HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 16 August 1990

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

WORKCOVER

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I move:

That a select committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon all aspects of the operation of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act including its administration by the WorkCover Corporation.

Some months ago the Opposition in this House moved that we should have a select committee but, because of the intransigence of the Government and the Australian Democrats in the other place, this select committee has been delayed by up to three months. Since that time, because of some concern expressed by constituents, to the Government in particular, the Government has now chosen to support the setting up of a select committee.

It is interesting that the Democrats, in the other place, have done a complete back flip on this issue, with both of them deciding some three months ago that it was not an important issue, while now they agree with the relevance of the statements we originally made. To begin with, I should like to read into *Hansard* a report given to me in the past couple of days from an actuary appointed by the WorkCover Corporation. The report states:

We endorse the actuaries' view that their estimate is highly uncertain. One of the major reasons for this is that it is not possible to forecast how tightly claims will be administered by the corporation. Many of the factors noted in our report have the potential to increase the estimated outstanding claims liability rather than to reduce it.

This, together with the fact that our own approximate estimate was $50 million above the actuaries' figure, leads us to the view that the required provision is more likely to turn out to be somewhat higher than the actuaries' $275 million than it is to be lower.

That report was in the hands of WorkCover and of the Government prior to our debating the legislation back in April. So, here we have another actuary's report—not only do we have the two that we have put before the Parliament, but a third report on the WorkCover actuaries' decision—which shows clearly that the estimates that we put before the House in requesting a select committee at that time were far in excess of the position the Government said was, in fact, the position of WorkCover.

These are not my comments, but the comments of a third actuary supporting the need for a select committee. It goes on to put a couple of other very important points, and it is a tragedy that they were not before the Parliament previously. They were available to the Government, because this report was in the hands of WorkCover in December last year, and I tabled a report in Parliament in February 1990, some two months after this report was available. The report continues:

South Australia's superior performance in the past with regard to rehabilitation, as compared with Victoria, appears to have been lost, and we endorse Mr Buchanan's comment that the corporation 'will need to substantially improve on the average referral delay experienced so far, which is 100 days or over three months from the date of injury'.

It has been found in Victoria that, despite many efforts to reduce the number of long-term claimants, as forecast by accident prevention and rehabilitation experts, no real long-term reduction could be achieved without altering the benefit access system.

It further says that experience in Victoria suggests that, even if the claims are tightened up, this may not be enough, and that generous long-term benefits will have to be reduced to less generous levels to achieve a real reduction in costs. It further states:

The fact that WorkCover benefits have recently stabilised around $8 million a month is likely to be only a temporary phenomenon; the cumulative effect of long-term weekly benefits means that it will be many years before stability of benefits is reached. At least 10, we would expect.

Those would have to be the most damning statements on the management and administration of WorkCover and the benefits of the Act that I have seen so far. This document was in the hands of the Government back in February.

Mr Ferguson: What's the Liberal Party's policy on it?

Mr INGERSON: We are calling for the establishment of a select committee to look at this, and we have the right to do that. I quote further:

. . . the range of cost you could experience, depending on claim administration, is less than two-thirds of the current level to well over twice the current level. Unless you maintain tight control over your claim handling staff, the consequences for the fund could be disastrous.

What this report is saying is that the benefits and the way the claims are being handled are a major concern in the blowouts in the cost of WorkCover. As I said earlier, those statements were made to the Government through a report in December of last year, before the reports that were tabled in this House. I would also like to put into perspective, in calling for this select committee, the statements made by the previous Minister of Labour, Mr Blevins, in 1985-86, when he said that Labor's WorkCover scheme would be introduced and would cut employer premiums by between 30 and 44 per cent. Later this morning I will talk about a few of the examples of premium increases and the nonsense that is currently occurring. Then in 1986, the Minister of Labour, Mr Blevins, said—and this is certainly very interesting:

I also believe that there will be significant savings to employers and, if there are not, we will reconsider our position on this Bill. Whether or not it involves this State or Victoria, if schemes like this do not serve the workers and industry as they are intended, obviously, they will have to be severely modified, because this State cannot afford to be out of step with our major competitors.

That was a fascinating statement in 1986, given that, just over three months ago, this Government, through the Parliament, authorised an increase of an extra $60 million to be taken out of the businesses of this State to fund this out-of-control machine. Some three or four years ago, the previous Minister said that he would fix it up. It is fascinating that this Minister has been forced to accept that we might have to look at this situation.

Back in June this year, the General Manager of WorkCover made an incredible statement when he said that WorkCover faces a further $23 million blowout. This morning I had a discussion with the General Manager and asked him where this figure came from, because there had not been any justification for this blowout. He advised me that, because of internal discussions and concerns, they thought they would reconsider the situation, and they found that, instead of being $60 million in excess, it was an extra $23 million in excess.

So in June of this year, after the Opposition called for a select committee to look at this whole process, we suddenly found more problems and more cover-ups. In fact, the Government is being very keen and clever to make sure that there is a cover-up. However, employers and employees are spending a lot of time complaining to us about this whole scheme.

One of the most interesting comments made publicly was in an editorial in the *News* of 7 June as follows:

It comes as no surprise to learn that the WorkCover Corporation faces a $23 million blowout to fully $90 million in unfunded

liability. It has been obvious from the outset that the scheme was misconceived and heading for disaster. The Bannon Government was warned well in advance that this was what would happen.

The Government was warned not only by the Liberal Party in Opposition but by employers and unions that, unless the scheme and the claims were properly monitored, there would be major problems. The editorial goes on to say:

Meanwhile employers pay, pay and pay. Small businesses battle or go to the wall.

That puts into context the problem that we have had with WorkCover. One of WorkCover's major thrusts was the claim that the rehabilitation scheme under the old program was not working, that people were not getting back to work or, if they were getting back to work, they were just dumped back in the workplace.

Because of the comment made by the Minister during debate on the amendments to this Act back in April, I thought that I would ask one of the major insurers under the previous scheme whether it could give me some sort of understanding about what used to happen under the old scheme, before we had this new so-called magnificent rehabilitation scheme. A comparison between the old scheme and the new scheme is as follows:

(1) Days lost claims in excess of 20 days compensated.

WorkCover	Major Insurer
Slightly less than 40%	38%

(2) Days lost claims in excess of 65 days compensated.

WorkCover	Major Insurer
Slightly more than 20%	16%

(3) Days lost claims in excess of 130 days compensated.

WorkCover	Major Insurer
Approximately 15%	8%

So, already we see in respect of 130 days compensation a halving of the days lost claims under the old scheme compared to the new scheme. The final comparison shows:

(4) Days lost claims in excess of 260 days compensated.

WorkCover	Major Insurer
Approximately 11%	2%

It is fascinating that the scheme that was supposed to improve the system shows, at the end of one year, that 11 per cent of people had claims and under the old scheme only 2 per cent had claims. WorkCover was to be the panacea in terms of getting people back to work. It was all about rehabilitation. It was going to solve all the problems experienced under the old scheme, and yet data from a major insurer comparing exactly the same data supplied by WorkCover shows that there are now 11 per cent claims under WorkCover compared with 2 per cent under the old scheme.

As I said, WorkCover is supposedly all about rehabilitation. Instead of having so-called rorts in the legal and medical systems, we now have the greatest rorts of all time in respect of the providers in this area and in the rehabilitation system itself. For example, I have in my possession two accounts from providers charging WorkCover for telephone calls at $25 a pop. In fact, providers and medical professionals have told me that hundreds of such cases occur. When I have questioned WorkCover about this, I have been told that these cases are not investigated. An amount of $25 for a phone call is disgraceful.

Examples have been given to me of people who have been asked, 'Do you think it is time to go back to work?' or 'Are you feeling well now?' It is all done by phone—no personal contact. Providers ring up and say, 'Look, if you are not feeling too well, we think you ought to stay off for another week.' There is no checking up by WorkCover and no investigation as to whether the system is working. The worst part of this whole system is that the person who ends up paying (the owner of the business) is never consulted and included as part of the rehabilitation process.

I have accounts which show clearly that people have debited against their name by the WorkCover Corporation sums of up to $25 000 or $30 000, and no consultation has occurred between WorkCover or the providers as to whether or not the rehabilitation scheme is working—no consultation whatsoever. But who in the end pays? The small business, or the small manufacturing business. At the end of 12 months the small business person sees a statement which says that Mr X has been off work for 12 months, and that the cost of that is $25 000. The small business person is then told that his premium will go up because he is above the average. He says, 'Come on, this $25 000, how do you justify that?' He is told, 'Well, that's all happened as part of the rehabilitation scheme.' No real answer is supplied: just a very bland letter saying that that is what it is all about.

That is just not good enough if the cost blow-out of the whole system is to be controlled. The system is poorly managed. The concept of rehabilitation is fantastic, but it must be managed in a proper and reasonable way so that the people who pay, the owners of the businesses, are protected; so that the injured worker is protected and there is a guarantee that he or she will receive proper rehabilitation; and so that a system is implemented to make sure that the providers in the system are checked. The rehabilitation system is involved in this transfer of the so-called 'rorts' that were available previously to the medical and legal professions.

I am concerned about a young lad who broke his arm and went to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. He was admitted for three days, and he received a bill for $450 for his stay in hospital. On the top of the bill were the words, 'Submit this to your health society.' He rang the hospital and said, 'Look, it is not a medical benefits claim, it is a WorkCover claim.' He was told over the phone, 'Tear that up, we will send you the real bill tomorrow.' The real bill arrived and it was $1 048. He rang WorkCover and said, 'Why is it that if I am in a medical benefit fund the cost of the hospital is $450, yet if it is WorkCover my boss has to pay $1 048?' WorkCover said, 'Well, that is the system that has been agreed to by the Health Commission. Under WorkCover we charge more for a bed because we don't receive the federal funding that applies under the national health system'. I can accept that some funding comes from the Federal Government for the payment of that bed, but how can one justify a 120 per cent increase in charges for the same person over three days. Again, who pays? The employer. They must pick up the cost for the running of the hospital at a rate totally different from that which the ordinary consumer pays if admitted to the same hospital. That situation needs to be looked at because it is wrong that there should be two different sets of charges.

The same applies to doctors and lawyers. Why do they receive increased fees when they attend to matters with respect to WorkCover or under the Workers Compensation Act? If there is an agreed Government position in relation to the national health scheme, why cannot that apply to workers compensation matters because, in the end, the same suckers in the system have to pay again. The employers in this State, the productive people, end up paying again. There are so many areas in this system that need to be looked at. Finally, I have received a letter from a group of warehouse distributors, and it states:

For months now we were promised a 'bonus' scheme for a good performance record from WorkCover. Well before any bonus offer arrived our levy rate was increased from 4.5 per cent to 6.7 per cent, (as you are probably aware this amazing rate applies to all staff employed by oneself, even clerical).

That is another issue. The letter continues:

Then the long awaited bonus letter arrives—nothing!!
Why did I expect a bonus?

Record—	Commenced 1.7.88.	
		$
	Gross Wages 88-89	859 548
	WorkCover Levy	38 680
	Claims made	2 602

Our wages, and consequently our levy payments have substantially increased in the 89-90 period but our claim rate is about the same low level. Now we face 90-91 with a 6.7 per cent levy—WHERE WILL IT STOP?

He has paid $38 600 into the insurance scheme, with claims totalling $2 600; and his levy has risen from 4.5 per cent to 6.7 per cent. He has a magnificent insurance ratio. I am told by the insurance industry that it it was able to manage the profits of its scheme with a payment/claim ratio of 80 per cent, yet here is a ratio well in excess of 15 times that and there is an increase in premium. The system is absurd. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

MAMMOGRAPHY SCREENING

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I move:

That in the opinion of this House the Government should continue funding for free screening mammograms for women aged 50-64 years and to include women aged between 40-50 years.

In March 1989 the State Government, with Federal funding assistance, introduced a pilot program of 'free' mammography screening for women as a means of detecting early signs of breast cancer, in the age group 50-64 years. This was indeed a commendable initiative and one in which women's health needs in this area and in this State were responsibly recognised.

On 1 July 1990 the Federal Minister for Health, Mr Brian Howe, announced that the Commonwealth Government would spend $64 million over three years to be matched dollar for dollar by State Governments. This decision was taken after meetings held in June when State and Federal Governments had agreed on a national breast cancer screening program. It is imperative that the funds allocated for this program are taken up by our State Government and that this program is then made available to women across the broader range of age groups. The cause of breast cancer is still not understood, therefore primary intervention which may assist women to prevent cancer from occuring or developing is not an immediate prospect. But we do possess the knowledge and the skills which can detect the incidence of breast cancer long before reliable symptoms develop, and the prospect of successful treatment is greatly enhanced.

In seeking support of this House for this motion, I ask members to consider some very relevant statistics and background information on this decision which kills thousands of Australian women each year. It is most important to understand that screening is the technology used to conduct tests on women who do not present any symptoms of breast cancer. In other words, screenings are conducted on symptom-free women. Women who have a family history of breast cancer, a breast lump or any other associated symptoms which have been diagnosed by a medical practitioner will undergo diagnostic mammograms.

The essential benefit for all women approaching the at-risk categories is that mammography, can detect tumors up to two years before a woman or the doctor can feel a lump or see any other signs. Treatment for breast cancer is most successful when the disease is detected early and can mean less extensive surgery.

The South Australian pilot program, in the nine months from its inception in March 1989 until December 1989, had screened over 7 000 women and 54 cases of cancer had been detected. It is most disturbing to contemplate that one in 16 South Australian women will develop breast cancer at some time in their lives. Every year in South Australia approximately 500 new cases are diagnosed, and this insidious disease is the cause of death of some 200 women each year. All older women are at risk, with the risk increasing dramatically around the time of menopause and beyond.

The definition of the age range determined by the phrase 'older women' appears to be interpreted by two different agencies of interest in women's health. The first interpretation favours the 50 years and over age range as the most effective age category for screening. This opinion is not based on medical science results: it is an opinion based purely on financial, administrative and technological constraints that relate to the availability of funds.

The second interpretation of the phrase 'older women' is based on medical science data from overseas and from Australian studies. Surgeons specialising in breast disorders and disease recommend that all women at or over the age of 40 years be offered a mammogram every year until the age of 50. After that the mammogram should be every 24 months until the age of 65 years. This is the practice that has been shown to reduce the death rate from breast cancer by 30 per cent.

The pilot screening program introduced in March offers free screening to women aged 50 to 64 years. This age group was chosen as the most cost-effective for the funds made available to this program. It does not establish precedent whereby 50 years and upwards is the accepted initial at-risk category, and it should be clearly understood that the predominant consideration was based on financial requirements of age eligibility of a minimally funded pilot program.

The South Australian Minister of Health in a recent letter dated 7 May 1990, in answer to a woman constituent in the Newland electorate who supported age extended mammography screenings, stated:

The pilot program, which is due for completion in June of this year, supports overseas findings that properly conducted screening mammography for symptom-free women, between the ages of 50 and 64 years, is likely to be effective in reducing breast cancer mortality.

The Minister went on to say:

Studies involving screenings of younger women do not have the same clear message. Therefore, it is important to concentrate resources where they will do the most good.

As separate statements, the Minister's words are relatively correct. But, inter-related and presented in answer to age extended screenings, which was the question asked by my constituent, the second statement in that context is incorrect, as it suggests that women under 50 cannot be effectively screened. The span of 10 years between 40 and 50 years is most definitely designated the high risk category and can be successfully screened. It would be extremely negligent of the Minister to suggest otherwise.

In the United States of America the recommendation endorsed by the American Cancer Society, the American College of Radiology and other learned societies is that there should be a baseline mammogram performed aged 35-40, an annual physical examination and a mammography every other year over the age of 50 years. The interval between screens in the younger women should be less than 18 months. Younger women in these recommendations being defined as the 35-40 age range. The April 1990 edition of *Modern Medicine of Australia* published an article on the fibrocystic breast by Dr Bruce Barraclough, who is Breast and Endocrine Surgeon, Westmead Hospital, Sydney, New South Wales. Dr Barraclough considers the criterion for high risk factors that may indicate breast cancer, as being: race—

caucasian; age—40 years; family history of breast cancer, most importantly multiple first degree relatives and particularly first degree relative premenopausal or bilateral breast cancer; nulliparity or first baby after 30 years of age; obesity; previous breast cancer; previous high risk but benign pathology.

The significance of screening from 40 plus must not be diminished by decisions taken on financial grounds as opposed to medical opinion. The positive aspect of this technology means that women now have the opportunity of early treatment to overcome this disease, an opportunity to avoid the mutilation of extensive surgery, and an opportunity to extend their life expectancy that later diagnosis may have denied.

In the past women have been encouraged to become part of national screening programs to detect early breast cancer. But it could be classed as a national disgrace that womens' health in this area has not been supported by our national health scheme. Of women participating in the work force, the 49 per cent contributing to Medicare have not been accorded the rights of support benefits to fight this debilitating and death dealing disease. The cost of a mammogram attracts Medicare reimbursement only when there are 'Medicare indications', such as a family history or a suspicion of cancer.

The woman who is not eligible for the free pilot program mammogram, or who elects to have private mammography, if there are no 'Medicare indications', will be required to pay the full fee of approximately $95. If there is a family history or a clinical suspicion of malignancy, women will pay the gap between Medicare and the scheduled fee of approximately $38.

It is beyond doubt that the high risk category is 40 plus. To the average woman of these age ranges, this cost factor may make many think twice about having a mammogram. There is no incentive for screening among low-income families. It is not acceptable that this available, life-preserving technology is provided for only those who can afford it. It should be within the reach of every woman.

The cost-benefits of these early detection programs have been shown to be sufficient to warrant continued screening programs. During the process of gathering relevant information on this subject of mammography, a further disturbing element emerged which I consider must also be addressed as an immediate concern and which relates to women whose general practitioners prescribe hormone replacement treatment and the place of mammography in that treatment.

Current data linking the risk of induction of breast cancer with the use of oestrogen and/or progestagens has medical science unable to agree on definitive conclusions. However, hormone replacement therapy (HRT) does cause a change in mammographic appearances, with more prominent fibroglandular tissue evident after HRT has begun. It is also accepted that oestrogen can accelerate the growth of an established cancer. These facts present one of the strongest arguments for mammography screening in the preventive sense when HRT is recommended. Screening provides the checks and balances when HRT is a recommended treatment. However, women may not be offered this option when HRT is prescribed, as our health system does not recognise the risk of induction of breast cancer with the use of oestrogen.

Symptom free women will be advised to have a mammogram. A mammogram will not necessarily be actively arranged as a risk reducing factor. The onus for screening is then the woman's responsibility as well as the full cost of $95, and any practitioner who may feel morally obligated to recognise these risk factors and orders routine mammograms purely on the basis of a patient's need for hormone replacement therapy would almost certainly be inviting a visit from the Department of Health, even though medical indicators do suggest HRT can and will accelerate the growth rate of a cancer.

In the nine months to December 1989, 54 women were found to have breast cancer in South Australia, in the selective age range 50-64, I might add—54 women who had not previously been diagnosed, therefore no established cancer; 54 women who were symptom free, therefore no established cancer; and 54 women for whom the possibility of receiving HRT without the benefit of a mammogram is almost assured. In the terminology of the profession, these 54 women now have established cancers—put very simply, this means cancers that have now been found. Why were these cancers found? Not because of family history, not because of any known symptoms, but because of an available technology that can see what neither the eye, self-examination nor family history could see.

Doctors, unwittingly, on the present evidence, will be treating a proportion of women with existing cancers, and I refer to cancers that have not yet been found. The introduction of oestrogens through HRT may accelerate the growth rate of that cancer, where a mammogram could reduce that very possible risk.

These 54 women are the living example that the criterion preferred by the National Health Scheme and draconically regulated by the Health Department, aided and abetted by some members of the medical profession, is not only out of date but also actively works against the best interests of women's health.

I find it difficult to express my own considered opinion in less than extreme anger. I admit to being unaware that, in this instance, women's health interests are being professionally diluted by the all enveloping and restrictive policy decisions of the Labor Government and the Department of Health, rather than appropriate prescribed treatment recommended by the practitioner on the basis of recognised medical data, available technology, and the best interest of the patient.

I consider that this disgraceful approach to women's health must be amended. Anything less must be considered as tokenism to the health and well-being of all women. This issue was first brought to my attention by women actively supporting screening and, after initial investigations, I issued a press release, which was duly published by my local paper, calling for support from the Government to continue funding for this program and to extend the age range. I must admit to a degree of surprise at the strength of support that came from women across this State. It was not an issue that made any headlines in major papers, but it was important to the women of this State and, in the networks where women meet and talk, a groundswell of quiet, unobtrusive activity developed. Women, seeking petitions to sign in support, rang their local papers, who reprinted the initial press release. Country radio stations wanted more information to supply to their listeners, who were calling for further information and for petitions to sign in support.

This motion is supported by over 5 000 women whose signatures appear on petitions presented to this House during this session. I have brought to the attention of this House other related matters which are an integral part of the process of mammography screening, and I call upon the Minister of Health to take up these issues on behalf of the women of this State. I refer to the financial disadvantage to low income earning women, and the added risk of prescribing HRT without benefit of screening. I believe it is

most evident that the high risk category is recognised by all medical studies to be 40 years plus.

The purpose of this motion is to bring to the notice of this House the necessity of mammography screening for women aged 40, and over, to call upon the Government to continue funding for free screening mammograms to women aged between 50 and 64 years, and to include women aged between 40 and 50 years. I ask all members of this place to support this motion.

Mrs HUTCHISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

STIRLING COUNCIL

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

That this House strongly condemns the Premier and the Minister of Local Government for the callous and immoral way in which they have treated the ratepayers of the Stirling council following the 1980 Ash Wednesday fire.

The purpose of this debate is to provide the opportunity for some facts to be put on the record in this House. Ten years ago a disaster occurred in the Adelaide Hills within the Stirling District Council, later to be known as Ash Wednesday I. On that occasion, 50 homes were gutted and the fire, in all, caused damage put at $5 million.

Since that time, the Stirling District Council and the ratepayers have suffered considerably. Considerable suffering arose directly out of the fire itself. Since then, with the problems that have been associated with legal fees and so on, considerable fear has been felt within the community on the part of the elderly, young people with families, those who for one reason or another have found it necessary to sell property, and many others who have lived in that district over a period of time. Of course, there has also been frustration and anger on the part of those people who have moved into the district since the 1980 Ash Wednesday fire and who now find themselves liable for extra payments through rates, together with those who were living in the district at the time of the fire. I do not think that many people understand—and I am sure that the Premier, the present Minister of Local Government and the previous Minister of Local Government do not understand—just how much fear there has been in the community over a period of time as to the outcome of this whole sorry saga.

It is incredible that we now find the entire Stirling community will have to pay for this event over an extended 15-year period—in all, 25 years after the fire itself. It is not just the length of time, but it is a fact that the community will be paying well into the next century at a cost to that community of more than $26 million for a fire that was originally estimated to cost $5 million by way of damages. Over the past 10 years the Stirling District Council has spent about $3 million on legal fees. Those legal fees have gone towards, first, trying to prove that the council was not guilty and, then, in fighting the actual claims. There is no doubt—and it is generally recognised as a result of the case before the court—that the council has been found legally liable for the fire. But who is morally responsible for the payment of the $14.5 million debt is a very different question.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Is it a legitimate debt?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: That question has been asked over a period of time and it has been extremely difficult to determine the appropriate answer. It is certainly a question that is being asked, and it is one of the reasons why in another place a select committee, to which I will refer at a later stage, will be established, quite appropriately.

Mr FERGUSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I refer to Standing Order 120, which provides:

A member must not refer to any debate in another House of Parliament or to any measure impending in that House.

I would suggest that the honourable member has referred to an impending measure in another place, and I would suggest that you might advise him accordingly.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is correct in drawing the attention of the House to that matter. I point out that this is a separate motion. The member for Heysen may therefore make mention of that fact but may not refer to the debate in another place, which is associated with that motion.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I thank you for that. I make the point that this is very much a subject before the public at present. The mere fact that the point of order was taken indicates the sensitivity of the Government in this area. As I said earlier, there is no doubt that the Stirling council has been found legally liable for the fire, but who is morally responsible for that payment is a question that is being asked by a large number of people at this time. I am sure that all members of the House would appreciate the difficulty that has arisen in this very sorry saga as a result of the impasse that was reached between the council and the Government over the final payment of the debt.

The council determined originally on behalf of the district ratepayers that it should pay only $1 million. As a result of further negotiation, it was felt by the council that the community could pay $2 million and, even further, with conditions—one of the conditions being the advice that the council would receive rates as a result of the Mount Lofty development proceeding—that the council, on behalf of the community, at the very outside could afford to pay $3 million.

I believe it was inappropriate that the council changed its mind on so many occasions. It was felt generally by the community of the district that $2 million was the absolute limit that could be paid by the council. However, we reached a situation where the Government insisted on $4 million and the council indicated that it would be willing to pay $3 million. We found ourselves fighting over a situation that involved $1 million.

At that time I sought to have an independent arbitrator brought in to negotiate appropriately over that sum of money. I believed that it was time for sensible negotiation. We were talking about the difference of $1 million. Both parties had backed themselves into a corner and neither party was prepared to give an inch on this issue. If it had been possible for an independent arbitrator to be brought in to determine the fate of that $1 million, we would not be in this situation.

To some extent, council was stubborn, but there is no doubt that it was encouraged to continue its legal battle by the Premier, the then Minister of Local Government (Ms Wiese) and the Attorney-General. They all gave encouragement to the Stirling council, and I will refer to that in correspondence. At a later stage, the present Minister of Local Government added her support. Because of the $3 million that resulted from legal fees being paid by council, the rates in the Stirling District Council area leapt by 22 per cent in 1988. That is another factor that is not generally recognised by the wider community.

There are those in the wider community who say that the people who live in the Stirling council area should be in a position to pay higher rates. However, very few of them realise that, in 1988, only two years ago, there was a significant increase of some 22 per cent in the council rates. Other people realise that the spending on works and services

within the Stirling district is at an all time low. If people only took the trouble to seek information from the Stirling council, they would recognise that very clearly.

To meet the claims and the costs to the council, council had no alternative but to borrow the $14.5 million which, of course, has brought with it monthly interest payments of about $200 000. The council of the day, back 10 years ago, had a $1 million public risk insurance policy, which was then considered more than adequate. However, one claimant, the SGIC, as well as legal costs, consumed that sum of money. I refer to a letter to the Stirling District Ratepayers from the then council in regard to the 1986-87 rates, as follows:

Stirling council has had to delay the setting of its 1986-87 rates and budget because of financial considerations arising as a consequence of the bushfires on Ash Wednesday, 20 February 1980.

Since the determination of the appeal, further claims numbering in excess of 200 have been received, many coming to hand just prior to 20 February 1986. The effect of the Limitation of Actions Act is that that is the last day on which proceedings could properly be commenced against the council for claims arising out of the bushfires. All claims received have been placed with council's insurers and solicitors.

In August 1979, your council had increased its public liability insurance cover to $1 million, a sum which appeared to be quite adequate and which was well in excess of that held by most other councils and businesses at that time. At this stage it is evident that claims will substantially exceed that insurance cover. The exact quantum of those claims and council's legal costs will not be known for some time, but council's potential liability will probably be between $2.5 million and $8 million.

That is very different from the final figure. The letter continued:

Such a liability far exceeds the capacity of this council.

And this is the interesting part:

The council has therefore had discussions with the State Government concerning the future defence and management of these claims.

And it continues. We cannot lose sight of the fact that the council was encouraged by Government to continue fighting it—and there is considerable evidence to show that—and, as a result of that, I would support the need for some compassion to be shown by the Government. I will now refer to some of that correspondence. On 16 May 1989 the Minister of Local Government wrote to the council—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Who was the Minister at that time?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The current Minister, the Hon. Anne Levy. The letter states:

Dear Councillors,

I write in the knowledge that you will be tonight considering the approach to be taken by the council in relation to the proceedings currently before the Supreme Court.

If council resolves to discontinue funding the defence of the current proceedings or if it resolves to dismiss its legal advisers without making arrangements for replacement representation in court on 17 May 1989, then the council will have withdrawn from the current proceedings.

The effect of a withdrawal by the council from the current proceedings is that damages will be assessed without the court having the benefit of the testing of the plaintiff's evidence, legal argument and submissions for the council. There is a real risk that damages would be assessed at a higher amount as a result.

It is unlikely that the current proceedings can be adjourned or stayed without the consent of the plaintiffs. It would appear that the plaintiffs will only consent to the proceedings being adjourned if an alternative procedure to arrive at a fair determination of the claim is agreed on, and if the plaintiffs and other claimants represented by their solicitors are paid a substantial sum by way of interim damages and on account of legal costs incurred to date.

And the letter continues with further detail in that regard. A letter of 6 June 1989 from the Premier to the council states:

Against that background, I am satisfied that the proposals contained in a letter to you dated 24 May 1989 were appropriate and reasonable. They represent a package which not only shows promise of bringing the litigation to a speedier resolution: they also propose a procedure which would provide necessary financial resources for council pending a negotiated assessment of Stirling's contribution to the final settlement of claims.

In their effect, the proposals would substantially reduce council's outlay on legal expenses from their current levels. They would at the same time provide an alternative forum in which the competing claims of council and the plaintiffs might be more quickly and amicably resolved. Significantly, the proposals are structured in such a way that the associated short-term borrowings would be without cost to ratepayers pending the discussions concerning funding of the final liability.

I am sure that you will agree that all of these features are totally consistent with council's objectives and provides, in my view, a basis for a solution that is fair to all concerned.

Nevertheless, in the broader interests of facilitating a resolution to the 1980 bushfire problems, the Government has considered your request [council's] for an undertaking on financial assistance in the event of your council incurring litigation costs subsequent to the 'fast-track' processes. As I am sure you will appreciate, the Government must do everything possible to protect its position and to ensure that there is full accountability for the public funds which may be involved in this arrangement.

There is no doubt that the Government had been particularly keen to ensure that its position was protected through this whole situation.

At 12 noon, the bells having been rung:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Call on Order of the Day: Other Business.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE CONSTITUTION (ELECTORAL REDISTRIBUTION) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr S.J. Baker:

That Standing Order No. 339 be so far suspended as to enable the Select Committee on the Constitution (Electoral Redistribution) Amendment Bill 1990 to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it thinks fit, of any evidence presented to the committee prior to such evidence being reported to the House.

(Continued from 7 August. Page 56.)

Motion carried.

STIRLING COUNCIL

Debate on motion resumed.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I now refer to a letter, undated, which was received on 6 June, from the Minister of Local Government (Hon. Anne Levy) to the Chairman of the Stirling council. The letter refers to the conditions that had been set out by the Premier, seeking assistance in these conditions for the consideration of council. The letter states:

1. The Government will only take moneys available to meet council's legal costs relating to the litigation of the Andersons claims which are incurred subsequent to the Government's receipt of advice from the Government legal adviser.

2. The Government will only pay to the council the amount of legal costs which have been certified by the Crown Solicitor as reasonable.

3. The council shall give all assistance and cooperation to the Government legal adviser and shall instruct its legal advisers accordingly. If the Government legal adviser should advise the Attorney-General that the council or its legal advisers have not given him full assistance and cooperation, and that situation is not wholly remedied within 12 hours of the council being so notified, then the Government's undertaking to pay the council's legal costs shall wholly cease and determine.

4. The council shall adopt and comply with any recommendation by Government following the receipt by the Government of the advice of the Government legal adviser in respect of any of the following matters.

It then sets out those matters. It goes on with a number of what can only be referred to as threats on the part of the Minister, backing up the letter to the council from the Premier. They are nothing but threats, making sure that the council recognises the conditions under which assistance is to be provided. I could go on with a considerable amount of correspondence and, on a further occasion, I will refer to some of the other matters raised in that correspondence.

The Minister determined that a committee should be established, made up of representatives of her department, of other areas of Government responsibility, and of the council. That committee brought down a report that established that council could pay $7 million out of the $14.5 million. That was just seen to be a joke. It was quite incredible that that committee should determine, on very little evidence, that the Stirling District Council and its ratepayers should be in a position to pay that sort of money. The other thing that has emerged from this is that we now realise that all councils have benefited from this situation, because of the new liability insurance scheme that is now in place as a direct result of the Ash Wednesday fire, ensuring that the situation does not recur and that we do not have the same legal difficulties that are currently being experienced by the ratepayers of the District Council of Stirling.

I believe that, as a result, it is very unfair that all Stirling district ratepayers should have to be the bunnies in this situation and have to pay out individually this excessive sum of money, when it is recognised that this situation will never occur again because of the remedies that have been introduced to which I have referred and which I support very strongly.

I know that it is very difficult to gain public sympathy from people not living in the district of Stirling. Unfortunately, it is seen by many people as being a district of silvertails, and so on, but, as I said earlier, if the population took the opportunity to get to know what the situation really is in that district, they would realise just how much people are hurting as a result of these legal costs and the claims that have been lodged. The fact is that people do not understand and never have understood the real situation that confronts the people in the Stirling district.

One thing that has been very evident to me as local member for the district is that there are very few people, even within the district itself, who understand what the real situation is. Just recently, I organised a meeting of some 40-odd community leaders in the district to discuss the situation that the Stirling district is now facing as a result of the fire, and I was amazed at how few people knew the facts relating to the situation in which the council finds itself. Concern and anger have also been expressed as a result of the council's being sacked by the Minister of Local Government. My personal view in this regard is that the statutes should not provide a Government with an opportunity to sack a local council.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Have you thought this through?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: In answer to the member for Napier, I have thought very deeply about it. I believe that, if we are genuine about the three tiers of government in this State, it is totally inappropriate for a Government to be able to sack or dismiss a local council these days. That would mean that a lot more responsibility than perhaps is currently the case would have to be adopted by local government.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: And accountability.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: And accountability; I do not back off from that, either, but I believe that it is inappropriate for the statutes still to contain a provision which enables a Government to sack a council. However, of course, that occurred; the council was sacked. We were told that the council was sacked because of 'serious irregularities'. I stress the plural. If we look at the *South Australian Gazette* of 14 June 1990, we see that it states:

The Minister is satisfied that the report discloses—

and, of course, the Minister is referring to the Whitbread report—

such serious irregularities in the conduct of the affairs of the council that the council should be declared a defaulting council.

When questions have been asked of the Government, the Premier, the Minister or the administrator who has been appointed, Mr Ross, about the serious irregularities, there have not been answers. Only one irregularity has been referred to, and that is that the council refused to pay back to the Government the $4 million. It is interesting that, on a number of occasions in correspondence, reference has been made to irregularities and, indeed, on two occasions the *Gazette*, which details the sacking of the Stirling council by the Minister, referred to serious irregularities. I would be most appreciative if somebody could explain, other than the fact that the council was refusing to repay the $4 million, what any other irregularities might have been.

Then, after the sacking of the council, we saw the appointment of Mr Des Ross as administrator. Mr Ross has been in an extremely difficult position, personally. I think that he has carried out his responsibilities very well indeed. I must say that I do not have a lot of sympathy for him, because he must have understood what he was letting himself in for, the difficulties of the job that he had. It has been a difficult job, and I believe that he has handled the situation reasonably well.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Do you support him?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I support the way in which he has gone about handling his responsibilities.

An honourable member: What don't you support?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I do not support all the recommendations that Mr Ross has put to the Stirling community, nor do I support all the recommendations that were put to the South Australian Government. I believe that it was totally inappropriate, for example, to sign the debenture which put in concrete the repayment of $4 million until the select committee, which has now been established in another place, had the opportunity to sit and report. However, I will refer to that a little later.

There was certainly a lot of anger in the district about the signing of that debenture. I can understand why that anger is being felt. If the Premier had had the guts to attend a public meeting which was called on Sunday, and if the Minister of Local Government had been prepared to show up as well, they would have seen the very real anger present in that community as a result of this Government's action. Both the Premier and the Minister received an invitation to attend, but neither accepted. They were not prepared to face the people of Stirling to determine exactly what their feelings are and to learn more about the situation that every person in the Stirling district is facing. Their attendance at that meeting would have helped them considerably.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I would hope that on a future occasion the Premier and the Minister of Local Government might make themselves available to attend such a meeting. There has been plenty of opportunity for them to show their face to the people. I doubt whether the Minister has even been into the district since all this started. I doubt whether the Minister, since the first public meetings were been held in this regard, has sought any information other than that provided to her by her departmental officers. As

far as I am concerned, that is a very sad reflection on the Minister herself.

I think it was inappropriate that the debenture was signed, which meant the payment of $4 million, prior to the select committee reporting, and also prior to the conclusion of the police investigation which is taking place at the moment. A lot of information is to be sought as a result of the select committee that has been established. As has been suggested on a number of occasions, one of the major things that must be determined as a result of this select committee is how the system, particularly the legal system, has allowed this situation to drag out over 10 years and, as I said earlier, not just 10 years but, in fact, 25 years. I say that because 25 years will have passed before the final payments will have been made in regard to this matter.

Many genuine claims have come forward, but there are many questions in regard to others, and they must be answered. That is why I was very keen to see a select committee established. In closing, there is only one other thing that I want to say, and that relates to the claim that has been made on a number of occasions regarding the reasons why the former Liberal Government did not declare the area a State disaster at the time. The declaration of a State disaster in 1980, I believe, would have made no difference at all to the outcome of the claims of residents for loss and damage. There was no State Disaster Act in 1980. However, even if there had been, the declaration of a disaster would have facilitated only the immediate clean-up; it would not have protected the council from the claims. If anyone wants to dispute that, let them do so.

In any event, many claims by residents did not come to the public notice until three or four years after the initial court cases were held and the council was found liable. No declaration of a disaster would have prevented those claims or, I suggest, would have reduced liability. Whether or not a state of disaster should have been declared, even if the law had then allowed it, is irrelevant to the debate before the House at the present time and the debate which is on the lips of the majority of the people in the Stirling District Council at this stage. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

CRIME PREVENTION STRATEGIES

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I move:

That this House congratulates the Government and the Attorney-General for the ongoing implementation of crime prevention strategies, including the broad-based 'Coalition Against Crime' and data mapping projects and further, this House congratulates the Government for involving non-government representatives, business, unions, community groups, local government and the media in its fight against crime.

It gives me great pleasure to move this motion. As all members in this House well know, it is my intention, as long as I am in this Parliament, to address this issue of the impact on law and order in this State.

In addressing the motion, I think it very important to address the issue of the Coalition Against Crime. I noted with a great deal of interest the contribution by members opposite just this week. In fact, I think the comment was made that the Government had buried its head in the sand and was not interested in this matter. I think people should recall—and not be selective with their memory—that it was last year, in fact, that the Premier advised that it was the Government's intention to form the Coalition Against Crime. Of course, the inaugural meeting occurred on 22 February this year, and it was chaired by none other than the Premier. I think it is significant that the Premier has involved himself in this field, because everyone in this community in some way or another is affected when a crime is committed. The Premier advised members of that group that similar small working groups of this nature have been successful overseas and were considered the appropriate method for large community groups to achieve effective results.

Chris Sumner, the Minister involved in this area, as the Attorney-General and the Minister for Crime Prevention, suggested that the coalition should meet three or four times a year with working groups comprising coalition members and invited community groups. Those special working groups would address issues such as alcohol, crime and the need for local communities and crime prevention committees to be involved. There is no doubt that alcohol plays a significant part in crime in this State and, indeed, in Australia. As we all know, people do foolish things when they become intoxicated, including driving motor vehicles. The coalition at that meeting discussed various programs which were already in place, and acknowledged their role in South Australia.

The Attorney-General acknowledged that the Neighbourhood Watch scheme was a separate program which had demonstrated considerable success since its inception. He suggested that the South Australian Crime Prevention Strategy offered a different perspective which would not operate in competition with Neighbourhood Watch but rather complement that role. The Attorney pointed out there was clear evidence from France and the Netherlands that a community-based approach was successful in reducing the incidence of crime, particularly street crime, and opportunity-related offences. It is very important that these issues be addressed in our community.

Recognition that the police, courts and corrective services could not by themselves reduce the crime level targeted the social causes underlying criminal activity. In response to an honourable member opposite when he made reference to an unfortunate and most concerning incident in relation to the assault of two of his constituents, I said in my contribution that the social problems and social causes that bring about criminal activity in our community need to be addressed. One of the issues is those children who are brought up in a violent environment in which it is par for the course, if you like, that the father constantly assaults the mother, and they grow up being used to the violence in the home. That situation also extends into the community.

I also refer to the disadvantaged kids who have low self esteem and those (particularly young males) who believe they must demonstrate that they are tough or, if you like, macho, out in the community. It is unfortunate that many of these teenage men in particular believe that they are really rough and tough by drinking and driving and carrying out stupid offences in many cases.

The Attorney-General also outlined the major recommendations of the State's crime prevention strategy which is built on the following themes: the establishment of a broad-based coalition against crime to address crime at community level; the establishment of local crime prevention committees, either geographically or sectoral based to address specific problems; the allocation of seeding grants at the local level for crime prevention initiatives; and the coordination of, and the high priority to, crime prevention through Government agencies. The Crime Prevention Policy Unit will administer the funds for programs and work with Government agencies in crime prevention issues.

The Commissioner of Police, Mr David Hunt, told the meeting that, although the charter of the police specifically mentioned prevention, there had been a commitment to it

only recently, and the question of prevention is a very important issue. Many people in the community see it as the role of the police and, if you like, the Government to prevent crime, but they do not see that they have a role themselves. If one thinks about the word 'prevention', there is no doubt that one could suggest that the community should—as, indeed, it does—play a very important role. We see this often in relation to major crimes where the police appeal to members of the public to come forward to assist. Neighbourhood Watch is one such organisation that is centred around this concept of 'prevention'.

I believe it is very important that the elderly in our community are made increasingly aware of what they can do by way of prevention methods, especially in relation to the security of their homes. However, that is not to say, as has been suggested in some areas, that we should set up a fortress mentality. Unfortunately, some people in the community promulgate the idea that we live in a society where we have to lock ourselves up and that at all times it is unsafe on the streets.

It is regrettable that there has been an increase in crime, but we should look at the reasons for this. Many elderly people in my electorate, with whom I have communicated, say that when they were young they could leave the doors of their homes open and walk in and out without anyone breaking in and stealing from them. Unfortunately, attitudes have changed for a multiplicity of reasons. We are seeing a more violent society in many areas and I believe very strongly that this is caused partly by television. I believe that some of the American programs that are seen constantly in this country contribute to our violent society.

Of course, drugs is another area. Unfortunately, people will go to almost any length to steal money or goods that they can sell to finance their habit. I was interested to see on the ABC recently an interview in which a drug addict said, in short, that he would commit almost any crime to continue his habit. In his own mind he could justify this because he had to have drugs to sustain his addiction. I have seen the results of drug addiction in my electorate and I have made no secret of the fact that if I find people peddling drugs in the community I will notify the police very quickly—and have done so. The Coalition Against Crime was the first group of its type in Australia. All the people involved, including the Premier, the Attorney-General, the Police Department, and other members of the coalition too numerous to mention in view of the time allocated to me today, should be congratulated on their community involvement in this important field.

Some of the areas towards which the Coalition Against Crime has directed its attention have included the city problem spots and, as we all know, they have been and are being assessed. The May edition of the newsletter *Together Against Crime* states:

> Adelaide's city shopping precinct will undergo a complete physical assessment in the first crime prevention measure of its kind in Australia. The State Government has made a commitment to a review of Hindley Street, Rundle Mall and Rundle Street in an innovative move to minimise crime in the area.
>
> The assessment, funded by the Crime Prevention Policy Unit and to be undertaken by an architect, will seek to identify the area's problem spots and promote crime prevention through improved urban design.

The article goes on to state:

> The move has been prompted by the success of similar projects in the Netherlands where the authorities funded crime prevention schemes following an assessment of shopping centre problem areas.

There is no doubt that an enormous amount of time and energy has gone into the funding and to directing the community's attention to the problem of reducing street crime in the Adelaide city area.

Many agencies have been involved in this area and have responded to those problems. I believe that the police also should be congratulated for their involvement, particularly in the Hindley Street area, in which they have been very active, and for encouraging suburban youth groups to do more to meet youth recreation needs in their own area. We have all heard of the camps on which the police take some of these unfortunate young men, and they should be commended. There is nothing better than to give those young people self esteem, and to let them know that in many ways they are equal to, if not better than, some people out in the community. If one gives those young people a chance, a bit of praise, attention, love and care, they will respond because many of them have never experienced those things. They are used to being abused, beaten up, kicked out, kicked from pillar to post and sleeping all over the place. They are crying out for attention. I reiterate: they are the sorts of issues about which I was talking earlier this week when I was addressing the root cause of crime in this State.

One of the other matters that I will address is the crime mapping program. A $45 000 grant from the Crime Prevention Policy Unit has been used to establish crime mapping in South Australia as a first step in its community-based crime prevention campaign. All members of Parliament have people coming to them and saying that the incidence of crime is very bad in their respective areas. Since I have been addressing the issue of law and order I have been made aware that there is more crime out in the community than is actually reported. That is supported by many surveys from England and parts of Europe.

Whenever there is an incidence of breaking and entering or any crime, it should be reported to the appropriate authorities. Many years ago, as a proactive campaign to support the local police, I called a meeting at which criticism was levelled at me by a very senior police officer. He said that my statistics did not coincide with the information held by the police. The information I had was based on talking to every householder in a specific area at West Lakes. That information was supported by the evidence I had on work sheets from every householder to whom I had spoken.

Unfortunately, the police officer incurred the odium of some of my constituents, more than 250 of whom attended that meeting. The point I make is that he should have known and, as people in that field and I know, members of the community must be encouraged to report the incidence of crime. I think that, the sooner we address those issues and establish the location of those trouble spots, the better. I believe that every member of Parliament, if he or she is doing their job, would know of the problem areas in their electorate. A number of areas in my electorate cause me considerable concern, and I know that a number of my colleagues are well aware of action that has been taken by me, with great support, I must admit, of the local Henley Beach Police Station, particularly Inspector Bruce James-Martin, whom I found to be very cooperative. He is not frightened to get off his butt and come to my electorate office to talk with me, as do his officers from that station.

I believe that they have a very difficult and hard job, as do the Government and all members of Parliament, in addressing the problem of knowing where the crime occurs. In my view, it is important to have information about crime patterns and trends on a geographical basis so that the police and other groups in the community, such as social workers and the like, are armed with that knowledge and then have

the opportunity to go to those areas and address these issues. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

CENTRE HALL DOORS

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): I move:

That this House directs the Speaker to forward a message to the Legislative Council advising that it is still the view of this House that the Centre Hall doors should be opened to the voters and taxpayers of South Australia as soon as practicable in order that visiting members of the public can come into their building through the major entrance which was incorporated in the original design and that, for security purposes, the two Houses should jointly cooperate in staffing the Centre Hall using existing resources and advising the Legislative Council that this House seeks its concurrence in this proposal.

This motion is almost exactly the same as that which was unanimously adopted in this House on 5 April. Members will note the addition of some key words at the end.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Very key words.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Very key words, and I will refer to them later. Once again, I have moved this motion for four reasons: first, opening the Centre Hall doors and closing and key-card operating the other two doors of this building will mean that we will have the maximum security benefit of only one public entrance to the building; secondly, the Centre Hall doors open onto a grand entrance, which originally was designed as the main entrance of this building, through the Centre Hall, which has been restored; thirdly, the Centre Hall doors are a natural entrance for members of the public and present less confusion to people when they come to visit their Parliament; and, finally, by not having those Centre Hall doors open, this Parliament holds itself up to justifiable public ridicule for its incapacity to get sufficient cooperation between the two Houses to do so.

I will now deal with those four points, although not necessarily in that order. In doing so, and in moving this motion, I am aware that the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee has written to the Treasurer seeking extra funds to provide extra staff. There is a need for some form of staffing arrangement and something must be done. However, I believe it would be irresponsible not to first make an honest effort to exhaust every opportunity to staff those doors by redeploying existing resources. In very tight economic times, it is most unlikely that any Treasurer would divert funds to that purpose until all resources had been exhausted in a generally cooperative effort between the two institutions that share a common building.

On 24 April a letter to the editor appeared in the *Advertiser* from a justifiably puzzled member of the public. Among other things, that member of the public said:

Surely a supposedly intelligent group of adults arguing about who should or should not open a door can only reflect on their capability in running our State.

It is true that in that remark the member of the public was a bit confused about the distinction between Parliament and Government, but it is an understandable confusion. He or she goes on to say:

I trust, in between petty bickering, some person can find a small portion of time to reassure me that a politician, and therefore Parliament, is worth having.

A letter from the Presiding Officer of another place appeared in the *Advertiser* on 2 May in response, as follows:

Referring to 'Omission of key words leaves doors shut tight' (*The Advertiser*, 6.4.90) and a letter 'Key words nothing to joke about' (24.4.90) regarding the Parliament House centre doors not being opened, the Whip, Mr Trainer, collecting a parcel at these doors, and various comments in your newspaper that petty squabbling between the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly has prevented the opening of these doors since 1982, deserves some comment.

In 1982, a person was employed for the purpose of manning and seeing that the centre doors were open. Due to staff redeployment this person was no longer available for this job. The only reason the doors have remained closed is lack of staff adequately to service and supervise the opening of the doors.

A letter to the Government, requesting funds to open the doors, was sent some months ago by me and the Speaker of the House of Assembly.

The doors have never been closed due to petty squabbling but rather to lack of resources.

I am sure no right-thinking courier or delivery person would leave articles outside a closed door but would use one of the two open side doors either to the House of Assembly or to the Legislative Council for their delivery.

I wish to comment on two points in that letter. The first is where the author uses the word 'closed'. Whether one agrees or disagrees with the comment in that letter depends on the distinction being drawn between 'closed', as applying to the original closure of the doors some years ago, or the same word as used to describe the condition in which they have been since, in the sense that they have remained closed. I would also comment on the remarks made about parcels being left there, because I can verify that that is the case.

It is true that the original closure was for economy. I have already drawn to the attention of the House the letter by a former Speaker, the member for Light, on 28 September 1982. Among other things, he said:

. . . to reduce access points to the minimum makes the closure of the side doors, leaving only the centre door open at the front of the building, the most favoured option. Closing the centre doors and using the side doors only would provide some effect in reduction of entrances, but would not be as effective . . .

Unfortunately, that is the option we ended up with. I believe that decision, to slam the Centre Hall door in the face of the public, was incorrect; but it is true that the original closure was on points of economy, not petty squabbling at that time.

I am surprised that the author of that letter is apparently prepared to deny that the main reason why the doors have remained closed to the public has been a lack of cooperation between the two Houses, which has prevented proposals jointly to staff the Centre Hall doors even being discussed, let alone being implemented.

In responding through the press I also pointed out that there seemed to be some lack of awareness of the efforts that were made by myself and a former President during the previous Parliament to find ways to redeploy staff for that purpose, and the total lack of cooperation with which our proposal was greeted. In order to refresh the memory of anyone whose memory needs refreshing, I draw attention to pages 228 and 229 of *Hansard* of 15 February this year. In that debate I quoted correspondence which made clear that any proposal to open the main Centre Hall doors and instead close the two smaller doors, with access on a key card system, was seen in some quarters as a House of Assembly assault on the independence and autonomy of the Legislative Council. In spite of the temptation, I will try to avoid being drawn into a slanging match with the other place. Apart from the requirements of Standing Orders, that would not be desirable, and our Standing Orders preclude that, although the same Standing Order does not apply in that other place. Most important of all, I will not do so because that may make it even more difficult to get the cooperation of those whose cooperation we are seeking. However, I will now refer to the President's comment regarding parcels being left at the Centre Hall door. He remarked in that letter:

I am sure no right-thinking courier or delivery person would leave articles outside a closed door but would use one of the two open side doors either to the House of Assembly or to the Legislative Council for their delivery.

That is not correct. Unless they are given prior instructions to use the two smaller entrances, many visitors are perplexed at finding the main entrance closed. Despite the statement made by the President of another place, parcels are sometimes left at those closed main doors by uninitiated employees of delivery agencies. That happened on the day of the photograph that was published in the *Advertiser* on 6 April to which he refers, and it can be verified with the House of Assembly attendants that this is not an infrequent occurrence.

Couriers and visitors, who are not initiated into the arcane, Byzantine ways of this House (indeed, many of them do not even realise that there are separate Houses within the building), are naturally puzzled. It is the Parliament that they wish to visit; it is the Parliament at which they wish to leave a parcel; and it is the Parliament at which they wish to deposit a letter. Even when the side doors are open, it is the Centre Hall doors that most will naturally approach. They do not even realise that there are such things as House of Assembly doors and Legislative Council doors. So, it is with some puzzlement that they encounter the existing situation. The Centre Hall doors are the natural entrance for the public to approach and use.

Mr Groom interjecting:

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: They open onto a majestic Centre Hall, which has been restored, as the member for Hartley has just reminded us. Those Centre Hall doors are the originally intended main entrance. If members are uncertain of that, I draw their attention to one of the black and white photographs in the photographic gallery along the eastern side of the House of Assembly corridor. If they look at one of the very earliest photographs taken not long after the building was opened in 1889, they will see that, even when there was only half a building, even when there was not a Centre Hall, even when the eastern facade of the building was raw brick and galvanised iron, that same area was the public entrance to the building. If members look at those old photographs they will notice that steps and a handrail go up from the footpath to what is now the western door of Centre Hall.

Those Centre Hall doors were always intended to be the main entrance, and in 1939 when the building was completed and the Centre Hall was added they became the main doors opening onto that grand, majestic Centre Hall that has since been restored. Unfortunately, in 1939 the budget of the day was such, despite the generosity of Sir Langdon Bonython, that they could not afford the marble floor that was originally intended.

They put down a somewhat inferior substitute in what is called ruboleum, with a very nice pattern in it. However, in what I believe was officially sanctioned vandalism in 1973, that was covered over with a horrible ochre carpet, which was removed last year to reveal the original ruboleum. In spite of some stiletto heel marks and a few cigarette burns, it was still in good condition. Once stripped, polished and sealed it looks excellent and, with a couple more palm trees having gone back into Centre Hall, it is the sort of grand, majestic entrance to a public building that the public deserve to enter through.

The public should be entering through those Centre Hall doors. That area was designed to help members of the public feel that they were entering a grand public building worthy of their community. South Australian citizens can be proud of the building, despite the dreadful alterations in 1973 to which I have referred earlier and which can be the subject of another debate at another time. The Centre Hall doors are what most members of the public expect to use as the entrance when they visit Parliament.

Indeed, as I pointed out, unless given prior specific instructions to use the smaller—almost hidden by comparison—entrances, visitors are perplexed at finding the main entrance closed and, similarly, parcels are frequently left at those closed main doors by uninitiated employees of delivery agencies, even when the other doors are open. Certainly, outside of opening hours the only likely place for parcels or letters when all the doors are closed, such as after 5 o'clock, is at the Centre Hall doors, which look the natural entrance. Furthermore, they are the only doors with a letter box slot. Naturally, when the doors of the building are closed, that is where letters are left—through the slot in the Centre Hall doors.

A complication of which I am sure most members of both Houses are not aware is that, to make matters worse for those who choose to put letters in through the letterbox slot of the Centre Hall doors, the box behind that slot, which receives those letters, is sealed off from the building. There is a second set of doors inside the building beyond or behind those Centre Hall doors. They are kept locked, as well, so if a letter goes in through that letterbox slot, it goes into a box that is in between two sets of doors, and very rarely are the doors opened for the contents of that box to be examined.

They therefore remain out of sight and out of mind for some period until staff members, perhaps specifically directed to do so because of an accumulation of letters is suspected or for cleaning purposes, open the doors enough to clear the letters in that particular box. I invite members of this House and those of another place to have a look for themselves. If they do not believe what I am saying now, they should have a look and see what the situation is with that letterbox slot and the sealed glass doors on the inside which cut off access to the letter box itself.

The main problem is not a Party political one. When the motion was put before this House earlier this year, it had the unanimous support here of members on both sides. Rather, the problem is the absence of a spirit of cooperation between the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council that would allow joint staffing of the Centre Hall doors. Despite the historic tensions between the two Houses in all bicameral Parliaments, apparently we are the only Parliament in Australia that is unable to achieve cooperation with our main public entrance. I invite members who have been to other Parliaments in Australia to consider that situation.

Queensland is an exception because it is not a bicameral Parliament; it is a unicameral Parliament. However, every other Parliament in Australia manages to get cooperation between its two Houses. I fail to see why we cannot get the same cooperation in South Australia. Whatever my status in this Parliament might be, I am still determined that the public of South Australia, who collectively created and maintain Parliament, should have access to it through the main public doors.

In February this year I placed on the House of Assembly Notice Paper a motion expressing the hope that the Centre Hall doors could be reopened. Over the ensuing weeks, that notice of motion gradually worked its way up the Notice Paper among all the other business. When it was finally debated in the House of Assembly in private members' time on Thursday 5 April, it was carried unanimously. I thought it was tactfully worded (I had sought the advice of the House of Assembly clerks) so that the Legislative Council's concurrence was not demanded. I suspected that to express it in the usual tone of a resolution might look as though we were demanding the Council's concurrence.

Given the way it was worded, if the Legislative Council wished to do so, as a sign of goodwill it could have sus-

pended its Standing Orders when it received the resolution and moved concurrence with the views expressed therein by the House of Assembly. However, when that resolution, in the form of a message from the House of Assembly, was eventually dealt with by the Legislative Council, it was in the closing hours of Parliament before it rose for the recess. I draw members' attention to page 1252 of *Hansard* of 5 April where they can see the short shrift it received on that particular occasion.

Because other business was more urgent, or for some other reason, which I prefer not to dwell upon, the Legislative Council chose not to suspend its Standing Orders to discuss the resolution but rejected it on the technical grounds that it did not specifically ask for that Chamber's concurrence. Notwithstanding the fact that the Government Whip in the Legislative Council was ready to move the appropriate Standing Orders in that place, that is what happened.

Out of charity, I will assume that, because of other more urgent business on the last private members' day of that session, there was insufficient time to deal with it. Whatever the reason, I have moved the motion again with the additional words to see how the other place handles it, if, as I hope, it is carried by this House. I seek the support of members on both sides for this motion.

Motion carried.

VANDALISM AND GRAFFITI

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I move:

That this House enjoins the Government to initiate specific programs to effectively reduce the incidence of vandalism and graffiti in our community; and that this House believes that all sections of the community, including the Local Government Association, be involved with the Government to formulate position strategies to address these two issues.

I believe it is very important that this matter be addressed in the community. Prior to my visiting Melbourne from 19 to 21 March this year for an international conference on the twin issues of vandalism and graffiti, I must say that I had very fixed views about these problems in the community. As members will recall, over the past 10 or so years, I have spoken about the need for a reparation scheme in South Australia similar to that which exists in New South Wales where offending members of the public can legally be made to clean up their mess. I believe that vandalism and graffiti offences should be considered by the courts.

Today I am speaking from memory because the information I obtained from the international conference in Melbourne is with the Attorney-General's office, which was very interested in the proposal I put forward and the information I brought back. I attended this conference as a result of an advertisement I saw in the Local Government Association's magazine. I spoke to the member for Fisher and the member for Stuart about it because they, too, were both very interested in attending the conference. I point out that the registration fee was almost $700, and the three of us who attended that conference would all agree that we were justified in using the entitlements that the taxpayers through the Parliament provide to us, despite criticisms from some sections of the media indicating that we should not have those entitlements.

The member for Stuart, the member for Fisher and I attended that conference, which was certainly no junket. There were numerous interstate and international guest speakers, and some of the contributions of the American speakers were—

Mrs Hutchinson: Of a very high calibre.

Mr HAMILTON: As my colleague says, of a very high calibre, as was the contribution and involvement of the Local Government Association and other South Australian representatives. Specifically, I mention the Woodville council, which was represented by the Mayor, Mr Gareth Van Der Linden and another councillor (whose name, unfortunately, escapes me at the moment). I think that this council was the only South Australian council that sent representatives. Representatives were also sent from the Arts Council of South Australia, the Minister for the Arts (I understand), the South Australian Transit Squad and Sacon. I believe that South Australia was the best represented of any State in Australia. Due to the time, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PETITION: PHARMACEUTICAL BENEFITS SCHEME

A petition signed by 90 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to oppose changes to the pharmaceutical benefits scheme was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: BREAST X-RAY SERVICE

A petition signed by 260 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to continue and expand the South Australian Breast X-ray Service was presented by Mrs Kotz.

Petition received.

PETITION: LAW AND ORDER

A petition signed by 65 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to devote greater resources to the maintenance of law and order was presented by Mr Matthew.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ADELAIDE REMAND CENTRE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: A number of allegations were made by the member for Hanson in the House yesterday about the Adelaide Remand Centre. The Department of Correctional Services has received reports from three correctional officers about a single alleged incident at the Remand Centre on 22 June involving another officer. The alleged incident occurred when the officer was off duty. At the time of the alleged incident the officer had already commenced recreation leave, but had agreed to come in for four hours in that morning to familiarise the officer acting for him. After he knocked off that morning, he had gone to lunch and returned to the Remand Centre later that afternoon for personal reasons.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave has been granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The allegations are being investigated by the department's senior investigation officer.

It is a very thorough investigation. The investigation has interviewed 13 officers and received reports from another six officers. The investigation is nearing completion and I will provide the member for Hanson with a copy of the report. The department is unaware of other allegations made in the House yesterday by the member for Hanson regarding 'regular' drinking sessions at the Adelaide Remand Centre or the crashing of a departmental car by an officer while under the influence of alcohol. I invite the honourble member to pass on his allegations to the Department of Correctional Services so that they can be investigated by the investigation unit. I will be happy to provide him with its report.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: WILLIAMSTOWN TIMBER MILL

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Forests): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Last week this House was treated to more than one attempt by the member for Kavel to use this place and, in particular, Question Time, not so much to elicit information but to make unfounded and unsubstantiated allegations. The Premier has already dealt with one of these matters and I, in this statement, will deal with the allegations concerning the Williamstown timber mill. First, the member for Kavel referred to '$14 295 claimed in expenses, other than air fares, for an overseas trip undertaken by the mill's General Manager'. Contrary to the honourable member's allegations, this expenditure did include air fares totalling $10 372 for two overseas trips by the mill's General Manager to inspect sawmill equipment. The remaining amount of $3 923 represented accommodation, meals and other expenses over a total of 21 days, averaging $186.81 per day, which I am told is a moderate amount for these purposes.

Secondly, the honourable member referred to $688 039 in purchase, freight and insurance costs and $82 000 in storage costs for imported equipment never used. The total cost and detail of this equipment has been reported in the company's financial statements in previous years—there is nothing new here. All that the honourable member had to do was to peruse the company's publicly available annual accounts. The honourable member then refers to the purchase of a debarker for $48 000 and a moulder and chipper bin for $65 000.

The debarker was disposed of in January 1989 by the company, and the sawmill equipment, the moulder and chipper bin, together with the kiln, were included in the sale of the company's assets to CSR. Next, the honourable member referred to $63 000 to settle legal action over other equipment ordered by the mill but not subsequently required. I am advised, Mr Speaker, that the company has never been a party to litigation in respect of plant acquisition.

The honourable member then turned his attention to donations of $300 to country racing clubs. I am advised that the Williamstown mill has been making donations of $300 each to two country racing clubs for the past seven or eight years. The mill has been supplying these clubs' local communities with treated timber and fence posts. In consequence, a request for sponsorship of a trophy for each of their annual race days was received. The mill manager agreed to the request and, in the process, negotiated an advertisement within the race program and radio advertising in the local area—all for the $300 amount. The mill manager believed that this sponsorship was nothing other than good business practice, and the facts would appear to support this belief.

The next allegation levelled at the mill manager involved his working only part-time from this holiday home at Port Vincent, but being paid full wages. The General Manager retired in June 1987. However, in view of re-equipment work planned at that time, his services were retained on a contract basis until 29 June 1990, the last year being on a three days per week basis. I am advised that the General Manager resides in Adelaide and, whilst he may have spent time during the past 12 months away from the city in his own time, his attention to the responsibilities of managing the Williamstown mill was always excellent. Whilst the trading performance of the company has been less than satisfactory in the past few years, the Chairman of Satco informs me that it could have been much worse, were it not for the tireless efforts of the General Manager whom the Opposition now seeks to deride on the basis of rumour and innuendo.

Now we come to the housing loan at 4 per cent provided by the timber corporation as part of the remuneration package negotiated with the General Manager when he moved from the South-East to take up the Williamstown position. Mr Speaker, I am advided that this loan was provided on 8 February 1980—during the term of the previous Liberal Government. The member for Kavel, if he is now unhappy about this arrangement, should direct his questions to the then Minister of Forests under whose administration this loan was provided.

Finally, we come to the company car provided to the mill manager. A car was provided to the mill manager as part of his contract of employment, which was not unreasonable given that his position involved extensive business travel. Vehicle change-overs were made in accordance with the Government's normal policy, that is, every 40 000 km or 2 years. The most recent change-over occurred in May this year prior to the decision to dispose of the mill.

Upon his retirement, and in light of the imminent decision of closure, the car was sold to the mill manager at its current book value. The vehicle was fitted with gas immediately after purchase as a means of containing operating costs and, had the mill continued in operation, the cost would have been recovered within the two-year company life cycle of the vehicle. The honourable member also referred to the provision of 'other extras worth $600'. I am advised that items valued at $524 were never fitted to the vehicle and a credit for this amount was obtained from the supplier. The remaining $76 represented the cost of a tow bar.

Mr Speaker, the member for Kavel has sought to imply that the mill manager behaved improperly and that the company's performance was influenced by what he terms 'extravagant, wasteful and irregular spending'. Clearly, from the details provided, this is not the case. I advise the House that, throughout the period to which the member for Kavel refers, Shepherdson and Mewett Pty Ltd has been subject to annual audit by a private firm of auditors on behalf of the Auditor-General. Neither the private firm of auditors nor the Auditor-General have ever raised any questions of spending irregularities or lack of proper internal control, as has been alleged by the member for Kavel.

The allegations of the honourable member are as much a slur on the auditors as on the company, and are nothing other than mischievous. As I said in my original answer to this question, 'It sounds as though we are hearing a lot of sour grapes from people who, unfortunately, came out at the sad end of this'. At the time I also said:

I have heard such accusations (from the Opposition) before and found there was nothing to them.

This has again proved to be the case.

QUESTION TIME

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SUPERANNUATION FUND INVESTMENT TRUST

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Treasurer confirm that the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust has lost $10 million through its investments in GPI Leisure Corporation and Quintex Australia, and will he explain why the SASFIT annual report to Parliament indicates it holds 2.5 million convertible notes in Quintex when the company share register confirms that 4.5 million are held?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will have to take that question on notice, Mr Speaker, and ask SASFIT whether it can furnish a reply.

MARALINGA NUCLEAR CONTAMINATION

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs please inform the House of the steps being taken to address the problem for Aboriginal people of nuclear contamination at the Maralinga nuclear test site? I understand that seven bombs and about 700 other devices were exploded at Maralinga by the British Government during the 1950s. The resultant contamination prevents the owners of the land, the Maralinga people, from living their normal lifestyle in this area. A report on the ABC television program *Lateline* last night indicated that a range of clean-up options is being considered by the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The report that was quoted from in last night's progam has yet to be released publicly by the Commonwealth Government. Certainly, I have neither seen nor yet received the final report of the Commonwealth's technical advisory group and, therefore, I have not yet had a chance to study its recommendations. Members will be aware that the royal commission into Maralinga testing reported back in 1984. Following the royal commission, the Commonwealth established a technical advisory group to advise on the extent of contamination, how to clean it up and the costs involved.

This group, which included British scientific experts, has conducted extensive studies of the area including research into Aboriginal lifestyles to determine the extent of the clean-up required for people to live on the lands with minimal health risks. I share the view of Aboriginal people that, after so much examination and so many studies, we have reached a stage where decisions must soon be made on the clean-up. The Commonwealth Government is being very constructive on this important issue for Aboriginal people and for South Australia.

The Aboriginal people have conveyed to me and to our committee on the Maralinga lands their frustration and impatience with the clean-up process after more than 35 years, and I am sure all of us would understand that. Aboriginal people must be assured that they can live safely on their lands. All the facts must be revealed and I believe that they will be revealed. We have been assured that the report will be made available to the Maralinga people. Aboriginal people must also be given access to scientific expertise in analysing and making their response to what is expected to be an extremely complex and technical report of that advisory group. Obviously, I would like to see a commitment to cleaning up the plutonium and other nuclear waste materials that contaminate a considerable part of the Aboriginal lands of South Australia in this area.

We now know that the contamination takes the form of millions of dispersed plutonium particles lodged in the soil and dust, particles fused to metal fragments scattered on the surface and large quantities of debris buried in what are called nuclear waste 'cemeteries'. No member of this House would underestimate the difficulties involved in cleaning up the lands to make them safely habitable for traditional Aboriginal people. The problem with plutonium is that it remains deadly and radioactive for hundreds of thousands of years. It cannot be destroyed or neutralised. All we can do is remove it. The easy option would be just to walk away and say that a clean-up is too hard or too costly, or to ask, 'Why go to all this trouble for a handful of people?'

Such a response, I am sure, would not be acceptable to any member of this Parliament and I know it would not be the attitude of the Hawke Government—and I pay tribute to the Minister (John Kerin) for his most constructive attitude towards the clean-up. It has involved the South Australian Government, including the State Department for Aboriginal Affairs, and the Maralinga people in the consultation process, which we have appreciated.

However, let it be said that the atomic tests had a devastating effect on the Maralinga Aboriginal people. They were rounded up, forced to leave their homes and carted off to allow the tests to be held during the 1950s. It was barbaric, it was unjust, and it has caused social havoc, personal hardship and distress for generations. We are now counting the human cost of that tragedy in terms of the people at Yalata and in other areas. I hope that the Maralinga people, their children and their children will never again be at risk from radioactive contamination.

STATE BANK

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Does the Treasurer believe that the State Bank should provide a 15 per cent return on taxpayers' capital in the bank and does he expect such a return this financial year?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have set no specific target of return from the bank. In fact, the Act, in terms of the sort of return the bank provides, makes clear that there can be no direction from the Government. Obviously, that is something that the board of directors must determine and it is based on the business performance of the bank. I make the point that, since its establishment, the bank has returned very strongly to revenue, but that has been in an establishment and growth phase. Therefore, we have not been interested in trying to take large sums out of the bank; that would be quite foolish.

However, if one compares the return from the then two banks in the three years of the Tonkin Government—I think the figure was about $8 million—against the nearly $200 million that has been returned over the past few years since the State Bank was established, one sees the tremendous benefits to revenue from having such a vibrant, active institution. In terms of an actual or notional rate of return, as I said, there are no particular targets but, obviously, we are looking for good profit performance from the bank as a commercial entity, and that will depend upon economic circumstances and, of course, that must be built over time.

WORKPLACE SAFETY

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Occupational Health and Safety advise the House what obligations banks have to provide their employees with safe working conditions? Given the alarming number of bank holdups in recent times, it is important that the risk to bank staff in these circumstances be minimised.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the honourable member for Price for his question because it illustrates his concern for the safety of workers in what are sometimes very dangerous situations. Of course, all employers have an obligation to ensure that employees work in safe environments, whether that involves protection from machines that may be dangerous or, in the case of banks, protection from people who intend to withdraw money illegally and, in the process, place bank staff in some danger. Lately we have seen employers in the banking area taking that responsibility very seriously by erecting in banks appropriate guards and screens. In some cases where that has not been possible the banks have stationed security personnel outside the bank.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS DUTY

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I direct my question to the Premier. Does the Government intend to increase the financial institutions duty by 50 per cent this financial year to make up for the reduced contribution to the budget of the State Bank group and, if not, how will this shortfall be made up?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The shortfall that we are facing is predominantly brought about, as has been very carefully explained and documented, by the large reduction in Commonwealth Government support for this year's budget. We have used the figure of $180 million. However, if one goes through the elements, one sees that it is more than that. It has left what I have described as a financial black hole in our budget planning.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader of the Opposition and the Commonwealth Treasury are the only two bodies in this country that accept the fraudulent figures that the Leader tried to use in the House the other day. Among those who reject the figures totally are the much praised Premier of New South Wales, Mr Greiner—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —who called them a fraud. So, I suggest that they get their own house in order before they tackle this. The day that the Opposition takes sides with the Commonwealth is pretty extraordinary. To come back to the question: we have, as I said, a financial black hole. Obviously, when looking at our budget, as I have said publicly on a number of occasions, we are trying to ensure the maintenance of services but, at the same time, we must introduce efficiencies and cutbacks wherever we can. But there will be a financing gap which cannot be closed instantly. Therefore, we must look at the revenue side, as every Government in Australia is doing. For example, both New South Wales and Victoria doubled their rate of FID some weeks ago.

Any revenue measures that the Government takes must be looked at in the long term and in terms of our financing requirement. I am not going to be responsible for this State's budget and finances being blown into major deficit. We have a very high reputation nationally for our management of debt in this State, and we are going to maintain it, because it is in the interests of our State, our children and future generations that we do so. That might be painful in particular instances, but it is responsible and it has to be done. The exact details of what is necessary and where it will be applied will be in the budget.

In relation to any impact of State Bank contribution to the budget, all I can say is that that cannot be looked at in isolation. In other words, particularly difficult years or commercial operations in a particular time can be corrected in other times, and will be. That contribution has already been substantial. We are not dependent on that. For more than 50 per cent we are dependent on the Commonwealth Government and its support, and we have been severely let down this year.

DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND HARBORS

Mr HERON (Peake): Can the Minister of Marine advise the House as to the level of consultation between the Department of Marine and Harbors management and its employees over the corporate plan and related matters?

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Peake for his question. In response to the interjection by the member for Mount Gambier, he is wrong. There seems to be a view prevailing among some members of our community that there has been a lack of communication between the Department of Marine and Harbors management and its employees. In fact, consultation has been extensive, and we all agree that it is very important. I will quote what one self-confessed business success had to say about consultation:

> Coming from a business background, I can assure you that if it's going to succeed and succeed successfully, you must have adequate consultation with those guys that are at the workplace and doing the work.

The author of those words was none other than the Leader of the Opposition, and they were spoken yesterday. So I expect the honourable member to endorse fully the extensive consultation that has occurred on the reorganisation of the Department of Marine and Harbors. The draft corporate plan was released for comment from employees in October 1989, and this was announced in a newsletter to all staff. Along with detailing a reorganisation of the department and the need for it, the plan made no secret of the need for about a 25 per cent job reduction in both white and blue collar areas. In October last year the Chief Executive Officer began a tour of all Department of Marine and Harbors workplaces to discuss the plan with staff, taking further copies of the plan with him.

On 12 December a paid three-day seminar began, conducted by the Trade Union Training Authority on the plan and the department's future directions. About 50 shop stewards from across the State attended. Full-time union officials were also invited to attend. By the end of that process, the department had received just two written responses from blue collar unions to its call for comments. I understand shop stewards accepted the draft plan in principle.

The Workplace Resources Centre was subsequently brought in as consultants to look at consultative mechanisms. There was a further two-day Trade Union Training Authority seminar about the recommendations in June this year. At the same time discussions were also under way with the United Trades and Labor Council about the new consultative processes.

Just days after that last seminar, the first industrial action over the corporate plan was taken. Clearly, the consultation

process has been lengthy and extensive. The offer rejected by the unions included further plans. Surely, this House, and especially the Leader of the Opposition, from his statements, would completely endorse this process. As the Leader earlier stated:

> If it's going to succeed, and succeed successfully, you must have adequate consultation with those guys that are at the workplace and doing the work.

He has not spoken to the workers at Thevenard, Port Lincoln, Whyalla, Port Pirie, Wallaroo, Port Adelaide or Port Giles about—

Mr S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order. I have raised before the point of order about relevance and brevity. It is irrelevant whether the Leader of the Opposition has been to Thevenard.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: It is obvious that the Leader has not talked to those people, because he has no interest in those workers or in the future of the Department of Marine and Harbors. The Leader has stated publicly that if the Liberals were lucky enough to win government (and South Australia was unfortunate enough to have him as a leader of a Liberal Government) he would sell all the regional ports and the port facilities in Port Adelaide.

NEW ZEALAND VISIT

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Has the Premier, as Treasurer, been briefed on the current visit to New Zealand by the Chairman of the boards of the State Bank and Beneficial Finance, Mr Simmons, and the Acting Chief Executive of Beneficial, Mr Hamilton, and is the visit to investigate the unexpected $19.6 million loss in the six months to March by the United Building Society which the bank acquired this year or to investigate other investments of the State Bank group?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have not been briefed on that matter. I imagine that at the next normal meeting I have with the Managing Director and Chairman that there will be some report on the New Zealand visit.

SUPERANNUATION

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Can the Minister of Labour inform the house whether small business is aware that they should be contributing to award based superannuation schemes for their workers? The *Sun Herald* on 8 July 1990, in an article by Roger Scott, stated that many small businesses are not aware they should be contributing to award-based superannuation schemes for their workers, even though their employees may not be members of a union. The article went on to state that some employers also believe mistakenly that, because they are paying their workers above the relevant industrial award rate, they do not have to contribute what is set to become 6 per cent of earnings at the next wage case towards their employees' superannuation.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the honourable member for his question, which is a very important one. Among the reforms that the accord has provided for Australian workers, for the first time blue collar workers have access to a real superannuation scheme. I indicate to the House that the Liberal Party has consistently opposed blue collar workers having access to superannuation such as that proposed.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I am told by the member for Goyder—it was actually the member for Custance who raised it the other day—that that is nonsense. However, not once has the Liberal Party in this House ever supported an application for wage increases. Those wage increases that have been sought by the union movement, particularly the ACTU, in the Industrial Relations Commission have included a component of 3 per cent superannuation, which has been looked upon as a productivity trade-off.

The Opposition cannot cite even one word that it has uttered in support of that. Usually, if the Opposition says anything, it is to say that an award increase should not apply.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order concerning the matter of relevance. I hope that this time you recognise the irrelevance of the subject being canvassed.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will resume his seat. I hope that he is not reflecting on the Chair.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Just requesting, not reflecting.

The SPEAKER: The Minister will be specific in his answer, as Standing Orders require.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Bragg, as the shadow Minister of Industrial Relations, is yet to ask me a question in this area. The Industrial Relations Commission and its predecessors the Arbitration Commission, the Industrial Court of South Australia and the Industrial Commission have, in many instances since agreement was reached with the ACTU in respect of the accord, provided for the 3 per cent superannuation in awards. We will soon see an application for a further 3 per cent. That award provision insists that employers pay into a separate trust deed that has to be established. Indeed, the courts and the commission have even nominated the trust deeds into which the money is to be paid.

Employers not paying into those trust deeds are liable for prosecution for breaching the appropriate award. If they do not observe the terms of those awards, they can be severely penalised. It is even suggested that, if a worker were unfortunate enough to pass away and the employer had made no contributions towards the trust deed, the employer would be liable to pay a considerable sum of money in insurance. The Department of Labour in this State has undertaken an extensive advertising and consultation campaign, with employer bodies and individual employers in particular, to ensure that periodic payments are made to the appropriate trust funds. We are concerned that workers are, first, in a position to receive superannuation when they retire and, secondly, that employers are in a position to pay for it when they can afford it. We do not want a situation where the employer goes broke and the worker misses out. Further, I do not want employers to be prosecuted for breaches of the award.

STIRLING COUNCIL

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Will the Premier advise whether the Government will support the inquiry into the settlement of the Stirling District Council bushfire claims?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I understand that a statement is being made on this matter in another place. I understand the honourable member's question to be whether the Government supports the establishment of a select committee in another place; if so, the answer is 'No', because it is absolutely unnecessary. I am very concerned in many ways about the role being played in this matter by the honourable

member. Whilst I understand the pressures that would apply to him in his role as local member and, whilst I also understand the pressures that would obviously apply to the Stirling District Council in this situation, there has been a distinct lack of leadership, partly instanced by the question the honourable member asks and by a number of other matters that have been raised in this case.

I put clearly on the record that the current suspended District Council of Stirling, which in fact will be reinstated at the end of this month on the recommendation of the Administrator (Mr Des Ross), was elected on a platform of discontinuing any further litigation or payment of legal costs in relation to that long-running case that had been going on for 10 years. In fact, it said that the case would be discontinued from the Stirling council side and judgment would be made by default. The effect of that would have been absolutely disastrous because the claims are more than double what has emerged from settlement. So, for judgment to have gone by default in that instance would have left a huge burden on the Stirling District Council.

It was quite an irresponsible undertaking on the council's part, and it was in big trouble, having been elected and charged with the responsibility of implementing that platform. In consequence, the Government said that the council could not as a local government body do that and that, in fact, it had two choices. The council was told that it could proceed with the litigation as a matter of policy and continue to fight the case. If its lawyers were advising that the claims were fraudulent and should be contested, and while realising the tremendous financial risks involved, the council could take part in proceedings, fly off to Britain and all other matters that were well under way at that time.

Alternatively, the Government advised that it was prepared to assist with some form of settlement procedure as it may have been possible to get the parties to agree to a conciliation process, undertaken by an acceptable and qualified person, to cut through the legal proceedings and arrive at a settlement figure. The Stirling District Council was delighted with that offer on the part of the Government and accepted it very eagerly indeed. In fact, it wrote to the Government, and I will quote the letter as it is relevant. It wrote to the Minister, the Hon. Anne Levy, MLC, on 7 June conveying this motion:

> . . . the Chairman advise the Premier in writing that the District Council of Stirling accepts the proposal as outlined in the Minister of Local Government's letter expanded upon by correspondence and accepts the specific conditions.

The Chairman went on to say:

> I am particularly pleased that the matter has now been placed within a framework where expeditious resolution can be optimistically contemplated. The State Government is most deserving of commendation for fundamentally assisting in this stage being reached.

Mr Mullighan QC was appointed to carry out his task, and he did. As well as the information that no doubt was in the hands of the lawyers for the defence, which was tabled irresponsibly by a member in another place, he would have had information on behalf of the plaintiff which was being used in the long-running legal case. In fact, he came to a settlement of the matter which was acceptable to both parties, and that was the award that was made.

In the case of the Casley-Smiths, it covered legal expenses and part of their claim—about $3 million or $4 million in legal expenses and about $3 million or $4 million in the claim, which was half of what was actually claimed. So, if there are allegations of salami, cut flowers, and things like this, and if they were fraudulent—and I put large 'ifs' by them—obviously they were discounted in the course of any settlement that was undertaken. It is disgraceful to make allegations based around that. So, Mr Speaker, that is the settlement that was agreed by the parties.

At any time those parties could have opted to continue with their action. They did not do so. They accepted, and I think that that is a great relief to all of us—to the taxpayers of South Australia, who were footing 72 per cent of the bill, and to the ratepayers of Stirling who were footing the other 28 per cent of the bill. In consequence of that, we also had another letter to the Minister from the current Chairman of the district council who, from a position of reasonable and, I thought, solid leadership in this matter in a difficult situation, has turned into a ranting demagogue in many of his approaches, which has come as quite a surprise.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, it can be used at the meeting on the 19th, with which I would imagine certain statements have been timed to coincide. I hope the Leader and the member attend that meeting and try to provide some leadership to the district.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Heysen had better worry about being here.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Chairman has surprised me greatly in a number of the quite extravagant statements he has made about Hitler, Eastern Europe and so on. I have been extremely disappointed because I felt he was displaying, with his council, good leadership in a difficult situation. I understood the council's dilemma in relation to reaching a settlement. That has been resolved, through the appointment of the administrator, to the satisfaction of all concerned. The council is now ready to resume its duties. I come back to the letter of 19 July, as follows:

> Our letter also intimated that Mr Mullighan QC may be directed to certain of the remaining non-Andersons claims . . . Council would fully endorse such a move as positive in treating all remaining claimants similarly and also in seeking to resolve areas of conflict within claims. Hopefully these endeavours will result in obviating the necessity for further court action in these remaining claims.

In other words, the council was determined, by all means possible—and these were the only responsible means—to ensure that the matter could be settled. The Chairman went on to say:

> It is extremely gratifying to observe that substantial progress is finally being made in the bushfire saga. Please accept my personal thanks and those of my council for your considerable efforts which have assisted in this facilitation. I trust that the cooperative spirit that has been engendered can be sustained to the conclusion of this matter.

It is a great pity that that cooperative spirit unfortunately has not been sustained, but it is not too late for it to be restored—and it will be restored only if people like the honourable member who asked the question shows some responsible leadership. After all, he was a member of the Tonkin Government Cabinet which initially resolved not to provide any disaster relief in this case and which initially said—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Is the honourable member denying he was a member of the Tonkin Government Cabinet?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Well, that is the situation. Litigation followed. It went on and now it has been settled; the matter has been resolved. The taxpayer of South Australia has a big burden to pick up but, to assist the interests of the Stirling council and those constituents of the honourable member, we are picking up that big burden. Apparently, he is not satisfied with that. I would ask him to show some leadership.

ENVIRONMENTAL PUBLICITY

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I direct my question to the Minister for Environment and Planning.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I say again, I direct my question to the Minister for Environment and Planning—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader may not be here to go there; will he come to order.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: For the third time, I direct my question to the Minister for Environment and Planning. Can the Minister advise the House whether there is any evidence to hand which substantiates claims that bad publicity generated through prosecutions over environmental legislation can, in the long term, damage a company's standing in the community? In yesterday's *News* there was an article in which the director of a South Australian law firm stated:

> Businesses could avoid embarrassing publicity and unnecessary and costly litigation by complying with environmental legislation.

The director is also quoted as saying:

> There is a heightened awareness of environmental issues and this will have increasing influence on future developments, manufacturing and industrial growth.

Mr LEWIS: In keeping with the rulings that you, Mr Speaker, have made in recent days about such questions, does this not represent the seeking of an opinion from the Minister about a statement made elsewhere as to the truth or otherwise of that statement?

The SPEAKER: Order! I will look into the question and we will return to the matter.

GOVERNOR'S SUCCESSOR

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): My question is directed to the Premier. Has the Government made a recommendation to the Queen on who should succeed Sir Donald Dunstan when he retires as Governor on 31 December and, if not, when does it intend to do so?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, the matter will be considered in due course. His Excellency's term, of course, does not expire until the end of this year and he will be on duty occupying the office of Governor until 31 December.

ENVIRONMENTAL PUBLICITY

The SPEAKER: Order! I have looked at the question asked by the member for Napier and I do not believe it contravenes Standing Orders. The question will stand.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order. The Minister for Environment and Planning.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank you, Mr Speaker, and I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in this matter. I am disappointed that the member for Murray-Mallee obviously does not think this an important issue, because indeed it is.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I ask that the Minister withdraw the imputation of improper motives attributed to me in making that statement. It is offensive. It is my right, as it is any other member's right, to make a point of order at the instant it occurs—

The SPEAKER: Order! I would ask the Minister to withdraw the statement and be careful with any personal imputations in any response she makes.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I find it amazing that the honourable member would find that offensive.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, not only did the Minister not withdraw—

The SPEAKER: Order! Point taken. I would ask the Minister to withdraw and be very specific with her response to the question asked.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Mr Speaker, I withdraw the comments that caused offence to the honourable member, and I will say no more at this stage.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Obviously, the wolves are baying. That would be an indication that they are not—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair cannot hear the Minister's response.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Again I thank the member for Napier for his question. In answer to it, I believe there is evidence to suggest that companies that flout environmental laws and are prosecuted in fact suffer quite considerable damage not only to their reputation but also in terms of that company's future standing in the community. I agree with the statements made in yesterday's *News* by Mrs Summers, who is a director of the legal company Summers and Co. I will pick up a couple of points from that, because what is now being recognised by the development and the business sectors, not just in South Australia but right across the country and throughout the world, is the importance of working within the environmental constraints that are demanded by the community.

The environment is a major issue in this community. It is not a passing phase and surveys have indicated that members of the public are much more likely to be supportive of decisions which come down on the side of the environment rather than those which put the environment at risk. The article in yesterday's *News* really states what the members of the business community are now saying to each other and certainly to me as Minister for Environment and Planning. It states:

> Anyone involved in business today must be environmentally sensitive or face the consequences of rigorous enforcement of environmental laws, more prosecutions, higher penalties and damages claims.

While I agree with those sentiments, I make very clear that the direction of this Government is not one of confrontation but one of working constructively with industry to ensure that we have economically and ecologically sustainable development in South Australia. I believe there is room for both legislative measures and self-regulation. We will have struck a balance in those areas in this State and I certainly thank the honourable member for raising the issue and agree that there is evidence to suggest that his question is quite appropriate.

CONTAMINATED FISH

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Fisheries inform the House whether there has been any testing of fish caught in Spencer Gulf and, if so, what were the

results of those tests regarding the lead content or any other heavy metal content which would render them unsafe for eating purposes?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Over the years, testing has been carried out of fish caught in Spencer Gulf, and I can identify the figures that have been obtained from those reports. Between 1973 and 1980, the South Australian Department of Fisheries sampled more than 313 marine animals from Spencer Gulf for analyses of the concentration of heavy metals in their edible tissue. Of these samples, 189 were collected in the northern and upper Spencer Gulf region.

These samples from the northern and upper Spencer Gulf area included: four species of shark and ray; eight species of shellfish; four species of crab and prawns; and 21 species of fish. The results of this study were published in a fisheries research paper in 1983, and they show that one garfish exceeded the 1.5 mg/kg standard for lead as set down by the National Health and Medical Research Council (NH & MRC). This was a deformed garfish and had a lead concentration of 5.2 mg/kg. However, all other garfish sampled did not exceed the standard.

A composite sample of six blue swimmer crabs had a mean concentration of .13 mg/kg of cadmium in their tissue. This value exceeds the NH & MRC standard of .05 mg/kg. All other samples were within the acceptable standards as applied by the South Australian Health Commission. I can also advise that, since those figures were obtained in the early part of the last decade, this year the Department of Fisheries has collected further samples of blue swimmer crabs and mussels for testing and is awaiting the results of tests from the Health Commission. For the information of the honourable member and other members of this place, I have some statistical data relating to these tests which I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading.

Leave granted.

LIST OF MARINE ANIMALS SAMPLED FOR HEAVY METAL ANALYSES FROM NORTHERN AND UPPER SPENCER GULF

Fish (21 species)
Cowfish, ornate
Flathead (2 species)
Flounder (3 species)
Garfish
Gurnard, red
Hardyhead
Leatherjacket, rough
Mackerel, horse
Mullet, red
Mullet, yellow-eye
Perch, striped
Porcupine fish
Rough, Tommy
Snapper
Snook
Toadfish
Trevally
Whiting, King George

Sharks and Rays (4 species)
Shark: Port Jackson
Angel
Ray: Eagle
Fiddler

Molluscs (8 species)
Butterfly shell
Calamary (2 species)
Cuttlefish
Mussel (2 species)
Razor fish
Scallop, queen

Crustaceans (4 species)
Barnacle, mangrove
Bug, Moreton Bay
Crab, blue swimmer
Prawn, western king

RESULTS OF ANALYSES FOR SELECTED SPECIES

Crab, Blue Swimmer — ppm (wet weight)

		Hg	Cu	Zn	Pb	Cd	As
No. of Samples—6	Mean Value	0.02	8.1	29	0.12	0.13	39

Garfish — ppm(wet weight)

		Hg	Cu	Zn	Pb	Cd	As
No. of Samples—5	Min.	<0.01	0.44	11	0.04	<0.01	4
	Max.	0.04	6.7	25	5.2	0.13	20
	Mean	0.01	2.3	19	1.5	0.06	10

Whiting, King George — ppm (wet weight)

		Hg	Cu	Zn	Pb	Cd	As
No. of Samples—23	Min.	0.01	0.19	6.4	<0.02	<0.01	10
	Max.	0.10	0.62	11.0	0.29	0.02	44
	Mean	0.05	0.38	9.5	0.09	<0.01	36

Snapper — ppm (wet weight)

		Hg	Cu	Zn	Pb	Cd	As
No. of Samples—11	Mean Value	0.07	0.37	13	0.36	0.03	18

Prawn, Western King — ppm (wet weight)

		Hg	Cu	Zn	Pb	Cd	As
No. of Samples—8	Mean Value	0.04	5.3	14	0.14	0.02	50

LIST OF NHMRC STANDARDS FOR SOME OF THE HEAVY METALS

Element	Food Group	NHMRC standard mg/kg (wet weight)
Mercury Hg	fish crustaceans molluscs	0.5 mean with 1.5 max.
Copper Cu	fish crustaceans molluscs	10 10 70
Zinc Zn	fish crustaceans molluscs	150 150 150 1 000 (oysters)
Lead Pb	fish crustaceans molluscs	1.5 1.5 2.5
Cadmium Cd	fish crustaceans molluscs	0.2 0.05 2.0

ATTORNEY-GENERAL

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I direct my question to the Premier. In view of the fact that at least one vacancy will occur on the Supreme Court bench in December with the retirement of Mr Justice Jacobs, and possibly two if the Chief Justice is appointed Governor, is it the Government's intention that the Attorney-General should go on the bench?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will refer that question to my colleague the Attorney-General.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Health inform the House of the availability of public and private hospital beds in the southern and south western suburbs? Further, will he say how that availability compares with the situation in the metropolitan area and the State generally?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It may be that the honourable member has been attracted to a statement made by the member for Bright where, as I recall, the honourable member claimed that in the southern and south-western suburbs there were 900 beds, of which 620 were public, including Daw Park. He concluded from this that, in fact, the south had three beds per thousand of population against a Health Commission goal of four beds per thousand. The Sax Report laid down, as a recommendation, that we should move to 4.5 acute beds per thousand population. The policy adopted by the commission is that for the Adelaide metropolitan area there should be 5.07 beds per thousand in the metropolitan area and 3.31 beds per thousand in the non-metropolitan area. The present position is that the metropolitan area has 5.41 beds per thousand, made up of 3.44 public beds and 1.97 private beds. In the south there are 4.11 beds per thousand—not three as the honourable member suggested. They are made up—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes, the south and south-west. They are made up of 834 and 549 private hospital beds. On the completion of the Noarlunga Hospital, which I have inspected recently, as has the member for Mount Gambier (and I think that we are equally impressed by what is being achieved there), the addition of 120 beds will result in 924 public beds and 579 private beds, that is 4.48 beds per thousand. I warn honourable members about playing with figures in any way because it depends very much—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Well, I exempt the member for Bragg. He obviously has an entirely different agenda, and on a Thursday afternoon who can blame him? Of course, it depends entirely on how the boundaries are drawn. In fact, the eastern region has about 11 beds per thousand. However, that region includes both of the psychiatric hospitals and also the Royal Adelaide Hospital which, of course, has certain so-called super specialties that are equally available to people from all regions because of the central location of the hospital. However, I thank the honourable member for his question, because it indicates that the situation in the south is roughly comparable with that which applies in the whole of the metropolitan area and which is getting better.

AGRICULTURAL CHEMICAL CONTAINERS

Mr GUNN (Eyre): Has the Minister of Agriculture or his departmental officers had any discussions with producers of agriculture chemicals with a view to establishing a system of collecting the chemical containers now being distributed around the country? The Minister will be aware that agriculture chemicals are used in very large quantities as an essential ingredient for effective agriculture. These containers—metal, pvc and plastic—are now creating considerable problems on farms and particularly where they are disposed of in local council dumps, because a larger bulk of that material is filling up those dumps. If the Minister has not already had those discussions will he, as a matter of some urgency, investigate this suggestion?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his important question. I will get a report on the status of investigations in this area by the Department of Agriculture. I am not able to give a chapter and verse response of what types of contacts there may have been to date between the department and the suppliers of agricultural chemicals and other relevant agencies—for example, the Waste Commission. I will obtain a report on that.

The honourable member correctly identifies that there is an appropriate use for chemicals within agriculture. By and large it has been the practice of many within the farming

community, in optimising that usage, to be as sparing as they believe is possible. However, there is a major risk, which is less certain of governance, with respect to the disposal of the containers which hold the chemicals. Once a chemical has been used it exits out of the economics of the production unit, and there may be careless practices involved which pose real risks and which therefore need to be monitored or controlled carefully. I will obtain a detailed report for the honourable member.

O-BAHN

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Can the Minister of Transport tell the House what changes the STA has made to increase safety on the O-Bahn busway following the accident last October?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Subsequent to the busway accident on Monday 2 October 1989 between two Adelaide-bound buses, a formal inquiry was established. Since the findings of the board of inquiry were handed down, the following changes have been introduced:

Use of a radar gun, identical to the hand-held model currently in use by the South Australian Police Department. State Transport Authority Transit Squad members underwent the SA Police training program in its use.

The fitting of standard signs to busway bus header panels advising passengers not to converse with the driver whilst the vehicle is in motion and not to stand on the platform.

A series of tests utilising various types of distance markers placed at intervals of 160 metres were undertaken. As a result of those tests, flexible white distance markers have been installed at various locations along the length of the busway to assist operators to judge the distance between buses.

The Engineering Branch of the STA is undertaking a review of technical suggestions received since the accident.

A committee of review was convened to investigate all aspects of operating and emergency procedures pertaining to the north-east busway.

Several recommendations of the committee of review have been acted upon, and include the following:

An operations manual has been prepared and will be distributed to all persons licensed to operate busway vehicles on the north-east busway.

A revised training/testing program has been arranged for operators working on the busway.

Advisory speed signs along the busway have been standardised.

Signs within Modbury interchange have been revised.

I assure the member for Playford that the public travelling on the O-Bahn, or the north-east busway as the STA prefers to call it, have the maximum degree of safety that it is possible to achieve. I am also pleased to announce that there has been a very large increase in the number of people using the busway since the extension from Paradise to Tea Tree Plaza has been completed.

CONDOMS

Mr SUCH (Fisher): My question is directed to the Minister of Emergency Services. Is it normal practice for the Police Force to confiscate condoms issued to prostitutes by anti-AIDS groups and their workers? If so, is this practice condoned by the Government?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I admit that I am not an expert in this particular area of Government. Indeed, neither am I an expert on brothels. I will take the lead from anyone in this House who believes that he or she has a greater degree of experience than I have. I am not aware of this situation, but I will get a report for the honourable member.

DOMESTIC AIRLINES

Mr HERON (Peake): Can the Minister of Transport outline to the House what the deregulation of the domestic airline market in November may mean to South Australia?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: There are several recent and impending changes in the air travel environment. Among the changes of particular interest are deregulation of the domestic airline market from November 1990; an increasingly liberal competitive environment internationally; innovations in aviation generally, both technological and organisational; and general trends in communication and travel needs. A review has been conducted on behalf of the Government by the Director-General of Transport, through the University of Adelaide, entitled 'Prospects and Prescriptions for the South Australian Airline Market in the 1990s'.

The report has as its summary the following observations:

Adelaide's major strength is the capacity of its airport infrastructure; this and the abolition of restrictions on entrepreneurial activity as a result of deregulation offer major opportunities to the State; the weakness of the State is the lack of traffic density and the threat is that biases against South Australia will arise in the working of the market after deregulation.

South Australia can best promote its interests by:

- taking advantage of the more liberal environment and the change in the structure of the international tourism market to promote South Australia as a destination, thereby increasing traffic volumes;
- taking initiatives which promote competition in the national air transport network, which involves monitoring developments in national airport policy, the application of trade practices legislation and the formation of international aviation policy.

It is particularly important, therefore, that we monitor the work of a number of Commonwealth institutions including the Prices Surveillance Authority, the Trade Practices Commission and the system for regulating foreign investment.

It is the intention of this Government to ensure that any opportunities that arise out of the further deregulation of the interstate aviation industry put us in a position to take advantage of any of those opportunities for the benefit of South Australia.

IVF PROGRAM

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Will the Minister of Health advise what is the Government's policy on the admission of single women into the IVF program at Flinders Medical Centre? Has the Government been involved in the exchanges and threats of litigation that have occurred between the Equal Opportunity Commission and the hospital over this issue? Has the Government considered the social implications of allowing single women, living in a non-married and non-*de facto* situation, in the words of senior hospital staff, to virtually 'walk in off the street' and demand access to the program?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am not aware that the Government has been involved in any discussions regarding litigation but I will obtain a considered reply for the honourable member.

BUS TIMETABLES

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Transport advise the House whether there are any plans to reintroduce timetables at bus stops? In the past, vandals have caused the STA to remove timetables from STA bus stops. An Albert Park constituent has advised me that the STA may have found a way of addressing this problem. My constituent would be delighted if this were the case and timetables were reintroduced at bus stops.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Albert Park for his question. As part of the STA's continuing objective to provide increased customer services, and in response to public requests, 'stop specific' timetable information showing departure times of buses, route information and maps is now being trialed in specially designed vandal resistant units. Route display units have been initially installed at bus stops in King William Street between North Terrace and Victoria Square to coincide with the 1990 July timetable changes. If these units prove successful, more units will be installed at key points in Adelaide's central business district and some major shopping centres.

I know that all members will be interested in the fact that these units have been designed by final year industrial design students from the South Australian College of Advanced Education, are manufactured by tradespeople at the STA's metal workshop at Regency Park and are made from 3 mm mild steel with polycarbonate 'windows'. In addition, it is intended to provide 'stop specific' timetables at most licensed ticket vendors. This initiative will provide the travelling public with much greater access to relevant timetable information in the whole metropolitan area.

BLYTH TO BRINKWORTH ROAD

Mr VENNING (Custance): In view of the spate of accidents on the Blyth-Brinkworth Road—including three separate accidents last night—will the Minister of Transport investigate the failure of the Department of Road Transport to carry out its original intention to seal the last remaining 5km section of the road, and will he ensure that action is taken to remedy the very serious situation that exists? This road was prepared for bitumenising about five years ago. The work was completed, except for this five kilometre strip. It has been left in a state ready for bitumenising. However, now people travel along the road, particularly in weather like last night's, at a speed commensurate with this wide, high speed road, but this section is a total death trap. Cars end up doing cartwheels down the road and they end up in a paddock. It is a serious situation.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Custance for his question. It will be a long time in this place before the name 'Venning' is thought of in any other way than in connection with Rocky River, especially for members who have been here for a while. Nevertheless, I thank him for his maiden question—it is certainly his maiden question to me. I can assure the member for Custance that the Department of Road Transport (formerly the Highways Department) is not negligent and does take its responsibilities seriously. However, the request by members opposite for the Department of Road Transport to apply its limited resources to each of their electorates is staggering. If the department had all the State's budget, it would still not satisfy the requests of members opposite. Nevertheless—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —I will obtain a report for the member for Custance to see whether anything can be done with that particular stretch of road. The member for Chaffey interjected and asked whether I was happy with the accident rate. All I can say to the member for Chaffey is that I am becoming increasingly happy about the accident rate. The level of resources that this Government has put into road safety and the amount of legislation that we put through this Parliament is at long last beginning to have an effect. I am pleased to say that this effect applies all over Australia: the accident rate is coming down, and it is continuing to come down at a rate which is not totally satisfactory but which is certainly in the right direction.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I certainly will. I congratulate all members in this House for the way in which they have supported road safety legislation in the past. I hope in the near future that they will have another opportunity, particularly the member for Chaffey, to demonstrate their concern about road safety. A number of road safety measures will be coming before this Parliament, and I hope that the member for Chaffey supports them. Certainly, I look forward to his cooperation and the cooperation of every member in this House who has a genuine concern about road safety.

TRAM EXTENSION

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Has the Minister of Transport further considered Professor Fielding's recommendation that the city to Glenelg tramline might be extended along King William Street to Adelaide Oval? Has consideration been given to extending the line to Barton Road, North Adelaide, near its junction with Hawker Street at Bowden?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Spence for his question. In the Fielding report as referred to by the member for Spence it was recommended that an examination should be undertaken of the merits of extending the Glenelg tram from Victoria Square along King William Street to the Adelaide Oval. In line with that recommendation, two feasibility studies were recently carried out to assess the traffic impacts and economic benefits of extending the Glenelg tram to the Adelaide Railway Station, the Adelaide Children's Hospital, Barton Terrace via O'Connell Street, North Adelaide, and Hill Street, North Adelaide via O'Connell and Tynte Streets.

The studies found that the tram extension would have minimal traffic impact and that, in terms of economic benefits, only extension to the Adelaide Railway Station would be justified. The State Transport Authority has been requested to undertake a more detailed study of the option to extend the tram to the Adelaide Railway Station.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Goyder.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

FISH PROCESSING CERTIFICATES

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Why is the Minister of Fisheries allowing Fisheries Department inspectors to harass hoteliers over fish processing registration requirements? On 29 March this year two inspectors visited four hotels on Yorke Peninsula to tell the hotel keepers that they would now need a fish processing certificate if they served fish to customers. Each hotel keeper duly signed and received their certificate assuming they would be registered for 12 months. However, a month later registration renewal forms were sent out.

Three of the hotel keepers assumed that this was a mistake by the department and thought nothing more of the matter until they received another visit on Tuesday from the inspectors who demanded to see their registration certificates. The inspectors then proceeded to issue on-the-spot fines of $205 each to the three unregistered hotel keepers. Their revenue-raising motive was betrayed, however, when they visited the one hotel which had renewed the registration, as one inspector was heard to say, 'We dipped out badly here.'

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I think that the honourable member is drawing a very long bow when he attributes alleged comments to an officer of the Department of Fisheries and then says that it is clearly part of its game to raise revenue. Then, of course, we hear the Leader of the Opposition saying, 'Sack them, sack them.' As it happens, another member of the Opposition raised this issue with me yesterday in respect of a hotel in his electorate, and I am having a report prepared on that matter. My guess is, having had that matter drawn to my attention late yesterday, that it is probably part of a campaign to deal with shamateurs—shamateurs being amateur fishers who sell some or all of their catch. Of course, that is a breach of being a recreational fisher, and I am certain no-one in this place would condone it.

Indeed, questions have been put to me about whether or not we will follow the example of the New South Wales Government which has had a kind of Operation Noah for shamateurs—ring in and give information on a 24-hour hotline about amateur fishermen who are selling fish. In fact, we will not have that in South Australia. Nevertheless, there is a serious point in regard to the management of fish stock and what fish are being caught. We know what fish are being caught by commercial fishers because they have to provide returns. We do not know exactly the quantity of fish being caught by recreational fishers but we know the bag limits that apply and we have survey data; therefore, we can make some reasonable predictions as to how much they are taking from the fish stock.

However, what will destroy that area is the extent to which shamateurism takes off, and therefore the extent to which recreational fishers will breach the law in terms of selling their catch and going beyond bag limits. That, therefore, requires the compliance of all those who are potential buyers of fish, and that includes not only fish shops but also restaurants that serve fish, hotels and other such establishments. They will, therefore, have to record the fish that they purchase and identify the source from which it was purchased.

Nevertheless, I will be very concerned if there has been an exercise of over-rigour by officers in this instance. I hope I can be assured that the member for Goyder is not about to say that we should not be concerned about shamateurism. I will obtain a detailed report for both him and another member who raised this matter yesterday.

QUESTIONS

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): My question is to you, Mr Speaker. Several members on this side of the House are of the opinion that the total number of questions asked in this Question Time, namely 23, probably equals the record in this House for a one-hour duration Question Time. Could you, Sir, do the House a service and direct your officers to inquire into the records?

The SPEAKER: Certainly.

PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGE

The Legislative Council transmitted the following resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

1. That a joint select committee be appointed to consider and report on the extent of parliamentary privilege and the means by which such privilege may be enunciated and protected in the interests of the community and the institution of Parliament.
2. In the event of the joint select committee being appointed, the Legislative Council be represented thereon by three members of whom two shall form a quorum of Council members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.
3. That the joint select committee be authorised to disclose or publish, as it thinks fit, any evidence or documents presented to the joint select committee prior to such evidence and documents being reported to the Parliament.
4. That Standing Order 396 be suspended to enable strangers to be admitted when the joint select committee is examining witnesses unless the joint select committee otherwise resolves, but they shall be excluded when the joint select committee is deliberating.

WORKCOVER

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour): I move:

1. That: A joint select committee be appointed—
   (a) to review all aspects of the workers rehabilitation and compensation system (WorkCover);
   (b) to recommend changes, if any, to the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act to optimise WorkCover's effectiveness, taking into consideration that WorkCover should be a fully funded, economical, caring provider of workers rehabilitation and compensation, with the aim of increasing workplace safety.
2. In the event of the joint select committee being appointed, the House of Assembly be represented thereon by three members of whom two shall form a quorum of House of Assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.
3. Standing Order No. 339 be so far suspended as to enable the joint select committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it thinks fit, of any evidence presented to the committee prior to such evidence and documents being reported to the Parliament.
4. A message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting Parts 1 and 2 and requesting its concurrence thereto and advising the Legislative Council of Part 3.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SHOP TRADING HOURS ACT AND LANDLORD AND TENANT) BILL

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour) introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Shop Trading Hours Act 1977, and the Landlord and Tenant Act 1936. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of the amendments to the Shop Trading Hours Act is to permit general retail trading until 5 p.m. on Saturday afternoons in the central, metropolitan and all

country shopping districts, and includes in that extension the sale of red meat. The Bill also provides for the repeal of two sections of the Act which limit the sale of foodstuffs or convenience store items in conjunction with a motor fuel outlet. An administrative simplification of the mechanism provided to create or abolish country shopping districts on the application of local government authorities is also included.

The proposal to extend retail trading hours until 5 p.m. on Saturday was clearly announced as part of the Government's election policy and this Bill is introduced in a climate where community support for such a change is even more overwhelming than it was when the Government last attempted to extend trading hours in 1988. The most significant change since 1988 has been the wages deal struck under the award restructuring process between the Retail Traders Association and the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees Association, which provides for the rates that will apply under extended trading. That deal was negotiated with the general support and encouragement of the State Government and it is to the credit of both parties to the negotiations that an amicable agreement has been reached. It is the Government's strong belief that a similar wages outcome would have been reached in 1988, had the Government's earlier Bill been successful. It is a pity therefore that the South Australian public has been needlessly denied the convenience of extended trading for the past two years when other States have enjoyed such extended trading over that period with no adverse effects on prices or on the number of small businesses that have continued to operate.

Under the wages deal that has been negotiated, the labour costs associated with working on a Saturday have been reduced by approximately 35 per cent when compared with the provisions of the old award. There have been compensating adjustments to the rates paid on weekdays but overall the package will have a negligible impact on prices beyond what would in any case have occurred had Saturday trading not been an issue.

Under this Bill it is proposed that red meat be sold during the extended trading hours. This provision has not been proposed lightly and has followed lengthy discussions with representatives of the industry generally, and the Government has been encouraged by the significant shift in attitude by industry representatives from one of previous strong opposition to a general recognition that such an extension was inevitable and that the industry would adjust to the proposed change in trading hours.

The retail motor vehicle industry has long been opposed to an extension in trading hours and much of that opposition relates to the non-availability at this time of essential security and registration facilities during extended hours. Whilst the Government is of the view that consumers expect an extension of available hours in this area, given the importance of the purchase of a car to families, it is not the Government's intention to extend trading hours for motor vehicles until the concerns raised by motor trading organisations have been considered and, where appropriate, have been rectified. For that reason, the extended hours of trade for motor vehicles will not operate until those matters have been addressed and a proclamation subsequently issued.

With regard to the sale of foodstuffs or convenience items from motor fuel outlets, the Bill repeals sections 15a and 15b of the Act, thereby removing an unduly restrictive prohibition on the sale of such items. Those sections were included in the Act in 1980 by the then Liberal Government. These restrictive anti-competitive provisions, however, are not appropriate particularly in the light of the unrestricted trading hours now applying to motor fuel outlets generally and the wide availability of products which may be purchased from such outlets at the present time. Demonstrated consumer support for the availability of such goods from service stations is available for all to see and it is the Government's view that changing marketing trends should not be inhibited by outdated legislative restrictions.

Finally, the Bill makes minor administrative amendments to section 12 in respect of the creation and abolition of proclaimed shopping districts, that is, districts outside the metropolitan area. Previous legislative requirements have obliged local government authorities in making application to conduct polls, sometimes at expense or inconvenience. The amendments seek to lessen that burden on applicant authorities and provide that the views of interested persons as defined be sought and given due regard in the course of a decision without the necessary formality of the conduct of a poll.

The general issues raised by this Bill have been the subject of lengthy discussions with interested organisations and have been the subject of much interest by the media and consumers. The provisions in this Bill are long overdue and have the support of the majority of South Australians

Part II of the Bill amends those provisions of the Landlord and Tenant Act which deal with the forced opening of shops. It is an important corollary of any moves to extend shop trading hours that the rights of retail tenants to run their businesses as they see fit are appropriately protected. In conjunction with moves to extend shop trading hours at the end of 1987, the Government introduced a Bill to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act 'to ensure that shop keepers in shopping centres cannot be compelled by landlords to open for extended shop trading hours'. The Opposition supported the amendments in principle but argued that they lacked precision. The Bill lapsed with attempts to deregulate trading hours but one consequence of its attempted passage was the establishment of a working party to attempt to reach a consensus on how shopping centre general expenses should be divided between lessees who open on Saturdays and those who do not.

The working party reported that its informal discussions '... seem to indicate that lessors and lessees agree shopping centre owners should be permitted to require lessees in centres to open if a majority of lessees in that centre agree (on a "one vote" for each separate leasehold interest basis) that the lessees should all open. If a majority did not favour opening, the centre could still open, but in that case the general running expenses for the centre would have to be divided between the lessees of premises who do resolve to open'. This agreement was to be embodied in a Code of Practice.

The recent breakthrough in industrial negotiations has added impetus to the need to embody this agreement in legislation. The Government recognises that it is appropriate that it be included in legislation rather than as a Code of Practice.

It is proposed that the existing general prohibition of a term a commercial tenancy agreement that purports to impose an obligation on tenants to keep their premises open for business at particular times should remain and that the exception to this general rule should be narrowed to recognise the special situation of enclosed shopping complexes. In these complexes it is recognised that the interests of all tenants demand some fetter on their right to open and close at will. A major part of the attractiveness of such complexes to consumers is the ability to enjoy a total shopping experience with a full range of shops in one convenient location all open at the same time.

A mechanism has therefore been proposed to establish, by democratic vote, the views of the tenants in a complex as to the appropriate hours of opening and closing the whole complex (outside of a 'core' of hours which preserve the current situation). It will be lawful for landlords to require tenants to open during those agreed hours.

Outside of these agreed hours tenants in enclosed shopping complexes (and all other complexes) may open and close as they wish and if they are closed they need not contribute to the cost of opening the whole complex for business.

The Government recognises that some existing tenants may be concerned that the rules under which they trade are being changed during the course of their tenancy. Although they will be given a chance to convince their fellow traders of the benefits of existing trading hours, they may be out voted and forced to open during extended hours. New tenants will be well aware of this possibility and can have no illusions about the possibility of being forced to trade longer hours. It is therefore proposed that the protection afforded by this amendment be subject to a sunset clause and that the need for this form of regulation be reviewed before it is renewed. This will give a potential minority of disgruntled retailers time to make alternative arrangements including, if necessary, selling their businesses to new tenants who will be fully aware of and committed to the possibility of trading extended hours.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for commencement. Subclause (2) provides that clause 11 will come into operation three years after clause 10 comes into operation. This provision together with clause 11 comprise a sunset provision for the amendments made by clause 10 to the Landlord and Tenant Act. Section 65 inserted by clause 11 is the same as the existing section 65 of that Act and therefore the existing law will be reinstated automatically at the end of three years unless further amendments are made.

Clause 3 is formal.

Clause 4 inserts definitions of 'caravan' and 'trailer' in section 4 of the Shop Trading Hours Act 1977. The need for these definitions is consequential on new section 13 (3a) inserted by clause 6.

Clause 5 amends section 12 as already discussed.

Clause 6 extends the trading hours prescribed by section 13 of the principal Act. As already mentioned it is intended that subsection (3) will be amended to extend trading in motor vehicles and boats to 5 p.m. on Saturday. For reasons already explained the new time can come into operation immediately for boats and caravans and trailers but not for cars. Paragraphs *(c)* and *(d)* of clause 5 achieve the staggered commencement of 5 o'clock closing. Paragraph *(c)* will come into operation when the other provisions of the Bill commence. Paragraph *(d)* will be suspended until the concerns of the retail motor vehicle industry have been addressed. When it does come into operation, it will replace subsections (3) and (3a) inserted by paragraph *(c)* with a single subsection that once again prescribes the same closing time for boats and all kinds of motor vehicles.

Clause 7 makes a consequential change to section 13a of the principal Act.

Clauses 8 and 9 repeal sections 15a and 15b respectively.

Clause 10 replaces section 65 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1936. The new provision outlaws terms in commercial tenancy agreements that require the tenant to keep premises open at particular times. The exception to this is enclosed shopping complexes where tenants can be required to keep premises open during core hours. Core hours are from 8.30 a.m. to normal closing time on a week day and 8.30 a.m. to 12.30 p.m. on a Saturday unless the tenants have agreed to other hours by a two-thirds majority. Subsection (4) is a transitional provision that preserves existing terms requiring shops to be opened in enclosed shopping complexes to the extent of core trading hours. Subsection (7) protects tenants against having to contribute to opening costs when their premises are not open in respect of periods when it is unlawful for them to open or outside core hours.

Clause 11 reinstates existing section 65 of the principal Act and will come into operation three years after section 65 inserted by clause 10 comes into force.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 9 August. Page 182.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I was rather fascinated when this Bill was introduced into the House on 9 August. There seemed to be no particular business on the agenda yet, when I looked in the gallery, I found that the television cameras were still present. I looked at the agenda paper and decided that there was nothing really important there: listed was the Supply Bill (No. 2), the normal Supply Bill to take the Government salaries through until November, when the Appropriation Bill takes over. I had no particular reason to suspect that the Supply Bill (No. 2) was any different from other Supply Bills over the past seven years, but indeed it was different; it was quite different from the usual Supply Bill and broke with the character that is normally associated with that Bill. Normally, the Supply Bill is simply a machinery motion to ensure there is sufficient money to run the Government until the Appropriation Bill takes effect.

This time, however, the Premier thought fit to use the Supply Bill (No. 2) as a means of continuing an argument that is unsustainable, namely, that his revenue situation had deteriorated due to the lack of consideration of the Federal Government and the Treasurer, Mr Keating, and that his Government was really being responsible. Indeed, he was claiming that the trading result for the Government over the past financial year was not all that bad. I say that he has failed on all counts, but I would like to look at the substance of the Supply Bill (No. 2).

In particular, in the second reading explanation, the Premier and Treasurer said that the budget for the 1989-90 financial year provided for a balance on Consolidated Account made up of a projected surplus of $95.1 million on recurrent transactions. This is wrong, wrong, wrong. Anybody who looks at the Financial Statement for the past financial year provided by the Treasurer will find on page 13 that the figure is actually $35.1 million. The Premier was indulging in a deliberate misstatement. He cannot bring forward the $60 million, which is something to which I have referred in this House on more than one occasion. Just to refresh people's memories, without getting away from the debate in any way, I point out that that $60 million SAFA surplus could have been used to correct a few ills and provide for some much needed operations at a time when the Treasurer put it aside for the election year. So, he has misled the Parliament in this statement.

That is not the most important item. I will go on. The $60 million fudge made by the Treasurer includes a SAFA payment, which the budget papers indicate was carried forward from the 1988-89 surplus as a recurrent transaction.

If it was a standard recurrent transaction, it would have been amalgamated with the $325 million estimated SAFA receipts for 1989-90. The 1989-90 budget estimated that, on Capital Account, there would be a $249.4 million deficit and, after allowing for the $60 million SAFA payment from the previous year, the budget deficit was predicted at $154.3 million. Last Thursday the Premier said that he was pleased to be able to report that the actual budget deficit was a deterioration of $26.2 million on this figure, to a total of $180.5 million.

How any prudent Treasurer could be pleased with such a lousy result is quite a mystery to me. It seems more than a coincidence that the Premier is claiming that the Commonwealth Government has made cuts to South Australia for 1990-91 of $180 million. In fact, as the Opposition has said, the actual Premiers Conference result for this State was an increase of $258.6 million, which means that grants are at roughly the same real level as they were last year. In other words, the Premier overspent his budget by $180 million in election year 1989-90 and is now trying to blame the Federal Government for his financial problems so that he has a *carte blanche* to raise taxes instead of cutting waste and unnecessary spending.

It is important to understand that the $180 million that is being bandied about is really a figment of the Premier's imagination. Even the institutions and financial commentators do not support Mr Bannon. Based on Access Economics estimates, the Opposition expected that there would be a revenue shortfall of about $20 million from stamp duties because of the depressed property market. In fact, the shortfall was a little larger than that—about $22.5 million.

Other matters were raised in this minor budget explanation of the Premier. The Treasurer is living in a fantasy land when he says that royalties were also $9.2 million below expected levels. Royalties in 1988-89 totalled $33.9 million and increased to $43 million in 1989-90, an increase of 27 per cent. It is hard to understand how the Treasurer could expect royalties to increase by over 50 per cent to $52 million in the space of one year. We know that the Government has been trying to renege on its commitments to the oil and gas industry in South Australia by attempting to double the royalties that industry has to pay to the Treasury. It is just not fair to move the goalposts once companies such as Santos have invested $2.5 billion in a high risk industry which requires continuing large expenditures on exploration.

The budget outcome on royalties was better than we had ever achieved previously, but the figure in the last budget included an attempt by the Treasurer of this State to change the rules. He said, 'I can bludgeon the oil and gas producers; I can put pressure on them to provide more money into the budget.' That would have meant breaking down indenture agreements, and that involves a very grave risk. Yet the Treasurer, the Premier of this State, was prepared to have this mythical increase shown in the budget figures. The $9.2 million revenue shortfall is what he claimed as the royalty loss.

The Treasurer stated that interest costs have been increased by $16 million. On the basis of that comment, one would have expected some comment about the performance of SAFA. With this Supply document, the Premier has given only half the story, or not even that. On the one hand he said that interest costs are up $16 million; on the other hand, he should be saying that SAFA has had a brilliant year. Record real interest rates must work in favour of an institution like SAFA through which all Government moneys are funnelled and presumably placed in an enterprise with no risk and good returns because of the buying power of a large organisation such as SAFA. Yet not once in his explanation of the Supply Bill, which traversed some elements of the budget, did we see a mention of SAFA. We are waiting with bated breath to find out the SAFA outcomes for 1989-90 and 1990-91.

On my calculations, if SAFA had performed as it should have, it would have more than covered the loss of revenue from such items as stamp duty, but the Premier has included that little item and failed to explain the other side of the coin—the earnings side. Compared with $41 million in 1988-89, the 1989-90 budget estimated that the State Bank would pay Treasury $25 million in lieu of Federal income tax, $15 million as a return on taxpayers' capital, which is currently $539 million, and $150 million perpetual debt in the bank. Already we know that that will not be possible or feasible for the past financial year, and the Treasurer has left a big blank space when talking about the 1990-91 budget.

For example, we know that the Premier has revealed that the State Bank group has not had an exceedingly good year and, instead of returning $40 million to the State coffers, the bank will be returning $17 million. That is unfortunate, but we need further information. As an Opposition, we require that information. We have been pursuing it over the past week or so with a great deal of zeal, and we will continue to do so.

The explanation notes that revenue shortfalls were offset in part by a net impact improvement of $6.7 million through indexation of Commonwealth general purpose grants. That is a fascinating admission—absolutely fascinating—because we know that there is an indexation process that does work. If the Federal Treasurer states in his budget document that is used for the Premiers Conference that the estimated inflation rate will be 5.5 per cent (as he did) and that all revenue will flow as a result of that, so that people can calculate whether the budget allocations have increased in real terms, and if the inflation rate is more than 5.5 per cent, an adjustment mechanism takes place.

Some financial writers simply did not grasp the fact that a top-up system operates. If the Treasurer deliberately, for strategic purposes, undercalculates the inflation rate, the Federal Government is honour bound to top it up. So the Premier is still trying to peddle the story that there has been this great loss of revenue because our situation has not increased in real terms. Indeed, it has increased in absolute terms and real terms, and this has been pointed out *ad infinitum*. The $180 million myth will not survive scrutiny.

One of the major reasons why the budget deficit on Consolidated Account was not worse than the $180 million recorded was that the Homesure scheme that the Premier promised during the election campaign was never delivered. Instead of $36 million being spent to help struggling home buyers, the Bannon Government has spent just over $1 million. On the positive side of the ledger, we are not further in debt because he promised recklessly when he knew that the budget was falling apart: on the deficit side of the ledger, there are many thousands of young people who were promised at election time that the Premier would assist them, but he has not done so. He must stand condemned.

The most worrying thing about this Supply Bill (No. 2) is that the Premier has told only part of the story. Still we do not know the outcome of the public sector as a whole and that includes both the Consolidated Account and the results from the public enterprises. In the budget papers, the public sector deficit—in other words, the net financing requirement—was estimated at $545 million for 1989-90, the worst per capita result on mainland Australia. The ABS estimated the overall deficit at $663 million, based on pre-

liminary figures. We would like to know what is the true public deficit figure, whether it is $400 million, $600 million or even $800 million. We believe it is probably of the order of $600 million, but we are unclear as to the position at this moment.

I have personally followed the figures provided over a period of time in the updates of revenue and expenditure items, sometimes on a monthly basis and other times on a quarterly basis. There are some extremely interesting figures. For example, I have not seen any of those budget figures since March but, if the contents of the second reading explanation of the Supply Bill (No. 2) are correct, there must have been wholesale selling of public enterprises or land in the last three months of the 1989-90 financial year. The last figures I looked at showed that the sale of assets was running well behind schedule. One can only assume that the Government embarked on a fire sale in the last three months to achieve the level that was provided for in the budget.

There is no mention of that being a major item of difference between the budget forecast, contained in last year's budget papers, and the actual outcome as alluded to in the Supply Bill (No. 2). The one thing that has been worrying me since the Premier announced the figure of $180 million is why he would put himself at risk. Why would any Premier be silly enough to tell a story which can so easily be refuted? That to me remains one of the great mysteries. He should have known when he announced that figure that $180 million was a myth. Why did he do it? It is good strategy to blame the Federal Treasurer. The Federal Treasurer is, in terms of his public profile, not one of the most liked persons within politics or in Australia as a whole.

The Hon. H. Allison: That's a euphemism if ever there was one.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes, the Treasurer, Mr Keating, is an easy target. He is the man everyone loves to hate. The interesting aspect is that Premier Bannon previously refrained from condemning his Federal colleagues. How many times, when the Premier has been under great pressure because of the antics of his Federal colleague, has the Premier stood up in this House and strongly supported the Australian Labor Party, irrespective of bad decisions it has made? How often has that happened, and how often has it been to the cost of South Australians when he would not fight against the wine tax, fight for the railways or for a number of other areas in which we wanted South Australia to reach its peak? How often have we wanted him to get out there and fight and to take on the Federal Government head on? He has never done so previously, so why do it now? I can only assume that the *Yes, Minister* syndrome has finally caught up with the Premier. I believe that his Treasury advisers simply found themselves in such a great hole over the diabolical state of his budget that they looked for excuses elsewhere, despite the risk of being exposed.

It has not been the Premier's habit to put himself in a risk situation. Whenever there has been a difficulty the Premier has been found wanting or has found somewhere to hide. On this occasion he has made every effort to sustain the great myth of the $180 million. I can only assume that Treasury has a particular view about the Premier's capabilities as a man of finance. After eight years in Government, Treasury officials must know full well that the Premier is incapable of understanding the finances and therefore can be fed any line.

Indeed, the Premier under these circumstances was fed a line. The truth is now starting to come out. The Treasury officials must have known that some areas under the direct control of the Premier have started to fall apart. Some are not his responsibility but others are. We can hardly blame the Premier for the downturn in stamp duties or for a loss of activity in some other areas involving the responsibility of his Federal colleagues and the economic strategy being pursued in this country.

So, in that respect, if there is any blame it really relates to the Premier's position as Federal President of the ALP and not to his handling of the State economy. That is only one part of the story. The other part of the story is his competence as leader of this State, and that is where we now find that the institutions under his control simply are not performing up to our expectations. Those institutions in this State, in which we have a great deal of faith, are simply not returning to the State budget the level of finance that the taxpayers can justly expect. If we are to benefit from the $88 million from the State Bank, and that is put at grave risk, a large sum of money must be taken out of taxpayers' pockets unless some other forms of savings have been identified. There has been no such identification of savings, so the poor taxpayer will suffer. We have already been given a very clear indication that everything will be up for grabs, whether it be the financial institutions duty, petrol tax, increased revenue from alcohol and tobacco or water rates, which we have already heard about. Every item on the revenue side of the budget will be increased if it is humanly possible.

The Premier must answer for a great deal. Under the circumstances he has taken a very unusual and perilous step in trying to debate via the Supply Bill (No. 2) his capacity as Treasurer. It is so unusual that I went back and looked at the Supply Bills considered in this place over the past eight years. Of course, the only reference in the Supply Bill was to the sum of money involved and to any variation in accounting procedures since the last return was presented. If I were to draw any conclusions from looking back over the past financial results, I would say that there is something drastically wrong; for example, in 1984, for the period from the end of August to November, the Supply Bill (No. 2) involved $390 million. Members will note that in 1990—some six years later—the sum is $1 140 million—a three-fold increase well over double the inflation rate. That is a clear indication to me of the extent to which this Government has spent the taxpayer's dollar, and it has done so without proper accountability.

I need hardly reiterate that I am disappointed that the Premier has used the Supply Bill as a device somehow to muddy the waters in the eyes of the South Australian population; that he has used the occasion as a press event somehow to depreciate the arguments that the Opposition was putting forward; that, again, he has not told the truth in the document he has introduced; that he has got the figures wrong in terms of the recurrent result in the 1989-90 budget; and that he has only revealed but a small part of the total budget outcome. In view of the events that have recently unfolded, it would be difficult for anyone who does not have a clear understanding of budgetary matters to gain any comprehension of the matters being discussed in this Parliament: this is a very difficult matter; it is very difficult to understand the figures, and it is very difficult to comprehend the accounting involved because the accounting practices change year by year.

If there is a plea to be made, let us see if we can put the budget in to a context that the men and women of South Australia can understand and, certainly, in to a context that the financial journalists can appreciate. Despite the Premier's attempt, on the information being provided, to mesmerise the press of this town, he has failed, and the stories he has been telling are not true. It is clear that he has failed

as Treasurer, given the mistakes that have been made in recent days.

I do not need to remind the House that the Premier seems to be absolutely petrified that he will take the blame for what has occurred recently. There have been a number of little slips. Who can accept that the Premier could not remember signing a $300 million loan involving the Victorian State Bank? Who could forget that he decided that, for some reason, Beneficial Finance Company was a publicly listed company and, therefore, could not be subjected to the questioning of this House? This is extraordinary stuff. The cracks have started to appear, and if there is a person responsible—a person who must take responsibility for the budget outcomes—it is the Premier and Treasurer of this State.

I can only request that when he does deliver the budget that he will come clean, that we will not have a change in the accounting practices to muddy the water and that there will be a clear explanation of what has transpired over the past year so that everyone can fully appreciate not only the mismanagement that has taken place but also some of the underlying problems. It would be quite decent of the Premier if he came clean so that the people of South Australia could actually understand some of the difficulties they will have to face.

It would also be rather marvellous if between now and the budget presentation, which will be within almost exactly a week, the Premier reconsidered the question of expenditure so that he does not use the poor old taxpayer of South Australia as his chopping block and does not simply increase taxes in all the areas outlined previously, about which there has been speculation in the press. If the Premier carefully looks at expenditure items and makes a resolution that he will operate a Government that will be absolutely efficient, lean and will save taxpayers money wherever possible, the ultimate cost to the taxpayers, despite this Government's mismanagement, will be minimised.

Obviously, the Opposition supports this Bill, which is simply a money Bill. However, I must express the Opposition's dissatisfaction with the way in which it has been introduced in this place.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour): I move:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for consideration of the Bill.

Mr OSWALD: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I should point out at this stage that I am not the lead speaker. Recently this House was subjected to some sensationalist misrepresentation. I refer to the comments made by the member for Peake in this place on Thursday 8 August 1990 regarding John Shearer Limited.

I am advised that for many years John Shearer Limited was a 'closed' shop. In recent years it was also making huge losses. In 1989, the new management sought to stop the rot. To do so, it needed to be able to employ the best person for the job, who would be productive and contribute to the company's future. The unions were advised of this 'survival' strategy. They were all aware of the losses being suffered by the company and the threat to their members' job security if the company could not trade out of its difficulties. The 'consensus' response from the unions was to call an all-out strike to prevent any change from occurring, and thereby further threatening the job security of their members.

John Shearer Limited was facing extreme financial difficulties; the 10 per cent bounty on locally produced agricultural machinery was then scrapped by the Federal Labor Government 12 months earlier than it had stated, thereby placing further financial pressure on the company which had made contracts at prices which included the bounty. Could anyone blame the board of John Shearers for looking elsewhere to manufacture machinery which, I should add, was designed in Australia, by Australians for Australian conditions? The company was receiving no support from the Federal Labor Government or the labour unions in its attempts to make the company profitable.

The member for Peake must have gained much of his information from that third-rate source. The National Farmers Federation at no time offered John Shearers money to combat the pressures it was under from the Government and the unions. Arbitration Commissioner, Greg Smith, never accused the company of being dishonest in its decision to shut down its Adelaide plant. The member for Peake should check his facts before publicly airing rumours and innuendo.

John Shearer (Holdings) Limited recorded a turn-around of $7.7 million at 30 June 1989, despite the antagonistic and totally unreasonable behaviour of the unions. In real terms the company broke even, after absorbing the losses incurred previously and discounting the bounty which had by then been reinstated, albeit only for those orders completed before 15 June 1990.

An agreement was reached between the Premier, the unions and the company in May 1989 on various matters, including the question of union membership, which was to be handled under the guidance of the Industrial Relations Commission. The unions reneged on the agreement, and then denied its existence, preferring to wage an all-out war on change of any kind within the company. The company rightly brought this union attitude to the attention of the Industrial Relations Commission on 12 November 1989. Meanwhile, it attempted to follow the spirit and intent of Commissioner Smith's decision of August 1989 on union preference at John Shearers.

The member for Peake should note that consensus had been reached. It was the unions which broke this agreement on many occasions and to such an extent that the company formally complained to the Industrial Relations Commission. The structural efficiency changes brought about at John Shearers in February 1990, following the company's initiatives in November 1989, were resisted at every stage by the unions. They fought opportunities for Shearer employees to change their working hours to suit themselves and production requirements; for employees to have one day's annual leave four times a year; and for employees to be given a month's notice of classification changes, instead of seven days. Finally, the commission ratified the changes, because they were to the benefit of the employees and the company.

The economy entered a slump in 1990. The farming industry was one of the first to feel the pinch of high interest rates. Add to that the late rains for seeding, followed by floods in many rural areas, and it is not hard to understand John Shearers telling its casual, fixed employment term workers that no further work was available to them. The member for Peake should note that these casual, seasonal, employees were aware the day they started that they were employed for a fixed period. They knew the exact day that they would cease their employment. That day came on 6 April for 12 of them. They were told that their casual

employment would not be extended beyond the date fixed, and agreed upon, at their commencement. These people, and the shop stewards, did not have seven days notice; they had three months notice!

The member for Peake has misquoted Industrial Relations Commissioners. At the hearing on 17 April 1990 (not the 20th) Deputy President Keogh actually said he was 'disappointed, indeed disgusted, with the manner in which certain actions have been taken'. He referred to the continued negative attitudes, as seemingly reflected by the parties. The commission was criticising both the company and the unions for allowing the situation concerning casuals to get out of hand. However, the company had been meeting the unions during April, advising them and the employees on the state of the market. Recorded dates are 6 April (met unions and advised employees) and 7 April (advised employees of the current situation). The company released press statements on 9 and 19 April that explained the situation. Company officers met the unions on 18 and 19 April. The commission set down 5 May to hear both parties.

On 19 April, 70 John Shearer workers (out of 174 shop floor employees) staged a sit-in. The three union officials demanded reinstatement of all casual employees immediately. The company refused to do so. The commission had set a date for the hearing and that was where the parties should naturally put their arguments. The union officials refused to leave the premises—in fact, they took over a section of the maintenance building and refused to move. When told they were in breach of the award and were required to leave the premises, the officials said 'No.' When the company said it may need to call the police to escort them off, the officials told the company to call them. The police were called. They spoke to the union officials who still refused to move. At 3.30 p.m. a fourth union official crashed through the Share Street gates, parked his car and walked towards the maintenance area. Three police officials intercepted him.

I am advised there was a scuffle. The official was detained by the police. The police went and detained the other officials. At no time did company officials either threaten to have their own employees arrested or to have the 'Dog Squad' and 'Star Force' brought to the property. The member for Peake should have confirmed this with Mike Tumbers, who was advised by the Group Human Resource Manager on the 19th that the company was providing electricity outlets for its employees during the sit-in that night and had no thoughts of removing them or having them arrested. The union officials had breached the award, not the employees.

The unions had decided upon, and advertised in the media, a State-wide strike before the commission hearing on Friday 7 May. The attitude and behaviour on 7 May towards employees at John Shearers was a disgrace and an embarrassment to any person who believes in democracy and freedom of action. Shearer employees were abused in the streets of Kilkenny; female employees were physically mishandled. Staff members (not members of any unions) were submitted to insults and brutish behaviour whilst walking to their vehicles. All this was recorded on video and televised for the world to see. In fact, one union official was so ashamed of his behaviour he later made personal apologies to the female staff.

The House would be well aware that the (supposed) root cause of these disputes was the non-continuance of casual employees in preference to permanent employees, many of whom had been long-serving union members and had resigned from the union in disgust at the behaviour and actions of the officials. On 9 May, D.P. Keogh supported the company's actions and varied the award to make it clear, even to the unions, that a permanent employee must always have preference in employment over a casual employee. The unions had attempted to overturn this long standing industrial/employment practice. On Monday 7 May, Shearer employees voted against going out on strike. This is a matter of record. One wonders whose side the unions are on—not the employees, so it appears.

I now go back to the member for Peake's remarks about consensus and agreements. The facts speak for themselves. Agreements reached with the Premier have been broken and denied by the unions concerned. Recommendations of the Industrial Relations Commission have been ignored by these unions. They blatantly breach award conditions. It is not award rates and pay that have worried people from overseas; it is the thuggish and irresponsible behaviour of the unions that would be the main barrier for establishing a company in South Australia. Even Australian companies manufacturing Australian goods for Australian customers are being harassed and abused by these unions.

The member for Peake cannot stop at one South Australian company. He has also harassed another South Australian company, Arrowcrest, which is the largest metal manufacturing exporter in this country, employing over 500 people. Apparently, the member for Peake's long union background has come to the fore. He cannot abide successful, profitable companies and seeks to prevent constructive Industrial Relations Commission-supported award restructuring to enable struggling Australian companies to survive.

The commission changed the rules, and John Shearer followed the new rules. It is the unions which need to change their dogmatic, unrealistic approach.

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

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I want to make one or two points in the 10 minutes available to me this afternoon to highlight some of the problems with WorkCover in my electorate. The best thing I can do is to refer to one or two letters that clearly set out the problem and the impact that the present WorkCover administration is having on businesses in my district. The first letter is from Loxton Engineering Works and is addressed to the Minister of Labour. A copy was forwarded to me for my information. In his letter the owner of Loxton Engineering Works Pty Ltd highlights the problems with which he was confronted in respect of the increase in the WorkCover levy. He states:

> We are very dissatisfied with the way we have been treated by WorkCover in relation to the increase in our levy from 4.5 to over 6 per cent. When introduced, WorkCover costs were supposed to be calculated to be well covered by the rates, in our case, 4.5 per cent. Recent publicity concerning waste through poor administration and blatant fraud going unchecked alarms and angers this organisation. If these allegations are true, then severe penalties should be used against workers cheating the system and negligent WorkCover officials similar to those existing in the system of employers. Our contribution over the 32 months, since WorkCover was introduced up til 30 May 1990 was $41 418 .86. Our claims paid by Workcover by our records amount to $2 035.51 over the same period. We think an increase from 4.5 to over 6 per cent in these circumstances is wrong.

It is clear that absolutely no consideration has been given to the performance of that company. Obviously, it operates a very safe workplace, and yet it has been severely penalised. The company has paid more than $41 000 in premiums and claims have been just over $2 000, yet its WorkCover premium will increase from 4.5 per cent to more than 6 per cent.

If WorkCover is to have any chance of succeeding and is to have any credibility whatever, there has to be a benefit to employers who operate safe workplaces, especially when

their claims against WorkCover are limited. However, this is not the case. Numerous examples have been forwarded to me over a period clearly indicating that no consideration is given to safe workplaces. The Government, through WorkCover, is just lumping everyone in exactly the same category. But that is not the true position: there are some poorly run companies, as has been stated in this House on numerous occasions. Those companies operating unsafe workplaces should pay a penalty, but certainly not companies that operate safe workplaces. If WorkCover is to have any credibility whatsoever, we must have no-claim bonuses and benefits for those companies that operate safe workplaces. Unless that occurs, more and more companies, especially small companies, will continue to go to the wall in South Australia. When one considers that a comparatively small operation has paid premiums of more than $41 000 in the past 32 months and has made claims totalling only slightly more than $2 000, it has been a significant contribution indeed.

A company's safe workplace record should be recognised in the form of a rebate or concession on the premiums that have to be paid. I have no problem with a company with a poor track record having to pay a penalty on its premium, but that is not the case in this instance. I now cite another instance, Dyer's Transport Pty Ltd of Renmark. The company writes:

> As you are aware of this WorkCover increase, there are one or two points that we are concerned about. One, that our increase is about 100 per cent (4.5 per cent to 8.424 per cent) which is outrageous. Secondly, we see that to protest is fruitless as it has to be on an industry basis.

The rate can be set on an industry basis, but there must be a rebate for those companies that operate efficiently and safely and a penalty for those companies that operate an unsafe workplace. The letter goes on:

> How can I control other firms' behaviour? To cap it off we could be penalised up to 50 per cent for a bad year. Some accidents are beyond management's control because our employees are at times their own masters and also how would we be able to pay a penalty of 50 per cent or budget for it and still be able to continue in business.

That is what it is all about. How can these companies suddenly be confronted with a 100 per cent increase and still remain in business? A great deal of research must be done into this matter. When WorkCover was introduced, the State Government claimed that the scheme would be much better and fairer for all concerned. It certainly has not worked out that way. I only hope that this matter is resolved in the near future and that the burden of unfair penalties on industry and workplaces will be removed.

The second point that I wish to make this afternoon is in relation to the Government's maintaining a vigilant watch on the Murray-Darling system in respect of water quality in South Australia. I noticed in Mildura's *Sunraysia Daily* newspaper recently a notice put in by the First Mildura Irrigation Trust, as follows:

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO CARRY OUT WORKS

BRUCES BEND

> The trust has a 2.66 km length of drain through the northern end of the Kings Billabong Wildlife Reserve. Due to siltation the capacity of the drain has been reduced to the stage where drainage of horticultural properties is in jepoardy.
>
> There is therefore a proposal to desilt the drain commencing Monday 9 July 1990. This matter has been discussed with officers of the Deparment of Conservation and Environement who will oversight proposed works. For further information contact the undersigned at the trust office.

The trust is talking about increasing the rate of drainage water flowing from the Mildura irrigation area directly to the Murray River. This is quite contrary to all the intents and purposes of the Murray Darling Basin Commission, which has made every effort to divert saline drainage water away from the river. I urge the Minister of Water Resources to check on this notice of work to be undertaken by the trust to determine whether or not this work is of a temporary nature, or whether it is regarded as a permanent installation by the trust to divert saline drainage water to the Murray River.

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

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): During the adjournment debate of 14 February (*Hansard* pages 180 and 181) this year I drew the attention of the House to the case of a young constituent of mine who lives at Nuriootpa. Between Christmas and New Year he was bashed over the head with a cricket bat while he was asleep at Edithburgh on Yorke Peninsula. The member for Albert Park on that occasion rightly said that those who had perpetrated this action were cowards, and I believe that every member of this House agreed with that point of view.

After a lot of effort by the parents to put information before the court, they were denied the opportunity to hear the court proceedings against the perpetrator. They were quite horrified that, at the end of the prosecution, the perpetrator walked away with a good behaviour bond and an amount of $650 awarded against him for compensation to be paid to the victim for damages.

In February I indicated that it was high time we apply adult penalties to adult crimes. This lad, who had been before panels on a number of occasions in the past, was let off on a good behaviour bond because he was a first offender. I ask: first offender at what? The charge might well have been murder and certainly should have been attempted murder, because the victim finished up with 38 stitches in and around his head—the damage and danger are obvious.

It is high time that the Government and Parliament looked very seriously at these matters and ensured that adult crimes are met with adult penalties, and that just because a person is young they are not let off on a bond. That is not good enough. This perpetrator had been on bonds on a number of occasions in respect of larceny, breaking and entering and drunkenness as a juvenile, but he was dealt with as a first offender for this particular charge.

The mother of the victim has correctly drawn to the attention of judges in the Juvenile Court and others the problems that have beset her family as a result of the trauma but, as at the end of May (which was my last contact with her), she had received no response. On behalf of my constituents, their neighbours and others who are aware of the situation, I state their genuine concern about the fact that our system is mollycoddling a lot of potentially very violent people in our community by giving them the powder puff treatment when a severe reprimand and/or gaoling, along with a considerable monetary penalty, should have occurred. This might well make them sit up and, at a later stage, become reasonable citizens.

Mr Deputy Speaker, you will appreciate the articles that continue to appear almost weekly in the *Messenger* newspaper circulated in the electorates of Elizabeth, Napier and Light, in which people say they feel as if they are confined to their own homes because they do not dare go out on the streets. Recently a pensioner said that one night he lost the battery out of his motor car, and the very next night damage was done to the paint work and a window of his car when the people returned ostensibly to take the cassette and radio but, because of an alarm, they were deterred; and the car alongside was also vandalised.

This type of situation does not occur only in South Australia; I am not suggesting that at all. However, as members of Parliament we have a responsibility to those we represent to show leadership in respect of the way people are treated by the law. I am very concerned that the Premier, in circulating his infamous document, has sought to make me a political eunuch, the same as the eunuchs who sit behind him in this House. I do not get a mention on this list.

Mr QUIRKE: A point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I am not sure that I like being referred to as a eunuch—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! That is not adequate to sustain a point of order. The Chair does not uphold it. The member for Light.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: It hurts to be shown up, by one's omission, in a document that suggests they do nothing on behalf of their constituents. I resent the fact that I was omitted. Many a time I have made representations to the Minister of Transport, the Premier and others requesting that action be taken to look at the priorities and requirements of my electorate.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The honourable member can think about whether he wants to remain one of those political articles to which I just referred. I raise the matter of the Gawler bypass, on which I made representations to the Minister of Transport a number of times. We are fast approaching the development that is required for stage 4, but the department is quibbling about a run-off which would take traffic back into the Gawler area for an amount of about $250 000 to $300 000. Instead, heavy traffic and a large volume of vehicles will be forced to drive past a high school, a church school and two primary schools. The whole of the western group coming into the Trinity College and Evanston area will be forced to go past the bottom end of the racecourse into a bottleneck.

I have previously lauded in this place and publicly the former Minister of Transport (Geoff Virgo) who undertook a costly change in relation to the Greenock/Nuriootpa bypass because it was likely to save lives. It cost an additional $130 000 and delayed the project by four months, but there has not been a death on what one would otherwise describe as a very serious T-junction corner. I can tell the Minister and the Premier (who left me off his infamous list) that I have no qualms whatsoever about having pressed for that expenditure. Of course, I am not alone in making these requests. I notice that the person who stood for the ALP in my electorate on the past two occasions has also been in the public arena asking for the same thing.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Dead correct.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I thank the member for Napier, because his constituents and mine will be disadvantaged when they try to get into Trinity College.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: You have my full support on that.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I am pleased that I can write to the Premier and the Minister of Transport and point out the extreme importance of ensuring that we construct road junctions that are practical and not death traps. That same ALP candidate recently appeared in the press asking for more money to be spent on police. I applaud his actions. He happens to be the local President of the ALP in Gawler. He does not want to be a political eunuch; he wants to stand up and fight for the people of the Light electorate. I will stand up and fight for the people I represent, and I hope to be on the next list that the Premier puts out.

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Once again I will present to the House the continuing problems of funding for adult literacy programs. Adult literacy courses through the community houses that we all have in our electorates are still at this stage in doubt of funding beyond this September. There are over 24 community houses providing adult literacy programs throughout the State, all of which are at risk because ongoing funding is not guaranteed. Again, in this International Year of Literacy, it is a damning endictment of both Federal and State Labor Governments that they show this inability to address this immense problem with any degree of genuine credibility.

Most people in the community would believe that literacy programs are bountiful and they would be confident that they are being promoted. We continue to be privy to a bombardment of publicity through the media and printed literature, but how much substance is there behind the glossy productions designed once again to promote the facade, the promises made and the directions initiated? But again, apparently, nothing happens. Do they actually hold the substance of reality? It is reality that we need to talk about, because it is real people in all our communities who require assistance with literacy problems.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hartley will come to order.

Mrs KOTZ: In May of this year, one of the printed pamphlets that was promoted throughout the State was called 'TAFE News', a staff journal of the Department of Employment and TAFE. This glossy piece of material has quite a promotional picture on the front, with the headline 'Adult literacy launch'. Part of the promotion within the material says:

> Following the national launching of International Literacy Year (ILY) in Canberra, the South Australian ILY committee held its own launching ceremony for the State program of four seminars to be held over the next four months.
>
> The ceremony was held in the Atrium of the Adelaide College, where College Director Colin Read welcomed Margaret Whitlam, who launched the seminar program. Mrs Whitlam is Chairperson of the National Consultative Council for ILY.
>
> John Steinle, Chairperson of the ILY State committee, outlined the seminar program, and Anne Levy, MLC, representing the Premier, stressed the importance of promoting and supporting literacy programs in our community.
>
> Mike Rann, Minister of Employment and Further Education, announced grants totalling $192 000 for adult education programs in South Australia—

which, in itself, is a cut in funding from $225 000 the previous year. The article continues:

> 75 per cent will go to literacy programs. He said low literacy skills cost Australia $2.2 million per year in lost productivity.

Four further seminars are promoted in this pamphlet. I wonder how much these seminars will actually cost. I wonder what proportion of the 75 per cent will be indulged in in these programs. Seminars can be informative, but I do not believe that they are reaching the people that they need to reach, and that is at the coal face of literacy.

On 12 May, the *Advertiser* published an article headed 'Adult literacy courses axed.' The article states:

> TAFE is poised to scrap basic adult literacy courses from next year. Some colleges have already dropped or cut back on existing programs and others have been forced by local pressure to maintain them until the end of this year. As a result, 1990—International Literacy Year—could go down as the year in which the State dumped responsibility for its adults most in need of help with reading or writing.

It goes on to state:

> TAFE has been the cornerstone of adult literacy courses in South Australia for the past 15 years, both through the provision of classes on campus, and by providing professional training and part-time paid co-ordinators to help volunteers working in community centres. Literacy and numeracy in future will still be taught even at the most basic level in TAFE colleges, but only to

those students who need the skills as part of a vocational training course.

This is likely to exclude many of the people the International Year of Literacy is most intended to reach in developed countries such as Australia—those adults who are too ashamed or embarrassed to admit that they are illiterate.

Migrant women who speak fluent English but read poorly and have never learned to write or spell English correctly are likely to be among the hardest hit, especially those whose Australian-educated, English-literate children have left home. The change had been widely feared and expected by workers in the adult literacy field for some time. It was confirmed by TAFE director of curriculum Dr Geoff Wood when he told a conference of TAFE communications lecturers on Thursday that 'in future there will be less of an emphasis on what has been known as community literacy programs.'

This state of affairs must be condemned. On 18 May the *Advertiser* continued with another update on what was happening in the funding of these courses, as follows:

The South Australian Government has refused to provide additional funds for adult literacy programs this year, International Literacy Year . . . Literacy lobbyist Mr Ross Irvine said the Government had provided less than $200 000 this year, sufficient to continue existing programs for only 20 weeks. Claims that the adult literacy case had been rejected by the State Government at the highest levels were made yesterday the first seminar organised by the South Australian International Literacy Year committee (ILYC).

Mr Irvine, of Morphett Vale, a past governor of Rotary District 952 and a participant in yesterday's seminar said 'John Steinle and I have been lobbying the Bannon Government for quite some time and got "No no no" from everyone'. Mr Steinle, former Director-General of Education, who is Chairman of the State's ILYC, could not be contacted . . . but other ILYC sources confirmed that the Government had rejected the ILYC's appeals.

'John Bannon would not even take it to the Cabinet,' Mr Irvine said. He said they had now despaired of any support from the State Government . . . Many of the 50 plus people attending the seminar . . . were critical of the lack of funding, and of the willingness of the State, local, and Federal Governments to push the responsibility of literacy onto each other. There was particular criticim of the spending of $3 million on the promotion of International Literacy Year by the Federal Government 'while spending nothing on the people who are actually doing something'. Referring to the posters and leaflets promoting the year—

and I am sure we have all seen them coming through the mail in great numbers—

'I get very cross when I see all this stuff because the money should be going to the people who are doing something about it.' One woman who works as a volunteer literacy tutor in a community centre said it was disillusioning to find that there was not even any paper to write on.

One of the community houses adjacent to my area has been one of many that have contacted me complaining about the levels of funding, the problems they are now facing and the needs within their own areas. I would like to read one letter in particular, which comes from the Wynn Vale Community House, as follows:

Dear Mrs Kotz, I was heartened to read in the *North East Leader* that you expressed your concern about the need to raise literacy levels in the north east suburbs this year. I would like to outline the community literacy program for adults at Wynn Vale Community House. In 1989 funding was available from the National Policy on Languages, which allowed training of voluntary tutors to work in community literacy. A program was started at Wynn Vale through a grant from OTE, paying a literacy coordinater for 10 weeks. Further submissions were made, and the next 10 weeks were funded through a grant from SACAL.

By December our program had become well established, with 11 working pairs and further interest expressed. We have established resource material and work in conjunction with literacy programs offered at TAFE. Along with other community literacy programs, we applied for funding for 1990. This we belatedly received at the end of March for one semester only. We have been told that there is very little hope of further funding from this source. There is a need to not only continue this program but to expand it. On a national level, awareness of literacy is being raised this year.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I welcome the opportunity to use this time to talk about matters that I believe should be addressed in the Supply Bill debate. They include the needs of the Neurological Resource Centre at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Many people in the community would not be aware of the wonderful work that these people do. Many of them are volunteers and many are people who have some sort of disability. I will preface my remarks by pointing out that the Neurological Resource Centre was opened by the Hon. Dr John Cornwall in April 1988 with the aim of providing accommodation and administrative support to neurological support groups. I remember vividly attending the opening of this centre, situated directly opposite the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

The role of the Neurological Resource Centre has expanded in response to demands for its services and now aims to provide a comprehensive community resource relating to neurological conditions. The NRC is a unique concept and has attracted interest from both interstate and overseas. The client groups of the NRC consist of individuals with neurological conditions and their families, support groups for people with neurological conditions, people wanting to form support groups, doctors and allied health professionals, relevant community organisations, and groups and individuals in the community.

Some time ago, when speaking with a member of that resource centre, I was astounded to find that a young man in his late twenties, unbeknown to me had a genetic disorder that he had inherited from his father. It rather amazed me, when I was provided with more information on that disorder, as to the sorts of problems that people can encounter because of disorders of this nature. For a number of reasons that I do not wish to have recorded in *Hansard*, I had often wondered why this lad had not married. I now have a pretty good idea. Groups such as this resource centre do wonderful work in the community but are given scant recognition in some areas. Excluding members of Parliament and the Health Commission, I suspect that many people do not know of the resources made available by Governments in conjunction with hospitals. I commend them for the wonderful job they are doing.

Having said that, I recognise that talk is cheap, but what these groups always need is money and additional resources. That is why I have raised this matter. I know that the Minister of Health is a compassionate man, and I hope he will address these issues because, as I said in prefacing my remarks, these people have been so successful that more and more patients are looking to them for assistance. One staff member of the Neurological Resource Centre, a Mrs Trenorden, has looked at American and Canadian groups to see what is being done with neurological self-help, and it would seem from the information provided by her to me that, even services in those countries, which are often looked up to by many Australians, do not match what we have in South Australia. It is a pity that these groups are not given more and more recognition.

I listened intently to what the member for Newland had to say about literacy, and I share some of the views she expressed in relation to those problems. It is a subject in which I have an interest. Many people have a disability, but there are many proud people in the community who, in many cases, do not know to whom they can turn to obtain assistance. There needs to be a heightening of awareness of these particular problems in the community. I have received many leaflets concerning the Neurological Resource Centre at 37 Woodville Road, and one of them refers to the problems of Huntington's disease and mentions genetic counselling. Video recordings are made available to help people understand the problems associated with that disease and many other similar disorders. The Motor Neurone

Society, the Parkinson's Syndrome Society, post-polio support groups, etc., are all involved in this area under the Neurological Resource Centre.

As I have said, I have raised this matter to bring it to the Minister's attention. I know that he has visited the centre and has seen the wonderful work that these people are doing. In some circles, praise is cheap—and I do not refer to the Minister's praise in this regard—but the reality is that the need for money is the issue. I know that money is tight, but the stark reality is that these people are looking for additional resources and they need that assistance because, in my view, they are doing a wonderful job.

The helpers at this centre work 15 to 20 hours overtime each week, and there is a total of about 80 hours voluntary work performed each week. The number of referrals to the centre is escalating as doctors now understand more and more about these problems and refer people for further assistance. Because of the information that is being provided to the community, I hope that the Minister will give favourable consideration to the needs of the Neurological Resource Centre.

The other matter which I will address is one that would concern each member in this place, and that is the need for accommodation and support services for the seriously mentally ill people in our community. The need for crisis accommodation is a problem. The Government has addressed this issue and I understand that work will continue until October, when the matter of accommodation will again be addressed.

I am advised that the problem of accommodation for the mentally ill has been given the highest priority by the South Australian Health Commission and will be considered in relation to the allocation of social justice funds in the 1990-91 budget. People experience severe problems with seriously mentally ill people. I know of one lady in my electorate who lived at Woodville South. She had a son in his forties who was very strong. Because of his mental problem he used to beat her up. When she passed away a year ago it was very sad that his sister had to try to contend with this difficult problem. If this chap did not take his medication he would belt up his sister. We need this sort of accommodation to assist those people who are less fortunate than us.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Goyder.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): First, I wish to direct my comments to taxes and charges and, in particular, fees levied in South Australia. Members will recall that, during the last session of Parliament before the election, the Premier made a big song and dance about keeping fee increases to CPI levels or less. He went to the election giving the same undertaking. Whilst the majority of people in this State clearly voted against the Government, because of the gerrymander the Government was returned. We now see that the Government is going back on its commitments.

I have been very displeased to see various regulations that have come before this House in the past three weeks and to note that so many of the charges and fee increases are not within the CPI. I cite the example of a Crown Lands Act regulation which provides for a charge for the preparation and checking of definitions for proclamations of notices. The fees there are to increase in line with the current Government business philosophy, which allows for the full cost recovery of its activities wherever possible.

Suddenly the Government says, 'We cannot keep charges within the CPI; we have to let them go higher.' So, the Government invents this business philosophy and says, 'We were not talking about that when we promised there would not be charges in excess of the CPI. That is on a different line.' Proposed fees under the Department of Labour are to increase in accordance with increases experienced in the CPI or administrative costs, whichever is greater. So, again the Government says, 'Use the CPI if necessary, but if administration costs are higher I am afraid they have to go up more than the CPI.' So, again there is this second line to the policy statement delivered before the last election.

Yesterday, we heard from the Minister of Water Resources who tried to explain to this House why the Engineering and Water Supply Department was increasing its fees in line with achieving full cost recovery for most services.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

Mr MEIER: The Minister gave an explanation yesterday in this House justifying fee increases, but she does not remember it. The full cost recovery for E & WS services is enunciated clearly in certain regulations. So, we have four different levels of fee increases: those that are kept within the CPI; those that come under the Government's new business philosophy, which will be more than the CPI; those that come under administrative costs if they are greater than the CPI; and those that achieve full cost recovery. This makes a total mockery of promises given by the Premier and I hope that the people of this State recognise that they have had the wool pulled over their eyes yet again—it is despicable.

Recently, I came across an article dealing with tax cuts as a whole. The article was condensed from the *Wall Street Journal* of last year and highlights what has happened in various Third World countries. Most of these Third World countries have borrowed heavily. They have suffered extreme poverty and been unable to pay their debts or raise their standard of living. However, it seems that there is a cure for economic stagnation that works in widely diverse countries. In fact, in 1985, after six years of depression, Bolivia's annual inflation rate was 23 000 per cent and its output per capita, after adjusting for the increase in prices, had fallen by 30 per cent—not a good situation. However, by 1987 inflation had dropped to 10.6 per cent.

That is a significant drop. Within two years it dropped from 23 000 per cent to 10.6 per cent and the economy began expanding at a rate of 2 per cent, despite weak prices for two of Bolivia's main exports—tin and natural gas. How did they do it? I hope the Government listens to this and transmits the message to Canberra as well. The highest income tax rate was reduced to 10 per cent. A budget deficit of almost 36 per cent of gross domestic product in 1984 had virtually vanished by 1986. The Government no longer had to print money to pay its bills.

We could consider the Indian Ocean island of Mauritius, which had a 17.6 per cent unemployment rate six years ago and many people were trying to emigrate. In 1985, Mauritius cut tax rates from 70 per cent to 35 per cent. It also extended the Export Processing Zones with tax advantages—no duties or constraints on investors. Growth of real gross domestic product hit 8 per cent in 1988. The budget deficit dropped, and now the Government says that joblessness has almost been wiped out. In Jamaica, output began falling behind prices in 1974 and continued to drop almost every year to 1985, by which time the top tax rate of 57.5 per cent applied to annual incomes of $3 350. About one-third of the professionals and managers left the country. Then Prime Minister Edward Seaga finally cut the top taxation rate to 33 per cent and reduced customs tariffs. Output grew almost 2 per cent faster than prices in 1986, and by 5.2 per cent in 1987 and .5 per cent in 1988. Inflation

dropped dramatically from almost 26 per cent in 1985 to about 8 per cent in 1988.

Turkey has long suffered rapid inflation, and still does. Its economy was weak until 1985-86, when personal tax rates, which ran from 40 per cent through to 75 per cent in 1981, were reduced to 25 per cent up to 63 per cent and finally to 25 per cent to 50 per cent a year. Since then, economic growth has averaged more than 6 per cent a year. Tax receipts jumped, largely due to increased growth and reduced evasion. That is very important: reduced evasion. The budget deficit fell from close to 6 per cent of gross domestic product in 1984 to less than 4 per cent in 1986.

These examples are merely a small sample. In the 1980s over two dozen countries, including all major industrial countries, have significantly reduced their highest income tax rates. Where the lower rates have been adopted, they have worked, so far. Output has grown, inflation has moderated and budget deficits have declined. No country has lost revenue. Similar supply side reforms have been adopted in only a handful of Latin American or African nations. Yet a 10 per cent tax rate on the most affluent half of the population is bound to yield more revenue than today's punitive tax rates, which typically rise to 50 per cent or more. When a country's budget deficit is financed by printing money and raising tax rates, capital flees, and part of the economy goes underground, reducing tax receipts. To break out of this stagflationary, downward spiral, tax rates must be cut.

I believe that those examples highlight one of the problems that Australia faces currently: our high tax rate. It is time that we tackled it so that more businesses do not leave this State; so that, rather, incentive will be put back into our economy and managers and businesses will come back; and so that we will not lose the professional people whom we have lost and are continuing to lose because of maladministration by Labor Governments, at both the Federal and State levels.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I am very glad to follow the member for Goyder and his discourse on taxation and events in the West Indies and other faraway places because I am sure that it will be very important as far as we are concerned. However, I do know what the Leader of the Opposition's solution is to our tax-raising problems, and I refer members to his Address in Reply speech on Thursday, 9 August. In case my colleagues missed it, and I know that they do not follow every word, I will refresh their memory of what the Leader actually said, as follows:

> The most obvious means of taxation reform is to look at replacing Commonwealth sales tax, which in South Australia raises about $600 million, with a broad-based consumption tax, where the rate is set—

this is a gem—

> by individual States to the extent that it raises more than the sales tax.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Is that their strategy?

Mr FERGUSON: Yes, and I thought what a wonderful strategy it is. Just imagine: an individual broad-based consumption tax put up by each State! Suppose I were a manufacturer of rubber goods in South Australia and I wanted to get them out as cheaply as possible. The best way for me to do that would be to store them in a warehouse in Melbourne and freight them by rail back to South Australia so that I could avoid the State's individual, broad-based tax. What a wonderful idea that would be for manufacturing industries. All they would have to do is put their goods on a truck, a train or a plane, send them over the border—it would not matter which border—and bring them back so that the goods would be absolutely free of sales tax. It might be a way of introducing a manufacturing-led recovery in South Australia.

The inconsistency between the States is the main attraction of the whole deal. It is an absolutely wonderful idea! Quite apart from that, the State would lose money from the Grants Commission because, although it raised extra money from the broad-based consumption tax, it would be a case of swings and roundabouts as far as the Grants Commission is concerned. It would save the Federal Government money, as well.

If a consumption tax is to be introduced, it must be introduced across the board. In order to do that, we need agreement between all the States. That is not an easy task. Trying to get agreement between all the States on a complicated issue such as a consumption tax is pie in the sky. I have been in touch with certain people in the Treasury and I asked them what would be the lowest consumption tax South Australia could impose, given that it would be swapping the Commonwealth for its sales tax. The lowest, effective broad-based consumption tax on sales and services would be levied at 30 per cent.

Mr Groom: What's it going to do to the farmers?

Mr FERGUSON: That is a very good question. The member for Hartley asks: what will it do to the farmers?

Mr MEIER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. The question asked was, 'What will it do to the farmers?' and I think the answer would—

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order. The honourable member will resume his seat. The member for Henley Beach.

Mr FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am attracting some interjections from the other side, so I must be hitting home. We are now talking about a 30 per cent broad-based consumption tax. Can anyone imagine what that will do to the inflation rate? The inflation rate will increase by 10 or 15 per cent on top of the current inflation rate. That means that, with a great deal of effort on our part, we will be able to get back to the inflation rate that was current in Australia when Malcolm Fraser was running the country. That is not a bad way of doing things!

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier does not have the call; the member for Henley Beach has it.

Mr FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. We would have to impose a consumption tax on all those things that are not taxed at the moment, such as foodstuffs and basic things like bread and milk. There are many goods which are now tax free. I know that the member for Goyder is a consistent church-goer. We would even have to tax those things that are now tax free and provided to all the churches. This is one of the reasons why we should look at the introduction of this tax very carefully. Not only that, but schools, Government departments, local councils and charities would all be drawn into this sales tax. Manufacturers who are now receiving a certain percentage of their input of goods which at the moment are tax free would draw this broadly-based—I think this is what the Leader said—consumption tax, so there would be an impost on manufacturers in that way.

In the United Kingdom and in New Zealand—and New Zealand was referred to in the Leader's speech, because he said that we should be introducing a consumption tax, the same as in New Zealand, for goods and services. Here we would be easing the tax burden on the rich and placing a tax burden on the poor. Apart from that, in the Leader's speech there was no mention of being able to compensate pensioners.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): This afternoon I wish to address some distressing circumstances that have come to my notice in one hospital, in particular, but in hospitals around South Australia, in general. The issue of the fate of country hospitals, particularly, and also those hospitals in the near city area is well known to members of this House. As I mentioned in the House previously, I was appalled to find no direction at all given for this important area of health in the Governor's speech. Despite that, I guess we must look constructively at where health is going.

Health provision is not just bed provision, and that is really the topic I will discuss during my speech. In case members opposite have forgotten about bed provision, I remind them that the next date for an orthopaedic clinic appointment at the Royal Adelaide Hospital is 1 March 1991. I also remind them that the first ear, nose and throat appointment at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is January 1991. If the Government members are happy with that, I do not believe they could be classed as at all compassionate.

People with orthopaedic problems and major ear, nose and throat problems are by no means able to wait for those great lengths of time without their lifestyles being affected. I point out that that is just waiting to get on the clinic list: once you have seen the doctor on 1 March 1991, then you go on the waiting list for the bed. As I pointed out, the problem is not just the provision of beds, it is also the provision of support staff. It is particularly that issue I wish to raise this afternoon.

It has been brought to my attention that a number of years ago one of Adelaide's orthopaedic surgeons withdrew his services from one of the near city hospitals because the hospital was unable to afford special after-care after major surgery such as hip replacement. He was recently faced with a pensioner who urgently needed an operation so, rather than have the patient wait until the middle of next year for this operation in Adelaide, he went to the Mount Barker hospital where, although he was not a regular operator, he was allowed to perform the operation.

He was told when he first tried to book the patient in, 'We will let you do it, although we are only allowed to do three joint replacements in this hospital per year.' He then went up to see the patient after the operation and, on going into the post-surgical ward where at least two people were on intravenous therapy, he was unable to find any staff in the ward. He looked for about 20 minutes before finding someone, eventually finding them in the medical ward. The staff in the medical ward said, 'It is not our fault: the person who is on in the surgical ward is, in fact, in casualty at the moment.'

The doctor went down to casualty and got someone to come up to the ward to help him with his post-surgical patient. I remind members that this is not a bunion operation but a hip operation. During the time no-one was in the post-surgical ward because of a staff shortage (which, my information indicates, has been directly attributed by hospital staff to a funding problem), major dramas could have occurred. If someone is on intravenous therapy and the drip 'runs through', to use the vernacular, there is a major problem with air embolus. People with immediately post-surgical conditions have enormous trouble with pulmonary embolus.

These things are not treatable two or three weeks later when someone happens to be walking past the patient—they require emergency treatment. What do we find for this hospital, provided for by the Government (with its health policy) to which no commitment at all has been given in the Governor's speech? We find no staff at all. Why not? It is because of a funding problem. If this Government wants a decent service to be provided in any hospital, it must provide the goods for aftercare—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: The life of the patient depends on that.

Dr ARMITAGE: It is as simple as the member for Light says: the lives of patients depends on aftercare. What does this Government say? Funding problem, do not bother with it. Expenditure on Mount Barker hospital amounted to $2.5 million, and I applaud that, but it is pointless providing beds if we do not provide the aftercare. In the Mount Gambier hospital orthopaedic surgeons are allowed to do only four joint replacements a month because of funding problems. It is an absolutely farcical situation given the collection area of that hospital.

The situation at Mount Barker is only likely to get worse. Why? It is because of the edict that the Gumeracha hospital in particular will not be allowed to carry out any operations under general anaesthesia. This means that there will be a huge increase in the number of operations required at Mount Barker hospital. Where do we go if there is an increase in operations and there is no funding increase? Presumably, this Government sits happily on the fact that it is playing with the lives of post-surgical patients on a daily basis.

Resuscitation and the urgency of stabilisation after medical emergencies are simply too important to put to the side in these sorts of arguments. The only potential that I see for the huge influx of people from Gumeracha who I predict will go to Mount Barker hospital is, as has occurred many times in respect of country hospitals further out; that is, once people have got into their car to travel from the country for medical care, they often by-pass the regional centre and come to Adelaide.

Of course, this will have two further detrimental effects. The Government has already spent $2.5 million on Mount Barker hospital, which may not be used. As to the second detrimental effect, if the patients come to Adelaide, what will that do to orthopaedic appointments? Does that mean that the orthopaedic appointment that I could get at a similar time will be later than 1 March 1991?

I ask the Government to look at these things from the point of view of its much vaunted social justice strategy. I refer to people who live in the country and who for good reason have their operations in excellent country hospitals with dedicated staff who are under pressure. Where is the social justice if, perhaps, their drip runs through or they have a pulmonary embolus and there is simply no-one in the ward to look after them, so that they are at grave risk of death? Why? Because of a funding problem. Where is the social justice? I am led to believe that shortly there will be three orthopaedic surgeons at Mount Barker hospital. They will service that general area and care for patients—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: One hip operation each a year.

Dr ARMITAGE: Precisely—one hip replacement per year.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr ARMITAGE: Three orthopaedic surgeons! How many joint replacements is that hospital allowed to do? I am told that it is three—a stupid situation. Not only is it stupid from the point of view of the people who are serviced by that hospital, but it is also ludicrous because the staff who are there—when they are not underfunded—are inexperienced at handling these major operations. If this Government has any pretensions whatsoever towards providing a

decent hospital service or upholding its own social justice strategy, it must provide better backup.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I must say that I was suitably impressed by the contribution made by my colleague the member for Henley Beach in terms of the Liberal Party's policy on a consumption tax. It is obvious that it is a very regressive and inflationary tax, as was quite properly pointed out by the Premier and by the member for Henley Beach.

When one takes note of the interjections and the manner in which members on the other side got very upset about it, it is obvious that the member for Henley Beach hit more than a raw nerve, to say the least, and I will come back to the question of a raw nerve later. I notice that the member for Custance is taking a great deal of interest in this.

An honourable member: He's leaving the Chamber.

Mr HAMILTON: No, he is not; indeed, he is coming back. I would have thought that a young fellow like him would be most interested in the impact on the farming community, a very good community, I might add, up around Red Hill. It is an area that I wander through quite often and, I must say, they are very generous people.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: What's the road like?

Mr HAMILTON: The road is very good. The next time I walk through there I will certainly call on the local member because his father's property is not far off the main road. I will probably call in for a cup of tea and say, 'Do you remember me from the House of Assembly?'

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: There you are—he is a generous man, as I indicated I thought he would be; I am not disillusioned. I will certainly take up his very kind and charitable offer to drop in and have a cup of tea when I pass through that area in January. For the honourable member's information, it will probably be on about 24 January. So, put in your diary on that day 'Kev's coming for a cuppa.'

Returning to the issue, I think the cartoon in today's *News* was very apt and very appropriate. Stonie's Day deals with consumption tax and shows Dr Hewson going over the hill, and God knows what is on the other side. The caption is: 'He is heading into no-man's land.' I think that is very appropriate. I must say that the saying is true: a picture is worth a thousand words. When I began, I mentioned raw nerves and, in that respect, I must say that I was stunned, if it is possible for the member for Albert Park to be stunned, by the contribution of a person for whom I have great affection, that is, the member for Hayward.

Mr Becker: He is sick.

Mr HAMILTON: I am very sorry to hear that, and I send him my best wishes. That is not said tongue in cheek: I seriously hope that he recovers very quickly. He is crook, as the sincere member for Hanson told me. I hope that the honourable member has a speedy recovery. I looked at his contribution yesterday and, as I said, I have a lot of time for the member for Hayward. I do not really know whether the honourable member had his tongue in his cheek, but yesterday he said:

> My colleagues phoned me because they wanted me to hear about the member for Albert Park's comments on remarks made by the member for Bright in the Chamber in relation to law and order.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Where was he when they phoned him?

Mr HAMILTON: He was in hospital.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: And they worried him; they troubled him?

Mr HAMILTON: I am at a loss to understand why. I just wonder whether it was some bizarre act or whether it was done to brighten up his day. I just wonder about their motive—the mind boggles. If I were in hospital and the member for Henley Beach telephoned me and said, 'Did you hear about the member for Bright's contribution?', I know what I would be telling him—it would not be printable, I can tell you that. Quite frankly, to ring a colleague in hospital—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: When he is dying.

Mr HAMILTON: I hope not—when he is sick and say, 'Did you hear about the member for Albert Park's contribution?', really, I must say, is one of the most bizarre things that has ever been directed at the member for Albert Park. I am a big boy in more ways than one. I am tall and I used to carry a bit of weight around but I walked it off, but, really, to attribute words to me to the effect that I bully people surprises me and I must say that I am a little hurt. When I first came to this place, I was very young and had a lot to learn, and still have, as members will appreciate, about a whole range of things, but I was given gratuitous advice by the then member for Davenport, I think it was, who said, 'Now listen here, son, you interject too much.' Well, I know that no-one in this place agrees that the member for Albert Park interjects too much.

I return to the point that to ring up a colleague who is in hospital and talk about my contribution is not on. I do not know whether his contributions was made to brighten up his day; that is a bit of a misnomer. Anyway, this remark was about my contribution dealing with law and order. The honourable member says that I talk about law and order issues almost daily. I make no apology for that, nor will I ever do so.

I must say this with some levity, Sir, but I did not know whether yesterday's contribution by the member for Fisher was fair dinkum. At first I thought it was an attempt at levity, but I did not really know. They should have dug out one of his speeches and sent that to the member for Hayward! It sounded like screaming Lord Such when I heard it yesterday.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I am saying this with some levity, Sir; the member for Mitcham is taking me too seriously. In this place adults are supposedly able to dish it out and take it. I learnt that very quickly from the Hon. Des Corcoran, who once told me, when I was in Opposition and when I was very angry about a contribution of the then member for Henley Beach, that you do not take it outside the Chamber. I agree with him, and I do not intend to take these sorts of matters outside the Chamber. For people to get so upset—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: No, physical violence does not achieve anything. I know that the Speaker would not permit that. Having some ability in that area, he would, I think, restrain me from doing that. To ring up a colleague when they are in hospital and say, 'Did you hear what the member for Albert Park said about the member for Bright?', is one of the most bizarre things I have heard in my life. He is only a boy; he has only been here for a very short time. For Kev to get stuck into him like that is really beyond the pale!

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I draw the honourable member's attention to Standing Order 128 and ask that he read it very diligently.

The SPEAKER: I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that he does not pass instructions on to another honourable member. There is no point of order.

Mr HAMILTON: As I said, if you dish it out in this place you have to cop it. All of us at some time or another become a bit sensitive about issues that are directed towards us. I do not believe we would be in this place if we did not have strong feelings on some issues. But, I think it goes beyond the pale to harass a colleague when they are sick. Seriously, I do not know what possessed my friend, the member for Hayward—and I think he is a nice chap—to raise that matter in the Parliament. For him to carry on in that manner amazes me. Despite the fact that he said it with some heat, I do not believe that he was fair dinkum. Fancy being harassed in hospital! I rest my case.

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): After the contribution from the member for Albert Park, I will try to bring a little more decorum back to this place and concentrate on a subject that is a little more serious. I am delighted that the Minister for Environment and Planning is here to hear me speak tonight because the matter that I intend to raise—the construction that is affectionately known by locals as 'Telecom Towers'—is one about which, I am sure, she will be equally as concerned as I am.

For the benefit of those members who have never heard of Telecom Towers, I will briefly explain what they are. The towers are a structure some 20 or 30 metres high, with a platform on the top and a number of antennae surrounding them. They are constructed to support the Telecom cellular mobile telephone network. Many members would ask, 'Well, so what? Mobile telephones are a good thing. They are helping the business community.' Many members perhaps use them and they can be a good thing for the State. However, there is a concern about the tower structures.

Perhaps members could imagine the ultimate picture when all those towers are in place. To help them visualise that picture, I would like to quote from a letter of one of my constituents, Mr John Docking, who actually sent this letter to the *Advertiser*, but regrettably it was not published. The letter states:

> Telecom's recently revealed plan to build some 30 transmitting towers throughout metropolitan Adelaide in support of their cellular 'phone network, beginning in the suburbs of Port Adelaide, Highgate, Modbury, Dulwich/Rose Park, Brighton, West Lakes, Glenelg, Elizabeth and Pasadena (Beverley and Glynde already built), brings with it the potential for major health risks from exposure to electromagnetic radiation. Indeed, Telecom's Regional Engineer, Mobile Networks, S.A. & N.T., when asked about the associated health risks has said, 'We're not going to give a guarantee; that'd be dishonest'.
>
> Telecom are having CSIRO (Applied Physics) test the radiation emanating from certain towers. These tests are being conducted to ascertain radiation levels are within limits as defined in Australian Standard 2772 (maximum exposure Levels—300 kHz to 300 GHz). This standard includes these words, '... However, whilst this 10-fold reduction may be adequate for a group of individuals which is subject to control and surveillance as far as radiation exposure is concerned, it may not be adequate for uncontrolled groups such as members of the public. A lower value may be warranted on various grounds including the greater variation in size, physique and age when compared to workers'.

I was interested when I obtained a copy of this letter, because the credentials of my constituent are in fact quite lengthy. The gentleman is actually an expert in weapons design. To give members some idea of the calibre of his experience, he has actually designed a missile that intercepts the Exocet missile that was used in the Falklands war. I understand that he has a contract with the United States Armed Forces. In completing part of his work, he has been involved in the testing of the effect of electromagnetic radiation on military weapons as they move through capital cities.

When someone with those sorts of qualifications expresses concern about particular structures being erected in our city, I thought it warranted investigation. The towers themselves emit an electromagnetic radiation, and I understand from tests conducted by Telecom that electromagnetic radiation in isolation does not cause a problem. It is important to put on record that individual towers do not cause a problem. However, other things within our city also emit electromagnetic radiation. The Telecom towers on top of those other things are increasing that tolerance level. I remind members of the numerous articles that warn of the dangers of cancer through electromagnetic radiation. For the benefit of members, I would like to quote from a book entitled '*Electromagnetism and Life*' by Robert O. Becker MD and Andrew A. Marino PhD, published by the State University of New York Press. The flap of the book states:

> Modern technology has been advancing so rapidly that adequate opportunity for cautionary investigations of the biological effects of the accompanying electromagnetic fields has been unavailable. Now, belatedly, scientists and the public must be told that the diverse electromagnetic advances have not come free; they are mixed blessings. And while science and industry vigorously promote the benefits of their products, far too little attention has been devoted to side effects that are not only often less than beneficial, but even harmful.

With the threat of one of those structures being constructed in my electorate, I decided to investigate these towers a little further. I found not only that one was to be constructed in my electorate but also that there were to be many others. At this stage, 30 towers are proposed in metropolitan Adelaide. Those 30 towers will be spaced at intervals of three kilometres throughout our entire city and, at the same time, towers are being built in Sydney, Perth, Brisbane and, in fact, all our other capital cities.

Add to that the possibility of what could happen when competitors enter the mobile network field. At the moment, I understand that Telecom uses an analog system. However, overseas, a digital system is used which has the capacity to attract even more subscribers than the analog system. The digital system is incompatible with the analog system and requires a different tower structure, once again spaced at about three kilometre intervals.

I ask members to picture 20 metre or 30 metre high towers spaced at 1.5 kilometre intervals throughout the entire City of Adelaide. Consider not only the visual nightmare that could be brought about by that structure but also the potential added health risks. I do not want to introduce scare tactics to this debate because, as I said, in isolation the towers are quite harmless. They fall well within the Australian standard. I am concerned about the net effect of all those towers, plus those things within our city that already emit electromagnetic radiation. It is something that I believe has not been considered in sufficient detail, and I am concerned that the visual environmental aspect has not been considered in sufficient detail, either.

Being concerned about these matters, I wrote to the Minister for Environment and Planning about the visual aspects. Regrettably, the Minister was away at the time, but the Acting Minister replied on her behalf. One paragraph of the letter that I received is as follows:

> I can appreciate concerns about the proposed tower at Brighton; however, Telecom is a Commonwealth Government department, and as you know is not subject to the South Australian planning system. I understand Telecom has a policy of consulting councils, in relation to the location of each proposed tower. Telecom has consulted Brighton council on the proposed tower and, recently, a public meeting was held on 30 May 1990 attended by both council and Telecom representatives.

I was aware of that meeting, because I actually chaired it. The meeting actually resolved that the tower should not be constructed in a residential area but should be constructed

at a site away from housing for both visual and potential health-related reasons. However, when speaking to the South Australian and Northern Territory Manager of the Telecom Mobile Network, I was shown a letter signed by the Director of the Department of Environment and Planning which gave the concurrence of that department to the construction of the tower on Hartley Road.

So, while the Acting Minister wrote back to me saying there was actually no State jurisdiction over this matter, the department had looked at it and replied, 'We have no objection.' It causes me some concern that this matter has not been aired before. It is certainly a matter that needs to be considered. I agree that it is a matter in which the Federal Minister needs to be involved and I hope that the Federal Government, in conjunction with this State Government, will consider the regulations under Environment Protection, (Impact of Proposed Development) administrative procedures. Certainly, there is provision in that for an environmental impact statement but, to my knowledge, that has not been done.

As a result of some of the media publicity that has occurred over this issue, I have had contact with a number of groups in New South Wales and they, too, are having problems. They received the most amazing document from Telecom Property Services which looks at a tower that has actually been constructed in Carlingford. The document refers to all sorts of ways of screening a tower, including: turning it into a flagpole; turning it into an artificial tree by screwing on metal arms—in fact, an artificial Norfolk pine 30 metres high; and putting up a lattice around the tower and growing vegetation around it. It suggests all these wonderful ways to hide it. Telecom in South Australia has been promulgating photographs of towers with native flora in the foreground so that you, too, would want one of these 30 metre monstrosities in your back yard! Clearly, it is something that needs to be looked at.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 21 August at 2 p.m.