LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 22 February 1994

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Peter Dunn) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Education and Children's Services (Hon. R. I. Lucas)—

Privacy Committee of South Australia—Report, 1992-93.
Economic and Finance Committee—
Response to the Report of the Economic and Finance Committee into Executive Structure and Salaries.
Response to the Report of the Economic and Finance Committee into the Use of External Consultants.

By the Attorney-General (Hon. K. T. Griffin)—

Country Fire Service—Report, 1992-93.
Magistrates Court Act 1991—Magistrates Court (Civil) Rules—Affidavits—Solicitor's Fee—Various.
Regulations under the following Acts—
Fisheries Act 1982—Licence—Abalone Fisheries.
Real Property Act 1886—Revocation of Form of Instruments and Certificates of Title.

By the Minister for Consumer Affairs (Hon. K. T. Griffin)—

Department of Public and Consumer Affairs—Report, 1992-93.

By the Minister for Transport (Hon. Diana Laidlaw)—

Outback Areas Community Development Trust—Report, 1992-93.
Wilderness Protection Act—Report, 1992-93.

QUESTION TIME

STUDENT NUMBERS

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services a question about student enrolments and teacher placements.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Since 1989 enrolments in primary schools have been increasing and in 1993 totalled 118 000 students. At the same time, secondary enrolments have been trending down and in 1993 fell to 63 000 students. This represented a reduction of approximately 3 000 students from 1992. Can the Minister advise the number of students enrolled this year in primary and secondary schools and whether staffing allocations have been made on the same formula for teacher/pupil ratios as were used in 1993?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will be pleased to get the actual figures for the shadow Minister and bring back the detailed response to those questions. In the broad, my recollection of the figures is that, in the first census conducted at the end of the first week in February, there was a further reduction in the number of students in Government schools in South Australia, particularly in the secondary sector. There were certainly fewer students in our Government schools in the first week of February than was predicted late last year by principals. That was some 2 000 to 2 500 fewer students in our schools than was predicted by principals at the end of last year when they went through their estimates for enrolments for 1994. In relation to the first part of the question as to the exact figures, I will be pleased to get a response and bring back that reply for the benefit of the shadow Minister.

The staffing formula has not been changed by the Government. The staffing formula that exists in our schools for 1994 is the same staffing formula as existed under the Labor Government over the past two or three years.

HINDMARSH ISLAND BRIDGE

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport a question about the Hindmarsh Island bridge.

Leave granted.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Last week in Parliament the Minister indicated that she had received advice that 'a bridge of some form must be built between Goolwa and Hindmarsh Island'. She advised that the option of incorporating a bridge at the Goolwa barrage was an option that the Government would investigate further.

In doing so she was clearly suggesting that the Government would like to reject the recommendation, which was made to the previous Government by independent consultants who had looked at a number of options before selecting the current location. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Is it true that the Government has now received advice of another legal opinion to the effect that the Government's obligation is to build a bridge at the current location? In other words, there is not a discretion about the question of location.

2. Has the Government considered this advice, and does it agree?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I have not received such advice and so I am acting, as is the Government, on advice received from Mr Sam Jacobs, when he recommended that we look at other options, and that is what we are doing.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I have a supplementary question. Will the Minister check her files at her office to determine whether or not she has in fact received advice of the legal opinion to which I refer, because my understanding is that she has?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I am not sure where the honourable member is getting her advice from within my office. Every night I look at all the papers I have received that day and I have not sighted such a paper.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Will you find out then?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I will find out.

GOOLWA BARRAGE

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport, representing the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, a question about the barrage at Goolwa.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I understand that the District Council of Port Elliot and Goolwa has received advice indicating that the barrage at Goolwa would qualify for 'A' class listing on the national heritage register. This barrage would also qualify for listing on the State heritage list. I understand that, in 1985, recommendations were made to the Government that the barrage should be listed on the State heritage list but this was not done, partly because the E&WS department classed this as a working barrage and was concerned that should it be heritage listed modifications it

may need to carry out at any time for its operations could not be carried out. I further understand that as recently as 28 January 1994 the Heritage Branch of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources wrote to the Chief Executive Officer of the E&WS department requesting that the issue of heritage listing be given further consideration. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Is the Minister aware of the advice given to the District Council of Port Elliot and Goolwa concerning listing of the Goolwa barrage on the national heritage register and the State heritage list?

2. Does the Minister agree that the barrage should be placed on both the national and State heritage lists and, if so, will he make representations to the Minister for Transport, who is looking at the possibility of building a bridge at the barrage?

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

TRADING HOURS

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Industrial Affairs, a question about the shop trading hours inquiry.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: Prior to the 11 December State election last year, the South Australian Liberal Party pledged to investigate the issue of shop trading hours immediately upon coming into Government. In an election pamphlet, of which I have a copy, the then shadow Minister for Industrial Relations and Tourism, Graham Ingerson, promised to set up an inquiry into the retail industry to advise on (a) whether shop trading hours should be extended and, if so, to what extent and how this should be implemented; (b) whether there was a need to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act to give more protection to small businesses when negotiating rollover and new leases and, if so, how this should be achieved; (c) whether there was a need to amend planning laws relating to shopping centres in our State; and (d) the role of retailers in the tourism industry.

The inquiry was to have comprised four people: an independent chair, a representative of small retailers, a representative of large retailers and a consumer representative. The terms of reference contained within that pamphlet were very clear and precise. However, on coming into office the new Liberal Government has already reneged on that pledge. Instead, the inquiry into shop trading hours announced by Mr Ingerson on 9 February will look only in isolation at the trading hours issue.

It will not investigate related issues that are hurting small business, such as the need to change the Landlord and Tenant Act to greater protect small traders on issues such as leases, something which was clearly promised in the election pamphlet.

I have heard a large number of horror stories of some traders facing rents which sometimes reach 20 per cent of turnover and with some shops in large centres locked into rental increases of up to 70 per cent. Small stores are bearing the brunt of huge rentals, sometimes facing rents of $900 a square metre, with large stores in the same shopping centre being charged only about $135 a square metre.

It has been put to me by small retailers that, without looking at these vital questions, it would be difficult for the inquiry to gain a proper perspective of the turmoil faced by small business. They argue that the extension of trading hours will clearly disadvantage small traders as against large traders. Small traders are saying that a failure to address the other major disadvantages from which they are already suffering and which include those issues initially identified for investigation is an invitation for disaster. These were a clear part of the promise made and should be investigated together in an inquiry; those were the words—'an inquiry'—that Mr Ingerson used. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Why has he reneged on a clear pre-election promise to investigate lease and roll over arrangements for small businesses?

2. Will the Minister broaden the terms of reference of the current inquiry so that the original promise made to small traders is met?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Government has not reneged on its promise.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Elliott had the opportunity to ask his question in silence and I ask him to be silent now.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The terms of reference of the shop trading hours inquiry does deal with one aspect of the Landlord and Tenant Act, and that relates to the issue of core trading hours. The area of landlord and tenant is primarily within the area of consumer affairs, and I have already established an inquiry and review of the operations of the Landlord and Tenant Act. I have had some discussions particularly with the Retail Traders Association.

The honourable member may recall that within a short time after taking office we announced a comprehensive review of all the laws administered by the Office of Fair Trading, and that review is currently under way. So, if the honourable member wishes to make some submission about it, or if he has constituents who are anxious to make a submission, I would invite him to do so through the Acting Commissioner for Consumer Affairs, Mr Tony Lawson.

In respect of the other matters raised by the honourable member, I will refer them to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: Mr President, I desire to ask a supplementary question. Does not the Minister acknowledge that a single inquiry was promised, and that they are interrelated matters which should have been covered within one inquiry?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I do not, Mr President. The honourable member is splitting hairs and being quite pedantic about it. In the interests of retail tenants it is important to recognise that there does need to be a comprehensive review of the operation of the Landlord and Tenant Act, and that is being undertaken.

AUSTRALIAN DEMOCRATS' POLICY

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Hon. Mr Elliott, as Leader of the Australian Democrats, a question about Democrat policy.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: It has been reported in the media over recent weeks that the Australian Democrats, who hold the balance of power in this place, will not support legislation announced by the Government prior to the December 1993 election in respect of non-compulsory voting. This policy and other Government policies were also referred

to in Her Excellency the Governor's speech at the opening of this Parliament.

In justifying their stance the Democrats stated that they held the view that not everything announced by the Government prior to achieving an overall victory on 11 December could be said to be part of the Government's mandate. My questions to the Hon. Mr Elliott are as follows:

1. Did the Democrats make themselves familiar with the Liberal Party policies announced prior to the election?

2. Of which announced Liberal Party policies did the Australian Democrats announce their disapproval prior to the election?

3. Of which announced Liberal policies did the Australian Democrats announce their approval prior to the election?

4. Do the Democrats say that the Government has a mandate to do anything; if so, what do they say the Government has a specific mandate to do, having regard to the announced policies; and, if we do not have a mandate to do things in relation to the announced policies, what are those policies for which we do not have a mandate?

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I thank the honourable member for his generous questions. It is a matter which I am more than happy to address.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: It does; it is an elevation. I did something during the election which I suspect the honourable member did not do. I knocked on some 7 000 doors, and I can tell him that the voters voted on essentially one issue and one issue alone, namely, the competence or otherwise of the Labor Party. At door after door, including from 80 year old people who had voted Labor all their lives, the judgment I was getting was that the Labor Party had well and truly blown it. I can assure the honourable member that that was the single issue upon which people voted in that election. They voted for the Liberal Party because it presented itself as being moderate, although already what Mr Ingerson has done in a few areas raises some questions about whether or not some lies were told in that regard.

We have also taken the opportunity to poll the electorate directly, and the honourable member might be interested to know that 68 per cent of the electorate supports the current compulsory voting system. That is from polling that we have undertaken in recent weeks. The honourable member would also be interested to know that the polling shows that 63 per cent of the electorate believes that the Labor Party and the Democrats in the Legislative Council should be willing to amend legislation, including that which was presented as Liberal Party promises.

We have had these issues polled in recent weeks, and those are the results. That is what people of South Australia were saying to me when I knocked on doors. We have polled further Statewide, and that is what we have found. The fact is that the mandate for the Liberal Party was essentially to replace an incompetent Government; it was largely to give South Australia good management, something which it has not had for some time.

You are kidding yourselves if you think that anybody votes for any Party because they support every policy it puts up. People who vote Labor do not support all their policies; those who vote Liberal do not support all their policies; and the same is true of the Democrats. No voter, I believe, supports the total package of any Party, and I know that some members of Parliament do not agree with the full package that their own Party has put up.

That is reality. To claim a mandate for every piece of information which has been put into policy documents, which are quite significantly lengthy documents, is an absolute nonsense. It is the obligation of all members of Parliament to treat every issue on its merits. That is precisely what the Democrats did when Labor was in Government, and it is precisely what we will do now that the Liberals are in government.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: For what part of our policy does the honourable member say we have a mandate?

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: Anyone who sits down, takes some of the key issues—and I guess that is what the honourable member is trying to take this to—such as industrial relations and WorkCover, which were plainly raised during the election, and examines the policy will find that they are capable of significant interpretation in any direction.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: That is the reality. In fact, in discussions I have had, Ministers have privately acknowledged precisely that. Of course, that is an election stunt: the Liberal Party was not going to say anything that would frighten anybody. If we take a recent example—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: —of Liberal Party behaviour, there was no doubt that the Liberal Party said it would get rid of compulsory unionism in the Public Service, and that has happened.

However, they have gone a step beyond moderate. They have now required that within six weeks everybody should sign up to remain members of unions and to do so every 12 months. I think you have gone beyond your mandate there; you have played your games; you have gone beyond moderate.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I remind members when asking questions like that not to reflect on the Federal Parliament, another Chamber or another member. In the early part of your response you cast an injurious reflection on one honourable member. I remind you not to do that again.

FEDERAL OPPOSITION

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I seek leave to make a statement before directing some questions to the Leader of the governing Party in this place on the present position of the national Federal Opposition.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: In an interview conducted by Tony Baker with the South Australian political scientist Dr Dean Jaensch, recorded in the *Advertiser* on Thursday 17 February this year, the following was the first paragraph of that story, which, incidentally, was about Dr Jaensch's new book entitled *The Liberals*:

> It is difficult to see the Liberal Party winning the 1996 Federal election, according to Dr Dean Jaensch in his new book.

I think it is fair to say that everyone in South Australia would just about agree with Dr Jaensch's assertion, given the bizarre state of the Federal Parliamentary Liberal Party both now and in the previous 10 years. Leaders have come and gone with regular monotony. We have had Malcolm Fraser, Andrew Peacock, John Howard, then Andrew Peacock again, who is also known to his mates as the colt from Kooyong. He must obviously be a sprinter as he does not appear to have too much staying power. Then there appeared on the scene the

Liberal Party's Joan of Arc, the Hon. Dr John Hewson. I would not presume to indicate whether or not he is a wet or a dry in the Liberal Party's factional hierarchy. Perhaps he belongs to neither. It may well be that he is in the damp squib faction, as he would at least appear to have all the necessary attributes of one.

Certainly the position has disturbed some present and prominent South Australian Federal Liberal politicians: people such as the Hon. Mr Steele Hall, MHR, Mr Alexander Downer, MHR, the redoubtable Senator Amanda Vanstone and, last but by no means least, the Leader of the Federal Liberal Party in the National Senate, Senator Robert Hill. This type of disarray and disorder concerns me greatly, given that the Federal Senate is supposed to be the States' House in Canberra where the senators from South Australia should be putting their best interests into representing what is best for South Australia. I now direct the following questions to the Hon. Mr Lucas as Leader of the governing party in this Council:

1. Does the honourable member believe that the present disgraceful and debilitating in-fighting in the Federal Liberal Party is distracting South Australian Liberal senators from their duties to the extent that they cannot give South Australia 100 per cent of their time and effort as they properly should?

2. Does the Hon. Mr Lucas agree with his Party's Federal President in sending letters out to all his State Presidents and apparently getting advance agreement with them that Federal Liberals who continue to speak out publicly against Dr Hewson will put their future preselections on the line?

3. Is it normal in the Liberal Party for the results of preselection ballots to be known in advance before a vote is cast, as would appear to be the case in accordance with the recent statements of their Federal President?

4. What sort of damage control does the Hon. Mr Lucas believe will be necessary in order that South Australians will not suffer detrimentally in the Senate and elsewhere from the agitated turmoil which is now convulsing Federal Liberal members from South Australia and elsewhere?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I thank the honourable member for that series of questions. Firstly, I refer the honourable member to all the publicly released opinion polls in the last two months: Morgan, McNair and, I believe, the Saulwick poll, which is produced in the Melbourne *Age* and the *Sydney Morning Herald*, all of which indicate the bad odour in which the Commonwealth Labor Government is held and all of which indicated that, had an election been held at that particular time, the Federal Opposition would have been elected to Government.

It was an interesting series of questions, as always, from the Hon. Mr Crothers, and I would be delighted over a cup of tea after Question Time to explore the ins and outs of some of those questions. But as Minister for Education and Children Services and as the Leader of the Government in this House I am pleased to say that I have no responsibility for the operation of the Federal Opposition or for the transmission of communication from the Federal President of the Liberal Party to the various branches and the operations of members of the Federal Senate, and therefore am not in a position to respond formally in this Chamber to each of those detailed questions.

CODE OF CONDUCT

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Leader of the Government in the Council, representing the Premier, a question about a ministerial code of practice.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: On 15 February, after being contacted by constituents in country areas concerned about the future of the communications branch of the CFS, I asked a question on their behalf. Having done that, I then, acting in what I believed to be a responsible way and in the best interest of my constituents, took the trouble to see the appropriate Minister in the other House to explain the situation and seek some speedy answers to the queries that I had raised. I did that, as I said, in a spirit of cooperation. I expressed to the Minister the concern that was being expressed to me and asked him for a speedy response and, indeed, he said he would look into it.

On 17 February a Dorothy Dix question was asked in the other place on exactly the same subject, to which an answer came back very quickly. I, to this stage, have not been given the courtesy of that answer in writing. I am pleased that I do have an answer on a question on diamonds that I asked on the first day of the Parliament. I made particular inquiries today to see whether there was an answer here but to my disappointment that was not the case. We have been talking about mandates and commitments given during election campaigns. One of the commitments given by the Liberal Party—and they made great play of it—related to their code of practice for Ministers. Given that, one would have thought that we could expect some decency and some propriety to be given by Ministers when dealing with questions.

I am not about to give up my thesis that there needs to be some cooperation between the Opposition—or the alternative Government—and the Government, especially in areas of sensitivity such as that within the CFS. My question to the Premier is: will he instruct his Ministers to act with decency and propriety in dealing with questions from members of this Parliament and to resist a temptation to grandstand in the respective Houses to prop up Liberal members in their constituencies?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I suspect that if the honourable member wants to raise that particular issue there would be a number of members in this Chamber who could give him a number of examples in relation to the previous Government and previous Ministers' handling of various questions, in relation to the length of time before responses were received by members or, indeed, with Ministers in some cases making public announcements or responding to questions in another place in perhaps a fashion similar to this particular example. I am not aware of the details of the example to which the honourable member is referring. I will be pleased to refer the question to the Premier and bring back a reply.

EUROPEAN WASP

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Primary Industries in another place, a question about European wasps.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: I note from Wednesday's *Hansard* that this question was asked by the Hon. Legh Davis whilst I was for a short time absent from this Chamber. I support him in his concern. However, I cannot share the sarcasm with which he approached the question on that day. This is a most serious matter which needs to be addressed by the Department of Primary Industries on a larger scale. Its

attention should be drawn to the following matter: leaving the eradication of the European wasp to individual councils could well prove to be a waste of ratepayers' money and a waste of resources.

What we might find is that one council area might be a breeding ground for the wasp and that the council in that area might in fact do very little to eradicate the problem, while another council nearby might have to expend considerable resources in an eradication program. The climate in South Australia, as I am sure I do not need to tell you, Mr President, is favourable for the wasps, especially during our hot weather. The number of wasps that have had to be destroyed by various councils already shows that the wasp population is on the increase. The rate of increase could soon well mean that wasps are in plague proportions, not unlike the recent experience with locusts and mice, as you, Sir, would recall.

Apparently the Department of Primary Industries does not consider the wasps as a threat to agriculture, yet our large areas of farming land may provide an ideal breeding ground for a plague of wasps to suddenly appear as a health hazard if the nests are not sought out and destroyed. Therefore, the matter needs to be addressed by the Department of Primary Industries at a Statewide level. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Is the Minister confident that the threatened plague of European wasps has been successfully addressed?

2. Is the Minister concerned about the burgeoning problem of European wasps that is escalating in the metropolitan area?

3. Is the Minister confident that there is not a gathering plague of European wasps in the rural areas that will become a health problem for the State?

4. Will the Minister investigate the problem and take action to treat it as a State problem rather than leave it to the local councils to discover and eradicate the nests of European wasps?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I will refer that question to the Minister for Primary Industries in another place and bring back a reply.

CANCER

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport, representing the Minister for Health, a question regarding funding for cancer research.

Leave granted.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: Many of us would be aware of an article from the *Advertiser* of 21 February 1994 which reported on the needless deaths of women with breast cancer. The article outlined that funding for breast cancer research at $1.4 million was well below research funding for other types of diseases, such as heart disease and AIDS, each receiving $16 million and $12 million respectively. Not only is there a greater disparity of funding levels for research between breast cancer compared with other diseases, but the unequal funding levels are even more unacceptable when it is known that in 1992 the number of deaths from breast cancer was 2 438, whilst the number of deaths from AIDS related diseases was only 22.

Breast cancer is not the only cancer related disease which is significantly underfunded in relation to deaths. The number of men dying from prostate cancer is even greater. In 1992 the Australian Bureau of Statistics reports that 3 344 men died from diseases defined as 'malignant neoplasm genito-urinary organs'. Given the general consensus is that preventive health care is the most effective way of providing health care (both in terms of financial costs and human comfort), and that research on cancer has to be undertaken to find out what causes cancer before we can prescribe preventive methods to deal with it, my questions to the Minister are:

1. What money is the South Australian Liberal Government allocating to cancer research for both breast cancer and prostate cancer?

2. What other programs, such as educational programs, are planned for preventing cancer?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I will bring back a reply from the Minister with respect to the honourable member's question. I will also be interested in the answers to those same questions.

AYTON REPORT

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: My question is addressed to the Attorney-General. Given that last week in another place the Deputy Premier said that he had received the Ayton submission to the Joint Parliamentary Committee on the NCA 'from a substantive source as everyone would recognise', I ask the Minister: does he know the identity of the substantive source referred to by the Deputy Premier, which source provided the Ayton report to the Attorney-General, the Premier and the Deputy Premier?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The answer is 'No'.

DISORDERLY BEHAVIOUR

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking you, Mr President, a question about people being accosted outside Parliament House.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: Over the past few years there has been a group of people sitting outside Old Parliament House at night time, including weekends, accosting people as they are walking along the road, throwing bottles and urinating all over Old Parliament House. It has reached the stage where it is totally unacceptable. Tourists to this State must be absolutely terrified when going to the Casino and such places.

Last year, the President (Hon. Gordon Bruce) and the Speaker (Hon. Norm Peterson) had a meeting with the Police Commissioner. The area was policed for a very short while, on Mondays, Tuesdays and Wednesdays, not Thursdays, Fridays or weekends, but mainly just those days that Parliament was sitting. This behaviour must stop and I would like you, Mr President, to look into this issue and try to resolve it.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the honourable member for his question. I have had a number of complaints concerning the same matter. I have set the wheels in motion to try to correct it as delicately as we can. I will bring back a report to this Chamber and tell the honourable member what action will be taken.

CREDIT LAWS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, as Minister for Consumer Affairs, a question about uniform credit laws.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: As I am sure all members are aware, there have been proposals to achieve uniform credit

laws in this country, with efforts starting towards this about seven or eight years ago. In May last year, a meeting was held of the Ministers of Consumer Affairs from all around the country who agreed on the principles for the uniform credit legislation.

In reaching agreement compromises were made with some States giving way on particular matters which they had wanted included in the uniform credit legislation, while other States gave way on other matters. A genuine compromise was achieved and, furthermore, one of the agreements made at that meeting was that the principles had been decided and that no Government would go back on those principles. One of the matters raised was the question of automatic civil penalties to be included in the legislation. If a financial institution breached one of the provisions of the legislation there would be an automatic civil penalty for which it would be liable, and this could be reduced or removed if the institution concerned applied to the tribunal, which was to be established under the uniform credit legislation.

The logic of applying the civil penalties in this way was to avoid the situation where an individual consumer might have to take action before the tribunal against a very large and powerful financial institution for what might be quite a trivial sum, as far as that individual consumer was concerned—though, obviously, if spread over a million or so creditors to the institution it could amount to an enormous financial benefit from the misbehaviour on the part of the institution. Another matter discussed at that Ministers' meeting was the question of a compulsory comparison rate which was for any provider of credit to give a figure which was derived from an agreed formula and which would enable consumers to make comparisons between different financial institutions as to the overall fees and charges for which he or she would be liable.

It is history that the automatic civil penalties was agreed by all Ministers at that meeting. The compulsory comparison rate was not agreed, though what was agreed was that if institutions wished to use a comparison rate they had to use the standard formula and not pick any number which suited them. The automatic civil penalties versus the comparison rate was a trade-off which occurred in the negotiations involving the various States. Shortly before the election advice was received from New South Wales that the drafters of the uniform legislation were proposing to not include automatic civil penalties, which, I may say, had been lobbied against, by the banks particularly, before the May meeting and after it.

I remind you, Mr President, that one of the agreements in May was not only on the various principles but that the Ministers would not go back on what had been agreed because to go back on one particular item would open up the whole issue again, and the negotiations, to be fair, would have to be undertaken all over again, not on that one issue but on the vast number of issues which were discussed at the May meeting. I understand that since the election South Australia has been approached and asked not to maintain the stand, which was agreed by all Ministers, of having a regime of automatic civil penalties in the Uniform Credit Act. I also understand that the South Australian Government has agreed to abandon the automatic civil penalties, and that will make an absolute nonsense of the whole credit legislation. It will be absolutely impossible for individual consumers to take action in the tribunal against a large institution for what may be a small sum, as far as they are concerned.

I apologise for the long explanation. While I and the Minister of Consumer Affairs are doubtless familiar with this story, there would be other members of Parliament who are not.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Very considerate.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Is it true that South Australia has abandoned the position of automatic civil penalties being included in the uniform credit legislation, despite the agreement to not change any of the principles which were decided in May last year, and despite the fact that this will have highly deleterious effects on consumers in South Australia?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: It is interesting that the honourable member uses some rather extravagant and colourful description of the way in which this Government and other Governments around Australia are approaching the issue of uniform credit legislation. As the former Attorney-General interjected, this has been on the agenda for something like 20 years.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Maybe even longer, but the fact is that it has taken some time to get to this point. Of course, what the honourable member reflects in her explanation is the reaction which the Government, of which she was a member, typically took. It was a 'them and us' position in relation not only to consumer credit issues but in relation to other fair trading and consumer affairs issues, yet what this Government is doing is seeking to work not only with consumers but also with industry to achieve the best proposition that suits the community and not just the interests of one group or the other.

In relation to uniform credit, I can say that soon after being sworn in (before Christmas) I was confronted with a number of faxes and some other correspondence in relation to the uniform credit legislation seeking some modification of the arrangements which had been agreed—I thought it was in July last year but, as the former Minister says it was in May, I am a month or two out. It was quite obvious from that correspondence that there would not be a continuation of the previously agreed position and that some alteration to that position had to be recognised. Of course, I did not regard myself as bound by that agreement, because the present Government has a different philosophical perspective on issues of this nature from that of the previous Government. We took the view that we ought to at least accommodate some of the propositions which were being proposed around Australia and, as far as I am aware, all Governments, except the Queensland Government, agreed with a number of the propositions for change as the drafting on the new credit legislation proceeded.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Throwing consumers to the wind.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: It is not throwing consumers to the wind. Automatic civil penalties are just grossly harsh and unreasonable.

The Hon. Anne Levy interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Well, they are unjust and unreasonable in the current law.

The Hon. Anne Levy: I haven't heard anyone complaining.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Maybe not, but you look at the principle of it. You would oppose minimum and automatic penalties applying in other areas of the law, yet you say it is good enough to impose those penalties on the business and

professional communities automatically. What is going to be enshrined—

The Hon. Anne Levy: Subject to the tribunal.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: What is going to be enshrined in the uniform credit legislation when it finally sees the light of day is a movement back from that harsh and unjust position of automatic civil penalties, but there will still be a significant penalty regime. My recollection is that the maximum penalty that was being proposed was about $500 000 for certain breaches of the legislation. It was interesting to note that all Governments except one agreed to that change in direction, on the basis that that will accommodate the principle that there ought to be accountability but that it ought not to be harsh and unreasonable. As far as I know, that has been the position accepted not only by financial institutions but also by consumer organisations. Consumer organisations accept the restructuring of that proposition.

In relation to the compulsory comparison rate, it is certainly not compulsory but, if there is to be a comparison, a formula is being proposed which will ensure that, where comparisons are required, they meet a consistent set of principles. I understand that the redrafting of the legislation is well advanced. Obviously, there will be a period during which it will again be exposed, but not for an inordinately long period and, in my view, it will both accommodate the position of consumers and financiers and provide a better product range to consumers.

One has to recognise that however much regulation we impose, whether it is in this or any other industry, if it does not have a reasonable objective, it will add to the cost, which always will be passed on to consumers. One has to recognise that one cannot regulate for the sake of regulating; and one cannot impose sanctions for the sake of imposing sanctions, without ultimately consumers bearing the cost.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

SELLICKS HILL CAVES

In reply to **Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES** (10 February).

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources has provided the following response:

1. The company with the full knowledge and support of the Department of Mines and Energy imploded a cavity under the main haulage road on 10 December 1993. The evidence available indicated that the distance between the surface and the root of the cavity was approximately 4.8 metres and regarded as highly unsafe. Officers of the Department of Mines and Energy responsible for advising the company and ensuring safety at the mine site regarded the decision as well researched and not an act of vandalism.

2. It is regrettable that relevant officers of the Heritage Branch of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources and the National Parks and Wildlife Service were not involved in assisting in the decision making process. The inspectorate staff of the Department of Mines and Energy are the experts in mine and cave safety and do carry out all inspections of caves in the parks system. The implosion of part of the cave system was carried out as a result of unsafe conditions.

3. The role of the Department of Mines and Energy leading up to the blast was, along with the Department of Labour, to assess safety and operational issues. The Department of Mines and Energy also had to consider all the wider issues such as scientific and other values of the cave as against mining.

The decision was taken not to prevent the operators from imploding the most dangerous part of the caves as a safety measure.

Since the event, the role of the Department of Mines and Energy has been to work with the miners to prevent more blasting above the caves while the Government reviews the matter. The department gave evidence to the independent review.

4. The submissions provided to the independent assessors were in camera to enable them to make a report to Environment. Whether contradictory evidence was provided by any party presenting information is a matter for the independent assessors to analyse and comment accordingly to Government.

I am informed that the Department of Mines and Energy took into consideration environmental issues associated with the caves taking into account the Cave Exploration Group's video and reports. It was concluded by officers of DME, who have experience in geological formations in caves and cave safety that damage had already occurred in the cave and safety issues were paramount. As a result of me becoming aware of the cave implosion and the significant public response to this action I, in consultation with my colleague the Minister for Mines and Energy, initiated the independent assessment.

5. The company had approval to operate a mine in an area where the presence of many caves was expressly noted in the approvals. Such cases are normal in limestone (dolomite) mines but it had to operate safely. Departments of Labour and Mines and Energy were notified at all times of the issues and facts. Late in 1993 when it was clear the caves ran under the main haulage with thin roof thickness, the action was taken. As to the reason for the secrecy between the company and cavers, a situation which was acceptable to both sides, the question should be asked of the parties to the agreement.

6. An order is not necessary at this time as the company has voluntarily agreed not to blast in the vicinity of the remains of the caves. This arrangement will be in place until a conclusion is resolved on the independent assessment and consideration by the Government of the findings.

7. The independent review commissioned by myself and the Minister for Mines and Energy was to establish the facts of the case and all parties directly involved in the matter provided information. No further benefit would be gained through a process of public submissions. The independent assessors had the freedom to call for further scientific evidence if he deemed it appropriate.

8. Options are currently being developed to establish arrangements for effectively managing such incidents in the future. No decision has yet been made as to the form these arrangements will take.

9. Appropriate arrangements will be put in place to ensure that appropriate consideration is given to such events in the future. No decision has yet been made as to the form these arrangements will take.

DIAMONDS

In reply to **Hon. R.R. ROBERTS** (10 February).

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Minister for Mines and Energy has provided the following response:

1. Exploration for diamonds in the Spencer Gulf is at a very preliminary stage. There are no known diamond occurrences in the gulf and the host rocks for diamonds 'kimberlite' (not kyanite bodies) have not been discovered within the gulf. Potential exists for their discovery as they are known in the Orroroo area and near Cleve on the Eyre Peninsula.

Carnegie Minerals NL, a publicly listed Western Australian based company, has applied for exploration licences covering a large part of Spencer Gulf. No samples have been collected nor will they be collected until the licences are granted which could be between three and 12 months. Other Government agencies will be advised of the licence applications through Mines & Energy, South Australia's (MESA) routine consultative procedures.

Initial investigations will be non-intrusive, using remotely sensed data from satellites and airborne scanning techniques to determine the possible existence of ancient river channel systems which might contain concentrations of diamond and gold. Any activities which require physical disturbance, such as the dredging of bulk samples will be subject to a declaration of environmental factors. Extensive consultation will be required with Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), Fisheries and other agencies before any approval is given to carry out such activities. MESA is currently investigating possible marine seismic surveys in the gulf which will be non-intrusive and will aid the delineation of specific target zones.

2. Prior to any mining operation, particularly dredging, being approved, a full environmental impact statement would be required. All exploration activities will be constantly monitored to ensure that damage to the gulf ecology is minimal. This is normal practice in all mining and exploration activities. MESA does not anticipate any environmental disturbance in the initial evaluation stage and will

ensure terms and conditions attached to the licences will protect the gulf environments and fisheries.

FOUR-WHEEL DRIVE VEHICLES

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport, representing the Minister for Environment and Natural Resources, a question about advertising standards and the environment.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: Members would have noticed the trend in four-wheel drive advertising, with four-wheel drive vehicles shown in advertisements to be tearing around at breakneck speed in the most pristine of wilderness areas with manufacturers trying to illustrate the quality of their vehicles to Australians generally and, in particular, appealing more to city-based four-wheel drivers than rural-based four-wheel drivers. I am sure that Government members can differentiate between the two, that is, the four-wheel driver with the kelpie on the back is far different from the one driving around in the eastern suburbs.

Advertising for four-wheel drives tends to give the worst possible signals to the community about how to handle four-wheel drives in delicate environments. The general theme, which seems to be standard across brand names, is for four-wheel drives to be associated with Aboriginal lands and with isolated areas and, in general, they are either in the Kimberleys (using my recognition skills of Australia's geography), Kakadu or Arnhem Land.

I suspect not many advertisements are made in Arnhem Land, because the Aborigines would probably exclude them. The advertisements tend to be made in northern South Australia, the Northern Territory, Western Australia or Queensland, and they tend to be driven at high speeds; and, the more rocks and dust they can throw up, it seems that the advertising agencies believe the more sales they will have of those vehicles.

Will the Minister take up this issue with the motor companies and advertising agencies which commission these advertisements? Will the Minister encourage responsible codes in advertising for recreational driving in sensitive environments and not rely on self regulation?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I will refer those questions to the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, although I think the last question was actually referred to me in terms of transport and recreation vehicles. I have had discussions with representatives of four-wheel drive clubs and tour operators in the outback. In the latter respect we are looking at their registration and code of practice, as I would like to see whether they should be embraced by the Passenger Transport Board.

A number of initiatives are presently being addressed to look at the image of four-wheel driving generally as a sport and recreational activity in outback areas because there is some concern amongst responsible owners about reckless practices, but that is being discussed generally between departments and within the context of the Passenger Transport Bill. I will bring back a reply on the first question and more detail on the second question.

GRAND PRIX

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: My question is directed to the Leader of the Government in the Council. Can the Leader give an assurance to the Council that no Liberal member of Parliament, staff member of a Liberal member of Parliament or official or staff member of the Liberal Party in South Australia was aware that the Grand Prix was going to Victoria prior to the December election?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I have no knowledge of that series of questions at this time, but I will investigate and bring back a reply.

FUNERALS, PREPAID

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Consumer Affairs a question on prepaid funerals.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Late in 1992 a working party was established to look at the whole question of pre-paid funerals. It included representatives of the funeral profession, consumers and Government officials. The working party was due to report at the end of last year but had not done so prior to the election, which was prior to its reporting date. Has the working party submitted its report to the Minister? Will he make the report public, either by tabling it in this Council or by releasing it in other ways and, if the working party has not yet reported, when will it report and will he make its report public when it is available? If not, why not?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I have no recollection of having received the report. I certainly did not regard it as a high priority in the consumer affairs area, anyway, but I will make some inquires from my staff about the current status of the report and then I will be able to address the other issue to which she has referred, namely, whether or not it will be published.

ACTS INTERPRETATION (COMMENCEMENT PROCLAMATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 February. Page 38.)

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I rise to support the second reading of the Bill, only in so far as it allows us to proceed to the Committee stage. What the Democrats do from there depends upon whether it is further amended. I spoke with the Attorney-General outside this place today and said to him that I have no problems with the original motivation behind this Bill, that being a recognition that the timing of the proclamation of the Children's Protection Act is causing some grave difficulties, and it is not possible for the Act to begin operating on that day. I accept that and I accept the need for a change in the proclamation date.

I also intimated to the Attorney-General that I believed it would be preferable to amend the proclamation clause of the Children's Protection Act itself so that that could occur, rather than introduce the broader Bill that we currently have before us.

In my eight years in this place that is the only occasion I recollect where we have run into a problem with proclamation dates and where there is a need for a further extension after a proclamation has occurred. So, it is not a regular occurrence, and I do not see any need for the broad

scope that this legislation is now offering. We could go into lengthy debate about the possible effects of the legislation in the broader context, but I see it as being unnecessary. I understand that amendments may limit this piece of legislation only to the Children's Protection Act. If such amendments are moved, the Democrats will support them. If they maintain the broader application that is currently within the Bill we will oppose it, but make it clear that we would support another Bill of only two clauses which would directly amend the Children's Protection Act.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I appreciate the Hon. Mr Elliott's indication that at least he will support the second reading of the Bill so that we can then deal with the substance of it in the Committee stage. I suppose the difficulty that one faces is that in attempting to deal with the principle of the matter in the context of a specific problem the issues tend to become somewhat confused. It may well be that as a result of the discussion in Committee some modifications will have to be made, but I would prefer to deal with that issue during the Committee stage.

When in the second reading stage the Leader of the Opposition raised his concerns about the Bill, I indicated that I would provide a response, and I have subsequently done that by letter, and I sent a copy to the Hon. Mr Elliott. It is important, however, that the responses be placed on the public record, and accordingly I propose to read in the response which I made to the Leader of the Opposition. I wrote to him on 17 February in relation to this Bill, and I said as follows:

> The Opposition has indicated that it opposes the above Bill for two reasons. First, that it is not sure that the Bill gives effect to the Government's intention and, secondly, that such an amendment may lead to an uncertainty with regard to when legislation comes into effect. The Opposition has also asked for further information to have justify the proposed deferral of the family care meeting system.
>
> The concerns expressed about the power to revoke or vary a commencement proclamation being used retrospectively were considered when the Bill was drafted. Provisions enabling the Governor or a Minister to act by proclamation or notice appear frequently throughout the statute book. In most cases the provision includes the power to revoke or vary the proclamation or notice, and in most of those cases it is critical that the revocation or variation not operate retrospectively.
>
> An example is section 6(4) of the Consumer Credit Act 1972. Under that subsection the Government may exempt persons of a class or transactions of a class from the provisions of that Act. The retrospective revocation of such a proclamation would have serious consequences, but the Act does not state that the power to revoke cannot be used retrospectively, because the law on this question is so well established.
>
> Another example is the status of a semi-governmental authority, bestowed by proclamation under section 17 of the Public Finance and Audit Act 1987. Having that status enables a body corporate to enter into a broad range of financial arrangements and to have its obligations guaranteed by the Treasurer. It would be disastrous if the status of such bodies could be wiped out retrospectivity.
>
> The Act does not state that the power to revoke cannot be used retrospectively. There are many other examples. In none of these instances has Parliament expressly stated that the revocation or variation of a proclamation or notice is not to operate retrospectively. It is most undesirable to make an exception in this case by including such provision in the Bill, firstly because there is absolutely no need to do so and secondly because it will lead to confusion and may conceivably induce a court to decide in another context that Parliament intended that the power of revocation could be used retrospectively, because that intention had not been expressly excluded.
>
> The Opposition has raised the question of uncertainty if the legislation is passed. I concede that there may be an element of uncertainty until the proclamation date arrives and brings an Act into operation. The bringing of an Act into operation is an act of the Executive and not of the Parliament, and accordingly it is the Executive which must suffer the consequences as a result of varying or revoking the proclamation. However, the Executive must also be able to deal with problems with flexibility when the need arises.
>
> Clearly, it is intended that the powers in the amending Bill be exercised cautiously and responsibly. The Bill is intended to deal with a situation in which unforeseen circumstances have made it impossible for the proclamation date as specified in an Act to be the operative date.

The Bill clearly gives effect to the Government's intention by allowing the Governor to vary or revoke a commencement proclamation before the date of operation if that should become necessary. It is clear beyond doubt that once an Act comes into operation by virtue of a proclamation, then the proclamation is spent and there is no suggestion that the amending Bill will have any effect after the date of commencement or operation of an Act.

I understand that the previous Government was aware of the difficulties of implementing the family care system before the last election. In a letter from the Chief Justice, dated 1 December 1993, the former Attorney-General was advised that the Courts Administration Authority estimated the resource implications of implementing the family care meetings and the cost for 1993-94 at $455 000 and a full year cost of $713 000. The Chief Justice at that time advised that the necessary funds for the preparatory work should be provided immediately if family care meetings were to commence on 1 March 1994. In his letter to the former Attorney-General, the Chief Justice said:

> As I understand it, you did not consider that the matter could be dealt with under the caretaker conventions.

The Chief Justice was advised that the matter would be considered after the election, but he was asked to commence preparatory work. I was advised by the Chief Justice on 21 December 1993 that the above response created a difficult situation for the authority. It could not afford to commit existing resources to this new Government initiative and it was unable to commence the preparatory work necessary to achieve the 1 March 1994 proclamation date. I was advised at that time that, as it would be virtually impossible to have the necessary arrangements in place for the proclamation date, even if the grant were to be made immediately, it would be necessary for the Government to delay the commencement of these provisions.

Accordingly, the Bill has been put before Parliament to deal with this situation and others which may arise from time to time. It is clear that it is preferable to have in place a general provision enabling variation or revocation of a proclamation date rather than to amend each piece of legislation individually if circumstances prevented the implementation of a commencement proclamation. To amend in each case would be unwieldy and time wasting. I then invited the Leader of the Opposition to discuss the matter with the Chief Executive Officer of the Attorney-General's Department if he wished any further information.

That is the response. The position remains that it is necessary to suspend the operation of the proclamation. As I indicated at the outset, I thought we could comfortably deal with the issue of principle in this way rather than deal only with the problem with the Children's Protection Act. As I said in my response, the decision as to when to bring an Act or a provision of an Act into operation is an Executive act, not an act of Parliament, unless the Parliament specifically provides that it should come into operation on a particular date or there is no provision as to proclamation and the Act

comes into operation on the date of assent. In those circumstances, nothing in this Bill would amend that position.

There is the ultimate safeguard under the Acts Interpretation Act that if an Act is not proclaimed within two years of the date of assent, it comes into operation automatically. That was passed in the 1980s and it took a reasonable position in respect of implementation by the Executive of the decisions of the Parliament. The other issues can be addressed during the Committee stage. I thank honourable members for their contributions.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement of Acts.'

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am not convinced that this Bill should be passed by the Committee for reasons which I explained earlier and which the Attorney-General's response has not altered to any great extent. I am of a similar view to that of the Hon. Mr Elliott. I cannot see why a particular Bill cannot be brought in to deal with this topic. That would solve the problem without having to introduce a general clause which may have some adverse effects at some point. The first question that I want to ask the Attorney-General relates to his letter. There still seems to be some confusion about the Government's intention in this respect. On page 2 of his letter, which was read into *Hansard* effectively, the following statement appears:

> The Bill is intended to deal with a situation in which unforeseen circumstances have made it impossible for the proclamation date, as specified in an Act, to be the operative date.

If that is what the Government is intending, it is even more offensive than what I thought it was trying to do. I doubt whether that statement can be correct in any event, because section 7(3) refers to a situation where the Act provides for the Act to come into effect by proclamation; it does not refer to a situation where the date is specified in the Act. I take it that that part of the letter, from what the Attorney-General has said, was inaccurate, and perhaps he would like to confirm that.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I read the letter into *Hansard*, but at the end I indicated that it was intended to deal only with those circumstances—and in my view that is what the Bill does—where in an Act there is a provision that it shall come into operation on a date to be fixed by proclamation, the Acts Interpretation Act allows the suspension of certain provisions to come into effect at a later date than those provisions which may be proclaimed to come into effect on an earlier date. The Bill is designed to address the problem where a date in the future is proclaimed to be the date upon which provisions will come into operation but which, as in this case, it becomes impossible to satisfy.

If 1 March is the date which has been proclaimed for certain provisions to come into operation and they are not yet in effect, I suppose the previous Government could have proclaimed 1 June or some other date and it may have been an easier program to meet. What is intended is that where the date of proclamation has not yet been reached within the overall parameters of the Acts Interpretation Act of a two-year maximum time, it should be possible for the Executive to vary that date. It cannot be done after the date has been reached because it has done its job and the provisions are in place, and we certainly then need an Act of Parliament to vary the provisions which have been brought into effect.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I would feel much more comfortable if the courts could have reference to *Hansard* to interpret statutes because then the honourable member's explanation could be resorted to by the courts to ensure that they were in no doubt about what Parliament's intention was. I am not quite as sanguine as the Attorney-General is about the effect of the Bill. However, if I can just get the intention clear: whether or not it is given effect to is I suppose a matter that will be debated by the courts at some point in the future, if there was any doubt about it. As I understand the intention, it is only to deal with the sort of situation that we are confronted with in this case and it does not go beyond that.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: That is correct.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am not sure what view the Democrats are taking on this as a result of the Committee discussion, but obviously the Government will have to make up its mind whether at some point it wants to press on with this or whether it wants to move an amendment to deal with the specific problem that we have—at least it is alleged to exist—with the family care system. I also want to address some questions to the Attorney-General about that.

Prior to this legislation being proclaimed to come into effect there were consultations with the courts at an officer level, as I understand it, and an indication was given to me that the courts were in a position to proceed with this legislation, and therefore the proclamation dates were made by the former Government including some delay in the introduction of the family care system. I am aware that the Chief Justice then subsequently complained about that, although in my view his officers had been consulted about the matter and agreed with the procedure that the Government had suggested. He also then came up with a Bill, which, with respect, seemed to me to be a pretty outrageous one, but which no doubt will have to be assessed by the present Government. Is the Government satisfied as to the costings that have been put forward by the courts or does the Government feel that the system can be implemented at less cost, or indeed to some extent within the existing resources of the Courts Administration Authority?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: One of the difficulties has been trying to get a handle on exactly what resources are required. I am sure the former Attorney-General would appreciate being confronted with a full year cost of nearly three quarters of a million dollars soon after taking office was not something that would create the best sort of reaction.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: An ambit claim.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: It may be an ambit claim. We are still trying to get a handle on what it will really cost in a full year. There have been some discussions in relation to the phased implementation of family care meetings. There is no resiling from the legislative commitment to have family care meetings under the auspices of the Courts Administration Authority. In some areas there has been a concern expressed that we will seek not to implement this and give it all back to the Department of Family and Community Services. I can give an assurance that that is not going to happen. The difficulty is to identify exactly—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: It was your idea.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I know it was our idea, and supported by the Australian Democrats. I was just putting it on the record because there have been some people saying around the traps that we are going to resile from this now that we are in Government and hand it all back to Family and Community Services. All I wanted to do, in case that was raised, was to anticipate it and say that that is not the case.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: You will pay the bill.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: We will pay whatever bill we work out as reasonable in terms of the implementation. Part of the process that we are going through at the moment, in discussions with the Courts Administration Authority—which the former Attorney-General will know is not all smooth sailing—is to identify the resources that will actually be needed; whether existing resources can be employed in undertaking some of the responsibilities. For example, it has been suggested that maybe magistrates in the Youth Court ought to accept some role in the chairing of family care meetings. That has not been resolved. Those issues are still being worked upon and at this stage all I can say is that we are proposing to work through those costings. I would hope that we do not need to spend three quarters of a million dollars in a full year, considering that there are something like 200 to 250 applications in each year which relate to this sort of issue. It is very difficult to perceive that, for those sorts of applications, three quarters of a million dollars is going to be the full year cost. We are trying to work out, in conjunction with the Courts Administration Authority, exactly what resources will be needed.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Has the Attorney-General any idea then, if this Bill is passed, as to when the Government would bring into effect this initiative, which I am reminded was in fact an initiative of the honourable member and the Democrats in opposition? It is interesting to note that had the proposal to the previous Government been proceeded with then taxpayers would have been saved three quarters of a million dollars in this area alone. Be that as it may, can the Attorney-General say when the procedures will be put in place?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I am not sure that it is correct to say that all this money would have been saved if the previous Government's proposals had been accepted. I think there would have still been a cost involved in implementing—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: It is not just the question of courts being expensive; it is the question of the shifting of responsibilities. It may be that even in Family and Community Services, as a result of some consideration of the process, we can reduce some of the work that is being undertaken so that we avoid the duplication which I know during the debate was suggested would occur, with Family and Community Services undertaking consideration of families and children in need of care informally and then having to repeat it through the Courts Administration Authority process. The only information I can give the Council at this stage about when it is likely to be implemented is that the minimum time frame, once we have the process resolved, would be about four months; comfortably within six months. To give one some latitude, it is certainly this year. Both my intention and that of the Minister for Family and Community Services is that it should be earlier rather than later, on the basis that Parliament has passed the provisions and we ought to endeavour to honour that as soon as possible. The information which has been provided to me is that it is a minimum of four, and a six month period would be a more comfortable period within which to work out all the bugs.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I do not want to inject a discordant note into these proceedings, and I do not want to debate this other issue to any great extent, but there has recently been a debate about a proposal—I am not sure whether it is a decision yet—by the independent courts administration, to do away with the resident magistrates' system, a system which has been in place in this State since the late 1970s, an initiative of the then Labor Government, which the Chief Justice, for some bizarre reason which has always escaped me, has attempted to do away with and undermine over many years.

The last time I had an assessment of this done, it was clearly demonstrated that the cost of the abolition of the resident magistrates' system would be substantial. In other words, it costs more to service those regional centres by circuit from the Adelaide metropolitan area than it does to have resident magistrates in place. My recollection is that a figure of some $100 000 is involved, but that may or may not be completely accurate. Certainly, the assessments done at that time indicated that the cost of servicing the country cities by circuit was significantly higher than having the magistrates in residence in those cities. That, of course, is apart from all the advantages that there are in having the resident magistrates in those major cities to the residents of those cities, to the legal profession and in terms of having a judicial presence in other than the metropolitan area of South Australia.

One can understand why country people do get agitated about the lack of services provided to them, and it seems somewhat odd that the Liberal Party, which was elected on a policy of improving services and improving facilities in country areas, should be apparently acquiescing in this decision by the magistracy, a decision which, if the Attorney-General really wanted to, he could almost certainly have reversed, but that is perhaps a debate for another day.

My point is that it costs more. The proposal of the Courts Administration Authority costs more. So there will be a burden on taxpayers. I think the Courts Administration Authority, if it has $100 000 to throw away by the abolition of resident magistrates for no good purpose, obviously has a significant amount of fat in the system, and I would have thought it could implement this proposal by the utilisation of that fat which is clearly there. If it was not there, it would not be able to implement what I regard as this disgraceful proposal to do away with the resident magistrates.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I suppose the Leader of the Opposition has linked that to this Bill in an appropriate way.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: You shouldn't let them get away with it.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I will make available to the Attorney-General a document prepared by the Acting Chief Magistrate in relation to resident magistrates, but the information which I have is that there is not a significant cost difference—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: There was.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: There may have been, but the magistrate in Mt Gambier was coming back to Adelaide, anyway, and one of the magistrates in the Iron Triangle is coming back to Adelaide every weekend, and is only living there—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Not at taxpayers' expense.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: No, not at taxpayers' expense; that is fair comment. The cost of providing accommodation—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: They all gave an undertaking they would go and do county service. They all give the undertaking, and as soon as they have to go they try to get out of it. It is an outrage.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Hon. M.S. Feleppa): Order!

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I will let the Leader of the Opposition have a copy of the paper which—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Are you acquiescing in this decision?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I do not have any option.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Anyway, we can visit that another day. In relation to the resident magistrates—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: I can have a copy of the report?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Yes. This is a public document. It has gone out to lawyers and other people around the community. I am sorry if the Leader of the Opposition does not have a copy. I will make sure he does receive one. There are a number of rather compelling arguments in favour of visiting magistrates. This paper does not talk about costs, except at the end where it says, 'The cost of servicing the regions by circuit will be marginally higher than the cost of residencies. The additional cost will be more than offset by the saving of unused magisterial time in the Iron Triangle.' That has been the proposition put to me. I am happy for the—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: What about all your promises to the country people?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: They will get a better service.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: They will not.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: They will.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: How can you get a better service if it is done by circuit instead of having a resident there? A resident can deal with urgent applications, restraining orders and the like, right on the spot.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: They will be dealt with. We will visit that another day. In terms of—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The Attorney-General is on his feet. Allow him to proceed normally.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Leader of the Opposition's question was really related to the question of cost. We are presently examining the way by which we can implement the legislative program in the Courts Administration Authority designed to effect the intention of Parliament. I would hope it would not cost the sort of money we have already referred to. Certainly our intention is to both phase in the scheme as well as find means by which we minimise the costs. As I said earlier, my recollection is there are approximately 200 to 250 cases a year which will need this sort of approach being brought to bear, and I find it difficult to accept that that will have the sort of substantial cost to which the Chief Justice and the Courts Administration Authority have referred. But I really cannot take the question of costs any further at this stage.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: As I indicated during the second reading stage, there is no question that the Democrats support the primary intent of this piece of legislation, that is, to allow for the time of operation of the Children's Protection Act coming into force to be set back some time. That is accepted. It appears as though the Opposition accepts that as well. I do not think there has been any clear case put for a need for the broader application that this current Bill is proposing. It was my stated preference during the second reading stage that the application of this Bill should be limited to the Children's Protection Act and that is still the course which I wish to follow.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I do not think it is the biggest issue in the world but I do think there is a principle involved, which I outlined in my second reading response. I am not convinced that we should proceed with the general provision. The Opposition supports a provision dealing with the specific problem that the Government is apparently confronted with, and that is on the understanding, of course, that the will of the last Parliament will be implemented within, as the Attorney-General has said, some four to six months from today and that this part of the Children's Protection Act will be brought into effect within that time frame. So, on that basis I indicate, to save time, that a Bill dealing with the specific problem will be supported by the Opposition as it is by the Democrats.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Having anticipated that there may be some difficulty, I am having some work done on drafting which would enable us to proceed with this Bill. Time will not allow a new Bill to be introduced to deal with it. What I would suggest is that we report progress. I will endeavour to have that amendment available within the next few minutes and later in this part of the sitting we can deal with it because it does need to be addressed today.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

STATUTES REPEAL (INCORPORATION OF MINISTERS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 February. Page 38.)

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports this Bill. If this is not the case perhaps the Attorney-General can advise me but, as I understand it, it is in precisely the same terms as the Bill introduced by the former Government and we raise no objection.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): The Bill is in the same form as it was last introduced into the Parliament. It is a Bill which the previous Government and the Leader of the Opposition, as Attorney-General, had introduced. This Government believes it is a desirable piece of legislation to facilitate the restructuring of Government from time to time, so I therefore give that assurance.

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

ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 February. Page 39.)

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Leader of the Opposition): For reasons given on the previous Bill, Mr Acting President, the Opposition supports this Bill.

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 17 February. Page 88.)

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I would first like to recognise the passing of both Jessie Cooper and John Burdett since this Parliament last sat. I have already spoken in the House on the contribution which both these members made to this place: John Burdett, as a contemporary whom most people here would have known very well, and Jessie Cooper who although less known to many members of the current Parliament nevertheless has her place in history, which cannot be diminished, by being the first woman ever elected

to this Parliament. I will not reiterate remarks which I made at that time.

This afternoon I wish to make a few remarks about 1994, which is a most important year for South Australia, being the centenary of the achievement of suffrage for the women of this State. It is worth acknowledging this important legislation, which passed on 18 December 1894. It passed the Legislative Council in August of that year and finally passed the House of Assembly in December, as I indicated. Whilst we were not the first place in the world to give women the vote, we certainly were one of the first places in the world to do so and we certainly were the first place in the world to give women their full democratic right not only to vote for Parliament but also to stand for election to Parliament.

We followed New Zealand by one year, and the campaigns for women's suffrage were similar in those two jurisdictions. Certainly, in South Australia the campaign had been undertaken for about nine years before success occurred, and there was a similar campaign in New Zealand, led by Kate Shepherd in that country. It is perhaps anomalous that in both cases the full extent of the democratic rights granted to women was achieved partly by accident due to the sort of circumstances which arise in politics and which can have unintended consequences.

When I was in New Zealand last year I was informed that the final vote to give women the vote in the Legislative Council—New Zealand still had a bicameral Parliament at that time—was passed by 20 votes to 18 votes. So, a small number of people changing their vote would not have resulted in women's suffrage. However, I was also told that there were two members of that Council who were really opposed to female suffrage and who, a week before the final vote was taken, had a violent argument with the then Prime Minister of the country, who, incidentally was opposed to female suffrage. They decided that the only way they could indicate their displeasure with the Prime Minister was to vote contrary to what he wanted on female suffrage.

So, while personally opposing female suffrage they voted for female suffrage in order to annoy the Prime Minister. Obviously, had those two people changed their vote and voted as they had originally intended, women would not have achieved suffrage in New Zealand in 1893.

In this Parliament a similar procedure resulted in women having the right to stand for Parliament in this State. It gave us the world first in enacting such legislation. As a study of *Hansard* of the period will show, the suffragists at the time were pressing for women to have the vote and had never even raised the question of whether or not women should be able to stand for Parliament. That was not part of their demands. It certainly formed no part of the enormous petition which they presented to Parliament on their behalf. It had never really been an issue that they had fostered but, when the debate occurred in the House of Assembly on the final Suffrage Bill (it was about the third one that had been introduced), a Mr Ebenezer Ward bitterly opposed suffrage for women and wished to do all he could to defeat the Bill.

He understood that there were not the numbers to defeat the Bill, so he moved an amendment to give women the right not only to vote but also to stand for Parliament. He felt that this would be such an absurdity that those who supported female suffrage could not possibly contemplate women being members of Parliament and would realise how ridiculous the whole procedure was and consequently vote against the Bill and defeat it. He was hoist on his own petard when his amendment, which I presume he voted for (although he obviously did not believe in it), was passed and apparently had no effect at all on members of either Chamber in their determination to see that women should get the vote.

So, our world-first of enabling women to stand for Parliament was achieved thanks to Mr Ebenezer Ward, who did not believe in it or in women having a vote at all. It is one of history's little ironies. Certainly, I can recommend a paper which has been put out by our magnificent State History Centre. Research Paper No. 3 *How a Parliament of Men Gave the Vote to Women* is obtainable at Old Parliament House next door and gives a wonderful summary of some of the debates and procedures that were followed and indicates the reaction of individual members and the community at large. Certainly, it is interesting to read the list of the names of the Ayes and the Noes on the final third reading, because people like Sir John Downer, an ancestor of the current Federal shadow Treasurer, and Mr E.W. Hawker, a Mr McLachlan, of the McLachlan family and a Mr Riddoch—a very well known name in the South-East—were all amongst those who voted against female suffrage.

Those who voted for female suffrage interestingly included Mr G. Hawker, father of the Mr E. Hawker who voted against it, plus then Premier Kingston. They should be duly remembered and recognised for the stand they took in giving women the vote.

It also includes names such as Dr Magarey, from the well known Magarey family, who voted for it. Surprisingly, the Noes included Mr Stirling, who was one of the first people to bring a Bill into the House for female suffrage. Mr Stirling opposed elements of this Bill, so his name goes down in history as having opposed female suffrage in 1894. I would strongly commend that pamphlet to anyone who is interested. It is a very readable and humorous account of the debates which gave women the vote in this State.

I think also it would be worth my while putting into *Hansard* today some of the comments which were made at the time by those who opposed female suffrage. Some of the arguments used against female suffrage are, unfortunately, still ones we hear today from people who oppose increasing opportunities and rights for women. I would like to quote a number of these, and one does not know whether to laugh or cry at the attitudes that are being expressed. The first is from a newspaper called the *Country*, one of the numerous newspapers which then circulated widely in South Australia. On 14 April the *Country* editorial said:

> Women are smaller than men. Their brain also is smaller. Does it not follow that their intellect also cannot be so great? You may now and again find some clever woman with far more intellect than the average man, but that does not put the sex as a whole upon an equality. They never can be on an equality, for nature has not made them equal. Therefore, to add largely to the weaker voters those who are still more weak would be an absurdity. It is nonsense to talk of women's rights to the suffrage, and those men who do so ought to be ashamed of themselves. A woman's right is to do her share of the work of the world. That share is chiefly to bear and rear children. No talk can get rid of that. Women's true strength is submission, and where one virago rules thousands of soft and loving women get their own way by submission and by smiles. One danger of the new movement is that it will unsex women as a class. The woman who goes shrieking on the stump and roaring, hustling and pushing at the polling booth cannot help getting rougher and coarser than if she had been home darning stockings or superintending her household. Some of the bloom must come off.

I can see smiles on the faces of some of my female colleagues, and I am sure we all recognise that the same class of argument is used against us today, if not quite the same

words. Another quote from the *Country* of 28 July 1894, when the debate on women's suffrage was proceeding, reads:

> The Chief Secretary made a very pretty speech on women's suffrage. Whether there was any logic in it or not it is not necessary to inquire. Possibly there was none. Probably it was not meant to have any logic. Nobody expects any logic on that particular subject, which is far better treated without that commodity. The more unreasoning and unreasonable a thing is, the more it pleases the women. No greater folly than this women's suffrage fad could be well committed. To have 50 or 60 legislators deliberately admitting that men are not able to govern the colony without the assistance of a lot of fussy, snuffy, gossiping old women is very funny. The suggestion that women are equal to men is absurd. They are inferior mentally as physically. Early ripening is a faculty they have in common with Negroes—

so we have racism as well as sexism here—

> Up to 12 a Nigger boy is probably ahead of a white boy; from 12 to 15 possibly equal; at 15 he stops, but nobody would say that because a Negro boy was ahead of a white boy at 12 that therefore he was equal, for after 15 he is hopelessly behind.

Another quote from the *Country* newspaper from 4 August 1894 reads as follows:

> It is a curious physiological circumstance for which the explanation is not readily forthcoming that women's rights agitators are almost always amongst the plainest of their sex. Now and again a good looking woman joins the ranks, but she is usually regarded with suspicion by her harder featured sisters and soon retires in disgust. Now it is the beautiful, the refined, the cultured and graceful women who really exercise any permanent influence over the male sex.

And so on. The automatic assumption in all these quotes that it is unfeminine to want to lead any life other than that of the stereotypic mother raising a family and that any woman who does so must be hard, undesirable and ugly is not far below the surface in many comments made today. Quite apart from the fact that I see no necessary correlation between physical features and mental activity, it is interesting that it is obviously felt that for a woman to be beautiful and desirable is the ultimate for her expectations and that this is what she should strive for, whereas no-one would ever suggest that being handsome and attractive is the most important thing that a male should achieve, with everything else being secondary to it.

Such arguments are still used today, and are repeated in phrases such as that feminists are these hairy-legged creatures, as if the physical state of their legs had anything to do with the arguments which they were putting forward. So, while we can laugh at the ridiculous quotations of 100 years ago, some of the assumptions and value judgments behind those quotations are still present today in many of the arguments which are used against women or any suggestion that women do not have equal rights and equal opportunities in our community today.

Perhaps one minor aside I might make is that several people, including the media, refer to people such as Mary Lee, Catherine Helen Spence and Elizabeth Webb Nicholls and other leading campaigners of 100 years ago as suffragettes. This is not the correct term to use. The word 'suffragette' was not invented until many years after their work. It is a British word which arose at the time in the early years of this century when British women were agitating for the right to vote.

It was a derogatory term which was applied to women suffragists. In this State and in New Zealand they were referred to not by that name but by the correct terminology, a suffragist—someone pressing for suffrage. I hope that we can get that message through to some of the people who will be taking part in the celebrations this year.

Another minor matter which should be corrected relates to the colours appropriate for the suffrage centenary. In this country and in New Zealand the colours chosen by the suffragists were purple and gold. All their banners and other material featured those two colours, and they were the colours of the suffrage movement. The colours purple and green, which people often mistakenly apply to the suffrage movement, were chosen by the British suffragists at least 20 years after the purple and gold appropriate to this part of the world. The purple and green were then picked up by suffragists in the United States. I suppose it is a measure of the dominance of the United Kingdom and the United States throughout the English-speaking world that many people are unaware that purple and gold were the original suffrage colours, and certainly the suffrage colours for Australia. I am delighted that in this State our suffrage celebrations will be carried out under a specially designed logo with the colours purple and gold. I hope that by the end of the year people will realise that purple and green had nothing to do with the suffrage movement in this country.

I am sure no-one would now be unaware that many celebrations are planned for this year for the suffrage centenary. Quite some time ago the then Bannon Government set up a Suffrage Centenary Committee to plan the activities for this year. It was a very broad-based committee with representatives invited from the political parties, organisations such as the CWA, the Women's Electoral Lobby, the National Council of Women and the Women's Trade Union Movement, together with representatives from ethnic communities, the Aboriginal community and a very broad cross-section of women throughout South Australian society.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore, who was a member of this Parliament until December last year, was the first person to suggest publicly that we should celebrate the centenary of suffrage appropriately in this State. However, she was not the first person to raise the matter. Quite some months before she spoke of this matter publicly, I had raised it with the then Premier and with women members of the then ALP Caucus, and the Premier had agreed that appropriate steps should be taken to celebrate such an important achievement during 1994.

The Suffrage Centenary Committee was provided with over $500 000 by the previous Government to organise appropriate celebrations. I mention this figure because on several occasions I have seen a figure of $200 000 quoted, but this grossly underestimates the contribution made by the Labor Government to the suffrage centenary celebrations. Of the $500 000 provided by the Government, it is true that $200 000 was allocated for community projects, and applications were requested from community groups or individuals for the funding of projects that they wished to undertake to contribute to the celebrations. In fact, the $200 000 has been allocated to community groups and individuals, and far more could have been so allocated. There was certainly no shortage of ideas or plans for appropriate projects. The Suffrage Centenary Committee could have allocated up to ten times that amount had it been available. The committee had very difficult choices to make, but it carefully selected projects to fund through community groups and individuals which covered a very broad range of activities.

Sometimes a particular group has not received the full amount for which it asked, but in every case the committee checked with the groups concerned whether, if they received a lesser amount of funding, they would still be able to put on the project, though perhaps not to the same extent as they had previously hoped, or whether there may be other sources of money which could contribute to make up the full amount.

Throughout this year we will be benefiting from the 60-odd community groups which have been funded through the $200 000 made available by the Government. But that sum of $200 000 for community projects was not the totality of the Government's contribution. A large sum of money was made available to the Suffrage Centenary Committee for it to plan and organise major events during this year to celebrate the importance of this occasion. The Suffrage Centenary Committee is responsible for a large number of projects. Important events will be taking place, such as the exhibition of women painters at the Art Gallery in April, the International Conference on Women, Power and Politics which is to take place in October of this year, and a street parade, general celebration and family picnic which will occur on the actual day, 18 December, when the final vote was taken in the Parliament to enact the Bill into law.

I do not think it is realised that the Government has contributed a great deal more than the $500 000 that I mentioned. That figure comprises $200 000 for community grants and $300 000 for projects to be run by the Suffrage Centenary Committee, plus costs towards the secretariat which, with a very small but efficient staff, is undertaking a tremendous amount of work to bring about this year's celebrations.

In addition to that sum, I do not think it is realised that a very large number of Government agencies have undertaken to provide particular projects or activities to celebrate the suffrage centenary and are doing so from within their own budgetary resources. This is not part of the $500 000 which was allocated by the previous Government. I thought it might be interesting to indicate the wide variety of initiatives which have been promised by public sector agencies. As I say, this is in addition to the $500 000 specifically allocated. There is a great range of things.

The Primary Industries Department is allocating resources towards a particular project of women and science at the Waite Institute to be called 'The Guardian Angels of our Good Earth'. This is also receiving support from the Suffrage Centenary Committee and the University of Adelaide Foundation. This is a major project documenting the extremely valuable work done by early women scientists at the Waite Institute, some of whom are still alive. One in particular, now in her 90s, has been interviewed by people undertaking this project and an oral history obtained from her which will be an extremely valuable part of this project. It is certainly hoped that the display, when prepared, will encourage a lot of girls to consider a career in science when they can see the enormous achievements which were made by some of these pioneers. The Department of Transport is offering an undergraduate scholarship to be named after Sylvia Birdseye, who was a notable women pioneer of road transport in this State.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: I am presenting the award this week.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I am glad to hear it and wish I were invited—which I haven't been.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: If you wish I will organise that.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I will certainly be interested. It will be a scholarship honouring her service to this State in the School of Civil Engineering at the University of South Australia's Levels campus, an award to the value of $5 000. Work experience in the Department of Transport will be provided to the successful candidate. The State Library is to produce a ready reference guide to a whole range of historical sources in the Mortlock Library on Women's Suffrage in South Australia. The Office of Crime Statistics in the Attorney-General's Department is preparing a research report on violence against women, using both police and community survey data. This will be a documented account of information on details such as the age of the victim, their relationship with offenders and location of the offence. The prevalence of physical domestic violence will also be estimated in the report.

The State Electoral Department is contributing to the centenary tapestries, which also have a private sponsor. It is making a donation of $12 000 towards these two historic tapestries which will hang in the House of Assembly. I realise the significance of hanging these tapestries in the House of Assembly. I wish there was some way in which something similar could be provided within this House because, although the Legislative Council did not inhabit this particular Chamber 100 years ago, it was in fact the Legislative Council which passed the Bill for Women's Suffrage before the House of Assembly did. It was introduced by a member of the Legislative Council and passed this House prior to going to the other place. It would be nice if that were in some way commemorated in this Chamber by a picture, tapestry or plaque.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: We think a tapestry about South Australia—all along the back wall.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: That is an excellent idea. Let's take it up—right across the back wall behind *Hansard*.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Actually, it is amazing what we can do in this Chamber when no men are on the benches!

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Yes. Shall we take that up and see what can be done in that regard? The two tapestries which are currently being woven in the foyer of the National Bank in King William Street are being viewed by many people with great excitement as they develop. If anyone present has not yet seen them, I suggest that they duck into the National Bank the next time they are going up King William Street. The volunteers who are giving so much of their time and work to create these tapestries are always hard at work and it is most exciting to see them grow. Doubtless, there will be a ceremony involved with their hanging when they are completed, and I hope that members of this Council will be included in such celebrations even though they are to hang in another place.

The Office of Public and Consumer Affairs has contributed financially to the International Conference on Women, Power and Politics. The Office of Government Management has also contributed financially to that international conference and even Treasury—never known for being generous with distribution of money—contributed $20 000 to the suffrage centenary celebrations without specifying any particular project that the money was to be used for. Untied money like this is rare and very welcome indeed; someone must have caught Treasury in a weak moment. The Department of Environment and Natural Resources has committed an annual award of up to $10 000 to be named after a prominent woman associated with the environment. I am not aware that they have announced the name to be used for this award, but it will be open to all who could qualify on the basis of significant achievement for the South Australian community and environment.

The Disability Information and Resource Centre is contributing considerable clerical and administrative support to a wonderful collaborative project involving numerous organisations, in particular Arts in Action, which is an arts

organisation for people with disabilities. It is putting on a performance called 'With a little bit of help from my friends', and I think this is to be part of the Fringe celebrations. It has not started yet but will in a few days' time.

The South Australian Health Commission will do a thorough review of its women's health policy. It proposes to release a draft policy for community consultation with groups and organisations representative of women's interests. There have been many significant health service developments for women in South Australia in recent times, with the establishment of our four women's health centres, the women's health services throughout the country, the breast x-ray screening service, the cervix screening program and many others. It is felt timely to review the whole women's health policy to consider the key issues for women's health in the 1990s.

The Education Department is promising a whole range of activities, including an 'Education of Girls' kit. It will also have numerous seminars relative to women in education. There is a 'Women in Business' network, which is being set up by the Small Business Corporation. The Department of Labour and Administrative Services is to establish the Auguste Zadow award to recognise contributions to improvements in women's health and safety in the workplace. It is also designed to stimulate interest and recognise excellence in women's occupational health and safety. It is named after Auguste Zadow, who was one of the suffragists who worked over 100 years ago. She was also the first woman to be a factory inspector in this State after the passing of the Factory Act earlier in 1894. She was very well known in the Labor movement. When Mary Lee established the Working Women's Union, Auguste Zadow was the first Treasurer of that organisation.

The Department of Recreation and Sport has promised many activities for women throughout this year. It will have seminars on issues for women in sport, such as 'Sport and the mature aged woman'. It will also be providing commemorative paving stones at the State's Sports Park where the names of women who have contributed to sport will be honoured by being engraved on paving stones laid at the State's Sports Park at Gepps Cross.

The Engineering and Water Supply Department has promised to contribute a social and pictorial history booklet of women's contribution to our water services. The Working Women's Centre will be launching its new premises and working with working women in many activities designed to commemorate the suffrage centenary.

There is the major exhibition of South Australian women artists from the 1890s to the 1940s. This will be held at the Art Gallery of South Australia and will show how in the late nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century South Australian art was dominated by women. They were producing the best art of the whole country at that time. There were painters such as Bessie Davidson, Stella Bowen, Margaret Preston, Nora Heysen, and Dorritt Black; ceramicists such as Doreen Goodchild and Gladys Reynell; and craft work from Maude Bailey. This extremely important exhibition is being funded both by the women's suffrage centenary committee and also the Art Gallery through the Department for the Arts.

The Women's Studies Resource Centre has promised to produce a kit called 'Into our own hands' on girls and decision making. The State Library will be producing a Barbara Hanrahan memorial exhibition which will honour both the literary and artistic achievements of the prominent author and print maker, Barbara Hanrahan, who so tragically died three years ago, a great loss indeed to South Australia.

The Tourism Commission has promised to conduct a research project on women and travel to obtain information valuable to women who wish to travel both to and within South Australia. The Department of Environment and Natural Resources has a project entitled 'Homes of historical significance—Catherine Helen Spence.' We can take it that, when a place has special associations with the life or work of a significant person, that place then becomes an important feature of South Australia's heritage, and this is certainly the case with Catherine Helen Spence, who was a public speaker, social reformer, keen supporter of education and equality for women, and whose portrait in tapestry will hang in another place. There is work to be done on the places where she lived throughout the metropolitan area, and the importance of protecting tangible reminders of such significant people.

There will be an exhibition organised by State Records in collaboration with the private sector through the Myer Centre, where there will be a display held in the Myer Centre of all the original documents relating to the suffrage petition exhibition, including an alphabetical index to all the signatories of that petition. So, those South Australians who have ancestors dating back 100 years in this State will be able to see whether or not any of their ancestors signed the petition. The State Library will have a special 'Voting for Women' display.

The Occupational Health and Safety Commission will dedicate an issue of its quarterly newsletter to the contribution of women to occupational health and safety, both in the past and in the present. A total of 60 000 people are estimated to read any such issue of this bulletin, so it will have a wide coverage.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has promised a national conference on women in planning. The division of recreation, sport and racing will organise a night of special events of harness racing and trotting to commemorate the suffrage centenary. Of course, the centenary committee itself, in conjunction with the jockey club, is organising a special race day at Morphettville, where every race will be named after one of the well known suffragists. The same will happen with the special events at Globe Derby Park. State Supply has promised awards for female students at the University of South Australia and the Panorama Institute of Vocational Education.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has also promised a study into women's access to housing finance. The Department of Mines and Energy is producing a special brochure on women's contribution to our mining heritage. This will be launched on Saint Barbara's Day, as Saint Barbara is the patron saint of miners. It is most appropriate to launch this brochure on Saint Barbara's Day later in the year. Artlab will have a special project on women in science, as many of the conservators at Artlab are women. State Systems has provided support services for the women's register to enable that register to be properly computerised and accessible.

The Department for Family and Community Services will provide small, one-off grants to community organisations for activities which they can undertake as part of the suffrage centenary. StatePrint is contributing by providing services at a much reduced rate to the Women's Suffrage Centenary Committee. The Department of Public and Consumer Affairs is organising an exhibition of cartoonists' views of women through the ages—most of them decidedly unflattering, rather

like the quotations from the country which I read out earlier. I hope that it will make people laugh rather than cry when they see the ancient views of women held by the males who drew the cartoons.

The Children's Services Office has promised to develop pilot projects regarding the child care needs of working mothers with mildly ill children. The Police Department is to run a Kate Cox Memorial Seminar, focusing on future directions for women in policing, named after Kate Cox who was the first principal of the women police in this State. The SGIC has promised a suffrage centenary prize to the top female graduate of the Insurance Institute Certificate course this year. Mr Acting President, I have read a number of these but I can assure you that they are only a small sample of all the projects which have been promised by Government instrumentalities and which are in addition to the $500 000 provided directly for suffrage celebrations.

I would certainly hope, Mr Acting President, that with the change in Government the various agencies will not be prevented from fulfilling their previous commitments—some of which I have detailed today—towards the celebrations of the suffrage centenary. I know that in an Address in Reply it is not customary to ask questions of Ministers but, if any Minister is making a reply in this debate, I would welcome any indication that the centenary projects previously promised by the various Government agencies and instrumentalities will still go ahead and have not been prevented by the new Government.

Those centenary projects were certainly all promised last year in response to correspondence which I had with every agency asking them to do something for the suffrage centenary and to which there was a magnificent response of over 90 projects coming forward from Government agencies and departments. One should not, of course, forget the Parliament itself, which is to have an exhibition in the centre hall on women in Parliament including some basic facts about the small number of women (now 22) who have ever been members of this Parliament.

Before winding up I could perhaps inject a slight note of disappointment. I was very saddened and angered in December when the new Government replaced the chair of the Women's Suffrage Centenary Committee who had been appointed by the previous Government. She had spent over 18 months, in an entirely voluntary capacity, working hard with the other members of the committee to plan and develop the wonderful series of celebrations which will occur throughout this year. On 28 December, three days before the year was to actually start, she was sacked by the new Government, and that seemed to me totally unnecessary and most unfortunate. Dr Jean Blackburn was appointed by the Bannon Government as a most eminent South Australian. I quote from one of the many letters of objection which have been sent to the Premier on this matter:

> Dr Jean Blackburn is known, respected and loved throughout Australia. She has been honoured for her services to Australian education by the universities of Melbourne (which awarded her an honorary doctorate) and Canberra (which made her their Chancellor), and by the Victorian Government. Her appointment to the South Australian Women's Suffrage Centenary Steering Committee ensured interstate, indeed international, as well as local recognition and respect for South Australia's program of activities for 1994 to commemorate our achievement of full (formal) citizenship for women a century ago.

For the preparation of this program Dr Blackburn has chaired a large committee of very diverse aspirations. I am aware that there have been many people who have objected to the removal of Dr Blackburn from her position as chair. I understand there were suggestions that she should be removed and that ill-health could be used as an excuse but that she indignantly refused that excuse as her health is certainly not such as to prevent her from undertaking suffrage activities. She was summarily dismissed for blatantly political reasons and I strongly suspect that those who did this were unaware of the precedent established only a few years ago.

The Tonkin Liberal Government set up a committee shortly before the 1982 election to organise the celebrations for South Australia's Jubilee year. The incoming Bannon Government did not change the Chair or members of that committee, which continued in existence as set up by the Tonkin Government through the years of the Bannon Government and organised the very successful celebrations that occurred for our Jubilee 150 year. I am sad that the Brown Government did not see fit to follow that precedent and not let someone who had done all the hard work enjoy the fruits of that hard work by chairing the committee through the suffrage year.

The whole incident has left a very nasty taste in the mouths of many people, including me. I certainly do not want the suffrage celebrations to suffer as a result, as I have always believed that the suffrage celebrations should involve all women in our community, across all political, religious, occupation and racial backgrounds; in other words, it should be truly comprehensive and involve all members of our community and particularly every woman in South Australia. It is divisive and politicising the event to remove Dr Jean Blackburn as Chair of the committee.

I understand that Dr Blackburn was told it was quite blatantly for political reasons. I should add, in case anyone has thoughts in that regard, as far as I am aware Dr Blackburn has never been a member of the Labor Party, so that it can only be that she was removed because she was appointed by a Labor Government and the incoming Government did not have sufficient tolerance or a sufficiently comprehensive view of the celebrations and wanted to throw its weight around in that way.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Whom do we have there now?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I am sure the Minister is aware that it is the previous Deputy Chair who has taken the place as Chair of the committee.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Do you have a problem with her?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I fail to see the relevance of the interjection. I am objecting to the summary dismissal of Dr Blackburn for no reason whatsoever. I regard it as a most inadequate and appalling recognition of her contribution, as well as a politicising of the event in a way that I find extremely unfortunate. I know that many people have written to the Premier and the Minister for the Status of Women complaining about the treatment meted out to Dr Blackburn. In response they get some reply that talks about politicising the executive, which is not what the letters had been about in the first place.

In response to that, I would like to say that, while the letters refer to repeated requests to change the composition of the executive of the steering committee, I can say that in the past 18 months when I was Minister responsible for the committee, not one request reached me to change the executive of the committee. I do not know to whom or when such requests were made, if they were made, but they were certainly never made to me in the entire period that I was responsible for the committee. I can assure members that if they had been made to me I would have given them serious

consideration and would probably have undertaken certain actions after consultation with the committee, of course.

But the treatment meted out to Dr Blackburn is in stark contrast to the precedent set by the Bannon Government with the sesqui-centenary committee and reflects poorly on those who made the decision to denigrate Dr Blackburn in this way and thereby to politicise what should have been, and indeed was, above Party politics, as any examination of the composition of the committee will indicate.

While I hope that the suffrage centenary celebrations will not suffer as a result of this behaviour on the part of the new Liberal Government, I repeat that it has left a sour taste in the mouths of many people and I feel it is extremely unfortunate that this politicising has occurred in regard to what certainly until then had not had a shred of Party politics in any way involved and where the planned celebrations, under the Chair of Dr Blackburn, showed no partisanship of any sort.

The planned celebrations cannot be faulted in that regard: they are comprehensive and cover every facet of women's lives throughout all sections of our community. I, for one, certainly hope the celebrations achieve what they have set out to do or what was originally planned, but I regret that they have been sullied by the actions taken three days before the year began by the new Liberal Government.

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: I support the motion and, in so doing, acknowledge the magnificent job that Her Excellency the Governor, Dame Roma Mitchell, is doing. She mixes with a vast range of the Australian community with ease, modesty and humility, no matter what the person's status may be. I thank her for her allegiance and style.

I would also take this opportunity to farewell my former colleague the Hon. John Burdett. When I entered Parliament about three years ago it was John who helped me put things into perspective. On the day that I felt particularly negative he told me that as I had encountered so much trouble in getting into the Council I had better buck up and get on with it. I always remembered that practical advice.

John was my adviser on many issues. At times when decisions were made against our Party members that seemed illogical or back to front, John would explain patiently the ways of parliamentary seniority, of merit and of relationships. In all cases he would always encourage me to speak my mind, but with caution. In the area of legal jargon, sometimes he would pop into my small office while I was looking up an unfamiliar legal term and he would explain that term with clarity and patience in response to what must have seemed a basic question. He gave advice on the framing of petitions, questions on notice and moving motions. At all times he was pleased that he could provide such advice and strongly encouraged all these activities.

At all times John was an honourable gentleman, a generous person and a true Christian. It is with deep sadness that I note that he did not live to enjoy his retirement with his wife, Jean, and we extend to Jean and his family our deepest sympathies. We will all miss the Hon. Mr John Burdett.

I also give my sympathies to the families of our two pioneer women in Parliament, although I did not know them, namely, the Hon. Mrs Jessie Cooper and the Hon. Mrs Joyce Steele. Their track records confirm that they served their community with distinction.

During the last session I did not get the opportunity to acknowledge our previous President, the Hon. Mr Gordon Bruce. He was the very first experience I had of the function of a President in Parliament. Since he was the President of the opposite Party, my expectation was that he would be biased towards his Party. However, this was not so, and he handled matters of contention in this Chamber with equanimity, fairness and balance. At a time when I had to make a personal explanation and when objections were raised that the explanation was too lengthy, the Hon. Mr Bruce allowed the clarification, understanding the trouble that had gone into collating the explanations.

The Hon. Gordon Bruce was a very fair person. At times he had difficulty in hearing me, and I will not question his hearing. However, given that he once confused my name with that of the then newest member of the Council, the Hon. Mrs Caroline Schaefer, I must question his vision, as we are not quite identical physically. We wish Mr Bruce the very best for the future. I also welcome our two new members, the Hon. Mr Robert Lawson and the Hon. Mr Angus Redford. Our Chamber now has a good team of lawyers. To our newest female member of the Council, the Hon. Ms Sandra Kanck, welcome; we toast another female in Parliament. Also, to our new President, the Hon. Peter Dunn, I offer my congratulations.

On the subject of women, as it is the suffrage year, we are celebrating the hundredth anniversary of the right of women to vote and the right of women to stand for Parliament, a first for our State. In an article from the *Independent Monthly* of February 1994, it is stated that 35 per cent of all full-time women working in the Australian public sector have shattered the glass ceiling; that is, they have broken through the hidden obstacles that prevent women from competing in the public workplace on an equal basis.

However, it is also identified that in the private sector this may not be as optimistic. It was found that in management positions women marginally improved their position from 10.9 per cent in 1984 to 11.8 per cent in 1992 but that the proportion of women who had reached management positions still remained at 2.9 per cent. It therefore reflects the increasing number of women in the work force but not the improved female promotion rate.

At senior management level, women's position slipped from 2.5 per cent in 1984 to 1.3 per cent in 1992. In this category, women have regressed. Women remain over-represented in low paid and part time work. The average income is still only 70 per cent of the average male income. For example, senior male managers earn $86 500, compared to their female counterparts, who earn $69 100.

Women battling to get ahead and tired of waiting for an opportunity have opted out and established their own businesses. The rate of women working in their own businesses rose from 216 300 to 272 400 between 1984 and 1990. Women now own 31.5 per cent of Australian small businesses. They are also more successful than men at keeping these small businesses afloat.

However, small business people do not usually form part of the decision making group of elite people in business. Therefore, this movement of women to self-employment is serving to perpetuate and accelerate the marginalisation of ambitious women in the work force. These are comments made by an author, Ms Still. Women are still stereotyped by certain occupations. For example, figures from the Royal College of Surgeons show that there are 134 females out of 4 500 surgeons. Further, a Victorian study shows that only 15 per cent of jobs in the construction industry are female, whilst 55 per cent of women have jobs in the recreation industry and almost 70 per cent in community service.

However, the article further comments that, despite these negatives, the progress of women in the Australian labour force has been impressive. In 20 years, women have taken their place at the highest levels and have changed the work culture. In America, as commented by *Time* magazine in the summer of 1990, we are heading for a time when issues like equal pay, child-care, abortion, rape and domestic violence will no longer be women's issues but viewed as economic, family and ethical issues, all of which pertain equally to men and to women.

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles: I hope I am alive to see the day.

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: The Hon. Caroline Pickles sounds very pessimistic about that comment. Women are finding themselves at a watershed when time is needed for evaluation and reflection. We leave the cosy and safe roads of the past and move into the future, which looms with so many choices that the freedom it promises is both exciting and frightening. There is a new appreciation of women as more than sex objects, as more than wives, as more than mothers.

It is interesting to note the results of a questionnaire obtained in September 1990 from 505 Americans between the ages of 18 and 24 years. In relation to the question they thought it easier to be a man or a woman, the results showed that of the female respondents 30 per cent said it was easier to be a woman and 59 per cent said that it was easier to be a man. Of the male respondents, 21 per cent said it was easier to be a woman and 65 per cent said it was easier to be a man. Therefore, it is agreed, even at the tender age of 18 to 24 years, that being a woman is rather more difficult.

On the question of which of the following was their single most important goal, of the female respondents the responses were, in order of priority: a happy marriage, a successful career, well adjusted children and contributing to society. Of the male respondents, the responses, in order of their priority, were: a successful career, a happy marriage, contributing to society and having well adjusted children. My interpretation of the responses to that questionnaire identifies that women are perhaps more family oriented and men are more career oriented. This questionnaire partly serves to substantiate some research which has been done in America and which concludes that the crux of women's existence is a sense of relationship.

Research states that this concept colours every aspect of a woman's life. Where most women use conversation to expand and understand relationships, most men use talk to convey solutions, thus ending conversation. Where women see people as mutually dependent, men view people as self-reliant. Women emphasise caring and men value freedom. Women consider action within a context linking one to the next; men tend to regard events as isolated and discrete. Perhaps that gives the women a more flexible mediating approach, while men tend to be more direct, sure and decisive. Neither is right or wrong. It is perhaps the difference between men and women. These concepts are interesting and the contributions of both sexes appear to be essential. In rural areas, due to the isolation and distance, women have to rely more heavily on inter-relationships, networking and teamwork.

I turn now to the attitude of Australia to Asia and Asian business ethics. Only recently have many Australians noticed that Asia has relevance to the wellbeing of our nation. Alison Broinowski reflects:

> At the outset, I had expected to reach a more optimistic conclusion than I have. I expected to find—I wanted to find—that Australians, uniquely placed to take advantage of the stimulation of ancient cultures, innovative modernity and growing economies in their region, and to become a centre of expertise about their neighbours, in the 1990s are well on the way to doing so, and in large numbers. While that conclusion is true of some. . . it would be premature as a generalisation about all Australians.

She further suggests that, far from expecting to find models for themselves in neighbouring countries, Australian settlers are conditioned by past European contacts to perceive Asians as people to be instructed, not to seek instruction from; to be patronised, not to be equal with. Australia had an historical foot in one camp and a geographical foot in the other, but West was 'us' and East was 'them'. Politics sided with history against geography, even to the detriment of economics, says Broinowski. As the Indonesian poet Rendres says, 'You will come through as a Western society and yet be uniquely different from America and Europe and help the lot of Asian people.'

Australians must try to cease seeing us as foreigners and accept Asians in all their variety as part of mainstream Australian life. Australia is not Asia, but Asia and the Pacific are part of Australia's hemisphere and culture—an interesting and growing part. It is clear that until Asia occupies a place equal to that of the West in Australians' minds, the nation's pursuit of its interests will remain distorted. If Australian identity and self-image are to change, they must do so in a way that recognises Australia in the Asian-Pacific hemisphere.

Our particular push in trying to get to know Asia is mainly due to economics. It is the fastest growing region in economic terms. I remember not so long ago when the Australian dollar was equal to about $3 or $4 Singapore and in Hong Kong the Australian dollar was equal to $6 or $7 Hong Kong. Now in Singapore, the place of my origin, where the Australian standard of living was looked up to, the Singapore dollar is virtually equal to the Australian dollar and the standard of living, although different, is comparable.

Table 2 from *Asia Week* of July 1992 shows the gross domestic product, which is the value of all goods and services produced in a country in one year. There is also a table which shows the gross national product per capita. The gross national product is GDP minus the surplus or deficit in trade in goods and services divided by the population per year. Mr President, I seek leave to incorporate these two tables in *Hansard*. They are of a statistical nature.

Leave granted.

TABLE I—GNP PER CAPITA

COUNTRY	GNP per capita $
Switzerland	35 020
Japan	27 235
U.S.	22 550
Canada	21 500
Germany	21 475
France	21 085
Italy	18 685
U.K.	17 445
Australia	16 350
Hong Kong	14 102
Singapore	13 600
Taiwan	8 685
South Korea	6 489
Malaysia	2 475
Thailand	1 605
Philippines	725
Indonesia	605
China	325
Vietnam	200

TABLE II—GDP GROWTH

COUNTRY	GDP growth %
Malaysia	8.8
South Korea	8.4
Thailand	7.9
Taiwan	7.3
China	7.0
Indonesia	6.4
Singapore	5.1
Hong Kong	3.9
Vietnam	3.8
Japan	3.2
U.S.	2.7
Germany	1.3
Italy	1.1
France	1.0
Australia	0.8
Philippines	0.5
Switzerland	-0.5
Canada	-1.5
U.K.	-1.5

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: We note in table I, which is the gross national product per capita, that the country at the top of the list is Switzerland, where the GNP per capita is $35 020. The countries at the bottom of the list are China, which is $325 GNP per capita, and Vietnam, which is $200 GNP per capita. Australia is around the median of $16 315. However, looking at table II, which is GDP growth, we note that Malaysia's growth is top of the table at 8.8 per cent, while at the bottom is the United Kingdom at −1.5 per cent. Switzerland, which is at the top of the GNP, is −1.5 per cent; Australia is .8 per cent, China is 7 per cent and Vietnam is 3.8 per cent. The conclusion that we would reach is that, although the standard of living is high in the traditional developed countries, the rate of improvement lies with our near Asian neighbours and this rate is moving at a fantastic speed.

We are told by the Arthur D. Little report that Australia must get into business with Asia. Therefore, we must be cognisant of Asian business ethics. Some of these ethical issues are discussed in the *Economic Review* of September 1993. I will mention just some of the issues. The first is the right to strike—a most divisive issue amongst business managers in Asia. Of those surveyed, slightly more than half—54 per cent—agreed that there should be the right to strike. The strongest support was from the Japanese at 80 per cent followed by Australia at 69 per cent and the Philippines at 61 per cent. Least likely to approve of the right to strike were the Singaporeans at 27 per cent, the Thais at 40 per cent and the Taiwanese at 40 per cent. As Asia grows wealthier and its middle class expands further, the activity of trade unions will become increasingly important.

Another issue relates to Asian management's major concerns which, in order of priority, were the supply of skilled staff (it was noted that unskilled staff were in plentiful supply in the Asian region); worker accuracy in quality and accuracy of output; the cost of labour; staff turnover; employee attendance and punctuality; and trade unions—in that order. Australian concerns in order of priority were slightly different. They were, first, trade unions; secondly, labour costs; and, thirdly, quality.

They were least concerned about skilled labour. In relation to business entertainment and gifts in the business culture, Australia, Singapore and Hong Kong tended to entertain clients by buying drinks and meals. However, in Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines and Indonesia, entertaining clients was mainly done by using nightclubs, monetary gifts, charity donations and escort services. Japan used nightclubs and monetary gifts for entertainment, whilst Malaysia was more prone to buying drinks and providing charity donation. Entertainment and gift giving to clients therefore varies with the business culture of the country.

Another divisive issue in Asia involves gender bias in pay and promotions. The question was put as to whether it was okay to pay a family man a higher wage than a single woman for doing the same job. One in three supported the practice, with Koreans, Singaporeans, Japanese and Indonesians most often in favour. A Hong Kong employer, on commenting about blue collar workers, stated that the male is worth a bit more than the female as they are more flexible and more willing to go beyond the call of duty. This rationale is not supported in Australia and only 14 per cent agree with the question.

Another question which was asked was whether promotion should be based on length of service and company loyalty. One in five supported the concept, with Korea, Taiwan, Thailand and Japan strongest in support, while Australia, Hong Kong and western expatriates most often objected. However, merit based promotion is becoming more acceptable and there is a prediction that there will be a significant shift to the merit based concept in three to five years. Thus, we can see that Asian business issues and ethics are quite different in many ways from the Australian business culture.

Finally, in this section I would like to comment in rather more detail about our mental health. The investigation into mental health by Burdekin, the Federal Human Rights Commissioner, described the situation as appalling and the services both in Government and in the private sector as inadequate. The findings are that the mentally disabled are discriminated against in all areas; from Government agencies, private medical funds, private psychiatrists, boarding house proprietors and throughout the whole of the general community. Governments have saved millions through the policy of moving people out of institutions into the community, but very little of the savings have been passed on to community based programs. Here in South Australia the community has been most concerned regarding the closure of Hillcrest. This particular hospital had arguably the highest standards in terms of treatment, facilities and medical staff for the mentally ill.

As the edict went out that we must deinstitutionalise and integrate our mentally disabled into the community, the closure of Hillcrest started, together with the withdrawal of services. The previous Government did this without first putting in place accommodation and care in the community. There was no infrastructure to receive some of our most vulnerable people into our community. Therefore, they were tossed into the general community and left to fend for themselves. I have heard that the standard of supported accommodation is dreadful, and I personally have seen photographs of Housing Trust homes where the mentally disabled are left to cope.

They are not coping well, as evidenced by the rat infested, dirty and unhygienic rooms that house the mentally disabled. I understand that they also are taken advantage of when they agree to exchange their television for a pair of shoes and further, when they become rowdy, the neighbours complain and the mentally disabled are again harassed by the police. This is all wrong. Integration into the community needs resource committed to provide the mentally disabled with a safe and caring haven in the community. As Burdekin

comments in the January 1994 edition of the magazine *Directions in Government*:

> We have dumped them in the community only to reinstitutionalise them, in many cases, in places that are less appropriate than where they came from.

The incidence of mental illness is not definitely known but an estimate is that 250 000 Australians, or 1.5 per cent of the population, suffer from severe mental illness. One in five adults has or will have some form of mental disorder. Schizophrenia affects approximately one per cent of the population or 170 000 Australians. Depressive disorders affect 10 per cent of the population. Dementia affects 5 per cent of people over the age of 65 years and 20 per cent over the age of 80 years. This is a great concern because, as we well know, our population in Australia is steadily ageing.

The principals for the protection of the mentally ill reaffirm the right to be protected from exploitation, whether economic, sexual or of other kinds; from abuse, whether physical or other forms; and from degrading treatment. In the Burdekin report there are some excerpts must which I must quote. In 'General Conclusions' he says:

> People affected by mental illness are amongst the most vulnerable and disadvantaged in our community. They suffer from widespread systematic discrimination and are consistently denied the rights and services to which they are entitled.

On the subject of mental health services he says:

> The promise of more and more effective, community based services following implementation of policies of deinstitutionalisation has not been realised. Most jurisdictions have not substantially redirected funds from expensive inpatient psychiatric institutions to community mental health services.

On community care and treatment:

> The inadequacies of existing community mental health services to treat, care for and support people with mental illness living in the community is disgraceful. Those services which do exist are grossly underfunded and underdeveloped.

On accommodation:

> People affected by mental illness face a critical shortage of appropriate and affordable housing. The absence of suitable accommodation is the single biggest obstacle to recovery and effective rehabilitation.

On people in rural and isolated areas:

> The irony is that in many of these areas, where the need is greatest, the services are fewest.

This is particularly the point in small country communities where mental health services are almost non-existent.

Further, more than five million Australians live outside major urban centres and more than half of those live in small rural towns or remote areas. These people have special needs in relation to mental health. Isolation, social factors associated with small scale communities and the effect of the recent severe rural recession can all exacerbate mental health problems. There appears to be a particular tension between effective recognition of the needs and rights of rural Australians affected by mental illness and the pressure of economic rationalism.

What is called for is a stricter licensing for boarding houses, better alternative accommodation, improved cooperation between Government agencies, education to change attitudes, and a redistribution of money to where it is really needed. The report asks for an urgent, concerted and effective response. So, even with the constant reminder that our State is in financial difficulties, we must address this most serious problem of our mentally disabled. We must allocate sufficient funds to this area for, as we all know, the strength of our community is in our weakest link, and this weak link at the present moment is our neglected mentally disabled. On that note of concern, I commend the motion to the Council.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ACTS INTERPRETATION (COMMENCEMENT PROCLAMATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate in Committee (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 100.)

Clause 2—'Commencement of Acts.'

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I move:

> Page 1, line 17—After 'in subsection (3)' insert 'that provides for the commencement of the Children's Protection Act 1993 or of a provision of that Act'.

The amendments which I have now put on file result from the discussion earlier in the Committee stage. There may be some argument as to whether this is the best way to achieve the objective, and maybe there are arguments that there are other ways we can consider doing it. Effectively, what the amendment seeks to do is vary the further proclamation date of 1 March 1994, which is the implementation date for family care meetings under the Children's Protection Act 1993. The amendment will defer the proclamation date to a future time when it will be possible to implement the scheme and then the provision will be repealed on 31 December 1994 by a proposed clause 3. That gives some flexibility.

As I indicated at an earlier stage, the advice which I have received is that four months should be sufficient time within which to put everything in place, and six months would be a reasonable time, but this builds in just some measure of safety. I can just reassure the Committee that it is the Government's intention to bring the legislative scheme into operation earlier rather than later.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: The amendments now proposed solve my principal concerns. It is not my preferred way of handling things. As I said during the second reading stage, I would prefer amendments to the Children's Protection Act itself. This is untidier, but within nine months what gets put into the Acts Interpretation Act will then disappear from print never to be seen again. It is a slightly untidy way of solving the problem. At least it does that, and I will not lose any sleep over it.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am not happy with this means of resolving this matter. The Attorney-General should have introduced an amendment to the Children's Protection Act. It is in my view a sloppy way to go about legislating. You put this obscure provision in the Acts Interpretation Act on the basis that at sometime in the future it will be taken out. People researching the matter will have to go to two Acts, instead of one, and that is the approach that should have been adopted in trying to simplify the law.

The honourable member no doubt has commented previously about simplification of the law and drafting things in a manner that is the easiest possible way for people in the community, not just lawyers, to understand. This will create confusion for lawyers as well as the general community, because you are dealing with a specific issue in a general Act. It is an unsatisfactory way to go about legislating. It is not the biggest issue in the world, as I acknowledge, but if you are going to do things you might as well do them properly. When this problem arose during the debate, I do not see why a Bill could not have been introduced to amend the Children's Protection Act, the specific Act we are dealing with. There would not have been any problem finding the change, but hiding it away in this manner in a general Act is a most unsatisfactory way of dealing with the problem.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I indicated when I moved the amendment that there may well be suggestions about how it should or should not be done.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I am not suggesting it is entirely satisfactory. The fact is that it is imperative to deal with this issue now. It has to go to the House of Assembly.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: We'll put a new Bill straight through.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: You have to get a new Bill prepared and printed.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: That will take about five minutes.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: No, it will take longer than that. I appreciate the comments which the Hon. Mr Elliott has made, and the comment made by the Leader of the Opposition, and I acknowledge that there is substance in the comments that they make. It is an issue which has to be addressed. When I first introduced the Bill, I believed that the issue of principle could have been dealt with rather than only the specific; I was wrong. The majority in the Committee is obviously concerned to deal with the specific. The amendment before us is, whilst untidy, nevertheless the quickest and simplest way of dealing with the issue to enable it to be addressed here and in the House of Assembly so it can be assented to this week, and the 1 March date be suspended by proclamation. I am afraid that there is no other reasonable and expeditious alternative, but I appreciate the indication from the Hon. Mr Elliott that he is prepared, notwithstanding that, to allow the amendment to pass.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

New clause 3—'Repeal of section 7(4a) of the principal Act.'

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I move:

New clause, page 1, after line 17—Insert new clause as follows:

3. Subsection (4a) of section 7 of the principal Act is repealed on 31 December 1994.

New clause inserted.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 109.)

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I support the motion, and in doing so thank the State Governor for the manner in which she opened the first session of the forty-eighth South Australian Parliament. She has, of course, been to the forefront of public life in this State for many years as a servant of the people in one way or another, and she continues to be a credit in all that she does and accomplishes, and long may she so continue.

Turning now, if I may, to the new members of this Council, I refer to the Hon. Sandra Kanck, the Hon. Angus Redford and last, but by no means least, the Hon. Robbie Lawson, the three of whom, in my opinion, made very fine maiden speeches, some of which contained some very fine principles, in particular that speech contributed by the Hon. Mr Lawson. At this point I would like to say that if death and taxes are two of the only certainties in life I would like to add a third to the inventory of knowledge of the three members in question, and that is that we on the Opposition benches of this Council will hold you to your principles—of that you can be assured. It would be remiss of me at this point—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: We don't have to worry about you, TC.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: Was that Legh Davis? I thought a wasp had attacked him in the head—a wood wasp or something. Oh well, what a pity; the wasp would have probably died. It would be remiss of me at this point if I did not mention the former members of this Council and their passing. I pay tribute to the Hon. Mr Bruce, the Hon. Bob Ritson, the Hon. Ian Gilfillan, and, of course, the late Hon. John Burdett and the late Hon. Jessie Cooper. The Hon. Gordon Bruce was, of course, President of this Council for the whole of the last Parliament, during which time, in my view, he served it very well and was a work colleague of mine in the old Liquor Trades Union, long before he ever became a member of this place.

Gordon will be best remembered for his forthright opinions and his ability to inject harmony into most groups with whom he came in contact, whilst in the personage of the Hon. Bob Ritson I found a man of exceeding great integrity and principle whom I personally shall sorely miss. I also mention the Hon. Ian Gilfillan who, in my opinion, was dealt with very severely at the last election in a manner which I found abhorrent in that some participants in the election appeared to have played the man and not the electoral policy substance. However, there may be more of that later, and at this time I have nothing further to add to my present comments, except to say that I wish the three former members well in their retirement and turn now to two deceased former members of this Council, namely the Hon. John Burdett and the Hon. Jessie Cooper.

The Hon. John Burdett was first known to me in his position as a Minister in the former Tonkin Government where, amongst other things, he held the ministerial overview of the Licensing Act. Because of that I often had to visit him as I was, at that time, the secretary of the old Liquor Trades Union. I am constrained to say, and place on record, that he never failed to see me when I requested. I also found that he always listened politely and carefully to what I had to say and if I could prove to his satisfaction that the union had rectitude on its side he equally never failed to act to correct the position which my union had found itself at odds with. He was, as a Minister, a true and humble servant of this State and it is a great tragedy that he did not live long enough to enjoy his retirement. I may also mention that he displayed enormous courage in the last six months of his life and I extend my heartfelt condolences to John's family.

Finally, I also offer similar condolences to the family of the late Mrs Jessie Cooper, who belonged to a long-time resident family of South Australia, namely, the Coopers of Cooper's Brewery fame. I came to know both her and the rest of the Coopers through my trade union connection and I would place on record that that establishment was amongst some of the very best employers I ever dealt with. The Hon. Jessie Cooper was no exception to that rule. I note with more than just a tinge of sadness her passing, and again my condolences go to her immediate family, most of whom are known to me, in their time of sadness at her passing.

I now turn to the new Liberal Government. I think it is fair to say that history will record that the Australian Labor Party suffered one of its most severe electoral defeats in this State's political history. This we on this side understand, and it did not come unexpectedly or entirely as a surprise to most of us. For those of us who believe in a parliamentary system of

Government this means that the Brown Government has been given a generous mandate by the South Australian people. However, it does not and, indeed, it should not mean that those of us who constitute Her Majesty's Opposition in this State have to remain passive in respect to those Government policies with which we disagree.

The Government will, I am sure, and should, note well that it could not win a majority in this Chamber and it ought not to complain about that given that it was one of its former leaders in this place, the Hon. Ren DeGaris, who fought long and hard to ensure that the present system—whereby members are elected to this Council—was put in place. And it is with that in mind that I now turn the attention of this Council to the statements made by the present Premier of this State on voluntary voting. I see in relation to the foregoing a recent press article indicating that there is much unease in the State Liberal Party rooms about the introduction of such a Bill and so, in my opinion, there should be.

Those of us who read a fair bit of history do well recall the election of Adolf Hitler, already referred to by one of my colleagues, the Hon. Mr Feleppa in his Address in Reply speech. But, as I said, those of us who read a fair bit of history do well recall the election of Adolf Hitler in pre-Second World War Germany where, with about 34 per cent of the vote, he became the leader of the largest political party in the Germany of that time, thus leading them on, by an ageing President Hindenberg, to be appointed Chancellor of what then became, in Hitler's view, the Third Reich.

However, in referring to that I must state that it is significant to note that in the election 30 per cent or more of the German people who were eligible to vote failed to do so and Germany and the rest of the world paid an awful price in the war that followed. In my view it was a price that probably would not have had to be exacted if compulsory voting had been in place in Germany at that time. Just as significantly, and in our times, too, the recent Russian elections saw the emergence of Vladimir Zhirinovsky, a Russian fascist, it is said, as the leader of the largest single Party in the present Russian Duma.

Again, he did this with 25 per cent of all votes cast, despite the fact that 50 per cent or more of the Russian electorate failed to vote. Those of us who have listened to the recent speeches of Mr Zhirinovsky must be fearful of what he proposes and sigh with the yearning of a compulsory voting system in the Russian State.

Further, I want to highlight this question that has been raised by the Premier concerning the ancient Greeks whose civilisation we use as a role model for democracy. They were so obsessed with each citizen discharging his or her democratic obligations to their society, but, Mr President, that democracy introduced in the early days a form of compulsory voting, and the form was as follows. Come election day, they would smash a large amphora or pottery storage bin into a multitude of pieces and distribute the pieces to those citizens who were entitled to vote. Ballot boxes were then provided for each candidate and each elector was given a shard of the broken jar. They would place it in the box of the candidate of their choice.

Even after the count of those shards of pottery was made, no winner was declared until such time as the amphora was rebuilt. It is significant to note that they went further: should one piece of that amphora be missing, the result of the election was declared null and void and the whole procedure entered into again. There we have it: the city States of ancient Greece, which our history and all our text books tell us was the cradle of democracy, showed us by their actions what they thought were the responsibilities of citizens in securing the government or candidate of their choice.

Nothing (and I mean 'nothing') has changed relative to that responsibility to this day, yet we have the Premier espousing the cause of voluntary voting in this State and threatening, as have political tyrants down through the ages, to interfere with the workings of this State Parliament if he, the Premier, does not get his way on this matter.

I, for one, pledge to the Council, irrespective of any threat by the Premier or anyone else, to fight this vicious legislation. It is legislation that some senior Liberal Party strategists believe will be to their political advantage. The term 'voluntary voting' used by the Premier is a misnomer, because no-one in South Australia is forced to vote. Under the law all enrolled citizens are required on election day to go to their polling booth and have their name struck off the electoral roll. It is certainly worth repeating that no-one is required by law to vote. One can see, therefore, that the term 'voluntary voting' is an absolute misnomer, because we have that now.

I say to the Premier that if he is still in the same frame of mind, irrespective of the opposition he is encountering from amongst his own ranks, 'Go your hardest in this matter and I, for one, will go my hardest to oppose you, along with my colleagues and, I trust, the Australian Democrats. No intimidatory threats shall deter me.'

Having disposed of that matter, I intend to speak of the new trade practices that will shortly come into being under the new General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). I intend to be fairly brief on this subject. If the agreed changes are implemented quickly, from the viewpoint of our agricultural export sector in this State, and other exports in South Australia in general, even though GATT did not go as far as it might have gone, I think the impact of GATT will be beneficial not only to South Australia but to our nation as a whole.

Although I am fearful of the potential for an all-out trade war between the USA and Japan, which could set back the implementation of GATT policies for months, if not years and which, were it to occur, would set back Australia's trading position to the detriment of all of us, and although I can understand the chagrin of the Americans about the tardiness of the Japanese in freeing up their markets, I fear also for the consequences of the bullying tactics of the Americans. The old truism that 'people in glass houses should not throw stones' is particularly applicable here. Ask BHP how the American anti-dumping laws are cruelly used to block our exports of Australian steel.

Indeed, ask our farmers about the way in which Australian beef exports to the US have been blocked from entering those markets. Ask our wheat farmers about the damage that was done to them when the Americans subsidised their wheat exports for several years to such an extent that our farmers—efficient at foodstuff growing as they are—could not compete on the world market. It strikes me that, if the Americans are to act as the conscience of the world in respect of free trade, they must first put their own house in order.

Moving on from GATT and the brief reference I have made to it, and knowing that in the brief time I have had available to me that I have not done it justice because of the enormous number of other considerations that I have not mentioned, I turn to the question of unemployment in Australia. It must be said that unemployment is not just an Australian problem but is a world-wide problem that will be with us for a long time to come. I do not agree with my State

and Federal colleagues who believe that some form of income tax should be levied to assist the unemployed. To go down that route would be only to apply a remedial band-aid to the position. Unemployment is an extremely serious problem and we will never resolve it by raising extra taxes. That would simply be a short-term answer to a problem that requires considerable thought and long-term solutions.

The unemployed deserve much better treatment than that. The level of permanent unemployment both here and internationally has been brought about by the all too rapid introduction of new technologies, particularly in the field of computer science. The benefit from such introduction which flows on to nations or a work force is merely coincidental. I believe that the pace and the rapidity of the introduction of new age technologies is aimed at maximising production and the profitability of the multi-corporates and their camp followers. In support of that proposition, I ask the Council to consider the number of jobs that have been lost here in South Australia, with our narrow industrial base and population of about 1.5 million people.

I believe that members would recall that, in the past decade and a half or so, thousands of jobs have been lost here in South Australia—job loss that came about through the introduction of word processors, computerised petrol pumps, computer ticketing machines in our public transport and the introduction of computers into supermarkets, the banking industry, and so on. This list is by no means exhaustive and, if we understand what that has meant in respect of job loss here in South Australia, then we see that truly the amount of job loss on a world scale is horrific and frightening. It is said by some that the introduction of the computer sciences into our industries will create as many jobs as are lost. In my view, this is a palpable lie, or at best an extreme distortion of the real truth.

Positive answers to these very serious problems do not lie in any new form of income tax levies or in any other form of tax levies as we currently understand the taxation system. We have to change the way we approach the problem of today's unemployed by developing new methods and providing gainful employment. The old WASP work ethic which were handed down to the world by 18th century Britain and which were made possible by the inventions of the Arkwrights, the Cartwrights, the Watts, the Stephensons and the John Loudon McAdams of that era are defunct. They are made all the more rapidly defunct by the speed with which we have introduced our New Age technologies into the work places of this earth.

I am no Luddite, but it seems to me that, whilst multinationals continue to operate globally as unchallenged as they are now, as out of reach of national Governments as they now are, the position of the unemployed will continue to get no better. In fact, I predict that it will continue to worsen until it becomes unbearable and, instead of the good government, which we currently enjoy, we will have anarchy, with all that implies with respect to the worsening condition of humankind on this earth, a position that I believe the majority of people do not want or desire. It is imperative that answers must be found which will provide long-term solutions and which will act to the benefit of the many and not just the privileged few.

To that end, I will now make a few points in conclusion. I believe that the break-up of nations which we are now witnessing is, with other things I have previously mentioned, most certainly not in the best interests of our global community. I watch with ever more increasing despair as people the world over revert to ethnic groupings, and areas which spring to my mind are the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, Lebanon, Afghanistan, Ireland and many others, such as the Kurds, Basques and the Macedonians, to name just a few. I suppose if I were to name them all it would almost sound like a roll-call of members of the United Nations as it is currently constituted. Such is the widespread nature of the problem of modern ethnicity that the world as we know it is desperately crying out to have international mechanisms in place in order that we may effectively apply correct and proper solutions to the problems that beset us.

These include unemployment, the ever-dwindling nature of the earth's resources and potable water supply (and most of these things are used up for profitability and not need), and the enormous and ever-increasing environmental problems which pose such a dangerous threat to our earth and its inhabitants, such as the proper distribution of the earth's food resources on the basis of need, and so on. This list is by no means endless, but it is very daunting and, as previously said, in order to address it we must set up a mechanism which can properly and effectively deal with these problems which beset us. Certainly, the multinationals have already shown us the way. Just as they have found that they operate at maximum efficiency and profitability by globalising their operations, then most assuredly that is the only way for the inhabitants of this earth to proceed if they are to find meaningful solutions to the current global problems.

I know that some of my colleagues in this Council and elsewhere, including some of my colleagues on this side of the Chamber, will be constrained to say, 'Did you hear poor old Trevor going off again today? He's right, you know, but what does he expect us here in little old South Australia to do about it? It is too big for us to handle, too big for us to do anything about it. Let's put it into the 'too hard to handle' box. Let someone else deal with it. It will be all right eventually and it will go away.'

But you see, Mr President, that is the frightening thing: Governments everywhere, with few exceptions, are saying the very same thing. Nothing will ever be achieved if that is our attitude whilst in the meantime, because of this 'let's sit on our hands, she'll be right, mate' attitude, the world as we know it keeps slipping down the plug hole of despair.

I say to all my colleagues here, 'Let us here in South Australia be the first elected Parliament in the world to take action, irrespective of Party or creed, and let our various united voices be heard.' We owe that at least to the people who elected us all. We owe it to our children and our grandchildren and indeed to all our descendants. The ability-to-survive clock in earth's time is most assuredly at five minutes to midnight. Time is not on this earth's side. There is after all but one earth. The majority of this planet's inhabitants have nowhere left to run. You know I am right, Mr President. I believe I am right, and that it is fitting that South Australians, in this year of female suffrage, through the first Parliament in this world to give females the vote, bequeath yet another initiative and yet another first to this earth and our descendants, that is, the right to survive as a terrestrial race on this earth. I say to all members, 'Let us be as one on these issues.' I conclude by commending the Address in Reply to this Chamber.

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.25 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 23 February at 2.15 p.m.