

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 17 February 1993

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

### PETITIONS

#### PRISONER SENTENCES

A petition signed by 11 610 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to provide for mandatory prison sentences for serious driving, larceny and firearm offences was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

#### SCHOOL COUNCILS

A petition signed by 99 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to transfer responsibility for schools from the Education Department to school councils was presented by Mr McKee.

Petition received.

#### STATE BANK

The **Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Premier)**: I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. LYNN ARNOLD**: The losses of the State Bank have had a direct and severe impact on the level of State debt, the cost to the State budget and the burden it potentially imposes on the people of South Australia. In January this year, the State Government commissioned financial advisers Baring Brothers Burrows to value the bank so that we could assess whether it would be in the State's best financial interests to sell or retain the bank. It has become clear during that process that a sale of the bank would be in the best interests of South Australia—

*Members interjecting:*

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. Leave has been granted for the Premier to make a ministerial statement. The House granted permission and he will be given that right. The Premier.

The **Hon. LYNN ARNOLD**:—if it were accompanied by a compensation package from the Federal Government to cover the loss of the Commonwealth company tax equivalent currently obtained by the State. The Federal Labor Government has now offered South Australia an assistance package that goes well beyond tax compensation. The Prime Minister (Mr Keating) has resolved the critical issue with a package of grants and debt relief with a net present value of \$600 million. The Commonwealth assistance, including tax compensation, together with the proceeds of the sale of the bank, will reduce the State's debt by an amount significantly more than \$1 billion below the level it would otherwise have been.

I will be recommending to my Cabinet colleagues, my Caucus and my Party, but most importantly the people of South Australia, that the State Bank of South Australia be sold to reduce the State's debt. The sale will be subject to receiving an appropriate price reflecting the value of the bank as an asset to the State. Sale of the bank alone will not at a stroke solve the State's debt problem. Some difficult decisions will still have to be taken by my Government in the context of the strategy that will be presented in my forthcoming economic statement.

The special financial assistance the Prime Minister has announced today will allow the State Government to proceed with certainty with an important component of that strategy. The bank will be brought into the Commonwealth tax net free of tax losses from 1 July 1994 and all its existing tax losses will be extinguished. The existing arrangements for prudential supervision of the State Bank by the Reserve Bank of Australia will be formalised in legislation no later than 1 January 1994.

The process of selling any major asset is a lengthy one, in all probability extending over more than one year. There will be ample opportunity for consultation and planning on the many issues that will arise. The Government will pay particular attention to the interests of the bank's staff and customers in the course of planning and implementing the sale.

### QUESTION TIME

#### STATE BANK

The **Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition)**: My question is directed to the Premier and concerns the State Bank. Why did the South Australian Government agree in its deal with Mr Keating to surrender tax losses held within the State Bank group which have a market value of almost \$200 million? The State Bank group is holding significant tax losses on account of former corporate entities such as Beneficial Finance. It can be calculated from the 1991-92 accounts of the bank that the value of those losses is \$195 641 000. Had these not been withdrawn in the deal with Mr Keating, as the Premier has just outlined, these losses would have been available to the purchaser of the bank and/or the purchaser of Beneficial Finance to count as an asset to offset against future tax payments. The effect of this deal will be considerably to reduce the price the State Government can ask for the bank, with the result that the net value of Mr Keating's offer is perhaps no more than \$400 million.

*Members interjecting:*

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The Leader will resume his seat. In the history of this State, there has probably been nothing as important to the future of the State than the State Bank and its sale or what we do with it. The State of South Australia deserves to hear the question and the answer clearly, so they are fully understood, as every member here has a responsibility to do. The Leader.

The **Hon. DEAN BROWN**: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Mr Keating is giving \$600 million with one hand and taking \$200 million away with the other.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The points raised by the honourable member with respect to tax losses and their value is highly conjectural, as there are certainly lots of tax losses around the place for people to take up. In any event, there is considerable conjecture about the real value of those tax losses held not only by the State Bank and its subsidiaries but also by other companies that hold tax losses around the place at the moment. So, this matter was taken into account in arriving at the—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Goyder is out of order. The Leader was protected in asking the question and the Premier will be protected in answering it. The Premier.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The question relates to the net value they may have had in any final financial deal, but the point is that what we have from the Prime Minister is a very generous offer of \$600 million net present value—an offer on the table, direct from the Leader of the Federal Government. That is unlike the sort of offer that we had sneaking its way through media interviews and all sorts of back of the envelope work that the Leader of the Opposition seems to have been doing with Mr Reith. In fact, the offer is not even on the table—it is a figure of some \$400 million quoted by the Leader.

The point about this offer is that it is on the table: it is a public offer. The Prime Minister has quite clearly made his view known as to where he stands on this matter. When he was here two weeks ago he indicated his view again about the State Bank and his willingness to look at South Australia's financial position. I said at the time that, with respect to the State Bank component of that, there were no figures for us to take into account; how could I make any recommendations to my Cabinet colleagues on the matter of the sale or non-sale of the State Bank when there were no figures on the table? I wanted figures on the table. That set in train even more detailed discussions over the intervening period, including a visit of the Federal Treasurer last week, and now we have on the table figures that tell us that there will be \$600 million from Paul Keating if the State Bank were to be sold.

I remind members that the key issue in this is that this deal will be accepted—this will be recommended to my Cabinet and to the Government—if we can obtain a fair market price for the bank. That process, of determining the fair market price in terms of assessing the options to maximise that, or determining what options may be before the Government, has been under way now for a couple of months and will be concluded reasonably soon. I repeat the point that I will recommend to my Cabinet and to my colleagues the sale of the bank and the acceptance of this offer if we can obtain a fair market price for the bank and its assets.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader is out of order. This is a very important time. Question Time seems to be getting more and more ragged, and it will not continue: the next member to interject perhaps will have to answer for it.

## AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

**Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell):** Will the Premier confirm reports that Mitsubishi has again threatened to cease its Australian operations if the Federal Coalition is elected on 13 March? Will the Premier quantify the damage to the South Australian economy which will result from such a closure, and will he assure the South Australian community that the State Government will do everything within its power to oppose the disastrous policies of the Federal Coalition which would result in such action by Mitsubishi? My office has been inundated by calls from employees of Mitsubishi and their families and from related motor vehicle component manufacturers concerned about the effects a Federal Coalition victory would have on their job prospects.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** It is very important to note the comments of Chas Alan yesterday on radio about this matter, and it is also important to note the views expressed yesterday not only by Mitsubishi but also by Toyota on this matter. It is quite clear where they line up with respect to the automotive industry and Federal Government policy. It is quite clear from their own words—not words put into their mouths. They are business people; they know how to earn a dollar; they know how to read profits and losses; they know when they are making a profit and when they are losing money; and they know that, with tariffs reduced to zero or negligible levels, they would be losing money by continuing to manufacture in this country. They do not have to be told by Government or anybody else what would actually end up happening; they can work that out. They are pretty clever people; they can actually do that.

The answer from Toyota and Mitsubishi is that a Federal Coalition Government would not be on for developing the automotive industry in this country. I believe it is very important the Federal Coalition hears that message quickly and reacts to it, as it has done with respect to so many other things. Yesterday we saw how the sugar tariff issue caused Hewson to change yet another aspect of his Fightback package. He decided, 'Hang on, this is going to cost us too many votes so we will change that', but he then went on to say, 'But we are not going to change the automotive industry.' Maybe now he will start listening to people who are employing people in the automotive industry in this country.

In the case of South Australia, some 20 000 people are employed directly in the automotive industry, including the component makers, plus a factor of three times that in terms of employment generally within the State related to the automotive industry. Maybe he will start listening to that and realise it is time for a change. I might say people are commenting about reports in this morning's paper. It was interesting to note that the State Leader of the Opposition mumbled that he would refer to the matter to Mr McLachlan—

**Mr BRINDAL:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

*The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:*

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

**Mr BRINDAL:** The Premier is debating the answer and I ask you, Mr Speaker, to rule on that.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will resume his seat.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The Leader of the Opposition this morning simply said, 'I will refer the matter to Mr McLachlan.' He did not have the guts to stand up for the automotive industry in this State himself; instead, he chose just to try to buck pass it away, flick it a way, because he does not want to know about the problems of the automotive industry and what it contributes to this State's economy. I might say that he has refused to sign the letter which I offered to him to sign and which I have already signed.

**An honourable member:** Shame!

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** And I think it is a shame, when other people in other States are prepared to stand up for important sectors of their State's economy. When I as Premier am prepared to do that for important sectors of this State's economy, it really behoves the Leader of this State Opposition, if he is precisely that, somebody attempting to represent part of this State, to do exactly the same: stand up for the automotive industry in this State and the role that it plays in our State's economy.

#### STATE BANK

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the Premier. In the light of his statement today, will the State Government insist that any purchaser of the State Bank guarantees that a head office banking operation and a full branch network remains in South Australia?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** If the—

**Mr S.J. Baker:** Yes or no?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** When it comes back, the report on the fair market valuation and the options will be considered by the Government, which will obviously consider my recommendation to them on this matter. If that proceeds further, it will lead to a proper, professional, commercial sale process that will consider all the factors that need to be considered.

I have indicated that it will not be a rushed process. There are things that have to be worked through—they will be worked through. There are issues that have to be worked through in terms of the staff and customers of the bank, and they will be worked through. Each one of those issues will be properly and fairly addressed. That is the important point that we need to look at—to have that assessment come back as to what the most viable options are and to proceed down that path.

I can guarantee members in this place that I will keep them posted about those developments, as I have done over time with respect to the discussions that have been taking place.

#### FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh):** Can the Premier advise the House of any financial assessment he has had made of the relative value of the Hewson and Keating tax compensation packages for the sale of the State Bank?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** It is—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** It is actually an important question.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I remind members of the Keating offer: the Keating offer is net present value, a package of grants and debt relief with a net present value of \$600 million.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Let us look at the Hewson package. The Hewson package, if the accounts having been heard are correctly reported, seems to be a stream of compensation payments over 10 years of about \$40 million each, or up to—that is the phrase used—\$400 million in nominal terms. Let me translate the nominal terms, because the Leader was trying to do some mathematics before. He was trying to do some taking away from this, thinking of a figure, and doing it from that. He was trying to get the \$600 million back to the \$400 million figure in the Hewson package, but he was not comparing like with like.

If he is going to take the net present value of the figure that has been offered by John Hewson, it is not \$400 million—it is \$158 million less than that. In fact, the figure comes to \$242 million. That is what the \$600 million equates with. We have \$600 million from the Keating Government and \$242 million from John Hewson. The Leader shakes his head. That is calculated at an 8.5 per cent discount rate which, by all reasonable assessments, is a fair discount rate to use in this calculation.

Clearly, there is a major difference in the benefit to South Australians out of these two packages. There is silence now, because they can work it out. It does not take too much to work out that \$600 million is worth substantially more-over twice as much—as \$242 million. That is comparing like with like—net present value, \$600 million from one and \$242 million from the other.

#### STATE BANK

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles):** Will the Premier confirm that the management of the State Bank has for some time been making intensive preparations for its sale, preparations which include dividing corporate clients into two groups—those whose loans will be transferred from 30 April and those whose loans will not be guaranteed after 30 April this year; requiring clients with corporate loans to obtain independent valuations; providing clients with current documentation of longstanding overdraft arrangements; and arranging termination contracts for senior staff to take effect from 30 April? Did the Premier give instructions for these preparations and, if he did not, when was he made aware of them?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** As to the first question, my answer is, 'Not to my knowledge.' As to the second question, 'No.'

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Henley Beach.

## INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** Mr Speaker—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Henley Beach.

**Mr FERGUSON:** I direct my question to the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety. What are the benefits of South Australia's industrial relations system, and how does it differ from that of the Kennett-Howard model of industrial relations?

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** I thank the member for Henley Beach for his question. We all know that he has had a long involvement in industrial relations in this State and has some knowledge of it.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** Our Labor Party Government at both the national and the State level supports a proven industrial relations system which is flexible and which enhances efficiency and equity in the workplace. This industrial relations system has been studied by the new Administration in America to see how it can be transferred into that system so that it can deliver wage justice to the workers in that country.

I want to share with this House the experience of one of our senior conciliation judges when he attended a recent international conference in Geneva. He was explaining to those people what was happening within the Australian context and the view that was being expressed by the Liberal/National Party Coalition at the national level. All those people expressed surprise to him that the Coalition would want to go down that route because, in their countries when they went down that route, they had had wage inflation, stagflation and unemployment.

They were envious of what was happening in Australia, where we had seen a considerable amount of restructuring which, incidentally, was led by the union movement—and only those employers smart enough to know about it cottoned on to it and implemented it, and they are the ones who are surviving and are leading, and are exporting overseas. The people who are being advocated and supported by the Liberal Party opposite are people who are going into oblivion.

Our policy of consulting with the unions and involving the management and employers to ensure that workplace reform takes place and that it is implemented on a sustainable basis is in stark contrast to that of the Opposition. The Opposition's policy would never have been able to bring about a national contract, which will enable the working of a national railways system to bring about a peaceful reduction from a multitude of unions to two. The thrust of its policy is low pay, low skill.

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** The member for Victoria interjects by saying it is a joke. His knowledge of industrial relations in the broad sense could be written on the back of a small pinhead with a big nibbed pen. He laughs, but he knows it is true. He has had no experience in that large area of the world. The move from compulsory arbitration and centralised wage fixing to individual contracts will place a large number of people under enormous pressure. I can understand why members opposite want to do that: they want the right of

award freedom to be able to force wages down and to pay low wages.

The member for Victoria smiles and smirks about that, but it is exactly what he and his friend, Mr McLachlan—the leader in the national area in this knocking down to no tariffs—want. They want to reduce the wages of Australian workers so that they go down to very low levels. They are the people who want to pay \$3 an hour to young people when they go into the work force and, when they are a bit older, \$3.50. That is what they want to do, and that is why they want to destroy the award system—so they can do it.

I have listened to the national leaders of the Party; I have listened to how they intend to do this. They will keep the award system, but they will not allow it to move. They know that in time the award system at that plateau will mean starvation wages for a lot of people. I remind the Opposition that over 135 000 female workers will be at the mercy of their employers in this State when that happens, because they are the most vulnerable in this area. Our studies show that. They will not have the protection of awards, and the Opposition knows that.

We have a policy that will protect workers and provide not only for the advancement of skill but for our industry to move forward into the future. Ours is a policy that provides for the future; theirs is a policy that pulls us back into the past.

## STATE BANK

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** My question is directed to the Premier. Will he give a guarantee that all the proceeds from the sale of the State Bank—the sale price received by the Government and the financial assistance to be provided by the Commonwealth—will be used to reduce South Australia's \$8 000 million—plus State debt?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I do not want to get into an argument right now about how the member for Bragg has misused figures. We have had some debate about the level of State debt, so I would draw the member for Bragg's attention to the previous statement made by the Deputy Premier as Treasurer in the ministerial statement made last week on the level of State debt. I suggest that the honourable member could do with a little self-education on that matter.

The whole purpose of this exercise, subject to receiving—and I make this point—a fair market price, is to help this State be in a better financial situation, and the reality is that we are facing very difficult financial circumstances at this time. We do have a debt problem that is of concern to all of us. We do have, as a result of the recession which is now technically finished and which we are slowly tracking out of as a country, recurrent budget difficulties and, if those recurrent budget difficulties are to be resolved by a total balancing of the budget without any package of assistance, there would be an enormous burden in terms of what would have to happen to services in this State.

But the clear point is that this is about trying to manage the debt situation effectively on behalf of South Australians and this package is about doing that; this package is about seeing our debt reduced in this State as part of a process of ongoing reductions to bring us back to the level that we believe this State should be at in

terms of debt servicing. I remind members of the achievements of this Government from 1982 to 1990, until the time of the State Bank, when there was a significant reduction in the State GDP that went on State debt.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Members opposite do not want to look at that question. Prior to the State Bank problems State debt was reduced as a proportion of GDP from about 24-25 per cent down to 16 per cent.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** It is not spurious at all; these are actual figures—this is what actually happened. This is how this Government, when it had the opportunity to do so, targeted debt reduction in this State. Then, of course, we have the problem forced on us by the State Bank: that has been a major problem for all South Australians, and a royal commission is under way at the moment examining all the issues behind that. But where it came to debt issues directly under the control of the State Government we have worked solidly to bring about debt reduction in this State. It is therefore quite clear that our track record shows that this is the direction that we want to go in; a direction of bringing back again the level of State debt in this State, both in *per capita* terms and also in terms of measurement against GDP.

#### VISA CARD

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Baudin):** My question is directed to the Minister representing the Attorney-General in another place. Will the Attorney, using whatever public authorities are appropriate, have investigated the circumstances in which my constituent, Mr Anthony Brooks, of Port Willunga, while on an overseas trip last year had his Visa card withdrawn without notice and without explanation, leaving him with nine pounds sterling in his pocket and forcing him to borrow from relatives despite the fact that there were, as was later revealed, ample funds in his account? My explanation will be brief, because I will use another form of the House at the end of Question Time to further expand on this matter. If I can take advantage of the generosity of the House—

**The SPEAKER:** I ask the honourable member to come back to the explanation.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Certainly, Sir; I am just thanking you for your generosity. In May 1992 Mr Brooks and his wife set out on a 10-week trip around the world. In mid-June he attempted to obtain a cash advance on his Visa card at a Barclays bank in Worcester, to be informed by the teller that the card was withdrawn. This very nearly wiped out what Mr Brooks had seen as the highlight of the trip, to Greece, and subjected him to considerable humiliation. Protracted inquiries through Visa Hindmarsh Co-op have failed to produce any admission of fault on behalf of Visa Hindmarsh Co-op or anyone else. Indeed, two mutually conflicting explanations have been offered him.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for his question. It may well fall also under the responsibility of the Minister of Consumer Affairs, so I

will have the matter referred to both the Attorney-General and the Minister responsible for consumer affairs. I also add that the honourable member's constituent may well seek legal advice because a remedy could be available in the civil courts as a result of what appears to be negligence on the part of the credit provider.

#### STATE BANK

**Mr OLSEN (Kavel):** I direct my question to the Premier. Will the State Bank be sold by a proper form of tendering and, if not, does that mean that there have already been negotiations with one of Australia's major private banks about the purchase of the State Bank?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** In answer to the second question, 'No'. In answer to the first question, I indicated before that a proper, professional and commercial sale process will be undertaken if it is the decision that a fair market price can be obtained.

#### SATCO/WOODS AND FORESTS MERGER

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** Will the Minister of Primary Industries advise the House of the current position of the merger of Woods and Forests and SATCO into a Government-owned company, Forward Products Pty Ltd? Will he also advise the House when the time line for this merger is to occur? I understand that one key union, which is involved, is holding a stop work meeting this Thursday, 18 February, in the South-East regarding the industrial implications of the merger. My particular concerns relate to whether the relevant unions have had the opportunity to be involved in the merger negotiations.

**The Hon. T.R. GROOM:** I thank the honourable member for her question for this is indeed a most delicate matter. The trade union concerned is having a stop work meeting tomorrow. It is a most delicate matter because of the industrial implications. There has been extensive consultation—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.R. GROOM:** The honourable member knows there has been very extensive consultation.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will direct his response through the Chair.

**The Hon. T.R. GROOM:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I apologise. The fact of the matter is that there has been a very extensive consultation process, particularly since last July when the merger was announced. The timber processing, marketing and related operations of both Woods and Forests and SATCO were resolved to be incorporated into a single entity, and the vehicle for that amalgamation process was to be a private company, although that private company is to be wholly Government owned.

As the member for Mount Gambier knows, the reason behind this is that the saw mills currently lose something like \$8 million to \$10 million a year. That is simply not sustainable. One cannot build a long-term industry in the South-East based on losses of that magnitude and it is important that we achieve improved use of our resources,

increased efficiency and profitability and that we reach international competitiveness. Otherwise, we will steadily lose our markets simply because we cannot compete.

As part of the merger process, an amalgamation committee, which was a fairly top level committee, was set up to oversee the amalgamation process, and there was an industrial working party. When the Forward Products Board, which is the wholly owned company and the merger vehicle, is put in place—the merger date is 19 February—the issue will be what to do with the amalgamation committee. All parties were aware that the amalgamation committee would cease and that its functions would be taken over by the Forward Products Board and that the industrial matters would be dealt with by the industrial working party.

The unions have asserted that the winding up of the amalgamation committee is the reason for the stop work meeting. The reality is that the issue is whether the merged vehicle should be a statutory corporation, which the trade union movement prefers, or whether it should be a private company, albeit Government owned.

The difference, of course, is the nature of the industrial relationship and the award structure. I have guaranteed that all Woods and Forests and SATCO permanent employees would be employed under the same terms and conditions under which they have worked in the past and that the temporary and new employees from 20 February would be employed by the proprietary limited company, and that is a very delicate industrial situation that needs to be handled with great sensitivity. I urged the unions (which have now virtually withdrawn from the industrial working party and are demanding the reinstatement of the amalgamation committee, which is just not practicable or feasible) that the consultation and communication process be kept open, because what is at issue is that I as Minister and the Government are determined to ensure that a viable industry survives in the South-East and that jobs are preserved and not lost.

#### STATE BANK

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I direct my question to the Premier. Will the proposed sale of the State Bank require ratification of the ALP State Convention and, if so, when does he intend to seek that approval?

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BECKER:** You cannot do anything without the convention.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** No.

#### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr HERON (Peake):** Will the Minister of Education, Employment and Training explain why in reality, although the Liberal Party is saying that the GST will not apply to child-care, every child-care centre will face increased costs to recover rebates on goods and services consumed by the centres, and obviously those costs will need to be passed on to the parents?

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I thank the honourable member for his continuing interest in and support for child-care in this State. On the face of it—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will resume her seat until the Opposition is finished. The Minister of Education, Employment and Training.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. On the fact of it, certainly what Dr Hewson is saying is that GST will not apply to child-care, but let us look at what this means in reality. In reality it means that, in order for this to apply, a massive amount of paperwork will need to flow between the centres and the tax office.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** The interjections are interesting, because I think I understand—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will resume her seat. I have spoken to the member for Goyder on three or four occasions already. He has continually interjected. I will not warn him now, but I caution him very strongly about continued interjections. The Minister of Education, Employment and Training.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I most certainly do understand very clearly the implications of the Federal Opposition's policy on child-care, because let me remind the House that the cost of every service provided by plumbers, electricians, carpenters and, most importantly (because most child-care centres do use their services), accountants, plus the costs of purchasing playground equipment, toys, books, colouring-in equipment, paints, paper, pencils and so on, as well as all local and State Government services such as electricity, water and gas, will all be increased by the impost of a goods and services tax. So, what a nonsense it is for the member for Goyder to be suggesting that I do not understand the implications of the Opposition's GST on child-care. Each centre will also have to account for all these costs; they will have to levy the GST in terms of a book entry at nought per cent and they will then have to keep records. They will get a rebate at a later date, but it will not apply to all these areas.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** It does not. Let me just remind members that the amount of work and the extra costs incurred by child-care centres in New Zealand is very interesting to look at. Not only will there be extra costs but, as I understand it, a person will need to be employed to work almost full-time on the paper work required, and this is based on the—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** They do not like this, because it is a fact. I ask members across the Chamber to refer themselves to New Zealand to look at this. By comparison, I would like to inform the House of what the Labor Party will be doing: we will be assisting child-care services to reduce the cost; we will be reducing the cost of child care, not increasing it.

*Mr Ingerson interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** They really do not like this because it has struck home that child-care centres and parents sending their children to child care will not like this policy. The Federal Government has announced that it will guarantee a sales tax exemption for goods used by long day care centres, outside school hours care, vacation care services and occasional care centres, and

they will coordinate the family day care services into units. This exemption will cover all goods purchased for the provision of care and will mean savings of about \$40 million to the child-care industry over four years. This policy is being and will continue to be warmly received by both private and community based child-care agencies. Indeed, it is in stark contrast to the Federal Opposition's child care policy which increases the cost of the provision of services in this area.

*Mr Olsen interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Kavel has had a good go here today; I think he should take notice of his actions.

#### STATE BANK

**Mr SUCH (Fisher):** When did the Premier first recognise that the debt burden imposed by the State Bank, in the words of the Prime Minister today, 'goes beyond the capacity of South Australia to resolve without placing undue burden on the citizens of this State'? Previous statements made to this Parliament by the Premier, the former Premier and the current Treasurer have denied this grave financial position.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Last year, when I was making some statements about the State economy and the fact that I was going to come out with a State economic statement in the first quarter of this year, I indicated that some attention would have to be paid to the management of the State's debt. Clearly, there does have to be a statement about the management of the State's debt. The question then is how it is done. If there is no assistance package, clearly you manage it without help, but it then becomes much more difficult. We have a very generous offer of \$600 million and, if you compare what that does to the capacity of Government to deliver services that the community expects and to manage the debt strategy compared with if we did not have the \$600 million, quite clearly there is a major difference. If one package does not have \$600 million in it, it is much harder to address.

Consequently, the impact of that on the level of Government expenditures on the sorts of services that South Australians want will be much more severe indeed. That is the issue that is at stake here: whether or not an unreasonable burden was to be put on South Australians or a burden that will itself be difficult any way, but not a burden that would have been unreasonable had a \$600 million figure been taken out of the equation. What we have here is a \$600 million figure that is in the equation that suddenly makes that situation so much better—not, as my statement says, eliminates the problem—than otherwise would have been the case, and certainly significantly better than the Opposition offer of net present value of \$242 million.

#### DUCK HUNTING

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** Can the Minister of Environment and Land Management inform the House of what the Government is doing about the use of lead shot for the hunting of water birds around the State other than in game reserves? Lead shot has been banned from being used in all game reserves. As there are many wetland

areas not in game reserves, what is the situation with respect to these areas?

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I thank the member for Price for his question because an important announcement is to be made in relation to people who are interested in the hunting of ducks, particularly as we get close to the announcement of the duck season. Certainly, from the position of the field and game shooters, the Hellenic Shooters Association, the Nature Conservation Society and the Ornithological Association there is a great deal of interest about what is happening. As members would know, the South Australian Government has set an Australian precedent in not only recognising the effects of lead shot on water birds but also in requiring steel shot to be used on game reserves in wetlands. As a consequence of discussions I have held with the organisation representing the interest groups, Cabinet has made a decision that there will be a 12-month moratorium on the prohibition of lead shot for duck hunting from 1993 to 1994 in those private reserves. That moratorium is subject to the following conditions: no further extension of the prohibition be granted; steel shot to be compulsory on all game reserves and voluntary by negotiation on private wetlands; and acceptance and implementation of the pledge made by hunting organisations to be actively involved in educating their members in the use of non-toxic shot.

It is important that we look at the reasons behind this. I must say that I have the support of the organisations in putting the moratorium in place knowing that we have some serious safety and animal welfare issues to address. For a number of years the Government has been aware of a number of issues involved in the cessation of the use of lead shot in hunting water fowl. Of course, there is the need to implement an alternative to lead shot. However, there are some safety aspects that come into play. Due to the higher breech pressures in firearms using steel shot, there is a safety issue and a need for suppliers of guns and ammunition and the industry to make adjustments for that. Of course, when we look at existing or new weapons there is a need for modification.

Also, animal welfare issues come in: steel shot differs from lead shot in ballistic details and used over a distance of 40 metres will have a different outcome, requiring the training of the shooter; and there are the effects resulting in a different kind of damage to the ducks. Duck hunters must be educated to recognise water fowl, and that is also an important aspect that we need to address. The Government has an open mind to the use of alternatives to steel shot, but in considering any alternative we must show beyond doubt that it is not toxic.

#### KINGSTON, MEMBER FOR

**Mr MATTHEW (Bright):** Is the Premier aware that Federal Minister Bilney is so worried about how 'the mess caused by the State Government's handling of the State Bank' will impact on his seat of Kingston that he has changed his address on the Federal electoral roll to give himself another vote, and will the Premier invite the State Electoral Commissioner to ensure that Mr Bilney is correctly enrolled for the next State election?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I have some difficulty in reconciling the question with Standing Orders. A question can be directed only to a member of the House in connection with their responsibility to the House. The Premier would not be responsible in any way for the Federal member for Kingston-

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Perhaps if the honourable member rephrased his question to address the electoral roll rather than the electorate of Kingston it would be more acceptable.

**Dr ARMITAGE:** Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Standing Order 96 provides:

1. questions relating to public affairs may be put to Ministers—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. Standing Orders provide that questions must relate to the responsibilities that Ministers have to the House. The Premier is not responsible for the member for Kingston. Perhaps the honourable member can rephrase his question and relate it to the electoral roll.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I have ruled the question out of order. The House will come to order. The member for Bright will resume his seat. I have ruled the question out of order because of the facts that I have put to the House. There is certainly a way in which the question can be phrased so that it is acceptable. I see the member for Adelaide leaping to his feet again with his little green book. Standing Orders clearly provide that all members are answerable only for their responsibilities to the House.

**Dr ARMITAGE:** Mr Speaker, Standing Order 96 categorically provides:

1. questions relating to public affairs may be put to Ministers, and

2. questions may be put to other members but only if...in the opinion of the Speaker, (they) are responsible to the House.

**The SPEAKER:** The Chair does not believe that the question is valid under the Standing Orders of the House. The member for Bright.

**Mr MATTHEW:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, at the end of my question I did ask whether the Premier would invite the State Electoral Commissioner to ensure that Mr Bilney is correctly enrolled for the next State election. I believe that was in accordance with the question posed to me in your earlier ruling.

**The SPEAKER:** Again, it is Mr Bilney's responsibility correctly to have his name on the enrolment. It is the responsibility not of the Premier but of Mr Bilney. The honourable member for Stuart.

### OIL SPILL

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** Can the Minister of Environment and Land Management advise the House of the current position regarding the monitoring of the Port Bonython oil spill? This matter is obviously of major concern to electors in my District of Stuart and probably the State as a whole because of the long-term effects on that area.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I thank the member for Stuart for her question; she has exhibited a vital interest in this matter over the past few months, since the spill on 30 August. It affects not only her constituents but industries located in her electorate. We have had the opportunity to get support from the private sector in relation to a monitoring program. However, there is a weakness in overall monitoring at a national level, and I hope that in future this type of monitoring will be covered under the national oil spill plan.

I intend to raise with my other State colleagues and the Federal Minister the concept of our having a national approach to the monitoring of oil spills and other chemical spills so that, rather than having to go through the pain and agony we have been through, we can come to a quick solution to address these needs. There is a need, as I am sure the honourable member will appreciate, to address this issue rapidly because of the likely impact on the areas concerned, particularly on the mangrove sediments and the commercial fish stocks within those regions. The bird populations as well can be directly affected, as can seagrass and other fauna associated with the inland areas of the coast.

We will undertake a three year monitoring program, the cost of which we estimate to be about \$120 000. Although that does sound expensive, from the point of view of our off-sets we have received support from a number of significant companies: BHP Australia, Howard Smith Industries and Santos will each contribute \$10 000, and Adelaide Steamship is putting in \$5 000. The Department of Mines and Energy, through my colleague the Deputy Premier, has made a contribution of \$10 000. So, we are able to off-set that \$120 000 with a \$45 000 contribution from other sources.

It is important that we undertake this very thoroughly so that we can assess the impact of this oil spill and the future needs that we might have to address if we ever face such a catastrophe again. I hope we do not, but we have to be prepared and, in being prepared, we have to have a monitoring program which can respond rapidly to the needs. What I hope we will see as part of the national oil spill plan is that this will be instituted very shortly.

### ON-COURSE TELEPHONE BETTING

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** I address my question to the Minister of Recreation and Sport. Is the Government still going to proceed with a commitment it made on 1 January to introduce on-course telephone betting for bookmakers now that the Minister has received highly critical representation from the Chairman of the TAB, Colin Hayes, appealing to him not to proceed?

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** First, the Government does intend to proceed with this legislation. I very much appreciate the support of the Opposition for this measure. It will be introduced in this session of the Parliament, as I have indicated to the community at large, particularly the racing community which, I must say, has been very warm in its welcoming of this initiative. That has been recommended now by two major reports into the racing industry in this State and further it



has been recommended more recently by the Criminal Justice Commission in Queensland.

I believe there is widespread support in the community for this measure, and obviously there are some people who will be, or believe that they will be, affected by it and will oppose it in one form or another. But I believe they are very much in the minority and are people who are not addressing the real issues confronting the racing industry, in particular the need for some long-term strategies to bring about the viability of this important industry for the economy of this State and indeed this nation. South Australia has a proud record in the breeding industry, in the development of intellectual property in this area, and in the general support that the community gives the conduct of racing in this State.

I might just correct the honourable member, who said that Mr Hayes is the Chairman of the TAB. He is not the Chairman of the TAB: he is a member of the TAB board. I also understand that people have been saying in recent statements in the press that Mr Jack Wright, the former Deputy Premier, is a member of the TAB board. He is not and has not been a board member for some time now, so there is a good deal of misinformation.

I will be pleased to meet with Mr Hayes. I spoke to him at some length last week, and I invited him to come and talk to me about his concerns so that they can be put into the proper perspective.

#### DISABLED PERSONS

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh):** My question is directed to you, Mr Speaker, and deals with access to the Parliament for physically impaired persons. Sir, notwithstanding the requirement for an overall long-term redevelopment of many aspects of the building, could you inquire into a short-term measure which would substantially improve the current access to the building that is provided to persons in wheelchairs?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER:** With your leave and a bit of silence in the House, I would like to briefly explain.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER:** Currently constituents visiting the Parliament who rely on wheelchairs, walking frames and similar aids to their mobility have to enter from North Terrace (via the Old Parliament House verandah) using a door on the lower ground floor in the south-west corner of the building. They are unable to access the passenger elevator at the front of the building immediately under Centre Hall because of the steps leading up to the elevator doors. Instead, they must go to the elevator at the back of the building to get to the first floor. They must then double back to the front of the building to gain entry to the public galleries of the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council. This could well be avoided if the access to the front elevator on the lower ground floor was improved by the addition of a ramp to supplement the steps.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! As the member for Walsh would be aware and as many members of this House would know, we have looked at the ramp situation for disabled access on many occasions. The proposed solutions have ranged from a ramp through a window

into a current office through to other ramp systems.

Representatives of the Disabled Information Resource Centre looked at access to the House for disabled people. They said it certainly was not good but, without any major change to the structure of the building, it is very difficult to upgrade it to be more easily accessible for disabled people. I suppose what it comes down to is the redevelopment of the House—the redesign or replanning of the House—which has been looked at over some years, but nothing has been done. If that was undertaken, perhaps we could look at it. I will look at it again. I will ask the appropriate people to do that. It has been looked at, but an easy answer is not possible.

#### HEALTH INSURANCE

**Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide):** Does the Minister of Health recognise the growing support among his colleagues in the Federal Government for the Coalition's policy of providing tax incentives for people to take out their own private health insurance. Last week I drew the attention of the House to a statement by the retiring Labor member for Grey, Mr Lloyd O'Neil, in which he urged the Federal Government to allow tax rebates for people who take out private health coverage. I have now received a copy of a letter to a constituent from the Labor member for Port Adelaide, Mr Rod Sawford, in which he states:

I agree with you that the Government ought to seriously consider incentives by way of tax concessions or rebates to encourage people to remain in private health insurance.

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** I do not know quite where the member for Adelaide thinks the debate in this place is taking him. This is about the third or fourth question concerning Commonwealth health insurance matters that we have discussed here, and I suspect that some of the real and pertinent issues in this State could be debated more effectively than those Commonwealth matters, which I am sure our respective Federal colleagues are debating very adequately on the Federal hustings. Clearly, Commonwealth representatives have their own interests in this matter and are free to make their own statements about it.

Subsidies for private health insurance would take money from the public insurance system and from public hospitals. Such subsidies would deprive this State of public hospital beds, and that is certainly not an outcome that I would expect to see. It would not have the anticipated effect, as members have claimed, of improving access to public hospitals. Rather, if people look at the statistics, they will see not only that private hospital activity levels have been increasing steadily over recent years but also that the number of people who have private health insurance for treatment in private hospitals has declined only marginally under Medicare whereas the number who have private insurance for treatment in public hospitals has declined significantly.

With the Fightback proposals providing subsidies for access to basic insurance only, obviously people would go back into the system at that level, they would return to the public hospitals as private patients instead of public patients, and they would still require a bed in a public hospital. That would not take away any space

from public patients and would make no difference to the current situation. There would be no change to that position arising from those subsidies. It would simply take money from the public hospital system and make access to that more difficult than it is at present. There is clearly no advantage in that, and I cannot see why members opposite continue to pursue a policy with that degree of futility.

Medicare offers this country a first-class hospital service. However, this country has a very important private hospital system. That system has grown under Medicare and will continue to grow. By comparison with OECD countries, this country has a very small public health system. Let no-one say that the public hospital system is too large here: it is not. The private hospital system continues to flourish under Medicare and continues to provide a valuable addition to our health system.

#### SEATON NORTH PRIMARY SCHOOL

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** Will the Minister of Education, Employment and Training provide information on the placement of students previously at the Seaton North Primary School and say whether any difficulties have occurred? The closure of that school was a protracted and sensitive issue and the school council put in many weeks of effort to provide a smooth transition of students to their new schools.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** This is an important matter to the honourable member, and he certainly put a lot of time, energy and effort into ensuring a smooth transition for those students. As members know, Seaton North Primary School closed at the end of the 1992 school year, and approximately 97 students needed to be relocated to other schools. Of that number, 25 went to Hendon Primary School, 21 to Seaton Park Primary School, 15 to Grange Primary School, 4 to West Lakes Shore schools, 18 to various high schools in the area, 4 to private schools, 9 to other metropolitan schools and I interstate. There was a very wide spread of students to other schools after the close of the Seaton North Primary School.

Principals in the receiving schools report to the Education Department that the students have settled in well and they have been very well received by the local students. I understand that there have been few difficulties in terms of the placements. I should like to point out that it was intended that a year 7 class operate on the old site in 1993. However, when only six students arrived to choose this option it was decided that these students should go to the Grange Primary School. A taxi service was provided to ensure that they could get to that other option and I believe parents have received this option well.

#### ELECTORAL COMMISSION

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.  
Leave granted.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** During Question Time the member for Bright raised a question with respect to a matter arising out of the activities of the State Electoral Commissioner. As the Minister representing the Attorney-General, who represents that sphere of government in another place, I can add this, because I believe the thrust of the question was to attack a member of another Parliament and his status as an elector in this State. I would like to clarify the law with respect to this area for all members and for the community at large. I quote from the Australian Electoral Commission guide for electoral procedures of February 1992 and the special enrolment provisions that relate to Federal members of Parliament, as follows:

A member of Parliament need not enrol for the division in which he or she lives. A member of the House of Representatives may enrol in the division he or she represents. Senators for the Australian Capital Territory may enrol in either of the Territory's divisions and Senators for a State may enrol in any division in the State that they represent.

#### WORKERS REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION (DECLARATION OF VALIDITY) BILL

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr INGERSON:** Yesterday in my contribution on the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation (Declaration of Validity) Bill I referred to the involvement of the Clerks of both Houses in what I believed was an awareness of change that was being made. I wish to correct that: the Clerk to whom I was referring was purely and simply from the House of Assembly.

---

#### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

**The SPEAKER:** The proposal before the Chair is that the House note grievances.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Baudin):** I wish to continue the unfortunate saga of my constituent that began with my explanation to the question I asked earlier this afternoon. I think I can best do that by quoting in part from a letter which my constituent sent to me some time ago and, among other things, it states:

I am, and have been for some time, a client of Hindmarsh Adelaide and a holder of a Visa card through them. In May 1992, I set off on a 10-week world trip, visiting my family in England and Ireland, armed with my Visa card and travellers cheques. I was accompanied by my...wife, and the bulk of our living expenses derived from the regular deposit of my State superannuation pension with Hindmarsh, to be accessed through my Visa card.

In mid-June, on the way to visit young relatives in Windsor, England, I stopped at a Barclays Bank branch in Worcester to obtain a small cash advance on Visa, my usual practice. After making the customary telephone call, the teller returned to say

that I could not have my advance, and she was instructed to withdraw my card. No reason was given apart from the fact that she had received these instructions from Visa.

I took the number of Visa Central, England, and went off to contact them, sure that some mistake had been made. They assured me that there was no problem with my card according to their computer, and the block must be coming from Australia. I then phoned the bank in order to apprise them of this, only to discover that the teller had followed instructions and destroyed my card. I had nine pounds in my pocket, was on my way to London and then Greece, had just paid 500 pounds for travel on Visa card, and was now blocked off from my funds, if they still existed.

In the early hours of the morning I managed to contact Visa Central, Australia, to be assured that no difficulty existed with my card, according to their computer, and the block must be coming out of South Australia, but no, they could not tell me if I was financial or not.

Remember, this gentleman is in England on holidays. The letter continues:

A further two conversations with South Australia finally elicited the fact that there was a fault with the magnetic strip on my card and it would be destroyed if I attempted to use it in an ATM. The young officer in Adelaide then attempted to help me by arranging to fax me 600 pounds to Thomas Cook in the Midland Bank in High Street, Windsor. At that time I was finally able to establish that I had not miscalculated and that no-one had stolen my money; ample funds did exist in my Visa All-in-One account. After a sleepless night—  
(and who can blame him?)—

I visited the Windsor bank to collect my money—no-one knew anything about it. Once again I contacted Adelaide, to be assured that the money should have been in Windsor five or ten minutes after the fax was sent—where was it?...

The letter continues:

After another 24 hours of worry and expense we established two facts: (a) The money was actually at Thomas Cook's central office, nowhere near Windsor; (b) The Thomas Cook branch at High Street, Windsor, did not even have a fax machine installed.

Due to the assistance of the manager of Midland Bank I was finally able to obtain my money and we could make our longed for trip to Greece, without my Visa card of course which had to be sent to Ireland to await our return—too bad if we had encountered an emergency in Greece and our money had run out. My new card was indeed awaiting me in Ireland—

and this seems to have been the first thing that went right—

and now, apart from an offer to pay telephone bills, Visa Hindmarsh Coop consider the annoying episode closed and their obligation to me discharged. I do not agree with them.

In my question I mentioned that two mutually conflicting explanations had been brought forward: the first was that it was all the fault of Barclays Bank. My constituent went to considerable trouble to demonstrate that, in fact, this was not the case. The second was to do with the magnetic strip. Of course, this cannot be corroborated because the teller had destroyed the card. In any event, the only drawback in relation to a faulty magnetic strip was in being able to use automatic telling machines, and my constituent was in the habit not of using automatic telling machines but rather of taking the card into the bank to get that personal service. In any event, he could have been given the courtesy of being allowed to explain the way in which he normally operated.

As I have said in my question, there has been extensive correspondence on this. There have been a number of telephone calls, a lot of people have been contacted and, of course, there has been the tyranny of distance factor, because the problem was originally presented to him on the other side of the world. I think it is important that this matter be thoroughly investigated. It is important that Australian tourism, or tourists of any other nationality overseas, should not be put to this inconvenience. My constituent believes that some degree of compensation is in order, and he is quite happy for that compensation to be paid to a charity if, indeed, it ensures that people are not placed in the embarrassing and somewhat humiliating position that he was placed in at that time.

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

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition):** Today we have had highlighted the chaos and confusion within the Labor Party over the State Bank of South Australia and whether it should be sold. I would like to examine some of that chaos and confusion, and I will deal, first, with the question of whether the bank should be sold. The former Premier, the member for Ross Smith, said, 'The bank will not be sold.' Our new Premier, last year, said, 'The bank will not be sold.' But now, in the past six weeks, the present Premier and the present Treasurer go from saying, 'No, the bank won't be sold', to, 'Maybe the bank could be sold', to, 'Yes, the bank now will be sold.' Why? All because of Paul Keating's visit to South Australia two weeks ago and his statement that the bank will be sold. We have the Prime Minister jetting in from Canberra two weeks ago and again today and treading all over Premier Arnold as though he is totally irrelevant, which is exactly the case.

Then we look at whether or not any special assistance should be given to South Australia in connection with the sale of the State Bank. We had Premier Bannon running off to Paul Keating at the beginning of 1991 and asking, 'Look, our bank's in trouble; we need your help; can you help us?' and Keating saying, 'No.' In July last year, just prior to the introduction of the State budget, we had Premier Bannon, through his Under Treasurer, going off again to the Federal Treasurer and saying, 'I desperately more than ever now need your Federal help; the State is in trouble,' and Keating saying 'No'.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I will come to that in a moment. Two weeks ago, we have Keating jetting into South Australia saying, 'Sell the bank,' and, when asked about what sort of assistance he would give, saying, 'I'll talk to you about that after the election.' What suddenly has happened today? Within two weeks Keating has gone back on his promise. Within two weeks, Keating has come out with a so-called offer of \$600 million. I will touch on that matter for just one moment: \$600 million on present day value.

He hands out with one hand but, with the other hand, he takes away the tax benefits that any smart person would realise lies within the State Bank group. One has only to go back and look at the last annual report to see that that tax benefit is an asset worth about \$195 million if it were sold with the bank. In other words, Keating's

offer is worth no more than a net \$400 million on present-day value. The Premier tried to make a big feature of the fact that we had put down an offer based on a policy laid out three years ago, not in an election campaign, but three years ago. We laid down a policy that it would be the equivalent of the State tax for a 10-year period. On present-day values the offer works out to \$400 million from a Federal Coalition Government. It is not discounted, as the Premier tried to do during Question Time today: it is \$400 million on present-day value—

**Mr S.J. Baker:** As a minimum.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Yes, as a minimum. We find the offer laid down under Liberal Party policy is at least equal to, if not better than—and, if we take into account payroll tax, it is far better than—the offer put down today by Prime Minister Keating. The member for Ross Smith must be absolutely spewing over the fact that he went to Keating two years ago and Keating said, 'No.' He went to Keating eight months ago and Keating said, 'No.' Now, with a Federal election and five marginal seats here in South Australia, Keating jets in to save his own neck and puts down a so-called \$600 million offer.

How the member for Ross Smith must be spewing in terms of his reaction to what Paul Keating has done to him today. He absolutely dropped the member for Ross Smith in the bucket. But the final highlight of the confusion is that we asked the Premier today about his policy on the sale of the bank and he could not give us one.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mitchell.

**Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell):** We have just heard the Leader of the Opposition talking about what might happen if the State Bank is sold. However, at this moment South Australia is facing one of the greatest economic threats it has ever faced, that is, the loss of the car industry if a Federal Coalition Government is elected on 13 March. That will be the greatest disaster that this State has ever faced. It will make any State Bank problems look absolutely tiny in comparison.

The car industry is vital to this State, and this Government is prepared to get up and say that. This car industry is vital to the State, but members opposite cannot say that. There is not one of them, not even a member from one of those districts near my electorate and the Mitsubishi factory, who will get up and defend the car industry in South Australia. All they are doing is making a few comments supporting their Federal colleagues. Apparently they all believe in this wonderful Fightback package that will devastate South Australia by destroying the car industry.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr HOLLOWAY:** The member for Heysen says, 'Rubbish.' Apparently it does not concern him that 20 000 jobs in this State, employed directly in the car industry, do not matter. To the member for Heysen that does not seem to matter. What about the three times multiplier effect, because there are at least 60 000 jobs at stake if the car industry goes—60 000 jobs. However, members opposite are silent on that. All they are worried about is what Mr Keating might have said in connection

with the State Bank. But this is a real problem and it is being faced out there by my constituents.

The simple problem is this: why would Mitsubishi Australia bother producing cars in Australia under a zero tariff regime when it can go to other parts of the world—for example, the fastest growing regions of Asia—and produce cars under tariff regimes of 100 per cent or more? Members of the Federal Coalition and their colleagues opposite ought to put themselves in the place of Mitsubishi directors in Japan. They are trying to work out where they should base their worldwide production. Do members opposite think that they will get their first year economic textbooks and open up to the chapter on level playing fields and decide where they will go, just because Australia talks about level playing fields? Will they come and produce here for that reason? Of course not. They can produce cars in Thailand, the Philippines and Malaysia under tariff regimes of 100 per cent or more, and they can bring cars in under the Coalition's policy without any penalty at all. What will they do? It is obvious what they will do.

The fact is that, under the Coalition policy of zero and negligible tariffs, the car industry is a dead duck and so will be the economy of this State if that policy comes into force. The fact is that members opposite are absolutely hung up on all sorts of ideological notions. Most of them do not understand economics. I point out that there is absolutely no sound economic basis for the sort of nonsense that is being peddled by members opposite. The car industry has more value than just the jobs it provides. The car industry is a base for heavy manufacturing in this State. Without the car industry all of our future heavy industries are at risk.

What credibility would Australia have as a developed nation without a car industry? Why is it that all those countries of Asia-Thailand, Malaysia and so on—have a tariff of 100 per cent on car industries? Why are they trying so hard to build up a car industry in their countries when the Coalition is so keen to get rid of such an industry? It does not make sense. If we want to know what Adelaide would be like without a car industry, let us look at Broken Hill following the closure of the mines. A great proportion of people in that town are now unemployed. The town's key industry has gone and there is a real risk that Adelaide will go the same way if we lose the car industry. What is so tragic about that is that members opposite and their colleagues in Canberra do not seem concerned about it. All they seem interested in doing is point scoring in this Parliament. They have not said a word or committed themselves to the future continuation of the car industry in South Australia, and that is absolutely disgraceful.

It is even more disgraceful for those members representing electorates in the southern suburbs near Mitsubishi. They are mute about Mitsubishi's threat to withdraw from the car industry if the Federal Coalition wins the election. I believe it is an absolute disgrace how these people opposite have let down this State. I hope that all voters in South Australia consider the future of this State on 13 March, because if the Coalition wins the Federal election and we lose the car industry we are in big trouble indeed.

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria):** I was going to speak on something completely different, but now that the member for Mitchell has raised this matter I will speak on tariffs and the car industry in Australia and South Australia, because I have never heard so much garbage before. Unfortunately, I cannot even tell by the clock above you, Mr Speaker, how many minutes I have, but I will go on until you stop me.

**Mrs HUTCHISON:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I point out that the clock above you is not working. There is something wrong with it.

**The SPEAKER:** I guarantee that the member for Victoria will get his five minutes.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** What the Opposition wants in South Australia and the Federal Coalition wants in Australia is an efficient car industry. We want an industry that can produce cheaper cars for the people of Australia and South Australia. We want an industry that is world competitive so that we can export cars around this nation and the world. We want to lower the unit cost of production. If we export, it will allow the turnover to increase thereby creating a viable car industry in this nation—not what we have at present.

Each car produced in Australia carries a subsidy of \$4 000—and that is subsidised by the taxpayers of Australia. That is not good enough. Let us look at the policies. What will happen under the present Government is that, by the year 2000, it will reduce tariff protection from today's level of 32.5 per cent to 15 per cent. The Federal Coalition, on coming to Government, will reduce tariff protection from what it is today—

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** To zero.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Not to zero, as the former failed Premier says, but 5 per cent—a difference of 10 per cent. Let us see what will happen in 1994. In October 1994 the Federal Coalition Government will remove wholesale sales tax on the car industry. That is a tremendous benefit.

*Mrs Hutchison interjecting:*

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** No. The honourable member should listen. Then it will take off payroll tax—one of the greatest taxes on jobs. Also in October 1994, it will take off petrol tax—one of the greatest impediments to production in Australia. Do you know what Mitsubishi has said that that will save it. I will put Mitsubishi's figures on the parliamentary record. In October 1994 Mitsubishi will save on each car it produces—

**Mrs Hutchison:** Have you checked these figures?

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** These figures were provided by Mitsubishi to the Federal Coalition. In 1994 Mitsubishi will save, in relation to payroll tax, \$410 a car; on wholesale sales tax the saving will be \$220 a car; and on fuel excise—what is that worth to a company of Mitsubishi's size?—it will save \$70 a car. Then we have the freezing of the super levy, which will save Mitsubishi \$14 a car. That is an overall saving, in 1994, of \$714 a car with virtually no difference in the tariff levels of either Party. That is the up-front saving to Mitsubishi on every car it produces, contrary to the rubbish peddled by members on the other side. So, Mitsubishi will be \$714 a car better off.

As the tariff reduction goes, as other savings flow through to Mitsubishi and as productivity levels increase with the better industrial relations policies of the Federal

Coalition that will flow through into the cost of manufacturing, the cost of cars will come down. Every South Australian will benefit from cheaper cars, every worker in South Australia will benefit from cheaper petrol, and every worker in South Australia, because the payroll tax impost will not be there, will have a more secure job under a Coalition Government. Members should remember that in Australia today 70 000 people are employed in the car industry—that is, less than 1 per cent of the work force. There are 270 000 people involved in the industry of selling petrol, selling cars and selling tyres.

**The Hon. J.P. Trainer:** Are you saying those 70 000 are disposable?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member can take a grievance later. The honourable member for Peake.

**Mr HERON (Peake):** Last week the Prime Minister made a statement in relation to child-care and said that parents would be able to claim a cash rebate of up to one-third of the cost of all work related costs for child-care. If one looks at the actual dollar signs in that there are some good savings for parents with children who attend child-care centres. On a yearly basis the figures of, say, \$1 466 per annum per child or a maximum of \$3 182 for two or more children represent a very good saving to parents. If we want to define that further, as the Minister said in this House the other week, that works out to a saving of \$28.20 for one child and \$61.20 for two or more children. This applies to parents whose children attend private child-care centres as well as to those who attend a community based or work based child-care centre. I hope we see a lot more work based child-care centres around Australia in years to come.

The Prime Minister's statement also said that the Government would meet all work related child-care demand by the year 2001; and that there will be an increase to a total of 354 000 places nationally compared with the present 200 000 places. He also announced a \$1.6 million per annum commitment to the establishment of a national accreditation system so that every parent of a child in this country will be able to use a child care facility whether it is private for profit or a public funded centre.

Following on from that statement, of course, we had guess who?—the Hewson claim. Hewson claimed that the Federal Labor Government's generous cash rebate for work related child-care costs was child-care for the rich. What the Prime Minister said is that child-care is a legitimate work related expense and should be affordable to all families. Families whose higher income currently precludes them from Federal Government health will benefit from cash rebates; however, so too will low and middle income families who currently receive child-care assistance through fee relief. What Hewson would have people believe is that rich families are the only ones to benefit. He has got that wrong, as he always does.

What I was really getting at through the question I asked the Minister today was the costing of the GST in relation to the centres themselves. I have not quite picked up all the answers that the Minister gave in her reply, but I gather that Hewson was saying that there will be no

effect of the GST on child-care, but what about the cost, as the Minister explained in her answer, of all the other facilities that are needed by the child-care centre. As the Minister said, the plumbing, the electrical work, the paperwork and any other work that goes on in a child-care centre will be affected by the GST, and there is only one way that those child-care centres will get the money back: they will have to hit the parents through the cost of the child-care. So, contrary to what Hewson is saying, that is why the GST will affect the cost to people who send their children to child-care centres. Let us not be fooled by Hewson saying that the GST will not affect child-care: it will.

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I do not normally get myself involved in Federal election campaigns; I think that they are big enough and old enough to look after themselves, but this campaign is probably one of the dirtiest and most vicious that I have experienced in my 23 years involvement in politics—something like eight State election campaigns and more than that federally. What concerns me is that the campaign, particularly in the electorate of Hindmarsh, is being run by the unions, and those of us whose electorates fall within the boundaries of Hindmarsh are quite accustomed to the standover tactics, the bully boy efforts, of intimidation of constituents, particularly some constituents of ethnic origin, who are escorted to the polling booth or who, when they attend at the polling booth, are taken into the booth and stood over—someone looks over their shoulder while they vote.

It is an old trick of the trade union movement to ask, 'Right, how did you vote?', making sure that others know how people vote by looking over their shoulder. We talk about mafia style tactics, but this is probably one of the worst tactics I have experienced in the last couple of elections in my electorate. I well remember that on one occasion we chased a couple of union officials out of the West Richmond area; those officials were trying to spread false stories and rumours, and we certainly gave them the fillip. They decided to go off to the pub, and finished the day off there in comfort.

I am quite concerned that the freedom of choice, the democratic right to vote by secret ballot in this country, is not being upheld. Those involved with the campaign in Hindmarsh put on notice that we will insist that our scrutineers at the polling booths report any person who is seen endeavouring to intimidate, to escort or to stand over people while they vote in the polling booths. It is high time we realised that not only has this country sunk into a third world category as far as the economic situation is concerned but we are experiencing third world tactics in relation to voting.

Let us look at what the Labor Party has done in Hindmarsh. Two senators have now located their offices in the Federal electorate of Hindmarsh. They are not satisfied with one; they are not satisfied with the godfather, Nick Bolkus, who considers himself to be the godfather of the whole area—and everybody shall do what Nick says. We now have Senator Foreman who has moved into Glenelg. I am surprised that he even found where to go at Glenelg. Why have two Federal ALP senators located in one Federal electorate? After all, we also have the Democrat senator, Meg Lees, as well as

one Liberal senator, Bayden Teague. If there was ever overkill, waste of taxpayers' money and interference within the normal democratic process, I think this describes it.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**Mr BECKER:** Mr John Scott is retiring. It is strange that the honourable member should mention John Scott, because he spat the dummy. He is winding down his office and I am told that, if people ring his office, someone says, 'I'm terribly sorry, we are no longer assisting anybody. You will have to go elsewhere for assistance.' They are the problems within the ALP regarding the Federal electorate of Hindmarsh. We know that there is a factional brawl, and it is about time it came out. What annoys me is that Senator Bolkus, like all the other Labor senators, is using his office and his huge electoral postage allowance to send out false documents. Senator Bolkus has sent out to about 5 000 small businesses in the area a 147 page booklet entitled 'This is how the GST works', but of course, when we go through it, we find out it is about how the GST works in New Zealand: it has nothing to do with Australia. Again, there is a hypothetical argument.

As we have just heard from the member for Peake, who talked about child-care, nothing has been said about the benefits under the GST; nothing has been said about how every person who drives their child to a child-care centre—and let us face facts; most of those who can afford to use a child-care centre will drive their children there—will find that the cost of their petrol will be down by about 18c. There is reduced cost in all areas, but we get these scaremongering tactics—as Prime Minister Keating would say, these little scummy tactics—to try to intimidate people in relation to what is going on. It is the worst campaign; it is the dirtiest campaign.

At 5.30 the other morning I was putting up signs on South Road; trucks were going past, buses were going past, and then all of a sudden I was showered in dirt, small stones and anything else when a semi-trailer tried to run me down. If that is the type of tactic they want to adopt, I do not mind. I can play just as dirty. Our candidate in Hindmarsh, Chris Gallus, is the sort of person who will not be intimidated by these sorts of tactics—and neither will I. All it has done is to encourage me to go out and help.

#### NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE (EMU FARMING) AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 10 February. Page 1879.)

Clause 2—'Insertion of division VA in part V.'

**Mr LEWIS:** During the debate last Wednesday, I moved and explained some amendments to this clause. Unfortunately for members, last week's *Hansard* is not yet available, but I have nonetheless asked for the amendments to be put on file. I am happy for the Committee to consider the clause.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I find that totally unacceptable. With all due respect, and without in any way trying to detract from the member for

Murray-Mallee's amendments, which he moved last week, I do not have a copy of those amendments on file.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I was in the Chair and the amendments were definitely distributed last week to all interested members.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I do not doubt for one minute that they were distributed, Sir. In fact, I received a copy then and I have just received another. The problem that I have with this piece of legislation is that it has been on the Notice Paper for some considerable time and has been held back with the consent of the member who introduced it. The Bill was introduced when the present Minister of Education, Employment and Training was responsible for its carriage, and I was given some assistance by that Minister; I was, in effect, armed with some form of briefing to give the Government's view of this legislation. By using my own research in addition to the briefing paper, I was ready to make a wholehearted contribution to this debate.

Time moved on and, suddenly, last week, these amendments were moved. Being as kind as I can to the honourable member opposite, I must say that the Bill now takes a totally different tack. The measure uses different delineations, if I can use that word, of parts of the State for the purpose of membership of the board, and I think that the post office in King William Street is one point from which a line is taken. One could be forgiven for thinking, as I do—and you may well agree with me, Sir, but you cannot say anything because you are in the Chair—that the membership of the board is being weighted around one part of the State, a part that is very close to the heart of the honourable member opposite. One could also say that scant regard is paid to the Aboriginal community; yet, when the honourable member introduced the Bill, I recall that he said he was doing it on behalf of the Aboriginal people who live in the part of the State that he represents.

I have given the Committee a lengthy preamble because, given the way this matter has been dealt with, we have been given little chance to have a significant input into the legislation. We have the original Bill and we now have this list of amendments and, able as I am to rapidly scan Bills, I am not that good as to be able to form a conclusion as to whether or not I support certain aspects of the amendments. I find that I am placed at a disadvantage. Last week the member for Murray-Mallee did not tell us why this Bill had been put off, week in, week out.

I know that I cannot speak on other matters that are before the House but, with your indulgence, Sir, I will mention the matter that appears on the Notice Paper immediately before this Bill. I picked up the adjournment on that Bill and I have adjourned it consistently, week after week, since 26 August. The reason for the adjournment is well known on both sides of the Chamber. It is an important piece of legislation which was introduced by an honourable member, who is now a Minister, in his capacity as a private member of the House. It is of such importance that it is my task to keep on adjourning it until the Government forms a position on that legislation.

There has been no indication from the member for Murray-Mallee why there has been a delay on this Bill. There has certainly been no indication to the Government

as to why it has been delayed, week in and week out. Again, this is not a reflection on the member for Murray-Mallee, but there was some hesitancy on his part when the matter came up for debate last Wednesday as to whether he intended to proceed with the amendments. If you recall, Sir, the Bill was read a second time and taken into Committee; on consideration of clause 2, the Committee adjourned, as is a common practice of this Chamber. The responsible Minister is sitting on the front bench to give the stand that the Government will take on this Bill. Speaking as an individual member, I find that the issue has been badly organised.

There is a swag of amendments, which cover the board and where its members should come from. This is covered in proposed new section 68h(2)(g), which provides that at least one member must carry on the business of emu farming in that part of the State that lies to the south of Anzac Highway, Greenhill Road and the South-Eastern Freeway and to the west of the Murray River. Unless we can modernise our technology and, as part of the *Hansard* record, have a big map of South Australia with someone pointing out exactly where we mean, what is the significance of those directions? Proposed new section 68h(2)(f) provides that at least one member must carry on the business of emu farming in the part of the State that lies to the south and east of the Murray River.

I do not know whether it is only the Murray River that attracts emus—whether the soil is conducive to farming, whether the water from the Murray River is the type that emus like—but there is no explanation whatever. I am an individual member. This is private members' time; I am not gagged or bound by what the Minister on the front bench will put on behalf of the Government, but I sincerely hope that the Minister can give a more satisfactory explanation as to why he will oppose or agree with the proposed new section than the member for Murray-Mallee has done. The member for Murray-Mallee has obviously thought about this piece of legislation for some considerable time, but we have yet to know why he proposes these amendments. The member for Murray-Mallee went right through without giving any explanation whatsoever. If I want to give serious consideration to these amendments, I would like to think—

**Mr Quirke:** As a primary producer yourself.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** The last thing in the world I would want to do is to answer interjections, but the member for Playford said, 'As a primary producer'. Who knows? I may wish to take up emu farming. I have sufficient land, Sir; mind you, it does not abut the Murray River. I have sufficient land, and perhaps the member for Flinders could advise me whether emus can walk uphill and downhill. I have always seen them on the flat, so I do not know whether they are able to breed in my area.

The member for Victoria knows that I am having a few problems getting animals onto my land; I think it is a plot by the Farmers Federation to deny me the right to carry on farming, but the member for Victoria has very kindly offered his assistance in procuring animals for my property. If I were to say to the member for Victoria, 'Thank you for your very kind offer in regard to merinos; I wish to go down the track of emu farming,' if

I did wish to carry out the practice of emu farming, I would find that, no matter how successful I was, I could not be a member of the board. The member for Murray-Mallee is yet to explain why we have this rather unique representation outlined in his amendments.

I think I have made my point; there is very little indication on and very little explanation of the amendments. It has been so long since we originally discussed the Bill in the second reading stage that I would be tempted to move that progress be reported, but I will not do that at this stage. However, if I get frustrated, I might be tempted to do that.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Before I call on the member for Murray-Mallee, I point out that his amendment to clause 2 is at present before the Chair.

**Mr LEWIS:** Briefly, to help the member for Napier, I begin by saying that Rudyard Kipling once wrote a poem called 'If, and what we have been subjected to this afternoon makes me feel that that has some relevance to the current context. I will not recite the poem but I invite members to look for it in the library. Despite what the honourable member says, I did explain (page 1019 of *Hansard*) what the explicit changes to the legislation meant, and the member for Napier knows that. I would forgive other people if they described him as a deceitful, facetious fool. What he has just indulged in was a filibuster, and he knows that. He also knows that, if he were to take up emu farming and if this legislation were passed, he could be elected to the board.

As I explained when I moved the amendment, the board would consist of 11 members and they would come from all over the State. I explained that, and my comments are to be found on page 1021 and 1022 of *Hansard* of 10 February. There is one member from the West Coast; the post office that the honourable member talked about (he did not even read the amendment before us) is in Port Augusta, so there will be one representative from the West Coast, but where do we define where Eyre Peninsula is? Parliamentary Counsel simply chose to identify it in those general blocks and provide in the legislation also that regulations would explicitly define the position of the boundaries.

There is one representative each from the West Coast, Yorke Peninsula, Upper North, Mid North, Lower North, Murraylands, Murray-Mallee, Upper South-East and Lower South-East. That is nine growers. If they are paying money into a fund, as they pointed out to me in the extensive consultations about which I told the House last week and which I have had not only with prospective emu farmers but also with others who are interested in the legislation, they are entitled to elect themselves a board to administer that fund—and that it be a fund established in law so it is all seen to be above board and fair.

The member for Napier has simply wasted the time of the Committee. He has not contributed anything to the debate. He well knows that I have been involved in discussions with him and other members; he well knows that I have been involved in discussions with prospective emu farmers who have formed themselves into an association; and he well knows that I invited him to come to a buffet dinner last night to meet representatives of the emu farmers association executive committee in the Speaker's dining room. He should have been there

and taken the chance to talk to any one of a number of those committee people who were there to have clarified any provision which they have asked be included in the legislation. If he had wanted to, he could have spoken to me then or at any other time about any other point not related to their interests.

For instance, they did not insist on having at least two men and at least two women on that board, but they saw the wisdom of it. They wanted it to be seen to be providing equal opportunity to make sure that there was some gender balance. They also sought to ensure that the State was represented locally. Just as the honourable member and I represent interests in the communities and districts that we represent—called electorates—these people believe that the board that runs the industry should be equally democratically elected, according to the provisions that have been discussed at length with people who understand these things much better than the member for Napier. My goodness!

The other point he raised was that when the legislation was first introduced it was to enable people of Aboriginal extraction to farm emus. That is true, but they have asked me not to restrict it to themselves alone. They do not see any reason why anybody should not be permitted in law to farm emus. It is as simple as that. The honourable member knows that, and I know he knows it—I have told him that—so he misled the House when he made most of those remarks in that 15 minute period. The vast majority—

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER:** On a point of order, Mr Chairman, on a previous occasion the House has not accepted that a member can say that another member misled the House: he can do so only by way of substantive motion.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I uphold that point of order. That is a precedent that has been established by the Speaker, and I ask the member for Murray-Mallee to take note of that.

**Mr LEWIS:** Thank you, Mr Chairman; I note your direction. It is unfortunate, then, that the member for Napier simply told the House things which he knew to be untrue, and accordingly I do not think it reflects well on him. That is one of the poorest contributions he has made since he came here.

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Chairman. Members are not permitted to reflect on other members; in particular, they are not permitted to reflect on their veracity.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I will not accept that point of order in this case because, if the member for Napier wants to take exception to what is being put to the House, he himself should take a point of order in accordance with Standing Orders.

**Mr LEWIS:** I will not play tit for tat but, if he did not reflect on my veracity in his remarks, I do not know what he did. The important thing is that we want to get on with this legislation. Let us consider the points of substance here which I have already explained at length at pages 1021-2.

**Mr BLACKER:** I support the amendment. I thank the member for Murray-Mallee for the invitation he extended to all members of Parliament to meet with the new farming group; I found it most informative and interesting. I was able to discuss any inquiry I had with



committee members who were present last night. I note that only one member of Government was present, and that is more the pity, because with this legislation we are facilitating what may well be a very valuable farming industry for South Australia, an industry which could bring countless millions of dollars to South Australia. The fact that Americans are farming Australian emus in their country and making a mint out of it is something we should look at very seriously. We should question our own farming practices to allow that to go on and not be part of such a farming enterprise.

It has been said that the emu is a native of Australia, which is true, but there is no better way of preserving the main breed of emu than if it is farmed. The best and biggest will always be preserved in the interests of breeding a better animal along the way. There is no better way of guaranteeing a strong healthy strain of emu than to have it farmed in this way. The same goes for any other species of wildlife or livestock.

Many people in South Australia have bought emu chicks and are rearing them. I could not guess how many emu chicks are around. To my knowledge, they are all bought from registered breeders, either from interstate or under permit from the National Parks and Wildlife. This legislation will facilitate the farming process and allow for the slaughter of the adult animal when that becomes necessary and for the manufacture of products from that animal. I can see nothing but good coming to South Australia from this measure, and I certainly cannot see how in any way it can compromise conservation of any kind.

I have pleasure in supporting this amendment and hope that the House will give it its absolute support, because it is an industry of immense value and one that South Australia well deserves. It provides an alternative industry for so many other farmers who are currently in difficulty with some of the more traditional means of farming. It is quite reasonable that farmers could have a few emus in a breeding program and work quite harmoniously with other parts of the farming enterprise. I see nothing but good with this legislation. I fully support the amendment.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** At the outset, I say that I am also in favour of supporting the establishment of the industry. I have some questions that the member who has the management of this Bill should address. Again we are seeing a repeat of the old agrarian socialism. The sort of approach we have seen involving egg and potato boards, in my humble view having been the Minister of Agriculture for some three years, does not assist. I pose to the honourable member that this Bill is overregulation and creates bureaucracy, and we should do everything in our power to reduce that, as this Government has done. I, as the then Minister of Agriculture, have had the pleasure and privilege of addressing those issues, whether they involved the egg, potato or milk boards. I, as the Minister responsible, do not intend, as long as I have breath in my body, to allow the sort of thing the amendment envisages to happen.

I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that, under his amendment, the matter is directed not to the Minister of Environment and Land Management but to the Minister of Primary Industries. There are good reasons why it should be directed to the Minister of

Environment and Land Management, that is, the amendments are directed purely at the commercial aspect of emus, but much greater issues are those of the conservation, monitoring and assessment of the native bird. That must be taken into account, and that is my responsibility as Minister of Environment and Land Management.

Certainly, I have indicated to my colleague the Minister of Primary Industries that there will be close consultation in terms of how the commercial aspect of the industry would be developed. The amendment from the member for Murray-Mallee contains huge failings, and I will address those with the honourable member. The Government intends to draft an amendment to the National Parks and Wildlife Act which will allow for emu farming in a commercial sense but also the conservation of emus throughout our State, ensuring the continued protection of the species.

The honourable member should be addressing a number of other aspects of the application of this amendment. A board is involved in regulation; I do not believe we need a board. I believe the power should be vested in this House through the Minister. It will give far greater flexibility with regard to the management and conservation of the industry. As I said, the processes of conservation are important and fundamental, and that matter must be addressed significantly in any successful Bill that comes before this House.

The conditions of establishment will be much broader under the direction and control of a Minister than under the requirements posed by the amendment before us. The overall application of this amendment is quite convoluted, bureaucratic and over-regulatory, and we will end up with entry quotas, registrations and with what we have seen happen with the poultry industry. If ever we have an example of something we should avoid, it is to follow the path with regard to what happened to growers in New South Wales and in this State who suffered as a consequence of what the Liberal Party has always stood for, namely, a free market approach.

This is not a free market approach: this is again the initiation of regulation. I utterly oppose it and I believe that the member for Murray-Mallee must address that. Shortly I will be bringing before Cabinet a series of amendments that will free up and provide the opportunity for this industry to flourish in South Australia.

**Mr VENNING:** I rise briefly, knowing this is private members' time, to support the Bill and, in doing so, I congratulate the member for Murray-Mallee on his foresight in introducing it. I also thank him for inviting me and other members to tea last night to meet people involved in this new industry. I enjoyed meeting those guests and I also enjoyed eating commercially grown emu from Western Australia. It is a most interesting delicacy, which I am assured is very healthy. Knowing my present condition, doubtless I shall be eating a lot more emu when it becomes a commercial proposition here in South Australia.

I am encouraged that this is another new industry for South Australia, a new industry in which many South Australian farmers can become involved, because we are talking about a native product of Australia that is adaptable and can exist in difficult and harsh conditions. Of course, it flourishes under intensive farming as well.

It is petty indeed of the Government to defeat this Bill, which stems from a brilliant piece of imagination and hard work by my colleague. However, it appears that the Government will defeat it so that it can bring in its own measure and claim the kudos for itself. That is despicable and a cheap show of politics. I was amazed by the Minister's comments a moment ago. I know of the trouble we have had with boards involving many organisations, but they have all been marketing boards. The Minister referred to the chook industry, but I wish he would get his facts right.

This board is about getting the new industry off the ground—about research and the extension work needed to get a new board off the ground. That is the situation as I see it and, once it is set up, I am sure the board would take a background position and not be regulating the market. I commend the member for Murray-Mallee for the work he has done on this Bill and especially the patience he has shown. I am sad that the Government is trying him out. I support the Bill.

**Mr MEIER:** I support the Bill. I have said much about emu farming in this Chamber and my contributions go back to 1990, soon after I became shadow Minister of Agriculture, as the portfolio was then known.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr MEIER:** That was when I sought to put pressure on the Government to get emu farming under way in 1990. The then Minister responsible for the National Parks and Wildlife Act, the Minister for Environment and Planning, the Hon. Susan Lenahan, gave me an assurance that she would seek to have amendments made to the National Parks and Wildlife Act in the next session, which was to be later in 1990.

That was put off, 1991 passed and it was then 1992. The member for Murray-Mallee then introduced his Bill. I again raised the matter with the Minister, who herself again indicated that she supported the concept and would be moving to have amendments brought into the House. Now we have another Minister and we again hear the same story, and the Government is not willing to accept the Opposition's move to establish an emu farming board. The Minister says, 'I will have amendments made to the National Parks and Wildlife Act', but for over three years we have been waiting.

Western Australia, Queensland and Tasmania have gone from strength to strength, and New South Wales is about to join the show. We have heard that America is well and truly into it. In fact, I came back from an overseas study tour to America and reported to the House and certainly to other primary producing organisations that the Americans were cultivating and farming emus, yet South Australia still sits and fiddles while the rest of the country goes ahead.

I support the Bill. I hope that the Minister will reconsider the position. If fine tuning is needed, so be it, but at least let us get the farmers under way. As one of them said last night, 'I don't know what we'll do if the Government hasn't moved by the time we have the next batch of chickens, and if we have hundreds of chickens and can't farm them.' We have had assurance after assurance. We have had another one today. Let us not take any more assurances—let us act by supporting the member for Murray-Mallee's Bill.

**Mr LEWIS:** Before the ideas go cold in the mind of the Minister, can I disabuse him of some of the remarks he made about the proposal and the allegations he made about my motivation in bringing the Bill forward at this time, remarks which were equally as irrelevant as those made by the member for Napier. He said he deregulated industry by abolishing the egg and potato boards. What he did not honestly tell the Committee was that they were marketing boards.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Minister can reply.

**Mr LEWIS:** The Minister well knows that the egg board controlled the production and sale and the legislation we have before us now, as I have proposed it, explicitly excludes that prerogative of the board; it prevents that. The Minister's model is to deregulate the number of people who can go into emu farming, the areas that can be licensed and the number of birds they can have.

Discussions with his advisers have revealed that to me—not only to me but to others who have been involved in those discussions with the Minister's advisers. As recently as last night the same points were made. For the Minister to claim here that this legislation overregulates the industry is an absolute nonsense. It is a *non sequitur*, and it is at odds with the Minister's own attitude and that of his Government and his advisers. They are not coming from any position of concern about a commercial enterprise involving the species that we know as emu. They are coming from a politically convenient position to shore up the support they might otherwise lose from the green lobby and some people—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** Yes, I am serious, I can advise the member for Walsh. They are the people who are opposing this proposition and putting the screws on the Minister.

**Mr Venning:** They have their heads in the sand.

**Mr LEWIS:** No, ostriches do that. They are not ostriches. Ostriches are useful. Tragic though it may be for the Minister to be caught out like this, he well knows that we have had extensive and continuing consultations on this matter. I have spoken at length to member organisations and to people associated with those organisations in the conservation lobby. I have met with groups of them. I have spoken at length to Aboriginal people who have an interest in the species, one way or another, and I have spoken at length to those people who own emus and who have had the belief that one day they would be able to use them as commercial stock.

For the Minister now to say that what this measure proposes is overregulation is an absolute nonsense. It does not regulate anything other than the collection of a fee to ensure that funds are available from the industry itself for the purpose of conducting research into emu farming and providing extension information to emu farmers about that research, as well as producing information relevant to wild stock, separate from commercial stock.

The Minister ought to have acknowledged honestly that the board in its proposed form comprises a member appointed by him to ensure that our concerns for the conservation of emus in the wild stock are properly considered. Indeed, the legislation goes further than that:

it gives the board—I trust the board more than the Minister, I have to say, given the way that he dealt with the assets of other boards that he has disposed of without consulting the people who contributed their moneys to those boards—the responsibility of ensuring that no wild stock are recruited to the commercial stock without the board's authority, that they do that once a year (no more and no less often), and that they do it without application from any individual.

They then decide whether there should be recruitment from the wild stock to the commercial stock, because fairly soon after we establish commercial emu farming in this State it is quite obvious that the commercial stock will change from the wild stock in that genetic selection for faster growth, and other characteristics which make for more efficient farming will differentiate the two and there will be separate strains of the same species. There is no doubt about that in my mind. The factors which select the wild stock in its survival will be quite different from the factors used in the selection of the commercial stock. In addition to the nominee of the Minister of Environment and Land Management on the board there is to be one member nominated by the Minister of Primary Industries. Other than that, it is a board of growers democratically elected.

The Government's proposal, as I pointed out to the Minister, provides for the licensing of farms and the issuing of a permit for a given number of birds on those farms and the way in which the farms can be structured. However, let us look at that in the context of any other commercial species. Nowhere do we have a Minister or a department of the Crown saying how many milking cows you can have, how many sheep you can have for fat lambs or wool and what size the water troughs have to be. All those things which concern the welfare of the animal are already covered by separate legislation. You cannot be cruel to any animal under existing legislation in that regard. So, that is all well covered by this and other legislation. There is no need for us to be in the least bit concerned about that aspect. So the Minister need not be too fussed about that.

In addition, I would ask the Minister whether he will reflect on what the former Premier said at the last election—that this Government, if re-elected, would show the people of South Australia flair and light and lead the way in the establishment of sunrise industries for the benefit of all South Australians. Here is an export opportunity—

*The Hon. M.K. Mayes interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** Then why haven't you acted to date? I have waited. I have consulted at length with you, your predecessor, your advisers and other members of the community and the industry, and I still have—

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** On a point of order, Mr Chairman, I draw your attention to the Standing Order which provides that members and Ministers of this Chamber will refer to either the constituency to which a member belongs or the portfolio a Minister represents.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I uphold the point of order and ask the member for Murray-Mallee to use the correct title.

**Mr LEWIS:** Thank you, Mr Chairman; I am sorry for the transgression. There is know question about it: I believe the Government has the opportunity—here and now—having failed in its own time and failed after all

the patience that has been shown by the House, to simply say, 'Let's get on with it; let's do it in the way in which everybody through consultation and compromise has agreed is commercially viable and politically acceptable.'

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** The attack the Minister has made on this Bill is symptomatic of the siege mentality that exists with this Government. The Government has had 10 years to do something about it. In fact, the Opposition raised this issue and presented it to the House three years ago and the Minister keeps saying he will do something about it, that he will introduce a Government Bill. We asked for that three years ago and we still have not got it. There is potential out there for a very viable industry. Our primary industries are suffering enormously. Those of us who are involved in that area are very conscious of that. Here is an opportunity. The rest of the world is farming emus yet we in South Australia are fighting the Government for the right to be able to farm emus.

I was in New South Wales last weekend with a tri-State committee made up of members of Parliament from Victoria, New South Wales, South Australia and the Commonwealth looking at aspects of the Murray-Darling system. The New South Wales members of Parliament advised me then that they were on the verge of introducing a Bill to allow emu farming in New South Wales. In the very near future, if the Minister cannot state a date and give us a clear indication when it will be legal to farm emus in South Australia, we will finish up being the only State in Australia where it is illegal to farm and utilise emus.

I believe this is a situation that just cannot continue. It is useless the Minister claiming that he will do something about it when he has had three years in which to do something. I urge the Minister to state quite clearly whether he will support this legislation and, if not, how much longer we will have to wait before we see a Government Bill.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (23)—H. Allison, M.H. Armitage, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, H. Becker, P.D. Blacker, M.K. Brindal, D.C. Brown, J.L. Cashmore, B.C. Eastick, S.G. Evans, G.M. Gunn, G.A. Ingerson, D.C. Kotz, I.P. Lewis (teller), W.A. Matthew, E.J. Meier, J.W. Olsen, J.K.G. Oswald, R.B. Such, I.H. Venning, D.C. Wotton.

Noes (23)—L.M.F. Arnold, M.J. Atkinson, J.C. Bannon, F.T. Blevins, G.J. Crafter, M.R. De Laine, M.J. Evans, R.J. Gregory, T.R. Groom, K.C. Hamilton, T.H. Hemmings, V.S. Heron, P. Holloway, D.J. Hopgood, C.F. Hutchison, J.H.C. Klunder, S.M. Lenehan, C.D.T. McKee, M.K. Mayes (teller), N.T. Peterson, J.A. Quirke, M.D. Rann, J.P. Trainer.

**The CHAIRMAN:** There being 23 Ayes and 23 Noes, I give my casting vote for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated; clause passed.

Title passed.

Third reading negated.

**STAMP DUTIES (CONCESSIONS) AMENDMENT  
BILL**

In Committee.

(Continued from 7 October. Page 672.)

Clause 3—'Exemption from duty in respect of a conveyance of a family business.'

**Mr LEWIS:** I suggest that progress be reported. Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

**ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** I move:

That the fifth report of the committee (inquiry into the continued existence of the West Beach Trust) be noted.

I draw the attention of the House to those parts of the report that I will mention in my address this afternoon. When I became the presiding member of the committee this inquiry was already well under way. indeed, I understand that it commenced in March 1992. Witnesses were called in April 1992. They were examined by the committee as it was composed at that time, and as I understand it up until 7 October, when I was appointed to the committee, some considerable consideration of the evidence given by witnesses and of other matters had taken place.

I would like to congratulate the staff of the committee who, over December and January, put a lot of work into bringing this report to the point where we could present it to the House last week. The committee had a number of issues before it, the most fundamental of which was whether the present West Beach Trust should continue in its present formulation and whether it should be modified or completely abolished. It has been suggested on many occasions that the West Beach Trust as such should be abolished, and I will deal with that in a moment.

The committee had very clear terms of reference before it. It was to look closely at the existing trust and make recommendations as to its future. There were a number of things that we were not asked to do as a committee, and one of those was to pass judgment upon anyone on the West Beach Trust—the Chairman or any of the members. In fact, the committee was at no stage interested in pursuing that line of activity, and indeed it was not included in our terms of reference. The committee called no evidence to determine whether or not we should proceed in that way. We sought no evidence on those matters.

When the report came down last week it was suggested that the committee should have passed judgment on personalities involved with the trust both now and in the past and that we should have recommended the dismissal of certain trust members. The reality is that the committee was not in a position to do that. That was not our brief; that was not what we called evidence on; and that was not what the inquiry was about. The inquiry was about determining the future of the West Beach Trust and in fact what development should take place on the reserve at West Beach.

I want to make these points very clear because the debate so far has been less than helpful on a couple of key matters. The spectre has been raised, which I think

is unfortunate, of people who wish to point the finger to make it clear that certain people on the trust are responsible for what has happened. It may well be that when a select committee of the other House comes down with its findings a much more detailed and much more specific report into failed developments on the reserve will be available. It may well be that that report will apportion blame to individuals or whatever. I repeat: that was not the intention of the Economic and Finance Committee.

On the reserve lands at West Beach, an operation has been going on since 1954. I want to put it on the public record and make quite clear that the operation has done its job very well. In terms of the operation of the caravan park, the golf course and the other accommodation facilities, in the opinion of the committee, the West Beach Trust has done an excellent job. When the committee visited the reserves, the members were very impressed. We were particularly impressed by the occupancy rate for 10 per cent of Adelaide's low-cost accommodation, which exists on the reserve. Occupancy rates of the order of 80 or 90 per cent were the norm. The new backpackers' hostel is already experiencing 30 to 40 per cent occupancy even though it is only a fairly recent venture. Many other organisations, which are tenants of the West Beach Trust, use facilities there and are happy with the administration that has been a hallmark of the trust over the years.

However, the committee came across one aspect of the current arrangements that we felt needed to be commented upon, and we did that. We discharged our duty on it and made it very clear. The committee has recommended to Government that large-scale developments on the reserve lands be conducted in such a way that Government is responsible for the success or failure of such developments. We believe that the current arrangements which, as I understand it, are enshrined in the Act, and which give the West Beach Trust virtually equal status when discussing such proposals with developers and the Government, are no longer appropriate. We hold the view that, as a result of the developments and the failure of those developments to be consummated over the past six or seven years, a fresh look should be adopted in this regard.

It is the committee's view that the West Beach Trust should continue to exist, but only to do that which it is good at doing, that which it gets full community support for doing, that for which there is no doubt that it is more than competent to do. Equally, we are of the opinion that, if any large-scale developments are proposed for the reserve lands, they should not lie in the hands of the West Beach Trust, and we have recommended accordingly.

I want to share with the House a number of other significant recommendations in the report. I refer first to what I will call the Zhen Yun site, which included the Marineland site and lands to the south of that site. As a result of the Zhen Yun proposal, approximately nine cabins were removed from that site. The trust was compensated for the removal and relocation of the cabins to another part of the reserve. What the committee views with concern is that, although compensation has been

paid, the West Beach Trust has well advanced plans to put more cabins on the site.

The Economic and Finance Committee views the Zhen Yun site as an important development site for South Australia and considers that it should not be occupied too quickly with new cabins or with older, relocated cabins. Now that compensation has been paid, a chance should be taken to see whether an appropriate development, which has gone through all the necessary forums, can take place on that site. The committee has recommended to the Government that any attempt to build on the Zhen Yun site at this stage is inappropriate.

The committee also made other recommendations in its report, one of which is very significant. We have recommended that, in consultation with other authorities, the West Beach Trust forms an overall master plan for how the reserve lands will develop. The committee was of the opinion that this needs to be an ongoing process, that a review of progress should be done every three to five years. Comment is made in the report that such a review took place in the middle of the 1980s but that we did not think it was followed very well. As a consequence of that, the Economic and Finance Committee has made very clear that, where the West Beach Trust is concerned, an adequate forward planning mechanism needs to be put in place and that this recommendation should be applied immediately, not in three or five years time, when it should be reviewed.

A number of other issues concerning the reserve lands are well beyond the control of the West Beach Trust. Nonetheless, we believe that the trust and the Government need to be prepared for those issues. The possible and proposed Federal Airports Corporation extension to runways at the Adelaide Airport lies beyond the hands of the West Beach Trust, but a number of contingency plans need to be put in place for that. Some of those have already been developed; but we feel that others need to be developed more fully. Another issue is the erosion of the sand dunes. The committee saw where as much as 200 feet of coastal land has been eroded as a result of the activities of the sea in the past 25 years, and that is an issue of grave concern.

In bringing down this report, I am proud of the work that was done by the members of the committee on this difficult and delicate issue. There is a good story at West Beach in the form of the development of accommodation and the utilisation, quality and quantity of such accommodation. There is no doubt that the West Beach Trust has supervised and administered an important part of South Australia's tourist development on the reserve lands. There is also no doubt that other users of the lands are very satisfied with the operations of the West Beach Trust. However, the developments that have not taken place have cast a shadow over the trust as it is constituted. As a consequence, the committee has strongly recommended that future large-scale developments be handled by those bodies which are competent to handle the arrangements and which have the resources to do so.

It is unfortunate that calls were made against individuals who did not appear before the committee, and I refer to staff members, including maintenance staff, who have worked very hard for the West Beach Trust. I point out that, where this committee has come down with

recommendations, we are grateful for the works that have been done down there. We believe that significant changes should be made in the future. Calls for the vilification of individuals were beyond the scope of this inquiry, and we did not report on them accordingly.

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I support the adoption of the report and wish to put on the record my appreciation for the committee's taking the time to look at the West Beach Trust as the first statutory authority that might have been replaced. It was the original committee's intention to look at a statutory authority with a view to reducing the number of statutory authorities in South Australia; be they public trading enterprises, statutory committees or whatever, there are between 240 and 480 of these bodies in South Australia. Try as I have over the past 14 years, while I have been a member of this committee, to obtain an accurate list of the number of statutory authorities as we know them, it has been extremely difficult. It is just unbelievable that, through various Government departments such as the Ombudsman and the committee itself, we cannot come up with an accurate listing of statutory authorities.

The purpose of the exercise was to ascertain whether the role of the West Beach Trust could be carried out by one of the local government authorities or a Government department, or whether it could be changed. It became evident during the inquiry that a considerable amount of lobbying was undertaken by the Chairman—a very aggressive person and former member of the House—the very person whom I lobbied very hard early in the early 1970s to take over Marineland.

Marineland was built by a Jack Boss, a resident of Surfers Paradise, I believe. The idea was to establish a Marineland show, using dolphins, seals and other marine animals—partly educational and partly entertainment. It operated very successfully for a good number of years, but Mr Boss found that the type of structure that he had built at Marineland was becoming a burden rather than a novelty, and he tried to sell off the undertaking. He could not get any buyers. He then threatened to walk out and leave all the animals there, leaving the fate of Marineland in the hands of the Government. So, he virtually held a gun at the Government's head to take over Marineland, and I believe the Government paid about \$195 000 for Marineland, which in turn was taken over by the West Beach Trust.

So, if it had not been for Marineland itself and the controversy surrounding it, the West Beach Trust would be an organisation providing first class recreation facilities such as an excellent public golf course (one of the few public golf courses in the western suburbs). A lot of controversy has surrounded the West Beach Trust, which has operated under various names since 1954. It had surplus land from the airport development of some 160 hectares. It was managed by a committee formed by the Glenelg and West Torrens councils; although the bulk of the area comes under the West Torrens council boundaries, a small portion is in Glenelg. Henley and Grange council was invited to participate but in those days was not prepared to put up the money to establish the \$40 000 capital to develop this area, as the late Sir Thomas Playford saw, as a recreation area for the people.

The recreation area for the people has been developed well. It provides a wonderful facility for those who wish to play tennis, through the Catholic Lawn Tennis Club, and the Softball Association has its headquarters there and now has two international diamonds. It is used by the Glenelg Baseball Club, which is a very strong and well known club; the horse and pony club; and the German shepherd dog club. There is a golf driving range and a rugby club. The cricket club used to use it. So, a whole host of sporting organisations have had access to the recreation area. The West Beach Trust developed probably one of the best caravan parks established in Australia; I understand that at one stage it rated number 3 in Australia, and it has more than held its place.

**Mr Venning:** I've been going there for 14 years.

**Mr BECKER:** It is considered by my in-laws to be one of the best that they have visited in Australia. The member for Custance claims that he has been going there for 14 years, so no doubt he was there just after his coming out of nappies. He would have seen the development there. I well remember his father, who used to stay there periodically for holidays, always complaining that there were insufficient telephone boxes so, every year, an extra telephone booth was installed there. I do not think there are 14 but there are about six or eight now, just to look after the Venning family.

The West Beach Trust did have a very controversial beginning because of the association of the two councils. All sorts of allegations were made, and I know that one councillor and I made representations to Mr Virgo, who was the Minister of Local Government, because we thought there was something untoward going on in relation to the movement of sand, and the famous Somerton couch grass was used by the trailer load to establish many lawns in the western suburbs—and probably a few in the eastern suburbs, if the truth be known. I believe that the trust has done well to provide what it could, obtaining its income mainly from the golf course and the caravan park. The idea is to use the surplus income to provide the recreation facilities at the least possible cost to those sporting organisations. One could not adopt a better aim in that respect but, of course, that puts a lot of pressure on the skills and the management of the organisation.

As the Chairman of the committee, the member for Playford, said, it was not our role to look at any one function or what has happened in the history of the trust: it was simply a matter of our looking at whether the trust should be replaced. We interviewed representatives from local government who make up some of the members on that trust, and local government really was not interested.

Back in the 1986-87 financial year, the trust consisted of Mr G.T. Virgo, the Chairman; Mr Mason from Glenelg council; Mr Boyce from the West Torrens council; Mr Baker from the Glenelg council; Mrs M.J. Fenwick, who was a Government appointee (as a matter of interest, Mrs Fenwick was the secretary of the local branch of the ALP); Mr T. Bell, a Government appointee, not unsympathetic to the Government; and Mr

R. Waite, a councillor from West Torrens council. They were the people who presided over it, and there was a subcommittee of three that looked at the major developments, that subcommittee being made up of Mr Virgo, Mrs Fenwick and Mr Bell. So, we can see that

the Government had control of any development projects under the trust.

As I said, we will leave the select committee that has been appointed to look into the Marineland issue to come down with its findings, but what does concern me was that Mr Abel, who was a member of Tribond (an organisation that took over the Marineland lease) believes that some of the facts contained in the report are not accurate and would like them corrected. In the Chairman's foreword, it is stated that the Marineland dolphinarium was operated by the trust until 1985. In actual fact, it was in January 1987 that Tribond, a company formed by International Oceanaria Development Company Pty Ltd, took over the lease. Tribond was formed in December 1986 and provided a letter of intent to lease Marineland and to undertake a \$9 million development. Tragically, of course, that failed because of outside interference. Believe it or not, two people really were responsible for stopping that project.

Mr Abel has drawn my attention to page 7, paragraph 2.1, where 'Tribond Investments Pty Ltd' is referred to: in actual fact, it should read 'Tribond Developments'. In paragraph 2.11, the date May 1991 in the third paragraph should read February 1990, and I believe that the West Beach Trust was advised in March 1990 of the establishment of the select committee. The sum of \$6 million referred to to finalise the Tribond lease and the subsequent table are misleading, because the Government announced that \$4.5 million would be required to expend the debts and the Government guarantees given to Tribond.

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

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** I will not take all the time I have been allocated in this debate. I would like to extend my congratulations to the committee on its report. I was very much afraid that, when this matter was originally referred to the Economic and Finance Committee, somebody had on their agenda that they would seek a target, and the West Beach Trust is one of those things that could easily be disposed of, being a scalp to someone's belt. I was involved in the original deliberations concerning the trust. I made clear early in my deliberations on that committee that I would not be a party to the disbandment of the West Beach Trust and, had I been in a position to do so and if the matter had gone against me on the committee, I would have produced a minority report.

The West Beach Trust, so far as the people in the western area is concerned, has been an excellent organisation. We have seen that waste land, as it was originally, turned into something of which people in the western area could be proud. It was a swamp land, with salt bush and box thorns, and the West Beach Trust was formed. I must pay tribute to Sir Thomas Playford, because it was Sir Thomas Playford who established the West Beach Trust in the first place. It was originally offered to the councils in that area, namely, West Torrens, Glenelg and Henley Beach, and none of those councils at that time wanted to take up what they considered to be the burden of developing that area. So, the West Beach Trust was formed, and it has provided facilities for people in that area that they would never

have had had the West Beach Trust not been formed. As the local member of the district adjoining that area, I have received invitation after invitation to attend the sporting clubs that have centred themselves on that area. It has been very interesting to see people involved with such facilities as a softball diamond of international stature, where interstate and international carnivals can be played.

Further, the public golf course is a facility of which many other countries would be absolutely envious. There are not many countries in the world where someone can pay a \$7 or \$8 green fee—and I am not sure how much it is now, because it is so long since I have played golf there—and enjoy the facilities provided at that marvellous golf course, which is available to all people in the western area. The caravan park is of international standard and, incidentally, it brings millions of dollars into the West Beach area. It is very surprising to realise how much money a caravan park actually brings into a district. If one calculates all the groceries that have been bought in that area, all the fees that have been paid for the caravan park, all the corresponding wages for cleaning and everything else that is involved, one sees that the local restaurants and the local hostels benefit, and the take-away liquor stores and so forth have all done very well out of the erection of the car park in that area, and it creates jobs. I would like to see further expansion of the tourism side of that establishment.

As I said, I do not intend to take the full time available to me, but I extend my congratulations to all members of the Economic and Finance Committee from both sides of the House for the production of this report. I was frightened that the problems of Zhen Yun and other development projects down there would have overshadowed the main game and that we might have seen a recommendation for the disbandment of the trust. I think that the committee has come down with the right decision. I congratulate it on that decision, and I hope that the trust itself will never again come under threat.

**Mr BRINDAL (Hayward):** I was a member of the Economic and Finance Committee, indeed that member of the committee who suggested that the report did not go far enough and that the trust should be disbanded. I note with particular interest the remarks of the presiding member for, while he is elected by all members of the committee to be the presiding member in the committee and to speak in public for the committee, in this House he is only one member of the committee and does not—I believe in this instance at least—have all wisdom or all knowledge. I certainly disagree with some of the remarks that he made. I would remind the House that the specific reference of the Economic and Finance Committee in this case was that the West Beach Trust be asked to justify its existence. How anyone can come into this House and say it was beyond the province of the Economic and Finance Committee to suggest that the trust should cease to continue to exist defies all logic. Yesterday in this House, we were treated to someone who holds the commission of a Minister of the Crown trying in a sense to pre-empt this debate and to comment on my position on the matter. By his actions, he shows his ignorance not his wisdom and perhaps makes eloquent comment of his fitness to be a Minister of the Crown.

I clearly stated that I believe totally in this report. There is no variance between other members of the committee and me in terms of this report. However, what I believe is that the report makes two conclusions which I totally accept, but there is a third and irrefutable conclusion which this report does not make. I have been criticised because I did not make a dissenting report. I acknowledge that it is my right to do so. I chose in this instance not to make a dissenting report, because that is a very serious matter and one not undertaken lightly. However, I did realise that I would have a right, as a member of this committee, to stand up in the House and share with the House my thoughts on the matter. So, whether I make a dissenting report or whether I report to the House my feelings on the matter in the context of this report is my business as a member of Parliament and not really for everyone else to comment on and say what they might have done. If they might have done it, let them come onto the committee and do it themselves. It is entirely up to them.

The House has been reminded by the presiding member—and I would also remind the House—that the West Beach Trust, under the West Beach Recreation Reserves Act, is a body corporate, and it is defined as seven members appointed by the Minister. One thing that has been said which is wrong, which I wish to correct publicly and which I have corrected with the members of the staff at the West Beach Recreation Reserve is that it was I who called for the disbanding of the trust. I called for the resignation of the seven people who currently constitute what the Act defines as the trust. I did not say—and I agree with the report of the Economic and Finance Committee—that there is no need for a trust to continue to exist. I did not say that I have a quarrel with the management structure.

What I clearly have a quarrel with is the current trust, those seven members as they are constituted. I believe that the two conclusions which we reached—first, that the trust had erred badly in a couple of major developments and, secondly, that it had no forward plan—lead me to an irrefutable third conclusion, that is, that those seven members should be looked at in view of replacement because, while I believe there should be a trust at West Beach, I do not know that those seven members constitute the best trust that this Government should have in place at West Beach, and I make no apology for that. I did not personally vilify anything. I defy any member of this House to stand up and find one reference to any individual. However, I draw the attention of the House to our own report which states:

The committee is concerned that the Chairman and CEO of the trust were central to the negotiations and settlement of the lease for Zhen Yun Australia Hotels Pty Ltd. I also draw the attention of members to the following paragraph:

The committee concludes that these two major developments concerning the Marineland complex and the redevelopment site have resulted in a considerable loss to South Australia. Above that is the carefully computed figure of \$10.063 million. There in our own report is the fact that the Chairman of the trust, one of the seven members, was central to negotiations which resulted in this State's losing \$10.063 million. That is what led the committee to this summary:

The committee concludes that the overall development record of the trust has been an unacceptable one, which has resulted in the burden to this State—the \$10.063 million burden—

The committee concludes that the development site is a prime development site that has potential benefit for South Australia.

However, we did go on to say that the trust did not have our confidence in carrying on those sorts of development. If the trust does not have our confidence to do that, if the trust does not have our confidence for forward planning, I believe the trust should be looked at in terms of being replaced.

Again, I hasten to add that I am not talking about the management structure: I am talking about seven members. At no time have I singled out any one of those seven members over any other one. In the 1980s we went through a period where this Government through various agencies and semi-Government agencies has lost thousands of millions of dollars. Every time it comes to this Parliament's looking at the matter, members say, 'Isn't it a tragedy that there was considerable loss.'

I believe that one of the reporters claimed that the committee was guilty of a nice understatement of the fact that there was a considerable loss. Perhaps in State terms and in the terms of this Government \$10.063 million might not be much, but to me it is a large sum. As I was saying, in each case we have looked and said, 'Isn't it bad luck that they lost all this money, but that was the character of the 1980s. There is nothing wrong with that because somehow in the 1980s everyone was losing money, so we should never point the finger and we should not ask anyone to accept responsibility.' I go back to where I began, that is, to the reference contained in the first page of the report as follows:

The West Beach Trust was asked to justify its... existence...

That is what we were asked to do. That is what we looked at. We found that the trust, at least in part—and I say 'in part' because I do not pre-empt or comment on the findings of the select committee—was responsible, but perhaps theirs was not the sole responsibility. Perhaps the select committee will come down and name Government departments and Ministers who are more responsible, but we did enough work to establish that central to the loss of that money was at least one person on the board.

Rather than single him out, I believe that the board needs to be replaced, and I make no apology for saying that. As some people have suggested, I do not seek to excuse the Government if the Government had any responsibility in it at all. As the presiding member said, that is not our responsibility: it is the responsibility of a select committee to look at that. Perhaps they had the lion's share of the blame. All I know from our evidence is that certainly this trust had a share of the blame and deserved a share of the blame and, just for once, perhaps this Government could ask someone to take responsibility.

The Government appointed these people and then it claims, 'It is not our fault.' Apparently it is not their fault. If they do not have the gumption to say, 'We should resign, it is our fault, we appointed the board', perhaps they should say to these people, 'You did not do a very good job. That is clearly demonstrated. Perhaps you should resign and let someone do it who can do it.'

If the Government objects to that, so be it. If the Minister at the table wants to make a fuss about it in any seat in South Australia, let him do so. So long as I am in this Parliament I will continue to stand up for what I believe.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell):** I support the Economic and Finance Committee's report into the West Beach Trust. First, I would like to address some of the comments made by the member for Hayward, who has just spoken. It should be pointed out right from the start that the committee's inquiry was examining the existence of the trust, whether it should continue to exist as an entity. We never looked at the conduct of individuals involved in the trust. There is a good reason for that: a select committee of the Legislative Council has been under way for some time, much longer than this inquiry by the Economic and Finance Committee.

That inquiry has been continuing for months and it has been looking specifically at the conduct of individuals on the trust and all those other people involved in the development of the Marineland site. It would have been a total waste of resources for the committee to go over all that ground again. It would have been a miscarriage of justice. Anyone reading the speech of the member who has just spoken should be aware that the Economic and Finance Committee did not take any evidence whatsoever from any of the principals involved, in Zhen Yun, in Tribond or any of the people involved in the West Beach Trust.

For us to have come out and recommended the sacking of trust members, when we had not even taken any evidence from those principals, would have been a gross miscarriage of justice and I certainly would not want to be part of it. That point should be made to every member of the House. The Economic and Finance Committee confined itself to looking at whether the trust should continue to exist as a body.

Certainly, we included a reference to the losses that had been made by the trust, but we did not pass judgment on that, mainly because a committee of another place is looking into the matter and, secondly, because it would have just been a waste of resources to have investigated that and double guessed the other committee. Whilst our committee could have brought those people before us and taken evidence, that is, from others involved in the Zhen Yun development, it would have been rather unfair to those people to have brought them up before two committees of Parliament, one in this House and one in another place. It would have been a total waste.

However, we believed that we had to make reference to those losses that are there. We were certainly not in any position to pass judgment on what has happened with them and I am sure that the committee in another place is capable of doing that at the appropriate time. Also, I should point out that we recommended that the trust should not participate in any major development projects following what had happened. That was obviously the appropriate thing to do. We did not pass judgment against the trust in doing so, but it was obvious with that much money involved in failed developments that some structural change is needed.



The problem with the trust is that it does not have the necessary financial expertise. The West Beach Trust is not a property developer, and no-one would claim it to be one. However, it does look after golf courses well, it manages caravan parks well and it looks after sporting clubs in the area well. Provided the trust confines itself to these tasks it should continue to exist in that way. As to those activities, the trust is a profitable enterprise and, had we recommended that the trust be abolished or absorbed, one must consider what would have happened. Suppose that the trust had been handed over to local government, and I believe that some members opposite would like to do that—

**Mr Quirke:** That's what—

**Mr HOLLOWAY:** As the presiding member points out, the mayors opposed such a course of action. If the councils had eventually got control of the trust, there is no doubt that they would have been struggling with the upkeep of the park. I think that ultimately parts of it would have been sold off and it would have been dissolved as an entity. I do not believe that that should happen. Had it been transferred to a Government department of some sort, I do not believe any Government department could have looked after that area as efficiently as the trust.

I believe the findings of the Economic and Finance Committee were quite sensible and consistent, given the task that was before us. The committee said that it should not be involved in major developments—developments beyond the expertise of the trust; that it would leave the judgment on past developments to the appropriate committee that is looking into and taking evidence in relation to that. But, as far as the operation of the recreational reserves, the golf courses and caravan parks at West Beach were concerned, the committee said that we should leave that to the trust, that it should continue to do the job it has done very well for many years.

I support the recommendations of the Economic and Finance Committee. I point out that the committee made a number of suggestions to improve the performance of the trust. We suggested that the trust should adopt a more comprehensive management plan for its operation and implement some changes regarding its accounts, particularly in relation to the valuation of the land which would improve the quality of the accounts produced by the trust. We also recommended that the trust should look at the future of the contaminated land at the site.

One corner of the West Beach Recreation Reserve land was formerly used as a rubbish dump and there is gas emanating from that land which renders it unsuitable for any development at present. Obviously the fate of that land needs to be addressed by the trust, although I am sure it is aware of that problem. I believe that, with the recommendations that have been made by the Economic and Finance Committee, the West Beach Trust will continue to do the job it has done so well for so long. As to a judgment of the individuals involved, I think we can leave that up to another committee.

I make one final point about the competence of those involved: the events in relation to the development of the trust go back at least 15 years—to the early 1970s—and there have been a number of trust members involved during that time. There have also been a number of other

players involved in the development down there—the special projects unit, various Government departments and individual developers. For us to make findings against one particular section without even taking evidence would not have been an appropriate thing to do. It would have been a gross miscarriage of justice, and that is why the committee very wisely rejected the course of action that has been suggested by the member for Hayward. Others will judge the conduct of the individuals involved. I support the recommendations of the Economic and Finance Committee.

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** The Parliament generally supports the recommendations of the Economic and Finance Committee, but like the member for Hayward I have grave difficulty in accepting the lack of will of the committee. The \$12 million loss I think is a fairly compelling reason to have recommended the sacking of the trust, perhaps doing away with the principals, and a reconstitution. I would have thought a loss of \$12 million plus a loss of face in the international marketplace was a very compelling reason for that.

I note the member for Mitchell's expression 'to continue to do the job it has done so well for so long': I do not consider that the trust has done a good job in any shape or form. Who is to say what structures will be appropriate for the 1990s and the next century? This is one of the weakest efforts I have seen from the Economic and Finance Committee, and I suspect that that is so because members opposite had a fellow traveller heading the trust—an old political hack there destroying the State in his own little way. That is why the committee did not see fit to examine the contribution of the West Beach Trust in the current context—and that is what it was required to do. I am not interested in what the trust did during the 1970s: we are talking about the structures, the types of organisation necessary to take up that development—in other words, the appropriate organisational structure. I do not think the committee came to grips with the fact that if you have hacks on the trust there is no way it can perform.

Why should it be a trust? Why should it not be a board or an adjunct of a department? What is the magic about saying that this trust 'may' have done a good job? Another trust or another composite body 'may' have done an even better job. West Lakes was established by a private developer, not a trust. You cannot say that because there is something on that dirt, and because some is good and some is bad, by and large the trust has done a good job. That is absolutely inappropriate. If the West Lakes developer had done the job we would have finished with a far better result than the rubbish we see down there today.

*Mr Holloway interjecting:*

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I could give you a dozen different solutions more palatable than the one you have arrived at, and you know it. We are not stuck with having a trust.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Leader will address his remarks to the Chair. If he does that he will find that there will be no need for distractions.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Thank you, Sir. I appreciate your warning. I was going to speak on this subject for only two minutes, but I will now extend it to three. The Economic and Finance Committee has let down this Parliament. I note it did not look into the past behaviour of the trust and why this State suffered a \$12 million loss and lost other development opportunities as a result of its activities. I believe that the committee itself was retarded in many ways because of personalities rather than any other issue. It has done no service to the Parliament in the way it has reported. Whilst there are some relevant observations, they simply did not do the job. It is about time the Economic and Finance Committee did the job properly.

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** I will speak but for a few minutes on this matter. I would like to answer some of the things that were said by the previous speaker, the member for Mitcham. Unlike the honourable member, the committee did go down and have a look at what was being done by the trust on site and found that in the area they were looking at—

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**Mrs HUTCHISON:** —and I have a louder voice than the honourable member—the trust in fact had done a very good job. The well-known phrase—talking through the back of his head—is exactly what the honourable member was doing. He was not speaking from any basis of fact whatsoever. The problem with what the honourable member was saying, as the member for Henley Beach interjected, and quite rightly so, was that a select committee looked at one specific part of the trust: this committee looked at the other part of the trust. We took no evidence on the \$12 million the member for Mitcham was talking about, so we did not have the basis to make a value judgment on that—and would never do so without first having the correct evidence before us.

I am sure you would agree, Mr Speaker, that you cannot make judgments without having all the evidence before you. We did have all the evidence before us with regard to the current operations of the trust. I, like the other members of the committee—and all the members of the committee I might add—were very impressed by the state of the developed reserve. What the trust is doing down there is providing a very important service for the people of those three local government areas. It is providing a recreation reserve which the people in that area enjoy, and it is a low cost recreation reserve; not only that, but it is funding that reserve from its other operations.

That brings me to the other part of the trust which is very profitable and which is operating extremely well—that is, the low cost accommodation it provides. Speaking as a country member, I am sure that even the member for Morphett would have to agree that it is very well used by people in country areas. Previously I noted the member for Custance agreeing that this is a very good accommodation area. It is low cost, it is in close proximity to the city and it provides a very good tourism service for South Australia.

The member for Mitcham's statement that the trust has not done a good job in any shape or form was made from a position of no knowledge at all. I suggest quite sincerely that he go down there and have a look at that

operation and then come back here and speak in this House. He should not argue fallaciously on something as important as this.

I agree with the comments that were made by the presiding member and the other speakers in noting the report. I totally agree with noting the report. It is a responsible report which deals with those issues that could be dealt with by this particular committee. For those who would argue differently, I suggest that they wait for the recommendations of the select committee, which is looking at the other aspect of this. I have great pleasure in supporting the noting of the report.

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** I agree with some aspects of the report. I am pleased to see that an overall management or master plan has been proposed and that it will be reviewed every three to five years; that is a positive move. The report has many deficiencies. I recall from my days on the Public Accounts Committee the powers of investigation that we had. I know that those powers have been increased, so I am disappointed. I started to look through the report to find out why the committee held back on determining what happened down there. I notice that members opposite keep mentioning the report to be handed down by the select committee. That report will deal with the personalities and apportion the blame, if you like.

Anyone who has been involved in the West Beach Trust knows that the decision making process down there is peculiar to the West Beach Trust. Geoff Virgo is totally autocratic; nothing happens in the West Beach Trust area unless Geoff Virgo agrees to it. The councillors that are on the West Beach Trust virtually have to get his approval for everything. They talk about putting proposals up but they know that, if Geoff Virgo does not agree to them, they will not go ahead. I thought it was interesting that the presiding member of the committee made the comment in one of his recommendations that any new major developments should be handled by experts other than the trust.

The committee has agreed that the caravan park, the golf course and some of the other tourist ventures are an asset to the trust and are well run. I do not have any problems with that; they are minor matters but they certainly are well run, well patronised and those that use them find them excellent. However, the statement by the presiding member that the trust is not capable of handling major developments and therefore they should be handed over to a higher authority begs the question: what higher authority for management can you have than the Department of State Development and the then Minister who is now the Premier, Lynn Arnold.

We have lost \$12 million down there through the activities of Geoff Virgo and the now Premier of this State. Government members are twisting and weaving as best they can in debate to get away from the fact that we lost the money down there and someone is to blame. They say, 'Let us wait for the other inquiry to report'. The Economic and Finance Committee had all the powers in the world to investigate and come up with the reasons. We know on this side of the House, the public knows and certainly the locals down there know that the Government ran at 1 000 miles an hour to get away from ever having to say that the Premier of the State was the

instrument by which the Zhen Yun project faltered. To some degree the Government has used Geoff Virgo as a scapegoat, and it has said that he, his operation and his CEO must not get involved in the future in any of these major projects. Leave them to run the golf course and the caravan park; it is something they have done well in the past and more senior authorities will take over the major projects.

The most senior authority, the Department of State Development, took over the major projects and failed. In fact, it failed to the tune of \$12 million. Why on earth did the committee not say that in this report, which cost thousands of dollars to produce? I put to the House that it did not say that because of the political implications, given that the Premier of this State, who purports to be the champion of business and development in this State, showed that he was totally incapable and totally incompetent during that whole Zhen Yun fiasco. The whole thing was a debacle as a result of the performances of Geoff Virgo and the then Minister.

The committee did not come down and state the facts. Surely we will get the facts out of the next committee report and, if that is not the case, the public will not believe it because what happened is generally known. The personality of Geoff Virgo and the operation down there has to be understood. Once you understand the way that the trust operates you can see how this committee has evolved and come up with such a weak and wobbly report which praises the golf course and the operation of the caravan park but is very thin on the ground in getting down to what an economic and finance watchdog committee is all about, that is, apportioning blame.

#### McKINSEY REVIEW

**Mr VENNING (Custance):** I move:

That this House notes the recently released Organisation Development Review Report of the Department of Agriculture but has great concern at the intended closure of nine regional offices vital to extension services in rural South Australia. Agriculture in South Australia stands at the crossroads. For generations the farmers of this State have been responsible in large part for the level of the State's prosperity. They have learned to cope with the difficulties in the very unreliable climate both in weather and economics. After a run of seasons exceptional in their harshness, after trying to cope with first one natural disaster and then another, they have the additional burden of trying to operate in a harsh and unreliable economic climate. We now have the spectacle of the Government again using this great industry as a punching bag for its own agenda.

I refer to the report 'Plotting a course for agriculture in South Australia' commonly known as the McKinsey report or the ODR. This report is the result of a \$1 million study commissioned by the then Department of Agriculture and prepared by outside experts. The brief was to slash millions of dollars from the agricultural budget. It is clear from many of the recommendations in the report that the consultants were given a brief to slash yet more millions from the DPI's budget, and to work backwards from there. Why in the first place target agriculture to help pay for this Government's

mismanagement? This Government sees agriculture as an easy target.

Despite what appears to be pressure from the Government to come up with a satisfactory result, there are some worthwhile recommendations in the McKinsey report. However, many of the recommendations make no sense at all if agriculture is to remain a strong and growing part of this State's economic growth and future prosperity. There are even recommendations that would cause hardship and disruption to many individual rural communities. Government spending in other States is worth comparing. Exhibit 5 in this report is a graph of spending by State Governments on agriculture. It shows quite clearly that, as a proportion of agricultural output value, South Australia spends less than any other State in Australia on its agriculture. I cannot stress that point enough. It already spends less than any other State. To be precise, we spend 2.7 per cent compared with Victoria's 3.6 per cent; New South Wales and Western Australia both spend 3.8 per cent; in Queensland it is 5 per cent; and in Tasmania it is 7.4 per cent. As a portion of the budget, South Australia also trails the rest of Australia. Of the total State budget we spend only 2.3 per cent on agriculture compared with 5 per cent in Queensland and 5.5 per cent in the Northern Territory.

**Mr Meier:** And they want to cut that back.

**Mr VENNING:** As the member for Goyder says, they want to cut it back still further. How much better off would this State be from the output of its agricultural sector if its support of that sector matched that of the other States? If, as the review's terms of reference state, the Government's aim is to maximise the economic value of agriculture, there is a need for more resources, not a cut in resources. That was recognised by the Arthur D. Little report, and how many times have we heard that report quoted in this House! It was a waste of money because, although we all quote it, we do nothing about it. simply refer to it and then do the opposite.

**Mr Meier:** Not 'we'; it is the Government.

**Mr VENNING:** As the member for Goyder says, the Government ignores it completely, but the Arthur D. Little report was right on in its recommendations. It named agricultural services as a high priority among the profitable areas to be targeted for investment. The biggest disgrace is that the Arthur D. Little inquiry was instigated by the Government; yet it has not acted on it at all.

The proposal to save costs by closing down important regional centres runs directly counter to common sense. I agree that, at the moment, the department is something of a hybrid of centralised and regionalised operations. Common sense tells us that, if we want to get the best result out of Government services to agriculture, they should be delivered where they are needed, and that is in the country regions, not in the middle of Adelaide, not in the Black Stump. It is a ridiculous situation. Approximately 62 per cent of the department's staff are located in the metropolitan area. Closing down regional centres would have the effect of even further centralising the department. It could even isolate it completely from the people and the industry it is supposed to serve.

The Clare office, which is in my electorate, is an example of my concern. That office has 16 staff, 10 of whom are funded by the State Government. It services

more than 1 000 farm establishments or units which have a current average gross dollar revenue of more than \$142 million. The Clare office is run efficiently and effectively, and I know that because I am personally acquainted with the work that the staff do. I know the people there and I place their performance on the public record.

The closure of the office would, on the books, make a small saving, but it would pass on considerable cost to the community it now serves and result in increased inefficiencies with people spending many more hours driving motor vehicles. This would be a continuing cost to the State economy, yet this report claims that it is aimed at making agriculture a more productive part of the State's economy. It is clear from these inconsistencies that the report has been deliberately nobbled by the Government for short-term gain. Why should agriculture have to pay for this Government's mistakes?

I cannot believe that the consultants, having obtained advice from the Advisory Board, from the South Australian Farmers Federation, from industry leaders and from ordinary farmers, would have got from any of them the suggestion of shutting down important regional offices. I can think only that, under pressure to come up with an \$8 million saving, the quickest way to do it was to reduce this regional service, where the electoral damage will be the least. It is just another easy target.

The Government has changed the rules, and I do not blame McKinsey for this. In the last days of the organisational development review, the Government changed the rules. It changed the Minister and yet again changed the structure of the department, bringing back fisheries and pulling in forestry. It gave the department a new name, the Department of Primary Industries, and it also created a new animal altogether, the South Australian Research Development Institute (SARDI). It told McKinsey to make that fit, which was almost the complete insult. So McKinsey had to scramble to make it fit into the report and the result is that, however excellent the review might have been, the report the Government has released must be suspect.

One of the great strengths of the department has been the ability of its regional officers. These are the men and women who become part of the community they serve. They know and care about the farmers, who are their clients, and they can tell the policy makers in the Black Stump back in Adelaide what the farming industries want and need to remain productive and to contribute effectively to South Australia's economy. Taking these people away from country communities would not just make it more difficult for farmers in those regions to get advice and services but it would also rob the department's policy people of a priceless source of real-world information. This State has a wide diversity of agriculture and farming conditions. It is the advisers who live and work in the regions who know best what are the particular needs and problems of each region.

Far from talking about closing down regional offices, we should be talking about further regionalisation of the department, that is, putting the people who matter where they will do the most good, not collecting them together in city towers. This Government talks about decentralisation, but it does absolutely nothing about it.

Let us look at what another State did when it wanted to make its Department of Agriculture more efficient. Approximately two weeks ago I went to Orange in New South Wales as a guest of the New South Wales Department of Agriculture. In January last year the entire department was moved right out of Sydney. Its headquarters were moved, lock, stock and barrel, to the regional centre of Orange. The size of the central operation was reduced in favour of greater regionalisation and 470 staff are now relocated in Orange.

The department moved into a purpose-built \$21.5 million headquarters. And here is the crunch: it was financed, would you believe, by SASFIT, the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust. It is South Australian money. For once we might have done something right. It is estimated that the department will save \$60 million in rent alone over the term of the 29-year lease. Isn't that ironic? South Australian money has been spent in another State to do something properly and it is about time that we learnt something from another Government. The department also moved quickly. The new centre was opened one year after the concept was organised. I know that a lot of people were upset and they lost a few personnel, but it is working brilliantly.

When opening the new facility, the New South Wales Minister of Agriculture (Ian Armstrong) said that it set an example to other States—that is us—that the administration of agriculture can be taken to the client base, that is, the people in the bush. Private agribusiness organisations are now following the example and moving to Orange. However, in South Australia, we have the spectacle yet again of a Labor Government planning to struggle against the tide. We saw it just a few moments ago with the emu farming Bill and I fear that they will drown South Australia's agriculture industries in the process.

The report was ill-founded. It was set up by people who do not know anything about the subject. It was conducted by a body who does not understand agriculture. It should have begun with an intensive look at the department's role. The question that should have been asked was, 'What is the department's role in modern South Australian agriculture?' That is where the review should have started, but there is no mention of that. It should then have been established whether the department is achieving that role. That is where we should have started it from, but we are doing it from the other way round. This review, which cost approximately \$1 million, is a complete waste of time and taxpayers' money. I urge all members to oppose the further centralisation of the Department of Primary Industries and to oppose the closure of nine regional offices, particularly the Clare office. I urge all members to support the motion.

**Mrs HUTCHISON** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### **WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE CENTENARY**

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles):** I move:

That this House notes the significance of South Australia's planned celebrations to mark the centenary of women's suffrage

In 1994 and South Australia's distinction as the first democracy in the world to grant women the right to stand for Parliament: commends the celebrations to the Parliament and the community; and resolves to dedicate space in the House of Assembly Chamber for two tapestries to commemorate these great constitutional achievements.

It is with great pleasure that I move this motion and hope for and expect the support of the House. The suffrage centenary celebrations have already been spoken about in this Chamber and I know that my colleague the member for Stuart, who will second the motion and speak in support of it, will outline some of the background to those celebrations. It is my principal purpose to address the issue of the tapestries. I know that many members would like to speak in this debate and that the opportunity is not available because of the pressures of business. I will therefore try to put on the record the facts that are relevant, particularly in a historical context. The idea for the tapestries was first conceived in order to recognise the facts that are mentioned in the motion. The importance of the project is demonstrated by the fact that both the Government and the Opposition Parties have agreed in principle to make space available in the Chamber in recognition of these great constitutional milestones of national and international significance.

The tradition of using woven tapestry as a medium to commemorate significant occasions is well documented over the centuries, but the concept of this tapestry is that of a community tapestry which will be woven in public view and with public participation. I think that is a very important component of this tapestry and one which members would appreciate. The passing public will be encouraged to add a pass or two (that is the technical phrase for passing the shuttle through the warp and weft) and they will be working alongside skilled professional weavers who are accustomed to sharing their work with the public. The concept of the tapestries had its origins in the desire of the steering committee to establish commemorative projects. There is nothing whatsoever in this Parliament that indicates our unique distinction of being the first democracy in the world to give women the right to stand for Parliament. I am sure all members will acknowledge that that deficiency should be remedied and that the time to remedy it is 1994, the centenary of women's suffrage.

Tapestries do not come cheaply, and the original notion for one tapestry was costed at \$20 000. When it was decided that it should hang in Parliament House and, better still, in the Chamber of the House of Assembly, the steering committee and the sponsorship subcommittee, of which I am a member, realised that, there being no single focal point other than the Speaker's Chair and the Chamber being of symmetrical proportions, two tapestries would be required and additional moneys had to be found. As a result, the committee is looking for sponsors. I am pleased to advise the House that \$20 000 has been donated by the Frank and Hilda Perry Memorial Trust for the tapestry.

It is most appropriate that the money should come from this source, the trust having been established by the late Sir Frank and Lady Perry. Sir Frank Perry was one of the few members who enjoyed the distinction of serving in both Houses of this Parliament. He was a member of the House of Assembly from 1933 to 1938

and a member of the Legislative Council from 1947 to 1965. His son-in-law, the Hon. Don Laidlaw, was elected to the Legislative Council in 1977 and his granddaughter, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, was elected to the Legislative Council in 1982.

The members of the trust are: Mrs Peg Laidlaw; the Hon. Diana Laidlaw; Ms Sonia Laidlaw and Mrs Trina Ross. Additional funds have been provided by S. Kidman and Company, which has donated \$5 000. I think it is particularly appropriate that one of Australia's great pastoral companies is supporting the tapestries, particularly in view of the fact that the achievements and influence of country women and outback women (I think we must make the distinction) in the development of this State will be commemorated in the tapestries. The tapestry sizes will approximate the size of the existing portraits hanging in what we now consider to be the centre bays. The materials will be cotton for the warp of the tapestry and wool, cotton and linen for the weft. In respect of mounting and hanging, the tapestries will be attached to an aluminium bar with a velcro strip, the bar to be bolted to the wall. We are advised that lighting would be ideally adjusted to focus on the tapestry, and conservation is of importance.

As I said, the tapestries will celebrate 100 years of suffrage and pay tribute to the women and to the men (notably, Dr Edward Stirling, later Sir Edward Stirling, Sir John Cockburn and Charles Cameron Kingston, the Premier of the day) who were supportive of giving women the vote. The tapestries will acknowledge the role of Parliament in pioneering reforms that have benefited women, including the right to own property, enshrined in the Married Women's Property Act 1884; the right to vote and the right to stand for Parliament, enshrined in the Constitution Act Amendment Act 1894; the right of mothers to have equal rights with fathers in the guardianship of their children, through the Guardianship of Infants Act 1940; and the personal and industrial rights of equal opportunity, enshrined in the Equal Opportunity Act 1975.

In addition, we want the tapestries to celebrate the qualities that have enabled South Australian women to achieve so much, often against enormous odds. The committee that prepared the design brief for the tapestries wants qualities of 'leadership and a sense of social responsibility, resolve and persistence, strength and gentleness, energy and a willingness to take risks' to be expressed in the design of the tapestries. Joining me on the subcommittee are the member for Stuart; the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, representing the Frank and Hilda Perry Memorial Trust; Mrs Heather Bonnin, representing the visual arts community of South Australia; Ms Kay Lawrence, the designer, who has an international reputation and who has had major tapestries commissioned by other countries as well as by the Australian Commonwealth Parliament; and the coordinator of the tapestry, Ms Elaine Gardner, who has work hanging in public exhibitions and who is a coordinator of significant repute.

I have no doubt that this motion will be supported, but I want to commend to the House the idea that the contribution of women to the history of this State is highly significant and should be recorded and acknowledged. It should be evident in this Chamber as a

perpetual reminder to members, staff and visitors that this State was settled by men and women and that the achievements and influence of women have too often been disregarded. The fact that the portraits hanging here are all of nineteenth century (with one exception) male politicians is a visual indication of community attitudes. I look for the day when there are equal numbers of men and women in this Chamber, and in the meantime I look forward with happy anticipation to the hanging of the tapestries with the consent and approval of the House.

*[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]*

**Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart):** It gives me a great deal of pleasure to support this motion, to second it and, in a truly bipartisan manner, to speak after the member for Coles. I would like to support all the comments of the member for Coles. I would also like to pay tribute to two people who raised the matter of the celebration of the centenary of women's suffrage with the former Premier John Bannon very early on, namely, the Hon. Anne Levy and the Hon. Carolyn Pickles. I also pay tribute to the member for Coles for the way she has supported the centenary celebrations. This would be without doubt the most significant event for women in western society, because we were the first democracy in the world to enable women to stand for Parliament; South Australia is in the unique position of being the first to give women the opportunity to stand for Parliament. I might add that it was quite some time after that that women were elected to Parliament, but South Australia was a world leader in that regard.

The member for Coles referred to the members of the steering committee, who have been very supportive and energetic, and they have given totally of their time to make sure that we will remember the 1994 celebrations for some time to come. At this early stage, I am asking all members in this House to support these celebrations and to start putting out some information to their constituents, not only the women but also the men, to ask them to support the celebrations in 1994.

The member for Coles also said that we will need some funding for those magnificent tapestries that will hang in this Chamber. I would like to think that we could all band together to see whether there is anyone in our electorate who is prepared to sponsor the celebrations in that year, in whatever shape or form they wish, because any assistance will be of great value to the year of celebrations and to the committee in putting on a really good show for this State. I am sure that members of the steering committee will welcome that sort of assistance. If members have any ideas as to what form some of those celebrations could take, we would also like to hear about those.

The member for Coles said that I would give a bit of background information on the women's suffrage movement. I was amazed that the debate in this Parliament extended over about five months. South Australia was not the first democracy to give women the vote, but it was the first democracy to allow them to stand for Parliament. During the debates in the different countries of the world, some very interesting comments were made as to why women should not be given the vote. I would like to cite some of those reasons for the

benefit of members, and I refer to a book written by Janine Haines, *Suffrage to Sufferance: 100 Years of Women in Politics*. It was said that it would cost more to run an election if hundreds of thousands more voters had to be processed; that it would lead to women neglecting their husbands and children by blunting the womanly, motherly and sisterly instincts; that a referendum of both males and females should be held to see whether the community wanted female suffrage, the complete irony of that being that women would not be able to vote in the referendum anyway; and that only hirsute women would be interested in politics—and I am sure that my two colleagues on the other side of the House would vehemently oppose that.

**The Hon. J.P. Trainer:** Some of the men aren't very hirsute.

**Mrs HUTCHISON:** As the member for Walsh says, some of the men aren't very hirsute. Another reason was that married men would benefit by getting two votes to a single man's one, and so on. So, as members can see, while this battle was raging in this House, some very interesting comments were made as to why women should not be given the vote. The member for Coles also said that Kingston was the South Australian Premier at the time when this Bill was introduced.

A document entitled 'Votes for Women 1894 to 1928', which was put out by the Constitutional Museum, gives some good background history. It states that the real beginnings of the campaign can be traced to Dr E.C. Stirling, who was a professor of physiology at the Adelaide University in the 1880s. Dr Stirling did a lot to encourage the female students at that university to gain higher qualifications. He was also a member of the House of Assembly in 1886, when he introduced the first Bill to extend the franchise to unmarried women. He supported that measure on the grounds of:

...justice to a class of persons who had never failed to prove themselves devoted and law abiding citizens.

Two years later in 1888 women themselves formed the Women's Suffrage League, of which Mary Lee was Secretary, and that grew to quite a big organisation which fought to obtain the franchise for women by means of such avenues as public meetings, lectures and deputations to Parliament. At that time, a number of community leaders and groups joined with them to support that move.

The other well-known organisation which supported women's suffrage was the South Australian Women's Christian Temperance Union, and a branch of that was opened in 1886. That union played a pioneering role in helping women to organise themselves as pressure groups and in teaching women to take part in public life. Those two bodies joined together in trying to get the vote for women, and the result of that was a petition which was presented to the Parliament and which contained 11 600 signatures. That was really quite unusual at that time and indicated the surge of public opinion that was pushing for the vote for women and also for women to be able to stand for Parliament. It came to the forefront, as I said, when Charles Kingston and his supporters adopted it as part of their platform in 1893, and that platform brought them to power.

Over those years, a number of Bills were introduced into this Parliament but none was assented to because

they were introduced but not sufficient members voted for them to enable them to be passed. It was interesting that the Bill that gave women the opportunity to become members of Parliament—the reason why the members for Coles and Newland and I are here—was really passed by default. A move was made by the Parliament at that time to delete the contentious clause; the opponents of the Bill considered that it would not pass if that clause were taken out. I am quite sure a number of factors were involved; for example, people who wanted to go home were convinced to stay in the House so that the Bill could pass. I am sure that we are all aware of the sorts of mechanisms that would be involved.

Eventually, at 11 p.m. on 11 December 1894, there were enough supporters present in the House of Assembly to enable the Bill to be read a second time. It then mentions the old gentleman who was not allowed to go home at that time at night. Eventually the prize was won for women over that period. Debate had been going on around the world, and eventually we became the first democracy to allow women to stand for Parliament. Since that time, in the 98 years since that Bill was passed, there have been 13 female members in the two Houses of the South Australian Parliament.

I have to say that we have not advanced as quickly as we all might have liked, and there is still much work to be done in the coming years to encourage more women to take their place in this Parliament. We all have a responsibility to ensure that that equality of opportunity is available for all women, because the celebrations in 1994 will commemorate 100 years of women's suffrage. We should be able to say proudly that we have advanced the cause of democracy in our area of the world for all our citizens and given them equal rights.

The member for Coles also documented a number of pieces of legislation that have been vitally important to us as South Australians and to Australians generally. They have been valuable pieces of legislation and have been supported totally by all members of this House. Credit has to be given in that regard. We could have done better over the past 100 years and I look forward to our doing much better in the next 100 years. Therefore, I would ask members to support all the celebrations that we will be having.

I would refer to the celebrations announced by the Hon. Anne Levy at the launch of the logo for the centenary of suffrage. Some of the functions include an exhibition of Australian women artists covering the period from the 1890s to the 1940s. That exhibition will be highlighting artists' themes and the achievements of women artists who worked in this State. Much of that will document the work that has been done by people in outlying areas of the State—in rural, outback and isolated areas as well as in the metropolitan area. We have to recognise that the women in those early years were some of the hardest workers that we could imagine.

There will also be a joint venture by our Art Gallery and the Women's Suffrage Centenary Steering Committee and an exhibition '100 Years of Housework'. Certainly, I hope all male members of the House will be interested to view that exhibition. The Jam Factory will be featuring the work of South Australian women artists as well, and it will be hosting a photographic exhibition 'Images of Women'.

The member for Coles has referred to the tapestry, and I have to pay credit to her for the work she has done on the tapestry and for the encouragement she has given to the designers, as well as for the effort she has gone to to get sponsors. I also congratulate the Hon. Diana Laidlaw for securing sponsors for that tapestry project, which is a vital part of the whole celebrations. We will recognise women in this Chamber in an excellent way.

Meryl Tankard's Australian Dance Theatre is to choreograph a special performance and other arts functions will be held as well. During the 1994 Adelaide Festival of Arts the internationally renowned Writers Week will have a special focus relevant to the centenary year. I do not have time to refer to the many other functions but, if members want more information on them, I am sure that the member for Coles or any of the women members in this Parliament will be delighted to provide it. I ask all members to endeavour to obtain sponsors to help us during this year, because it will be an extremely important year for South Australia. Let us be proud of being the first State to give women the opportunity to sit in Parliament. I believe that we deserve that accolade and I hope that we will have many people supporting us in 1994.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition):** I support strongly the motion moved by the member for Coles. First, it is interesting to see how South Australia as a State has led the rest of the nation and so many other countries in what it has done. This significant step was taken almost 100 years ago, whereby we became the first colony in the whole of Australia to grant women a vote. It was a most significant event in a world and in a colony which were dominated and controlled by men in which women got very little, if any, recognition.

Perhaps few of us today understand the fight that took place to achieve that recognition for women. It was a nine year battle: doubtless it was probably much longer than that. It was a long, drawn-out campaign, and eventually the men of South Australia, who dominated and controlled this Parliament, agreed. Their faces look down upon us today, and it is interesting to see that there are no women whatsoever in any of these portraits that look down upon us day after day.

**Mr Ferguson:** They're all a bunch of pirates, anyway.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I would not put them quite in that category. It is with pleasure that I support this motion, and there are several points in the motion to which I would draw the attention of the House. First, I refer to the decision to put up the two tapestries within this Chamber. I especially draw attention to the contributions regarding the production of those tapestries. First, there was a generous financial contribution by the Laidlaw Foundation of, I think, \$20 000, and there was also a contribution by the S. Kidman Company, which has its founding roots here in South Australia.

In particular, it is appropriate that the Laidlaw family be involved; going back through that family's history, one notes that its members have held a dominant position in this Parliament through a number of generations. At

least the third generation of that family is directly involved in this Parliament. To that extent, I refer to an honourable member in another place whom I think I cannot name here. I commend the fact that both those parties have contributed so that the tapestries can be completed.

I look forward to next year when the tapestries will be hanging in this House, not just for a year but on a permanent basis. They will always remind us of the significant event that occurred in 1894 and of the fact that there is a feeling within our community that we have failed to understand and give due recognition to the role that women should and can play, and perhaps eventually will play, within our community.

I would very strongly support that role, but we have a long way to go at present. I give my full support to the motion and particularly commend the member for Coles who, along with the other committee members, is playing such a significant role in planning the events for 1994 when we celebrate the centenary of giving women the vote in South Australia.

**The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh):** I think it appropriate that a couple of token males should express support for this motion, following on as we do the excellent contributions of the member for Coles and the member for Stuart. Members would of course be aware of my interest in the rich history of our Parliament and of my enthusiasm for giving acknowledgment to its outstanding traditions and achievements and making sure they are preserved.

South Australia has been the leader in many democratic reforms, but there are two in particular that are highly significant because they are basic components of any democratic system anywhere in the world: one is that of female suffrage to which we are paying tribute in this motion of the member for Coles; the other, less well known, dates back further to 1857 when South Australia was the pioneer for the whole world (not just one of the first but the very first) to give full adult male suffrage and to do so by way of a secret printed ballot as we know it today.

I think it is a tragedy that so many South Australians are not aware of these tremendous contributions that South Australia has made to the democratic traditions of the free world. The secret ballot is so basic to the operation of any democratic system that the community's not knowing about its having been pioneered here in South Australia is a real tragedy. It is so significant in terms of political science that the secret ballot, in my belief, is the equivalent in its contribution to human development to that of, say, the discovery of the wheel or of fire. I think it is tragic that so few people are aware of that particular development being pioneered here in South Australia along with this other significant development that has been mentioned by the previous speakers, that is, the way in which South Australia, in 1894, was one of the first three or four places in the world to give women the vote and, at the same time, the very first to provide for them to stand for office.

I also point out, by way of supplementing some of the information given by the member for Stuart, that it would not have been possible for the Bill to be carried in 1894 had it not been for the Whip of the day preventing

one of the members who voted for it going home early. I think I should draw that to the attention of my colleagues in view of the fact that my role as Whip sometimes may not be appreciated.

As has been pointed out, in 1894 we were the first to give women the right to stand for office. Unfortunately, it took another 65 years before this Parliament, through either of its Chambers, actually elected a woman to office. Those two persons, in 1959, were Joyce Steele in this Chamber and Jessie Cooper in the Legislative Council. I think it highly significant that on the occasion of the election of Jessie Cooper she was challenged, after the election, by one of the Liberal Party candidates whom she had defeated in preselection. I will not draw any analogies with some of the matters that have been happening in recent days concerning people who missed out on Liberal Party preselection, but, in the case of Jessie Cooper, her success in the election was taken to court on a constitutional challenge. The Constitution referred to the election of a person to the Legislative Council and, in the viewpoint of the challenger, a woman was not a person. Fortunately, that challenge was thrown out of court.

Returning to 1894, and the importance of that in terms of world political history, this little Colony as it was then gave women the vote 30 years ahead of Great Britain, 30 years ahead of the United States and 30 years ahead of all the democracies of western Europe. In fact, it is my understanding that only in recent years has Switzerland extended the vote to Swiss women, and that two Swiss cantons still do not allow women to vote in local government elections.

Turning now to the subject of the tapestries that we hope will soon be adorning this Chamber if a sponsor can be found, on more than one occasion I have drawn members' attention to the portraits of former members which are currently placed on the walls of this Assembly. Some of them served with great distinction; some perhaps served with less distinction than others. In any case, I do not believe that those whose portraits grace the walls at the moment should be a selection that is frozen for all time as representing the only portraits that should be there.

There are indeed a couple that I believe are a little less worthy, such as that of the entrepreneurial charlatan Sir Robert Torrens, about whom I have spoken previously; he could be referred to as the Alan Bond of the nineteenth century; or that of Sir Richard Butler, who was stripped of his position as a Minister because of corruption which was revealed in a royal commission. I do not believe that those portraits are terribly worthy of staying on our walls. Even Archibald Henry Peake was not the most outstanding of all the Premiers we have had over the years. I think you could find a Playford, Dunstan or Kingston more worthy of a position than that particular Premier.

In the case of Archibald Peake, the only thing I can say in his favour was that his daughter was my mother's bridesmaid in 1924, so he is one whose portrait might possibly be included as being appropriate for removal in order that the women's suffrage tapestries can go on our walls. It is highly significant that every single one of the portraits is of a male, whether or not the individual made a significant contribution; in other words, the portraits



cover only the male component of part of our history. I look forward to these adornments in the Chamber paying tribute in the future not to just some limited aspects of our parliamentary history but all aspects, including the important role that has been played by the 1894 extension of the franchise to women and the role that women have played to an ever increasing degree in recent years. Accordingly, it is with great enthusiasm that I support this motion.

**Mrs KOTZ (Newland):** It gives me great pleasure to rise to support the motion moved by the member for Coles. As one of the women who has actually benefited by what took place over 100 years ago, by being able to sit in today's Parliament, I very much support the effort that will be put into the centenary celebrations that will take place during 1994. I think we also recognise the fact that there is still quite considerable under-representation of women in Parliaments, and perhaps some of the results of the efforts that will come out of the 1994 proposals will in some way address and perhaps encourage a changearound that will see a greater representation of women in our Parliaments in future.

I also take this opportunity to thank the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Walsh for making their contributions and acknowledging what is an extremely important occurrence, an historical event, that South Australia can be very proud of—the fact that 100 years ago South Australia was the first Colony to take what has been this very historic step and one of the first places anywhere in the world to win this privilege for women.

South Australia, as has already been stated, was the first State to secure the right for women to sit in Parliament. The celebrations that will occur in 1994 will pay tribute to what was a most remarkable and persistent effort of a group of very dedicated women who fought for a period of nine years to achieve this result. I believe it will also serve to remind all South Australians of the vital role that women have played and continue to play in this very fine State of ours—South Australia.

In marking this historic occasion, the South Australian Government has bipartisan support for establishing a steering committee, which will coordinate plans for the celebrations that will be staged throughout 1994, and of course many of those events were documented here by the member for Stuart. The year will culminate in the actual anniversary of the passing of the Constitution Amendment Bill 1894 on 18 December. The steering committee will coordinate the events, which will commemorate the social, economic and historical framework which existed a century ago.

I would like to conclude my remarks by congratulating all members who have put so much effort into establishing the steering committee at this stage and I know that the results throughout 1994 will have a continued benefit in the support towards women in this State for the coming decade and beyond. I would also like to point out that what did occur here 100 years ago is indeed an historical milestone, which has served as an inspiration to other women in other democracies throughout the world, and that in itself is an achievement of which women in South Australia should be extremely proud.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Education, Employment and Training):** I rise to support this motion moved by the member for Coles and I believe very ably supported by a number of members on both sides of the Parliament. It is always pleasing to members of this Parliament to see motions being supported in a bipartisan and very open way and this is one such motion. I would like also to very warmly acknowledge the contributions, particularly in terms of looking at the historical development and the way in which this moved through the Parliament. I know the member for Stuart and I believe the member for Coles highlighted some of those aspects, which really does put a much more human and personal framework in creating the atmosphere and climate of the time. I think we sometimes forget that things were not always as they are now.

I want to highlight one other aspect of the great achievement of that particular time, and in that regard I refer to the *Votes for Women* publication put out by the Constitutional Museum, because it does indicate the way in which things can happen, not necessarily through deliberate intention but indeed in some cases through accident, with enormous consequences for history.

I refer to the period in which the debate was being conducted, and the publication refers to an old gentleman who mildly supported the Bill and who usually went home to bed by 11 p.m. I suspect many of us in the Chamber today would have liked to utilise that particular practice last night. However, on the night that the Bill was being debated he was waylaid in the corridor and taken back to the Assembly Chamber where he helped to pass the second reading by the exact statutory majority of 28 votes. The Opposition had inserted some amendments in the hope that they would be able to wreck the Bill but these were also passed. I think the Opposition sought to remove the ability for women to stand for Parliament, not just to have the vote, but in fact these amendments were also passed and this meant that women could actually stand as candidates for the House of Assembly and could register postal votes.

The Constitution Amendment Bill enabling all women over 21 to vote in elections was passed on Tuesday 18 December at 11.30 p.m. by 31 votes to 14 amid loud cheering from around the House and in the galleries. South Australia had therefore become the first Colony in Australia to grant votes for women and indeed to enable women to stand as candidates for the House of Assembly. That really does highlight yet another very important achievement, which we will be celebrating in 1994.

It is important, however, in acknowledging what was a very significant historical milestone in the lives of women, to look, as my colleagues on both sides of the Chamber have done, at what happened from there. I do not intend to actually go through everyone of the times in which women were then elected but I do want to highlight that, notwithstanding that women could stand as candidates in 1894, it was not until the State election of 1959 when Joyce Steele gained a seat in the House of Assembly and Jessie Cooper in the Legislative Council that women actually took their place in the Parliament of South Australia. Of course, that is an incredible situation when you consider the huge timespan between the granting of the ability for women, not only to vote in

South Australia but to stand as candidates, to the time in which they actually were able to.

The other thing that is important to acknowledge, and the previous speaker has alluded to this, is that we still make up a very small percentage of the number of elected representatives to both Houses of the South Australian Parliament, and I think that any fair minded South Australian would see that this certainly does not represent the very broad section of the community and indeed does not reflect the fact that women constitute over 51 per cent of the South Australian population. However, on a lighter note I would like to say that what we lack in numbers we certainly make up for in quality and I am sure some of our male colleagues would be generous enough to acknowledge that.

It is important that in celebrating and recognising, as this motion does, the enormous achievements of women in South Australia we also very clearly highlight the road ahead. As a Parliament and a community, we have an enormous number of challenges. There are still impediments to women standing for Parliament, in my view, and many of those are because of such things as the way in which the Parliament conducts itself, its business, the times of sitting, the fact that we do not provide facilities such as child-care and in many cases—and both Parties are guilty of this—do not encourage young women to stand for Parliament. This particularly applies to Lower House single member seats.

I am not wishing to criticise any particular individual or indeed any particular Party, but I do think that as we move into the second century of our franchise for women and the ability for women to stand for Parliament we must look at this in a mature and rational way and possibly consider the way we should reform the procedures, processes and expectations of members of Parliament in terms of ensuring that this Parliament truly reflects the broad cross-section, skills, abilities and the talents of all of the community, and that indeed includes the 51 per cent of the community that we are celebrating tonight in this motion.

This motion really does take us forward and, having said that, we need to look at some of the traditions and maybe revisit some of those where we are prepared as a Parliament to celebrate, through the hanging of tapestries in this Chamber, this 100 years of achievement for women. I know the member for Coles spoke at some length about all of this but I understand that the National Bank has been prepared to be a focus for the tapestries so that women can come in from the community and be able to participate in the creation of these tapestries. I am not sure whether that has actually been put on the public record.

It is important to acknowledge the fact that such institutions as banks, and in this case the National Bank, are prepared to be so supportive and indeed to facilitate the process of the creation of these tapestries. I would like also to acknowledge the work of my two fellow members of Parliament, the two women members who are on the Centenary Suffrage Committee, and the work they are doing along with a number of women from the community who are working tirelessly. We saw some of that work at the launch of the logo for the celebrations in 1994, and that was a most exciting celebration and an unveiling.

I know that many of the women on the committee have worked tirelessly to ensure that it will be a program in 1994 that will include all women whether they are young, older women or working women, whether they are at home, whether they are professionals, students or parents. Indeed, the committee has a program which certainly members of this Parliament will find exciting and will want to be part of. I should like to acknowledge the hard work of the committee. I am not a member of that committee but I certainly believe that we will see what it is doing come to fruition next year, and I should like to put on the public record my thanks and appreciation to the committee.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles):** I thank all members who have contributed to this debate and I recognise that many more would like to have done so. I am sorry that the opportunity is not available tonight, but I am sure that it will be in the future. Other members have looked at different perspectives and the member for Stuart complemented what I was able to say in the time available by giving additional information about the background to the suffrage centenary and about the tapestries. Each member who has spoken has added something to the import of the decision that I hope and believe the House will make tonight.

In concluding the debate, I want to say how proud I am of my female predecessors in this Parliament. I am only the second Liberal woman in the House of Assembly, the first being Mrs Joyce Steele, who was elected the same day as the Hon. Jessie Cooper, and the member for Walsh outlined the circumstances of that election.

I should like to reiterate the gratitude of the steering committee, and I believe of the Parliament, if I may do that, Mr Speaker, to our sponsors at this stage, the Frank and Hilda Perry Memorial Trust, S. Kidman and Company and the National Australia Bank and its State Manager (Mr Geoff Armbruster) who has agreed to make space available in the banking chamber for the weaving of the tapestries on public view from approximately June this year until June next year. That generous offer of space amounts to sponsorship and the National Australia Bank should be recognised for its generosity, its cooperation and its warm-hearted support for this project.

One of the distinguishing qualities of South Australians from the time of settlement has been our ability to work together for common goals and for the common good. I feel certain that these tapestries will give expression to that very proud heritage. I thank the House for its support and, in December 12 months, or before that, although I will not be on the floor of the House, I hope I will be in the gallery to see the hanging of the tapestries and to applaud the House for its decision tonight.

Motion carried.

## RETIRED PERSONS

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** I move:

That this House commends the Federal Coalition for the sympathetic assistance it will provide in Government to self-funded retirees under the Fightback package in recognising

the unsympathetic taxation discrimination that has been of major concern to those who have prepared for their own retirement.

I am sure that there is not a member of this House who at some stage has not received representation from self-funded retirees who are very disgruntled at the situation in which they find themselves. It has always seemed wrong to me that people who have provided for their own retirement have not been better looked after. I was delighted when I noted under the Fightback package some excellent policies that will assist these people, when the Coalition is in Government, and I support those moves very strongly.

Approximately 500 000 to one million people are in the category of self-funded retirees. Like many other groups in the community, they have been hard hit by the recession, and we know that only too well. They get little or no assistance through the welfare system. Therefore, assistance must be given through the taxation system. I believe that it is inequitable that those who have provided for their own retirement are disadvantaged under the current tax system.

On the question of tax assistance, considerable concern has been voiced by many retiree groups, including the Association of Independent Retirees, about the alleged discrimination against the inconsistent tax treatment of self-funded retirees compared with aged pensioners. Aged pensioners pay no tax up to a threshold of \$10 060 while persons funding their own retirement pay no tax up to a threshold of \$5 400. This has come about as a result of the fact that full pensioners are eligible for a pensioner tax rebate that is structured to ensure that they pay no tax where their income consists of the full pension plus the income and tax-free area of \$43 per week for a single pensioner and \$76 per week for married couples. This has resulted in an effective tax-free threshold of approximately \$10 060 per year for single pensioners and \$8 490 per year for each married pensioner. For married couples, this means a combined tax-free area of income of \$16 980.

It is recognised that, where one spouse has insufficient taxable income to take full advantage of the individual tax-free area of \$8 490, the unused component is transferred to the other spouse. Over and above the threshold assistance, both full and part pensioners also receive a range of Commonwealth, State and local government concessions that help to meet the cost of various Government charges through transport, health and telephone expenses.

One of the areas in which there has been significant improvement in recent times has been the introduction in this State of the Seniors Card, which assists those people very much. There are a number of areas, particularly in the private sector, where pensioners are able to receive reductions in costs and charges for various items, including travel and manufacturing goods. That has been the policy of the Liberal Party in this State for some time and I was delighted when the present Government, through the Premier, picked up that policy and introduced it late last year. A lot more work needs to be done with respect to the Seniors Card and there is a need to ensure that it can be used in all States. It is useless having a situation where the card can be used for transport concessions in this State but cannot be used in another State and I hope that that will be addressed.

There are a number of areas under Fightback where the Coalition has moved to assist self-funded retirees, and I refer to taxation measures that will deliver real additional benefits to these people. They include the raising of the tax-free threshold from \$5 400 to \$7 000, the lowering of personal income tax rates, the abolition of fuel excise, wealth compensation to fully compensate self-funded retirees for any devaluation in their savings due to the introduction of the goods and services tax, the extension of the pharmaceutical benefits concession card to all people over the age of 65 up to an income limit of \$50 000, and changes to the superannuation regulations to allow income to be held in rollover funds beyond age 65. That measure will allow retirees to hold a pool of money in a fund for access at a later date when there is greater call on health and aged care costs.

Another area where self-funded retirees will be assisted is in allowing more flexible annuity products to be sold, such as cash-back pensions, which will better meet the variable financial needs of many retirees. Most retiree groups and their representative bodies, such as the Over 50s Society, the Council on the Ageing, the Australian Retired Persons' Association and the Association of Independent Retirees, recognise that these measures will be of significant benefit to them. One of the more vocal and respected champions of their cause, Daryl Dixon, referred to Fightback as follows:

These... taxation changes will be enough to provide sufficient income tax reductions to most self-funded retirees to compensate for the introduction of the GST. Apart from the very slight increase in the size of the tax threshold, they will still not be sufficient to remove the present gross discrimination against self-funded retirees and other low income people in the current system.

Only a major increase in the amount of the tax threshold and/or action to remove the discrimination against fixed interest investors in the tax system can remove present injustices. Unfortunately, neither the Government nor the Coalition have shown any interest in the problems of self-funded retirees.

I am very delighted indeed that that situation has changed. I would urge all members of the House to support this motion. I believe that a considerable number of people in the community will be very pleased indeed to learn of these changes, and again I make the point that I think it would be generally recognised that, when people in the community have provided for their own retirement and have been very careful in the way they have spent their money and in the way they have made appropriate savings to ensure that they were comfortable in their retirement, those people should receive benefits at this stage and not be disadvantaged, particularly through the tax system. So, I commend this motion to the House, and I would ask all members to support it at the appropriate time.

**Mr HOLLOWAY** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### STATE BANK

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I move:

That this House rejects any attempt by the Premier to force a sale of the State Bank without ensuring that—

- (a) all moneys from such sale are directed at debt reduction;
- (b) the sale price is maximised; and
- (c) South Australians retain the banking services of the State Bank and the head office thereof.

After the performance of the Premier today I believe all South Australians should be concerned about the future of this State and the State Bank. Over recent months we have seen the scrambling that has taken place within Government ranks somehow to work out a scheme to distance themselves from the massive losses of the State Bank and the impact that has had on the State economy and on the State budget. We were assured by people close to the bank and a number of other interested parties that the Government would do anything to quit the State Bank, in the belief that somehow the smell would go away. We have heard on good authority that the bank has been preparing to sell itself or to be sold by the Government, yet the Premier today and previously denied all knowledge.

At one stage I had a belief that the new Premier of this State, who replaced the member for Ross Smith, was a person of integrity. However, all I can conclude from recent statements from our new Premier is that he has no integrity whatsoever and is just as bad as his predecessor, because there is no doubt that this House and the people of South Australia have been misled. The so-called 'no sale' sign on the bank has not been a no sale sign at all; it has been a sign saying, 'We do not want you to talk about it because we intend to go through the process of getting it up for sale.' If the Premier had been clean and honest he would have said, 'Yes; it is our intention to look at the sale of the bank,' and ensure that those three items mentioned in this motion have been satisfied. But, no, we did not get any guarantees. Not only has the Premier misled the Parliament and the people of South Australia but, importantly, he gave no guarantees—

**Mr QUIRKE:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. There has been an allegation that the Premier misled the House. I understand that has to be done by way of a major resolution before this Chamber and I ask for it to be withdrawn.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If there was an allegation, yes, I would support the call for it to be withdrawn, because the only way such an allegation can be made is by substantive motion. The Deputy Leader.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The point I am making quite clearly in this House—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader will address the point of order.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** If you wish me to address the issue that has been raised, Sir, I can only say that it has been the normal practice of the House that, if a member misleads the House, it is appropriate to deal with that by substantive motion: that is the Standing Order. However, I can recall many occasions during debate in this House when a member has accused another member of misleading the House and they have never been asked to withdraw.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader will resume his seat. If my memory serves me correctly, even today the Chairman of Committees requested the withdrawal of exactly the same words. I ask the Deputy Leader to withdraw the words.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I withdraw. The point is quite clear: we are not being told the truth, and have not been told the truth, and the Premier is no better than his predecessor—no better at all. The point of the motion is that we wish to secure the future of South Australia. We do not want the State Bank to be sold at any price; we do not want the 4 000 employees of the State Bank thrown on the scrap heap; and we do not want the debt to escalate whilst the funds that have been garnished from the sale of the State Bank and any Commonwealth bail-outs are also used to prop up a shaky budget. We do not want any of those things and neither do any South Australians, except perhaps some of the members on the other side of the House. It is absolutely imperative that, when the sale of the State Bank occurs, it be done properly with no short cuts, no bail-out and no fire sale. We have to get the best price, the best result for the people employed within the State Bank and the best result for the State budget, which is absolutely in tatters.

I am very concerned about the future and our capacity as a State to perform and the capacity of the budget to withstand the pressures that are being placed on it by this Government. The first part of my motion states that all moneys resulting from such a sale must be directed at debt reduction. That does not mean part of the sale price: that means all of it. That means that, if for electoral purposes the Prime Minister wishes to offer the State Government \$600 million, that \$600 million has to be applied to the debt, not to prop up the next Government so this so-called Government can go on a spending spree as it has been doing for the past 10 years.

If the Government is able to obtain \$1 000 million from the sale of the bank, that money must be applied to reduce the State debt. No other area is acceptable. However, every member in this House knows that that is not the plan. The plan is obviously to present a budget with some promises that cannot be kept and with some moneys dragged from somewhere so that the Government can survive until the next election. It is well known around town that the Government cannot afford to go to the next election. It cannot afford to go to the next State budget, because it has no capacity to pay the bills. Its levels of expenditure and its commitments are far too high and its revenue base is far too limited to enable it to continue to cover the levels of expenditure currently within the public sector.

We demand that, whether it be \$1.6 billion or \$1.4 billion when the Hewson Government gets elected, the money goes toward debt reduction. Usage of the funds in any other area is totally untenable. The second point is that the sale price must be maximised. We do not want the Government to rush off to the market and say, 'You can have it for whatever price you bid.' We know there are not too many banks in the marketplace because a number are suffering from the recession and from bad investment decisions. We know, for example, that the Commonwealth Bank does not want another Victorian State Bank on its hands; we know that the ANZ Bank is barely keeping its head above water; and we know that Westpac is slightly below the surface. So, none of those banks could have an interest in the State Bank of South Australia. Only one bank has the capacity to absorb the State Bank, that is, the National Bank.

It would be absolutely untenable if the National Bank said, 'We will give you \$900 million' and it were sold on that basis, because we would see a total destruction of the branch network that exists in South Australia today and the loss of at least 4 000 employees. Members have talked about Mitsubishi; Mitsubishi will survive because of the Federal Liberal Opposition's tariff policies. But the State Bank will not survive the Federal Labor Party's policies, and we could see a massive loss of jobs.

So, the maximisation of the sale price means that we have to go further than that. We must take our time. We must work out whether it is better to float the State Bank and give South Australians a chance to invest in the good part of the bank. We must ascertain the best available options. A very large interstate building society might like to have a branch network and branch headquarters in South Australia, or an overseas entity might want to set up practice here in South Australia, retain its branch structures and at the same time use South Australia as its base to go out into markets interstate. We might want to see just what the share market could provide for South Australians. We could see how many people would like to invest in what could be quite a profitable venture, given that many of the bad and doubtful debts have been excised into the Group Asset Management Division.

It is an important issue. The Premier was actually smiling today about the fact that he had done a deal to sell the State Bank. But what a deal! There were no guarantees about the future of the State Bank in terms of its 4 000 employees. I wonder what the union movement is doing about this. I must ask some of my colleagues opposite how they feel about this proposition and the sale of a bit of home territory. I wonder how they feel about seeing thousands of jobs potentially going down the drain. I notice that one or two members opposite are smiling, but deep down they must be hurting. Of course, we have not heard from the union movement, which probably had discussions with the Premier behind closed doors.

Debate adjourned.

#### COURTS ADMINISTRATION BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### POLICE SUPERANNUATION (SUPERANNUATION GUARANTEE) AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Treasurer)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Police Superannuation Act 1990 and to make a related amendment to the Superannuation Act 1988. Read a first time.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

This Bill seeks to amend the Police Superannuation Scheme so that the scheme complies with the requirements of the Commonwealth's Superannuation Guarantee (Administration) Act. In terms of this Commonwealth legislation, employers are required to provide for employees a minimum level of employer support in a superannuation scheme. This is a requirement in respect of employment on and after 1 July 1992.

The minimum level of required support commenced at 4% of salary on 1 July 1992 and increased to 5% of salary as from 1 January 1993. The superannuation guarantee charge to employers is to rise in steps to 9% of salary in the year 2002-2003.

There are at present two areas where the scheme may, in certain circumstances, not comply with the Commonwealth legislation. One of the areas is where a police officer resigns and elects not to preserve the accrued benefit by leaving his/her own contributions in the scheme. In these circumstances the present scheme provides no employer financed benefit. The Bill seeks to remedy this situation by providing a compulsorily preserved employer financed benefit at the level required under Commonwealth law.

The second area in which the scheme may not comply is on the death of a contributor, and in circumstances where there is no spouse entitled to a benefit under the scheme. The Bill seeks to remedy this situation by providing a benefit equal to the accrued benefit, payable to the former police officer's estate.

The Bill also makes a minor technical amendment to Section 50 of the Act. The amended provision provides greater clarity to the original intention of the provision by reinforcing the fact that the Police Superannuation Board has prime responsibility for administering the scheme and resolving any doubts and difficulties that arise.

The Bill also includes an urgent technical amendment to the wording of the death benefit provisions under the Superannuation Act 1988. The technical deficiency in the Superannuation Act was identified in the preparation of this Bill. The amendment will not only remove the possibility of double benefits being paid in certain circumstances, but also make the wording consistent with that under the Police Superannuation Act.

In summary, the amendments being sought in this Bill are similar to those made to the main State scheme under the Superannuation Act and for the same purpose.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

*Clause 1: Short title*

Clause 1 is formal.

*Clause 2: Commencement*

Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act. The Act (except for clause 9) will come into operation retrospectively on 1 July 1992 because this is the date when the *Superannuation Guarantee (Administration) Act 1992* of the Commonwealth came into operation. The reason for the retrospective operation of clause 9 is explained in the note to that clause.

*Clause 3: Amendment of s. 4—Interpretation*

Clause 3 defines "**the Commonwealth Act**".

*Clause 4: Amendment of s. 22—Resignation and preservation*

Clause 4 amends section 22 of the principal Act which provides for resignation under the new scheme. The provision is drawn on the same lines as the amendments made to the *Superannuation Act 1988* last year. A contributor who elects on

resignation to take his or her contributions is entitled to the minimum payment under the Commonwealth legislation as well. This amount must be preserved unless it is less than \$500.

*Clause 5: Amendment of s. 26—Death of contributor*

Clause 5 amends section 26 of the principal Act. Paragraph (c) inserts new subsections (5) and (6). Subsection (5) provides a benefit for the estate of a deceased contributor who is not survived by a spouse but is survived by an eligible child. Subsection (6) replaces existing subsections (5) and (6) of section 26. Under the existing provisions it is possible that the estate of a deceased contributor will receive less than the minimum required by the Commonwealth. New subsection (5) and the formulas in new subsection (6) avoid this problem. Paragraphs (a) and (b) make consequential changes.

*Clause 6: Substitution of s. 33*

Clause 6 amends section 33 of the principal Act which provides a benefit for the estate of a contributor under the old scheme who is not survived by a spouse or an eligible child. The formulas in this section are the same as those in existing section 26(5) and the new section is in line with new subsection (6) inserted into section 26 by clause 5.

*Clause 7: Amendment of s. 34—Resignation and preservation of benefits*

Clause 7 amends the resignation provision of the old scheme in the same manner as clause 4 amends section 22.

*Clause 8: Substitution of s. 50*

Clause 8 replaces section 50 of the principal Act with a provision that expresses the intention more clearly.

*Clause 9: Amendment of Superannuation Act 1988*

Clause 9 amends section 38 of the *Superannuation Act 1988*.

Subsection (7) of that section provides a benefit to the estate of a deceased contributor who dies without leaving a spouse or eligible child. It was never intended that a contributor who retires should in addition to receiving a pension until he or she dies be entitled to have a lump sum benefit paid to his or her estate. This amendment makes that intention clear. Subsection (7) was inserted by Act No. 67 of 1991 and therefore clause 2 makes this amendment retrospective to the date on which that amending Act came into operation.

**Mr S.J. BAKER** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Mineral Resources)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act 1966. Read a first time.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

The Aboriginal Lands Trust was established in 1966 following the passing of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act. The Intent of the Act is principally to acquire and hold land on behalf of the Aboriginal communities, and three nominated by the Minister of

Aboriginal Affairs, including the Chairperson. The Minister is also represented on the Trust.

In holding land on behalf of the Aboriginal community, the Trust and the Government are keen to ensure that the benefit to the Aboriginal Community Derived from these land holdings is maximised. The establishment of the Parliamentary Committee on Aboriginal Lands and the Business Advisory Panel in 1992, following amendment of the Act in 1991, are part of the Government's program in this area.

The purpose of this Bill is to assist the Aboriginal Lands Trust to carry out its program of working with Aboriginal communities to increase the return from the lands which it holds. The Trust has sought the amendment of the Act in four areas, firstly to allow for the appointment of deputies to members, secondly, to remove the requirement that no meeting of the Trust shall be held without the Minister's representative, thirdly, to make provision for the operation of an Executive Committee, and fourthly, to provide for the appointment of a manager or management committee in respect of the land.

The Trust currently meets on a quarterly basis, and it is not always possible for each member to attend all meetings. This means that the Community which that member represents is not able to fully participate in the affairs of the Trust. The Trust has therefore sought the establishment of a system of deputies to members, to assist in providing continuity in the representation from Communities on the Trust.

In passing the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act in 1966, the Parliament took the view that the Minister should be represented at all meetings of the Trust, and Section 10 (3) required that no meeting of the Trust should be held without the Minister's representative. A number of reviews of the Act since that time have recommended that this provision be removed. The Government is therefore moving to delete this requirement and provide that the Minister's representative is entitled to attend meetings of the Trust.

Between meetings of the Trust there are on occasions matters which arise which require more urgent attention than a quarterly meeting will allow. The Trust has therefore sought provision to allow for the establishment of an Executive Committee to operate between meetings of the full Trust. The full Trust would be required to meet in relation to major matters such as the leasing of land, to approve major expenditures, the appointment of staff and making recommendations in relation to legislation. However, these amendments would allow the Trust to delegate other powers and functions to a member, or a committee of members.

The Trust and the Parliamentary Committee on Aboriginal Lands have sought the amendment of the Act to allow the Trust to appoint a manager or management committee to manage land which has been previously leased by the Trust. This provision will allow the Trust, with the consent of the Minister, to appoint a person or committee to manage land, where the Trust is of the view that the land is not being managed by the lessee for the benefit of the Aboriginal Community for whose benefit the lease was granted.

Clause 1. Short title. . This clause is formal.

Clause 2. *Commencement.* . This clause provides for the measure to be brought into operation by proclamation.

Clause 3. *Amendment of s. 6—Membership of Trust.* This clause amends section 6 of the principal Act to make provision for the appointment of a standing deputy for any member of the Aboriginal Lands Trust. . Where a member of the Trust has been appointed on the recommendation of an Aboriginal

community, a deputy of the member must also, under the clause, be appointed on the recommendation of that community.

*Clause 4. Amendment of s. 10—Meetings and quorum.*

Section 9a of the principal Act requires that the Minister appoint a Minister's Representative for the purposes of the Act. Section 10 (3) currently provides that no meeting of the Aboriginal Lands Trust may be held in the absence of the Minister's Representative. Under this clause, subsection (3) is replaced with a provision providing instead that the Minister's Representative is entitled (but not required) to be present at a meeting of the Trust.

*Clause 5. Insertion of new s. 11a—Delegation by Trust.*

Proposed new section 11a is designed to allow the Aboriginal Lands Trust to delegate powers and functions to a member of the Trust or a committee of members. Under the proposed new section, certain functions or powers would not be capable of delegation, namely—

- (a) the granting of a lease in respect of any land vested in the Trust pursuant to the Act;
- (b) the appointment under proposed new section 16aa of a manager or management committee in respect of land the subject of a lease granted by the Trust;
- (c) the approval of expenditure in an amount exceeding \$5 000;
- (d) the appointment of an officer or employee of the Trust or the determination of any matter relating to the terms and conditions or termination of the appointment or employment of an officer or employee of the Trust;
- (e) the making of any recommendation to the Minister as to legislative amendment;
- (f) this power of delegation.

Any such delegation—

- (a) must be by instrument in writing;
- (b) may be conditional or unconditional;
- (c) does not prevent the Trust from acting itself in any matter;

and

- (d) may be revoked at any time by the Trust.

*Clause 6: Insertion of new s. 16aa—Appointment of manager or management committee in respect of land leased by Trust.*

Proposed new section 16aa provides for the appointment of a manager or a management committee in respect of land that has been vested in the Trust and is the subject of a lease granted by the Trust under the principal Act. Under the section, such an appointment may not be made except at the request of the lessee or with the consent of the Minister where the Trust is satisfied that the land is not being properly managed by the lessee for the benefit of the Aboriginal community for whose benefit the lease was granted.

Where the Trust appoints a manager or management committee in respect of land the subject of a lease, the manager or management committee will have all the powers, functions and duties of the lessee in respect of the land and must report regularly to the Trust on the management of the land.

The remuneration of the manager or a member of the management committee and all other costs and expenses arising out of the management of the land are to be payable by the Trust but recoverable by the Trust as a debt from the lessee.

The section empowers the manager or management committee to require the lessee or any person who has been involved in the management of the land to report (orally or in writing) on matters relating to the management of the land and non-

compliance with any such requirement is to constitute an offence punishable by a maximum fine of \$4 000 (Division 6 fine).

A manager or management committee appointed by the Trust must, on the termination of the appointment, fully account to the Trust for the management of the land.

The section allows regulations to be made in relation to the management of land by a manager or management committee appointed under the section.

**Dr ARMITAGE** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### SELECT COMMITTEE INTO THE ORGANISATION OF HEALTH COMMISSION SERVICES

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health, Family and Community Services):** I move:

That a select committee be established to examine—

- (a) the administrative arrangements for the provision of health services in South Australia;
- (b) coordination of and ways of enhancing cooperation between providers of health services in this State;
- (c) the adequacy and appropriateness of the administrative controls, lines of responsibility and accountability of the providers of health care to the South Australian Health Commission and Government; and
- (d) the South Australian Health Commission Act to identify required changes to facilitate any structural reform.

In moving this motion, members will recall my past association with select committees and indeed my preference for this technique personally as a means of resolving some problems within the Government structure. Indeed, members will be aware that many select committees of this House have examined topics of particular importance to the community and have indeed proposed sensible, rational and indeed bipartisan measures to resolve some of those issues. A select committee into the matters which I have outlined to the House on behalf of the Government would be one way of examining this topic which certainly needs close examination. The South Australian Health Commission Act 1976 was certainly radical for its time and recognised that it was not possible to manage a complex, specialised and diverse health system through traditional centralised Public Service structures.

Over the intervening period, the structure which was established by the 1976 Act has indeed proved to be very successful in terms of providing localised management, local influence through hospital boards and indeed a very comprehensive and well staffed structure for health delivery in the State. But no structure is immune to change. No structure should be immune from examination and review. No structure, which is as important as the health services delivery scheme in this State, should be exempt from that kind of review. It is with that approach in mind that I propose to the House the formation of a select committee that would have the opportunity of taking evidence during the winter break, of looking at some of those health and hospital structures throughout the State and of talking not only to consumers of health services but also to the providers of health services at the local level.

It is essential that we examine this on a local, regional and State-wide basis. We must examine not only the way in which services are provided in small country towns or in the major metropolitan area of Adelaide but also the differences between those structures and the ways in which the system as a whole could be adapted to improve the quality of service. No matter how good the quality of the service is, it can always be improved and we can always plan better for the future, and we can always learn from consultation within and throughout the community.

It is with that objective that I commend this motion to the House. The list of topics to be examined is not intended to be strictly exhaustive. I am sure that as the committee proceeds through its work it will find other matters which are closely related to the terms of reference and which it will want to examine and report upon. Of course, such exploration of the topic would not be resisted by me, should I be appointed a member of the committee by the House. I believe that such an approach is useful and it has been followed by other select committees of which I have been a member.

It would certainly be my hope that this committee would look at matters on a non-political basis, because the delivery of health services in this State is a particularly important question and, at the structural level, is not one that should be resolved simply on ideological bounds. Certainly, there is plenty of scope, as we see in the day to day press at the moment, for ideology in respect of other areas of health service delivery.

I believe that the topics which are the subject of the motion lend themselves to a bipartisan examination, to a sensible and rational examination by members of Parliament speaking directly with their constituencies, and it is for that reason that I have suggested that we establish the committee. It is my intention that it would meet over the next few months during the winter break and report back to the House in the budget session with any necessary legislative proposals for change.

We would be looking at the management structures and the delivery of health service at the local level, but we are also required by the terms of reference to examine the South Australian Health Commission Act as a whole to see whether there are ways in which it can be structured and improved. It is apparent to anyone in the 1990s that issues of accountability, management and control are also important, and they would need to be examined closely by the committee.

The health system in this State deals with substantial sums of money—of the order of \$1.5 billion of taxpayers' funds—and, whether that comes directly from the consumer or from the State or Federal Governments, it is still taxpayers' funds at the end of the day. With such sums being involved, it is important that lines of accountability and issues of control are well delineated by the Parliament within the framework that we set out in the laws of the State to ensure proper control over these matters.

As this is a topic that I hope would be examined in detail by the committee, it would be redundant and irrelevant of me to canvas these matters at great length in the House, because I would hope that the committee would spend substantial periods examining these matters

outside this place. For that reason, I will deliberately keep my remarks brief this evening. I commend the motion to the House on that basis.

**Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide):** In debating this motion, which seeks to establish a select committee to investigate the administration of health services in South Australia, I signal to the House that, as Opposition spokesperson in this area, I am continually contacted by people from around South Australia and from all sectors of the health services area expressing their considerable dismay about some of the procedures by which health is administered today.

The reason that is of concern to me is that, clearly, when the administration of health services is not optimally carried out, there are clear imperatives for service provision to be better than it is; if it is not carried out as well as it might be from an administrative point of view, there is inefficiency and waste of money. As the House knows, every dollar that is wasted in the administration of services is taken directly from the provision of those services. It is my view that every member of the House, no matter which side of the House we are on or which Party we represent, wishes to have as many services as possible provided to his or her constituents and to the people of South Australia in general.

Bearing that in mind, the Opposition is happy to support the motion. In doing so, we note the particularly circumspect paragraphs (a) to (d) of the committee's terms of reference and we accept the Minister's statement that many other topics will be either immediately brought to mind or brought to mind during the committee's consultations and will flesh out the rather bald statements in the motion.

In particular, while my list is certainly non-exhaustive, it would be the position of the Opposition that any examination of the administrative arrangements for the provision of health services in South Australia would include examination of the various trends in the provision of health services, including specifically the balance between the hospital and community based services. As the Minister would undoubtedly know, as would anyone who has an interest in health services in South Australia, there is frequently a *contretemps* between hospital and community based services to the detriment of all services, in my view, but I think that we must investigate the balance between those two services because, in many instances, they compete.

With more rapid discharges, it is often community based services which are being called into question or which are required more and, as such, they become more part of the hospital process. We should look at the methods of resource allocation within the health service—an extremely important measure. Management methods must be looked at, and there is much talk around the world—not just in South Australia—about the introduction of the devolution of management arrangements. It is most likely that the committee would want to look at the possible introduction of area health Service management arrangements and, more particularly, the separation of the administrative responsibilities for funding, purchasing and providing health services. It is the Opposition's view that the most



efficient way of providing health services is to have a purchaser/provider split.

There has been anxiety in the health community since the Minister announced the proposal to establish a select committee. People are anxious that the committee will do nothing more than give a parliamentary *imprimatur* to the green paper and the so-called light green paper, which were Health Commission responses to the Opposition's plans about regionalisation of health services.

The reason for that anxiety in the health community is reflected in an article about the media release of the Minister of Health in the *Advertiser* of Wednesday 20 January 1993, and I quote from that article, as follows:

Proposals to be examined by the select committee include:

1. A move to regional administration for the 200 health units operating under the commission's central office.
2. Establishment of five regional health services in the metropolitan area and 11 in the country.
3. Amalgamation of the Royal District Nursing Society and domiciliary care services.
4. Amalgamation of the five services now catering for child and adolescent health into a new Child and Adolescent Health Service.

Those four bald paragraphs are really the nub of both the green papers, and they certainly cover a lot of the recommendations of the so-called green papers which were promulgated by the Health Commission over an 18 month period last year and the year before. Neither of those papers met with much approval: the first met with nil approval, and that is why the second paper had to be brought out. There is real anxiety in the health services area that this committee will be a rubber stamp, if you like, for the green papers.

I understand people's anxiety, but I assure members of the health community that, from the Opposition's point of view, all cards are on the table and are to be examined, and there is no pre-supposed position. Whilst talking about coordination and the ways of enhancing cooperation between providers of health services in this State—in other words, paragraph (b)—it is extremely important that we look at opportunities to coordinate service delivery within the public health system that will increase the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the system. We must look at linkages between the public health system and other health service providers. We must look particularly at areas where changes in organisational arrangements will improve patient care because, in many instances, bureaucracy tends to exist for the mere sake of its own existence, and it forgets that the reason there is a health bureaucracy is actually to provide patient care. If we are able to make recommendations via this select committee to seek changes in organisational arrangements that will improve patient care, the committee will have done well.

Whilst talking about coordination and the ways of enhancing cooperation between providers of health care, I would say to the Minister that it is extremely important that the private sector be asked to provide input so that the opportunities for the use of the private sector to improve the efficiency and quality, and indeed the accessibility, of health care services may be looked at. If the select committee failed to look at ways in which the public and the private sectors can be utilised to mutual benefit for the patient, it would be failing in its duty.

Paragraph (c) refers to the adequacy and appropriateness of the administrative controls, lines of responsibility and accountability of the providers of health care to the South Australian Health Commission and Government, and this is particularly important, because the relationship between the Health Commission and health units has been a matter of some concern for some time.

Whilst looking at the whole area of the administrative controls and, indeed, the Health Commission itself, we can look at the provision of corporate services to the health system as an important measure and the planning of the delivery of health services in South Australia. One of the major concerns for the Opposition is that a number of reports have indicated that asset management and planning within the health system are recognised as being less than adequate, and if we are to endeavour via the select committee to provide a plan, if you like, for the next 10, 15 or 20 years, clearly we need to be looking at those types of things. Indeed, part of the problem may well be the relationship between the Health Commission itself and central Government agencies. I think there are enormous opportunities and fertile grounds for us to look at.

Lastly, paragraph (d) provides that the select committee would examine the South Australian Health Commission Act to identify required changes to facilitate any structural reform. Clearly, there is no point in this select committee investigating and taking what I imagine will be public input in a public forum and then finding ways of changing things if it does not go ahead and organise those changes.

That is a far from exhaustive list, but it is clear from that grab bag of issues which I believe need to be investigated that there is much ground to be covered. I indicate to the House that the Minister's time frame seems to me to be particularly optimistic. There have been many previous reports on the health system—the Bright report, the Uhrig report, and the list goes on and on. I hope that from this select committee will emanate some sensible plans for a coordinated system utilising all providers of health services, both public and private, for the benefit of all South Australians. There will be many opportunities, should I be elected as a member of the select committee by the House, for me to expound on these views later. I go no further other than to indicate the Opposition's support for a total and thorough investigation of the administration of health services in South Australia.

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health, Family and Community Services):** I thank the Opposition for its support for the motion to establish a select committee into these issues. I agree with the member for Adelaide that a wide range of topics will have to be discussed as part of the issues of structural reform. I make the point that it is not a select committee into the whole of the health system and its delivery of services throughout the State. While it is a very worthwhile topic, that is a topic for another day and perhaps another forum in this House, the intention being that select committees should examine a specific area of endeavour and attempt to bring down a worthwhile

report in relation to that area. Of course, we will wish to define our discussions to those structural issues.

I agree that one has to establish the inter-relationship between the public and private sectors and examine a whole range of issues that are associated with structural reform, but the committee, I would imagine, would need to be careful to ensure it did not take on so many tasks in this area that it was unable to bring down a report within a sensible time frame. I again thank the Opposition for its support and commend the motion to the House.

Motion carried.

The House appointed a select committee consisting of Messrs Armitage, Atkinson, Eastick and M.J. Evans and Mrs Hutchison; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on Thursday 22 April 1993.

### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION (INCORPORATED HOSPITALS AND HEALTH CENTRES) AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health, Family and Community Services)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the South Australian Health Commission Act 1976. Read a first time.

**The Hon. M.J. EVANS:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

This Bill is essentially administrative in nature. As members would be aware, section 58a of the principal Act provides for the removal from office of the members of a board of an incorporated hospital or health centre and the appointment of an administrator.

A board of an incorporated hospital or health centre must have—

- contravened, or failed to comply with a provision of the Act or its approved constitution;

or

- in the opinion of the Governor, persistently failed properly to perform the functions for which it was established.

In those circumstances, the Governor may remove all members of the board and appoint a person to administer the service until the appointment of a new board. During the period of appointment, the administrator has all the powers of the board. The administrator must arrange for a new board to be constituted within four months after the removal of the previous board.

This is not a course of action which is taken lightly. Fortunately, it has been used rarely. Nevertheless, it is an important power to have available, should circumstances arise when such action is necessary.

Members will recall the unfortunate circumstances which arose in the SA Mental Health Service late last year. The tragic death of a doctor was followed by a series of events which necessitated decisive action to restore stability and ensure the maintenance of patient care. Section 58a was invoked.

While substantial progress is being made, it is apparent that matters will not have been concluded by 11 April 1993, the end of the four month period. Pre-emptive or precipitate action in such circumstances would not be conducive to the satisfactory conclusion of the tasks at hand.

The Bill therefore seeks to introduce a degree of flexibility by enabling an administrator to be appointed for up to 12 months.

The opportunity has also been taken to ensure that the grounds for removal of a board include serious financial mismanagement. It is arguable as to whether that is already encompassed within the provisions. However, in the interests of accountability for public funds, it is important to ensure that it is explicitly included.

A further amendment seeks to cover the situation where a Board itself is unable to deal with problems confronting it and, of its own volition, seeks dissolution and the appointment of an administrator. Again, this is a rare occurrence, but the Act needs to be flexible enough to deal with it. I commend the Bill to the House.

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 58a—Provision where incorporated hospital or health centre fails persistently to properly discharge its functions

Section 58a provides for the dissolution, by the Governor, of a board of an incorporated hospital or health centre on its failure to perform properly its functions and for an administrator to be appointed until a new board is constituted. The proposed amendment provides that a board may be dissolved if it is guilty of serious financial mismanagement and that a board may seek its own dissolution. The proposed amendment also increases the length of time within which a new board must be constituted, should a dissolution occur, from four months to 12 months.

**Dr ARMITAGE** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### MOTOR VEHICLES (WRECKED OR WRITTEN OFF VEHICLES) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 10 February. Page 1910.)

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** This important Bill aims to reduce the incidence of stolen vehicles being registered with false identification obtained from wrecked and written off vehicles. Recently a young constituent of mine came into the office after having had his vehicle stolen on a Friday night at a well-known Adelaide hotel where many young people meet. That vehicle was recovered on the Tuesday of the following week with changed doors and a changed engine, and the only thing that was obvious about it was that the colour of the front and the back of the vehicle was the same. The tyres and also the wheels had been changed. Everything had been changed.

Although I know this Bill does not cover the matter, where does this young person stand? He had the vehicle returned to him, but it did not have the original engine and consequently the engine number was different, the doors and nearly everything else were changed and it was returned to him by the police as if it were his vehicle. The interesting point of course is that it is not his vehicle, and if it is not his vehicle what is his liability

in terms of that stolen vehicle now? He cannot prove that he is the owner; the only thing he can prove is that the vehicle has been stolen. That is another issue that perhaps the Minister ought to consider, namely, how we overcome the problems of innocent victims of stolen vehicles.

Initiatives have been proposed and recommended by the Motor Vehicle Theft Committee and reflect the practices in Victoria, which have been successful in reducing the availability of compliance plates by nearly 90 per cent. The Bill proposes that the insurers, the motor trade, wreckers, auctioneers and private owners will be required to notify the Registrar of Motor Vehicles when a motor vehicle is wrecked or written off. The Bill requires that a rebuilt wrecked or written off vehicle will be inspected before allowing re-registration and that the registration of a wrecked or written off vehicle is not transferable and must be cancelled and re-registered if ownership changes.

That is the point that I came in at. Here we had an innocent individual whose vehicle was stolen—and I assume wrecked if the engine, doors, wheels and everything else had been changed—but who is now required to re-register that vehicle, and he has done nothing other than leave his vehicle in a hotel parking area on a Friday night only to find that when it is recovered by the police on the following Tuesday it is a totally different vehicle. I think that matter needs examining, and I do not believe it ought to be the responsibility of the individual who has lost that vehicle to then have to pay new re-registration.

Since January 1991 insurance companies alone, and then only on a voluntary basis, have been notifying the Registrar about wrecked and written off vehicles. Further notification obligations upon private owners will be confined to such vehicles that are registered in order to cancel the registration. All other parties will be required to notify the Registrar whether or not the vehicle is registered.

The Motor Trade Association, while not opposing this Bill, has been fairly critical and has said that there are some very major loopholes in this particular legislation. It has sent to the shadow Minister of Transport, who has passed them on to me, some interesting comments, which I think ought to be put on the record. The MTA says that this whole approach is a continuing piecemeal approach and an ineffectual way to address the major crime of vehicle theft in South Australia. It believes the following strategy ought to be adhered to:

\* All insured, written off vehicles fitted with Australian Motor Vehicle Certification Board compliance plates, i.e., manufactured after 1970, have those plates defaced or marked at the time the vehicle is declared a total loss or write-off. Such defacing or marking would render the plate useless as an identifier and therefore be useless to vehicle thieves.

\* Motor vehicle number plates issued by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles be more stringently controlled and be required to be returned to the Registrar or police at the lapse of the term of registration where such registration is not to be renewed. This measure will deny the thieves another source of re-identification for stolen cars. Number plates can presently be found at council rubbish tips, car swap meets and in wrecking yards—a ludicrous situation. Ample provision is already made for historic cars to be regularly laid up and for personal and historic number plates

to be retained. The normal alpha series 'Festival State' plates are nothing more than a receipt for registration and new numbers can readily be assigned to vehicles presented for re-registration following a lapse. This is no different to issuing new series plates to interstate vehicles registered in South Australia for the first time (as is current practice).

\* All vehicles should be required to undergo an ID check (at the very least) at every change of ownership. Thieves do not steal cars to drive around for long periods, they steal them to sell them without inspections and, with so many vehicles sold via private treaty and the classified sections of newspapers, the thieves have an easy method of disposal.

\* All persons buying written off vehicles from the small number of damaged vehicle auctions should be required to indicate, in written form, the purpose to which they intend to use the wreck. A register of buyers thus formed will provide police with a resource that will enable every previously insured car to be traced.

\* Automobile dismantlers, as the primary repository at present for compliance plates, registration number plates and complete motor vehicles, should be registered via a licence or registration system kept by the police. MTA auto dismantlers have already repeatedly made their support for this proposal quite clear.

\* The provision for proof of ownership of a vehicle via a title system does not exist in South Australia. Registration papers are not proof of ownership. Car dealers are required to pass on 'clear title' by law yet they have no way to prove clear title exists, nor does any South Australian vehicle owner who does not possess a bill of sale or other proof of purchase. A title system must be introduced.

They are the six primary strategy recommendations of the MTA, whose criticism is that this Bill is a little sloppy and does not cover as much as it ought to cover. In supporting the Bill, we ask the Minister at least to consider these options as we further go down the track of tightening up this area.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Business and Regional Development):** I would certainly like to commend my honourable and learned colleague for his contribution. I will certainly take up with the Minister of Transport Development the matters raised, which do not actually fall within the purview of this Bill in particular. Although I am handling this Bill for another Minister I feel I speak with some authority having driven many wrecked cars and having a number of them written off, as well as having had at least three stolen. Indeed I can say, just by way of an apocryphal story, that my rather famous 1970 Ford Cortina, which used to be parked in front of Parliament House during Opposition days, was stolen from the Salisbury interchange and was seen several days later by my wife on the back of a truck going through Salisbury, probably to have its number plates exchanged for a wrecked car; it has not been seen since. I actually view this Bill with some relish as well as obvious support, and I commend it to the House.

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

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (MOTOR VEHICLES  
AND WRONGS) BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 February. Page 1928.)

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** This is the second most important Bill to be considered today. The Opposition has supported the second reading, noting that the Bill in essence amends the Motor Vehicles Act to address a problem arising in the case of *Clinton v Scheirich & Gotthold*, where a passenger in a motor vehicle opened his car door into the path of an oncoming motor vehicle.

While it was considered that the passenger was not liable in that case, SGIC made an *ex gratia* payment recognising that there was some justice that needed to be addressed in that situation. This Bill attempts to correct that situation so that the passenger is covered by the CTP legislation. I remember that, when we debated this subject early in my career in Parliament, several examples of this nature were brought up, but they were discarded as not being matters of importance; yet, seven or eight years later this Bill recognises those comments, although I cannot remember which member made those points.

The Bill seeks to provide that, where an insured person intentionally or recklessly drives a vehicle or does or admits to doing anything in relation to the vehicle so as to cause death or bodily injury to another person or damage to his or her property, that person will no longer be covered. That is a significant change because, for the first time, it recognises that under the compulsory third party insurance legislation some very stringent penalties are placed on individuals who do not drive carefully. As we all know, the Act contains penalties for people who do not wear seat belts and are involved in accidents. There are also penalties relating to driving under the influence of drugs or alcohol.

This is the first instance in which legislation provides for reckless driving and it is a major discussion point in the community as to the responsibility of young people, particularly, when driving vehicles. Questions relating to stolen vehicles and to the ability of young people to drive more safely are of concern in the community. This provision covers not only young people but anyone who drives recklessly. It is an important social change because it ought to be part of any road traffic training system and any road traffic code of conduct used to teach young people to drive. It is important that we recognise our responsibilities on the road as well as recognising that other people on the road may not drive with the care that we use when driving.

The third point concerns the excess that is recoverable by SGIC, which is the insurer, where the insured person is liable to the extent of more than 25 per cent of the accident. The excess is increased from \$200 to \$300. I find that increase fairly small and I note that in the other place there was some criticism of it. In supporting it, I recognise that there is a special purpose for keeping the excess low.

The fourth point concerns a case in which a driver is in breach of seat belt requirements. Damages will be reduced by at least 15 per cent but only if the injured person is not a minor. It is of interest that the Bill

reduces the age of a minor from 18 to 16 years. That raises a number of questions as to which other Acts will be amended to include a reduced age for minors. What will happen under the Boating Act and with the legislation relating to drivers licences? Are changes to be made there or is this only a one-off, convenient move by the Government? If this trend continues, I hope that we will have a full-blooded debate in this House to decide whether we should lower the minor age in all Acts of Parliament to the age of 16. It would be a very interesting debate. I have three children and I have watched them progress through the ages of 16 and 18 years and noted the different responsibilities and attitudes that children adopt at those ages. I would find it a very interesting debate, just to see how members view the responsibilities of individuals at 18 and 16 years. It is important that we note that it has changed, and the Opposition supports the change.

Whilst I note that the Government has reduced the age of a minor to 16 years in relation to a reduction in damages for a person who is injured while not wearing a seat belt, it seems to me that we need to look further at this age in relation to the illegal use of drugs when driving a vehicle. The Opposition supports this very important change and we hope that the measure has speedy passage through the House.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Housing,  
Urban Development and Local Government  
Relations):**

I thank the Opposition for its support of this measure which amends the Motor Vehicles Act and the Wrongs Act, as the member for Bragg has outlined to the House, in a number of important ways. I will not go over those points except to say that the concept of loss spreading through insurance has some limitations to it and this is a refinement of the way in which those members of the community who are within the insurance pool pay for the unfortunate accidents that occur to others. In the main in this country we have tried to spread that security blanket across the community as far as we possibly can. Here we have some coming back from that broad coverage in circumstances where clearly people have acted in a way that is intolerable to the community that they should have to pay for the irresponsible or reckless behaviour of others, including those who have suffered some injury and are claiming that against the policy and the contributions of those in the community who have not claimed upon the fund.

There is an element of fairness about it, it brings it into line with prevailing community attitudes and it provides a strong deterrent effect for those in the community who behave in an irresponsible way and anticipate that they will be saved by the security net of our broad-based insurance provisions in this State. This strikes that balance. Obviously, it is a matter that needs to be monitored from time to time and the member for Bragg has raised some other circumstances where our attention might be placed in future. I commend the measure to members.

Bill read a third time.

## ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier):** It is a well-known fact that over the many years I have been in this Parliament I have taken great delight in highlighting to the House any articles written by any political journalist that pour scorn or criticism on members opposite, and I will continue to do so until I retire. I am no hypocrite: I will not stand up and say that I have always passed the hand of friendship across. If there is something in the newspapers that criticises members opposite I will make sure that it gets in *Hansard*, but I have always made one distinction. If that criticism is on political shortcomings then I will highlight those shortcomings and I will make sure that I will extract every bit of mileage I can out of those newspaper articles. But I do draw a line between political attacks and personal attacks. Political attacks are fine: attack the policy but not the person. Attacking the person is just sinking to the depths that we all condemn in this House.

There is no way that we can attack political journalists unless we use the forums of this House. I have noticed recently that one journalist (Alex Kennedy) has, for reasons known only to herself (perhaps because she used to work for the member for Kavel when he was a senator and perhaps she is still outraged that the honourable member did not win the leadership when he left the senate—I do not know), has completely personalised her attack on one member of the Liberal front bench. Let me make perfectly clear that I do not in any way place any blame on the member for Kavel for the actions that Alex Kennedy has taken over the past two or three months.

The way one person has been singled out has become an obsession with her. I go back to 6 January of this year where, under the byline 'Brown shuffling over shadow Cabinet reshuffle' in the *City Messenger*, she made a typically scathing attack on certain members of the front bench. Right at the start of the article was one very intriguing little paragraph. It dealt with the Leader perhaps not having the wherewithal to make the reshuffle, but I will not go into that. The article states:

... with the Party split absolutely down the middle about who it wants as leader, any move is a dangerous move.

This is the line:

Upset just one petulant non-performing supporter, even one with a personal life just perhaps on the cusp of becoming an embarrassment, and it's a recipe for potentially disastrous Party chaos.

It has nothing to do with the Party reshuffle at all. Then the article deals with certain members of the front bench. I will not read out what it says about them, but I will list the people. It mentions the Hon. Rob Lucas as opposed to the Minister of Education, Employment and Training. It mentions the member for Adelaide as being dealt with easily by the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services. It is pretty good stuff. I would have agreed with it and I would mostly likely have said something about it in a totally different set of circumstances, but this is the quote that ties in with that first paragraph:

Then there's Correctional Services, etc., which, while hardly vital for election votes, does seem under Wayne Matthew to have become quite obsessed with all things sexual. Porn and honking is a neat line of interest which may bring headlines in the silly season but it has its downside.

That refers not to the way the member for Bright is dealing with his portfolio but to his obsession with all things sexual. I was pretty annoyed about that. In fact, I rang my colleague the member for Henley Beach, because I was on holiday, and asked him whether he saw any significance in that, and he thought the same way as I did. But let us see when the newspaper upped the ante on 10 February where, under the heading 'Hanging, caning: Liberals suffering heat stroke', Alex Kennedy went on about the capital punishment argument. Alex Kennedy has already written about the member for Bright being obsessed with all things sexual. Again, rather than collectively having a go at the Opposition in general, she writes:

Dear Wayne Matthew, Shadow Minister for State Services and Liberal custodian of our goals—what next? I suppose if Wayne becomes a powerful Government Minister some time in the future we'll see him advocating victims stabbing stabbers, shooting the shooters and crashing into the car of the person who crashed into us...

and it goes on and on and in a pretty petty way, obviously in response to a press release put out by the member for Bright. The article continues, and this is again the crunch:

Really, the past 10 days... in SA politics [have] sounded like collective heat stroke on the Opposition side. After statements on capital punishment and caning in schools, what's left? Castration for all wandering husbands or is that too close to home?

That is the way that article—not very cleverly—has completely eliminated everyone else from the 6 January report and then brought the accusation home to the member for Bright. The member for Bright has been accused of being obsessed with sex and is now being accused of being a wandering husband. If the member for Bright stands up in this House and denies it, in standing up and saying he is not guilty it is for all the world to say that he is. He has no right of redress whatsoever.

It may sound strange to members opposite, but I am standing up and seeking redress for the member for Bright, because I tell you, Mr Speaker, there are more stories to come—more stories will appear in the *City Messenger*. There is the gym story and the wife beating story. If I or anyone else were to stand up in this House and accuse anyone on either side of politics of some of the things of which Alex Kennedy has accused the member for Bright, you, Sir, would correctly draw our attention to Standing Orders and punish us severely.

The member for Coles has a Bill before the House (and I will not discuss it) which deals with political journalists. That Bill talks about registering pecuniary interests, and the member for Coles made a very good speech, but I would have thought that the House might consider talking about ethics and standards of decency. We are all bound by standards of decency but, if one member of Parliament has been accused of doing all things that he should not be doing (and the worst is to come), there must be some way that we can have a

mechanism to be able to bring that journalist to the Bar of this House to extract our revenge, because otherwise we cannot: this is the only way that I can do it. This is the only way that is possible at the moment.

We have no code of ethics, no code of decency and nothing in our Standing Orders to bring journalists under some form of control. It may even provide some form of satisfaction to see one of our colleagues suffering this, but let us look at it. If I said to you, 'Have you stopped beating your wife?' (and you know the way I am saying this, Sir), you would have me, sure as anything. In all probability, Alex Kennedy will be saying that the member for Bright is beating his wife and making some other outrageous statements.

Well, it is time it stopped; it is time that journalists who cover the proceedings of this Parliament restricted their coverage to what happens during the parliamentary debate. What happens in our private life is our own business; we are our own judge, and we do not expect our peers to judge us, although perhaps we do if we transgress our parliamentary role. But no way do I expect a journalist to do that because that journalist has become obsessed.

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

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles):** Tonight I wish to use the adjournment debate for what I think is its purpose, that is, to raise constituency matters. One of those matters was brought to my attention by a constituent who has a severe hearing impairment. I read briefly to the House from her letter:

Recent visits to places as different as Her Majesty's Theatre and the Coroner's Court have brought home to me—painfully—how public buildings in Adelaide are lacking in equitable access to a section of the community.

She goes on to refer to the proportion of the population that has a hearing problem. Better Hearing Australia, South Australian branch, advises me that up to 20 per cent of Australians have some degree of hearing impairment. One in five is a very significant number which warrants the attention of Government in terms of public access to everything that we need to hear, whether it be a public meeting, the courts, entertainment or theatres. My constituent goes on to say:

You will understand how important this—  
that is, the ability of hearing impaired people to hear—is in public venues such as courts. I was dismayed that a place, such as the Coroner's Court, did not provide a simple amenity, lack of which placed the hearing impaired at a great disadvantage. It is important to understand that ordinary amplification poses great difficulties for people dependent upon hearing aids. The loop system goes a long way towards overcoming those difficulties.

The loop system, which intrigued me, is an electronic system which picks up a signal from the public address system travelling around a complete loop of wire. This signal emits a magnetic field in the looped area, and people sitting within that area select what is called the 'T' (telecoil) position on the hearing aid which activates its magnetic pick up. This signal is re-converted into sound. Generally, this provides the listener with improved reception, as the use of a 'T' switch cuts out the aid's microphone and reduces interference from

background noise. It is obvious that when either security or privacy is essential, as in the case of the courts, for example, systems have to be used which preserve both security and privacy and which cannot be picked up on radio networks.

It surprises me that South Australia, with its excellent record of policies acknowledging the needs of the disabled, has not installed a loop system in the Coroner's Court. I note that one of my colleagues supports the case for a loop system, and I hope that he will take that case to the Attorney-General, because, if we are talking about one in five South Australians, equity demands that those people have the right to hear what goes on in the courts. I also urge members to see whether loop systems can be installed in any public place in which election meetings are held. To do so would set an excellent example. Again, I reiterate that Adelaide and South Australia have an excellent record of access for the disabled. I know from the years I spent wheeling my frail and elderly mother in a wheelchair around the city that, partly because of our geography—the fact that we are a city built on a flat plain—the legal requirements for access for the disabled have been able to be met at relatively limited cost. This would not be the case in a city built on very steep ground.

I urge the Government to take note of the shortcoming not only in the Coroner's Court but in many public buildings, including this very Parliament. It would be a worthy goal if the Parliament were to improve the hearing in both the Speaker's gallery and the stranger's gallery by installing a loop system. Sometime ago, I think it was last year, we witnessed the sign language of a guide for a group of hearing impaired people who were in the Chamber. It would be good if those people could come in without the need for assistance of that kind, knowing that technology was meeting their personal needs.

The other matter I wish to raise is on behalf of the Murray Park Theatre Company, which had its origins in my electorate. The Murray Park Theatre Company has been working with the western youth strategy on a unique project which is designed to assist and rehabilitate young offenders through art and drama. A production upon which these young people worked, *Spare*, was staged last year so successfully that delegates to the National Conference on Juvenile Justice strongly endorsed the innovative approach to juvenile offender programs through what was, in fact, a science fiction extravaganza which was designed, developed, scripted and performed by these young people. Let us look at the nature of the young people who undertook what was a significant artistic achievement, as well as an enormous personal achievement.

About 120 young people were involved in this project. Many of them were repeat offenders, with histories of car theft, break and enter, fraud, assault, and robbery with violence. A number of them were pregnant teenagers or young parents, some in violent relationships, some from backgrounds of sexual abuse and alcohol and drug dependent homes where violence was the norm. Many either ran onto or were dumped on the streets from the ages of 12 to 14 years, and from then on it was a case of survival. Some of them had known only one or no parents; several of them had

parents who were in goal. They were all expelled from school between the ages of 12 to 14 years and had not been back. Some of them had severe substance abuse problems.

What happened in the process of that production was that they gained improvement in literacy, they developed strong friendships, they developed a sense of identity and importance, heightened self-esteem and self-image, and they were able to develop a whole range of skills ranging from welding and painting to other technical abilities. That project could continue for as little as \$50 000 *per annum*, which is a relatively small sum when one considers that it costs more than \$100 000 *per annum* to keep a young offender in detention—and I see the former Minister for Family and Community Services nodding his head in agreement.

This project is probably the most cost effective way that we could possibly devise, not only to keep young people off the streets and out of gaol but to give them some hope for the future and to develop their skills. I urge the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services, the Attorney-General, the Minister responsible for the police and all other Ministers whose portfolios have any bearing whatsoever on this project to give every kind of sympathetic hearing and consideration and support for continued funding of this project. I commend most warmly those who are involved in it, and they are Rod Idle, Kiersten Coulter, Bob Petchell, Jenny McCormick, Bob Daly and Kalyna Flowerpott.

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

Motion carried.

At 9.40 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 18 February at 10.30 a.m.