

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 10 October 1995

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

MEMBER, NEW

The PRESIDENT informed the Council that he holds a commission from Her Excellency the Governor authorising him to administer the oath of affirmation to members of the Legislative Council, and produced a letter from the Clerk of the assembly of members notifying that the assembly of members of both Houses of Parliament had elected Mr Paolo Nocella to fill the vacancy in the Legislative Council caused by the resignation of the Hon. M.S. Feleppa. Mr Nocella, to whom the affirmation of allegiance was administered, took his seat in the Legislative Council.

The PRESIDENT: I lay on the table the minutes of the assembly of members of the two Houses held this day to fill the vacancy in the Legislative Council caused by the resignation of the Hon. M.S. Feleppa.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I move:

That the minutes of the proceedings be printed.

Motion carried.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Reports—

- Construction Industry Training Board, 1994-95
- Department for State Services, 1994-95
- ETSA Corporation, 1994-95
- Non-Government Schools Registration Board, 1994-95
- University of Adelaide Report, 1994
- State Supply Board—Addendum to Annual Report for year ended 30 June 1995
- South Australian Housing Trust—Statutory Financial Statements, 30 June 1995
- University of Adelaide—Legislation for 1994
- Regulation under the following Act—
- Sewerage Act 1929—Charges—AWT Systems

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

- Report, 1994-95—
- Australian Financial Institutions Commission
- Soil Conservation Council
- South Australian Timber Corporation
- Regulation under the following Act—
- Youth Court Act 1993
- Rules of Court—
- District Court—District Court Act 1991—
- Guardianship and Administration Act
- Magistrates Court—Magistrates Court Act 1991—
- Summons—Failure to Comply
- Restraining Orders
- Supreme Court—Supreme Court Act 1935—Guardianship and Administration Act

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

- Commissioner for the Ageing—Report, 1994-95
- Development Assessment Commission—Report on demolition of Tenterden House, Queen Elizabeth Hospital
- Regulation under the following Act—
- Reproductive Technology Act 1988—

- Code of Ethical Clinical Practice
- Code of Ethical Research Practice
- Racing Act 1976—Rules—
- Off-Course Totalizator
- On-Course Totalizator
- Harness Racing Board—Mobile Phones
- Economic and Finance Committee—
- Response to Report by the Minister for Family and Community Services
- Response to Report by the Minister for the Ageing
- Response to Report by the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources.

SA WATER

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I seek leave to table a ministerial statement from the Minister for Infrastructure in the other place on the subject of the water contract.

Leave granted.

QUESTION TIME

SERCO REPORT

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services a question about the Serco report.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: The Minister has told this Council, on a number of occasions, that he has made no decisions on proposals by Serco to outsource management functions at schools pending advice from a committee established to examine the options. That committee has now finished its work and the report is sitting on the desk of Mr Ralph, the Chief Executive of the Department for Education and Children's Services. It is also interesting to note that Serco may well end up being the employer used by the successful tenderer in the proposed water management contract. Will the Minister table a copy of this report and, if not, will he give a guarantee to comply with a request under the Freedom of Information Act for the release of the report?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It is not sitting on the desk of my Chief Executive Officer, Mr Ralph: it is sitting on my desk.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: A good place for it to be, too.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Exactly, a very safe place. I received the report in the last two weeks. The Government and I, as Minister, have yet to make a decision in relation to the recommendations of the report. I would envisage that we will make a decision in the not too distant future. When we have done so, we will make a judgment about the release or not of the report. Certainly, it is inappropriate, as the honourable member has been advised, that, prior to the Minister's even seeing the report, there should be an FOI release of that particular report which was the request that would be put in by—

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles: No, that's not my question.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Well, that is in effect what has happened. The answer that the honourable member was provided with, both privately and publicly, is that certainly it will not be released to the Leader of the Opposition before the Minister has even had a chance to look at the report to which the honourable member has referred.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA—STATE OF BUSINESS

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services a question about the publication *South Australia—State of Business*.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I asked a question in respect of this matter in the last week that Parliament sat, and was advised by the Minister that the Government was looking for a state of confidence and an air of confidence in South Australia. The Opposition is very keen to do that. However, I am still pressed to seek information in respect of that publication. *South Australia—State of Business*, which was distributed as an insert in the *Advertiser* and the *Weekend Australian* of 16 and 17 September, carried with it an editorial piece under the heading 'Education and Training'. Within that section, no mention is made of South Australia's primary or secondary education system, except for a fleeting mention of Prince Alfred College. This section of the 18-page publication failed to make any mention also of South Australia's technical and further education system, which is responsible for most of the State's vocational training which, I am sure, would be of interest to people expecting to invest in South Australia. Of the three universities in South Australia, only one received a mention under the heading 'Education and Training', and I submit that is another glaring oversight when dealing with education.

Mr President, you might wonder what does get a mention in this section of the Liberal Government's glossy publication. Of the 11 paragraphs of text under the 'Education and Training' heading, four are devoted to the activities of Gerard Industries and its Chief Executive Officer (Mr Robert Gerard). My questions are:

1. Will the Minister advise the Council who produced this publication, which was inserted in the *Advertiser* and *Weekend Australian*, and how was the publication funded?

2. Did the Minister or his colleague the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education authorise the text to be used in the 'Education and Training' section of the publication and, if he did not, why was he not invited to do so?

3. Does the Minister believe that the text in that section is a fair representation of the education and training systems in place in South Australia and, if so, how is that so?

4. Does the Minister believe it was appropriate to devote four paragraphs of an 11-paragraph feature on education and training in South Australia, in what I believe is a Government-funded publication, to the activities of Gerard Industries and, in particular, Mr Robert Gerard?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I suspect that over the coming four months we will have to listen to every paragraph of this document because it is obviously the only issue that the honourable member intends to pursue during this session.

The Hon. A.J. Redford: It was better than the first question.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It is all relative, though.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Don't worry, the prawn season starts soon.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am not sure when the prawn season starts, but it may well be that we will move on to some fisheries questions. At the moment the honourable member's questions are suggesting that 23 words looked at one issue, 49 at another; three paragraphs out of 14 dealt with another

issue; and, if we looked at the percentage of that, there was more of this than that; and he suggested that there should have been 49 more words on this matter, and asked why the Government did not put that in and why did it not, in effect, have the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* looking at the whole of South Australia! I suppose next week we will be asked why we did not put this or that into the document. I assure the honourable member that this topic is not on everyone's lips at the moment.

The honourable member asked a number of questions in relation to authorisations and costings concerning this document, and I undertake to get replies for him. If they have not already been covered by earlier questions, I will refer to the appropriate Minister the honourable member's questions in relation to the costs and who paid for it and bring back a reply. The only point that I can make, to save the honourable member the pain of going through this on further occasions during Question Time, is that the advice provided to me in relation to this document is that the thought behind it was to highlight to companies in other States which might be contemplating investing in South Australia areas in which there were investment opportunities in this State. It was not intended to be a compendium of everything that we do wonderfully well in South Australia.

Last week or the week before the honourable member listed agriculture, and he has talked about education and training, mining and resources. If we so desired, we could go on for pages and pages and indicate the wonderful things that the South Australian Government is currently doing in terms of all the portfolio areas referred to in this document.

However, the advice provided to me was that the intention of the document was not to do that but, in effect, to highlight the potential investment opportunities for companies in other States for investments in South Australia. It was not just a publicity blurb on the things that we do in South Australia; that is the advice provided to me. I can only relay that to members to see whether or not that might ensure that we do not have another one of these questions about how many paragraphs we have on this and why we did not mention that.

ABORIGINAL DEATHS IN CUSTODY

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Correctional Services, a question about Aboriginal deaths in custody.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: Yesterday, a young Aboriginal man died in the Port Augusta Prison. This was the sixth such tragedy to occur in South Australian prisons this year, and I think all members would agree that it is deplorable. The Minister for Correctional Services, Mr Matthew, is quoted in today's *Advertiser* as saying that he has launched a detailed investigation and a report into this young man's death. Mr Matthew has also directed the Department of Correctional Services to look closely at its prisoner observation procedures and make any necessary changes.

While it is right and proper that investigations and reports are made and observation procedures tightened, this is not the answer to the problem of black deaths in custody. The solution appears to lie in addressing the social conditions in which Aboriginals find themselves in this State: issues of health, education, job skills, etc., as well as prison conditions.

In the same *Advertiser* article, Mr Tauto Sansbury, Chairman of the South Australian Aboriginal Advocacy

Committee, said that this death reflects the fact that the State Government is not properly implementing the recommendations of the 1991 Royal Commission into Black Deaths in Custody. Mr Sansbury said:

The State Government has got to start listening to Aboriginal groups and be more involved with the implementation of the recommendations of the Royal Commission.

My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Will the Minister for Correctional Services establish in his inquiry the social conditions that have led to a disproportionate number of Aboriginal people being held in custody? Aboriginal people represent less than 0.01 per cent of the South Australian population while 18 per cent of the prison population are Aboriginal.

2. Will the Minister establish in his inquiry the reasons for the high level of unemployment among Aboriginal people in the community generally?

3. Will the Minister establish the reasons for the low school retention rates for Aboriginal students, the lack of encouragement for Aboriginal students to enter tertiary institutions and the educational problems of Aboriginal students in isolated areas?

4. Will the Minister establish why there is a lack of job opportunities in both the public and private sectors which have been promised over the years for young Aboriginal people?

5. Will the Minister widen his investigation into this tragic death at Port Augusta Prison to look at the conditions generally in the prison system for Aboriginal prisoners?

6. Will the Minister widen his investigation to look at the change in or lack of medical services operating in prisons today, not just for Aboriginal prisoners but for all prisoners, including women prisoners?

7. Will the Minister include in his inquiry the availability of counselling support programs and drug and alcohol services programs for Aboriginal people in prisons, the latter of which that have been reduced in the latest budget cuts?

8. Will the Minister include in his report alternatives for incarceration for Aboriginal people such as job training opportunities for young Aboriginal people?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: These are quite obviously a series of questions which I am not able to answer off the cuff: they are more in the nature of questions on notice, and that is the way they will be treated. We will certainly endeavour to bring back some answers. However, it is important to recognise that the honourable member seeks to put the onus upon the Minister for Correctional Services to conduct inquiries which are not directly related to this death in custody but which are of a broad social and political consideration. I am sure the honourable member will recognise that no one Government can be required to accept the responsibility for the conditions in which Aboriginal people live and the circumstances in which they find themselves in relation to education, health, jobs and so on.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The honourable member's question, with respect, was much broader than that. He asked if the Minister would inquire into a range of issues unrelated or marginally related to the question of deaths in custody.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I listened to the questions, and the questions were broader than just the question of deaths in custody—

The Hon. Anne Levy interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: If we are going to play politics over this, Mr President, we can hark back to what the previous Government did not do in relation to deaths in custody. I am trying to deal with this in a sensitive way, but if I get these sorts of interjections which start to cast blame, then we will never get a solution to the problem. The fact is that the previous Government set up a coordinating committee to deal with Aboriginal deaths in custody. This Government has continued it. This Government has diligently endeavoured to implement the recommendations of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody, those recommendations which had not previously been implemented, and one of those in my area of responsibility is the court cells. I think it is in this financial year and last we are spending approximately \$300 000 to ensure that all the court cells meet all the requirements recommended by the royal commission. In fact, that job has probably now been completed and the Sheriff has given a report which indicates that they do now meet with the requirements of that royal commission.

In terms of monitoring the implementation of the recommendations, I know that one of my legal officers is on the coordinating committee and the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs tables a report publicly and in the Parliament on the progress of the implementation. There are some of the recommendations of the royal commission that the previous Government did not implement that the present Government will not implement because, as a Government, we do not agree with the recommendations which have been proposed. That was open to the previous Government and was an option which it accepted, and that is an option which the present Government is pursuing. But we are diligently endeavouring to ensure that deaths—whether of Aboriginal or non-Aboriginal people—in custody, do not occur. But it is a particularly complex issue which has to be addressed.

No-one gets any joy out of having to deal even with one death in custody, no matter what the racial background of that person may be. It is important that members opposite and the Parliament recognise that this Government is as diligently endeavouring to address the issues, including the social issues, as any other government in coming to grips with this particular problem. So, it is not correct for the Hon. Mr Terry Roberts to come here and say that the State Government is not properly implementing the recommendations of the Aboriginal Deaths in Custody Royal Commission.

With respect to this particular death in custody, the Minister for Emergency Services has indicated that he has commissioned an urgent investigation to endeavour to ascertain what occurred. Quite obviously the Coroner will be involved. The Coroner is a person independent of government. You only have to see the number of inquiries he conducts and the areas in which he conducts those inquiries to know that he is quite obviously independent of any government in the way he tackles his task. He now has, as a result of this Government's initiative, a full-time paid-for counsel assisting the royal commissioner. That was recommended by the Aboriginal Deaths in Custody Royal Commission, and we have appointed that person. The previous Government did not, if you want to play politics about it. So we are diligently endeavouring to implement those recommendations.

In relation to other coronial inquiries, there has been correspondence between the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of State Aboriginal Affairs and the Coroner with respect to some of the coronial investigations which have not

been completed. There are a number of reasons for that, but the Coroner has been at pains to point out that coronial inquiries do not occur overnight. Major crime squad and coronial squad detectives are involved in determining the facts of every death in custody, and ultimately there will be a finding in relation to each of the deaths in custody. It is also important to realise that, in relation to some of those deaths in custody where Aboriginal witnesses are to be interviewed, advice has been given to some of the Aboriginal witnesses that they should not give a statement to investigating police officers without a field officer being present. It is not always possible to get a field officer from the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement when the detective or other investigating officer seeks to make that investigation. Police investigating these cases have respected the wishes of the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement with respect to those inquiries.

The fact is that the Coroner will make totally independent inquiries, and reports will be made available when the Coroner has been able to complete his investigations. With respect to this case, again, the same process will be followed but, in addition to that, the Minister has indicated that he has already established an investigation to determine, as far as is possible in the circumstances, the reason for this death in custody. The other matters which the honourable member raised in his questions I will refer to the Minister for Emergency Services. If they are specifically within his portfolio responsibility I will bring back replies.

CREUTZFELDT-JAKOB DISEASE

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about mortuary attendants and the handling of bodies which may have Creutzfeldt-Jakob Disease.

Leave granted.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: Creutzfeldt-Jakob Disease, or CJD, is a nervous system or brain disease which has affected people who have undertaken a particular type of hormone treatment for dwarfism and infertility. This hormone treatment began in Australia in the 1960s and ceased in 1985, when the connection between the treatment and CJD became known. No tests can be done to show whether or not you have been exposed to CJD, nor are there any treatments to prevent contracting the disease. It is highly transmissible and is able to withstand extremes in temperature and normal surgical sterilisation. The only way that the presence of CJD can be detected is by post-mortem examination of brain tissue. At a meeting of the South Australian CJD support group which I attended in June and which was addressed by Dr Graham Maynard of the Human Pituitary Hormone Task Force in Canberra, we were told that a laboratory in which the CJD organism has been researched is contaminated, in his words, 'for ever more'. On the other hand, it is not transmitted via sexual intercourse, nor is it passed on to embryos *in utero*.

The first reported Australian death from CJD was in 1990. There is a total of five deaths to date, two of which have been South Australian. The Federal Government has set up a special task force within its Health Department to inform the more than 2 100 Australians who may be at risk of contracting CJD. There are approximately 250 South Australians who are at risk. Sadly, the coordinator of the South Australian branch of the CJD Support Network Inc. committed suicide in Melbourne in August this year. The woman, who had had hormone treatment for infertility some years earlier, was very fearful of contracting the disease.

At that meeting of the support group, which I mentioned earlier, I met this woman, who phoned me the next day. She told me the shame she felt about being a potential CJD carrier. She put it in the same category as AIDS and told me that only her husband and children knew she was at risk; she could not bear any of her friends or relatives knowing. When she attended a meeting of the National Human Pituitary Hormones Advisory Council in mid August, she tabled a letter in which she expressed her 'shock, dismay, outrage, betrayal, anger, violation, distress and distrust' about her name and address being tabled in documents to a Senate Estimates Committee. Following her suicide in Melbourne, a post-mortem examination was never carried out on the deceased woman, because the Victorian laboratory workers feared acquiring the disease. According to an article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 2 September, mortuary attendants threatened industrial action if they were forced to deal with the body, and samples of her blood that were passed on from one laboratory to another were never tested, because of similar fears.

For a woman who compared her risk of having CJD to that of having AIDS, her post-death treatment would have confirmed her worst fears. Given that approximately 250 South Australians are at risk of contracting CJD, I am concerned that at some time in the future when these people die their bodies will be subjected to the same demeaning boycott as happened recently in Victoria. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Do guidelines exist for South Australian mortuary attendants who may have to do a post-mortem examination on a CJD-risk corpse? If so, what are those guidelines?
2. If not, when will guidelines be developed?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I will seek some advice and bring back some answers.

LEARN TO SWIM CAMPAIGN

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services a question about the Learn to Swim campaign.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: It was recently announced that—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: It was recently reported by the Minister that children will be charged \$9 for a full course of nine Learn to Swim lessons, which lessons were previously provided free of charge. It was reported in the weekend press by the Chairman of Kidsafe South Australia (Dr Brian Fotheringham) that drowning was second only to car accidents as a cause of death in children aged nought to 14, and he was quoted as saying that even a small charge may be the barrier to stopping a significant number of children attending Learn to Swim lessons. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Does he believe that the Government has a social responsibility to ensure that all young South Australians have the opportunity to learn to swim?
2. What is the estimated fall in the number of young South Australians who will attend Learn to Swim classes this summer as a result of this new charge's being imposed?

3. What provisions, if any, will be made to assist children in families on low incomes, such as those receiving school-card, to participate in Learn to Swim programs?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: This question rightly should be directed to my colleague representing the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. I am not sure whether the honourable member has caught up, but three years ago the previous Government transferred responsibility for Learn to Swim to Recreation and Sport from the Department for Education and Children's Services. I acknowledge that the honourable member is new to this Chamber, although he was a member of the Government that made the decision. I can provide some information, which I will be happy to share with the honourable member but, as I said, I will refer his question to my colleague the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing to give a more detailed response.

I am advised that taxpayers will provide a subsidy of \$500 000 in the first year for the continuation of this program. The cost of this program in South Australia is \$9 for nine lessons, or \$1 a lesson, as the honourable member has indicated, and when one compares that to other States one finds that in Victoria the cost of a similar program is \$35; in Western Australia it is \$18 and is expected to rise in 1996; and in New South Wales it is \$27. When one compares—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is a bit too much byplay: I cannot hear the answer.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: When one compares the projected rate for 1996 in South Australia with those of all the other States, all the other States charge a fee for the equivalent to Vacswim, or Learn to Swim, as the honourable member has called the program. All the other States charge a fee for the program and, as I understand it, although I will check it for the honourable member, thousands and thousands of children from families from the lower socioeconomic groups through to the upper socioeconomic groups in those States (under Labor and Liberal Governments) continue to avail themselves of the opportunity of the equivalent to the Learn to Swim campaign. The other point I can make is that the South Australian Government, through the Department for Education and Children's Services, continues to offer a term-time swimming program to students in all our schools, and the advice provided to me is—

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: You haven't come to that one yet.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Mr Elliott would have to be the most negative person I have ever heard: he ought to join the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: In two years I have never heard one positive word from the honourable member. I am determined to live long enough to be able to say that, on one occasion, I heard one positive word coming from the Hon. Mr Elliott.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: All I can say to the Hon. Mr Elliott is that I at least contest elections and manage to win election back to this Chamber. Suffice to say how he manages to get himself back into the Chamber. As I was going to say before being interrupted, the South Australian Government, through the Department for Education and Children's Services, continues to offer term-time swimming programs to its students, and I am told that for primary level students we continue to undertake up to 7½ hours of instruc-

tion on water safety and swimming or aquatics every year during school time. I am told that the program is very well patronised by schools. That is the advice that has been provided to me: I will refer the honourable member's question to the appropriate Minister and bring back a more detailed reply to his questions.

TRUCKS

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I seek leave to make a precied statement before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services, the Leader of the Government in this place, some questions about trucks imported into Australia. Leave granted.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: As most members would already be aware, the Federal Liberal Opposition and its Leader (Hon. John Howard) recently hired a truck and placed a message on the body of the truck to the effect that all Australians collectively owed in excess of \$183 billion between them. It has been drawn to my attention that the truck in question cost approximately \$75 000 and was fully imported. It has further been made known to me—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Name an Australian-made truck. Go on: name an Australian-made truck. You can't, can you?

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: The Australian Army just bought 6 000 of them, my ignorant friend. May I continue, Mr President?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I remind the questioner that he should just ask his questions and ignore the interjections.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I am doing my best with my precied statement, Mr President. The truck in question cost approximately \$75 000 and was fully imported. It has further been made known to me that the \$183 billion debt breaks down approximately as follows: the Federal Government owes some \$6 billion; State Governments (which are of all political persuasions) owe some \$23 billion; local governments (which are again of all political persuasions) owe some \$20 billion; and the rest is owed by various Australian businesses and enterprises. This last business accrued debt makes up \$130 billion or so of the total debt of approximately \$180 billion.

Investigations by me show that such a truck as hired by the Liberal Party cost some \$75 000 to import. This truck, as I understand it, broke down before it even left Canberra. Now, as all members would understand, Australia has recently been having considerable problems with its balance of payments—as a nation we are importing more products than we are exporting.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: Well, listen, my ignorant young friend. You listen and you learn, you see, Mr Redford. Of course, in respect of this some people would argue that at least, in part, the Australia wide drought for the past four years, coupled with a number of big ticket replacement equipment machinery items such as aircraft, etc., and also the worldwide slackening of demand, and indeed some would say recession, has also led to the lessening of demand for our mineral exports and a reduction of the prices in the world market for those minerals which we have continued to export. Some economists would even argue that a combination of these factors has substantially weakened our balance of payments position which, in its turn, has added further to Australia's indebtedness.

I am told that Australia makes its own trucks. My questions to the Minister are simple ones and I ask that he

listens carefully to them so he can give me concise and direct answers without straying from the parameters of my questions which are as follows:

1. Does the Minister agree with me that the more trucks which Australia imports, the more we do damage to our South Australian automotive industry?

2. Does the Minister agree with me that the more trucks which Australia imports the more we add to our balance of payments deficit between that which we export and that which we import?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I might be inclined to take the honourable member's question more seriously if at the same time he took the particular issue up with his Federal colleague the Prime Minister, who has been known to import all of his suits, antique clocks and a variety of other purchases—

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Some of his suits would probably cost as much as the truck. I am advised by one of my colleagues more learned in trucking matters than I—I profess to not have much experience—that there was no Australian-made equivalent of the particular variety of truck required for this task.

The Hon. T. Crothers: Not true.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The honourable member contests that, but one of my colleagues more learned than I in trucking matters tells me to the contrary that there was no Australian-made equivalent. If that is the case, then any user or consumer of trucks in Australia, Liberal Party or otherwise, does not have an option in relation to choice of product; in other words, they cannot choose between an Australian-made truck or an imported truck. Before we can resolve the issue about importing trucks and the effect on the balance of payments, or the national debt, one needs to resolve to our mutual satisfaction the issue which is contested. The honourable member's advisers tell him one thing: my learned advisers tell me another. As I said, I cannot profess to be an expert on the accuracy, or otherwise, of the statements.

The third point I make in relation to the honourable member's analysis of the national debt is that when the Federal Treasurer and the Prime Minister used that analysis one of the Commonwealth Government's most senior economic advisers dismissed it as simplistic economics.

The Hon. T. Crothers: A former economic adviser.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: And a very senior one, as the honourable member will know, dismissed it as simplistic economics. One knows that the level of debt in the economy nationally very much depends on the macro-economic circumstances constructed by the Commonwealth Government through its macro-economic policy. It is not correct to say that all that level of debt which exists in the private sector is all the responsibility of the individual private companies because they have to survive under the economic conditions created by a Commonwealth Labor Government. A very senior economic adviser to the Commonwealth Government indicated that it was simplistic of the Prime Minister, the Treasurer and the Commonwealth Government to seek to rationalise away the national debt in that way.

RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES TRIBUNAL

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the Residential Tenancies Tribunal.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: A few months ago Parliament passed new legislation relating to the Residential Tenancies Tribunal, legislation which, of course, has not yet been proclaimed. Certain regulations are required before it can be proclaimed and I understand that these regulations have not yet been produced. The members of the existing Residential Tenancies Tribunal had terms of office which were due to expire at the end of June (it may have been the end of May). However, all their terms of office were extended to the end of November of this year which would obviously allow for the regulations to be prepared and appointments made in consequence. Unfortunately, the presiding member of the Residential Tenancies Tribunal has resigned to take up a new position—and I am sure every one wishes her well in her new position—but this means the tribunal currently has no presiding officer, though it does have an acting presiding officer.

One of the responsibilities of the presiding officer is to organise the roster of tribunal members for the sittings which take place. One would assume that, when the presiding member is no longer present through resignation, the acting presiding member would take on the responsibility of organising the roster of tribunal members for the various hearings, but I understand that that is not occurring. The roster of tribunal members for the hearings is being organised by officers in the Minister's own office. Phone calls have been received by people from officers in the Minister's own office—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. ANNE LEVY:—and the acting presiding member of the tribunal has not been given the opportunity to organise the roster as might be expected for someone acting in that position. My questions are:

1. When will the regulations for the new Residential Tenancies Act be promulgated and new appointments made to take effect from the end of November which, after all, is only six weeks away?

2. Will the Attorney ensure that the Acting Presiding Member of the Residential Tenancies Tribunal undertakes the responsibility of organising the roster for tribunal members and for the various hearings and ensure that his ministerial office plays no part whatsoever in organising this roster?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: That is the greatest load of hogwash I have ever heard.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: It is the greatest load of nonsense that I have heard in this place. The Minister's office is not involved in organising rosters.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: No, it is not aware. Let me tell the honourable member a few facts of life. The Presiding Member retired and her resignation took effect on 23 September or thereabouts. She should have received a letter from me by now indicating my thanks on behalf of the Government for the work that she undertook. Some discussions took place with Ms McEvoy and, under the Act, she became the Acting Presiding Member. She has made some representations to me in relation to the workload of existing members and has sought to understand who will accept the responsibility for managing the affairs of the tribunal. She indicated that she had a week—I think it was last week—where she could be full time in the management responsibility for the tribunal but, after that, she was not available for full-time involvement in the commission. On that basis,

arrangements were made for Mrs Pat Patrick to be available, if that was the way it all panned out, for the longer than one day a week that she sits at present. In those circumstances, that approach is quite appropriate.

In respect of the listing, that is not within my province, and I would not dare get involved in that. In terms of who is available or not available, I have written to each of the current members of the tribunal, both lawyers and non-lawyers, throughout South Australia, indicating that we are giving consideration to the constitution of the tribunal when the new Act comes into operation. I have sent them their *curriculum vitae*, which I had, and I have asked them to indicate to me whether or not they wish to be considered for a new appointment under the new Act and, if so, to update their CV and get it back to me by, I think, 23 October.

I have written to a number of organisations including Shelter, SACOSS, the Landlords' Association, the Retirement Villages Association and the South Australian Retirement Villages Residents' Association, among others, indicating that we are putting together a list of persons who might be approached and then appointed to take up their position on the new tribunal. I have given all of them until 23 October to let me have the names of persons whom they wish to have considered for these positions, and that is quite appropriate as well. We are certainly aiming for 30 November to bring the new Act into operation, but it depends on whether all this can be pulled together within that time.

In terms of the regulations, my recollection is that approval for drafting has been given and that the drafting is being undertaken. I am not sure when those regulations will be available as a draft, but I certainly intend to make them available, and I will make some inquiries about when that is likely to occur.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Who is doing the roster?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I am not doing the roster. My office has had nothing to do with the roster. If the honourable member has evidence that suggests otherwise, she should let me have it. The Minister's office is not involved. Why would I want to get involved in rostering persons who sit on the Residential Tenancies Tribunal? I have better things to do with my time than set up a roster of who is going to sit, who is not going to sit and when they are going to sit. My office is not doing it, full stop!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. Anne Levy: Who is?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I don't know who's doing it!

The Hon. Anne Levy: Well, find out.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I will find out for the honourable member so that she will stop interjecting 'Who's doing it?' all the time. I said that I do not know who is doing it and I will bring back an answer.

PCB DISPOSAL

In reply to **Hon. T.G. ROBERTS** (27 July).

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

1. The Polychlorinated Biphenyls Management Plan is being formulated by the Scheduled Waste Management Group which is to report to ANZECC. This is part of a program which is to provide a national approach for management of these materials and other persistent halogen-containing wastes (Schedule X Wastes). The Management Plan is at the Final Draft stage and a Proposed Plan is being discussed. A representative of the Office of the Environment Protection Authority represents South Australia on the Scheduled Waste Management Group.

2. The Polychlorinated Biphenyls Management Plan makes provision for a register of Polychlorinated Biphenyls to be kept provided that they are over a threshold quantity and concentration. Once the Plan is adopted establishment of this register will be implemented.

3. Results from testing by an analytical laboratory indicate that the equipment that was offered for sale at Osborne Power Station would not meet the criteria that render it necessary to include them on any future register.

The material offered for sale at Osborne Power Station would not amount to a Schedule X substance as intended under the Polychlorinated Biphenyls Management Plan.

4. It was not necessary for a member of the public to inform the Environment Protection Authority of this sale. The South Australian Waste Management Commission (which was the responsible authority at the time) was aware of the proposed disposal of the transformers on 18 June 1993.

5. Although this material would not be classified as a Schedule X Waste under the Polychlorinated Biphenyls Management Plan it was considered appropriate and diligent to require that the name and address of the purchasers be recorded. This information will be passed on to environmental regulatory authorities in other States and Territories.

6. The Electricity Trust of South Australia has initiated an evaluation of the contamination of the site. The outcomes of these investigations will be available to Ports Corp SA and should it be required, for assessment by SA Health Commission and the EPA.

7. Auctioneers are no longer subject to the requirements of licensing. Responsible auctioneers are members of the Auctioneers and Appraisers Association which has a code which specifies standards of behaviour with which members are expected to comply. These matters are administered by the Commissioner for Consumer and Business Affairs in the Attorney-General's Department.

HALLETT COVE EAST PRIMARY SCHOOL

In reply to **Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES** (19 July).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Individual houses are being purchased by individuals, and no prospectus will be issued.

CHILDREN'S SERVICES OFFICE

In reply to **Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES** (27 July).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The 1993 report on Early Childhood Services Needs of Aboriginal Communities by Anne Glover did not cover the communities of Anangu Pitjantjatjara, Maralinga Tjurrutja, Flinders Ranges or Port Pirie as suggested in the honourable member's question.

I am aware of the issues raised in the report.

DECS Children's Services is committed to the employment of Aboriginal staff. Of the 1049 positions in DECS Children's Services, 58 are filled by Aboriginal people. Of these, 14 people were employed in the Northern country. These positions do not include Aboriginal people employed in Child Parent Centres as I am advised it is difficult to extrapolate child parent centre staff from school staff.

Children's Services Early Entry to Pre School Policy applies to Aboriginal children. Aboriginal Children are able to participate in pre school from the age of three years. The report confirms for DECS the value of early entry for Aboriginal children and the policy has been reviewed and confirmed as a result of the report. It is important to note that the early access model is not based on a deficit approach, rather DECS Children's Services supports the views of Aboriginal communities that early entry enables an Aboriginal child to learn that there are 'two ways of being, two (or more) language codes and that they can function equally well using either'.

The report identifies the relationship between attendances and the availability of transport. DECS Children's Services acknowledges this relationship. Bus services are provided in the communities of Port Augusta, Ceduna and Port Lincoln, either by the state or through other government grant provision. Since January 1994 Children's Services has administered an Aboriginal Access Transport Program whereby a taxi can be used to transport children to and from services. The report does not indicate that there are any immediate issues in relation to transport, rather that the existing strategies should prevail.

Co-location of services is an agreed strategy for all communities including Aboriginal communities. These strategies can only be realised in newly developing areas or in areas of redevelopment. Within the communities of Port Lincoln, Ceduna and Port Augusta an opportunity has arisen that enables the co-location of a number

of suitable services for Aboriginal children and families. In these communities, co-location and integrated service delivery will cover pre school child care.

The report identifies the need for some caution to be exercised by government agencies prior to proceeding with collaborative service delivery for education, health and welfare services.

However, collaboration between agencies could result in effective support for Aboriginal families, thereby having an impact on the lives of their children who use the services. Significant differences to the lives of Aboriginal children and their families can be made when services and/or agencies work together and cooperate to support families through a process of information and resource sharing.

At this stage the focus for the Department for Education and Children's Services (DECS) has been improving the collaborative efforts between Schools and Children's Services following the amalgamation of the two agencies. Considerable progress has been made in this respect with a joint Aboriginal Education and Care policy being developed for the whole of DECS and coordination of support services such as transport, special services support and curriculum and advisory support.

It is important to note that the allocation of staff to pre school services is based on attendances of children and this principle is applied to Aboriginal services also. The value or quality of a program is not based solely on attendances, nevertheless, good participation can be viewed as a measure of parent satisfaction with a service.

As indicated in the report it is difficult to evaluate program goals due to complexities of determinants. However, DECS Children's Services do evaluate programs with the view to identifying whether program outcomes are being met. Pre-schools are required to have individual centre plans with clear goals and objectives with identified outcomes for individual children. The development of these plans involve parents and these plans are monitored on a regular basis by Children's Services Regional Coordinators. All preschool staff are required to participate in performance management which entails a monitoring process of their performance against centre goals.

In addition the recently announced agreement between the Government and University of South Australia to create the Chair of Early Childhood Research at the University, de Lissa Institute will research outcomes for preschool children in a variety of early childhood settings in South Australia.

Children's Services staff, both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal, are in the process of an evaluation of the Aboriginal Language Program, which will examine the Program and identify future directions of the program.

HALLETT COVE EAST PRIMARY SCHOOL

In reply to **Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES** (20 July).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:

1. I sought advice from officers of DECS and from senior officers of the Department for Treasury and Finance. The Department for Treasury and Finance analysed the offer for the purchase and lease-back of the school and have supported the proposal as being in the State's financial interest.

The benefits are that the Government is being paid more than the property is valued today and the risk of future capital devaluation is borne by the investors. In addition funds from the sale will be used for urgently needed capital works in other schools.

2. The proposal from C&G was a unique concept that has not been tried before. Given that C&G only facilitate the contractual arrangement between investors and the Government and receive no payment from the Government it is not appropriate in these circumstances to call tenders. The Government is managing the sale of the school and small investors are purchasing the school.

As the offer for the purchase and lease-back of the school came from a group of small investors and as this concept had not been tried before it was decided not to go to tender but to accept their offer and evaluate the arrangement as a trial. If it is successful and there appears to be investor demand for Government infra-structure investments then future projects of this nature may involve some form of competitive tendering.

3. Some members of the South Australian community, facilitated by C&G have made an offer to the Department for Education and Children's Services to purchase the houses for \$135,000 each and lease them back at \$11,800 pa. The department, with the assistance of the Department for Treasury and Finance, have

assessed this offer from a financial and risk perspective. On the basis of their recommendations I have approved the proposal.

4. Rent will be reviewed on an annual basis in line with CPI.

5. Not at the current time.

6. No. The leases are between individual owner/investors and the Minister for Education and Children's Services. If the member is seeking answers to further specific questions, I would be prepared to consider those questions.

IRRIGATION DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport, representing the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, a question about the Upper Cooper Creek catchment in the Lake Eyre Basin.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: A proposal is currently being considered in Queensland for the growing of cotton using water in the Upper Cooper system. It is already on the record that it is the cotton growers and rice growers of Queensland and New South Wales who have been largely responsible for the current plight of the Darling River and the Murray Basin system generally.

There are three areas of concern. The first is that this application will set a precedent for further irrigation development in the catchment, where currently there is none. Secondly, it is a threat to world heritage wetlands, including the Coongie Lakes, which are subject to the Ramsar Convention for the Protection of Wetlands of International Importance. Thirdly, pastoralists and townspeople of the Cooper catchment in South Australia and Queensland are united in their opposition to the proposal as they are reliant upon the waters that come down the floodplains and the pastures thereon. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Will the Government seek a moratorium on further irrigation development of the Lake Eyre Basin?

2. Will the Minister provide half of the \$70 000 in this area to fund a full-time project officer for the catchment management of the Lake Eyre Basin steering group?

3. Will the Minister and the Premier prevail on the Queensland Minister to subject the Windorah proposal to a full and independent EIS based on ecological and economic implications for the whole of the Cooper catchment and join with South Australia in declaring an indefinite moratorium on irrigation developments in the Lake Eyre Basin catchment?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister and bring back a reply.

PRINTING COMMITTEE

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I move:

That the Hon. P. Nocella be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. M.S. Feleppa, resigned.

Motion carried.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I move:

That pursuant to section 21(3) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 the Hon. P. Nocella be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. M.S. Feleppa, resigned.

Motion carried.

CLASSIFICATIONS (PUBLICATIONS, FILMS AND COMPUTER GAMES) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 27 September. Page 70.)

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES (Leader of the Opposition): I will not spend too long on this Bill because no amendments are proposed by the Opposition and because of the extensive groundwork that has already been done in preparation of this Bill. Members will be aware that considerable work has been done in the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General over a long period so that a draft Commonwealth Bill was finally agreed upon in January 1994. The Commonwealth Bill was finally passed through Federal Parliament in March this year. Obviously, it is a massive task to get State and Commonwealth agreement right around the nation, particularly when we are talking about an aspect of censorship. Accordingly, the Opposition will not be obstructive in relation to this Bill.

The Bill sets out the mechanism by means of which films, publications and computer games will be classified. The Bill also covers the matters to be taken into account when a decision is made as to classification in clause 19. There should be little argument about the very general criteria set out in clause 19, although there is bound to be plenty of argument from time to time about how those criteria are to be applied to a particular film or publication. The most open and potentially contentious criterion is set out in clause 19(a), which refers to the standards of morality, decency and propriety generally accepted by reasonable adults.

I have one particular problem with the way that the criteria are interpreted based on the explanations given in information bulletin No. 7 of the Federal Office of Film and Literature Classification. The document to which I refer sets out what to look for—so to speak—in respect of language, sex and violence in relation to each of the classifications G, PG, M, MA and R. I am concerned that the breakdown into these categories is somewhat mechanistic, and no account seems to be taken of the relationship between people where sex and/or violence is occurring in a publication or on film.

Although a lot of men in particular ridicule political correctness—but it is by no means confined to men ridiculing it—the fact is that there is still an awful lot of television, film and media content which shows women in a derogatory and demeaning light, despite the feminist issues which have been raised over at least the past 30 years. In other words, I am concerned that the people responsible for making censorship decisions consider the explicit or the gross nature of sexual violence without fully considering the undesirability of the portrayal of women in abusive relationships, even though the sex or violence is not explicit. Perhaps the Attorney will take those concerns to the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General for further consideration.

The Attorney may wish to tell us why he has insisted on renaming the State censorship body, which in the Bill is called the South Australian Classification Council. My question is really whether it should have been possible to leave classifications to the Commonwealth Classifications Board with or without the capacity for the relevant Minister in South Australia to step in and classify something. Has the South Australian Bill been drafted in its current form in order that the Attorney might retain a considerable degree of control over the classification process? Would there be any adverse financial implications if South Australian classifications were made by the Commonwealth body, or is it simply a matter of enacting legislation that mirrors the legislation in every other State?

Another specific question (perhaps just a matter of drafting) arises from a comment made in the Government's outline of this Bill. On page 6 of the report produced by the Attorney-General dated 24 July 1995, in relation to this Bill, it states:

If the Minister classifies the council may not proceed to classify a publication, film or computer game.

Is this an accurate description of what the Bill contains? My understanding of section 16 is that, if the Minister wishes to classify something personally, the Minister must first require the council to provide advice. If that action is taken then the council may not proceed to classify the publication, film or game unless the Minister gives the go-ahead. It is only after considering advice from the council that the Minister may proceed to classification. The wording in the report seemed to suggest that the Minister could completely pre-empt the Classification Council's proceedings. That is another point—perhaps just a minor point—which I would like the Attorney to clarify in due course.

I make two final points about media which are not covered by this Bill. Of major concern is the content of television programs, particularly children's television programs. I understand that the Commonwealth has all the power in respect of television censorship, and I wonder whether the Attorney has considered any possible moves to give South Australia a greater say in the content of television programs shown in South Australia. I know that the Attorney does not mind a bit of censoring himself, so it must irk him to see some of the depravity which is available on our television screens and which irks me personally. The most disturbing to me are those cartoons aimed at young children which display grotesque monsters or alien creatures engaged in violent combat.

Finally, there remains the thorny issue of regulating what are called 'on-line services' and computer bulletin boards. I am pleased to see that this Bill and the corresponding legislation elsewhere will permit classification of material on bulletin boards. It may be, however, that it is impossible effectively to censor these bulletin boards and the cyberspace which has been created by worldwide computer networks. In this difficult area it is important for both major political Parties to work together, and the Government will certainly have the Opposition's cooperation in this area if anything constructive can be done. I support the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

**CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING)
(MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 28 September. Page 72.)

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the second reading. This Bill makes sensible amendments to our sentencing legislation. Generally speaking, the Bill brings the legislation into line with current sentencing practices. More flexibility is given in the case of community service orders, particularly to cover the interaction between the court making the order and the Department of Correctional Services which must provide a placement. In respect of justices of the peace, I dare say that not too many will miss the power to imprison, since in Adelaide at least JPs are generally given minor traffic matters and other work at that sort of level. The Opposition will not be proposing any amendments in respect of the Bill, and we are happy to support the second reading.

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

**CONSTITUTION (SALARY OF THE GOVERNOR
AND ELECTORAL REDISTRIBUTION)
AMENDMENT BILL**

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act 1934. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill makes a number of amendments to the Constitution Act 1934. First, the Bill amends section 73 of the Constitution Act 1934 to provide that the salary payable to future Governors is to be determined in accordance with any percentage increases in salary payable to a judge of the Supreme Court. Section 73(1) currently bases the salary of the Governor on a rate of \$30 000 per annum commencing 1 July 1981 and adjusted each financial year by applying the Consumer Price Index for the March quarter.

A review of the remuneration payable to the Governor and the senior staff at Government House was completed in June 1995. One of the recommendations was that the salary payable to future governors be tied to the percentage increase payable to a Supreme Court judge. Her Excellency the Governor indicated that she did not wish this increase to apply to herself. Accordingly, section 73(1) continues to be applicable in determining the salary payable to Her Excellency the Governor. New subsection 73(1b) provides for the salary payable to future governors.

Section 73(1b) provides that the salary payable to a future governor upon the cessation of the term of office of Her Excellency Dame Roma Mitchell will be the same as the final salary paid to his or her predecessor in office and will be increased during his or her term in office, at the same time and by the same proportion as the salary of a Supreme Court judge is increased during that period. The Remuneration Tribunal is required to review the salaries payable to the Judiciary annually.

Section 77 of the Act is also amended. This section requires the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission to draw the electoral boundaries in accordance with an electoral quota determined at the 'relevant date'. The 'relevant date' was stated to be a date falling not earlier than two months

before the date of the order, the order being the making an electoral redistribution.

Practical difficulties have been encountered by the commission in meeting the two month time frame provided in section 77 of the Act because of the need to adjust provisional figures, provide accompanying reasons after the quota has been determined, make the necessary alteration and have the report and order printed and published. These difficulties have been compounded by the 1994 amendment to the Act which requires the Commission to issue a draft order, and then, after considering any public response, publish its final order.

This Bill amends section 77 to extend the 'relevant date' to a 'date falling not early than six months before the date of the order'. Extending the time to six months allows the commission to specify a date prior to the issue of its draft order and obviates the need to change the date, and therefore the quota, when the final order is made. It also has the advantage of providing more accurate electoral roll figures, as the closer the relevant date is to the preceding election the more accurate the figures upon which the quota is based. This is consistent with the principle that whenever an electoral redistribution is made the number of electors comprised in each electoral district must not vary from the electoral quota by more than the permissible tolerance of 10 per cent.

In relation to the final amendment, it has been the practice since 1955, or thereabouts, for additional remuneration to be paid to members of the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission as the responsibilities of the commissioners are onerous and work involved falls outside of their normal duties. These payments have been made on an *ad hoc* basis, with approaches being made to the Executive on the occasion of each distribution. For some time there has been concern that this method places the integrity and independence of the commission in jeopardy. The amendment to section 78 avoids the need for such approaches and authorises the Remuneration Tribunal to determine the remuneration payable to members of the commission.

The Chairman of the commission is excluded from this provision because the Chairman of the commission is a Supreme Court judge who continues to receive the salary of a judge during the time he or she performs the functions of chairman. It has not been the practice for the judge to receive any additional salary. I commend this Bill to the Council and I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 73—Salary of the Governor

Clause 2 sets out the new basis for the remuneration of governors who hold office after Her Excellency Dame Roma Mitchell.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 77—Basis of redistribution

This clause amends the definition of 'the relevant date' in section 77(2) of the principal Act so that the relevant date will be a date falling not earlier than six months before the date of an order for an electoral redistribution (instead of the current two months).

Clause 4: Variation of s. 78—The Commission

This clause amends section 78 of the principal Act by inserting a new subclause (7) providing that members of the commission (other than the chairman) are entitled to remuneration determined by the Remuneration Tribunal.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 28 September. Page 75.)

The PRESIDENT: This is the Hon. Paul Holloway's first contribution in this Chamber and I ask that honourable members give him the amount of decorum that they also received when they made their maiden speeches.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Thank you, Mr President. I have, of course, made a maiden speech in another part of this building, but I will not go into that. I would like to begin by congratulating Her Excellency the Governor on the delivery of her address to this Parliament. It is a great honour for me to be chosen by the Australian Labor Party to replace the Hon. Barbara Wiese as a member of the Legislative Council. Barbara blazed a trail of achievement in politics that few are likely to match. It has been stated often in the past few weeks that Barbara was the first woman to hold a ministry in a South Australian Labor Government, and she was the first woman to become President of the Australian Labor Party. She was also the youngest person to hold that position, and I believe that was quite a remarkable achievement.

I had the privilege of being Barbara's campaign director when in 1977 she first stood for Parliament in the seat of Glenelg. Barbara made my job as a campaign director very easy as she devoted herself tirelessly to what was an impossible task of winning that seat. I can well recall calling around to sign up an enthusiastic supporter whom Barbara had met out doorknocking during the campaign. That person was Susan Lenahan, who made a significant contribution to this State in her own right. I was fortunate to work with Barbara again over the past six years as a secretary to her Caucus committee in Government and then as a policy adviser in Opposition. In many ways Barbara paid a very high price in blazing a trail for others to follow, but I believe that the inspiration that she gave to many South Australians is a legacy of which she can justly be proud. I join others who have spoken in this Council to wish Barbara well in her new career.

It was not until I was 26 years old in 1975 that I was able to cast my first vote for the Legislative Council. Until 1975, enrolment for the Legislative Council had been conditional on property ownership, and at the time hundreds of thousands of people like me were denied the basic right to vote, because we did not own property. We could vote for the House of Assembly and both Houses of the Federal Parliament, but we could not vote for the Legislative Council. Some of my earlier political involvement as a member of the Australian Labor Party was devoted to enrolling voters with more modest property holdings onto the Legislative Council roll. This was part of the war of nerves between Don Dunstan's Labor Party and the Liberal dominated Legislative Council; the Liberal Party controlled 16 of the 20 seats in this Council. Fortunately, that war was won by Don Dunstan in 1973 and the system of election to this Chamber is now a model of democracy.

I am pleased to have played a part in that process, however small. My elevation to this Chamber, for which once I could not even vote, let alone hope ever to join, shows that all things are possible with persistence and if the cause is right. Of course, the future of this Chamber was not fixed for all time by those changes, and indeed the existence of all State Parliaments is itself far from guaranteed. Twenty years ago,

any referendum to abolish the Legislative Council would have been soundly defeated. Today I am not sure that this would be the case; however, I do not expect that the Brown Government is likely to put this to the test.

The global communication revolution that we see around us now is rapidly shifting the political and economic centre of gravity away from local and State to national and international politics. The Hilmer report recommendations on national competition policy will accelerate the transfer of State powers to the Federal arena. Even in the Governor's address, measures are foreshadowed such as the heavy transport vehicle scheme, which effectively transfer matters that traditionally have been under State jurisdiction over to a Federal scheme. The global nature of many environmental problems, such as the hole in the ozone layer, the greenhouse effect and problems in the marine environment, demand international cooperation and agreement, and they transcend local political considerations.

So, we can see that the scope for independent action by State Governments is declining. This trend is inevitable and, in my view, in many cases it is desirable. What we have to do in State Parliaments is concentrate on those areas where a State perspective is still relevant and where local benefits are likely to be overlooked at the Federal level. We need to redefine State responsibility to fit the conditions of the next century. There is no point in State Governments which merely implement or duplicate Federal programs. The future of State Governments is also intimately tied up with the future of local government.

The Governor has told us that the Brown Government will soon introduce legislation to reform local government in South Australia. I do not think anyone should be surprised if larger, regional local government bodies which may emerge from such a process ultimately challenge the need for State Government. I remember that Gough Whitlam was once viciously attacked by conservative State Governments for his advocacy that regional and local government should replace State Governments. It is rather ironic that a Liberal State Government should now be proposing what could be the first steps in such a process. My view is that the Australian Constitution, established as it was when transport and communications were literally in the horse and buggy days, does not provide the best Government structure for the 1990s, let alone the twenty-first century.

The strongest case for retaining State Government at the present time may well be that the calibre of local government is generally so poor. This is an inevitable result of having so many councillors representing so few electors. When 200 or 300 electors choose a councillor in the wards of even our biggest councils, it is inevitable that the parochial interests of vested interest groups will dictate the fortunes of local government. Larger councils with fewer wards, bigger budgets, more responsibilities and more broadly based election systems may attract better candidates from the large pool now available. Maybe State Governments will then become increasingly irrelevant. However, it is my belief that local government can become fully representative of the community only if compulsory voting is introduced, and we know that the Brown Government will not support such a measure.

The Brown Government's rhetoric allows local government to be a separate and autonomous tier of Government. However, its actions and those of Liberal Governments across the board, particularly in Victoria, appear to suggest that local government should be an arm of State Government, operating

more like a Government department. In Victoria we have seen whole areas of local councils removed and replaced with non-elected officials. I look forward to the coming debate on the future of local government and hearing how the Brown Government intends to reconcile its internal conflicts and its confused objectives for the future of local government. I also wait with some interest to hear the Brown Government's latest views on Federalism and the reform of Commonwealth-State financial relations.

When they were in Opposition the Brown Liberals took a rather primitive view on changes to Commonwealth-State relations. I well remember that the Liberals originally proposed mutual recognition legislation, which established an Australia wide scheme for recognising occupational qualifications and product standards. I recall that in one case a Liberal member said that we had to be different because we did not come from convict stock in South Australia, unlike in New South Wales. Well, things have changed. For South Australia's sake we can all only hope that the Brown Government has developed a less parochial stance on some of these national issues.

Probably there has not been a Government since Stalin's Soviet Union that has so systematically tried to reinterpret past events and to hide the negative attitudes it took in Opposition as the Brown Government. This is the Government that promised to increase spending on health and education. It promised to stop the Hindmarsh Island bridge, even though it spent the past 18 months and millions of dollars condemning the Federal Government for doing just that. It promised to increase the number of operational police by 200; it promised that the Public Service would not be reduced by more than the 3 900 target set by the former Labor Government. It promised that Sunday trading would not be permitted. It promised to be more accountable.

Its Leader promised that there would be no new taxes and that charges would not be increased by more than the consumer price index. Indeed, when the Premier was in Opposition he told us he would resign if there was any increase beyond the CPI or if any new taxes were imposed. I am sure that some members of his Party would like him to honour that one promise. The Premier even gave us an assurance before the election that he would not say that things were worse than he thought after the election was over to justify breaking election promises but, of course, he did.

There are also many things now on the Brown Government's agenda which were not mentioned in the election campaign. The Government's plans to privatise the management of our water and sewerage systems, Public Service computer systems operations, prisons, public hospitals and public transport were deliberately concealed from the public at the last election. The Brown Government has also shown that it is heavily into self-promotion, something for which it criticised past Governments but which it has taken to new heights. We recently saw an insert in the *Weekend Australian* and the *Saturday Advertiser* which must have cost tens of thousands of dollars. I would have thought that, to have any benefit in promoting South Australia, this propaganda would need to reach potential customers and investors in overseas and interstate markets.

But this sycophantic pamphlet was clearly aimed at South Australian voters, and you had only to count the number of times that the words 'Dean Brown' appeared to realise that. You would think from the text of this and other Government statements that the Premier had personally invented the computer and established the wine, motor vehicle and

aquaculture industries in South Australia. Does it really help this State for its Premier to claim that Adelaide is the centre of the information technology universe? I am sure that we would all support any measures that would establish new industries, and particularly information technology industries, in this State. This will come and, indeed, has been coming for some years now as a result of creating the skills base, the infrastructure and the right environment for such industries to establish in South Australia.

However, there is already evidence that the Premier's hype over the computer contract with EDS and his attempts to claim credit for deals before they have been consummated have harmed rather than helped this State's credibility. There are very few ways in which any Government can influence long-term economic growth. Whilst Governments can fiddle with spending levels, taxation and industry incentives in an attempt to increase immediate economic activity, our long-term prospects depend more on the creativity and resourcefulness of our population. Education and research and development are two of the few ways in which Governments can have some direct influence over the inventiveness of our people and, in turn, enhance long-term growth prospects. Therefore, I find it disturbing that the Brown Government should so heavily target education in its budget cuts.

On the one hand, the Premier claims credit for the State's skill base: on the other, he takes action that will erode that base. Several weeks ago I heard Professor Gavin Brown, Vice-Chancellor of Adelaide University, state on ABC radio that he was concerned about shortages in the supply of qualified students to take up information technology and related courses. If this State is to build on and profit from its information technology industry, it must sustain a supply of suitably qualified workers. This will not happen by accident. The Brown Government must ensure that its rhetoric on information technology is matched by action in our classrooms that will make young South Australians aspire to careers in information technology. Cuts to school service officers and increases in class sizes in our public schools are hardly the basis on which to build creative industries in this State.

We do not need to educate factory fodder: we need young people with skill, initiative and creativity. We will not get them from a school system that is forced to focus on survival rather than on excellence. In this Chamber in recent days we have seen cuts to musical education, Learn to Swim programs and so on, which may not be directly linked to the technical areas but which, nevertheless, are all part of establishing a creative society in this State. This Government appears to have the cargo cult belief that foreign multinational companies will come to South Australia and transform our essential service utilities into expansion industries based in Adelaide. Presumably out of the goodness of their hearts, they will forgo profits in the interests of establishing job-creating industries here.

One of the most amazing pieces of rhetoric that this Government has produced is its claim that privatising the management of our water and sewerage systems will lead to the development of an export-oriented water industry. What exactly will we export, and to whom? Not surprisingly, we have heard few details on this supposed new industry. The privatisation of management is really, I believe, the Brown Government's tool to pass on the odium for making massive staff cuts and cuts to working conditions, and to evade responsibility for the consequent reductions in service that will inevitably follow. Cost savings are possible in the water

and sewerage industry and other public sector service industries only by large reductions in the work force.

We have already seen the impact of cuts to the work force of SA Water flow through into poorer services. It was reported just yesterday in the *Advertiser* that many Brighton residents were without water for nearly 11 hours when a main burst, and that residents claimed that they were left without water overnight because of a crackdown on 'non-emergency repairs'. These sorts of delays in repairing choked sewers and burst mains will grow as staff cuts bite. It is not particularly hard to save money by reducing public services, but what the voters of South Australia will need to decide at the next election is whether the inconvenience of poorer public services (such as those suffered by the residents of Brighton) is worth the alternative purposes to which the Brown Government is applying the savings made.

I am sure that the voters will bear in mind when the time comes that much, if not all, of the savings from reduced services is necessary to pay for the profits that the operations running these essential public services require for their shareholders and overseas parent companies. The privatisation of management deals in which the Brown Government is now up to its neck also raise fundamental questions of this Parliament's role in ensuring that the public interest is protected. The Auditor-General in his recent report has made a valuable contribution to debate on this subject, and I look forward to discussing these matters in more detail when that report is debated. For as long as I am a member of this Chamber I intend to apply the lessons of the State Bank losses, even if the Government that benefited so richly from that event fails to do so.

I will use every opportunity in this Parliament to uncover the secrecy in which the Brown Government shrouds the multitude of deals with the private sector. The present Premier sounds more like one of his predecessors every day, when he resorts to claims of commercial confidentiality to hide deals from scrutiny. Over many years this Parliament has developed mechanisms, such as the Industries Development Committee, which can scrutinise Government commercial arrangements on a bipartisan basis while protecting information that is commercially sensitive. If the Brown Government evades such scrutiny it will deserve and receive from this Opposition hostility to its deals.

Another matter raised in the Governor's address is debt reduction. At the next election the Brown Government will no doubt claim that it has reduced debt. Unfortunately, it will find it much harder to claim that its debt reduction policies have actually made this State better off. Again, the Auditor-General has made an important contribution to this subject and I will say more about this when the opportunity arises. However, all South Australians should beware of any manipulation of statistics by the Brown Government to paint a distorted picture of this State's debt and financial position. I would like to make this point by using an example.

If a householder has a \$100 000 mortgage on a house in which he or she lives, that person is \$100 000 in debt. At an interest rate of 10 per cent a year over 25 years, about \$210 per week is required to service that debt. If the householder sells the house and rents a comparable dwelling for \$230 a week for the next 25 years, clearly that person is worse off by \$20 a week and the householder will not stand to own any asset after the loan is repaid. However, if the proceeds of the sale of the house are used to pay off the mortgage, the householder will be able to say that the debt has been reduced by \$100 000, even though his or her financial position is

worse. This is the illusion that the Brown Government will almost certainly employ to claim success for its debt reduction policies: we may reduce debt, but our financial position may deteriorate as a result.

The public of South Australia is entitled to know whether the Brown Government's debt reduction and asset sales programs are in our best interests or whether they are being distorted to make political capital or to serve ideological purposes. In the past our schools, hospitals, roads and buses have been funded out of Government borrowings, which are counted as State debt. The interest on these borrowings is less than if the money had been provided privately, because the Government is able to borrow at lower rates because of its ability to guarantee loans. If the Government agrees to pay private financiers to provide infrastructure, it will cost taxpayers more over the life of the facility but its contract to pay the private financiers is not presently classified as debt. Its additional obligations may appear only in the fine print of financial reports. I believe that new accounting standards are urgently needed to ensure that Governments such as the Brown Government cannot hide their tracks.

I would now like to turn to the important subject of health. The claim in the Governor's address that 'the Government will continue with its program of reform of health services to ensure that the health care needs of the community are met more effectively' is, I believe, an insult to the intelligence of the South Australian public. Only one consideration is driving the Brown Government's health policies, and that is cost cutting. As in most other areas of policy, the Brown Government set out to deceive the electorate in health. At the last election the Liberals promised \$6 million extra to cut waiting lists; they promised that \$50 million of administrative savings would be returned to the health system; they promised more nurses; and they promised capital upgrading at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Port Augusta Hospital.

Instead, we got \$65 million of cuts from health all given to Treasury, hundreds fewer nurses, more than 1 000 jobs in total gone from our public hospitals (with more to come), and a slashing of the health capital budget. The health system of South Australia has been plunged into crisis by this Government. Every day we see the disastrous effects the Brown Government's cuts are having on the service provided in our public hospitals. Fewer and fewer nurses, doctors and hospital staff are coping with more and more patients with less and less resources at their disposal.

In its first budget the Brown Government cut \$33 million from the forward estimates for health spending and committed itself to slashing a further \$32 million over the next two years. For the first time in decades the expenditure on health in South Australia was actually cut. Contrary to the Brown Government's election promises, all of the savings have been taken by the Government to spend elsewhere. Not one cent of these so-called savings has been returned to the health system. The cuts have come in spite of additional Commonwealth payments to South Australian health services under the Medicare agreement. In 1994-95 Commonwealth grants to South Australia for health grew by \$48.7 million and in 1995-96 they will increase by \$76.8 million, a total increase of \$125.5 million over levels in 1993-94. Even if one makes allowance for the transfer of the Repatriation General Hospital at Daw Park that still represents an increase of \$67.5 million. Compare that Commonwealth increase with what has happened to the State's contribution.

Over the same two years the State's budgetary contribution to health—and I am talking about the appropriation from consolidated account for the Health Commission—fell by \$36.9 million in 1994-95 and by a further \$17.5 million in 1995-96, a total cut of \$54.4 million since 1993-94. So, while Commonwealth funds to South Australia for health services rise, the State Government puts these increases in its pocket and cuts its own share. While we have received \$67.5 million extra from the Commonwealth, the State has taken \$54.5 million of that to prop up its other programs. If this trend continues Commonwealth funding for South Australian hospitals next year will exceed the State's contribution for the first time ever. This Government is simply running away from its responsibilities on health.

The \$6 million extra provided for waiting lists has turned out to be a pea and thimble trick. In its first budget the Brown Government took \$6 million out of the allocation to hospitals and placed it in what was called a casemix bonus pool. Not surprisingly, the casemix pool was exhausted in only three months and this caused great difficulties to those hospitals that rather foolishly believed the Government's promises. I note that in the current budget the Government has not proceeded with its discredited bonus pools. Other key election promises on health have also been broken. The number of staff in our public hospitals has fallen by over 1 000 since the last election. Hundreds of nursing positions are amongst the jobs lost and many more will no doubt be going in the next 12 months. New capital spending allocated in the last Labor budget was frozen. Proposed new buildings at Port Augusta Hospital were scrapped. Work on the much needed upgrade of Flinders Medical Centre Accident and Emergency was delayed and the promised upgrade of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital did not eventuate—and probably never will eventuate.

The Brown Government does not believe in and is not committed to a publicly run hospital system. The Chief Executive of the Health Commission told a national conference in Sydney earlier this year that the core business of the commission 'is not to operate hospitals and other health services'. We might well ask why we need a Health Commission at all under the Liberals. If the Health Commission does not operate hospitals and other health services, then what should it do? The Brown Government believes that private managers should run all of our public hospitals and health services, just as it believes they should run our prisons, our public transport system, our water and sewerage system and our public computer networks. Following the privatisation of management at Modbury Hospital in February, the Brown Government announced a short list of three private managers to tender for the Port Augusta Hospital. It will call shortly for expressions of interest from private companies to run the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. To justify the privatisation of health services the Brown Government claims that its Modbury Hospital deal will save \$6 million per year. However, the Government has strenuously refused to provide any details of the contract with Healthscope which would enable these claims to be substantiated.

First, it conceded that up-front costs associated with the privatisation, such as the cost of separation packages, will not be recovered for almost three years. During the budget estimates the Minister for Health confirmed that the total costs of the privatisation of management at Modbury Hospital, including consultants' and legal fees, were more than \$17 million. We have now discovered that the claimed savings from Modbury Hospital do not include certain costs

that other public hospitals must meet, such as catastrophe insurance. It has also been confirmed that the claimed savings are based on the costs of running Modbury Hospital in 1992-93 and not on the reduced budget it would have received following the introduction of casemix and the Brown Government's cuts to the health budget. We simply do not know what price escalation clauses are built into the contract in later years. These might well change savings into losses. The financial benefits of the deal must be questionable when the private operators of Modbury Hospital have subcontracted key hospital services such as intensive care and anaesthetics back to the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

In addition, the taxpayers of South Australia have lost \$7 million on the value of shares held by SGIC in Healthscope (and these were purchased in April 1994), the private company which operates Modbury Hospital. So, six months after the management of Modbury Hospital was privatised the outcome does not auger well for the Brown Government's plans to privatise the management of other public services. It should also be recognised that within the health sector our largest public hospitals have borne the biggest cuts. In the current financial year funding for public hospitals—and the figures I gave earlier were for the health system as a whole—has been cut by almost \$20 million after allowance is made for the transfer of the Repatriation General Hospital from the Commonwealth. This is a \$45 million cut when allowance is made for inflation.

We are now seeing how these budget cuts will be transformed into reduced services and higher costs. We can expect the closure of more wards and beds, longer waiting times for surgery, the loss of hundreds more skilled nurses and hospital staff, inexperienced agency nurses in our front line medical services, higher fees and charges for medical supplies and appliances, reduced outpatient and other hospital services, older inferior and more poorly maintained equipment, quicker and sicker discharge of patients, and a greater risk to patients in a system where fewer and fewer staff are expected to do more and more under ever increasing pressure. The decline in our health system in less than two years of the Brown Government is a disgrace. The Government must not be allowed to get away with blaming the Commonwealth for a situation which, as I demonstrated before, is clearly of its own making.

In concluding my address in reply, I believe it is a tragedy that this State has one of the most unequal and unbalanced parliaments in the democratic world. The huge majority of the Brown Government in the House of Assembly should make life very easy for the Government, but the internal divisions in the Government and its restless back bench are obviously a hindrance rather than a help to good government. It is rather ironic that perhaps that large majority the Brown Government does have is not the godsend that perhaps it thought it would be. South Australia deserves better than the bloated, in number, collection of members who comprise the Government.

I spent my first years in politics working for a Federal member of Parliament, and I note there is a remarkable resemblance between the Brown Government and the Fraser Federal Government. With a record majority the Fraser Government turned on itself and after a few short years became totally paralysed. It went from the largest majority in the history of the Australian Parliament to ignominious defeat just seven years later, and the Federal Liberals have not been trusted by the electorate since. The Brown Government is fast heading the same way, and there is nothing in the

program, as I see it, in the Governor's opening speech to this session of Parliament that is likely to reverse its fortunes in any way.

I support the adoption of the Address in Reply. I am honoured to have been chosen by the Australian Labor Party to follow in Barbara Wiese's footsteps, and I look forward to doing my part in helping the Labor Party's fortunes in this State to be revived, and I am sure that it will not take very long.

The PRESIDENT: I call the Hon. Paolo Nocella. I remind members that this is the Hon. Mr Nocella's maiden speech, and I hope that they will show him the same courtesy that they were shown when making their maiden speech.

The Hon. P. NOCELLA: Thank you, Mr President. I should like to join the previous speaker in congratulating Her Excellency on opening the Third Session of the Forty-Eighth Parliament of this State. My entry into Parliament as a member of the Legislative Council in the State of South Australia is due to the retirement of the Hon. Mario Feleppa as well as to the decision of the Labor Party to select me to fill the resultant casual vacancy. First of all, I should like to pay tribute to the Hon. Mario Feleppa, who sat in this Chamber until 28 September. I have read his final speech and the tributes paid to him by many members of this Council, and I wish to join them in acknowledging the valuable contribution he made not only to this Council and to Parliament but also to the union movement and to the emancipation of many people of non-English speaking background, particularly Italians, in helping them to participate in the political process.

It was nearly 25 years ago that Mario, driven by the desire to improve the working conditions and prospects of many recently arrived migrants, established a sub-branch of the Labor Party, not a geographical one but one that was ethnically based. He argued then that the limited knowledge of English of recently arrived Italians did not allow them to make adequate representation, nor to participate fully in the processes of the Party. I believe it took all Mario's negotiating skills to convince the hierarchy of the Labor Party to modify its rules and to allow the establishment of an Italian sub-branch. Having achieved that, he went on to provide support and assistance until the branch grew to hundreds of members capable of attracting up to 600 people to functions and fundraising events.

I am sure that, in retirement, Mario will be anxious to assume again the role he was all but forced to abandon because of his commitments in this Council. I have also noticed that almost every fellow member in this place made reference to Mario's gentle nature and gentlemanly qualities; yet only one member, the Hon. Ron Roberts, used the words 'dogged' and 'tough' in relation to him. I happen to share that view of Mario, having seen at first hand the perseverance and tenacity he displays in following up and bringing to successful conclusion many cases that have been rejected as too hard by others in positions of considerable power. It is precisely these qualities—the unwillingness to give up or let go, the refusal to take 'No' for an answer or to accept defeat—that make Mario a very often underestimated adversary. In replacing the Hon. Mario Feleppa in this Council, I am aware that I have been given a precedent that will be difficult to match, especially when taking into account the aforementioned attitudes.

Nevertheless, I feel honoured and privileged to have been chosen by my Party to replace a person of Mario's impec-

able standing, and I wish to take this opportunity to publicly thank the many people (far too many to mention individually) in the Party, in Parliament, in this Council, members of the business community, the community in general, many diverse ethnic communities and the Italian community in particular, all of whom have expressed their good wishes, encouragement, pleasure and satisfaction at my appointment, whether by letter, telephone, fax or in person. I also wish to thank my parliamentary and Party colleagues who have placed their trust and confidence in me, a trust and confidence which I fully intend to repay with great commitment and dedication, employing all the skills I have learnt over the whole of my professional and working life.

I spent the major part of my working life as a member of large multinational organisations such as Olivetti, Rank Xerox, the British Foreign Office and Alitalia Airlines, both in Europe and Australia. Most of my work, apart from my community work, was concerned with sales and marketing, trade and export promotion, civil aviation and tourism. However, my most recent professional involvement has been in the area of ethnic affairs in the position of Chairman and Chief Executive of the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission. This is an area in which a considerable degree of bipartisan support has existed and may well exist for a very long time.

As I am expected to maintain an interest in this area, I will remind the Government from time to time that the careful balance achieved in the past by recognising the rights of people of non-English speaking background, as well as in providing appropriate services for them, can be negated very easily if attention is not given to the totality of the needs and requirements of the ethnic communities in this State. There is a very real danger that, by establishing priorities which place economic development first, second and third, issues of social justice such as access to services vital to those members of our community who, for a variety of reasons, are neither importers, exporters nor employers of others, can easily be relegated to the very bottom stratum or even ignored in Government programs.

Having spent the majority of my working life in private industry, I am well aware of the necessity of creating and maintaining a healthy economic climate that is conducive to progress and prosperity. However, I am equally aware of the gross injustice that is perpetrated when some sections of the community are sacrificed on the altar of economic rationalism.

Reading through *Hansard*, I noticed that my predecessor spoke more than once on a subject very close to his heart, that is, his desire to see Australia become a republic. This subject is also close to my own heart and, as I understand it, to the hearts of an ever-increasing number of Australians. I am absolutely convinced that the achievement of an Australian republic will be proof of the maturity of this country. It is often said that Australia is a *de facto* republic, that the monarch has no real power and, therefore, there is no need to change current constitutional arrangements. I do not entirely disagree with that sentiment, but I think that two important aspects have been ignored. First, I believe it is naive to underestimate the strength of symbols. A change from monarchy to republic would be a powerful symbol capable of capturing the popular imagination and allowing every member of our community, from the seventh generation Anglo-Australian to the last people off the boat, including literally the boat people (refugees), to feel part of a nation whose ownership is shared equally by all. As long as we

perpetuate this monarchical regime, we continue to sustain the perception that some members of our community are more Australian than others and that the system favours those with closer links, ancestry and connections, or even those with names originally belonging to the country of the monarch.

Secondly, I am equally convinced that the establishment of an Australian republic, by virtue of the very empowering effect that I described just now, will unleash such a massive surge of energy that it will engender great and positive benefits in every aspect of our lives—from education to the creative arts, from public administration to the administration of justice and even to the economy, which will receive a massive injection of national pride, easily transferable to trade and commerce with countries of the world, where Australia will then be seen as a mature, independent country, well capable of holding its own in and among the other independent countries of the world.

The announcement two weeks ago of a Constitutional Reform Committee established by the Government to look into the implications of an Australian republic for the State is a move in the right direction, and I look forward to the findings of this committee and also to the outcomes of such findings.

On the subject of symbols, my entry into this Council takes place during the International Year of Tolerance—a time designated by the international community to encourage us to pause and reflect on the existence of and means by which to combat any intolerance which may still be present in our community. It is unfortunately a matter of public record that South Australia has gained something of a tarnished reputation in this area, particularly in view of a spate of recent acts of ethnic and religious intolerance. The perpetrators of these acts may well be few in number but, nevertheless, provide an extremely negative role model for our young people, as well as inflicting fear and anxiety onto those who are most threatened by their actions.

I am delighted that the Leader of the Opposition as well as my predecessor in this Council have responded to these community concerns by announcing the introduction of a racial vilification Bill designed to impose criminal sanctions on those who would seem impervious to fines, common fairness, education or conciliation. The deterrent represented by the likelihood of a criminal sentence should act as a much more convincing educative tool. Conviction need not be the end result of this action in all cases since the draft Bill provides the opportunity to bring offending parties face to face with the victims of their attack, with the purpose of bringing about a realisation of the end effects of what is all too often an impersonal, cowardly act of ridicule, offence or humiliation directed at a faceless and anonymous victim.

Being a Roman, educated in Rome and spending the first 30 years of my life there, I am well aware of the importance that my forefathers attached to the Senate. They were guided by a set of basic principles which allowed them to establish what became the greatest empire the world has ever seen. First, in the order of Roman virtues, comes *religio*—a recognition that a man should admit his subordination to something external which has a binding power upon him. A religious man was usually a man of the highest *pietas*, and *pietas* is part of that subordination to which I have just referred. You are *pious* to the gods if you admit their claims; you are *pious* to your parents, elders, children, friends, country and benefactors and all that excites—or should excite—your regard, and perhaps affection, if you admit their

claims on you and discharge your duty accordingly. The claim exists because the relationships are sacred.

The demands of *pietas* and of *officium* (duty and services as in ‘tender offices’) constituted in themselves a massive and underwritten code of feeling and behaviour which was outside the law and which was so powerful as to modify in practice the harsh rules of private law which were only a last resort. *Gravitas*, perhaps another important quality, means a sense of importance of the matters in hand—a sense of responsibility and earnestness. It is a term to apply at all levels; to a statement or a General as he shows appreciation of his responsibilities; to a citizen, as he casts his vote with consciousness of its importance; and to a friend who gives his advice based on his experience and regard for your welfare. It is the opposite to *levitas*, which means trifling when you should be serious. It also means flippancy and instability, and is a quality the Romans despised. *Gravitas* is often associated with *constantia*, which means firmness of purpose or with *firmitas*, or tenacity. It may be seasoned with *comitas*, which means the relief given to overseriousness by ease or manner, good humour, and humour.

Disciplina is the training which provides steadiness of character; *industria* is hard work; *virtus* is manliness and energy; *clementia* is the willingness to forgo your rights; and *frugalitas*, which means simple tastes. These are some of the qualities which Romans most admired, so perhaps we can include *severitas*, which means being stern with yourself. The manner of life and the qualities of character that I have described make up the *mores maiorum*—the manners of my ancestors—and are among the most potent forces in Roman history. In the broadest sense, this may include the political constitution and the legal framework of the State, although generally such words as *instituta* (institutions) and *leges* (laws) are added. In a narrow sense, it means the outlook on life; the moral qualities, together with the unwritten rules and precedents of duty and behaviour which combine to form a massive tradition of principle and usage.

In becoming a member of this Council, I sincerely hope that my *honorum cursus* (the sum total of my professional experience) will assist me in making a significant contribution to our collective cause, which I believe to be the welfare of all the people of South Australia.

About 140 years ago there was a fellow Roman among the inhabitants of South Australia. It was the year of our Lord 1850 when Charles Sturt was Colonial Secretary. His signature appears at the bottom of the certificate of naturalisation which granted citizenship on 17 June 1850 to a certain Nicola Caporelli, Professor of Languages in Rome, who had resided for five years in Britain and 18 months in South Australia. He had taken lodgings at Hall’s Boarding House in Hindley Street, where he received pupils for the purpose of teaching them French and Italian. Although Caporelli was the first Italian to become naturalised in South Australia, a closer look at the document he received shows that the colonial administration:

... grants to the said Memorialist all the rights and capacities of a natural born British subject except the capacities of being a member of councils or of the Legislature.

In the year of our Lord 1995 I am very pleased to see that enlightenment has intervened somewhat over the years to redress such a discriminatory attitude in time for me to take my rightful place in this Council as *primus inter pares*.

In conclusion, in acknowledging that my own mother braved age and distance to travel all the way from Rome to be present in this Chamber today, I would like to leave with

a principle which has guided me throughout my working life: *Labor Vincit Omnia*. It does not necessarily mean (attractive though it might sound) that Labor will win overall, but it does mean that hard work will conquer all.

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: I wish to add my thanks to Her Excellency the Governor for her address to the Parliament and also for the outstanding work she has done for this State. In an age when political Parties and Governments of all persuasion pay at least lip service to opportunities for women she is a pioneer, one of the first to break the glass ceiling and a role model for us all.

I take this opportunity to welcome the new members of this Chamber—the Hon. Paul Holloway and the Hon. Paolo Nocella—and I hope that we can work well together. I also wish the Hon. Barbara Wiese, and particularly the Hon. Mario Feleppa, happy and fulfilling retirements.

In her address, Her Excellency mentioned the work of the Eyre Peninsula Strategic Task Force. Many here will know that I chaired that task force and today I wish to speak about its report. The task force was appointed by the Minister for Primary Industries in March this year with terms of reference to develop for the Minister for Primary Industries, for implementation in the 1995-96 financial year, a package of measures to address reconstruction and related natural resource issues on Eyre Peninsula for consideration by the State and Commonwealth Governments, and to report by 30 June 1995.

Our aims were: to ensure long-term viable and sustainable industries and communities on Eyre Peninsula; and to assist farmers, including those who are leaving their occupation, to obtain viable employment opportunities within the region. The committee consisted of representation from the following organisations and interests within Eyre Peninsula: the South Australian Farmers Federation, the Advisory Board of Agriculture, aquaculture, local businesses, rural counselling, rural consultancies, Aboriginal interests, and regional offices of the Department of Primary Industries. There was also a representative from each of the Australian Bankers Association, the Sustainable Resource Development Branch of the Primary Industries Department, and the Federal Primary Industries and Energy Department, as well as the Hon. Frank Blevins and myself.

We contacted over 500 organisations on Eyre Peninsula and, as a result, held seven public meetings attended by 381 people; heard 59 personal representations, many from large groups; and received 95 written submissions. I believe that we can truly say that our public consultation was thorough and accurate. The task force brought down 29 recommendations which would cost an estimated \$25.3 million over three years. Eight of these recommendations addressed debt management. Others addressed maintaining communities, natural resource management, revitalisation measures, and education and training. Of course, many of the recommendations and submissions overlapped and covered more than one subject.

It quickly became obvious to us as a task force that to simply address restructuring measures, no matter how important they might be, would not reflect the concerns of the people of Eyre Peninsula. These people want to remain on Eyre Peninsula and want to be part of vibrant, profitable communities and to be able to offer long-term opportunities for their young people. While they are most willing to diversify, most saw Eyre Peninsula as primarily an excellent grain growing district. Most were aware of the potential to

produce increased yields and profitable, sustainable crops with further research and development. They were, however, aware that value-adding, tourism and small manufacturing, which are more labour intensive, could be the way to maintain, revitalise and repopulate towns. Depopulation is a major concern as people see their services diminish and the communities age.

We were unable to establish a correlation between farm size and debt equity. Many with smaller farms appeared to be viable because they had less risk exposure in times of poor rainfall. For these reasons, the task force adopted the following desired outcomes: any reconstruction program for farmers must be linked to regional development initiatives; transfer of research technology should be more effectively facilitated and farmers' business skills must be improved; farm production must be profitable and in accordance with capability and sustainability of the land; land degradation—for example, dry land salinity and soil fertility—must be addressed.

Restructuring measures were reasonably easily addressed and included an extra \$30 000 added to the re-establishment grant for three years, thus bringing the cash grant to a maximum of \$75 000 for those who are leaving the industry. Interest rate subsidies for farm build-up and the continuation of normal rural assistance scheme interest rate subsidies provided productivity improvement can be proved, and the extension of the rural assistance scheme funding to local small businesses. This has, of course, been an area of anomaly for many years.

To stop there would have been to abrogate our responsibility to those who gave evidence to us. These recommendations largely offer help to those who are already in financial difficulty. It became clear to us that we must also address those who are managing debt but with difficulty and those with sound long-term futures. We had to find ways to increase profit on Eyre Peninsula because a return to profitability would solve most of the social problems and many of the land care problems.

We recommended the establishment of a Centre of Excellence as a joint initiative with the University of Adelaide at the existing research centre at Minnipa. As well as the immediate benefit of bringing people to central Eyre Peninsula, this could fast track research into sustainable whole farm systems, suitable grain legumes, pastures and alternative crops, etc., and the benefits would quickly flow to all of Eyre Peninsula. Minnipa is recognised as a world leader in dry land farming techniques, and findings would obviously flow on to other areas.

It was widely put to us that, in spite of its pristine waters, its huge ecotourism potential and the \$1.75 billion export income it contributes annually, the image of Eyre Peninsula has become tarnished. Rather than the bread basket, it is perceived as a basket case of the State. While the residents were the first to admit that they have had an exceptionally hard time in recent years, they were also concerned that a negative image may perpetuate the problem and certainly do nothing to encourage young people to remain in the district.

Our task force has recommended the appointment of a media coordinator to work with the regional development board to positively promote the region, and that two community development officers be appointed to help establish development priorities in local areas. Several issues came to the fore at all meetings, and one of these was land care. Farmers are genuinely concerned that falling incomes have made them unable to cope with degradation problems. Lower

Eyre Peninsula has an increasing area of salinity which is encroaching on some of the most fertile soil, and Upper Eyre Peninsula has a wind erosion problem.

Many of our major recommendations were centred around the need to inject sufficient funds to allow people to begin survey work, fencing, soil types, etc., and particularly again the need to educate farmers to acquire a whole farm plan. It also became apparent that farmers were very willing to change methods but are grappling with rapidly changing technology and business practices, at the same time as they are trying to do their day-to-day hands on farming. Much of our report centres around education and training, and access to communication links that will bring this training. It is all very well to have audiovisual computing links, but that is of little value if there is no ISDN link. Similarly, cash price marketing of wheat is of little value to the farmer on the header with no mobile phone access.

Finally, we saw Eyre Peninsula as having a fine future and the ability to return to its status as a major export earner for this State. Certainly, a return to reasonable rainfall patterns and high commodity prices should help, but a return to profitability is the real cure. As such, sooner or later, debt management must be addressed. Our committee has suggested a scheme which will allow farmers to offset principal payments of existing long-term debt against income tax in a year of high earnings, and bring back in that amount of income in a low income earning year, in a similar way to the use of income equalisation deposits now.

It is an innovative plan, but in fact it requires no Government money, only some lateral thinking and legislative amendment. We believe it addresses the heart of the problem, and it has been referred to the Commonwealth Government for appraisal and the National Farmers Federation for support. There may be some other method of debt reduction which would achieve the same aim and, if so, I am sure it will be enthusiastically taken on board, but there is no doubt that servicing debts accrued over the drought and compounded by high interest rates is the single greatest limiting factor for the development of Eyre Peninsula.

Our report has been enthusiastically received by the State Government; it has pledged financial support for the first nine recommendations, which require joint funding. We have also been encouraged by the early response from Senator Collins' office and we were heartened last week by a visit from the Prime Minister, who pledged \$5 million over three years. Many of the task force recommendations require cross-ministerial and dual Government funding. Many may be able to be addressed by the Federal Government Rural Partnership Program. All will require the goodwill of the people of Eyre Peninsula and a certain amount of financial commitment from them as well.

This report is designed to give a short term boost over a three to five year period. It is not designed to provide long term charity. As the Chair, I have been delighted with the cooperation and encouragement received from all quarters. I thank members of the Opposition, particularly the Hon. Frank Blevins, for their bipartisan support and the Minister, the Hon. Dale Baker, for giving me a task and allowing me to do it in my own way. If approved, many of our recommendations will have long term ramifications for people in marginal farming areas, wherever they may be. I thank the Governor for the attention she has given to the task force in her address and I thank the Government for its encouragement and support. I support this motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I rise in support of the Address in Reply motion and take this opportunity to wish Her Excellency continuing good health and every success in the discharge of her duties. It must be said that this State has been very lucky to have such an eminent South Australian agree to serve as Governor, and again it must be said that she has graced the position with a quiet dignity and intelligence during her current term of office. She really is a quite remarkable person in a long list of State Governors. Given the current debate concerning Australian heads of State, she may well be one of the last people to serve South Australia in that office, although I believe that Australia and all the States of Australia have come a long way from the days, not so far distant, when Australians both at State and Federal level had to accept Governors who themselves were not Australian citizens and who were appointed by the United Kingdom Government and the sovereign of the day.

Having opened my supportive contribution to this debate by dealing with matters of a political hue, I will carry on briefly in the same vein and use the opportunity that the Address in Reply debate opens up to me and centre my remaining contribution on the institution of the parliamentary system itself, that is to say, that parliamentary system which is now called the Westminster system of parliamentary democracy. For the readers of *Hansard* I put on record that, when members of this Parliament speak to the Address in Reply motion, by tradition they are allowed to talk freely on virtually any subject of their own choosing.

Let me therefore commence with a quote from that great orator and fine parliamentarian, the late Sir Winston Churchill, when he said that the Westminster system really is a bloody awful system—a terrible system, in fact—but in all his years he had never found or come across a better or more democratic one.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: The Hon. Mr Redford interjects again. At times I do wish that he would cease interjecting and put not his voice but his ears into gear so that he might grace this Chamber in a much more dignified fashion than he has done since he came in here. Perhaps if he put his ears—his audio system—into gear, he may even learn something from some of the speakers. Having disposed of that interjector, let me say that is true that the method of voting for a democratic system such as the Westminster system can be gerrymandered, as we here in South Australia witnessed in the Playford years and of course in much more recent times, when the present State Government attempted its own gerrymander by introducing a Bill in this Parliament aimed at doing away with our present compulsory system of voting, which, thank goodness for all concerned, was defeated by the Australian Labor Party and the Democrats combining to defeat this piece of short-sighted and politically opportunistic legislation. I said 'Thank goodness for that,' and let me put on the record what I mean by that.

It is not coincidental that, with two notable exceptions in the present Commonwealth, there have been few attempts at political *coups d'etat* or military interventions against the elected representatives of the respective Parliaments of these Commonwealth nations. This is true more particularly of the English speaking members of the Commonwealth, such as we find in the old dominions, the various island States of the West Indies and places such as Malta and Gibraltar. There are no doubt other places—India springs readily to mind as a case in point—where a form of the Westminster Parliamentary system has been operational for the past 50 years or so

without any interference by its military forces or any other form of unusual political *coup d'état*. It is true that from time to time the system via the assassin's bullet has come under severe stress but, by and large, it is absolutely true to say that, where the Westminster system of parliamentary democracy is in place, it has worked. This is particularly so in the case of India which, as we all well know, is a nation of over 1 billion (the English billion—1 000 million) souls.

Of late there has been a very disturbing political trend in some of those English speaking Westminster nations to which I have referred. Let me cite but two examples: the United States of America and the nation which is regarded as the mother of the Westminster system of Parliament—Great Britain herself. The recent trend in both these nations has been towards more acts of despicable violence which have been politically motivated. Three recent incidents in the United States have between them caused an excess of 250 deaths. I refer to the planted bombs in the World Trade Centre, the more recent Oklahoma City bombing and the act of self-immolation of David Koresh and 70-odd members of his Branch Dravidian sect.

This was all done, I repeat, by people who were convinced that the political system in the United States had failed them. I could, of course, also canvass the massive number of deaths in Guatemala by shooting of many, many hundreds of (mainly) Americans who believed that they also had to find their own political and religious Messiah because, again, the system of their own country had failed them. The scene in Great Britain is similar, particularly if we turn to Northern Ireland where, for the past 25 years, the bomb and the bullet have reigned supreme. There have been upwards of 1 200 deaths over the past 25 years, brought about in the main by the fact that the then semi-independent successive Unionist Governments had treated the substantial Roman Catholic minority citizens as second class citizens. I remind this Chamber that, if anyone in this present company should know what he is talking about in respect of that, then I do, as I was brought up there.

I have no axe to grind in this matter. Like so many other Irish people, I have the blood of both Irish Roman Catholics and Irish Protestants coursing through my veins, although so much do I despise the actions of some men of the cloth in condoning the use of the bomb and the bullet in furtherance of their own causes that I am by choice an agnostic. I might add that I loathe violence as a political tool, and that the men of the cloth to whom I have just referred came from and still come from every major religious organisation in Ireland, and that Northern Ireland was only ever governed by members of the Unionist Party—which, of course, is a parallel sister Party of the British Conservative Party. But Northern Ireland is not Britain's only political black spot. There have been over recent years many race riots, which in the main have been caused by people's perception that their elected Governments have ignored them and their problems.

Again, I have to say that my experience has been that, in the main, a lack of justice has been instrumental in bringing about those race riots. Further, we have seen the course of justice thwarted for political reasons. The example I give is the gaoling for many years of six innocent men (known now in history as the 'Birmingham six') simply to demonstrate to the masses the strength of political will that the then Thatcher Government had. In addition, I am also of the view that the initiation of the so-called Falklands War was used by the iron lady to further her chances of electoral success in the British general election called shortly after the Falklands charade. I

believe that the despicable sinking of the Argentine crew of the *General Belgrano*, with the loss of over 600 Argentinian lives, bears mute testimony to that which I have just asserted.

There is the very fact, or so I am led to believe, that the Royal Navy Lieutenant Commander commanding the Royal Naval submarine that fired the fatal torpedo at the armed cruiser *General Belgrano* asked London to repeat the order, because when he asked them to repeat the order to sink the Argentine cruiser he had navigationally plotted the cruiser's position and found it to be outside the 200 nautical mile exclusion zone and, indeed, at the time of sinking, his recorded log showed the cruiser to be moving farther away again from the 200 mile exclusion zone. I think that this shows the political aims of the Thatcher Government at that time. He of course, or so I am told, as a person of some honour and integrity, resigned his command and asked for a court of inquiry to be held, which duly occurred, only to find at the inquiry that the log book of the submarine that he had commanded had disappeared: the first time in over 950 years of British naval tradition that such an event had occurred and the first time since Alfred the Great, King of Wessex, had founded the then English navy.

The key to this disappearance was that the submarine log book had as part of its record the position of the submarine and the cruiser at the time of the firing of the torpedo that sank this vessel. What a coincidence: what a farce! But we must also understand that voting in elections, both in the United States and in Great Britain, is voluntary. I am led to believe that only 38 per cent of voters turned out for the last American presidential election, and I do not know whether or not my British figures are accurate but I am told that the turnout for the last British election was well under 60 per cent of those who were entitled to vote. The signs are ominous: they should be plain for all to see. The point I am trying to make—and I wonder whether Mr Redford would listen to this—is that one of the reasons why English-speaking nations have been free from the *coups d'état* and military interventions that happen elsewhere is the fact that, under our system, people have always been able to consider their options of voting out Governments that, for whichever reason, have fallen into disfavour with the electorate.

In my view, this has acted as an escape valve and in the main has kept open an alternative to military intervention, *coups d'état* or *coups de main* for the population in general. Our system here in Australia, which ensures that everyone is required by law to attend a polling booth on election day, does not require people to vote: it requires them to attend the polling booth on election day and the option as to whether or not they vote is theirs. Our system here, in my view, has a double safeguard that the voluntary system of voting does not have. I say this to the present Government: do not abolish compulsory voting for short-term political gain, as it most certainly is not, as I have pointed out, in the long-term interests of our State or, indeed, our federation.

I made the point early on in this contribution that on two major occasions in the history of the English-speaking world the Westminster system has failed. One was the failure of King Charles 1 to take the advice of his Parliament, leading to his execution in 1649; the other was at the time of the Irish uprising of Easter 1916. Even the simplest examination of these events will show that they occurred because people believed that their variant of the Westminster system was not working for them and, indeed, was being used to work against them. Again, the simple message from these two events is this: the system, if abused or taken into disrepute, will not

work. We all must be aware of that and, indeed, must realise just how precious and fragile it is. In my view, we have to assiduously and in a highly principled way be mindful that this system can work well for people if the custodians of that system work well for it. We must not by our actions bring it into any more disrepute than is currently the case.

I propose at this stage to give a brief potted history of the historical emergence of our present-day Westminster system, before turning to some other matters and vagaries of present-day MPs, which I believe are also doing much damage to our parliamentary system. Our present-day system is an amalgamation of many other governing systems, but I suppose it is fair to say that this system is really a coming together of the old Anglo-Saxon *witans* and some of the *Althings* of other Scandinavians, such as the Danes, the Swedes and the Norwegians.

Indeed, the oldest surviving Parliament in the world is the Icelandic *Althing* which goes right back to the tenth century and the *Mant Parliament* which was also a north Parliament (the *Tynwald*) goes back almost as far but not quite as far as the Icelandic Parliament. In addition to that combination of the ancient Anglo-Saxon Parliaments and the ancient Scandinavian Parliaments, descendants of the Vikings such as the Normans also adopted the decision-making processes of the progenitors. I feel that as a Celt who can trace his Irish ancestry back to circa 1 000 BC in Ireland, I can view these matters in a most dispassionate manner.

I now come to some relevant parliamentary history. It is a recorded historical fact that King Alfred was the first Saxon king of a united England which, prior to that time, had been divided into seven separate Saxon kingdoms: Northumbria in the north, Mercia in the Midlands, and the other two main Saxon kingdoms of Wessex, or the West Saxons, and Essex—short for the East Saxons—along with Kent were the five major kingdoms in the south of England. As I previously said, there were seven kingdoms in all but England in Alfred's time was under much duress from repeated pillaging raids by the Vikings—themselves a people of Scandinavian origin—and at the end of the day the most successful of the Saxon kings in warding off the Vikings was Alfred himself who at that time was king of the West Saxons. So successful was he in this that he soon became king of all England, and kings of his line held sway in England until the invasion of the Normans under William, Duke of Normandy as a result of the death of the last childless Saxon king, Edward the Confessor.

William's campaign was successful. The Saxons were routed and the coming of the Normans introduced the word 'parliament' into the English language. Incidentally, 'parliament' in Norman French simply means talking place, as I am sure that many noble practitioners of the art of talking in this place would well understand. Three of the other events which played a major part in shaping the present Westminster system—they were by no means the only events—were the calling of King John to account at Runnymede by his barons over the right to the tenure of their lands, the execution in 1649 of Charles I and the further enfranchisement of all people in the early part of this century, a situation in which the suffragettes played a very major role. The execution of Charles I was the beginning of the end of the ability of British sovereigns to thwart the will of the Parliament.

But what of today and the position that our parliamentary system currently occupies in the minds of the present electorate? Suffice for me to say, that the standard of acceptance of our parliamentary system in the general

electorate is being steadily eroded. There are many reasons for this, but one which I would like to touch on is the inspired parliamentary leak to the mass media. There are many outstanding examples, much too numerous to canvass here. But very often MPs, myself and my own Party included, complain bitterly about the standard of reporting of parliamentary events and matters associated with those events by the media. But, how can we blame the journalists when they are merely reporting events which have been leaked quite deliberately to them by MPs and their camp followers? When biased reporting occurs, how can anyone blame the journalists? They simply respond by reporting the information given to them and, as I have said, that information is more often than not biased or slanted so as to favour the giver of the leak or the political Party to which the giver belongs.

Some of my own Party's members are no exception to this type of informed leak. Indeed, it is fair to say that it is a form of cancer that has commonality to every political Party and group in the community. It is right and proper for all political bodies to communicate *bone fide* and proper information to the media, as the media today virtually controls the only means of disseminating such information to the mass of any nation's citizens. That being so, such matters, in the interests of all, must be treated fairly and with great accuracy, but sad to relate such is not always the case. One only has to look, in the main, at the unfair and inaccurate reporting of some sections of the media in respect of the Hindmarsh Island royal commission and that other royal commission in Western Australia where Federal Minister Carmen Lawrence was made to play such a major role. All things considered, it is small wonder to me that the general public has become very cynical indeed about their parliamentary institutions in the English speaking world when events such as the two I have just named are being constantly paraded in front of them.

Let us not—and the reader should bear in mind that I am talking about the institution of Parliament only—blame the journalists; let us start with the MPs and endeavour to put our own house in order. I am reminded of that old rule of physics which states that for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction which, when applied to the subject matter, simply brings Parliament into further disrepute in the eyes of the general public. The Westminster system, in my view, is a very valuable one. It must be treated with great respect and I guess it will not be missed until we have lost it. We lose it, in my view, at our peril because, if we do, then we really will become a banana republic with *coup d'etats* and military dictatorships becoming the order of the day. Anything we as present day custodians of the Westminster system can do to re-establish the validity of that system must be for the good of all and I commend the motion to the Chamber.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: In the address in reply debate I wish to make some comments on the recent major international conferences which were held in Beijing, one of them being the Fourth World Conference on Women. I was one of 30 000 women from all around the world who were lucky enough to go to Beijing for what must have been the greatest gathering of women of all time. There were approximately 500 Australians who took part at this conference and approximately 7 000 from the United States of America. I learnt there were 800 from Sweden, 3 500 from Japan and many others from all countries around the world. Certainly, when one looked at the women present it was obvious they came from all parts of the world. Indeed, their great diversity and variety was a pleasure to see. I occasionally just sat back

and watched the passing parade of the great diversity of women who were there: tall and short; black, brown, yellow, pink; heavy and slight; young, middle-aged and elderly with a bewildering and colourful display of national costumes, and of course many in casual clothes. Many of the African women were particularly striking with their tall physique and their colourful national costumes, including elaborate turbans, which added considerably to their height, imposing though that was in the first place.

I said that this was probably the greatest gathering of women of all time. I am sure that equally large gatherings of men have occurred throughout history, but this would mainly have been as armies for military purposes. On the contrary, this unique meeting of women was peaceful in intent, although just as serious as many armies must have been in wanting to change the society that they were meeting. This gathering of women certainly wanted to change society, to recognise women and their contributions to the world, and to achieve equality and justice for half the human race.

Beijing was two separate conferences. The NGO (Non-Government Organisations) forum was held at Huarou, 60 kilometres from the heart of the Chinese capital. Here the 30 000 women gathered daily for workshops, seminars, discussions, plenary sessions, cultural events and just plain networking and meeting people. Specific regional tents were set up, and Australia was part of the Asia-Pacific region, so Australian women could go to the Asia-Pacific tent and make contact with New Zealanders, Pacific Islanders and women from all the countries of South-East Asia. Likewise, there was an African tent, a European tent, and so on.

There was also a peace tent, where candlelight vigils commemorated women who have been killed and raped in wars. On 6 September, when the first nuclear test occurred at Mururoa, a vigil was held in the peace tent at which women from all over the world protested at the French testing of nuclear weapons.

On a stage at the site, an incredible variety of singing, dancing and traditional ceremonies were presented, either as evening performances or during the day for casual passers-by. Australians took part in these cultural events.

Workshops were held in school classrooms, and there was a convention centre and hundreds of large and small tents, which were scattered around the very large site at which the forum was held. Obviously, it had to be a large area to accommodate 30 000 women. It included a school, but where the students were for the time I do not know. It also included hotels and the many tents that had been set up. The discussions in those workshops covered every conceivable topic and were not limited to issues that are traditionally regarded as women's issues, although they were certainly included.

There was much debate about debt reconstruction in the world, the influence of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund and the global effect on women of the policies of these organisations.

The plight of migrant women workers was discussed and, in the international context, the term 'migrant workers' does not mean what we in this country mean when we speak of migrant workers. Internationally, migrant workers are guest workers in a country for a short period who send their remuneration back to their families at home. Some of the conditions under which these women exist are totally obnoxious, and responsibility for them is held neither by the home country from which they come nor by the country in which they are temporarily resident. The deplorable conditions under which they survive is a major matter of concern

to many nations and certainly to many of the women present in Beijing.

Another topic on which a great deal of emphasis was placed was the value of unpaid work and how this should be measured and recognised. There was urging of many countries to include the value of unpaid work in calculating gross national product, particularly as various estimates have suggested that the value of unpaid work is about two-thirds of the value of paid work in many communities. Unpaid work is not limited to women, of course, but is predominantly undertaken by women in most societies.

There was much discussion about how to arrive at more women in decision-making positions in all societies. It was interesting that this was a common theme among women from all countries in the world. Obviously, it is a problem that is of great concern everywhere, not just in developed societies such as Australia but also in underdeveloped ones.

There were workshops on the effect of fundamentalist religion on women's status in different countries, and this was explored in great depth in numerous workshops. There were studies on women's treatment by the media, and it was interesting to find that the studies that have been done in Australia showing the absence of women from the media, both in hard news and in sports areas, are mirrored in many societies, both developed and underdeveloped, and it is a problem for women throughout the world.

Workshops were held on female genital mutilation, which still affects millions of women, predominantly in Africa. There were individual stories of great violation of rights, again from women throughout the world. Discussions were held about the comfort women dating from the Second World War, where the Japanese army organised so-called brothels for their servicemen, with the women in these brothels dragooned or captured from the local population and forced to be prostitutes for Japanese soldiers. While, regrettably, rape often occurs in war and should be treated seriously as a war crime, the organisation by the military authorities of the comfort women in the Second World War is unprecedented in the world's military history.

There was much condemnation of this and calls for the Japanese Government not only to recognise that this occurred and apologise to the surviving comfort women but also to provide compensation for them as it has provided compensation for other victims of its atrocities in the Second World War; but the women who were subjected to this appalling treatment have never received any compensation. It was interesting that the calls for compensation for these women came just as loudly from the Japanese women who were present at Huarou as from those of other nations such as the Philippines, Indonesia and Korea whose nationals had provided most of the comfort women during the Second World War.

I participated in a workshop relating to the comfort women and was extremely moved by the individual story related by a Philippine woman who had been a comfort woman and who for the first time ever spoke of her horrific experiences 50 years ago when she was captured from her village by Japanese soldiers and taken off as a teenager to be a prostitute in a brothel. One should not even call them prostitutes because they were not paid: they were just sexual slaves. Her story, which she gave in Tagalog with someone translating that into English, was so moving that by the time she completed her story a large number of the people present were in tears.

The number of workshops at Huarou was absolutely astounding. The forum lasted for 10 days. Each day had five different sessions and for each of these sessions there were concurrent workshops and seminars, which were set out in the official program. I counted up to 137 concurrent workshops for each of these sessions. The number of concurrent ones did vary, but my rough estimate is that about 5 000 different workshops were being presented by women from all over the world. Probably the hardest thing of all was choosing what to attend each day, and each evening when I arrived home it took me at least an hour to go through the program for the next day and decide which workshops I would attend.

In considering other impressions of the conference at Huarou one immediately thinks of the rain which created mud and which was difficult to cope with but which did not dampen spirits. Apparently, it is extremely rare for it to rain in Beijing in the month of September, but this year it did for the first time in 60 years, and the mud that the rain created certainly provided a challenge to many people. Hundreds of Chinese students spoke English or other of the UN languages and acted as guides and information providers throughout the Huarou site. Volunteer students from secondary schools and universities—certainly those to whom I spoke—were extremely helpful and always smiling with a pleasant manner. They could not always answer my questions but certainly did all they could to help.

I recall, too, the session at which Hilary Clinton spoke. She was to have spoken at an outdoor venue but because of the rain it was moved indoors. So, the audience capacity was much less and I was one of the thousands who were turned away from the venue, which was already full. As an amusing incident, when the gate closed in front of me I turned around, and amongst those who like me were refused entrance was Jane Fonda, who was standing pretty well next to me. I proceeded to have a conversation with her and decided that that conversation with Jane Fonda was probably a lot better than just listening to Hilary Clinton. We both went off with others to hear Betty Friedan instead. That is perhaps an indication of the variety of offerings and people who were present at the conference.

In listening to the discussions there was every conceivable opinion on political, social, cultural and religious matters; and there were demonstrations which expressed these views. Obviously, no-one could see them all, but I did witness one by Iranian women refugees who are absolutely devastated by the effect on women in Iran of the current regime in that country. There are something like two million Iranian refugees throughout the world, mainly in the United States and in Europe. The women to whom I spoke were based in the Netherlands, and the stories they told of what is happening to women in Iran by the application of fundamentalist laws was absolutely horrifying.

I saw another demonstration—a very powerful one—by Latin-American women from Mexico to Chile and everywhere in between regarding the absolutely immoral blockade of Cuba by the United States which continues to this day. I doubt whether this latter demonstration was reported anywhere in the Western media. I know for a fact that Hilary Clinton's presence in Beijing was not reported in the Chinese media—certainly not in English language Chinese media, and I imagine therefore that it was quite unlikely to have been reported in the Chinese language Chinese media. So, messages from the forum were being very selectively reported by the world's press, but one can ask, 'What is new in that?'

I gather that in Australia a great deal of emphasis was placed on security problems, and while these certainly existed I think the wrong impression was given. While there may have been an incident which involved perhaps a couple of hundred women—and I am not saying that they did not occur because I witnessed one of them—the other 29 800 women would have been totally unaware that such an incident occurred. Knowing what was going on depended very much on what place you were at what time, and the overall impression would not have been of burdensome security measures, although these certainly occurred.

As an example, for the first few days, on entering the Huarou site, all people and bags had to go through a security check (as in airports). With 30 000 people trying to get through about three gates, this meant enormous queues and great delays in getting through the gates. After a few days, the Chinese security people relaxed, and while one still walked through the gates and little machines went click, click, click if they detected any metal, no-one was taking any notice and people were quite freely entering and exiting as they wished. I am sure we were just as safe as we had been on the first day when the tight security was in force.

I want to say something about what was known as 'Womenspeak'. This was a uniquely Australian institution, one could call it, set up in one of the five star hotels in Beijing where a large space was booked each evening from 6 p.m. to 10 p.m. for Australian women to congregate, exchange stories, discuss what they had been doing each day, make plans for future times, and generally socialise. We listened to guest speakers, including Carmen Lawrence when she was in Beijing. Other people spoke to us as to what was happening at the official UN conference. Australian performers, such as the Australian Women's Circus, performed on different evenings for the Australian women there. It was a very welcome innovation at such a large conference. We were the envy of other nations by having such a meeting point. In particular, the Canadian women I met were very envious as they had no comparable place where they could meet up with each other.

I am happy to say that 'Womenspeak' was entirely sponsored by Westpac, a major bank here as everyone knows. I am sure they earned a great deal of goodwill from all the Australians who were present in Beijing by providing 'Womenspeak' for us. Perhaps this is an indication of what can be done by private enterprise when the board of directors includes a good feminist and when several senior positions within the organisation are also held by extremely capable women who are good feminists. Certainly, all Australians in Beijing came back with a very different view of Westpac from what they had had previously.

Apart from the NGO forum, the second official UN conference was held in Beijing itself. This conference was attended by about 3 000 delegates from 185 Governments all around the world. There were also about 3 000 observers from accredited NGOs who were permitted to enter the convention centre. I was lucky enough to be one of these 3 000. Whilst, as observers, we could not take part in any of the formal discussions or speak in any of the sessions, we could certainly sit at the back and observe, have conversations with delegates in the lobbies and corridors, sit in on meetings, and give our opinion, particularly to the official Australian delegation with whom we had a very good relationship. We had a very busy time indeed scurrying from meeting to meeting, taking part in lobbying, caucusing, and generally exhausting ourselves in trying to achieve world

consensus on the declaration and plan of action for women which was to be the final product of the whole procedure.

Throughout the 10 days of the official conference, there was a plenary session and each Government had one opportunity to speak in that session. We were told initially they had been allocated seven minutes each, but this must have been changed, because most took 15 to 20 minutes. Each country's delegate in turn spoke on the position of women in their country and what they felt should be done to achieve what had not already been achieved in the way of equality, development and peace, the three themes for the conference.

I was privileged to hear Benazir Bhutto speak at the plenary on behalf of her country Pakistan, and was very interested both to observe her and to hear what she had to say. She is definitely a charismatic person with enormous presence, and she held everyone's attention throughout her address. She spoke principally about the necessity of financial independence for women as the only means by which they could ever be able to lead full, enriching lives. If they depended on others for their financial means, they would never have the freedom and empowerment which financial independence would give them. This is a message in which I firmly believe, but it is not often articulated, and it was particularly brave to have it come from a woman who leads an Islamic country where the financial independence of women is very much less than it is in many other countries of the world.

Prior to the conference, Australia had proposed that each Government should not only present rhetorical platitudes but should actually make commitments in Beijing—commitments as to what they planned to do in the near future to improve the status of women in their country. Just prior to the opening of the conference, the Australian Government made its five commitments which received a good deal of publicity. These related to measures to improve the status of health of Aboriginal women; to establish working women's centres where they do not exist in this country; to consider gender issues and the possible differential impacts, according to sex, of our overseas aid; and to give particular assistance to measures which will improve the status of women throughout the Pacific areas. There were also commitments regarding increasing the level of representation of women in responsible positions in this country, in both the public and private sectors, and many commitments about violence against women, both domestic and non-domestic, and measures which should be taken to reduce violence against women in this country.

I may say that violence against women was one of the issues on which there was unanimous agreement throughout all countries: it was agreed that this is a major problem, which must be tackled. The views on this are in no way related to socioeconomic development of a country. It was a common thread that ran through the delegations from all countries that violence against women is totally unacceptable, that there is far too much of it in every country of the world and that it is the urgent responsibility of all governments to see that it is reduced.

Following Australia's plea that all governments should make commitments in Beijing, we were pleased to find that 65 nations followed our lead and made concrete commitments for action to benefit women in their countries. While 65 out of 185 is perhaps not a high percentage, we were assured that in United Nations terms, to have this lead of making active

commitments was a remarkable achievement and one of which we as a country could feel very proud.

I was surprised that very few European nations made commitments, as it was quite obvious from their discussions that a very large number of these European countries are well sensitised to the inequalities which affect women of their nations and have taken considerable steps to eliminate them. In many cases they are well ahead of Australia. It was a surprise that few of them made commitments, with most of the 65 nations making commitments coming from underdeveloped countries throughout the Asian and African regions.

I should mention that one of the commitments was made by Austria, which caused quite a flurry when its delegate said that it was promising to bring in legislation to ensure that housework and child-care were the dual responsibility of both parents and that failure to fulfil these responsibilities would be regarded as a matrimonial offence. I do not think commitments from any other country reached quite that peak but, certainly, amongst the 65 nations which made commitments, a very large number related to getting more women into positions of responsibility, into Parliaments, onto boards, and into senior positions throughout the whole community. Again, this was a topic which was of great concern throughout the world in all countries.

As well as the plenary sections, there were two working groups, which was where the real work of the conference went on. A draft plan of action had been prepared beforehand, mainly at a meeting in New York last March, but this draft plan of action had large sections which were still in brackets, and this indicates in UN jargon that these words or phrases or paragraphs were disputed: there was not consensus on their being included in the final document. It was on these 400 brackets that work was done in the conference. There was virtually no discussion of the areas which were not bracketed. They had been agreed and time did not need to be spent discussing them, even though they covered extremely important issues, such as elimination of domestic violence.

The two working groups went through the bracketed sections line by line, sometimes word by word, because a slight change of word can represent a vast difference in attitudes. As people spoke about the words it was obvious how slight differences could include fundamental differences in approach. The working groups included only one or two representatives from all 185 countries, but still it meant an extremely large gathering of individuals who were discussing these wordings, with about an equal number of observers sitting at the back listening intently to every word. If consensus could not be achieved in these working groups, a particular phrase or paragraph might be sent off to what they called a 'contact group'. There was a smaller number of people, including representatives from the countries that were most vocal on the issue, which determined whether they could work out a compromise. The NGO observers were not permitted to be present in these small contact groups, so we did not know what was going on there and had to rely on reports coming out from the Australian delegation if Australia was included in a particular contact group or else just wait for the contact group to report back to the working group so that we would know the outcome.

The working groups were conducted in all the United Nations languages, so everyone had to have a pair of earphones to be able to catch the simultaneous translations, because successive speakers would switch among French, Arabic, Chinese, Spanish, English and Russian and back

again; and without earphones one would have had great difficulty in following what was going on. As issues were discussed, the atmosphere was frequently quite tense, although it was always polite and dignified and the issues were taken very seriously indeed, just as much by the men present as by the women. About a quarter of the delegates at the conference were male and three quarters were female.

The predictably contentious issues were quickly identified, and I suppose these tended to be matters such as the sexual and reproductive rights of women, the effect of macro-economic policies in the world on women, how to value unpaid work, the question of the use of land mines, nuclear weapons, abortion, sexual orientation, the causes of poverty and how to eliminate them, the intellectual property rights of indigenous women, how one should define or refer to the family, inheritance rights and so on. Of course, different cultures around the world hold very differing views on these matters. Many of these had not been resolved when I had to catch my plane back to Australia, as there is only one direct Qantas flight from Beijing to Australia per week. So, I had to leave two days before the end of the conference.

The sessions had been running morning and afternoon to begin with; after a couple of days it was morning, afternoon and evening; by the end it was morning, afternoon, evening and night; and I believe on the last night there was an all night session where the main Australian delegate was involved in discussions from 8 a.m. through to 8 a.m. It reminded me of certain sessions in this Parliament. But that was necessary to achieve the final result in the last days as the deadline approached. This means that I am not sure of the exact wording that has been adopted in the final document on some of these highly contentious issues. We may need to wait until the official report is issued by the United Nations, which may not be for several months.

I gather that, after a very long debate, all references to sexual orientation were dropped from the document. Although the European nations had supported its inclusion very strongly, a number of the Islamic countries and the Vatican were opposed to it equally strongly, as were some of the South American countries. I gather that in the final outcome the references to sexual orientation were dropped but, as a *quid pro quo*, also dropped was a footnote that some nations had wanted inserted, which would have allowed countries to interpret the plan in light of their own traditional and cultural practices, which would have meant that they could take no notice of it whatsoever and that discussions of women's rights being human rights they could interpret as they wished, rather than, as was intended, that there is a universality of women's rights that should prevail.

One matter that is new in the document and an advance on what was achieved at the Cairo conference on population and the Copenhagen conference on social development in discussing abortion is a strong recommendation to all Governments that there should be no punishment for women who have illegal abortions. Without going into whether or not abortion should be legal, there was agreement that women who have illegal abortions should not be further punished by the State, regardless of what punishment there may be for those who perform such illegal abortions. There was also finally an agreement that, while the word 'family' is used throughout the document, it is to be interpreted as families in all their possible diverse forms, so that there is an understanding that there are different forms of families, different cultures, and different understandings of what constitutes a

family; that they are all valid, and that the word 'family' is to be interpreted as having this diverse meaning.

There was considerable discussion on the question of land mines, and I do have in my notes the final wording that was adopted, which was as follows:

To urge all countries to adopt at the earliest possible date a moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land mines, including to non-government entities, noting with satisfaction that many States have already declared moratoriums on the export, transfer and sale of such land mines; and, furthermore, countries should undertake to encourage further international efforts to seek solutions to problems caused by anti-personnel land mines with a view to their eventual elimination, recognising that States can move most effectively to this goal as viable and humane alternatives are developed.

I must say that I am concerned about that final paragraph on land mines, particularly as I know that the Australian delegation, acting on instructions from Canberra, was very influential in arriving at this final statement. In talking about humane alternatives to land mines, I could not help thinking they are talking about humane, alternative ways of killing people—which, to me, is absolute nonsense. We should not be having such ways of killing people at all. There are something like 82 million land mines scattered around the countries of the world at the moment, and 80 per cent of their victims are civilians, not military personnel, with the majority of the civilians affected being women and children.

The large number of civilians being killed by land mines or left as amputees is an increasing problem, particularly in countries such as Rwanda and Cambodia. In Cambodia it is estimated that in a few years time about 5 per cent of the population will be amputees, and that is not a country that is well equipped with wheelchairs, ramps, buses to take wheelchairs and all the other things that we have to assist people who have disabilities such as amputation, and the lives of such people is completely shattered by these land mines, which are not affecting the people they were intended to affect.

I understand that about 30 countries reserved on questions of fertility control and women's control of their own bodies. The comment was made to me that it really is amazing in this day and age that there are still 30 nations in the world the Governments of which do not hold that women should be able to control their own fertility and have control over their own bodies. This shows what a long way there is to go in many parts of the world. Another matter that was of enormous concern to many people was inheritance rights for women. This developed into an argument between the Arab men and the sub-Saharan African women as to what the rights of women should be in inheritance, because in some countries women are not able to inherit or, if they are, they do not have equal inheritance rights with their brothers; it may be on a 70 to 30 basis. This is obviously a very hot topic in a number of African countries and the women from these African countries wanted the support of the United Nations document saying that men and women should have equal inheritance rights. Many of the Arab men did not want that, because they felt that in their countries this did not apply, it does not apply and they did not want it to apply. But equal inheritance rights eventually won out, although they may be modified in some way.

The plan of action that results from the Beijing conference, when it finally appears in its official form in a couple of months, will be a most important document both nationally and internationally. It will set standards for what should be done regarding the status of women and the condition of women throughout the world. Non-government

organisations throughout the world have already pledged themselves to monitor the implementation of the plan of action. They will certainly be lobbying most vociferously both at national and international levels to ensure that governments and international organisations do not ignore the wide-ranging recommendations and commitments which are part of the plan of action. Certainly, if the plan of action were to be fully implemented there would be enormous strides by women towards equality with men. We can but wait and see as to what extent the document becomes a reality but, certainly having witnessed its formation and shared in the common aspirations of so many of the world's women who were in Beijing, I predict that a new energy and dedication will be a lasting legacy for all those who had the good fortune to go to Beijing.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES secured the adjournment of the debate.

WAR TERMS REGULATION ACT REPEAL BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 27 September. Page 42.)

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the second reading. The Bill is straightforward: should members of public, traders and charities be permitted to use terms such as 'Aussie', 'AIF' and so on? In fact, many people would be surprised to learn that there are current legal restrictions on use of the word 'Aussie'. I am sure I have seen it used for advertising purposes here and there. Now it will be open slather, I suppose, subject to business name registration requirements and so on. It is not presently within our power to free up the use of the term 'Anzac', since Commonwealth regulations protect the use of that term. Perhaps this is just as well, since the term 'Anzac' still evokes a certain sentimental sense of pride and nostalgia, especially for those who fought in either of the two world wars. For the reasons put forward by the Attorney-General, the Opposition supports the second reading of the Bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 6 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 11 October at 2.15 p.m.