritage:

1. What was the purpose of the trip?

2. Did the Department or any other SA Government agency make any financial contribution to the cost of the trip, and if so, what level of funds were approved.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The reply is as follows:

1. The purposes of the study tour were to:

- obtain a greater understanding and knowledge of other cultural practices.
- specifically learn how other nations deal with arts and cultural funding.
- compare how other nations deal with arts and culture as part of their political, social and economic framework.
- consider differences between urban and regional arts practice and the role Government plays.
- consider issues of future cultural exchange.

2. The cost of the study tour was provided from Departmental funding allocations and was approved by the Overseas Travel Committee. The budget provided for this trip was $11 000.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Promotion and Grievance Appeals Tribunal Report, 1991-92.

Disciplinary Appeals Tribunal Report, 1991-92.

Harbors Act 1936—Regulations—Waiver of Fees, Charges and Fees.

By the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Hon. Barbara Wiese)—

Drugs Act 1908—Regulations—Advisory Committee Attendance Fees.

By the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage (Hon. Anne Levy)—

Marine Environment Protection Act 1990—Regulations—Commencement and Fees.

Planning Act 1982—Crown Development Report—Land Division at Eden Hills.

CONSULTANCIES

The Hon. ANNE LEVY (Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Last Thursday in another place the member for Fisher alleged that the Minister of Tourism concealed from Parliament funding by Tourism SA of consultancy services for the Tandanya supplementary development plan. The honourable member also alleged that the appointment of the consultant represented a conflict of interest since that firm had been involved with other phases of the Tandanya development.

On the same day in this Council the Hon. Mr Davis—totally inappropriately in view of the Worthington inquiry—raised the same allegations with the Minister of Consumer Affairs. It is appropriate that these mischievous allegations be laid to rest. Briefly, the facts are these.

As part of its normal work, Tourism SA has identified a number of key tourism sites in South Australia and provides a wide range of advice to facilitate development at them, including assistance in ensuring zoning is appropriate for tourism development. Tourism SA regards the development of accommodation on the western end of Kangaroo Island as an important part of its development strategy for the State, and has actively participated in facilitating development there since the inception of the Tandanya project.

In December 1990, System One Co. Ltd purchased the site and wanted to make substantial improvements to the project's structure plans to take account of environmental concerns raised about the project, which also brought the proposal more into accord with Tourism SA's development strategy. In order for those improvements to

take place, provision for them had to be made in a site-specific supplementary development plan. Tourism SA was given the opportunity to comment on the proposed SDP.

Officers of Tourism SA's Planning and Development Division appointed Nelson Dawson and Associates to provide detailed comments on the SDP to reflect the improvements to the project desired by System One. Nelson Dawson, as System One's architects, had extensive knowledge of the site, including the environmental issues under consideration and the proposed amendments to the development concept, together with a sound understanding of Tourism SA's development strategies. Their appointment to assist Tourism SA in suggesting changes to the SDP therefore made good sense, and their comments were incorporated in Tourism SA's submission.

The Tourism SA officers concerned had delegated authority to make such an appointment, and there was absolutely no reason why the Minister of Tourism should have had knowledge of the decision or been required to grant approval of it—and indeed she did not. For members to suggest that there was anything unorthodox about the appointment of this consultant, that it was anything more than the normal conduct of business by Tourism SA, or that the Minister of Tourism sought to conceal it from Parliament is merely further evidence of their mischievous waste of the Parliament's time in the pursuit of political ends.

Also in this place last Thursday, the Hon. Mr Lucas raised allegations in relation to the list of consultancies supplied to the parliamentary Economic and Finance Committee by Tourism SA. I wish to advise the Council of the precise nature of the services provided by the person to whom the honourable member referred and to make clear why it was not appropriate that those services be included with the consultancies listed by Tourism SA in its response to the committee. The person concerned was first contracted by Tourism SA in 1987 to administer the South Australian Tourism Awards program, a function she had performed since the previous year in her capacity as Executive Officer to the South Australian Association of Regional Tourism Organisations which then had responsibility for the administration of the awards.

When Tourism SA undertook administration of the awards in 1987, it decided to do so by contract for three reasons: first, since the task was largely concentrated during part of the year, it was not a full-time one, and the agency did not have sufficient staff to assign to it during that period; secondly, since the agency paid only for 1 000 hours of service, the arrangement was less costly than using full-time staff; and, thirdly, the agency had justifiable concerns about being seen to be too close to the awards, which, by their very nature, have been competitive and occasionally controversial since the Harry Dowling Award was initiated in 1983. The contracted administrator's sole task is to administer and organise the tourism awards program each year. This involves the planning, budgeting and scheduling of the awards and the myriad tasks that those functions require which may range from liaison with the regional tourism associations, the nominees, the judges, Tourism SA, and so on, to the payment of accounts. It is a contracted service with clearly defined tasks performed under the supervision of Tourism SA.

State Government agencies contract many services. They may be such services as office cleaning, specialised transportation requirements, the dry cleaning of uniforms, brochure printing—or, as in this case, task-specific administrative services. This is a cost-effective means of performing tasks which the Government either does not have the resources to carry out itself, or which can be performed more efficiently by other parties. It does not make them consultancies. Consultants, as the name implies, are engaged to provide advice or expertise that the contracting agency does not itself have or, when necessary, to confirm or validate opinion from within the agency.

When the South Australian Association of Regional Tourism Organisations ceased to exist, the person to whom the honourable member referred formed her own company which she has called a 'consulting and services' company. Initially, her contract of employment was an informal arrangement which has since been formalised by the execution of a formal contract. That contract, drawn up with advice from Crown Law and the Commissioner for Public Employment, refers to her as 'the Contractor'. She is not, and never has been, an employee of Tourism SA under the terms of the Government Management and Employment Act. As a contractor, not an employee, and being free to undertake outside consultancy work, her role has been unique and has been referred to in the past in a number of ways.

In identifying the names of consultants to present to the parliamentary Economic and Finance Committee, on the basis of the information I have just given, Tourism SA deemed it inappropriate to include her in its list. There has been no attempt to mislead Parliament. This is an exercise in semantics, and I find it questionable that the issue has been raised at all at this time.

QUESTIONS

PRIVACY

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will try to keep a straight face after that, Mr President; it is difficult. I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about personal privacy.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: He's an expert on this one.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: We don't mind interjections, Mr President. We're relaxed.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Lucas.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: We don't mind the interjections, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member does not have to respond to them.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, but we won't complain about them. I refer to recent press coverage of the keeping, by the State Bank of South Australia, of secret dossiers on State parliamentarians, judges, public servants, police, journalists and other influential people. Among the files allegedly kept by the bank are those on the Speaker of the House of Assembly, Mr Peterson, the Independent member for Elizabeth, Mr Martyn Evans,

and the member for Victoria and former Opposition Leader, Mr Baker.

I do not intend to canvass the issue of whether or not the State Bank should keep such files. However, I am concerned about the accuracy of the information being kept on individuals. Back in 1986, when faced with Opposition moves to introduce freedom of information legislation into this State, the Attorney-General reported to Parliament that State Cabinet had agreed to the implementation of information privacy principles, which said in part:

Personal information should not be collected by unlawful or unfair means, nor should it be collected unnecessarily.

A person should not collect personal information that is inaccurate, irrelevant, out of date . . . or excessively personal.

Where a person has in his or her possession or under his or her control records of personal information, the record subject should be entitled to have access to those records. That is the privacy principle upon which the Government's FOI proposals have been based.

The Attorney then went on to detail that under these principles:

. . . a person who considers that a record of a personal information about him consists of or includes information that is inaccurate, out of date, misleading, incomplete or irrelevant may request the record-keeper to do one or more of the following:

(a) correct the inaccurate or misleading information;

(b) bring up to date out-of-date information;

(c) add information to make the record complete;

(d) delete irrelevant information.

I have searched through the current FOI legislation and, of course the State Bank of South Australia is one of several exempt bodies under the Act. My questions to the Attorney are:

1. Do the information privacy principles, agreed to by State Cabinet prior to December 1986, still apply, given the introduction of FOI legislation and if so, do they also bind bodies such as the State Bank?

2. Will the Attorney-General undertake, on behalf of all members of Parliament, to contact the State Bank of South Australia and request that members be allowed to view their own files and correct any inaccurate or misleading information?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member has given a correct assessment of the relevant privacy principles which have been in place in South Australia since 1988 and which have been supervised by a Privacy Committee. The effect of that committee and the principles have been explained in this Council on previous occasions and, in particular and most recently, were the subject of debate when the Privacy Bill was before us. However, those administrative privacy guidelines are in place, the Privacy Committee is in place and the introduction of the FOI Bill did nothing to detract from those privacy principles.

The principles that the honourable member has outlined are important privacy principles, and there is a general rule relating to information held by Government, except where the organisation is exempt in the sense that it is a law enforcement agency or something of that kind. Apart from that, members of the public are entitled to see their own files, and to do what the honourable member indicated could occur under the privacy principles to correct, update, add or delete information.

So the answer to the first question, 'Do we have the information/privacy principles?' is 'Yes.' The answer to the second question is that I do not believe that they were applicable to the State Bank, because it was a commercial organisation operating in the commercial sector in competition with other private organisations, and therefore did not have, from the State Government's point of view, the privacy principles applied to it. However, I must say that I am not completely sure of that without checking, and I will certainly do that at the earliest opportunity. I do say, though, that as far as I am concerned the State Bank should allow members to have access to any information that it has compiled on us, with a view to ensuring that the remedies under the privacy principles are accorded to honourable members. So I have no problem in writing to the State Bank to the effect that the honourable member has indicated in his third question; but my recollection which I will check is that the principles as such did not apply to the State Bank by administrative direction. But I would expect all organisations in the community to comply with those basic principles of fairness. Certainly, the privacy principle that has been outlined by the honourable member is utilised by members of the public to get access to their personal records and to correct information which is held on them.

While on the topic of the so-called State Bank dossiers, it is interesting to note that the report, in the *Advertiser* at least, has said that these dossiers contain details of financial affairs, assets, friends, beliefs and personal habits. I have not seen any of them, of course, and therefore am not at this stage in a position to adjudicate on whether what they kept was reasonable or not. One would expect any organisation to keep briefing notes on people that they deal with, curriculum vitaes and the like, which may also include in the case of members of Parliament declarations of financial interest, which we all are required to publicly declare, and indeed we make those available publicly. We make our curriculum vitaes available publicly to the community. So I do not see anything wrong if the State Bank has information of that kind that is relevant and reasonable. However, it is quite clear that if the State Bank was going beyond that—and from the *Advertiser* report they may well have been—to include materials such as friends, personal habits and, in particular, I find references to members' private lives, such as occurred in the case of former Leader of the Opposition Mr Baker, quite offensive. Furthermore, I am not quite sure whether the files did cover judges or police. No doubt, however, the Ombudsman will be able to report on those. The only ones that have been referred to are four, I think, members of Parliament. On the face of it they are relatively innocuous, although I have said that I find some of the material kept, at least in relation to one of the members referred to, offensive.

Whether there is any more detail than this, we do not know. We will have to await the Ombudsman's report. However, I would indicate that, in my view, the keeping by the State Bank of these sorts of dossiers was a pointless waste of time. I think Mr Martyn Evans's view on the topic, that it showed immature judgment on the part of the State Bank, was spot on. If it was done to attempt to combat criticism of the bank at the time, that is, to spot the members who were criticising the bank and get information on them, to try to deflect that criticism by reference to their personal lives or whatever, again, that is to be deplored. I notice, also—and it has already been

referred to by you, Mr President—the comment from one Mr Ian Kowalick which was written in December 1990 just two months before the first $1 billion loss of the bank was revealed. I quote it in part for the purposes of the Parliament, as it is not on the record:

> The Opposition's tactics are based upon the poor perception of the 'Baker Boys' within the Liberal Party, so the leadership is desperately trying to extend the Victorian and Western Australian problems to the Government in South Australia.
>
> They say they are not trying to damage the bank, but a good rule of thumb is that the average politician (in either Party) would put his wife and daughter on the streets if they thought that would give them some narrow political advantage, that is, in the final analysis they are never to be fully trusted.

Mr Kowalick has now written, Mr President, to you and others attempting to justify this little bit of humour, as he seems to have referred to it. In fairness to him, I quote from his letter as follows:

> As a 'tongue in cheek' parody of political comments that unfairly impugned our integrity, at a very stressful time for those bank staff trying to determine the extent of the bank's problems, I referred to a 'rule of thumb' that I had first heard in jest from a former Minister, with the expectation that it could only be seen as facetious by Mr Paddison.
>
> I have to accept that this attempt at humour (or venting of spleen) was ill advised and in poor taste.

That would be the understatement of the year. He continues:

> I did not anticipate that a confidential note could be illegally obtained by the *Advertiser* and published without regard for, or the opportunity to explain, its context.
>
> I wish to offer an apology to members of both Houses for any offence they might take from the publication in the *Advertiser*, especially as it leaves a totally misleading impression of my regard for the parliamentary process and members that I know.

Mr Kowalick has at least done us the courtesy of writing to us and putting his side of the story. Nevertheless, it was written in December 1990, and I would have thought that anyone who was anyone within the bank at that time must have had at least some inkling of the problems in the bank and, quite frankly, it is astonishing that, instead of dealing with the problems of the bank, they were apparently involved in the preparation of dossiers on MPs. I find that statement from Mr Kowalick untrue, gratuitous and insulting and, quite frankly, given those circumstances, it is totally out of place for the officers of the bank, the executive officers and the senior executive officers of the bank, many of whom were on quite exorbitant and obscene salaries—much more, Mr President, than the average politician and, in many cases for these senior executives double the salary of the Premier—to have been involved in preparing these dossiers. They would have been better off occupying their minds on resolving the bank's problems instead of wasting their time in preparing dossiers and making those sort of statements and assessments of politicians.

It is a regrettable fact that politicians are not held in high regard by the community. However, the State Bank and its executives, and former executives in particular, can be assured of one thing, that today in this community bankers are held in even less regard than politicians after their activities in the 1980s and the losses that they have imposed on the South Australian community, both in the private and public sectors. I say that that is particularly true of the former fat cats who sat at the State Bank splurging South Australian taxpayers' money on a lending and spending spree unprecedented in modern history.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: It is a pity you didn't say this a couple of years ago.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I didn't know about it a couple of years ago.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Now we get some idea—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Council will come to order. The honourable Attorney.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I thought you would like this.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable Attorney.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Council will come to order. The honourable Attorney.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: We now get some idea of the bank's preoccupations during this time—keeping inane dossiers and insulting those who are ultimately responsible for providing the funds, namely, the members of Parliament and the Parliament of this State, to enable them to continue their lifestyles in the manner to which regrettably they had become accustomed.

WORTHINGTON INQUIRY

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make an explanation prior to asking the Attorney-General a question about the Worthington inquiry.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: In establishing the inquiry by Mr Worthington QC, the Attorney-General announced terms of reference which contained the following paragraph:

> It is proposed that the investigation concentrate solely on establishing the facts. The principles in relation to conflict of interest and the application of those principles to the facts are to be determined by the Premier and Government.

The terms of reference went on to say that the principles, the report and the Government response will be tabled in Parliament. I see that it has been reported publicly in the past day or so that the Attorney-General has now received a report. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Did the Government determine the principles in relation to conflict of interest before receiving the report from Mr Worthington QC?

2. Can he indicate when will the principles, the report and the application of the principles to the facts in the report be tabled in Parliament? Will they be tabled together, or on different occasions?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Cabinet has already considered a report on the principles which I prepared for it and noted that that report will form the basis for Cabinet's consideration of the facts as established by the Worthington report and both reports will be tabled together.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: As a supplementary question, can the Attorney-General indicate when that is likely to occur?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I have said publicly that it will occur as soon as possible, but at the moment, as members would be aware, the Premier is occupied before

the Royal Commission into the State Bank of South Australia and is unlikely to be free of that until later this week at the earliest. The Government would want to deal with the report as soon as possible, but it depends on the Premier's availability. As soon as the Premier is released from his current commitments and is able to give attention to Mr Worthington's report, the matter will be considered by the Government. I should say that it is in everyone's interests, not least of all the Minister's, to have the matter dealt with as soon as possible, but because it is clearly a matter that the Premier needs to be involved in we will have to deal with it when he returns to duty.

BUS SERVICES

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Transport a question about STA service cuts and passenger forecasts.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Currently, the STA caters for less than 7 per cent of daily passenger journeys in the Adelaide area. Patronage fell by 17 per cent in the five years to 1988-89. It increased slightly the next year after the Government introduced its free travel policy for schoolchildren, a scheme that since has been abandoned. Now the STA anticipates it will lose a further 500 000 passengers as a result of the initiatives (in inverted commas) introduced last Sunday to change timetables and routes and to cut by one-third services on weekdays after 7 p.m., on weekends and on public holidays. According to the STA's current corporate plan, our so-called public transport authority forecasts a drop in patronage to 54 million by 1994—a loss of a further 3 million passengers over the next two years. My questions are:

1. Why has the Minister tolerated the STA's introducing widespread cuts to public transport services in the Adelaide area without first insisting that alternative services are operating to meet the needs of passengers now abandoned by the STA?

2. As the taxi transit scheme launched last Sunday as a pilot project in the Hallett Cove area has the potential to provide passengers with an alternative after hours public transport service, why did the Minister not insist that the scheme (which was submitted to the STA by the South Australian Taxi Industry Association 18 months ago), was tried and tested over the past 18 months so that it is now ready for widespread introduction to help passengers whom the STA is no longer prepared to service?

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

PLANNING APPEAL TRIBUNAL

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the Planning Appeal Tribunal.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: Recently, the Premier released for public comment the proposals for change to development legislation put forward by the Planning Review as part of its 2020 Vision reform package. A major initiative in these reforms relates to the operation of the appeals and enforcement mechanisms for planning matters.

By way of background, my question is highlighted by the length of time it took the Planning Appeal Tribunal to issue its determination on the Cape Jervis tourist proposal and concerns expressed in the past few years about delay in some tribunal determinations. Does the Attorney consider that the reform proposals can improve the time taken for the determination of planning appeals, and will any of these reforms assist the Planning Appeal Tribunal in the interim, particularly in terms of reducing the time taken to issue determinations?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: There is no doubt that some unacceptable delays have occurred within the system between when a case is heard by the Planning Appeal Tribunal and the decision is given. The honourable member has referred to one case this year, the Cape Jervis tourist proposal, which I understand was heard in February, but where judgment was not delivered until some few days ago. I had certainly received complaints about the delay in the delivery of that judgment and had taken the matter up with the senior judge, although by the time he got my letter a judgment had been delivered. That is one example of the delays which most people in the community would find to be unacceptable, that is, the delay between the hearing of the case and the delivery of judgment. Regrettably, with the Planning Appeal Tribunal a number of other instances of that kind have occurred, and there really is no excuse for them. The only way that that can be dealt with under the present legislation is by the judiciary, in particular the heads of jurisdictions in the judiciary, who must take steps to ensure within their own jurisdictions that there no judgments are outstanding for this sort of length of time. However, apart from that, not much can be done.

Obviously, if members have examples, they should draw them to my attention, and I can take them up with the head of the relevant jurisdiction. In this area of planning and development, it is critically important that we have a system which ensures that these issues are dealt with expeditiously, so that developers, potential investors, know where they stand. Changing the system does require legislative amendment, and that has been foreshadowed in the Planning Review. In that review, a specialist division of the District Court was proposed, which is intended to be expeditious, informal and comprised of experts in the several fields it will encompass. The proposal is that it will conduct hearings to resolve specific disputes rather than considering afresh all the matters that led the Planning Authority to the original decision. These proposals are expected to reduce the time taken to resolve planning appeals.

I have not studied the Planning Review's proposals in detail yet, but obviously I will comment on them when they are being finalised. Undoubtedly, there is a need for a new system, and I support it and would support the general thrust of the planning review's proposals. Once an issue in this area gets to a court, the court really should be concerned only with matters of law, matters of whether natural justice has been accorded to individuals, but the circumstances surrounding the actual planning decision, the facts of the planning decision, should really

be left to planners with public input from democratic representatives in councils, and so on, where that is appropriate.

Undoubtedly, there is an urgent need for reform of the system. One of the reasons for the establishment of the Planning Review was to look at this issue. It has done so, and I expect the Parliament will have to deliberate on a Bill on this topic in the reasonably near future.

REMANDEES

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Attorney-General representing the Minister of Correctional Services a question about remandee accommodation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: Yatala Prison's F Division has come under attack for its treatment of prisoners and remandees by the South Australian Correctional Services Advisory Council. The most recent report by the council on the State's prison system stated, in relation to F Division, that, '. . . it is doubtful whether it can be called humane'. The report is critical, because it claims that, although the division can accommodate 95 prisoners, there are limited work and education opportunities for prisoners, and prison staff keep inmates locked up for excessively long periods.

The report is also highly critical of the management of remandees, pointing out that South Australia has the highest percentage of remandees to sentenced prisoners in Australia. Currently around 26 per cent of all prisoners in this State are remandees awaiting sentencing. In most cases remandees must wait months for sentencing, and in some cases, remandees have been forced to wait several years before sentencing is handed down. This has led to intolerable pressures and conditions for remandees at the Adelaide Remand Centre, with severe overcrowding, forcing many remandees to be sent to Yatala—a point picked up by the Advisory Council. It noted that the old Adelaide Gaol was originally closed because it was assumed that the new remand centre would cater adequately for remandees, but the overcrowding that has resulted prompted the advisory council to report that, '. . . the rationale of the Adelaide Remand Centre appears to have defeated the purpose of closing the Adelaide Gaol.'

The advisory council, which was set up 10 years ago to monitor and evaluate the administration of the State's correctional service facilities, has identified the problem of overcrowding at the remand centre as 'warranting urgent attention'. My questions to the Minister are:

1. How many remandees are currently held in the Adelaide Remand Centre and how many are in Yatala?

2. What is the average waiting time for someone on remand before having a sentence handed down?

3. What is the maximum length of time each day a prisoner or remandee is locked in their cell in Yatala's F Division?

4. What access to work and educational opportunities do inmates of F Division currently have?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will refer that question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

COMPUTER INFORMATION THEFT

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the theft of computer information.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Last week the Independent Commission Against Corruption in New South Wales reported that there was an alarming growth in the illicit trade of computer-based information in that State. The ICAC report highlighted widespread information theft and suggested that a national policy should be developed for all Government-held information which determines what should be freely available and what should be protected. It is suggested that information which is to be available should be easy and cheap to access. Of course, that will reduce the prospect of an illicit trade developing.

The Australian Computer Abuse Research Bureau—a national body monitoring computer security issues—claims that the theft of computer output and information is widespread throughout the nation and that there has been a marked increase in information theft over the past 18 months. The New South Wales Attorney-General, Mr Hannaford, has already responded to the ICAC report and has stated that he will introduce new legislation this year to cover the problem that was raised in the report. There has been some public discussion about this matter in the media in recent days. Has the Attorney-General had a chance to examine the ICAC report? Is it proposed to take this up at a national level at the next ministerial meeting of Attorneys-General? Does the Attorney-General have any views on this report, if he has had the chance to study it?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I was asked a question about this matter—

The Hon. I. Gilfillan: Last week.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: —last week by the Hon. Mr Gilfillan, who is obviously much more on the ball than the Hon. Mr Davis.

The Hon. I. Gilfillan interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: No, it was a dog's breakfast of a question. I recall that, Mr President.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I did say that, on the points that were raised by the Hon. Mr Gilfillan, I would be getting information about whether the practices revealed in New South Wales in the ICAC report existed in South Australia, and I intend to proceed with that and bring back a reply in relation to it. I will now look at the issue that has been raised by the Hon. Mr Davis; I have not done so to date. I will certainly consider whether or not the ICAC report and what is raised in it should be taken up at the national level through the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General, and I will advise the honourable member about that.

If the honourable member is talking about the theft of computer information, he may recall that we have passed legislation in this Parliament to deal with that issue. I think that at the time that happened legislation of that kind had only been passed in the Northern Territory and South Australia. So, it could be that we are already a jump ahead of New South Wales on that point. However, I will certainly check it and bring back a reply for the honourable member. In return for all that, Mr President, I

would anticipate that the honourable member and other members opposite will give serious consideration to the privacy legislation that will be introduced by the Government in the next few days.

STATE BANK

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about State Bank files.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: I suppose that the revelation that the State Bank of South Australia has files on members of Parliament, public servants, police, journalists and other influential people in the community comes as a surprise and a shock to us all. It is clearly a breach of privacy. What is unnerving is that, while there is certainty as to the existence of the files, there is uncertainty as to the need for the files and the use to which the bank might put them. In the uncertainty I believe there is a sinister implication.

That the bank should keep such files would damage the bank as a commercial enterprise. The files are not for legitimate commercial and administrative purposes. Who would want to give a confidence to such a bank? In my view such a bank would lose the confidence of its customers and the public in general. Why should a bank want to know the personal strength, weakness, opportunity or threat that any person might be to the bank if it is acting in a proper manner?

Action taken on information in the files may be in breach of parliamentary privilege or in contempt of court, and politicians and judges have some means at hand to protect themselves. But, what about the ordinary people in our community who do not have these protections, and have no legal protection? Are they at the mercy of the bank?

The New South Wales Independent Commission Against Corruption has revealed that there is an extensive trade in file information on people and companies. The State Bank of South Australia files contain not only banking information but more general and wide-ranging details which could become a stock for trading in personal information: it may or may not be about bank customers. The *Advertiser* of 30 August 1992 reports:

> An enormous amount of people's lives have been turned upside down by this [trading] and they never know why or how.

The same paper cites the case of a Mr Glen Barry as follows:

> . . . own experience of the system started when bank contracts were used to accuse him falsely of embezzlement. Even after the accusations were proved false, rumours about Mr Barry continued to spread around town.

Mr President, that is the sinister side of keeping these files. It cost Mr Barry several jobs, his own business, marriage and house. Mr Barry's experience could be the experience of anyone who is targeted for discrimination and defamation on the strength of doubtful information in secret files. Finally, I add that the revelation of secret files (this time by the State Bank) would remind us all of the 1970s when the issue of secret files greatly disturbed the citizens of this State. My questions are as follows:

1. Can a body be established—if one is not already in place—that can demand and have access to any personal files that are kept by any organisation except the Australian Tax Office, the Department of Social Security and other bodies that might need to be exempted?

2. Can trading in information regarding persons and corporations other than that specifically allowed by law be made a criminal offence?

3. Can it be enshrined in law that an individual or corporation has the right to know what is held on file by any organisation about himself or herself or about the corporation itself?

4. Will the Ombudsman's report on files held by the State Bank reveal if the State Bank has files on any other current or former members of Parliament, other than those already reported upon in the media?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I thank the honourable member for his question, which raises the matter for the third time today and adds to the issues raised last week about privacy. It is interesting that, only a few months ago, members of this Council were condemning moves to introduce privacy legislation to deal with the abuse of personal information held by Government or private sector agencies, yet in the past two weeks in this Chamber we have dealt with the ICAC report from New South Wales, which has very important privacy implications and, now, the issue of the so-called State Bank dossiers which, as I said in answer to an earlier question from the Leader of the Opposition, also raises and, as he said, has privacy implications.

It would be worthwhile at the outset to await the Ombudsman's report on these files because, although certain allegations have been made by the *Advertiser*, they are and must at this stage be treated as just that, namely, allegations that the information extends to judges, police and the like. We do not know that as yet.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: He's not talking to me. We don't know whether or not files were kept on judges or police: that is an allegation made by the *Advertiser* which, I am sure, will be being investigated by the Ombudsman. We do not know the extent of the file-keeping by the State Bank on members of Parliament (some four have been mentioned to date), nor do we know the extent of the information on the files. However, I have dealt with the nature of those files and what I think is legitimate information to be kept, and what I consider to be illegitimate information, in privacy terms.

What I say must be qualified by the fact that the Ombudsman's report has been asked for by the Speaker and by our President and, no doubt, will arrive in due course. The fourth question that the honourable member has asked should be referred to you, Mr President, to enable you to draw it to the attention of the Ombudsman, so that he can bear that in mind when he is reporting on these issues at your request.

I have already answered the question about access to personal files. It is an important privacy principle that individuals in the community should have access to personal information held on them by Government and by other agencies, and should be able to correct that information. I am not sure that that requires a separate organisation, as suggested by the honourable member, but the Privacy Committee has been established in South Australia to protect the privacy of information held by individuals within the State public sector, and there is

also a Privacy Commissioner at the Federal level who oversees the collection of data by the Federal Government, and the privacy principles that I have mentioned about access to information by citizens applies also at that level.

The honourable member has asked whether trading in information can be made a criminal offence. It is my impression, from the ICAC report in New South Wales, that the trading of the information in that case did in some circumstances constitute a criminal offence. It was certainly labelled as corrupt and, no doubt, that circumstance is where individuals within the public sector and, indeed, the private sector were selling information for their own private benefit. I do not think that you can totally prohibit trading in information, because it may be important in the public interest that information be widely disseminated.

It may be important in law enforcement, for instance, that information be made available to law enforcement agencies. The important thing about trading in information is that, if it does occur, it should occur in accordance with established guidelines relating to privacy. So, I do not believe that it can be prohibited altogether, and it probably should not be, in the public interest. Undoubtedly, there is some trading in personal information that should be absolutely prohibited by Government or anyone else. The point about privacy legislation is to establish principles under which data are held and the circumstances in which those data can be released to third persons.

The point the honourable member raises is, therefore, important. It deserves to be examined in the context of the Privacy Bill, which will be introduced shortly by the Government. I commend that to the honourable member and to other members of the Parliament. I have already dealt with the third question of whether members of the public have a right to know. In my view, they do, and that is already the current practice in the State Government.

SWIMMING POOLS

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for Local Government Relations a question about swimming pool fencing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: The Minister will recall that, on a number of occasions, I have asked questions relating to swimming pool fencing and safety. In November 1990 I was told that a draft white paper was being prepared. Again in November 1991, I was told that a draft white paper was being prepared and should be released in 1992. We have, at least, reached 1992. Four or five times a year we are reminded through tragedy that there is still no public move towards better legislation if, indeed, better legislation will be the answer. A recent tragedy last month, where a child crawled through a gate and under a pool cover but where the pool fencing met with the Australian Standard, highlights the difficult decisions that lie ahead.

In November last year the Minister told me that work is being done to devise an Australian Standard for pool safety which will be written not in guideline but in mandatory form for calling up in the new building regulations which, I believe, came into operation in January this year. My questions of the Minister are:

1. Now that the New South Wales elections are out of the way, what is the position in New South Wales regarding pool fencing?

2. Has the Local Government Ministers' conference agreed to a common approach to an Australian Standard in relation to swimming pool fencing, and will the Local Government Relations Unit still be responsible for a draft white paper; and when will it be released for public comment?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: That question raises a number of issues. I hope that a draft white paper will be released in the near future. I am sure members will appreciate that the State Local Government Relations Unit is now very small, and it has been occupied with negotiations with the LGA—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: On cats?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: No, the State Local Government Relations Unit has nothing to do with cats. The unit has not had the time it wished to devote at an earlier stage to this draft white paper. We certainly recognise the importance of the matter; it was discussed at the Local Government Ministers' conference at my request.

It appeared from the discussion that took place that it would be unlikely to be possible to achieve uniformity around Australia with regard to any legislation applying to already existing pools. Different States are taking a different approach: although the approach taken by New South Wales and Queensland is very similar, it is not identical, and Victoria differs considerably at this stage. So, with regard to what should be done for existing pools, while we can obviously benefit from knowing what is happening elsewhere in Australia, the idea of uniformity around Australia cannot be achieved.

With regard to new pools, I think the honourable member was over simplifying when he said that the new building regulations became operative on 1 January. Argument and discussion are still going on with regard to the building standard that should apply to the fencing of swimming pools. There is no argument on technical matters such as how close together posts should be and whether any rails should be on the inside where they cannot be climbed on, and that sort of aspect. However, the actual placement of the fence and its relationship to a swimming pool has not been fully determined in the Australian building standards, and discussion is continuing. The last I heard is that the building standards committee was proposing alternatives, one of which would have to be met in the placement of a fence around a new pool.

It is a few weeks since this was reported to me, and the situation may have changed in that time. I will inquire what the state of play is at the moment with regard to that building standard but, as I understand it, whatever will be decided has not yet been fully adopted and ratified, but it may be that there will be alternatives which will have to be met in respect of any new pools.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 13 August. Page 91.)

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I am grateful for the leave to conclude which was given to me last Thursday, and I remind the Council that I was making a case for the widespread introduction of solar hot water units in South Australia—of course, the same argument applies right across Australia—and the flow-on benefits of increased employment and economic activity, as well as the quite irrefutable environmental advantages of changing from fossil fuel sourced energy to solar energy for heating water.

The concluding part of my Address in Reply contribution continues in the same vein. In reference to some material to which I referred when I was last speaking in the Chamber, I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* table 4.16, headed 'Generation costs and costs of avoiding carbon emissions associated with alternatives to fossil fuels (1989 US dollars)', which is purely of a statistical nature.

Leave granted.

Table 4.16 GENERATION COSTS AND COSTS OF AVOIDING CARBON EMISSIONS ASSOCIATED WITH ALTERNATIVES TO FOSSIL FUELS (1989 $US).

Fossil Fuel Alternative	Generating Cost[1]	Carbon Reduction	Estimated Pollution Cost	Carbon Avoidance Cost[2]
	(US cents/kWh)	(per cent)	(US cents/kWh)	(US dollars/ton)
Improving Energy Efficiency	2.0-4.0	100	0.0	<0-16[3]
Wind Power	6.4	100	0.0	95
Solar Thermal Power (Dish)[4]	6.0	100	0.0	<100
Geothermal Energy	5.8	99	1.0	110
Wood Power	6.3	100	1.0	125
Solar Thermal Dish/Gas/Steam Turbine[4]	5.5	92	0.1	100-140
Steam-Injected Gas Turbine	4.8-6.3	61	0.5	97-178
Solar Thermal (Troughs with Gas)[5]	7.9	84	0.2	180
Nuclear Power	12.5	86	5.0	535
Photovoltaics	28.4	100	0.0	819
Combined-Cycle Coal	5.4	10	1.0	954

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I also seek leave to insert in *Hansard* table 6.2, headed 'Australian hot water production 1989-90', which is also of a purely statistical nature and is contained in the same document.

Leave granted.

Table 6.2 AUSTRALIAN HOT WATER PRODUCTION 1989-90

Type	Production	% Market
Solar Domestic HW	21 000	3.6
Solar Export HW	11 000	1.9
Electric storage—mains	331 000	56.7
Electric storage—other	19 000	3.3
Electric Instantaneous	16 000	2.7
Gas	186 000	31.8
Total HW production	584 000	100.0
DOMESTIC HOT WATER INSTALLATION RATE		
New Homes DHW	150 000	3.0
Replacement DHW	423 000	8.5
Public housing construction	13 000	0.23
Total public rental units	360 000	7.2
Total installed units	5 000 000	100.0

Data from P. Versluis (1991)

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: On page 6-5 of the document entitled *Application of Solar Thermal Technologies in Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions* under the heading 'Solar DHW market penetration options' (DHW standing for 'domestic hot water') it is stated:

The Government has a wide variety of options to implement policies of greenhouse stabilisation. Three examples are shown here to boost solar hot water penetration.

Government Purchases

The Government builds about 13 000 public housing units for low income housing. Replacing failed water heaters adds 30 000 units/year for a total of 43 000 units/year. This is only 2.2 per cent of the construction market, but 8 per cent of the water heater market.

However, public housing water heater purchases are 200 per cent of the existing domestic solar hot water market. Installing solar hot water in new installations and for water heater replacements in all public housing could immediately double the solar hot water market.

The installed public housing stock of 360 000 units is equivalent to 17 years of present solar hot water sales. Retrofitting these systems with solar hot water would further increase demand.

The Government can obtain major reductions in cost by placing large orders, particularly by ordering for a number of years ahead. Placing large orders totalling 400 000 units with scheduled deliveries of 40 000 to 100 000 units/year would guarantee the production required to install more efficient assembly line equipment and reduce costs.

At least 33 per cent reduction is immediately available by ordering wholesale in quantity. A further 17 per cent should be readily available by ordering in these quantities.

The Government could obtain a 50 per cent reduction in solar water heater costs by using them for all public housing. This action would immediately double or triple the solar hot water market share to 10 per cent or 15 per cent. This will make solar water heaters strongly cost competitive on regular life cycle costing throughout the country.

Retrofitting public housing could immediately give domestic hot water manufacturers the demand to boost production equivalent to 50 per cent of market share and drop costs through economies of scale.

Action of this nature will give a major boost to the market, increasing volume and dropping costs. Long-term orders by the Government for (say) 400 000 solar hot water heaters would give the manufacturers the guaranteed demand to increase production, quality and provide a base for the research and development to improve products.

Mandated Solar Use

Passing legislation to eliminate sales of electric and gas hot water heaters (as is done in Israel) would provide the fastest penetration of the market. Then:

Once mandated, the solar hot water market share could immediately increase to maximum capacity of existing plants which may be about 50 per cent of the current water heater market. This could then grow to over 90 per cent in about three years once demand is guaranteed.

Solar hot water could then penetrate over 95 per cent of the domestic units by 2002 using only the natural pace of new installations and replacement systems.

The contrast in rate of increase in market share and market penetration of mandated solar use is shown in figures 6.1 and 6.2 and table 6.3.

I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* table 6.3, which is purely of a statistical nature.

Leave granted.

Table 6.3 POTENTIAL GROWTH OF SOLAR DOMESTIC HOT WATER

	DHW Market 1000s		Solar DHW Sales 1000s			Market Share			Market Penetration		
Year	Units*	Units/yr	BAU	Economic	Mandated	BAU** %	Economic# %	Mandated %	BAU** %	Economic # %	Mandated %
1990	5 785	584	21	21	21	3.60	3.60	3.60	4.50	4.50	4.50
1991	6 111	519	22	26	260	4.31	4.97	50.00	4.97	5.03	8.85
1992	6 214	528	24	39	396	4.52	7.33	75.00	5.27	5.57	15.08
1993	6 319	537	25	58	537	4.74	10.81	99.00	5.59	6.39	23.33
1994	6 426	546	27	87	546	4.96	15.95	99.00	5.92	7.64	31.44
1995	6 535	555	29	131	555	5.20	23.53	99.00	6.26	9.52	39.42
1996	6 645	565	31	196	565	5.46	34.71	99.00	6.62	12.31	47.27
1997	6 757	574	33	294	574	5.72	51.20	99.00	7.00	16.45	54.98
1998	6 872	584	35	434	584	5.99	74.34	99.00	7.39	22.50	62.57
1999	6 988	594	37	509	594	6.28	85.72	99.00	7.80	29.41	70.03
2000	7 106	604	40	552	604	6.59	91.32	99.00	8.23	36.69	77.36
2001	7 226	614	42	578	614	6.91	94.07	99.00	8.68	44.07	84.58
2002	7 348	625	45	596	625	7.24	95.42	99.00	9.15	51.45	91.67
2003	7 472	635	48	610	635	7.59	96.09	99.00	9.64	58.76	98.65
2004	7 599	646	51	623	646	7.96	96.41	99.00	10.16	65.98	100.0
2005	7 727	657	55	634	657	8.34	96.58	99.00	10.70	73.09	100.0
New Construction as % of Base					1.69	Solar Sales Growth Rate			Business as Usual**		6.6
DHW Replacement Rate (12 year life)					8.50				Economic		50.0

*Total Housing Units per projections of Australian Housing Research Council.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: The report continues:

These examples indicate that the level of solar hot water heater penetration could vary from insignificant to over 90 per cent market penetration by 2005 depending on Government actions.

A systematic installation of solar hot water programs could reasonably save over 70 per cent of energy usage and greenhouse gases in domestic hot water systems by 2005.

Solar Fraction

These projections assume 70 per cent solar fraction, a 90 per cent market penetration from installing new homes and water heater replacements, and a 20 per cent reduction in water consumption and/or energy efficiency. Conventional projections often assume 60 per cent to 70 per cent solar fraction. The solar fraction could be increased to over 85 per cent to 90 per cent with improved solar technologies and adding 1-2 day's storage (Mills 1991).

Potential CO_2 Savings

ABARE projections assume solar domestic hot water penetrations increasing from 5 per cent to 12 per cent with 0.95 per cent to 1.7 per cent of total domestic energy consumption.

By contrast, the above discussion shows how domestic solar hot water could achieve penetrations of 70 per cent to over 90 per cent.

A solar water heater program would directly save Australian consumers from $2 billion to $5 billion in life cycle costs in one generation of equipment, depending on the price reductions possible from efficient production, marketing and installation.

Annual carbon dioxide emissions due to domestic hot water could thus be cost effectively reduced by over 70 per cent to 80 per cent depending on the installed equipment efficiencies. This alone would save 18-21 per cent of residential CO_2 and 3.6-4.1 per cent of total CO_2 emissions by 2005.

In Summary:

The attainment of such solar penetration is strongly dependent on government policies and actions to achieve efficient economic reforms, greenhouse gas reductions, and elimination of market distortions and barriers.

An effective solar heater program could be implemented by redirecting utility efforts from installing fossil fuelled hot water systems to solar units, eliminating current financing barriers, and eliminating market distortions favouring fossil fuels. A simple ban on new gas or electric water heaters similar to the ban on leaded [fuel burning] vehicles would be effective.

Some solar hot water companies already export 20 per cent to 45 per cent of production and have little international competition. A solar hot water program would further increase exports by lowering costs.

Mr President, the situation in other countries is of significance. I would also like to quote from page A3-5 as follows:

Promote Solar Water Heaters

A very large penetration of solar hot waters can be obtained with appropriate government policies and action. 'In Cyprus, Israel and Jordan, solar panels already heat between 25 and 65 per cent of water in homes.' . . . These countries have established strong government policies to encourage solar water heating to reduce fossil fuel usage and increase the energy securities of their economies. In Israel, all new buildings must have solar hot water heaters.

So, as I indicated earlier in my address, there is precedent in other countries for dramatic change in the acceptance of solar hot water if we are prepared to follow that path. It further states:

The State Electricity Commission of Victoria has set the pace in Australia by encouraging the conversion to solar hot waters. They have banned any advertisement of using off-peak electricity to heat water except as a backup to solar water heaters. The SECV is now actively advertising solar hot water.

The authors of this document recommend:

. . . that all relevant State and Federal Governments take similar actions to SECV to strongly promote solar hot water systems and ban advertisements of very cheap off-peak electricity or natural gas. This will strongly boost the implementation of solar hot water heaters. A generic promotion by the Government will result in a very major increase in manufacturing activity within Australia with some decline in coal and electricity production. For instance, if the solar hot water industry were increased from the current 25 000/year to 500 000/year and the price dropped 40 per cent from $3 000/system to $1 800/system, this would create a $900 million/year industry. This would approximately double the employment and turnover of present hot water industry.

So, Mr President, that re-emphasises my motives, as I explained earlier, in promoting, through this address, the energetic intervention by the South Australian Government, with enthusiasm from this Parliament, to see solar hot water introduced widely for South Australian domestic and industrial requirements.

In conclusion, I make two observations, which I believe are of interest to members. For further encouragement for us in South Australia, it is useful for us to consider what has happened with the State Energy Commission in Western Australia. Currently 120 000 houses use solar hot water in Western Australia. It is also interesting to note that Australia is the only OECD country that does not have building regulations on energy efficiency. By using solar hot water we can as a nation move not only to help the environment and reduce the greenhouse emission but also to increase profitable economic activity. So, members will realise that there are further exciting developments taking place in this area and I would like to refer to the wider residential system that is described on page 6-8 of this document:

> An integrated retrofit system of solar water heating, cooking and space heating has been developed by the University of Sydney, and prototype production of some components is proceeding. This is coupled with typical least cost efficiency measures of weather stripping, ceiling insulation and wall insulation in new houses.
>
> With one day's storage, the solar fraction provides over 90 per cent of energy usage requiring less than 10 per cent backup from off-peak electricity or gas. The cost of the total solar system (90 per cent solar) is typically $0.039/kWh (solar only) in Sydney with utility financing (for example, 7 per cent real at 15 years). This compares to the average tariffs of $0.08/kWh. Mills (1991) estimates this system displaces 75 per cent of overall residential energy usage and 60 per cent of residential CO_2 emissions.

Finally, I would like to reinforce what was emphasised in that last quote, namely, for a nation that is really sincere about reducing greenhouse gas emission in anything like the proportions that we have accepted in the Toronto Protocol, we must take these measures not just to the prototype stage but to the implemented stage right across the nation—and South Australia could be at the forefront of this move. I therefore urge that, in the process of the deliberations of this and succeeding Parliaments, we legislate where necessary to ensure that these steps take place.

I have quoted from this document entitled 'Application of Solar Thermal Technologies in Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions', Hagen and Kaneff (1991). I also quoted two specified authors Gavin, G. (1990a), 'The Economics of Domestic Solar Hot Water Systems' as spelt out on page 8-5 of this document, 037-P2/-2/88/GG. jc, February and, also, Mills, David (1991), 'Atmospheric Stabilisation Approach for the Domestic Sector: A Retrofit Integrated Solar/Efficiency Approach' 19 April, Ecologically Sustainable Development Workshop Canberra 17p. With those remarks I conclude my Address in Reply speech and support the motion.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I support the motion. Her Excellency's speech to Parliament raised many issues which we as a Government must address. Perhaps the most pressing is the youth unemployment situation in South Australia.

It is our responsibility as a Government to do everything we can to help our young people become as skilled as possible for entry into the work force. Measures already in place in South Australia, or about to be adopted in response to the Federal Government's employment and training options, go a long way towards addressing the problem. I am quite sure that tonight's statement in the budget will provide some more details along those lines.

The Hon. I. Gilfillan: Are we all going to be cheerful tomorrow morning?

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: We hope so. In the words of one of the young men who worked on the Timeball Tower restoration project at Semaphore, as part of this Government's highly successful Youth Conservation Corps program, 'there is light at the end of the tunnel if you look hard enough'. Those are rather sad comments to make. But I was very fortunate to be present on the day that that project was officially announced. The Youth Conservation Corps, and other Government initiatives, both existing and to be put in to place in the next few months, are a good example of how we can, and are, helping young people better equip themselves for the future, and at the same time give them the desire and capability to make a valuable contribution to their State and to the community. Other initiatives include relevant youth programs under the Department of Technical and Further Education's Skill Centre program.

In 1992, about $50 000 of start-up funding was provided to industry-based skill training centres to undertake labour market training for unemployed young people. About 60 young people received industry-recognised training under this scheme, including 20 who have been working on the notable Nelcebee project.

That project has taken unemployed metal trades apprentices and is giving them off-the-job training as part of the South Australian Maritime Museum's renovation of the historic Nelcebee ketch. Approximately $130 000 has been allocated to that one project, including $30 000 from the Maritime Museum. During 1992, the State Government is providing $6.8 million, complemented by a Federal Government contribution of $13 million, to provide about 2 750 pre-vocational places in TAFE colleges throughout South Australia.

Add to this the 1 000 apprentices and trainees across the State benefiting from the group training scheme, with a total of more than $1.5 million funding equally provided by DETAFE and the Federal Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET), and you can see that this Government already is heavily committed to projects aimed at helping unemployed young people.

A shining example of the success of the group training scheme is the Statewide group training scheme which ran an Aboriginal metal trades training program this year. Email sponsored 13 young Aboriginal people (10 male, three female) for a 12-week skill training scheme. As a result, eight were placed in permanent jobs. The KickStart program also has delivered a number of youth-related projects in the past year, including major programs at Whyalla, Port Lincoln and Cleve, demonstrating the equal commitment of the Government to helping young people in rural South Australia as much as those in metropolitan Adelaide.

Under the Federal Government's National Employment and Training Program for Young Australians, South Australia will be able to add to its existing good record

in the area of youth training and development in a number of ways. This Government applauds the setting up of a national TAFE training system, and has responded with plans to develop Training 2000, the South Australian Vocational and Education Training Plan.

Our Youth Conservation Corps, as suggested at the Youth Summit by the Hon. Mike Rann, will be used as a model for a national landcare and environmental program. Up to 6 000 young Australians, including 600 or so in South Australia at least, will discover that these programs, because they contain between 25 per cent and 50 per cent off-the-job training, with full TAFE accreditation, are much more than 'digging holes and planting trees'. And such schemes tap in to young people's awareness of the environment and their enthusiasm for doing something to help protect and conserve it. However, we must continue to press the Federal Government in to creating a wider-ranging Youth Community Services Corps which could involve the placement of young people in projects aimed at helping such worthwhile organisations as the Salvation Army, Anglican community centres and even women's shelters.

While it is commendable that the Federal Government has picked up some of South Australia's strategies for tackling the youth unemployment problem, we must continue to maintain the pressure to ensure that, as one of the less populated States, we are not overlooked when funding is distributed and decisions are made on which projects get support. It is a sad fact that jobs traditionally filled by young people have been disappearing in the past few years. While it is true that the unemployment rate of university graduates is an unacceptable 6 per cent, the unemployment rate of young people with no qualifications or further education is an equally unacceptable 14 per cent.

Our current youth unemployment rate is untenable; there is no argument about that. But it must be kept in mind that the number of 15 to 19-year-olds actually looking for full-time work, as a percentage of all those in that age group, is about 12 per cent, not the 40 per cent thrown about by those who do not try to analyse the statistics correctly. The majority of our young people as Paul Keating has pointed out, are in schools, university or TAFE.

It is interesting to note that, contrary to the State Opposition's bleatings about South Australia supposedly having its worst ever youth unemployment rate, the current rate of 15 to 19-year-olds looking for full-time work is way below that of 1981, when the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Dean Brown, was the industrial relations Minister. In fact, in January 1981, the last time the Opposition was in power, youth unemployment was 66 per cent higher than it is now.

We are and should continue to encourage young people to look at training in areas which are likely to provide the greater number of jobs for young people in the future—such as the tourism and hospitality industries, and the children's and community services areas, as I mentioned earlier. But at the same time, we must look at ways of changing work practices to make jobs more suitable for young people.

While there is a need to maintain and support a strong manufacturing base in South Australia, we must also harness the increased educational and skill levels that training incentives will produce in our young people by targeting clever industries, those developing new technology and long-term projects such as the multifunction polis.

At the same time, we need to continue to push for more tertiary education places. School leavers are finding it increasingly difficult to get in to our universities and other tertiary institutions. It appears that young adults and mature age students are getting a growing share of university placements. While it is commendable that places are available for mature age students, we must ensure that this is not done at the expense of school leavers. In fact, places should be available for both mature age students and for school leavers, for all those who wish to get there. It is tragic that more young people returned to repeat Year 12 this year, to get a better matriculation score for university entry, than were taken on as school leavers by our universities.

The Government has called for another 8 000 university places to be offered nationally to school leavers in the next three years. At the same time, the Government is continuing to apply pressure on the Federal Government to bring forward the three-year capital works program which would alleviate much of the pressure the universities are feeling in trying to maintain the growth in the university sector which has been so rapid since 1983.

Unfortunately, there is no quick fix for our youth unemployment predicament, and there is no single solution. Neither will the solutions work overnight. In the long term I believe the whole community—business, unions, community organisations, parents and young people themselves—must accept some of the responsibility for helping South Australia get back on its feet and for reviving our economy in order to create those much-needed jobs, as well as a better standard of living for all concerned. Supporting our local manufacturers, buying South Australian, for example, is a way we can all help.

If we recognise that we are in a recession, that there are likely to be more tough times before things improve, it does not mean giving up and doing nothing. We certainly should do everything in our power to ensure that young people who are unable to find work are encouraged and supported, and not made to feel worthless. The wider community must help build up young people's self-confidence, not knock them for being lazy or dole bludgers or as the Federal Coalition Leader, Dr Hewson, so inaccurately and stupidly has described them, as couch potatoes.

I sincerely believe that the vast majority of our young people genuinely want to work and are doing their very best to find jobs, but when there just are not enough jobs to go around that is the very time we need to show how much we care and understand their plight, and when we need to help them cope with the depressing effects of their predicament.

Mr President, I would like now to turn to something which I believe will be of significance to all South Australians, especially women. On 3 June this year Her Excellency launched the Women's Suffrage Centenary Steering Committee. I am pleased to be a proxy on it for the Hon. Barbara Wiese. Historically, the centenary, in 1994, is a milestone for South Australia and Australia.

South Australia was the first State in Australia to give women the right to vote, and even more importantly the first democracy in the world to enable women to stand for Parliament. There is considerable interest in the centenary from interstate and overseas.

The objectives of the celebrations, throughout 1994, are to stimulate artistic, cultural, sporting, community and intellectual activities of a lasting nature and involve a wide spectrum of individuals, organisations and groups within and beyond South Australia. The committee's terms of reference include taking on the role of coordinating a series of activities for women in metropolitan and country areas of South Australia such as public forums, televised debates, drama, poetry, prose—fiction and non-fiction—a short film for cinema or television, music, street theatre, arts, craft and so on. It is also charged with informing and educating the community about the women who achieved enfranchisement in this State, how it was achieved, the obstacles that had to be overcome and the legacy handed on to the present generation.

The Women's Adviser's Unit to the Premier is providing executive support to the steering committee, which is chaired by Dr Jean Blackburn, and has members from a range of organisations and backgrounds including unions, Aboriginal women, young women, academia, women from non-English speaking backgrounds and the major political Parties. It is very pleasing to be on a committee with women from the Opposition and the Australian Democrats who are all working together to support the fine work that this committee is doing. The committee is eager to hear from interested groups and individuals about events already scheduled or being planned for 1994 which can incorporate the suffrage centenary theme. As well, it wants ideas about specific events which could be staged to mark the centenary, but in particular any events which celebrate all aspects of women's lives and the total contribution women have made and continue to make to South Australian and Australian development.

While there are many examples of women who have made significant contributions to politics, the professions and other high-profile occupations in our State in the past 100 years, I am sure there are just as many, if not more, examples of women who have made equally valuable contributions in less publicly-recognised areas such as trade unions, workplaces employing unskilled or semi-skilled labour, and of course the least recognised area of all—unpaid women's work in and outside the home.

Not everyone is aware that South Australia was the first democracy in the world to enable women to stand for Parliament. However, it is ironic, and more than a little sad, that South Australia was the last State to elect a woman to Parliament. That did not happen until 1959—65 years after the right to stand was won as a result of a long struggle and concerted nine year social and political campaign.

The Constitution Act Amendment Bill, which was passed in December 1894, was a pioneering achievement of South Australia and was of great significance to Australia and the world, but of particular significance to women. It is perhaps an indictment then of our society, and of the phenomenon described by American author Susan Faludi as the 'backlash against feminism' in the past decade, that in those 100 historical years of women's suffrage, only 15 women have been elected to Parliament in South Australia compared to 481 men. Since 1959, nine women have been elected to the House of Assembly and six to the Legislative Council. Meanwhile, 333 men have been elected to the Lower House and 148 to the Legislative Council.

That level of representation for women is totally inadequate, and is certainly not what South Australia's early suffragettes had in mind. The honour of being the first woman elected to Parliament in South Australia was shared by two Liberal and Country League women—Jessie Cooper to the Upper House and Joyce Steele to the House of Assembly—in a general election on 7 March 1959. Mr President, I recall that in my maiden speech in this place I indicated the rather rocky road that Jessie Cooper had to hoe in order to attain the achievement of being the first woman into the Legislative Council. As Her Excellency noted in her speech, Mrs Steele, who died in September last year, was also the first woman to hold the position of Opposition Whip in the Lower House, and was the State's first female Minister. Since that time, of course, we have seen June Appleby, who was elected as the first woman Government Whip, and Barbara Wiese, who was elected as the first woman Labor Minister.

It would be nice to think that the trend Joyce Steele and Jessie Cooper started 32 years ago could pick up momentum in the next decade, because I firmly believe that, from my experience in Parliament, a woman's perspective in society is not reflected unless more women are in Parliament. But, as Susan Faludi points out in her book *Backlash: The Undeclared War Against Women* some people would have us believe that women have achieved true equality, that we now 'have it all' and have 'made it'. They say there is no need to continue equal opportunity policies to have affirmative action strategies—and I understand that it is Dr Hewson's intention to disband the Affirmative Action Agency in Canberra—and to continue to strive for equal representation because, supposedly, we now have it, or at least in terms of Parliament there are no impediments.

We have the opportunity to stand for State or Federal Parliament, and to get jobs at all levels in the private and public sectors—except to serve on Navy submarines. If there is real equality, why are there still so few women in Parliament? Why are there so few women in prime ministerial, Cabinet or congressional positions in this and other western countries? South Australia has one of the better records in elevating women to Cabinet positions, but even the current three out of 13 is far from truly representative.

The anti-feminists point out that we now have equal pay for work of equal value but, despite winning this right in 1972, Australian women by 1990 still earned 83 per cent of the average earnings of Australian men. Even so, the pay gap in Australia is the lowest of any of the Western countries, but for how much longer?

Faludi also notes that there are signs that the legislation to remove the centralised wage fixing system, which favours women, may disappear altogether. The pay gap will undoubtedly widen as a system of industry-by-industry bargaining is introduced and women's wages will fall, undermining the efforts of women's

organisations since women first began campaigning for equal pay in the late 1930s.

The lack of progress is also reflected in the way our workforce is still highly segregated, despite media exhortations and headlines proclaiming that women are breaking new ground almost daily in traditional men's occupations. In 1911, 84 per cent of female labour worked in disproportionately female occupations and by 1985 the figure—at 82 per cent—had barely changed. There is a need, within the budget strategy, to recognise the valuable role of women's work, particularly unpaid work, in South Australia. We must do more than pay mere lip service to the growing demand for strategies and funding which legitimise women's work and which further the aims of organisations that support true gender equality.

There have been attempts in past years—many of them successful—to scale down the number and size of bureaucratic and Government-funded units set up specifically to help women achieve equality and justice in all areas of their lives. Some women's rights agencies have been swallowed up by larger bureaucracies that have no specific interest in gender equality.

We must strive to ensure that does not happen here. Where breakthroughs for women have been achieved, perhaps spearheaded by the 1894 suffrage vote, it has not been because men have been convinced by arguments, or thought it would not really happen, but mainly because women have worked hard for those rights and, in many ways, now have to work even harder to retain them. At a time when women have so much to offer at home, in the workplace, in the community and particularly in Parliament, we should be encouraging more women to stand up and be heard, to stand for office. And we should be doing everything in our power to ensure that no barriers are put before those women.

The Hon. Peter Dunn: Are you suggesting there should be barriers to men?

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: You can make that suggestion in your speech, if you choose.

The Hon. Peter Dunn interjecting:

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: Where is the half in this place? The centenary of women's suffrage in 1994 will be a timely reminder of all that women have contributed to this State, a chance to recognise and celebrate the advances still to be made, and to urge all South Australians to keep fighting for true equality.

In this important year of 1994, I call on all organisations—in business, in trade unions, in education, in political Parties and in the home—to recognise the valuable contribution of women and strive to give us the real equality that we so rightly deserve. Let us not wait another 100 years. I challenge all South Australians including the Hon. Mr Dunn to make 1994 the year in which women finally stand side by side and shoulder to shoulder as equals in all sections of society.

Returning to my earlier point about organisations which aim to protect and promote women's rights, and by extension those of our children, I wish to raise the topic of women's shelters and their dire need for financial and community support. Sadly, one of the effects of the recession and high unemployment has been the increase in family breakdowns. Marriages that may already have been a bit rocky are crumbling under the strain of financial woes, and when families split, young people are often the main casualties. An even more tragic effect is the increase in domestic violence, particularly child abuse and physical and verbal abuse of women.

Our women's emergency shelters, already overloaded before the recession really began to bite, are finding it harder and harder to help women who come to them seeking shelter, food, counselling and other aid after fleeing an untenable domestic situation. Shelter staff are severely overworked and maintenance of existing funding, if not a real increase in funds, to South Australia's women's shelters should be given a high priority. Few people realise the seriousness of the domestic violence problem in South Australia—it is still an issue people prefer to ignore, to pretend does not exist, or is being exaggerated.

These people are also unaware of the long hours and sheer hard work of the people who run and staff those shelters. In many cases a huge amount of unpaid overtime is worked because the shelter workers care so deeply about their clients. At the same time, our Police Force and a wide range of welfare agencies spend a lot of their valuable time and service as back-up to the shelter workers. These women do not rest until they are assured that they have done anything they possibly can to assist the women and children whose lives are threatened by the insidious crime of domestic violence.

I am sure that members will be interested to hear the details of a week in the life of a shelter worker, as it gives a good insight into the amount and limitless range of work done by these people, who often put themselves at risk of physical assault while helping shelter residents, and almost daily are subject to verbal abuse. This is a typical week, in simple terms, of a shelter worker.

Monday: Interview new resident and take her to doctor for urgent check-up; counsel and meet with other residents; answer and make dozens of phone calls and write several letters to agencies.

Tuesday: Take resident and another shelter worker to resident's home to recover clothes and personal items. Meet police at house. (This is hazardous if the women's ex-partner is present, as usually there are many occasions of verbal and attempted physical abuse to the resident and workers). Report child sex abuse to Family and Community Services. Dozens of phone calls received and answered. Help move resident to Housing Trust home, organise furniture, prepare shelter bedroom for new resident. Counsel other residents.

Wednesday: Attend access handover with resident; verbal abuse and attempted physical attacks, requiring police intervention. Attend urgent call-out to resident who is upset and needs urgent counselling; visit half-way house to follow up with resident.

Thursday: Attend half-day training workshop; go to police station and assist with restraint order statement. Attend urgent call from shelter, difficulty with resident and mental health problem.

Friday: Attend Magistrates Court with resident; follow-up counselling with resident; assess resident with mental health problem, refer to Glenside Hospital or another service. (This process can be very problematic for the shelter as, on many occasions, Glenside Hospital will not accept the referral and, if Catherine House is full, the woman is left homeless).

Saturday: See all residents for house meeting (unpaid work).

Sunday: Accept referral of a new resident and attend shelter (unpaid).

The shelter administrator has a similar workload each week, with the added burden of extra paperwork, liaison with other agencies such as the Family Court, management training sessions (which are usually unpaid), giving talks on domestic violence to school students,

assessing new shelter workers, coping with security breaches by men at the shelter looking for their ex-partners (which can be extremely hazardous) and staff meetings.

Other work—how they fit it all in, I do not know—during the week includes grocery shopping, transporting families to other locations, maintenance work on the half-way houses, accepting and sorting donations of clothes and furniture, school holiday programs, counselling with children, child-care, dealing with the media, and organising volunteer helpers. The list goes on and on.

It is clear that these workers have a very difficult job and do huge amounts of unpaid overtime, so it is imperative that we not only ensure that they continue to get adequate direct funding but strive to find other ways of helping to alleviate their budget problems. If we do not tackle now the problems of child abuse, domestic violence and similar problems, which are on the rise because of the recession, they will go on to become bigger problems and, before we know it, will be almost beyond our control. I believe that, unless we nip these problems in the bud now, they will go on to be greater economic cost to the State, both in economic and social terms. On the one hand, we will soon celebrate the Women's Suffrage Centenary and, on the other, women are still underpaid, overworked, their unpaid work is not recognised and their contribution to society is not fully appreciated. Where have we gone in 100 years, and why do we have to continue to fight so hard to hold on to the gains we have made?

I urge all my colleagues here and throughout the world to consider what society today, plagued as it is by high unemployment, crimes such as domestic violence and a distinct lack of gender equality, would be like if women had not stood up for their rights all those years ago, and worked, against all odds, to ensure that their fight had a positive result. It is up to us to translate those ideals into effective meaningful action.

Although, I guess, in many ways that has been a rather depressing view of society today, I am quite sure that 100 years ago it was even worse, and we must all commend those wonderful women who fought for the right for women to stand for Parliament and fought for the right of women to vote, and I think that 1994 will be a year in which we will all celebrate that fact.

I would like finally to turn to a most important area of proposed legislation contained in the report of the Planning Review—namely, the Development Bill. The Bill has been made available for public comment, and no doubt a number of changes will be proposed. I am delighted that at least we are to have a streamlined process, and I think the words contained in the Planning Review Report sum it all up:

> . . . The planning review system should have the benefit of being far more lucid and easy to comprehend than the current fragmented system of development control.

I must say that in recent weeks I have been somewhat perturbed by the media reports of the proposed development at Cape Jervis, and I did ask a question today about this matter. It does seem to me, although I do not claim to be an expert in planning matters, that there is something fundamentally wrong when one person, for the sum of $20, can thwart the wishes of the whole community. I cannot say that I have viewed the plans or that I necessarily agree with them, but there should be a fairer approach for all parties than the present one.

Members will have noted that my question to the Attorney-General about delays in the Planning Appeals Tribunal highlights that there is a difficulty. At present a variety of courts are charged with enforcement of provisions under the Planning Act. There are actual cases which highlight the potential for a single development application to result in a number of legal actions. In such examples, legal issues arise that are not able to be dealt with by the appeal body considering the planning merits of the development. Therefore, the legal issues must be removed to the Supreme Court or the High Court before returning to the original appeal body for determination on the merits. I must say that when I was reading some notes for my Address in Reply speech I found that, as a person who is supposed to understand the legislative process, the whole planning issue is extremely complex, and I would defy a lay person without several lawyers in tow to understand it.

A question of jurisdiction can arise and be determined by the tribunal, and where the tribunal cannot determine the jurisdiction question the costs resulting from lengthy litigation can be great. Also, lengthy delays are involved in this process. This method seems to be neither fair nor appropriate in present day South Australia, because this multiplicity of possible appeal systems results in greater costs to the parties and to the community.

The Development Act proposes an integrated system for appeals and enforcement of the Act within the jurisdiction of a new division of the District Court—the Environment, Resources and Development Court. That system is also planned to be used for the proposed new Environment Protection Act and the Heritage Act. It will be a single court for all development appeals and enforcement. The procedures are to be inexpensive, informed and expeditious. There will be a specialist expert commissioner who, as the Bill outlines, must be a person with practical knowledge of and experience in local government, urban or regional planning, architecture, civil engineering, building or building regulations, administration, commerce or industry, environmental conservation, land management, housing or welfare services or heritage. The court will encourage resolution at conference and there will be limited rights of further appeal.

I think that these suggestions are sensible and long overdue, and I am especially attracted to the informality and reasonable cost aspects of the proposed legislation. As a lay person who has had limited knowledge of planning matters—although I did deal with some planning proposals when I introduced the Prostitution Bill and later I dealt in some depth with some planning matters when I was considering amendments to the Hon. Mr Gilfillan's Prostitution Bill—I feel that this proposal will receive a favourable response once the consultative process is over, because it will make it simpler for people to understand. I hope I can look forward to a sensible approach to the legislation once it is introduced, as I believe that a properly constituted and integrated single combined appeal system would reduce costs and delays and result in a substantial reduction in the utilisation of expensive resources in the long term.

In supporting the motion, to come back to my earlier remarks about the Women's Suffrage Centenary in 1994, I believe that in the Governor of South Australia we have a fine example of a woman who throughout her life has exemplified the earlier aspirations of those women who fought for women's suffrage. She has, I believe—and not only in her present occupation—been a woman of whom South Australia can be proud and we can look up to her. I, for one, wish her many more years in her role as Governor. Although Her Excellency is not in her younger years, I believe that we all admire and envy her energy and enthusiasm. With those final remarks, I support the motion.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I am pleased to support the motion. I thank Her Excellency for her address, and I take this opportunity again of confirming my allegiance to her Majesty the Queen of Australia. I observed in Her Excellency's address to the Parliament that reference was made to the deaths of two former members, and I was saddened today and last week to hear the news of the deaths of two other former members of Parliament. We have paid our respects to the memory and service of the two former members of the South Australian Parliament who were mentioned in Her Excellency's address, but I want to point out that they were members not of this Parliament (the 47th Parliament) but of former Parliaments or were former members of The Parliament.

Both former members were Her Majesty's Ministers in former Governments and, as such, were entitled to be addressed as the Hon. Joyce Steele and the Hon. Albert James Shard. I am being pedantic, but I am puzzled by the informality of what is always a formal occasion and which should, in my opinion, remain so. Traditions in this Council and in the other place still require that we address each other with formality. I will uphold that tradition as long as I am here, and while formality is crashing around our ears to the encouragement and applause of a minority, so too are community standards that are so evident in the daily doses of anti-social community behaviour carrying with it the massive crime rate. In case I am misunderstood, I make perfectly clear that I link none of my remarks to Her Excellency. She has my very highest respect and regard, but I have used the words contained in her address to make those few points.

I know it is not the common practice of the Council or of members to refer to the death of South Australian citizens in general, but I have in the past taken a little time and the liberty to say something about people who have influenced my life and thinking. Hurtle Cummins Morphett, MC, Order of Saint John, who died on 5 June, is one such citizen. His name alone conjures up South Australian history. His forbear, Sir John Morphett, was a member of the South Australian Colonisation Society, who worked closely with Edward Gibbon Wakefield and Robert Gouger and the Duke of Wellington to colonise South Australia.

John Morphett arrived in South Australia aboard the *Cygnet* as a land agent for the South Australian Company on 6 September 1836. Morphett and Field discovered the River Torrens and Morphett was instrumental in helping Light to site Adelaide in its present position by voting his land orders, of which he held more than any other, towards the resolution of where Adelaide should be sited. One could say that that would be a 'Morphettmander' in modern technology. I wonder whether anyone disputes that decision today.

This decision highlights what people of foresight and courage can achieve. If people could project beyond their noses, their envy and their academic powers, they would see that the so-called test of fairness has brought this State to ordinariness riddled with debt and unemployment. Fairness should be applied to the implementation of progress and not to the ideas of progress which emanate from initiative and leadership.

In 1842 Morphett built the historic home, Cummins, which was taken over by the South Australian Government in 1977. John Morphett became a member of the Legislative Council in 1841 and advanced to become Speaker and later President of this Chamber. The 100-year anniversary of the death of Sir John Morphett is to be celebrated this year. I hope we will be able to participate in some celebration of his contribution to South Australia.

Hurtle Morphett was Sir John Morphett's grandson. He won a military cross by serving with the second 48th battalion AIF from 1940 to 1945. He was the first Australian to captain the Oxford Rowing Club but was unable through circumstances to emulate the feat of another former member of this place, Sir Collier Cudmore, who rowed for Oxford and won a rowing medal for Great Britain. Mr Hurtle Morphett was President of the National Trust, Chairman of the Citrus Organising Committee, Governor of the Wyatt Benevolent Trust and Director of the Old Adelaide Milk Supply Company, which most members who have eaten icecream in their younger days would remember as Amscol. He was also a member of the Saint John Ambulance. I simply want to acknowledge his contribution to South Australia during both war and peace.

Hurtle Morphett married Joan, the daughter of Sir William Goodman, who also made a contribution to this State. The old Goodman building is still in the news today as it will be retained when the bus depot departs for another site. This area, of course, is in the news today because of the Olympic gold medal double flip performance of the Minister for Environment and Planning over the retention of tram barn A. If I may, I will take the time of the Council to read some of the sequence of events from 1982 which backs up—

The Hon. T.G. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: No, I am not making any comments about that; I am just referring to these double flip performances by Ministers. I will refer to the sequence of events which, if members have not already studied them, can show that I am well justified in making that statement. On 20 September 1982, Premier Tonkin approved the J150 conservatory for the Botanic Park on the board's recommendation of the Guy Maron design. I refer to the 6 December heritage assessment of Goodman building bay A and amenity buildings by departmental staff.

On 5 April 1984 the building was listed on the State Heritage Register. In 1984, following public debate, the Government sought an alternative location for the conservatory. In September the STA site was identified as

the alternative location for the conservatory. On 1 August 1985 Commissioner Tomkinson provided a report to the Government on the future use of the depot site. On 6 August 1985 the board advised the Government how the then listed tram barns on the State Registry would compromise the use of the preferred site for the conservatory.

On 16 August the National Trust requested the use of the ground floor of Goodman Building, but understood that the tram barns were recommended for demolition and hence no request was made in that respect. On 23 August Commissioner Tomkinson supported the report and recommendations prepared by Andrew Taylor and Brian Morley dated 23 August 1985 and included advice that the tram barns should be demolished but that the Goodman Building should be retained.

On 2 September 1985 Cabinet approved the bicentennial conservatory project on the STA site after accepting the report and its recommendations. That is a significant date and time in the sequence, because that is when the approval was given by Cabinet for that conservatory project on the STA site, bearing in mind what it would look like as it was fitting into that site. On 22 September 1985 there was a public announcement by the Premier on the future of the Hackney depot site. On 22 September Dr Hopgood advised the board of its custody of the Hackney site and retention of the Goodman Building and provided a copy of the Tomkinson report and recommendations, which the Government has acted upon.

On 11 August 1987 the Goodman Building and Bay A were included on the National Estate Register. In 1988 the Goodman Building was listed on the City of Adelaide Register, but the tram barns were omitted in line with the ACC policy at that time. On 11 January the board requested SACON, through Dr Hopgood, to prepare a conservation study of the Goodman Building and that was completed in 1991. At the instigation of SACON, the study also included the tram barns. It was found that the tram barns were less important than the Goodman Building and could be demolished, if necessary; the amenity building was of no heritage significance. On 29 March 1989 there was an inspection of the nearly completed bicentennial conservatory by the Premier, Dr Hopgood and Mr Blevins and that confirmed the need for demolition of the tram barns.

On 30 March Cabinet approved funds for further landscaping renewal to the south of the conservatory by demolition of the STA car park, temporary screening of the STA depot to the east of the conservatory, and funds to permit a landscape plan to be prepared with indicative estimates of costs for when the STA would vacate the depot site.

The official opening of the bicentennial conservatory was 18 November. On 3 April 1992, anticipating the demolition of the tram barn, the board approved the Hackney depot landscape renewal plans. On 25 June the National Trust proposed in the media horse-drawn vehicles with regard to the tram barn. On 26 June the Minister approved the release of the Hackney depot plans, and I remind members this was all in 1992—this year.

On 28 June 1992 the National Trust was offered three alternative sites for the horse-drawn vehicles. On 7 July the National Trust proposed a compromise option regarding the retention of the tram barns. In August 1992 the Minister for Environment and Planning announced that tram barn A would remain. Whatever the final result will be, I think there is plenty of evidence of the to-ing and fro-ing of the Minister in the face of advice from a number of people.

At the conclusion of that sequence, on air last Wednesday Keith Conlon of the ABC asked the Minister whether this was a backflip and she said in capital letters 'No'. I am getting a little tired and annoyed at having to wear the brick bats of electors who lump me and some other members together as politicians who cannot lie straight in bed. I do not intend to make any comment at this stage on the merit or otherwise of tram barn A, but I do reflect on the competence of the Minister and the Government. As a result of this monumental botch-up, the Minister for Environment and Planning should be replaced. How on earth can anything be achieved in this State? How can architects design for one set of rules and then have them changed? My father resigned from his profession because concrete pours were stopped in the middle of the 12th floor of a building.

I highlight the constant changing of ground rules to which architects were required to comply and the enormous cost to the community but, more particularly, the enormous cost to the people who happened to put up the risk capital to build. How can the Botanic Gardens protect the integrity of the bicentennial conservation building? One remembers the ASER project and the hideous cladding on the Riverside Building. What a mockery the Government makes of aesthetic values. It should not be trusted and its supporters should be ashamed.

All the rules were broken regarding that ASER Riverside building, and we were left with a limp excuse from the Premier and others that it would be too costly to reverse the decision and to replace the colours. Is there not one person left of any integrity or understanding who can explain a few facts of life to this Government? It is quite obvious to me and the public that all the efforts of the recently completed planning review will stand for nought, if we continue to procrastinate and have stop-go decision-making and ill-informed bureaucratic decision-making that is allowed to break all the rules, which have been thrashed out, usually by a lengthy public debate.

Such plans as the City of Adelaide plan are a nonsense—and I underline 'a nonsense'—if the Government changes them at will and forgets what is in them and subsequently ignores them. I want to know who are the experts who provide the advice. Why is a majority always overruled by the minority? No wonder developers leave this State in droves. No wonder we are being turned into a backwater by the Bannon Government's performance, and no wonder we must revert to tricks and diversions like the proposal for Eastern Standard Time. As I see it, that is nothing more than a diversion to take up the time of this Parliament, which should have better things to do than spend additional hours going over the same ground that we visited only a couple of years ago.

Nothing has changed: the sun still comes up in the east and sets in the west. I do not see what has changed. If the modern electronic communication age has really achieved anything, and it has made any advances, that alone should wipe out forever the stupid notion of a common Australian time. I have noticed that no-one ever talks about Western Australia in the same breath as they talk about changing South Australia to Eastern Standard Time. I am pretty certain that Western Australia is quite happy where it is, and it is even further behind us in relation to time. However, it is certainly not behind us when it comes to economics and other State matters.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Would you go back half an hour?

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: We could go to the full one hour difference, and that matter will come up in debate. Whatever we do, though, will involve many hours of public debate, and the wrangling and gnashing of teeth. It will be a diversion for the business sector, which is trying to get on with its business, if we inflict upon it another debate on this matter. In relation to the proposal to consider legislation to support the establishment of an economic development board, I realise my thoughts on this issue might differ from those of others—but that is not unusual. When the Hon. Murray Hill was Minister of Local Government, I can recall in the early 1980s opposing his moves to encourage local government to set up development boards. In those days, I was a member of a local council that was grappling with these ideas.

Quite simply, I support small government and therefore believe that governments and councils have a prime responsibility to create a healthy and competitive business and living climate, with very few input costs, and letting businesses, large and small, get on with being productive. It should let individuals go about their decision making within a simple and logical framework. We certainly do not need a board to do anything except find ways to keep the Government out of the way.

Governments do not understand business, and that has been painfully demonstrated in every State of Australia. Business people, such as farmers, are in competition with each other. Why would they want to come together to share the secrets with each other? It is all very good in thought and in theory, but in practice it does not work. I would have thought that the Economic Planning Advisory Council (EPAC) was a good example of getting absolutely nowhere. It is the best example I can find: extremely good people individually from a wide range of businesses and endeavours but it is a collective nonsense.

In Australia and in this State, there is a desperate need to get secondary industry going again. I say again: we cannot go on relying on the primary industry sector. Quite simply, the announcement by Mr Bannon of a $40 million Government injection for South Australian industry, linked as it will be to the economic development board, is an example of defective thinking: it is upside down thinking. Why not take $40 million, $50 million or $60 million less from business in taxes and charges and let them be competitive on domestic and overseas markets. If Mr Bannon has $40 million to spare from the sale of SAGASCO, which will go ahead, he should use it to retire debt and not splash it around trying to be popular. South Australia needs new directions and redefined objectives. I will run through a few of those objectives.

The first is to give first priority to economic development and the creation of jobs. It is not an unusual priority to have that at number one on the list, of course. The second is to establish a competitive edge for South Australian industry, with the Government leading by example through lower taxes and charges, reform of WorkCover and reducing other imposts on business and scrapping unnecessary red tape and regulation. A competitive edge is vital to encourage industry to put a new focus on export opportunities.

South Australia should not see itself as being a fortress State with a fence or a large wall around it. It should be there in open competition with all the other States. We should find it not too difficult—although a few sacrifices might be necessary in the early stages—to get back to where South Australia used to be, that is, leading Australia as a low-cost State for industry. Heavens above, as a primary producer, I know how much we need to get secondary industry up and running in this State. We cannot just rely on one sector over and again—as we traditionally have done—to pull the country out of its difficulties.

The third objective is to deliver essential Government services to the community to improve the quality of life, the key services being: education and training, health, community security and public transport. This will include facilitating services which broaden community culture. I could spend some time on each one of those aspects, but I will simply say that we must not be diverted by other matters as regards the private sector. Most of those services—as essential as they are—can be delivered by the private as well as the public sector. There is no reason why the private sector cannot have something to do with the prison system, for example, even if it is only in bringing some healthy competition into that area.

In relation to education within the prison system, about 30 per cent of people in prison are illiterate or innumerate. Of course, that is higher than the general State average, which is probably between 10 per cent and 15 per cent. I put to the Council that 10 per cent or 15 per cent illiteracy in Australia today is a tragedy and a disgrace on the part of our education system. I do not believe that the new announcements for the TAFE system, as good as the education might be, in any direction, will pick up that problem of innumeracy and illiteracy. The TAFE system should not be there to pick up what the secondary school system has not been able to achieve. Again, I think this is an indictment on those people in the education system who have allowed people in the average down to the bottom end range to fall away so badly. For the community to pick that up means an enormous increase in cost.

Fourthly, there must be increased productivity and incentive for better work practices through major industrial relations reform. Again, the Government must set the standard with improved productivity within the public sector, so that we have a Public Service of which all South Australians can be proud. I shall refer to further factors relating to that last statement in a moment. The fifth objective concerns smaller and more efficient Government so that taxes and charges can be reduced. Sixthly, we must have increased Government

accountability, with greater community input in decisions and more individual freedom. I make a plea for more open government in the State Government sphere, and particularly in the local government sphere. I say quite simply that if governments of any sort want to get into commercial business then it should be totally open to the public. If anyone else wants to deal with government, and they know that ground rule, we will not have this nonsense of hiding behind confidential clauses and commercial confidentiality. Basically, though, I do not think that government should be in the commercial field at all.

The final objective is to stabilise and then reduce the State debt and to ensure that the Government lives within its finances, so that we can keep taxes and charges down in the long term. What we saw through the 1980s was a rush of blood to the head in both the private and public sectors. The public sector, of course, is held accountable for its over-spending and for the way that it conducts its business. Those who were not good at it are gone, at great cost to some people, but governments have mostly stayed on. With the election being called in Victoria, we are now seeing the first chance for the people to judge a Government. In a sense, they have already made a judgment on former Premier Mr Cain, who stood aside for Mrs Kirner. But now there is a chance for the Victorian people to judge a Government, and that process will go on around Australia over the next few years.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I will not mention Mr Greiner other than to pay tribute to what he was able to achieve as Premier in the very difficult situation he inherited in New South Wales. It is sad that because that Government had some courage and did some hard things the people have judged it badly. He did not deserve to just creep into Government at the last New South Wales election. I do not think that there has been a final judgment on his appeal yet; but the judgment, as correct as it may have been, was very harsh in the light of what has been going on in the other States of Australia—whether that be in South Australia with Mr Bannon being in the hot seat at the commission or whether that be in Western Australia where people have been put through the mill in the Western Australian Royal Commission, where some of them got their just deserts.

Late last year I was made aware of an address that was given to the national forum by Hoover Australia. This gave a telling example of what we face in Australia as far as manufacturing is concerned. Hoover Australia developed a washing machine that was superior to that of its parent United States company. The Australian machine has a labour cost of about 7.5 per cent of its total cost, which is equal to that of the United States' labour cost, and is a relatively low cost. Material costs account for 92.5 per cent of the machine costs and are far higher here than in the United States. For costs other than material and labour, Hoover is confronted by what is called the factory burden which comprises such items as labour-related costs such as payroll tax, superannuation, workers compensation, holiday loading and so on which represents a premium of 42 per cent of gross wages. Other items such as council rates, taxes, water, gas and electricity are included in the factory burden. They are all factors in the material cost which have a cumulative effect all along the production line.

Only by dramatically addressing these issues can the bulk of Australia's manufacturing cost disadvantages be overcome. I cannot see any light at the end of the Federal Government's tunnel to give Hoover or any other manufacturer any hope in the future. Eleven per cent of the $22 million of gross sale value from Hoover's performance is directly associated with Government charges and taxes. As one of Australia's often maligned manufacturers observed: to what extent, if at all, is the concept of productivity measurement and improvement applied to the provisions of the Government's services, all of which contribute to the cost of this Australian product and therefore affect its ability to satisfy the criteria of international competitiveness?

Twenty years ago 70 per cent of items on show at the Australian International Engineering Exhibition were Australian made. Today the percentage of Australian made items would be something between 5 and 10 per cent. The wages explosion of the Whitlam era was one reason for the swing away from Australian made products. This was coupled with a cut of 25 per cent on all import duties which again occurred under the Whitlam Government. It is a proven fact that business is going broke in Australia from the burden of input costs—and not tariff protection.

The two industries that have fared the worst during the current recession are the textile, clothing and footwear industry and the automotive industry—the two industries with the highest levels of assistance by far. Between August 1989 and August 1990 employment in TCF fell by more than 17 000 people. In that year, protection levels for the TCF sector were at a peak, with several clothing and footwear items enjoying effective protection of more than 250 per cent or nearly 20 times the average for the rest of industry.

In the following year, from August 1990 to August 1991, another 4 000 jobs were lost from the TCF sector. Ironically, whilst employment in this sector has slumped, employment in the food and beverage industry, for example, has increased by 12 500 people, yet this sector receives negligible average protection of 3 per cent. If anyone has any interest in the tariff debate they ought to consider both sides of that argument and consider the fact that where protection is taken away from one industry generally the flow of people leaving that industry will be taken up by another industry, and that is almost exactly mirrored by the example I have given.

To return to the development board concept, I use some of my own local examples. Tatiara Meat was started by two brothers, one of whom was a butcher in Bordertown. This company is now of great importance to the South-East and the State as a significant exporter of meat into Europe, the United States and other destinations. The business started in Bordertown because it wanted to. Former Premier Dunstan wanted it to set up in Victoria so that it could bring the meat into the old metropolitan abattoir area and, in a sense, that is the only way it could have operated into that metropolitan area—that is, to set up outside the State. This shows how ridiculous the old metropolitan abattoir area concept was. Thank goodness these people did not heed the then Premier's advice. The local council gave considerable encouragement in relation to its setting up, the site

preparation and the sealing of roads, and it welcomed the project with open arms. But, it did not need a development board to get it up and going: if you like, the development board was the council itself.

In my town of Keith, a young lad called Trevor McGrice set up a pine furniture manufacturing business in his father's wool-shed. It has grown into Australia's largest pine manufacturing furniture business and is known as Midas Furniture. Trevor left Keith prior to the business hitting its prime because of the utter frustration of trying to put everything together in a regional area, despite being so close to the source of his pine wood requirement. This business did not need a development board to set up. It is a tragedy that this sort of business is not encouraged to thrive in a rural area. Another key person, Margaret Bower, set up a smocking business in Keith using the talents of local people in a manufacturing process. She invented a machine, which was produced locally, and exported. Before this business moved to Adelaide she hosted an international smocking convention in the town. Again, this business did not need a development board to help it establish.

As I move around rural South Australia and conduct research, I have compiled a large file of exciting things that are being done in rural South Australia. I hope the momentum continues and the innovative effort does not diminish, as some traditional commodities inevitably return to a gross return situation. I am simply saying that if one sticks to the old traditional high-fliers in the commodity areas of wool, wheat and grain that is fine when they are all in good order but, when they move into decline, as they inevitably will, in their traditional cycle downwards, people tend to look for other alternative products to produce on their farms. I am saying that I hope they stick with those alternatives and do not move out of them when something else is on its upwards cycle.

Governments can establish and encourage the appropriate climate and resist the temptation to rape the hard-working producer, whether that be a primary or secondary producer. It is way past the time to look at Asia, but if ever a country was well placed to provide competitively priced high-class products into Asia it is Australia, it is South Australia, and it is now. It is getting too late, and I do not see anything to excite me yet in this direction. When I talk about raping the producer of products in South Australia and Australia to feed the monster Government I include the value of the Australian dollar. Mr Keating as Treasurer and now as Prime Minister has badly misled the Australian people about the floating of the Australian dollar. It certainly does not float against the United States dollar, and it never has, not in Mr Keating's time, despite radio interview after radio interview that I have heard where he denies, like Ms Lenehan denies over and over again, something that is actually happening.

He knows that it is happening: he has been pulling that lever for it to happen. For years the Reserve Bank has manipulated the Australian dollar and poured billions of dollars into the Federal Government's coffers. The well-publicised example of 12 August of the Reserve Bank's pouring in $1 billion to stop the fall of the Australian dollar is just one more example of a dirty float. I do not know what else we can call it. There was no profit from this interference, but there are profits from buying and selling the Australian dollar which, inevitably, flow to the Government's budget. Probably, on my research some time ago and projecting it now, an average in excess of $2 billion a year is put into the Treasury by the Reserve Bank's trading.

This exercise is nothing other than a redistribution of wealth, with the great beneficiaries being the non-productive in this country. The Reserve Bank probably has the best money market dealers in Australia. It also has the advantage of an enormous, never-ending pool of funds, like the State Bank, and plays the currency markets on any given day. It is being used shamelessly by the present Federal Government and Mr Bernie Fraser to manage the interest rate/currency position. The Reserve Bank has contributed vast sums over the years to reduce the budget deficit.

There are many levers to pull connected with the Australian economy. Mr Keating has been pulling or failing to pull them for 10 years now, and the chickens of his mismanagement of the economy are coming home to roost, to the detriment of every Australian. Mr Bannon's contribution is that this State maladministration, added to the Commonwealth's woes, has made economic conditions worse for all South Australians than for their interstate cousins, including, of course, the factor of unemployment.

Whatever the arguments for a higher or lower Australian dollar—and they vary depending on whether you are an exporter or an importer, or a domestic trader—crunch day is coming. Reserve Bank profits, not used to retire debts but, rather, to fund philosophical monsters such as Medicare, have been used up. As the Australian dollar falls on the international market, the Reserve Bank stands to lose billions of dollars and will be in no position to make contributions to the Commonwealth budget. I wonder whether anyone here can see a familiar picture in this scenario with the South Australian State Bank experience.

Exporters, including primary producers, have had enough of bearing the brunt of idiotic socialist decisions and directions. Mr Bannon's shameless manipulation of the State Bank interest rates during the election period is well-documented, and another example of where the productive pay through the nose helping Mr Bannon to maintain his popularity, while they themselves are carrying interest rates in excess of 20 per cent. Perhaps they are not carrying those now, but they certainly were.

I refer specifically to many farmers who were carrying on their loans from banks the 20 per cent or more with penalties, making it much more, when this manipulation of interest rates was going on in one sector of the State Bank's work. We should be cautious, because housing-led recoveries have not been sustained previously and will not be the answer this time or in the future. The Hon. Mr Ron Roberts may well reflect on all this now that he has had his sideswipe at primary producers. An angry group of farmers is not a pretty sight, but they have many justifiable reasons for being angry. Much anger has been based on the matters I have discussed during this contribution and previously. The Hon. Mr Roberts would well know that there are just as many champagne socialists or closet capitalists, such as Peter Duncan, roaming the hallowed meeting places of the ALP as there are those with primary production interests living

in the leafy suburbs of Adelaide, attending UF&S meetings. If they have retired in Adelaide, they probably deserve a rest from their lifetime's hard work and risk-taking. If the Hon. Ron Roberts wants to be the next Minister of Agriculture when the Hon. Lyn Arnold steps up, good on him, but he is not making a very auspicious start.

I refer back to the Governor's speech, and should like to point out a few areas in which there is conflict of emphasis and where only half the story is related. It is stated that wool prices are predicted to rise by 9 per cent over those of last year and, when combined with the new wool tax 3.5 per cent lower, this will give a boost to income. It was also stated that beef prices are expected to firm marginally, but wheat returns will fall some $20 per tonne or 11 per cent in comparison with last year. This statement conflicts somewhat with the recent statement of Dr Radcliffe, the Director-General of the Department of Agriculture, in an article in the *Stock Journal* of 6 August, in which he said:

> There would seem to be greater opportunities in beef in the short term than perhaps, areas such as wool. It looks as though the climb out for the wool industry will be slow, based on the size of the stockpile.

It may be that the two statements differ only in emphasis, but it can already be shown that the wool return has not lifted yet this year. Thanks to the Australian dollar, wheat has risen and may rise further. These changes have occurred within the past two weeks. So, it shows once again the fickle nature of primary production. Any predicted increase in primary interest returns from production must be taken in context with the predicted cost rise of 3 per cent in 1992-93.

We may consider the prediction of the New South Wales Farmers Association, where things look even worse. An article in the *Advertiser* of 20 July states:

> The average New South Wales farmer would make a loss of about $30 000 this year, association spokesman Mr Bob Lawrence said yesterday.

The average wool and wheat farmer would work every day this year and still make a loss of about $30 000, another reason why the Hon. Ron Roberts should know why the farmers are angry. I know it from my own farm accounts. We have only to look at some comparative union costs to understand why our farmers are working seven days a week and still making no profit. I seek leave to have a table inserted in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

	USA	Uruguay	Australia
Average total cost of beef slaughter and fabrication:			
— A$ per head (1990 values) . . .	88	82	193
— A$ per kg dwt (1990 values) .	0.25	0.32	0.79
Average labour cost of beef slaughter and fabrication:			
— A$ per head (1990 values) . . .	36	56	111
— A$ per kg dwt (1990 values) .	0.10	0.22	0.45

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: This shows that the average cost of beef slaughter and fabrication for the United States is $A88 per head. The Australian cost is $A193 per head, more than double the US cost. The average labour cost of beef slaughter and fabrication in the United States is $A36, and the labour cost per head in Australia is $A111, more than three time the cost in the US. The average total cost of slaughtering lamb in New Zealand is $8.40, compared with the Australian cost of $11.90. This is why the farmers are angry.

I quote from a document that sums it up quite well by saying that in 1970 a tonne of wheat bought 2 200 litres of fuel. By 1991 it bought less than 200 litres of fuel. This simple statement highlights the problems farmers are facing in the last decade of the twentieth century, and indicates the double whammy effect of rising input costs, which are the rising cost of a litre of fuel, and the declining commodity returns at the same time.

It is little wonder that automatic slaughtering equipment is being considered in Australia—even more automatic than it is now. It will be costly to install, but it will reduce input costs by at least 30 per cent. It may be already too late for union members to reconsider their jobs because of the high cost of their labour-productivity ratio. When economic conditions improve, the automatic shearing machine, recently auctioned due to lack of ongoing finances, hopefully, will be finished. This technology will be in competition with shearers, and the winner will be whoever offers a quality service at the lowest price.

With the shearers' future threatened by such technology, it is no wonder that the Labor Government was unwilling to give some assistance to bring the shearing robot into production. Increases in inspection costs by the Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service on 1 August threaten the future of small slaughtering establishments. Increases from $96.60 to $322 a day have been announced. Seed and grain merchants were suffering from increases ranging from 19 per cent for field inspections to 138 per cent for in-office inspections. The citrus industry is under the same pressure from price rises. One citrus packer revealed that the increase will be from $18 to $43 per quarter hour for an in-office inspection or, as he said, $745 per day. Is it any wonder that the farmers are angry? Roll on the Hewson Government and the Fightback package. The Coalition policies offer the best opportunity ever seen, at least in the past 30 years, for input costs to be lowered.

I would like to mention briefly two other matters. The effectiveness of the Parliament is very much enhanced by advice given to the Government by standing and select committees, always with the qualification that the Government does not have to take notice of what those committees do or say. I am not a member of a standing committee but, in the short time in which the new arrangements have applied to standing committees, I have observed that they are working well. I refer, in particular, to the Economic and Finance Committee, which was established in the other place. Without attempting to explore all the factors that may have contributed to the way in which this committee has got off to such an explosive start, and bearing in mind that the committee has not yet reported, I have to say that I greatly admire the work it is doing and the direction it is taking.

What is of importance to me—and I put it to this Council—to the people of this State, is that that committee of this Parliament should, without fear or favour, scrutinise this Government—and there is certainly plenty of fertile ground—and any future Government. It may well be that we have reached this appalling stage of terrible economics and just as bad personal standards of

behaviour by not having an effective overview established by the Parliament itself to protect the interests of the people—and that is what we are here for.

As a member of only one select committee of this place, I have to say that I am very disappointed with the lack of progress made during the winter on completing that committee's work. I also have to say in general that we are elected by the people to represent them in this Parliament, and we are paid by the people who elect us. I see it as my prime responsibility to be available for 365 days a year, give or take a holiday period. I certainly do not see political Party work or overseas or interstate so-called study tours as priorities over my responsibility to be available here. The three winter months should be the prime time to do an enormous amount of select committee work. The committees should be bound—and this might be going a bit too far—to meet at least once a week while Parliament is not sitting. It is my observation that the select committees set up by this Council have been far too drawn out: Marineland 28 months; Stirling, 22 months; penal, 22 months; and country rail, 22 months. None of those committees have reported; one has been sitting for over two years and the other three will have been sitting for two years before they report.

Finally, I would like to refer to something that is positive and exciting. Last weekend, I had the privilege of being invited to a seminar to hear about a 15 to 20 year plan to develop what is known as the Munno Para Arc. I congratulate the Hickinbotham Group for their initiative in arranging the seminar and for the excitement that was generated. The Hickinbotham Group proposes to retain what it calls the Andrew Farm estate and redevelop it as a pilot project to a new twenty-first century lifestyle made possible by water. The pilot project could then be repeated 10 or 15 times over the plains of the Munno Para Arc, an area of between 30 and 60 square kilometres given over to mixed irrigation and urban development.

If I link that statement with what I heard from the Hon. Mr Gilfillan today, one can see the excitement there. I do not mean to promote Hickinbotham but simply say that this is a private enterprise development area which has some excitement for South Australia. I was stimulated by the way problems have been identified and up to the minute technology applied to solving them. Many techniques will, undoubtedly, evolve over time, and I think it would be a good idea to at least try out stormwater management, effluent management, the use of solar energy, energy efficient housing, and probably anything else you can think of, in this outer metropolitan area of South Australia.

I have no doubt that local and State politics will play a part in shaping what is to be done in this area of land that has been identified by the Hickinbotham Group. It is my hope that local and State governments will do nothing more than provide the climate that will allow private enterprise to get on with the job of completing the project, and many like it. I hope this example is the first of many around this State. With those comments, I support the motion.

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: I support the adoption of the Address in Reply and thank Her Excellency the Governor for her speech. In my tertiary medical training, we were taught always to be positive and to present the bright side of things. However, with this Government's track record of financial and administrative mismanagement, it is impossible to be optimistic. We have a litany of losses in the millions, so much so that the large sums have blunted the community's perception of just how enormous the debts are. To name just a few: State Bank $2.3 billion—that is, $2 300 million, the cost of the Government's and taxpayers' bail-out; WorkCover, $135 million of unfunded liabilities; SGIC, $81 million pre tax loss last year before Collins Street was on its books; SATCO, $85 million—the amount of money now believed to have been lost on Scrimber, the Greymouth New Zealand Plywood mill and other timber ventures; and Marineland, $10 million which is the cost of the failure of this venture.

Yes, this list leaves you gasping. The Arthur D. Little report, aptly entitled 'Rebuilding the South Australian Economy, June 1992', identifies our State's difficulties. The opening paragraph entitled 'New directions for South Australia's economy', which prompts me to ask whether we have been going in the wrong direction, states:

> South Australia for many years has enjoyed a high standard of living, an enviable lifestyle and a relaxed pace of life. Today all of those are under threat. Unemployment is running at levels which society cannot sustain without encountering severe social difficulties. (We know that our State has the highest unemployment rate of all the States—12 per cent).
>
> The unemployment situation could get worse. It is time to ask whether this is simply the product of the current recession or whether there is a most fundamental cause for South Australia's difficulties.

The report states further:

> The answer to this question is not difficult to find. The problem is not the current recession, it is much deeper and more fundamental . . .

I concur with the Little report statement and will venture to add my own interpretation and observation of the problem of this great State of ours. The problem is attitude:

> Attitude, you know, is far more important in this world than aptitude. With the right attitude and only a modicum of aptitude you can succeed in almost anything you choose to undertake, but all the aptitude in the world won't make you a success if you have the wrong attitude.

The experts in the Little report tell us that more than one half of South Australia's exports are agricultural and food products but, even with this base, South Australia's export orientation is very low. The report further states that the manufacturing sector in South Australia is dominated by protected goods serving a domestic market with severe competitive pressures. Such goods are the automotive, white goods, textile, clothing, footwear, metal products and steel.

The report further tells us that we need to develop goods based on competitiveness and attractiveness and not based on price. Such new commodities are wine, electronic applications, computer services, education services, engineering and construction services, agricultural items, tourism, fresh fruit and vegetables. Our goods need to be based on quality, service, speed and image. The area we ought to look towards is the Asia-Pacific. Our opportunities, according to the report, are new manufacturing industry, tradable services, agriculture and added value to minerals.

Suggested enabling strategies include changing the basis of competition, building our Asia-Pacific alliances

and developing a more supportive business climate. These suggestions are easier said than done. For example, in building the Asia-Pacific alliances, on which particular country and on which particular region should we focus our attention? What is our attitude towards the four Asian tigers of economy, namely, Taiwan, Korea, Hong Kong and Singapore. The Asia-Pacific region is not an homogeneous area—not in race, culture, creed, or development. How will we target this region? Do we understand its business culture and ethics, for example? Although we are geographically close to this Asia-Pacific region, our culture is based on Anglo-Celtic origins, so our attitude might be millions of light years apart.

The suggestion of an Economic Development Board is an interesting concept. Being born in Singapore, one is aware that the EDB has proved to be a powerful driving force for economic development of the state. How such a board will accommodate Australian attitudes needs to be further contemplated. Take, for example, the State Government departments and agencies spending more than $100 million on consultants in the past five years. A list of these expenditures as follows: Treasury Department, $24 million; Health Commission, $9.3 million on 328 consultancies; and Tourism South Australia, $900 000. Some of these details of TSA are $180 000 on assessment of benefits for upgrading roads in Kangaroo Island, $1 500 to facilitate a public meeting on Kangaroo Island, $18 300 to a former TSA employee for written work, $15 000 for an overview of interpretive sign-posting in the Flinders Ranges, $3 000 for a study of Australian travel and intentions after the Gulf War, and $28 000 for a psychographic segmentation of the tourist trade, whatever that might mean.

These are some of the findings of the parliamentary Economic and Finance Committee. They beg the question as to the expertise in the departments, the reluctance to take responsibility and the lack of accountability. Again, I put to members that the attitude is not right. Departmental expertise must be available, but the attitude shows a lack of pride and ownership in one's department. There is no sense of responsibility or accountability. This Government's track record for economic management is abysmal.

As another indicator, that of employment—or, rather, unemployment—shows the unemployment rate in South Australia is 12 per cent and, as members know, the national rate is 11.1. That is equivalent to approximately 90 000 South Australians unemployed. This is the highest unemployment rate since the Great Depression. Youth unemployment, in particular amongst the 15 and 19-year-olds, is approximately 40 per cent. What is the Government's attitude towards this high unemployment rate? Is the attitude to be that it is a worldwide phenomenon and that we cannot do anything about it, or will its attitude be more positive and one of trying to devise ways and means to overcome this terrible plight. We in Australia need to adjust our attitude to life and to work in particular.

With these thoughts in mind, I move on to the rural area. There has been a silver lining in the rural scene with the heavy rains across much of the State. The grain farmers on central Eyre Peninsula have (and I quote Mr Schulz, a farmer in Wudinna) 'smiles a mile wide'. There have been significant rises in the price of wheat and wool over the past month. The market indicator price for wool has climbed from 470c per kilo in November to 645c per kilo. Australian standard white wheat of 10 per cent protein is expected to return $US180 per tonne—a rise of $US10 in the past two months. An above average wheat yield of almost 2 million tonnes was recorded in South Australia this season. South Australian wheat growers had good prices, because of increased international demand, particularly from the Commonwealth Independent States, as well as the drop in the value of the Australian dollar.

However, the dark clouds have collected again, and we see the Federal Government's proposals to reduce research funding. Currently, the Government matches growers' research contribution dollar for dollar to .5 per cent of gross value of production for individual industries. Under the new proposal effective in July 1993, the Government's contribution is to be reduced to 50 cents for every grower dollar up to .25 per cent of GVP, a dollar for dollar for .25 per cent to .5 per cent of GVP, and 50c for every grower dollar for .5 to .75 of GVP. In effect, this will be a loss of 25 per cent, or an increase of growers' levy by 25 per cent to maintain the current level of expenditure on grain research and development. It is at odds with the Little report, which calls for the Australian industry to be more productive, more efficient and internationally competitive.

The State Government ought to send a message to its Federal counterpart that, if we talk about value adding, then it is 'an act of idiocy' as quoted by the *Stock Journal* to cut agricultural research funding by more than 25 per cent. The attitude here again is all wrong. It should be an attitude of support for research which will achieve our long-term goals.

Further, we see a decline in our rural towns. Only one in five people live in rural Australia. An article in the *Rural Times* dated August 1992 refers to the decline as 'the death of a thousand cuts'. The rundown has become a vicious circle. With the loss of services due to financial constraints, services are being rationalised, which means cuts. That means services of health, education and law and order are all decreased. This leads to a loss of population, a loss of business, further decreases in population and more services lost. Rural hospitals are either changed to nursing homes or closed completely, and the population has to go to a regional hospital, although it may be 80 kilometres away. To add insult to injury, the patient possibly does not qualify for the patient-assisted travel benefits, as the hospital is, as they say, in the region. Dr Stoeckel states:

> The quality of life in rural Australia, the productivity of the people, and the ability of the towns to service local rural communities is in serious jeopardy. Post offices, banks and related services are being progressively withdrawn. A wide variety of businesses are closing, social networks are disappearing and social structures are being undermined.

He does not see this rural decline as a passing phenomenon but rather as a gradual 2-3 per cent decline over most of the post-war period. He says that there is a lack of vision for rural Australia: a lack of a flexible business plan and of community developed vision. This Government has attempted to put out economic visions, the Adelaide planning vision and the social service vision, but what of a rural vision? The attitude towards the rural community is negative, as the votes are not there for this present Government. The rural scene has a

low priority. It is about time we gave full support to the rural community, which provides over half of Australia's exports. The rural community deserves our attention right now.

What is our attitude towards our environment? In these times of financial constraints, whenever one shows concern for the environment, the person is branded as a 'radical green'. This attitude of over-reaction to a legitimate concern is pervasive and at times precludes rational debate. We must be able to find a middle ground between maximising financial returns and care for the environment. We must move towards 'sustainable development', as defined in Bruntland's Report (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987), as:

> . . . development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

Those of us who do not feel comfortable with using the term 'ecologically sustainable development', even with the notion of an 'economic sustainable development' (with Bruntland's definition), implies a concern for social equity between generations, a concern that must logically be extended to equity within each generation. We are aware that due to this present 'recession we had to have', that the issue of the environment is at a low ebb. However, let us not forget that, once we lose an area of environmental significance for the sake of financial gain, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to replace. So, with this present recession, with high unemployment, what is our attitude towards our environment for our children?

Let us look at the planning review 2020 Vision. This review is not before time. At long last we have at least a planning strategy and an accompanying draft Development Bill. It is relevant to note that 95 per cent of it is rehashed, old material. For example, there is the Metropolitan Adelaide Residential Planning SDP, formulated 8 December 1988; the Longer Term Development of Adelaide SDP, formulated on 30 July 1987; the Metropolitan Open Space System, formulated in 1987; and the Transport SDP, formulated in 1985. All these ideologies and strategies have been included in these SDPs, but they have been provided only recently. This is a minute step forward to include in the Development Bill the replacement of the Planning Act; the City of Adelaide Development Control Act Building Act; the development control provisions of the Real Property Act; the Strata Title Act; the Coast Protection Act; and the South Australian Heritage Act.

Unfortunately, the draft Development Bill does not incorporate the control provisions of the other 100 separate Acts that the planning review initially boasted that it would do. The planning strategy has given us motherhood statements with words of platitudes and allegations of 'one-stop', 'certainty', 'efficiency' and 'predicability'. Although this may be so to a very limited extent, there is still no certainty for the uniform interpretation of the new terms 'conforming' or 'non-conforming'. These terms take the place of the old planning terms of 'consent' and 'prohibited'. These are new terms but there are no criteria for them.

If the Minister is serious in her endeavour to make things more certain, then she should have a third category of 'prohibited' which truly means 'prohibited', such as certain areas of the Flinders Ranges, certain areas of the Murray River fringes or certain areas of the coast. There is no certainty for the term 'seriously at variance', which is noted in the Development Bill in sections 27, 37 and 38. There is no certainty for the term 'substantial public opposition', in section 21 of the Development Bill. There is no certainty that important issues and matters will be firmly upheld, as they are mainly in regulations rather than in the body of the Bill of the Act. Examples of this issue are in section 7 of the Development Bill, which relates to the application of the Act.

It is unsatisfactory that the power to exempt application of the Act is by regulation. Section 26 of the Development Bill relates to the circumstances where the State is the authorising body. It is unsatisfactory that the power to decide these circumstances is by regulation. Section 28 of the Development Bill relates to the three categories of development. It is unsatisfactory that the power to decide on the basic consistency in the three development categories to the details of notice of inspection is by regulation. Section 37 of the Development Bill relates to Crown Land. It is unsatisfactory that the power to exclude development on Crown Land from approval and notice of inspection is by regulation. All these are examples of regulations used for coping with major issues, rather than writing them in the Bill or the Act, which is then subjected to full parliamentary debate. This method by regulatory means results in no clarity, no constancy and no certainty.

Further in relation to the planning review, regarding section 33 of the EIS, ministerial discretion to require EIS is unsatisfactory. What types of development require the EIS? When and where is an EIS required? What is their scope? In section 19 of the planning strategy there is a failure to prescribe public procedure, as amendments to the strategy are a major concern. At a future date the Minister could unilaterally rewrite the strategy and, therefore, affect the whole Development Bill, the Act and the regulations.

Regarding the hills face zone (schedule 13) different conditions apply for this unique area for the different councils. This surely cannot provide for certainty for a whole area. What has started out to be a vision for Adelaide is now a hollow crown. We need to make sure during the time of consultation that it becomes a vision of substance, not a mirage.

Looking at our attitude towards women, what is a woman's worth? What is the recognition that we accord to women? As the report of the Inquiry into Equal Opportunity and Equal Status for Women in Australia (entitled *Half Way to Equal*) states:

> Recognition is intrinsically tied to the notion of visibility and value.

It goes on to say that, whilst visibility is easy to define, value is rather more difficult and that it is related to status, which in turn is associated with monetary worth. Thus, non-marketed goods and services, as is the job of a housewife, have no financial cost, and are therefore of no worth.

We must work towards greater recognition for the contribution made by women. Our attitude about ourselves has to be addressed. We do not recognise our own skills and attributes. As *Half Way to Equal* states, our self-esteem happens from the cradle. Girls are nurtured in a more protective environment and thus tend

to be more hesitant in putting themselves forward and are less confident. Ms Robyn Archer, our well-known singer, song writer and educator says:

> They do not recognise themselves first and they have to recognise their own worth first before anybody else is going to recognise them.

Greater recognition of women's contributions ought to be in the school curriculum. More research needs to be done on the implication of women being more involved in the work force. Community attitude needs to be changed and the *Half Way to Equal* report suggests that change can be achieved through legislation. As Helen Styles, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, states:

> . . . fastest way to change people's attitudes is through fear of litigation.

Others suggested education programs, although it was put forward that the focus of programs should shift the burden from women to encouraging positive responsible behaviour from men. Dr Keith Butler noted:

> Re-education of the Australian male is the most difficult . . . humanising of the Australian adult male needs to begin in pre-school.

It was noted that women are under-represented in politics. The discussion as to the reason behind this was split between personal reasons or that the Party did not choose them. In Australia there are 112 out of 842 members of Parliament—that is, 13.3 per cent women in Parliament. In local government the percentage is higher—that is, 19.5 per cent. The challenge is to change our own attitudes towards recognising our own potential and also to change the attitude of the community in relation to the status of women.

In the area of health and, to a lesser extent, welfare services, we have almost unspeakable despair. Although the greater part of funding is from the Federal area, the State has its input. The health system is not working. We have almost 9 000 people on the waiting list to have problems corrected, and some have been waiting two years, possibly in pain, waiting for a bed in a public hospital. We now hear that there is possibly to be tendering for beds to the private sector. The health system is in a mess and cannot be indefinitely funded from taxes alone. People must be encouraged to put reliance from the tax system to the privately funded system, if possible, otherwise there will be insufficient resources to provide adequate health care. Of course, there always must be a safety net for the disadvantaged. We will see further health financing cuts expected:

	$
RAH	3 500 000
QEH	2 900 000
FMC	2 300 000
Women's and Children's	2 150 000
Lyell McEwin	200 000
Modbury	750 000
Southern Districts	500 000
IMVS	300 000
Community Health Services	250 000
Statewide Community Services	1 400 000
South Australian Mental Health	900 000
Onkaparinga Hospital	400 000
Disability Services	1 400 000
Total	17 100 000

Where will the cuts be implemented? Will it be the closing of beds? Will it be the full closing of wards? Will we have longer waiting lists, or will there be a cutting of the children's disability services, etc? Doctors are being targeted, from the newly graduated interns who will now not be guaranteed a first year internship in South Australia to the senior specialist or the visiting medical officers, whose position is threatened by the system wanting to replace them with full-time salaried staff. Again, I say that the attitude is not right. There is no consideration for the care of the patient. The health system is now a factory production line, churning out people as quickly as possible without care for the outcome of the procedure. Quantity is everything by which productivity is measured and quality of service becomes unimportant. This defunct health system is such an immense problem that our attitude is blunt to the needs for the care of the sick. We must put back in place a workable health system, not just an ideology that leads to ill-health for the community.

Further, what about Aboriginal health? If our system for mainstream health is poor, the health of our Aboriginal community is of greater concern. For too long our attitude towards Aboriginal health has been along the lines of the 'white man's medicine'. Perhaps we should note how the Maoris have expressed their 'wish to define health for themselves, to identify their own specific health concerns and devise solutions to meet their own needs. They see health as part of who they are, where they come from and where they are going, and they wish to take responsibility for their own health at the level of the extended family . . . rather than as individuals'.

Those health professionals who have worked amongst the Aboriginal community invariably remark that the Aboriginal health concept is quite different from our traditional Western method. When the First Fleet arrived a three-pronged attack was made on the health and welfare of Aborigines: first, by introducing new diseases, so immediately fatal, and others fatal in the long term; secondly, by taking away ancestral land, thus causing psychological illness and spiritual despair; and, thirdly, by herding Aborigines into small reserves and settlements thereby destroying their healthy lifestyle and substituting conditions and diet that were poorer than those of the poorest newcomers.

Looking at the Aboriginal population (from the 1986 Census by States and Territories) we note that there are over 220 000 Aborigines nationally and that makes up about 1.4 per cent of the total Australian population; the Northern Territory has the highest proportion of Aborigines—22.4 per cent; next comes Western Australia with 2.7 per cent; and South Australia is fifth on the list at 1.1 per cent, which is equivalent to New South Wales.

I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a table of the 1986 Census of the Aboriginal population, by States and Territories.

Leave granted.

AUSTRALIAN ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER POPULATION BY STATES AND TERRITORIES, 1986

State/Territory	Total	Australian Aborigines	Torres Strait Islanders	Proportion of total population Per cent
Queensland	61 268	48 098	13 170	2.4
New South Wales	59 011	55 672	3 339	1.1
Western Australia	37 789	37 110	679	2.7
Northern Territory	34 739	34 197	542	22.4
South Australia	14 291	13 298	993	1.1
Victoria	12 611	10 740	1 871	0.3
Tasmania	6 716	5 829	887	1.5
Australian Capital Territory	1 220	1 160	60	0.5
Total Australia	227 645	206 104	21 541	1.4

Source: ABS 1987a

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: The birth weight of babies is usually an indicator of their health. We note that babies born to Aboriginal mothers invariably have a lower birth weight than those born to non-Aboriginal mothers. A statistical table showing birth weight distribution between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal mothers highlights that the percentage of low birth weight babies (that is, under 2 500 grams) in South Australia was 11.7 per cent, whilst it was 5.7 per cent for babies of non-Aboriginal women. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a statistical table on the birth weight distribution of babies born to Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal mothers.

Leave granted.

BIRTH WEIGHT DISTRIBUTION: BABIES BORN TO ABORIGINAL AND NON-ABORIGINAL WOMEN

Weight (grams)	Aboriginal								Non-Aboriginal	
	Qld 1987[a]		WA 1983-86		NT 1986-87		SA 1983-86			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<2 500	58	17.0	624	12.9	360	15.2	144	11.7	7 577	5.7
2 500-2 999	107	31.2	1 109	22.9	683	29.0	273	22.0	20 140	15.4
3 000-3 499	112	32.7	1 781	36.8	828	35.1	434	35.0	49 340	37.7
3 500-3 999	51	14.9	1 001	20.7	363	15.4	303	24.5	39 920	30.5
>=4 000	15	4.4	321	6.6	122	5.2	85	6.5	13 980	10.7
All weights	343	100.0	4 836	100.0	2 356	100.0	1 239	100.0	130 957	100.0

Sources
Australian Institute of Health, unpublished, from data supplied by the Queensland Department of Health, the Health Department of Western Australia, the South Australian Health Commission and the Northern Territory Department of Health and Community Services; Australian Bureau of Statistics 1987[b]

Notes
[a]The Queensland figures are for the Aboriginal reserve communities.
[b]The non-Aboriginal data are for WA, 1983-86, SA, 1983-86 and the NT, 1986-87.

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: Finally, in a statistical table showing Aboriginal observed and expected number of deaths and standardised mortality ratios, we note that the observed number of deaths is approximately twice as high as the expected number of deaths in the non-Aboriginal population. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a statistical table regarding this observed and expected number of deaths in the Aboriginal population.

Leave granted.

ABORIGINAL OBSERVED AND EXPECTED NUMBER OF DEATHS, AND STANDARDISED MORTALITY RATIOS[a]

	Males			Females		
	Observed No.	Expected No.	SMR	Observed No.	Expected No.	SMR
Queensland communities, 1985-86	113	41.2	2.7	95	22.5	4.2
Western Australia, 1985-86	404	163.0	2.5	285	96.9	2.9
Northern Territory, 1985	209	56.1	3.7	151	40.3	3.7
Western New South Wales, 1984-87	205	59.0	3.5	110	37.0	3.0
Kimberley, WA, 1983-84	108	68.0	1.6	81	34.1	2.4

Sources
Holman and Quadros 1986; Gray and Hogg 1989; Australian Institute of Health, unpublished, from data supplied by the Queensland Department of Health, the Health Department of Western Australia and the Northern Territory Department of Health and Community Services

Notes
[a]See text for details of standardisation and SMRs.

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: We must address this issue of ill-health in the Aboriginal community as a matter of great urgency. And what of our youth? Our next generation? As mentioned, their unemployment rate is at an all time high—for 15 to 19-year-olds an incredible 40 per cent. We are also made aware that interrelated is juvenile crime rates. Juvenile crime, a terrible phrase, is reported to be on the increase. The response of the general community is to 'get tough', with frequent calls by some leaders in the community advocating more repressive measures. Interestingly, South Australia had the first Children's Court in the world—April 1890—101 years ago. The system has not changed much since then. We still have an adversarial system in which there is a defence and a prosecution arguing the case without the youth (defendant) being able to present his/her own account, and the victim excluded from active participation. This system is inflexible and inappropriate for juveniles/youth as it does not meet the rehabilitation needs of the child (offender) nor the restitution needs of the victim. Research has shown that 'more police, more repression, heavier punishment' does not seem to improve the situation.

We are now made aware of the encouraging results of the French experience (Bonnemaison style) in juvenile crime. In 1981, during a long hot summer in Lyon and Marseille, violence erupted with an orgy of attacks on cars set alight and stolen for 'rodeo' races. Leaders of the community mobilised themselves to address the problem. Of particular merit was a report in 1982 by a committee chaired by Mr G. Bonnemaison, Deputy Mayor of Epinay-Sur-Seine and member of the French Parliament. The Bonnemaison report in essence states that in opposing crime we must have prevention, repression and solidarity; and that repression must combine social preventive measures working together with forces of law and order. The report identified the problems as those that beset society in general and life in larger cities in particular.

The report identified the problems of poverty, of unemployment, of poor social life, of being excluded from the mainstream of society; compounded by drugs, alcoholism and increased temptation offered by the growth of disposable goods. Here in South Australia the system in the Children's Court is said to be fragmented. There are various agencies in authority, that is, welfare, courts, police and Government. The Senior Judge of the Children's Court advocates that a more simple, uniform and consistent system be instituted under one authority. Perhaps a Bonnemaison style can be used in which a balance is struck between rehabilitation and the punitive approach.

The balanced approach to juvenile/youth crime is well illustrated in the American *Juvenile and Family Journal*, that is, taking a three pronged approach of accountability, rehabilitation and community protection. Perhaps with the right balance of punishment and rehabilitation we might help the next generation move towards a brighter future. An attitude must be struck by the community of not only tougher penalties but better strategies towards rehabilitation.

Last but not least, I need to comment on the role of the Legislative Council. This is in response to what I consider an irresponsible and rather ignorant statement made by the Speaker, the member for Semaphore, in the other place. He contended that the Legislative Council was not necessary, as the Council very seldom opposed the decision of the House of Assembly. I indicate that the role of the Legislative Council or Upper House is to—

1. Review and revise, if necessary, all legislation passed by the House of Assembly or Lower House in order to prevent adverse effects of hasty legislation and to safeguard the rights of the community. The role of the Legislative Council therefore is not to prevent legislation, rather, it is to monitor and improve (if necessary) legislation.

2. Initiate Bills—Bryce (1917) details that the subjects of the Bills be of a non-controversial character. However, the short time that I have been in this House makes me believe that some Bills seem to be of a controversial nature.

3. Comprehensive discussion of important questions.

4. Delaying extreme legislation as needed to enable the community to express its view.

In my short observation of the workings of the Legislative Council noting the conferences held on important issues, for example, Wilpena, the MFP and close intense debates on subjects like the 'pokies', the Legislative Council is no rubber stamp. Rather, it serves as a House of separate and comprehensive assessment. To say that this House should be discontinued because it hardly ever or never votes the Lower House's legislation out shows a poor understanding of the role of the Upper House.

In conclusion, I return to the concept of getting the right attitude, in particular, the attitude towards work and toward achievers. Our work ethic is poor. We need to work harder and to try harder in the face of obstacles. We need to reward achieving, and to promote it. We need to nurture our tall poppies, not to cut them down to one mediocre mass. Our attitude has to be towards self-discipline and self-reliance. Not that the world owes us a living but that we rely on our own selves. This Government's ideology has destroyed this self-supporting attitude. We must have the right attitude before we can begin to change direction. As the saying goes, 'With the right attitude you can do everything wrong and still succeed, but with the wrong attitude you can do everything right and fail.' I support the motion.

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

EXPIATION OF OFFENCES (DIVISIONAL FEES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Expiation of Offences Act 1987 and to make related amendments to the Acts Interpretation Act 1915. Read a first time.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In light of the fact that this Bill was introduced last session and given the time, I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill contains amendments consequential to the amendments to the Expiation of Offences Act.

The consequential Bill amends certain Acts by inserting at the foot of each provision referred to, a divisional expiation fee. Some of the offences referred to have already been expiable under the Act, while others are newly inserted.

Regulatory offences under the Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act 1979, the Food Act 1985, the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972, and the Noise Control Act 1976 are to be included as expiable offences for the purposes of the Act.

Moreover, offences relating to declared 'dry areas' under the Liquor Licensing Act 1985 are to be included as expiable offences. It is considered by the Commissioner of Police to be a desirable amendment given the increasing numbers of prescribed prohibition areas and the volume of offenders detected and reported by police.

The opportunity has been taken to rationalise some fees so that there is consistency between expiation fees and fines. In some cases maximum fines have been the same but expiation fees have been different.

With the adoption of a divisional fee system which will complement the already existing divisional fine system, over time there will be a rationalisation of fees and fines.

This Bill and the Expiation of Offences Amendment Bill will be left on the table until the next parliamentary session.

This course of action has two advantages. First, the Bill can be amended in the new session in relation to various pieces of legislation that are presently being processed through the Parliament. (The Firearms Act Amendment Act is an example where this will probably occur.) Secondly, it is hoped that these Bills will then be dealt with early in the new session so that subsequent measures can, if appropriate, adopt the new scheme proposed by these Acts.

I commend this Bill to honourable members.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure.

Clause 3 provides that the Acts set out in the schedule are amended to incorporate the new expiation scheme proposed by the Expiation of Offences (Divisional Fees) Amendment Bill 1992.

The Schedule sets out amendments to specified provisions of the various Acts referred to in the long title of the measure.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (EXPIATION OF OFFENCES) BILL

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act 1979, the Commercial Motor Vehicles (Hours of Driving) Act 1973, the Dangerous Substances Act 1979, the Education Act 1972, the Explosives Act 1972, the Financial Institutions Duty Act 1983, the Food Act 1985, the Industrial Relations Act (S.A.) 1972, the Land Tax Act 1936, the Lifts and Cranes Act 1985, the Liquor Licensing Act 1985, the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972, the Noise Control Act 1976, the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989, the Pay-roll Tax Act 1971, the Public and Environmental Health Act 1987, the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Services Act 1936, the Stamp Duties Act 1923, the Tobacco Products Control Act 1986, the Unclaimed Moneys Act 1891 and the Valuation of Land Act 1971. Read a first time.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill seeks to amend the Expiation of Offences Act 1987 in several ways.

First, it seeks to amend the definition of 'responsible statutory authority' in section 3 of the Act to embrace not only the responsible Minister, or Chief Executive Officer but also statutory authorities and local government councils who may be responsible for the administration or enforcement of relevant statutory provisions that give rise to expiable offences. For example, the Tobacco Products Control Act is enforced by the South Australian Health Commission. The Public and Environmental Health Act is enforced by both the Health Commission and local councils. Neither can presently issue expiation notices except by the cumbersome and time-consuming procedure of authorised officers making reports through the council or commission, to the Minister of Health, recommending their issue in particular cases.

The second and perhaps the most important change made by the Bill is that clause 4 changes the scheme of the Act so that offences will be expiable under the Act where the words 'expiation fee' appear at the foot of a provision of an Act or regulation. This will replace the present system whereby offences are made expiable by being designated in the schedule to the Expiation of Offences Act.

The amendment will allow people when examining an Act, to realise that certain offences are expiable without reference to another Act. It will also mean that decisions on whether or not an offence should be expiable can be considered in the context of discussions on the Act containing the offence, not subsequently by means of an amendment to the Expiation of Offences Act.

The amendment also provides for divisional expiation fees, building on the existing scheme of divisional fines and imprisonment in the Acts Interpretation Act.

The Bill also provides that the expiation notice must be in a form approved by the responsible authority based on the model form which will be prescribed by the regulations. In this way the responsible authority will be able to design a form capable of being generated by their own printer/computer equipment, provided it is based on the model form.

The Bill also seeks to redefine who may issue expiation notices and clause 4 makes it quite clear that only those who are authorised in writing by the relevant Minister, statutory authority or council are empowered to do so.

Provision is also made for an authorised person to withdraw expiation notices.

A late payment regime is provided for the first time, and given that local councils may retain fines, penalties and forfeitures recovered in proceedings commenced by them (see section 717 of the Local Government Act 1934) the Bill provides that expiation fees recovered under Acts administered by local councils can be retained by them.

In addition, since the Bill was first introduced into the Legislation Council in April 1992, some other 'technical' amendments have been made as a result of consideration of various legislative schemes that apply, or will be applying in the future, in respect of the enforcement of criminal provisions. In particular, the Bill now recognises that, in certain cases, an officer or employee of a council will be given specific power to issue expiation notices—not just councils. In such cases, the relevant council will remain as the 'responsible authority' under the legislation, and any fees payable as a result of the issue of an expiation notice will continue to be payable to the council.

In all, the proposed machinery amendments to the Act, are considered to be desirable, for the better and wider public administration and enforcement of relevant statutory provisions, as well as enabling more detailed scrutiny of those offences which will be expiable.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure.

Clause 3 enacts a new section 3. Particular reference is made to the definition of 'responsible authority', which will include a responsible Minister, or a statutory authority or council that is responsible for the enforcement of the provision against which the offence is alleged to have been committed.

Clause 4 makes various amendments to section 4 of the Act. In particular, where in an Act, after the enactment of this Act, a

provision includes the words 'expiation fee', these words will be taken to mean that an alleged offence against the provision (or against the provision in specified circumstances) may be expiated by payment of the appropriate expiation fee. (The Acts Interpretation Act 1915 will set out a scale of divisional expiation fees.) An expiation notice will be based on a model prescribed by the regulations.

Clause 5 will allow a person who is specifically authorised to exercise the powers under section 6 to withdraw an expiation notice.

Clause 6 provides a scheme for the late payment of expiation fees.

Clause 7 relates to the application of amounts received by way of expiation fees. As a general rule, such amounts will be paid into the Consolidated Account. However, a council will be entitled to any fee paid in respect of a notice issued by or on behalf of the council. If a notice is issued by or on behalf of a council as a result of a reporting of an incident by an officer of the State, half of any fee must be paid into the Consolidated Account.

Clause 8 empowers the Governor to make regulations for the purposes of the Act.

Clause 9 repeals the schedule to the Act.

Clause 10 and the schedule amend the Acts Interpretation Act 1915 to introduce a scheme of divisional expiation fees.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (COMMERCIAL LICENCES) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 12 August. Page 55.)

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I support the second reading of this Bill. It relates to the occupational licensing areas under the jurisdiction of the Commercial Tribunal, and they can be seen in the various parts of the Bill, so I will not repeat them. The Bill proposes to remove the present requirement to advertise the suspension of a licence for non-payment of annual fees. Under these proposals, licensees who fail to pay their fees will continue to be suspended, and must continue to be notified of their suspension so they can make good their default in the normal way, but the requirement to advertise the suspension will be removed. That seems to be sensible. It is taking away some of the administration of bureaucracy, and it is taking away some breach of privacy against the licensees when they do not wish to renew their licences.

In place of the requirement to advertise suspension for non-payment of fees there will be a requirement that the Registrar advertise disciplinary action taken against a person where such action consists of or includes disqualification, suspension or cancellation of the licence. Most of the affected occupational associations whom I have contacted have no objection to the Bill or to the proposed course of action. However, it is interesting to note this Government's continued lack of consultation: only the Real Estate Institute was aware of the Bill prior to my contact. For certain technical reasons, the Motor Trade Association does object to the inclusion of the Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act in the Bill. The association says that a small percentage of dealers continue to carry on business notwithstanding the fact that they have been suspended for non-payment of fees, and they continue to quote licensed vehicle dealer numbers, notwithstanding that the licence has been suspended or cancelled.

The LVD number is quoted to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to obtain exemption from stamp duty on vehicles purchased because they are treated as stock in trade. He relies on the fact that the number is quoted. It is, of course, true that on checking with the Commercial Tribunal it could be ascertained whether or not a particular person is still registered, but you do not know in respect of whom to inquire if there is no advertisement. Unless the advertising of routine suspension is continued, it would be impractical to check on these dealers. Moreover, I am informed that the association and the Office of Fair Trading are negotiating amendments to the Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act, and the association considers that any changes in the licensing and suspension procedures should be held over pending the outcome of these negotiations. I have therefore placed an amendment on file to delete Part VI, but the Bill as a whole seems to be appropriate and should be commended. I support the second reading.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.23 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 19 August at 2.15 p.m.