

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 22 August 1991

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

WATERWORKS (RATING) REPEAL BILL

The **Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to repeal the Waterworks (Rating) Amendment Act 1991 and for related purposes. Read a first time.

The **Hon. D.C. WOTTON**: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The new water rating system has aroused the anger and concern of a large section of the community, and is it any wonder when we consider that it perpetuates a tax on the family home? The new system also incorporates a retrospective charge in the transition to the new system, resulting in people paying twice for the same water, and elderly citizens, pensioners and people on fixed incomes, as well as young families battling high mortgage rates, will be severely affected by this iniquitous system.

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order! There is too much background noise.

The **Hon. D.C. WOTTON**: The variable charge payment, about which we have heard so much concern in respect of all properties valued about \$117 000, is nothing less than a property tax that bears no relationship to the supply of water. It is a barefaced means of raising revenue to offset lower charges on other properties and a clumsy attempt at so-called social justice. Where is the justice for home owners who have built up their properties, with justifiable pride, over a lifetime? Not all the owners of higher valued properties are wealthy. This imposition will hit many elderly residents, who are not entitled to a rebate from the E&WS Department. Young families battling high mortgages will also be affected by this tax.

The retrospective element of the system is not just that the price of water was increased as far back as December 1990. The point is that allowances were drastically reduced from then, but the compensating reduction in the quarterly charge did not have effect until 1 July 1991—that amounts to double charging.

Legal advice obtained by the Liberal Party indicates that the Government may be illegally charging water consumers excess water rates by forcing people to pay twice for the same water. We have questioned the suitability of Crown Law providing an opinion to the Government on this matter considering its initial involvement in the drawing up of the offending legislation. The Minister's refusal to obtain an independent legal opinion means that it is left to the community to consider a challenge in the court to determine the legality of the new system.

The Opposition strongly opposed the legislation which provided for this new system, despite the views to the contrary expressed by some E&WS officers answering telephone inquiries in recent times. We foreshadowed during the debate many of the problems now widely recognised. The Democrats supported the legislation in another place on the basis that it was a conservation measure. I certainly recognise the need for appropriate measures to be introduced in this State in support of the need to conserve water. The Minister has suggested that the only alternative to this

system as a conservation measure is the expenditure of some \$200 million on a new Murray River pipeline.

But what is the Government doing to give a higher priority regarding the need to implement a program to reuse storm water as a resource? What is the Government doing to make it easier for people to put in their own rain-water tanks and in relation to the many other measures that we can take to conserve water? Conservation of water is a very important matter in this State. However, this issue is not about conservation: it is about fairness and equity.

The recent desperate move by the Government to engage a leading public relations firm to defuse, at a cost of some \$60 000-plus, the public backlash against the new system is a further expenditure of taxpayers' money that should not have been necessary. The Minister has constantly stated that 84 per cent of consumers will be as well off, if not better off, under the new system. The Opposition strongly disputes this statistic, which grossly misrepresents the current situation.

Members would now be aware that the Burnside council has decided to challenge the accuracy of the claims made by the E&WS Department that '84 per cent of Adelaide families will pay no more (some will pay a lot less)' under the new water rating system. The challenge of the Burnside council has been forwarded to the Advertising Standards Council for its opinion as to whether or not it is in breach of the Code of Ethics.

The user-pays principle is generally accepted by the community—so long as provisions exist for essential services to be available to all who need them without fear of being unable to pay in full. Why does the Government see fit to distort this principle by seizing an opportunity to bleed more from those who happen to live in houses worth more than \$117 000? Any reasonable measure to contain usage of water will attract full community support so long as it is fairly applied. People do not mind paying their fair share—but they do not like paying someone else's.

The intent of this legislation is to revert the present water rating system to the previous format. I realise that the previous system was not without fault. The reason for my taking this action, however, is to provide the opportunity for the Minister to introduce a fairer system, based on a true user-pays principle, with tariff adjustment provided to eliminate annual retrospective charging. If ETSA can do it, so can the E&WS Department.

In recent weeks, I have received a massive amount of correspondence from people within the metropolitan area as well as in country areas of this State. I should like to provide the opportunity for all members on the other side of the House to read that correspondence.

The **Hon. T.H. Hemmings**: I've had one inquiry.

The **Hon. D.C. WOTTON**: If the member for Napier has received one inquiry, as I pointed out to the House the other day, it shows how very much out of touch he is with his own electorate. I should like to provide the opportunity for members opposite to go through the correspondence that I received, so that they can see for themselves just how much concern there is in the community. They would be very welcome to do that. It is impossible to provide to the House a full cross-section of the representations I have received, but I will try by referring to two letters.

Mr Ferguson: We knew you would!

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The member for Heysen will resume his seat. The members for Napier and Henley Beach have had a fairly good run this week in this Parliament. I draw their attention to the Standing Orders and would ask them to comply with those Standing Orders, otherwise the Chair may have to take some action.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Both letters are short, and I will read them into *Hansard*. They are copies of letters written to the Minister of Water Resources. The first letter states:

I wish to add my protest to those already voiced regarding the new system of assessing water rates. My husband and I have struggled for years to establish and maintain a nice home and garden, and feel we are being penalised for our efforts. We are now age pensioners and feel that it is unfair that, while we pay extra because our house is assessed as over the limit on the average house, we are only allowed the same amount of water as a single person living in a home unit with little or no garden area. We trust you will reconsider this unfair tax, which affects so many people.

An honourable member: What's the address?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It is from a person living in Manningham. I refer to another letter from a couple in St Peters, which I understand is in the electorate of Norwood. The letter states:

Dear Minister,

It is with great anger and frustration that we write to you over the new water rating system. Where is the sense in it and where is the logic in it? The elderly couple who happen to live in a unit in a so called 'affluent area' and who are struggling to make ends meet, probably on a pension, consume water in excess of 136 kilolitres and in theory are supporting the family of six living in a property of lower value who basically have no incentive to conserve their water usage because they will not be paying the same for it. And your Government refuses to call it a 'wealth tax'!

We feel we fit into the 'average' family category, the people that your Government is hurting the most—we struggle to make ends meet with both parents working, a mortgage to pay off, a small business to run and three children to educate. What aggravates us the most is that we do watch our water consumption—we have a rainwater tank and two years ago put down a bore, the water from which does all our garden. Only once have we had a very small excess water bill . . . but now even though we are careful consumers we will be paying and supporting those who do not happen to have St Peters, or North Adelaide, or Norwood as their residential address.

By all means introduce a user pays system—but every user pays the same per kilolitre regardless of their property value. Basically your system stinks and the very marginal seat of Norwood has now lost two Labor voters. We look forward to your reply but do not expect a stock standard letter giving the impression that this letter has been read and filed as just another complaint.

That letter very clearly portrays the attitude of a large number of people in the electorate presently—people who are watching their water consumption, doing the right thing and have families facing increased costs, taxes and charges in this State as a result of the Bannon Government's mismanagement of finances. These people have every right to express a grievance regarding the new water rating system. I support entirely what those people have said.

Members opposite have asked what a Liberal Government would do. I have had some discussions with officers of the E&WS regarding alternative schemes, but my Party would ensure that the department worked from a base with a differential between residential and commercial properties, and in country areas it would be necessary to have a differential between residential and rural properties. It would also be necessary to ensure that rebates were available to the disadvantaged, to those on pensions and so on. The system that the Liberal Party supports would be based on a true user-pays system. That is what the people of South Australia are requesting, and that is what we want to deliver. I commend the Bill to the House.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the Act to come into operation on 28 March 1991. Clause 3 repeals the Waterworks (Rating) Amendment Act 1991. Clause 4 is a transitional clause. Money paid to the Minister for the time being administering the Waterwork Act 1932 in respect of rates for the 1991-92 financial year which became due under

that Act before the date of the Governor's assent to this Act or which were expected to become due under that Act at some later date will be taken to have been paid on account of rates fixed by the Minister under that Act in respect of that financial year on or after the date of the Governor's assent to this Act, and any amount paid in excess of the amount of those last mentioned rates is a debt due by the Minister to the person who made the payment.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

UNITED STATES WHEAT SUBSIDIES

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I move:

That this House supports the action by the Australian Government over its strong criticism of the United States Government's decision to further undermine the viability of Australian wheat farmers by subsidising that country's wheat exports to China and the Yemen.

When I first approached the Minister of Agriculture and told him that I intended to place this motion before the House, he, knowing my interest in all things agricultural, said that it was a damn good idea but what a pity that it had not emanated from the other side of the House. Funnily enough, while I was visiting Yorke Peninsula last weekend I spoke to some of my farming friends and they expressed the same sentiment.

In fact, one old gentleman said to me, 'Terry, we like you as a person but we certainly do not like the politics that you ascribe to, and we certainly do not like the politics that are coming out of Canberra.' He then said, 'Bugger me'—and I apologise for saying those words, but they are the words he used—'why is it always your lot who take the running on dealing with the Yanks who are trying to cut our throats? Why can't one of ours, for once, take up our cause? What's young John'—and he was there referring to the member for Goyder—'doing in this regard?'

I informed the gentleman that the member for Custance had told me that he would second the motion, and I thank the honourable member for that. I also told him that in the Address in Reply debate the member for Eyre had made a very good speech on exactly the same subject. In fact, I think that the member for Eyre's contribution really provided me with the framework for some of the things that I will say in support of this motion. I also made the point that the member for Goyder was at this moment very active in promoting catfish farming and that perhaps he could not spend the time on the problems of the—

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, the motion is about wheat sales. The honourable member is straying from that subject and I ask that you rule on relevance, Sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sure that the member for Napier will return to the subject of his motion.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Sir, I thought that I was leading up to the problem with the viability of Australian wheat farmers, but that stupid point of order—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member return to the topic of his motion.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I do not know whether or not I satisfied that farmer. I am not here to score political points over members opposite. It has never been my policy to engage in the practice of point scoring over members opposite, nor will it be as long as I remain in this Chamber. I am sure that this farmer did not just conjure up what he had to say for my benefit. I am sure he is saying it all around Yorke Peninsula. However, it just underlines the

frustration that some of these people in the rural community are feeling at the moment not only because of interest rates and all the other aspects of the economic situation that this country is facing but also, on top of that, because the American Government and the European community are engaging in a subsidy war which is affecting some 45 000 wheat farmers in this country. I can understand that frustration.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I will ignore interjections from members opposite. I represent a seat which neighbours yours, Mr Deputy Speaker, and, because we are considered to be in the urban part of South Australia, members opposite suggest that we do not care about or have any knowledge of rural matters. I remind the member for Bragg that I do care about the farming community, as I care about all people in this country who are suffering at this moment.

Some 75 per cent of those 45 000 Australian wheat farmers will return a negative income this year. That can be sheeted home directly to the effects of the subsidies on the world export market. Let me outline step by step what has happened concerning the vicious subsidy war over the past few years in the world market. It is a war where the casualties are some 34 000 farmers—and for the benefit of members opposite, that figure of 34 000 represents 75 per cent of our 45 000 wheat farmers—plus the countless thousands who depend on the wheat industry for their living. No-one can quantify the countless thousands who are suffering as a result of the decisions being made in Washington and Brussels. We are the casualties.

In 1990-91 there was a record world wheat crop largely due to the existence of subsidies which induced greater production than would otherwise have been the case. Approximately 597 million tonnes was produced and, in conjunction with the export subsidies of the United States and European community, this resulted in severe reductions in world wheat prices. The Australian Wheat Board's national pool return before charges for 1990-91 is estimated at about \$120 per tonne, down from approximately \$180 per tonne the previous year. Given expectations that the world wheat crop in 1991-92 would be some 33 million tonnes less than that in 1990-91, significant price increases were forecast, with the Australian Bureau of Agriculture and Resources Economics predicting in June 1991 a pool return for that year of \$148 per tonne.

However, subsidised sales from the United States and the European economy have depressed world wheat prices. The Australian Wheat Board has estimated a pool return for 1991-92 of about \$130 per tonne, just \$10 per tonne above last season's low return.

In June, Australia protested to the United States about its decision to sell 100 000 tonnes of subsidised wheat to Kuwait. The Middle East, as we well know, is regarded as a traditional market for Australian wheat. In July 1991 it was announced that the United States had given a near record subsidy on a 125 000 tonne wheat sale to Algeria, further dimming hopes of an end to the trade war that has depressed world wheat prices since last season.

The sale price to Algeria was reported as a free on board equivalent of around \$US70 per tonne and incorporated a 'bonus' under the United States export enhancement program of \$US52.86 per tonne. That subsidy was reported to be just short of the then record subsidy of \$US55 per tonne given to Tunisia last October. That United States move followed a reported sale of 1.5 million tonnes of French wheat to China at about \$US75 per tonne also in July 1991. I am sure the member for Culance is well aware of the facts I am citing.

This price compares with the Australian Wheat Board's 'card' export price on 6 August 1991 of \$US133.50 per tonne free on board for August delivery. This card price is the asking price by the Australian Wheat Board in its traditional markets that have not been directly affected by subsidised European community or United States sales. This sale by the European community was at a significant discount below recent subsidised sales to China by the European community of over \$US80 per tonne. China is one of Australia's most important wheat customers, buying 1.2 million tonnes in 1989-90, representing some 11 per cent of Australia's wheat exports.

Responding to that European community sale, the United States sold a reported million tonnes of subsidised wheat to China, also at around \$US75 per tonne which represented an effective subsidy of almost \$US52 per tonne. No wonder the Australian farmers are saying we need some help.

On 6 August this year it was announced that the United States had offered 300 000 tonnes of subsidised wheat to the Yemen. In 1989-90 the Yemen Arab Republic imported 321 000 tonnes of Australian wheat and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen 126 000 tonnes. Also, further wheat sales have been made by the United States to Algeria at around half the unsubsidised world price. The deal for 300 000 tonnes was made at \$US64.50 per tonne and attracted a record \$US65.55 per tonne subsidy.

The world is going crazy, and that was one of the comments made by the member for Eyre during his speech in the Address in Reply. He made a very pertinent comment; he said that the Australian farmers want a fair go. The Australian wheat farmers realise that, on the tax base that we have in this country, Australian Federal and State Governments cannot provide the subsidies that are being provided by the United States Government and the European community. What the member for Eyre was saying—and I endorse that—is that they want a fair go. If they were given a fair go on a level playing field, the Australian wheat farmers could compete with any other farmers in the world. At the moment, because of those vicious subsidies, the Australian farmers cannot compete.

The end of the story (but one would like to think that eventually the European community and the United States Government would come to their senses and get rid of those subsidies) is that the wheat industry throughout the world will be in chaos. By that time, so many wheat farmers would have gone to the wall, walked off their land or been foreclosed on by the bank that it would take a decade for them to get back on their feet. The Federal Minister for Trade and Overseas Development (Hon. Neal Blewett) summed up the whole tragedy in Federal Parliament on 18 February this year when he said:

Australia is not prepared to remain silent whilst its farmers are victims of this iniquitous transatlantic trade war. Nothing so undermines the excellent relations between our two countries than the damage inflicted on our farmers and our economy by the use of an accelerating export enhancement program.

It is good to see our Federal Minister, who happens to be my own Federal member, saying those words in the Federal Parliament. Other members have been equally critical. Under the heading "Hostile" US Slam by Evans' the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade in the Senate said:

This is an act, not of any ally or even of a friend, it is the act in effect of a hostile country.

The report continues:

He said the United States was clear on Australia's own opinion of the sales, and there was no reason to behave like 'yobbos or grovellers' to reinforce that opinion.

Mr Crean, the Federal Minister for Primary Industries and Energy, has made similar comments. Bearing in mind that

on Mr Crean's appointment a lot of criticism was made because he came from the trade union movement. I think the Federal Minister is proving to the people of South Australia that he can serve farmers as well as he can serve the trade union movement. I would like to think that the farming industry is grateful for what Mr Crean is saying.

What was the reaction of the Federal Liberal Party to those statements made by Mr Blewett, Mr Crean and Senator Evans? The only reaction I have been able to glean from the newspaper—and I may be wrong—is that only one person actually spoke up—Mr Chapman. He did not actually speak up in support of the Federal Ministers: he attacked the Federal Ministers. He attacked the Federal Government, and he attacked the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke. He said:

If the Prime Minister cannot stand up to George Bush on this matter—which affects the very livelihood of Australian farmers—he should stand down and let someone with a less sycophantic attitude to America do the job.

The farmers do not want to hear that from Mr Chapman: they want to hear some positive support. I have searched also for comment from the other partner in the Coalition, the National Party, which had nothing to say about the subsidy war.

Mr Blacker interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I am not saying that about the member for Flinders. The member for Flinders, in this State Parliament, and most likely in his local paper and through other avenues to which he has access, has decried the actions of the United States Government. My criticism is not directed not at the member for Flinders but at his national counterpart. To my knowledge, the Federal National Party has said nothing.

As I said earlier, the member for Custance has agreed with this motion, and I am sure that when he stands up he can utilise his rural expertise in support of it. I look forward to hearing that contribution. I look forward to this motion having a speedy passage through this House so that the United States Government can know exactly what the State of South Australia thinks about its vicious subsidy war.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I have pleasure in supporting this motion, which was put so capably by the member for Napier. It is encouraging to see the member for Napier making such a good speech. It is a pity that he ruined it by using blatant politics in criticising the shadow Minister, because that shadow Minister has worked particularly hard in this area. I welcome very much an attempt to have a bipartisan approach on this very important issue. It is not an issue with which any of us can play politics—not at all.

If it had been my motion, I may have included the EEC, but the member for Napier said that we on this side have not put anything forward. The motion was moved on day one and the Opposition noted that it was there. We are quite prepared to give the Government the running on this issue so that we can have a bipartisan approach. If we had done it the opposite way around, I do not know whether it would have happened.

However, the Opposition gives its total support to this motion to enable whatever can be done to solve this problem. I appreciate the figures given today by the member for Napier and I would like to study them. I therefore seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SOVIET UNION

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, as an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House is present, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

Mr FERGUSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I support the suspension, but this is not the time for a Party debate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FERGUSON: This is private members' time, and no consultation has taken place.

The SPEAKER: Order! I understand what the honourable member is saying. However, the House has made a decision, and the House is always in control of its own business. The House has decided to suspend Standing Orders and I will follow the direction of the House.

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The question is that Standing Orders be suspended.

Motion carried.

Mr BRINDAL: I move:

That this Parliament rejoices in the deliverance of the constitutional Government of the Soviet Union from the communist *coup d'etat*.

I appreciate that this is private members' time, but this is a private members' motion. I have not asked the House to take this step lightly. As you, Mr Speaker, so rightly say, the House has expressed its will on this matter. I do not intend to detain the House for long on this matter. The motion speaks for itself, and I hope that all members in this House will support it.

We live in interesting times, to quote an author, and, in fact, in momentous times. The events of the past four days could not have gone unnoticed by any person in our society. I move this motion because, as a member of a parliamentary democracy, I am proud of what appears to have happened in the USSR. A number of days ago we saw an illegal and unconstitutional seizure of power by a ruling clique in the USSR. It appears that, because of the use of parliamentary democracy and the Parliament in Russia, that unconstitutional seizure of power has been thwarted and the people of the USSR will again enjoy the increasing freedom that they were winning for themselves. I believe that this is to be applauded. I ask all members of the House to support this motion.

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Mr Speaker, these are special times. As a student of the February 1917 Russian revolution, the October 1917 coup and the Russian Civil War, I consider that the past 12 hours have been amongst the happiest in my life. I think it was the Polish historian, Leszek Kolakowski, who said that anyone who is a student of the Russian language or of Russian history will almost inevitably be an anti-communist. I am quite happy to take on that title.

The rule of Bolshevism in Russia started in October 1917 with a warship threatening to blow away the first Russian Parliament, or Duma, elected on a broad franchise. Bolshevism has now ended, with army tanks unable to drive the first Russian President to be elected from the Russian Parliament building. I would say that communism is now as dead as National Socialism, that is, as in Nazism. This is a

moment to remember the tens of millions of people murdered in the prisons of Dzerzhinsky's CHEKA, starved in the Ukraine famine and shot with a single bullet each in the great purges of the 1930s.

Images of the last couple of days will live in my mind for ever: the priests blessing the crowds outside the Russian Parliament and the 400 000 people outside the Winter Palace in St Petersburg where, I guess, modern revolution started in Russia in 1905. We can now look forward to independence for Lithuania, Moldavia, Estonia, Latvia, Georgia and Armenia. This is the last great stage in decolonisation. It remains only to be said that we should give thanks to Almighty God for delivering his people.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology): I rise in support of the motion, notwithstanding that it is unfortunate that the arrangements were not able to be made more appropriately for this matter to be dealt with. Nevertheless, it is enormously exciting to all members of this place, regardless of Party, that the coup attempt in the Soviet Union has failed.

However, while I am very pleased that is the case and while I support the motion, I do not fully support that aspect of the motion which talks about the deliverance of the constitutional Government of the Soviet Union, because I do not at this stage accept there is in fact what we might regard as proper constitutional government in the Soviet Union. I think that many things still need to be done in the Soviet Union. Along the path that has been followed over the past few years of democratisation and liberalisation and tearing away of the constitutional fraud that had taken place in that false federation over previous decades, much, but not everything, has been achieved. There is still a lot more to be done if there is to be what can truly be called a constitutional government arrangement in the Soviet Union or its various republics.

For example, one thing that has not yet been resolved is the signing of the new union agreement. I very much hope that that will be back on the agenda. I very much hope that there will be no attempt by some in the aftermath of the failure of the coup to say, 'Maybe this is not the time for change; maybe we should just ease up a bit because we do not want to have the conservative reaction rise up again.' That would be a major loss in the momentum that has been established in recent years. If the various republics that make up the false federation of the Soviet Union are not given the chance to determine their own destiny, it cannot be called constitutional government in the spirit of that phrase. It is a false federation that has existed in the Soviet Union, because it was not a federation of equals; it was not a federation freely entered into; it was a federation that, as my colleague the member for Spence detailed a moment ago, resulted from travesties, misrepresentation, coercion and other activities that do not sit alongside any spirit of democracy.

I hope that the Baltic republics—the Ukraine, Georgia, Moldavia, Armenia and so many of the other republics in the Soviet Union—get the chance to properly assess and determine their own future, and that includes the Russian republic itself. It needs to be noted that the President of the Russian republic, Boris Yeltsin, has played a very significant role. It is also to be noted that, when the crisis came, whilst there had been differences before between, for example, such people as President Gorbachev, Boris Yeltsin and President Landsbergis of Lithuania, they then recognised that they were at least pointing in the same direction. That was not the direction of those who attempted to steal power earlier this week.

In addition to the question of the rights of the republics of the Soviet Union to determine their own destiny, there is also the question of some other groups in the Soviet Union who do not actually have, in the constitution of that country, republic status. One group that has been raised in this House once before—and I hope that it will be raised again—is a group on behalf of whom I wish to speak today because, at the moment, they are facing very real problems of persecution. They are the Molokans, a small group of Christians who are caught in Armenia. They are subject to persecution both from Islamic adherents in Azerbaijan, from those in Armenia, and also from some members of other Christian groups in Armenia.

We have a number of Molokans living in South Australia; they hear regular reports from their relatives in the Soviet Union, and they gravely fear for the future of their relatives in that country. I have written to Gerry Hand about this matter, asking that they be taken into account in the special arrangements he has been making this year for how people can be granted refugee status. To date, the responses have not been as positive as I would have liked because, frankly, they are being overlooked in the situation that is being faced at the moment. People do not recognise that this small group is facing real persecution. I just raise that matter on this occasion because I hope that, in people's examination of what happens in the Soviet Union, they look at all these issues, including those minorities whom it might be so easy to forget, even in any process of democratisation, but who also have rights that need to be protected.

Given that this motion is before the House, I would have preferred that there perhaps be more chance to talk about its wording, so that we could agree totally on the wording. Nevertheless, the spirit is something that I am certain all members can agree with.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I just wish to make a few remarks on this issue. I would like to be associated with the basic text of the resolution now before the House, and I thank the honourable member for bringing it on. I am not a member who has been here for a lengthy time, and I do not know the formalities just referred to, but I must say that there is an opportunity here for this House and for many members to express some of the sentiments that the member for Hayward, the member for Spence, the Minister and, I am sure, many other members and much of the community of South Australia have expressed.

One of the interesting things over the past three days for the cynics, such as myself—and I confess to a degree of cynicism on quite a number of political issues—is that it is an absolutely great uplifting experience to see the likes of Boris Yeltsin, a man who has grown in my estimation enormously over the past few days. There is no doubt that the rocks that this coup was founded on were named Boris Yeltsin. There is no doubt that the hardliners in the Soviet Union who wished to turn the clock back found that there were people of principle over whom they could not drive tanks. I agree with the Minister when he says that much in the constitutional area of reform is still necessary.

I agree with many of the other sentiments that have been expressed here in the sense that there is a real problem in the Soviet Union for many of the different political entities in working out their arrangements in respect of their relationship with the central body or in determining whether they are to go totally their own way.

However, one thing that has happened over the past three days is that, along with the situation in the Philippines almost six years ago, we can see that people cannot be taken for mugs all the time. Certainly, I would be the last one to

say that all the Soviet Union's problems went away this morning. Indeed, they have not. The 1917 revolution, referred to by the member for Spence, and the 1905 situation basically resulted from bread riots at that time, and I have no doubt that many of the problems—including the debureaucratising of the Soviet Union, the ending of the command economy and the introduction of a market-based economy, which I go on record as supporting—will involve difficult transition periods over the next few years for the Soviet Union.

But, when we have people of the calibre of Boris Yeltsin who are willing to stand in front of the tanks and encourage hundreds of thousands of Russians in Moscow and other cities to stand up and be counted on this issue, we can see democracy evident even in a country like Russia, which has spent most of the twentieth century moving in the opposite direction until only a few years ago. It provides an uplifting spirit for all of us in countries where we take our democratic institutions for granted. Again, I thank the member for Hayward for giving us the opportunity to speak on this issue, which is of relevance to people who support democracy all over the world.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Employment and Further Education): I will speak briefly in support of the motion. All of us are delighted that the causes of reform have won out in the crisis in the Soviet Union. All of us were concerned that the Iron Curtain would again be brought down upon the Soviet people. President Gorbachev has played a major role in the liberation of many Eastern European countries, and we want to see those reforms continue—we want to see democracy continue. We look forward to a strong partnership between Mr Yeltsin and Mr Gorbachev to ensure that the reform process continues. I strongly support the thrust of the motion.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I support the motion before the Chair, but I must say that I regret the way that the motion has come before the Parliament. This is private members' time, which is provided to enable private members—

The SPEAKER: Order! I understand the honourable member's position. However, a debate is before the Chair and Standing Orders clearly provide that the debate must be relevant to the matter before the Chair. I am afraid that the matter raised by the member for Henley Beach is not part of that debate, and I ask him to bring his comments back to the subject of the debate.

Mr FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. At the outset, I said that I support the motion. It is most unlikely, however, that I will ever support another suspension of Standing Orders if it comes up in similar circumstances, and that message goes out to my side of the House as well as the other side.

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

SOUTHERN SPORTS COMPLEX

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That this House calls on the Government to dedicate for its long-term recreational and sporting use the land at Noarlunga Centre near Colonnades that was identified in the report of the ministerial working party established to investigate and report on the establishment of a multi-purpose sports complex south of Adelaide, known as the Crome report.

This simple motion calls on the Government to dedicate the land near Colonnades for recreational and sporting use.

It does not involve a debate about the ongoing use of that land and about which sport will end up on it; it is a simple motion that says we should move now to dedicate the land. One of the ministerial officers in the department said that the land in question is already dedicated. That was just a partial truth: there are portions of land in the region, but we are talking about dedicating that piece of land which was referred to in the Crome report for recreational and sporting use. The demographics of the southern region indicate very clearly a need for some sort of recreational and sporting facility in the Colonnades area. The Crome report referred to more than one site. From my discussions with local government and with many sporting organisations, I know that the preferred option is the Colonnades site, for many reasons, none more important than the fact of its proximity to transport and to the Colonnades area, which is becoming a centre for the district.

If we look forward to 2020, the area south of Darlington has the potential to house about one-third of the population of metropolitan Adelaide. Already, of those who live down there, over one-third are under 18, and many of the statistics carefully put together for the Crome report indicated that more young people and young adults in the southern region watch and take part in sport than in many other parts of Adelaide. There is no doubt in anyone's mind that the need is there. Certainly, it was recognised by the Crome committee, and this House should respond to it.

It is interesting to look at the membership of the Crome committee. I will not name individual members, but it was made up of very senior people in local government and senior people in the Department of Environment and Planning; there was input from the recreational and sporting area, and, indeed, anyone with knowledge of the area had the opportunity of some input. The Government, for some reason known only to itself and to the Minister, has continually walked away from supporting some sort of facility in the south. All emphasis is going to the area north of Gepps Cross. I live in Glenelg, within three streets of the Glenelg Oval, which is the last oval to have a grandstand as you go south. That is an appalling situation, considering the number of people living south of Darlington. The land to which this motion refers is owned by the South Australian Housing Trust, and the concern of residents in the southern region is that, once the Housing Trust starts to develop that land for its purposes, it will be lost to recreation and sport forever.

At 12 noon, the bells having been rung:

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON PRIVACY

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I move:

That the report be noted.

The report of the select committee is a balanced and responsible report. It was made on a non-Party basis. There was no predetermined position on the part of the Government or, I understand, the Opposition in relation to its findings. It was a committee on which individual members assessed the evidence for themselves, free of any Party restraints. Members have objectively and subjectively arrived at a conclusion that is balanced and responsible.

From the outset, I might say that the process was a complex one. We had a number of issues with which to grapple that warranted solutions. At the end of the day, the committee came down in favour of recommending that a general right of privacy and a right of action for an infringe-

ment of that right be created in the law. This means that the individual in our democratic society for the first time will be clothed with a right of privacy. Evidence before the select committee showed that some 11 million records on individual Australians and trading organisations are held by the Credit Reference Association of Australia Limited. They are not secret files, but available to be examined by the individual concerned.

The Justice Information System in South Australia holds 129 640 individual files and an additional 46 897 files where the individual is also known by another name. An additional 32 834 files are held where the individual named is known to more than one JIS agency. I will come back to the JIS later.

Evidence also showed that there were 1 500 to 2 000 inquiries per month made by or on behalf of landlords regarding tenants, both residential and commercial. Other evidence was tendered to the select committee that the Department for Social Security handles 1.2 million unemployment, sickness and special benefit records per annum, 1.5 million pensioner records and 1.72 million family allowance records. I will not go into other aspects of files that are held on individuals, but the sum total of evidence quite clearly reflects that there is a file somewhere on each one of us.

The select committee concluded that the sheer quantity of data being recorded against individuals and the very real potentiality for inaccurate information to be not only stored but misused in respect of individuals made it essential that a person should generally have the right of access to data collected on him or her and be given the opportunity to correct wrong or inaccurate information to prevent harm being done to that individual. I stress that it was on the potentiality. There is no question that the JIS has one of the best security systems in Australia and possibly in the world in regard to its files.

The other aspect, in so far as the concept of privacy is concerned, is that the select committee found that common law private nuisance to property should be included in the concept of invasion of privacy. This is an important innovation in the law because, presently, an injunction to prevent common law private nuisances, such as those by way of smell, smoke, noise, the deliberate and malicious playing of musical instruments for the purpose of annoying a neighbour, damage to adjacent properties caused by tree roots or unlawful water run-off, can only be granted in the Supreme Court.

All members of Parliament have at some stage or another encountered problems from constituents where these types of neighbourhood problems cannot be resolved even though there is presently the theoretical right in law. To get the injunctive remedy one needs one has to go to the Supreme Court. One is then up for huge fees. This has meant that no practical remedy is available to resolve neighbourhood disputes. Those of us who have been in this Parliament for some time know, from our own knowledge and from information from the police and other agencies, that unresolved neighbourhood disputes can lead to ill-feeling or violence.

Consequently, a new avenue of redress is necessary, and by way of including the concept of invasion of privacy dealing with property the select committee recommended that all courts be vested with the power to grant injunctions restraining private nuisance, as well as to award compensation. This simply means that neighbourhood disputes can in future be resolved in the local courts of limited jurisdiction with minimal cost.

As members know, if a claim is under \$2 000—and it is intended to increase that to \$5 000—parties do not have

legal representation in courts of limited jurisdiction. In the past constituents went off to neighbourhood mediation services, which do not have any power at all. They might write to the neighbour, saying, 'Will you come and talk about it?', but if the neighbour said, 'No', nothing could be done, except go to the Supreme Court—and a person would not do that because \$5 000 to \$10 000 worth of fees was not practicable for a \$200 or \$300 claim. Now, for the first time in South Australia neighbourhood disputes will be able to be resolved in a court of limited jurisdiction without legal costs and at very minimal cost to the participants. All people want is an avenue to have their grievance determined quickly and efficiently.

In respect of the media, the committee stated that its concern is to ensure that the media respect private grief and personal privacy. The select committee acknowledged the proper role and function of investigative journalism. We spelt out that we wanted to make it plain that in respect of the media no impediment or restriction should be placed on the proper investigation of the affairs of organisations such as Beneficial Finance, the State Bank, SGIC or any other legitimate target, including, say, Elders or Skase in the non-government sector.

In this regard the committee included in its draft Bill the defence of public interest which will provide greater protection against a privacy action for investigative journalism than investigative journalism now has against a defamation action, because the defences in a defamation action are essentially justification and fair comment, not public interest. As members know, the Watergate revelations in the United States were only able to be unfolded because there is a defence of public interest in the United States in relation to defamation actions.

So, investigative journalism is far better off and far better served under the privacy legislation than under current defamation law. In other areas, evidence before the select committee detailed gross media invasions of personal privacy, in particular of families of victims of crime. The families of victims of crime as well as the victims themselves have been subject to invasions of personal privacy that no enlightened community should tolerate. The committee concluded that private individuals ought to have redress against this type of media attention.

I will say something about the contributions of members subsequently, but I think the committee's feelings in this regard were admirably summed up by the member for Mount Gambier when he said (at page 163 of the evidence) when Mrs Betteanne Kelvin appeared before the committee:

On behalf of everyone I would like to congratulate you and Mr Kelvin on the fortitude shown in the face of this continuing abuse. I am amazed at the extent to which you, the Langleys and the Barnes families have been abused. I did not realise there were so many ways that people could take advantage of families.

I think that that summed up the feelings of the committee with regard to the way in which the media invades purely personal grief and personal privacy. Two current situations apart from the question of families of victims of crime or other grieving relatives at funerals or on any other occasions were highlighted by an event reported in the *Advertiser* on 12 August this year under the headline 'Gays urged to abandon hit list'. This was when people who were homosexual were to have their names published throughout Australia in a way that was a massive invasion of their privacy. Of course, everybody said it was wrong and that just because people are outside of mainstream sexuality, their right to privacy should be respected. However, there is no right of privacy in the law.

The difference is that, with a right of privacy in the law, those people could take injunctions to restrain publication

of their name, and obtain damages against organisations. Without a right of privacy in the law, there is nothing to prevent the publication of that type of information. With respect to defamation cases, if the information is true, nothing can be done about it because truth is an absolute defence in a defamation claim. It highlights a need, and everybody claimed that there should be a right of privacy in the law. Even in Victoria, the Liberal spokesperson on legal affairs, Ms Jan Wade, said:

New privacy legislation might need to be investigated to outlaw the movement.

In other words, new privacy legislation to protect people's privacy. The need for privacy legislation is cross-Party.

The second current event is the article by Paul Johnson 'on the latest invasion of privacy' in the London weekly, the *Spectator*, of 3 August 1991. Part of that article states:

The absence of a privacy law in this country has many sad consequences. Among the worst is the way in which it allows the media to wreck the marriages of prominent persons by making public tittle-tattle which might otherwise die a natural death and by setting aggrieved spouses against one another and thus sending a rocky but retrievable union into the ditch—then licking its greasy chops over the result. The family unit, and the till-death-do-us-part marriage which produces it and makes it reasonably secure, are the most successful institutions humanity has ever devised, the ultimate source of our civilisation and prosperity.

It continues:

All marriages go through difficult phases. Most, I suspect, come near to breaking point at one time or another. Spouses who are patient hang on and wait for the skies to clear. If they have the sense to do this, it is rare for them to feel later regrets.

It further states:

The silly season kicked off last week with a particularly mean-minded presentation of the marriage problems of Sandy Gall—

Of course he is a television star. That article totally invaded his purely personal privacy in relation to his marital situation. The article continues:

The responsibility lies with Parliament and it is MPs who must act to make such invasions of privacy liable to civil damages, and, in the worse cases, criminal prosecution.

It will not go that far. The article concludes:

When are MPs going to pluck up a bit of courage and end this glaring abuse?

Mr Atkinson: A journalist wrote that.

Mr GROOM: The writer was a journalist, while the person in question, whose privacy had been invaded, was also a journalist at some stage. So, the select committee did just that here in South Australia. In England, they do have a data protection law which gives a civil remedy for damages in relation to the misuse of data information stored. This legislation is quite unique, because it gets away from bureaucracy and vests the right in individuals.

It was just not possible for members of the committee to overlook the weight of evidence in relation to media invasions of purely personal privacy and private grief. We are not interested in restricting investigative journalism in any way. Freedom of the press is an essential ingredient in our society. We have seen the recent events in Russia, and just how important freedom of the press is. However, the press had no right to intrude on people's private grief against their wishes, and no right to intrude on purely personal privacy in an attempt to cater for the peurile interests of some members of society.

It is a difficult problem because it does impose some restrictions on the press, in this limited regard. The select committee exhibited to the back of its report some of the examples of invasions of privacy that were quite untenable. I will not go through them but just urge members to look at the report. There may be exceptions, such as in the Chan murder, where there was a front page photograph of the family at the funeral on Thursday 11 July 1991. Because of

Doctor Chan's prominence, it may well be that the family wanted to share their grief with the world—that is quite legitimate. If the grieving relatives want their grief shared with the rest of the world, it is their right to consent.

Another one that did not make our select committee's report by way of exhibit, because it did not arrive until 24 July 1991, occurred in Port MacDonnell, in the member for Mount Gambier's electorate. I understand that a camera crew intruded on a family's tragedy; it crept around sandhills using a telescopic lens from behind tombstones and all the rest of it, just to get a picture of the survivors in the family—the father and daughter—at the funeral. They had no right to invade people's personal privacy against their wishes. If people want to consent, that is quite in order, but how does one handle a situation like this with the media?

The select committee looked at the journalists' own code of ethics and recommended that two of its code of ethics should be incorporated in the Bill. Code 9 states:

They shall respect private grief and personal privacy and shall have the right to resist compulsion to intrude on them.

That is the journalists' own code of ethics. Code 1 states:

They shall report and interpret the news with scrupulous honesty by striving to disclose all essential facts and by not suppressing relevant available facts or distorting by wrong or improper emphasis.

So, the select committee concluded that the journalists' own code of ethics should be used and incorporated into regulations to determine claims of invasion of privacy against the media. This is similar to accounting standards published by the Institute of Chartered Accountants, the Australian Society of Accountants and the National Institute of Accountants. Those accounting standards published by those bodies, with the approval of the Australian Securities Commission, are picked up by companies legislation and have the force of law against which one's financial statements are tested for compliance against the Companies Code.

So, in this regard, the Australian Journalists Association will have an enhanced role in the way in which we recommend the adoption of its own code of ethics—not all of the codes, of course, but only those codes that can be tailored to cover private grief and purely personal privacy legislation—in regulations under the Bill. This will give the AJA a greater role in policing and developing ethical guide lines for the media, because many non-member journalists work on an independent contracting basis and are not bound by the code of ethics. However, it will still enable the Australian Journalists Association to deal with its own members as it deems fit. We think that the appropriate code to determine invasions of private grief and personal privacy is the journalists' own code of ethics.

Certain concessions were made to some of the agencies. One of those was in relation to the Police Force. Anything done by a member of the Police Force in the course of his or her duties will not infringe a right of privacy, and I emphasise 'in the course of his or her duties'. The committee was of the view that, in the detection of crime, the police should not have to rely on defences under the Bill and should have this up front concession. Also, anything reasonably done by an insurer or anyone acting on behalf of an insurer for the detection of fraud should not constitute an infringement of privacy. I emphasise 'reasonably', because evidence before the select committee showed that insurance fraud is costing about \$1.7 billion annually, and the committee considered that, in the ordinary course of detecting insurance fraud, the magnitude of insurance fraud requires special consideration at this time.

Another concession was in relation to credit reference agencies or commercial organisations in carrying out reasonable inquiries into the credit worthiness of a customer

or potential customer. We recognise that the Federal Government has legislated in this area with regard to credit reporting standards and there should be no conflict or duality between the Federal Act and the proposed Bill. However, credit reporting agencies' databases should be subject to the right of examination by an individual in respect of accuracy, and with the ability to correct wrong or harmful information and to take appropriate legal action.

I do want to emphasise that, in respect of the insurance industry and credit reporting agencies, the concessions are there for particular purposes only, and this means that data matching, an activity that is of great concern to civil libertarians and privacy advocates, will be confined. This is because data matching violates a number of accepted privacy protection principles in that information received for one purpose is, without consent, disseminated for another purpose, that is, handing information gathered for determining a loan application to the person's employer or potential employer. A fundamental attraction of the Bill will be that it uses existing legal structures; no additional structures will be required.

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

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I intend to speak briefly, because of the shortage of time available, on the report of the Select Committee on Privacy. While I am a signatory to the report, my colleagues would be well aware that, on the many occasions on which the committee met, I expressed a number of concerns with regard to the Bill. However, I believe that all members of the committee could not help but be affected by the harrowing descriptions of intrusions upon personal privacy at times of extreme distress and suffering. These intrusions should be avoided, as they all too often have unnecessarily increased and prolonged the distress of the families involved. The Chairman of the committee chose to quote comments that I made quite spontaneously to at least one of the witnesses who appeared before us and who was obviously in some considerable and continuing distress.

However, I also indicated to my colleagues that there may be an element of, shall we say, illogicality, at the very best, in proposing legislation to redress the wrongs of intrusion on personal privacy while at the same time making considerable provision to exempt and thus to legitimise from provisions of the Bill a wide range of activities which, in themselves, most certainly intrude daily upon our privacy and against which we have little protection and perhaps of which we may have little or no knowledge.

Equally, it may also legitimise the quite innocent collection of data on a person unless we choose to inform them that such data is being collected, for however innocent a purpose. Because of the time constraints, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SOUTHERN SPORTS COMPLEX

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Oswald (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 436.)

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Before this debate was adjourned previously, I was making the point that this motion simply asks the Government to dedicate land for recreational and sporting use—and I remind members of that: it is not a debate about what the facility will be used

for. Quite clearly, football would have to be involved; the very successful game that was played at the Bice Oval on 3 August, at which about 9 700 spectators attended, demonstrates the need to incorporate football into that facility.

It is interesting that the Government has now shown a considerable amount of interest in talks with the SANFL as a result of that game. Until then, the Minister and the local member (the Minister for Environment and Planning) showed very little interest in the development of a sporting facility. Further down the track we will no doubt have a debate on the type of facilities that should be built there and what should be involved in the complex. If members refer to the Crome report, they will find ample information on the various organisations that showed an interest.

Clearly, the Government cannot put money into a facility for the use of just one organisation: it must involve many organisations, and we will have ample time to consider that. The South Adelaide Football Club has secured a short-term lease on the Adelaide Oval for the next five years. That will give some breathing space, but it does not mean that the matter is off the agenda.

Every member who is sports orientated would have to support this motion because, indeed, it refers only to the setting aside of the land. Let us not have a debate in future weeks on what the facilities should be; that can come under a different motion. This debate is about setting aside the land, as was recommended in the committee's report, before it is utilised by another Government agency for its own development. I urge all members to support the motion.

The Hon. M.D. RANN secured the adjournment of the debate.

FOOTBALL FACILITIES

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I move:

That this House notes the strong public support given to the SANFL match between South Adelaide and Norwood played at Bice Oval, Christies Beach, on Saturday 3 August 1991 and congratulates the Government and the Minister for initiating discussions with local government, South Adelaide Football Club and the SANFL on the provision of adequate facilities for football in the southern suburbs.

I was one of 9 714 people who attended the Bice Oval on 3 August this year. I congratulate the South Australian National Football League, the South Adelaide Football Club, the Christies Beach Football Club and the Government, who assisted in the organisation of that match. It certainly was an excellent day and Bice Oval is a suitable venue. It is close to public transport and it certainly has a good playing surface. Indeed, I think the surface area is larger than that at Football Park. The match was even improved by the result—South Adelaide won very convincingly. The only problems I noticed with Bice Oval were, first, that there was a delay in getting through the gates on the outer—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HOLLOWAY: Unlike the honourable member who interjects, I went to the outer, not to the reserve area.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HOLLOWAY: Well, I was there. There were no turnstiles and there was some delay in getting in. There were also some difficulties with temporary facilities such as toilets. Further, because there were no fences, at one stage a dog ran onto the field. I have not seen that happen at a football match for many years. For all that, it was an excellent day and I am sure that the patrons enjoyed it very much.

Why is it that we have not had football in the south earlier? The Government has been most unfairly blamed for this. The reason we have not had football in the south is that the South Australian National Football League has not been able to give a guarantee that matches would be played in the south. One can understand that. There has been a lot of turmoil in the football league. The Adelaide Crows have entered the national competition, and I am sure that they have been more successful than many people had thought they would be. In addition, the effect on the local South Australian National Football League competition has been greater than many would have expected.

Of course, given all that turmoil, obviously the football league has been unsure of which way it was going. Indeed, at one stage I believe that it had a policy of ground rationalisation. For example, the Glenelg Football Club has not used its oval this year. The Eagles moved to Football Park.

Members interjecting:

Mr HOLLOWAY: Yes, that is right, they will go back next year, because the South Australian National Football League has had a change of mind. It has decided, after it has seen the way the Crows have gone, that the way to go for local football is suburbanisation. So, it is moving back to local football. The reason we have not had football in the south before is that the football league was obviously reluctant to commit itself to football in that area.

I think we are now at the stage where the future of football is really under the microscope. I have just mentioned the impact of the Adelaide Crows, but I think we are still at the stage where the jury is out, as it were, in deciding what will happen. On the future of football in the south, some hard thinking must be done by the South Australian National Football League. There is more than one option. The member for Morphett has spoken about a stadium in the Noarlunga area. I should like to quote from some comments made by Lance Campbell and reported in the *City Messenger* on 7 August. Canvassing the idea of what should happen in the south, he says:

Despite the strength of the roll-up—

he is referring to the match at Bice Oval—

it just won't happen in the foreseeable future if it turns out the population, on the whole, would rather watch whales mate.

He then goes on to say:

It made me wonder whether there is a need for this Pantherdome edifice complex, which, to be fair, South isn't saying is the be-all and end-all. The push is to take footy back to the people. Glenelg has wised up, and so might the Eagles . . . what more is required than already is on offer at Bice Oval, for example?

Permanent toilet facilities, yes, and a grandstand. Watching from temporary stand had the pavilion atmosphere of what footy must have been like to the spectator 60 or 70 years ago. It was adequate and yet, despite all the hooaha, the stand was not full.

Some terracing, too, would help, but the era of a 20 000 crowd is over. The Crows have seen to that. They are the only ones, week in, week out, who require the whole shooting match.

My feeling is that it is not the facilities that stand in South and the SANFL's way, but the sheer risk of an undertaking to move down south.

Relocating an entire club infrastructure in a competition in a complete state of flux would be an enormous gamble.

That article draws attention to the fact that we need to think seriously about where we are going. It is the job of the SANFL, not the Government, to decide where we are going with football. The uncertainty over what will happen in football could become greater in the future. There has already been talk that a second Adelaide side might be added to the AFL, and there has been talk of further mergers within the SANFL competition. If there is a message there, it is that there is a need to move cautiously. The decision on the future of football must be made by the South Australian Football League. Of course, South Adelaide Football

Club will have to consider its future. It is not up to the Government to decide on the direction of football or where particular clubs should go. The role of the Government is certainly to assist, and no doubt this Government will assist where necessary.

I should like to mention the Government's policy generally on sport in the south. A task force was established by the Minister some time ago to look at sporting facilities in the south. That working party has confirmed that the immediate priority for people in the southern suburbs is the development of regional facilities in an equitable manner to enable all citizens to have access to the facilities. The southern suburbs cover a large area and the idea of having everything concentrated in Noarlunga is not necessarily what people want or need. If we are to be realistic, a better solution would be to have a number of facilities in the area where they are required by the people. The State Government has already done this. As a first priority, which was identified by that working party, the Government announced some time ago that it would develop the synthetic grass hockey and tennis facilities at Kauri Parade Reserve. The Government has approved a grant of \$230 000 towards the cost of establishing it.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

Mr HOLLOWAY: That will be of great advantage to the people of that area. If the member for Morphett does not wish to have it there, perhaps he should stand up and say that he is not happy with that project going ahead. I would have thought that the people of that area would greatly appreciate what this Government has done to assist.

The Department of Recreation and Sport has also been working with local government. It is important to talk not just to the football league and the clubs, but to local government, which must consider the needs of people in the area because it has responsibilities for the maintenance of those facilities. The Government has developed a recreation and sports strategy plan to identify all those areas of recreation and sport and open spaces in the southern region and to maximise the use of our present facilities.

I would like to conclude by congratulating the Minister of Recreation and Sport on the ongoing dialogue that he is having with the South Australian Football League and the South Adelaide Football Club on this matter. As I said, it is up to the league to decide the future of football, and I am sure that this Government will assist the league and the football clubs when they decide in which direction they want to go. I would also like to congratulate the Minister on his very sensible policy of developing regional sports facilities in the southern suburbs.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I would like to tell the House what this motion is really all about. The siren has blown, the players have left the field and, suddenly, the Minister of Recreation and Sport in this State has realised that he is not associated with the development of football in the southern region. He is asking his backbenchers now to put this motion on the Notice Paper so that it will be circulated, no doubt, and he can say, 'I am now suddenly involved, and I am close to the development of football.' He is not on the tram; he has lost his ticket; and he is making an effort through this motion to get some sort of change of perception out there. The public will not be fooled. The Opposition has had the running on this matter for nearly two years. The public knows it, and the Government will need a vast change of attitude if it is ever to change public perceptions down south. The Liberal Party has been working assiduously to try to change things around, to get the SANFL

interested, and to get public discussion going behind the scenes and at the official level.

I would like to amend the motion so that it more truly reflects what, indeed, it is all about. I therefore move:

Strike out the words 'congratulates the Government and the Minister for initiating,' and insert in lieu thereof the words 'notes with concern the time it has taken for the Government and the Minister to initiate'.

I believe that that form of wording will more accurately reflect what this motion is all about. I look forward to debating this matter at the first opportunity. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

MEMBER FOR HEYSEN

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I move:

That this House condemns the Member for Heysen in the strongest terms for inciting the people of South Australia to act outside the law and calls on the Leader of the Opposition to sack him immediately from his position as Liberal Party spokesperson for Water Resources.

The problem with moving a motion such as this is that it can be seen by the person against whom it has been directed as a compliment. It could be seen as an indication that that particular member is doing a good job, that has become a thorn in the side of the Government, and that the Government is reacting by sending in one of its older and wiser backbenchers to boot the living daylights out of him. Let me enlighten the member for Heysen (if he has the courage to come into the Chamber) and all members opposite that that is exactly what it is not about. What the member for Heysen has done is utterly reprehensible. He has actively encouraged people to act outside the law; he has actively incited people not to pay a portion of their water rates; and, perhaps even more odious, he has actually encouraged little old ladies who live in the eastern suburbs to go out at their own personal expense and seek legal advice, because he stood up and questioned the legality of the Act in question.

Well, if the member for Heysen is convinced that there is some illegality in the Act then he, as spokesperson, should either go to the Liberal Party and say, 'Let's get one of our silvertails to go in and question it' or even flog off his own family silver and ascertain exactly whether he is right or wrong about the alleged illegality. But no, he does not do that; he organises a public meeting in Burnside and stands up all of a quiver and says, 'Go out and see my lawyer mates.' In all probability he had a few dodgers in his hand to give to those little old ladies in Burnside. This House will now proceed to expose the member for Heysen.

After the autumn session, which finished in April, there was a marked change in the member for Heysen who, in the past, has not had a reputation as a gutsy 'lets kick them in the groin' politician such as the member for Mitcham.

Mr Ferguson: He's a wimp.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I would furiously defend the member for Heysen; he is not a wimp, but perhaps he would jump at his own shadow. In the past, he has always been looking over his shoulder and waiting for the bogey man to jump out. He is definitely not a wimp. It is fair to say that the member for Heysen hasn't any balls at all. Be that—

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The language that has just been used by the member for Napier is far from parliamentary and I ask him to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair was distracted then and I did not hear the statement but, if the honourable

member is so offended, I ask the member for Napier to withdraw the remarks.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Mr Speaker, I am not sure what I said that was unparliamentary, but if it satisfies the wimp—I mean the member for Heysen—then I withdraw whatever I said that was unparliamentary.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier is being far too flippant. The dignity of the House is being offended by the manner he is using in this debate. However, I am not sure what were the words used.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Mr Speaker, the honourable member first of all referred to me as a wimp and then suggested that I did not have any balls at all.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Obviously, a fair degree of levity has come into the House. It is affecting the dignity of the House, and I ask the honourable member to withdraw those words unconditionally and be very careful in his application of words in the future.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I am sorry, Sir; I withdraw unconditionally and apologise to the member for Heysen. The reason we have had this sudden reversal of character is that the member for Heysen has been noticed by the power brokers in his Party, as highlighted by my colleague the Minister of Employment and Further Education, as being a non-performer. He is always very busy, always looking in his diary, always on the telephone, but he is never exactly going anywhere.

The member for Heysen knows—and the matter was explained when the Bill went through the House in early 1991—that the new system is a fair one. The member for Heysen knows that his 'Let's get back to the old system'—which was introduced this morning, which I know I cannot talk about now but about which I will talk later—was riddled with inequities and injustice for certain people in this State and, more importantly, did not encourage water conservation. Because he was desperate to be seen as an achiever and a doer, the member for Heysen went down the dangerous path of encouraging lawlessness out in the community.

The member for Heysen has also thrown up the red herring of the illegality of the Act. As the present Liberal Party spokesperson on water resources—and I hope that, when this motion is carried with acclamation, he is executed by his Leader—one would assume that he was familiar with the relevant Acts.

Obviously, the member for Heysen is not. The state of his memory is well known, and it seems as though his retention rate is as bad as his memory. Let me give the member for Heysen a lesson on what the new Act does and how it is administered. I will do that in simple language and, if the member for Heysen is unsure, I will go back and repeat it. The Waterworks (Rating) Amendment Act 1991 was proclaimed to come into operation on 1 July 1991.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I hope that the member for Bragg does not try to show us his ignorance, as well. That Act amended Part V of the Waterworks Act 1932 so as to introduce a new system of rating residential land. This was done by the enactment of sections 65a to 65d. Under the new system, rates on residential land are made up of two components: an access rate and a water rate based on the volume of water supplied to the land.

I am sure that the member for Heysen is with me up till now. The access rate is either an amount fixed by the Minister or, where the capital value of the land exceeds a threshold value (also fixed by the Minister), that amount plus an amount determined by application of a rate (yet

again fixed by the Minister) to the amount by which the capital value of the land exceeds the threshold value.

Section 65c enables the Minister, by notice in the *Gazette*, to fix the values and rates required to calculate the rates payable on residential land. Each notice, by virtue of section 65c (2) (c), has effect in relation to a financial year specified in the notice. Section 4 of the Waterworks Act—and I advise the member for Heysen to read that—defines 'financial year' as the period beginning on 1 July in any year and ending on 30 June in the next year. The water rate in respect of water supplied to land is one of the rates that the Minister is to fix under section 65c. Section 65d enables the Minister also to fix a quantity of water (the water allocation) in relation to residential land. That allocation is deducted from the quantity of water supplied to a parcel of residential land when determining the water rate payable in respect of that land. Hence, the rate payable in respect of each parcel of residential land since 1 July.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier will resume his seat. The honourable member for Morphet.

Mr OSWALD: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I refer to Standing Order 118, which specifically refers to members in the course of debate referring to the subject material of Bills or resolutions that are also on the Notice Paper. I refer you to today's Notice Paper, Notice of Motion: Other Business No. 1, to be moved by the Hon. D.C. Wotton. The subject matter is the same as the honourable member is debating at the moment. I suggest that the subject matter overlaps and that he should not be allowed to do that.

The SPEAKER: There is some substance in the point of order. As the Standing Order states, you cannot anticipate debate. The honourable member is beginning to anticipate the debate in the motion moved earlier by the member for Heysen, which is an Act to repeal the Waterworks (Rating) Amendment Act, and I ask the honourable member not to refer to that during his contribution.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I take your point, Sir. But in explanation—and this is not questioning you—the reason for this motion is that the member for Heysen has questioned the legality of the Act, and I am going through the existing Act to explain it. But I abide—and always will abide—by your ruling, Sir, although it just goes to show again what the member for Heysen is all about. He has to get old sleepy up there to rise on a point of order.

Mr S.J. BAKER: That comment is in contravention of the Chair and in contravention of your guidance, Sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! When I am on my feet members will be quiet and resume their seats. I think that the tenor of the honourable member's contribution is now becoming provocative, and I will rule before it affects the dignity of the House. As I understood that a point of order was about to be taken I would ask the honourable member to withdraw the remark he used in relation to the member for Morphet.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Yes, Sir, I withdraw my comment. I cannot follow that line in going on about the existing Act. I do not know, Sir, when you receive your water rates account, but those accounts are issued between January and June. It is impossible for 350 000 residential meters to be read on one day, so we have a situation where it is quite possible that the people who were at the Liberal Party organised public meeting in Burnside and were up in arms quite mistakenly, had received bills which were issued earlier in the year but which take up the whole of the financial year. I have the details chapter and verse but, unfortunately, because of your ruling, Sir, I cannot make my point. However, I will make one point which I believe that you and members opposite will allow me to make. We

have heard of hundreds of thousands of people who will be affected by the new water rating system. The member for Heysen knows that that is incorrect, and most members opposite know that it is incorrect.

Mr OSWALD: The honourable member is clearly flouting your original ruling, Sir. The point he had just made was a debating point that would better have been made in the other debate.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. The comment used was directly related to an honourable member and was not offensive.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: How many people will be adversely affected by the new rating system? It will be very few indeed. About 86 per cent of consumers will benefit or will be unaffected by the new system. Under the old system everybody's bill would have gone up by at least 6 per cent, as annual increases in charges were being kept below the CPI. Under the new system 22 per cent of customers will find that their bills will go up by less than that and for 14 per cent the bills will go up by more—hardly a figure that justifies the term 'an outraged community'.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier will resume his seat. The member for Morphet is taking continual points of order. I hope that it is specific and relevant.

Mr OSWALD: The motion moved by the Hon. D.C. Wotton was 'that he have leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to repeal the Waterworks (Rating) Amendment Act 1991 and for related purposes'. The points being made by the honourable member are related to that motion and should be treated in that context.

The SPEAKER: We must agree to differ. I cannot see how the motion that the member for Napier has put forward can be debated without reference to the principal Act. There was no reference to any amendment but to the Act as it stands. That is not out of order, in the judgment of the Chair. However, I again ask the member for Napier to tread that line carefully between what is acceptable and what is not.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Sir, I want to clarify the point that has already been made. In his motion the member for Napier is seeking that the member for Heysen be sacked. Now he wants to explain the background.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: That is intrinsically involved in the first notice of motion. If he wants to make a point about water rates and about how many people will and will not be affected, he has the right under Notices of Motion, Other Business No. 1; he does not have that right under item No. 5. He has to address the substance of his motion without reference to that.

The SPEAKER: I take the honourable member's point, referring to the motion and to a condemnation of the member for Heysen, calling on the Leader of the Opposition to sack him 'for inciting the people of South Australia to act outside the law'.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I accept the point of order and ask the member for Napier to relate his comments as near as possible to the motion, which does not specifically relate to an amendment to the Act or to the Act itself. We cannot, obviously, have a debate without some reference to the Act that is causing the dissension, but I accept the point of order and ask the honourable member to relate his comments to the motion.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Thank you, Sir. As I was saying, 14 per cent of the community will pay increases of more than 6 per cent.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the member for Napier is proceeding contrary to what I have just ruled. He is now using statistics which, in effect, have nothing to do with inciting the people of South Australia or sacking the member for Heysen. I would ask the honourable member to think about his comments and relate them to his motion.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Thank you, Sir; I accept your kind advice. I think the actions of members opposite show how much protection the member for Heysen needs. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

MAGAREY MEDAL

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

That this House congratulates NWS Channel 9 and the South Australian National Football League for acknowledging the social realities of the twentieth century by admitting women to the 1991 Magarey Medal presentation as partners of players attending the counting ceremony.

The annual presentation of the Magarey Medal has been the highlight of the SANFL season for many years. This award is a venerable institution that has been around for over a century, and most of us would hold Dr Magarey and his medal in respect. We would not necessarily agree with the views expressed by Arthur Mortimer, of Largs Bay, in a letter to the editor of 19 August, where he said:

W.A. Magarey had fine qualities but he hardly had a 'best and fairest' attitude towards his fellow man. He once said: 'Football is a worthwhile pursuit in that it makes working-class men take showers.'

Possibly at the 1990 Magarey Medal presentation the Leader of the Opposition could have done with a cold shower. What brings this motion to mind is the announcement about women guests in the *Advertiser* of 13 August. I have quite a few remarks I would like to make about that, and will refer to some correspondence between the football league, Channel 9 and myself. As I do not have time to do that in the remaining minutes available to me today, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[*Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.*]

PETITION: HEATING APPLIANCES

A petition signed by 42 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to review the policy on the provision of heating appliances in Housing Trust dwellings was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

PETITION: FISHERIES ACT

A petition signed by 74 residents of South Australia requesting that the House reject the proposed amendment to section 37 of the Fisheries Act was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

SEWAGE SLUDGE DISPOSAL

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Cessation of sewage sludge disposal into the sea from Glenelg and Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works.
Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Before calling for questions, I indicate that any questions relating to the portfolio of the Minister of Emergency Services will be taken by the Deputy Premier.

WORKCOVER

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier share the Public Service Association's view that average WorkCover costs per employee have fallen dramatically since 1987 and that it is a myth that employers are facing hardship because of the level of WorkCover levies and, if so, does he believe that there is no need to modify the scheme?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think it is very true to say that, if in fact the cost structure that applied before the WorkCover scheme was allowed to continue, employers generally would be paying very much more indeed. It has been one of the unfortunate factors of the debate about WorkCover that we have heard a lot from those who have experienced cost increases but we have heard very little from those, who have been very much in the majority, who have actually achieved considerable decreases in their costs as a consequence of the system. The evidence is overwhelming. Whether the reduction in cost over time can be as great as was first anticipated depends on the working through of the scheme.

Further, the bonus penalty system which rewards those who perform well and punishes those who are not prepared to attend to safety and other practices is an integral part of the scheme. It means that employers have the ability, to an extent, to control their own costs. On all those points, I would agree. In relation to the broader question asked by the honourable Leader, as I said yesterday, this matter is currently before a select committee of the Parliament. I would have thought, rather than address questions to me, the matters raised and those issues can be discussed most appropriately by that committee. That is why it has been established and that is where those questions should be considered.

QUORN OVAL INCIDENT

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Deputy Premier, representing the Minister of Emergency Services, inform the House whether a report has been made by the police into an incident which occurred at the Quorn Oval last Saturday and, if so, has any action been recommended? I have been informed that a disturbing incident involving the Leader of the Opposition took place at the Quorn Oval last Saturday afternoon during the running of the Variety Club Bush Bash.

I am told that police went to the oval early on Saturday afternoon to talk to participants in the rally. The police action followed the dangerous use of flares at the beginning of the rally that morning. This incident unfortunately resulted in a fire at Glenelg, and I am sure members would be aware that one courageous police officer who fought the blaze was hospitalised as a result of inhaling smoke fumes.

I am informed that later that day police went to the Quorn Oval to caution rally participants against the contin-

ued use of flares. I am told the Leader of the Opposition was subsequently seen in animated conversation with police officers on the oval. When the serious nature of the situation was explained to the Leader, I am told he did not respond positively to the police. I am told that, shortly after, the Leader returned to his rally car and spoke laughingly to members of his crew. After a short conference, one of the Leader's fellow crew members then got into the team car. I am told that, within a minute, dozens of observers on the oval heard a tape being played over the car's loudspeaker system. The observers told me they were shocked to hear that the tape recording was of pig noises, clearly aimed at the police who were trying to conscientiously perform their duties.

I am informed by observers that the Leader joined in with the rest of his crew in laughing and joking while the offensive tape-recording was played. I am also told that at no stage did the Leader attempt to stop the crew's behaviour, and in fact observers say that he actively joined in and condoned it. Many residents of Quorn and my own constituents were present on the oval to witness this appalling attempt to humiliate the police.

It has been put to me that police officers throughout the State are aware of the Leader's behaviour and regard it as offensive to all police. It has been further put to me that police officers are questioning the Leader's integrity when he stood on the steps of this House and claimed to support the police, their valued work and their current pay claim.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have no idea whether a report has been made to the police but, having been asked the question, I will find out. In passing, all I can say is that the Variety Club Bush Bash is an extremely important and worthy cause, and it should be supported for the very good work it does. I would hope that that support continues to come from the people of South Australia.

WORKCOVER

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier give the House an absolute assurance that the Government will reject any decision made at this week's ALP State Convention which prevents the honouring of his commitment to reduce WorkCover levies to nationally competitive levels within two years?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That matter is, quite appropriately, a subject for discussion and debate at the ALP conference. Presumably, policy will be made in those areas. I believe that it is the desire of all parties to ensure that we have a competitive, cost-effective workers compensation system. The disagreement is over how that can best be achieved and how quickly. Those matters will be discussed at the conference, and they will be discussed further in this place. Of course, those matters are before a select committee of the Parliament at this very moment.

DISPOSAL OF SOLID WASTE

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning provide details of the operation of a recycling fund for the disposal of solid waste which was established by the Waste Management Commission in 1990 and which was financed by a levy on fees?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I again thank the honourable member for his commitment to this concept of recycling.

Indeed, the recycling fund was established through an increase in the solid waste levy of 23 cents per tonne from 1 July 1990. Income for the first year totalled about \$345 000. Guidelines for applications have been developed and provided to all councils and, at the end of May this year, assistance had been committed to some 23 projects, totalling \$345 000.

I will briefly provide a couple of examples for the honourable member and, indeed, for other members. These projects include \$30 000 to the District Council of Northern Yorke Peninsula for the development of a comprehensive community recycling scheme. I am aware that that scheme has the support of the local member, and I believe it has shown the way throughout Australia, particularly for regional councils in the way in which they can move from a system dependent on land fill to a system of complete recycling within their local community. I commend the District Council of Northern Yorke Peninsula for its exciting initiative.

Some \$20 000 has gone to KESAB for the further development of its paper bank office paper recycling scheme. This gives me the opportunity to implore all members of Parliament to ensure, when they are ordering paper for their electorate offices, that they order recycled paper, which is now available through State Services. I am sure that every member of this House who is conscientious and caring about the environment would already—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Yes, they are certified for use in photocopiers. I would also ask that all members consider using the KESAB paper bank office waste paper collection scheme.

Finally, I should like to share with the House the fact that \$25 000 has been given to the District Council of Stirling for site establishment costs for a garden waste composting scheme. That scheme has the support of the local member, who is a shadow Minister. It is important that those three examples give members of this place and, indeed, the community some idea of the range and diversity of the recycling programs, projects and schemes that have been supported through the imposition of this levy and the establishment of the recycling fund.

WORKCOVER

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Minister of Labour confirm that WorkCover's unfunded liability as at 30 June 1991 was as high as \$259 million and that for every month that Government legislation to bring the scheme under control is delayed the unfunded liability will blow out by a further \$12 million a month to \$400 million by 30 June 1992?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Bragg for his question and advise the House that I cannot confirm anything until such time as the two actuaries who have been employed by WorkCover—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Bragg did ask a question. If he were not so rude, he would not have interrupted. They are reporting to the board of WorkCover. The two actuaries are well respected in the financial circles of Australia. They are employed to advise WorkCover on what its projected liabilities might be for the next 40 years. It is anticipated that their report will be available in the middle of October. When it is, we will know what the unfunded liability is.

SCIENCE EDUCATION

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister of Education advise the House what action is being taken to support school students to strengthen their skills through science education? Schools in my area are currently involved in highlighting to parents and the wider community their science work, because this week is Australian Science In Schools Week.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question and I am pleased to learn from him that schools in his district are participating in what is known around Australia as Australian Science In Schools Week. I was pleased to launch this project earlier this week in the presence of the news presenter, Jane Doyle, at the Telecom Museum in the city, and many schools were represented.

The week provides an opportunity not only for our students and teachers to focus on the importance of science in the curriculum but also for parents and the wider community to reinforce this important element of the work that goes on in our schools. Indeed, we are witnessing major changes in the teaching of science in our schools and its importance within the curriculum in South Australia and nationally.

States are working together to prepare a national statement on science for Australian schools and document some of the best practices in effective science education. In South Australia we are developing a set of attainment levels in science which will ensure that our students set their sights high and are continually urged to strive to achieve their personal best. Within South Australia we have a network of science and technology primary focus schools. In secondary schools our physics teaching is being enhanced through an exchange program. Environmental education focus schools are advancing student knowledge in that important area.

The Science Teachers Association in this State is a very active professional organisation and it is playing a fundamental role in professional development programs in this area. When members visit the Royal Show this year they will see the developments that are taking place for the establishment of the Investigator Science and Technology Centre, which is an innovative and exciting new opportunity for all South Australians to see the importance of science in our community and in our daily lives.

The recently released Finn report, to which I referred in this place last week, highlights scientific and technological skill among the six national competencies essential for employability in this nation in the future. The fact remains that much more work is still to be done in our schools in this area. Members will be as concerned as I am to know that only one in five girls studying publicly examined subjects chose to study physics and one in four chose to study chemistry, yet we all know that, looking to the future, the physical sciences are pathways to better choices in careers. That is being denied to far too many girls. However, it is being redressed in the new South Australian Certificate of Education and in support for weeks such as Australian Science in Schools Week.

WORKCOVER

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): My question is directed to the Minister of Labour. What are the latest estimates for the public sector of the annual cost of workers compensation and its unfunded future liabilities?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The public sector has never put together funding for the future for its liabilities in

WorkCover, because it pays on a year by year basis. The real cost of workers compensation in the Government is coming down, and we are pleased about that, because the Government is performing quite well.

MEDICAL FEE

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Following the introduction of the Federal budget, is the Minister of Health now in a position to inform the House of the impact of the Federal Government's introduction of a \$3.50 fee for GPs, and particularly the effect on our public hospitals?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Premier, being asked a not too dissimilar question in the House the other day, said that he felt he would have a great deal of difficulty in justifying this charge, and I am told that the member for Adelaide has also spoken in similar terms in the Chamber.

Dr Armitage interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: On a couple of occasions in this House, the member for Adelaide has similarly criticised the imposition in the Federal budget of a \$3.50 fee.

Dr Armitage interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: That is my reading of *Hansard*. In any event, I hope that the honourable member picks up the phone and rings his Federal colleagues on this matter, because Dr Hewson and Mr John Howard have both given rather more than tepid support for the \$3.50 imposition. The member for Adelaide was talking about narcolepsy in certain quarters: I think that some selective amnesia might be operating here. As a matter of fact, Dr Hewson said:

We also welcome the fact that they have started to face reality on Medicare, for example, although in terms of the document itself, it tells you they have still got a long way to go, but it is a move in the right direction.

There is a straw in the wind if ever I heard it, but I will not go further in that direction. I can confirm that there is now some considerable concern about the impact of the charge on the traffic through the accident and emergency departments of our hospitals. Two of the directors of these departments were on radio this morning, and I would have to echo what was said in relation to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. It does not service a large residential population, therefore it might be under rather less threat than say, Flinders, which clearly services quite a large residential population—people who are within walking distance of the hospital.

The concern is greater in country areas. As members may well know, we have an arrangement with country GPs whereby we guarantee a refund of 100 per cent, therefore it is not so much that there will be an incentive for the customer to go to the hospital for treatment but that there will be an incentive for the doctor to book the customer into the hospital rather than seeing that individual in his or her own surgery.

One of my very senior officers is at present discussing the impact of the charge with the Commonwealth. I have no doubt that the other States are doing the same thing. We will see what comes of that. It would not be possible at this stage for the hospitals in fact to impose the \$3.50 fee: that would breach the Medicare agreement. So, there would have to be some amendment to the Medicare agreement for that to happen. Alternatively, the Commonwealth might be prepared to advance money to the States in order to assist in dealing with the additional traffic in accident and emergency if the additional cost is not to be put on.

All I can say is that generally the conclusion is that this concept of a co-payment is unlikely to achieve that which

is intended. Economic opinion, if it can be relied on (and we know that it cannot always be relied on), would suggest that co-payments do not really start to bite until they are up to about 50 per cent of the cost of the service being considered. We will keep the matter under very active review, because the present situation will require some modification to our procedures.

WORKERS COMPENSATION COSTS

Mr GUNN (Eyre): Does the Minister of Labour agree with the PSA that it is a myth that stress claims are blowing out workers compensation costs; and, if so, how does he account for the Auditor-General's criticism of this problem, particularly in the Education Department and the prison service?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Like the member for Eyre, I do not always believe everything I read in the *Advertiser*.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning advise the House of the Government's strategy to help reduce the greenhouse effect in South Australia? What are the targets for stabilising greenhouse gas emissions? The Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change which was established by the United Nations predicts that, under a 'business as usual' emission scenario, global temperatures will increase by about one degree by the year 2025 and three degrees by the year 2100. While there are uncertainties about these predictions both in degree and timing, global warming would have a number of far-reaching consequences for South Australia's natural, economic and human systems.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: This is a critical issue, and it is an issue on which I think we must adopt the international term 'the precautionary principle'—in other words, we do not wait until there is some absolutely definitive and unassailable evidence that this is happening before we take action to do something about it. This Government has determined that it will work very closely with all the States and at a national level to ensure that we have the same policies and directions as the other States and the Commonwealth.

South Australia has gone a step further than most of the other States and, in response to the predictions about greenhouse, we have developed and endorsed as a Government a comprehensive greenhouse strategy which involves 21 groups and agencies and lists more than 120 separate recommendations.

The measures outlined in our greenhouse strategy need a high level of commitment from everyone, not just from the South Australian Government but from industry and every individual within the community. This kind of commitment will need to extend over a long period. The measures are necessary both to meet the challenge of stabilising greenhouse gas emissions by the year 2000 and to reduce them by 20 per cent by the year 2005.

Last year in South Australia the emission of one greenhouse gas, carbon dioxide, amounted to nearly 15 tonnes for every person living in this State. This was twice as much per person as in 1960. So, within 30 years we had more than doubled the amount of carbon dioxide which we are releasing into the atmosphere. The next five to 10 years will be critical in reversing the trend from increasing emissions

to, first, stabilising those emissions and, finally, decreasing them.

As the honourable member has pointed out, the consequences of doing nothing, pretending that it will go away or be someone else's problem are quite horrendous not only to future generations but, I put it to members, to this generation, albeit in our old age.

FINNISS SPRINGS PASTORAL LEASE

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning tell the House whether the Government has acquired the Finnis Springs lease or has resumed it, and can she specifically detail the relevant Acts under which she exercised her authority?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question and I will be delighted to provide that information. In fact, in the ministerial statement I made yesterday I made clear that the actual resumption of the lease was under the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act. However, the rationale for that resumption was under my powers under the Aboriginal Heritage Act. In answering the question, I would like briefly to refer the honourable member to section 32 (1) of the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989 which, under 'Resumption of land' provides:

32. (1) The Minister may, by notice in the *Gazette*, resume any pastoral land.

(3) The resumption takes effect on a day specified in the notice in the *Gazette*, which must be a day falling at least six months after the date on which that notice is given.

Hence, the Government's decision to communicate to the public that the resumption will take effect six months from the time of the announcement. This section goes on to provide other conditions with which we have in fact complied. Section 32 also specifies the way in which compensation must be determined and paid. I made very clear yesterday in my ministerial statement that every one of those conditions had or would be met. With respect to compensation, section 39 (1) provides:

39. (1) A lessee is entitled to compensation on . . .

Subsection (2) provides:

(a) resumption of pastoral land; . . .

(a) will be determined by agreement between the Minister and the lessee—

I think I gave that information yesterday—

or, in default of agreement, by the Land and Valuation Court.

Finally, subsection (2) (b) provides that the compensation—
must be based on the market value of the pastoral lease as if the lease were not being resumed or were not expiring but had been duly extended in accordance with this Act.

I give an assurance that every condition provided in the Act will be carried out. In explaining the second part of my answer, I was referring to section 30 of the Aboriginal Heritage Act and, indeed, the decision taken by the Government was based on that Act, but the actual resumption took place under the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act.

SPENCER GULF REGIONAL GROUP TRAINING SCHEME

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education inform the House of the current funding situation for the Spencer Gulf regional group training scheme? A recent report in a regional news-

paper stated that this scheme would fold if future funding were not secured and that that would leave 93 young trainees without jobs.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I was pleased to announce last month that \$30 000 in special assistance was provided to the Spencer Gulf regional training scheme. It is recognised that this scheme operates across the remotest areas of the State and therefore is experiencing unique problems during these current difficult times. This grant was in addition to \$120 000 of State moneys provided to all group training schemes in South Australia to assist apprentices facing losses by remaining in training. I was therefore surprised and somewhat dismayed to read the newspaper report which cast doubt on the future of the Spencer Gulf regional group training scheme, and I was particularly surprised that the report was implicitly critical of the State Government.

However, I have been advised that the article did not adequately reflect the comments of the Manager of the group training scheme. The Manager of the scheme had informed the reporter that he had appreciated the strong support of the member for Stuart, the member for Whyalla and the Federal member for Grey. He was also fulsome, in his praise of the State Government, as it had been the only body to step in with extra financial support to the tune of \$30 000, and it had done so promptly.

I am sure that members on both sides of the House would agree that group training schemes have a special role to play in industry training, particularly with respect to the quality and quantity of training for small business, and it is certainly worthy of continuing support and development. That is why the State Government contributes almost three-quarters of a million dollars worth of grants to these schemes to assist them to pay their administration costs.

The Spencer Gulf regional group training scheme has, for example, had contact with the Office of Labour Market Adjustment, and only last week the South Australian Government's Kickstart regional assistance team for Whyalla met with the scheme to discuss involvement of the scheme in the Kickstart program. It is the intention of all group training schemes to achieve essentially self-sufficiency. In progressing this, the State Government is fully committed to providing ongoing advice and assistance. Group schemes will be well placed to take advantage of the training market and indeed to establish enterprise activity either on their own account or in joint venturing arrangements with industry and/or community-based organisations.

FINNISS SPRINGS

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Can the Minister of Lands tell the House which tribal elder or elders of the Arrabunna people she consulted; how many of the Kuyani people she spoke to; and with whom she spoke from the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement in Port Augusta in relation to the resumption of Finnis Springs? The Minister, in her statement to the House yesterday, referred to consultations she had with 19 of the traditional Arrabunna owners, and that she had received strong representations from the Kuyani people. The Minister may not be aware that the Arrabunna tribe are not traditional owners of the Finnis Springs land and that, of the Kuyani tribe who are the traditional owners, none are alive today.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am sorry that the Opposition finds this amusing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I do not intend to drag into this place the complexities and sensitivities of the Aboriginal owners of this lease and the traditional people who are involved. The local member for this area is very well aware of the complexities and some of the sensitivities of the issues surrounding the resumption of this lease and the return of that area to the traditional owners. I will be prepared to get the person who oversees the Act in the department, Mr Bruce Lever, who has handled the negotiations in this—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I do not find this a laughing matter at all.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: As my colleague has said, it is grossly insulting to the Aboriginal people to have this kind of humorous point scoring exercise at the expense of Aboriginal communities, their history and culture, and I for one will not indulge in that kind of behaviour. I have offered a meeting, and it has been accepted through the local member, with Mr Bruce Lever. If it is appropriate, I am prepared to extend that courtesy to the member for Murray-Mallee. I do not intend to drag individuals' names into this Parliament for them to be held up as some sort of laughing stock. I will continue to administer my portfolio in the spirit of the law and to the letter of the law, and with some understanding and appreciation of the cultural historic—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: —sensitivities of the Aboriginal people in our community. Even if I am ridiculed by the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: —I am proud to continue in the way I am administering—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: —the Aboriginal Heritage Act and the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act. I am prepared to provide this information on a personal basis to the honourable member. If he is serious about wanting information, I am sure he will be delighted. If he wants to score some kind of cheap political point at the expense of the Aboriginal community, I expect that will also be exposed in the fullness of time.

E&WS DEPARTMENT

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I direct my question to the Minister of Water Resources. Has a review been undertaken of the organisational structure of the E&WS Department?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I can inform the honourable member that a review has been undertaken. The review is a report entitled 'Options for a New Structure'. It was received by the department and me in May 1991. Indeed, the report has been accepted in principle by the Government and new arrangements will be subject to consultation and implementation over the next six to 12 months. Again, this is an example of the Government's move forward in terms of providing for its service departments, such as the E&WS, an efficient, effective, customer-oriented service. Not only do I welcome this change but also I will support the admin-

istration of the E&WS in implementing this new structural report.

FISHERIES DEPARTMENT

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Does the Minister of Fisheries acknowledge that the situation in the Department of Fisheries is critical and that his own authority is in question, demonstrated by the fact that at least four votes of no-confidence in the Director and four votes of no-confidence in the Department of Fisheries have been carried at regional meetings of fishing organisations around the State in the past two weeks; and what plans does he have to restore confidence in his administration?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The honourable member is referring to a vote that was taken amongst some of the fishers of the southern zone rock lobster fishery, and it relates to the future need for rationalisation in the southern zone rock lobster arena. I do think there has been a misunderstanding of a statement that the Director made in a letter, which he wrote, I think, to the association—and he may also have repeated it to individual members. This led them to take the action that is now being reported.

Anyone who pays any attention to the southern zone rock lobster fishery, which has been a fishery that has certainly generated much revenue for the State in the past, will recognise that it has had to be closely monitored and managed. There is the danger, as with any other fishery, of over fishing it for commercial purposes and, consequently, it dying out. Discussions occurred earlier this year on precisely that issue of whether or not it is time for further rationalisation in the southern zone rock lobster fishery, particularly with respect to any changes in the management arrangements.

The department argues very strongly that there should be a reduction in effort. I also have to say that a number of fishers in the fishery argue there should be a reduction in effort, because I have received letters from a number of them. The point is: how do we then get to that? I expressed the view when I addressed—

Mr Meier interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Mr Speaker, if I can be allowed to continue.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member asked the question, and I expect that he would want to get some information. At a recent meeting of SAFIC I was asked whether I would impose arbitrary changes to the arrangements without first consulting that organisation. I said that it was important that any changes, any reduction in effort, in that fishery should result from consultation between the fishers in the industry and the department. I was adamant that that would be the case and that I would not introduce any such changes without consultation.

What the Director has said to them is, 'Let's sit down and talk about what changes there can be, but I have to tell you that, if you are not prepared to agree to a reduction in effort, I will be advising very strongly that there should be a reduction in effort anyway, and that there should be a change to the management arrangements.' It is entirely within his right to make that recommendation. He is entitled to have an opinion about the matter and then have me consider it. He does not lose his right to have an opinion about the matter. For example, if there were no consensus of view, some fishers would say, 'Something has to happen.' So, the Director would express the view that there should be a reduction of effort.

I would not expect that any member here would say that the Director should lose the right to express a view to me. However, in the final analysis I stand by the commitment I made to SAFIC; that is, I will listen to what the fishers in the industry want before the decisions are made. When the decisions are made, they will have taken into account those views, and the Director of Fisheries, like others, will have an entitlement to express a view.

UNDERPASSES

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Will the Minister of Transport consider including in his department's program of review of pedestrian crossing facilities along the Glenelg tramline the underpass immediately east of Marion Road, which is adjacent to Mavis Avenue, South Plympton, a facility which elderly constituents nearby are fearful of using and which is in an offensive condition? Many elderly residents living nearby are concerned that not only is the underpass unsightly, because of graffiti and litter, and unhygienic from being used as a public toilet but it is also poorly lit and gloomy, and residents feel that it is a potential hiding place for petty criminals who prey on the elderly.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The short answer is 'Yes'. Where there is an alternative to underpasses, we are removing them.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Apparently things turn full circle. I remember when it was a great initiative of this Government to put in underpasses, and I recall the Opposition for many years demanding that they be put in. At the time I was one of those who thought that they were correct. However, I get as much pressure today to close underpasses and provide alternative means of crossing tram or train lines as I am sure the Hon. G.T. Virgo got to do away with crossings and to introduce underpasses. We have a program of phasing them out. As far as I am concerned, it is a pity. Nevertheless, they will be phased out as soon as we can find alternatives and funds permit. I will obtain the program for the honourable member and see where that particular underpass is listed.

STATE BANK

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Given his increased powers under the State Bank indemnity, will the Premier, as Treasurer, direct that the performance of the State Bank since 12 February 1991 be subject to examination by this year's parliamentary Estimates Committees?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would have to take that question on notice. I must admit that I have not given it any specific consideration. However, as I have already announced to the House, the intention is that the annual report of the State Bank and its results will be presented on budget day as part of an overall picture of the State's finances and, of course, our budget initiatives. I do not know whether that in itself would qualify for an Estimates examination, and I am not sure whether the State Bank Act, which is very specific about the powers that not only the Minister may exercise but thereby Parliament over the State Bank and its independence, could make it subject to such examination. I suspect not because, unlike other statutory authorities, it is not under the control and direction of the Minister. The Act specifically protects the State Bank and its board from interference by the Executive or the Legislature.

In the absence of a change to the Act, or amendments of some kind, I do not believe that such an examination would be appropriate or warranted. I will take advice on that, but, frankly, it had not occurred to me. In a sense it should be superfluous because, as the honourable member would know, as everybody does, the State Bank is being subjected to an extremely detailed and extensive examination through the royal commission. Part of the outcome of the royal commission could well be some recommendations by the Commissioner on the question of the legislation and the way in which the State Bank could be subjected to Parliament. The Auditor-General, under the Act, is specifically precluded from auditing the State Bank's accounts. It is required to appoint two independent auditors. But, concurrently with the royal commission, the Auditor-General is carrying out a major inquiry into the bank and its situation prior to February 1991. Again, there may be some outcome from that which would be put before the House at the appropriate time.

SPECIAL OLYMPICS SWIMMING CARNIVAL

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Education advise the House of the effectiveness of the recent Special Olympics Carnival involving young people with disabilities and community organisations? I understand that a Special Olympics Carnival was held at the Adelaide Aquatic Centre, which included support from a number of community groups, including the Henley Surf Lifesaving Club.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The Special Olympics Swimming Carnival held in July at the Adelaide Aquatic Centre was a tremendous success, with nearly 300 participants and support from a wide range of community groups and individuals. It is unfortunate that that most significant event in the life of our community received so little publicity, so I am pleased to acknowledge the activities and outcomes of that carnival.

The event involved school students and other people with disabilities. Students from Government and non-government schools throughout the State, and young people from sheltered workshops took part in a range of water activities. The event, which is now in its fourth year and which is proving more successful each year, is coordinated by Ms Elaine MacFarlane, formerly of St Ann's Special School, who is now with the South Australian Sports Institute. The participation of families, school staff and others within the community, including the Variety Club, Henley Surf Lifesaving Club, the Swimming Association of South Australia, the Marion Swimming Club, Aussie Masters and the Kiwanis Club, ensured its success.

Volunteers from these organisations assisted on the night as carnival officials, while sponsorship from the Variety Club ensured that more young people could participate from the country areas. Those community groups and families are to be applauded for their support in highlighting the abilities of people with special needs. For example, for the first time this year, students from the Mount Gambier special school and Port Augusta special school took part, thanks to the support of the generous sponsors.

Similarly, there was strong participation from students and staff in other country locations, including the Riverland and Port Lincoln. Young people competed with enthusiasm, energy and skill, and I am advised they were thrilled when presented with medals for their achievements, which were thus acknowledged. The carnival reflects the increasing recognition of how young people with disabilities can achieve

and demonstrate abilities when presented with the appropriate opportunity.

ANTI-DUMPING MECHANISM

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): Does the Minister of Agriculture agree that a fast track anti-dumping mechanism would help achieve a basis of fair trading for primary products in Australia and, if so, what action will he take to influence the Federal Government in that direction?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: This question is really an echo of issues that were canvassed in this House some months ago. The answer is, 'Yes'. The second point is that that view has been expressed both by the Premier and by me to the Prime Minister and to the former Federal Minister for Primary Industries and Energy, John Kerin.

We echo at every opportunity we have that that should happen. I agree with the honourable member that nothing has happened at the Federal level, and I believe that there is a need for action. The honourable member's question concerned what we have done, and I can tell him that we have actively pursued the matter. However, I will obtain a report on where the Federal Government stands on this situation and when we can expect an answer. It is an important issue, and I believe that we have evidenced that by what we have done in the past.

DANGERS TO CHILDREN

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Has the Minister of Health any information on how common it is for young children to swallow very small batteries thinking that they are sweets?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: There is considerable concern about this matter. The Health Commission's Injuries Surveillance Unit has recently recorded 31 cases of children between nine months and six years swallowing very small batteries. Six of these children required admission to hospital, while nine others required follow-up outpatient treatment. If a child is suspected of swallowing a battery, medical attention should be sought immediately.

Hospital X-rays of the child will obviously determine the position of the battery, and qualified medical opinion can then determine how best the battery can be removed or the chances of its passing. I am afraid that these batteries are very accessible to young children. They are accessible from electronic games, hearing aids, TV remote controls, whistling key rings (which embarrassed me a couple of times at a musical performance when I had one in my pocket), watches, calculators, musical cards, and so on. They are all over the place.

A number of things have been considered with a view to trying to prevent this from happening. There is the suggestion, for example, that these objects should be coated with some very foul tasting chemical, which is otherwise harmless to the child, to induce the child to expectorate the object once it is put into the mouth. I guess that vigilance on the part of the parents is also very important. I would suggest that if people want more information about this problem they take it up with the Injuries Surveillance Unit of the Health Commission. In the meantime, the unit is doing all that it possibly can to alert health units, medical practitioners, nurses and other people in the industry about the danger of these otherwise very useful little devices.

SAGASCO

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Following the Treasurer's assurances to the budget Estimates Committee last September that 'there is no present intention to sell down' any of the Government's shareholding in SAGASCO Holdings Limited and 'we have much longer-term interests in SAGASCO as an effective operation and it is still in an early stage of its performance', will he explain what changed his mind?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: My mind did not change. In fact, a commercial decision was made, in the light of the very strong share market performance of SAGASCO and the fact that the Government had bonus and dividend shares available to it, to realise on that in the market. It was a very sensible and sound financial decision. We did that on the advice that we received. The Government's original holding in SAGASCO was maintained. Our majority control of that company was maintained. What took place a couple of months ago in no way changes what I said to the Estimates Committee last year.

COASTAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I address my question to the Minister for Environment and Planning. Has the Government prepared a new coastal development strategy to make allowance for predictions of a rise in levels during the next century as a result of the greenhouse effect? As you would be aware, Sir, I have a considerable section of coastline in my electorate, as do you and my colleague to my left. Many of our constituents live adjacent to this coastal region and are vitally concerned about the impact of the greenhouse effect.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. Members may be aware that when I first became the Minister for this particular portfolio the member for Albert Park had me come down to his electorate, at Semaphore Park, I think to Mirani Court, where I had a look at some of the construction—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: This happens to be a fairly important issue, particularly if we consider that over the years totally inappropriate development has taken place on sand-dunes. Indeed, we also have drained swamps as well as building houses over the fragile coastline and dune system. This has resulted in the need to have many kilometres, indeed in excess of 14 km, of seawall to protect the coastline from the ravages of winter storms.

It is important, as I said in my previous answer, that we adopt a precautionary principled approach by looking at future planning development along the metropolitan coastline. We must ensure that our future planning is not carried out in such a haphazard fashion as has taken place in the past and that future generations do not bear the cost of this short-sightedness.

With the advent of the greenhouse effect and the inexorable rise in sea level during the coming century, planning new coastal development becomes more difficult and, I put it to this House, more challenging, and it is important that planners should, quite literally, if I may use a pun, err on the high side. It seems appropriate that we should use this type of caution in future planning so that we can ensure that present day taxpayers, and indeed future generations, do not have to bear the cost of current and future development that does not take into account the whole concept

of a rise in sea level which, of course, is now being shown to be the result of the greenhouse effect.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): My question is directed to the Treasurer. Has the \$55 million net return which the South Australian Government Financing Authority received from the sale of the Government's shareholding in SAGASCO been used to cover the budget shortfall caused by the State Bank bail-out?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: A very profitable realisation on bonus and dividend shares took place in that case and will obviously be applied towards reducing the State's debt.

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICERS' AWARD

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Agriculture advise whether an employee of his department has recently won a prestigious award?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I can advise members that Lynette Dohle of the Department of Agriculture was last night made the South Australian Young Achiever of the Year. I know that all members of this place will be happy to hear that, because they know that the work she has done merits such an award. The Premier was present at the ceremony last night as, indeed, were other members of this place.

Lynette Dohle, who was awarded the Rural Development Young Achiever Award in addition to the South Australian Young Achiever Award, has been the Soils Officer in Kingscote for the past two years after graduating with honours from the Melbourne University as a Bachelor of Agricultural Science. She is the first full-time Soils Officer and the first female Extension Officer on Kangaroo Island. She has helped to establish five land-care groups on the island and has raised \$100 000 for the running of those groups through sponsorships and the like. She is also President of the Kingscote Rural Youth Club and is involved in a number of programs aimed at increasing substantially land management.

Not only has Ms Dohle thrown herself into her duties as required by her job but also she has, through her personal energies in her private life, dedicated herself to the issues of environmental care and land management on the island, and I think she is a worthy recipient of this award. I am very pleased as Minister of Agriculture to note that she has won this award and I pass on my congratulations to her along with the congratulations of this Parliament.

OLYMPIC SPORTS FIELD

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Will the Government be a bidder if the Olympic Sports Field is put up for sale? What action will the Minister take to ensure that the considerable capital investment in the Olympic Sports Field by Athletics SA and the State and Federal Governments is protected in the event that the sports field is sold; and does the Minister support his former Chief Executive Officer George Beltch-

ev's statement to the Burnside council that the future of the Olympic Sports Field would be governed by what the council chooses as its new policy?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question and interest in this matter, which is before the courts at this moment. I think it would be appropriate for me to talk off the record with the honourable member at this stage, pending the outcome of the court hearing. Obviously, the Attorney has an interest in this matter, as he represents the trustees in this hearing.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am afraid that I will have to take advice. I do not necessarily accept the member for Morphett's legal advice on this matter. I would be happy to answer the question, but I think it most appropriate that I ascertain the exact situation. I had a discussion with the President of Athletics SA about this very issue. I do not want in any way to jeopardise the situation confronting that organisation. I have a very strong sympathy for its case, as is well known, and I will do all I can to ensure that not only the public asset but also the position of Athletics SA is protected. I will take legal advice on this matter.

STUART HIGHWAY

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Transport indicate to the House when it is anticipated that the detour around Red Hill on Highway One—Stuart Highway—is likely to be completed? Materials for the reconstruction of this section of the highway have been accumulating over a period but, to date, no work has actually been done.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As I understand the question, as much of it as I heard, if the matter has been approved by the Public Works Standing Committee—

Mr S.G. Evans: It rejected it.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It rejected it?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Speaker, I think the member for Davenport is confusing this particular bypass at Red Hill with the Adelaide Entertainment Centre! I will obtain the schedule in respect of that section for the member for Stuart so she will be able to tell her constituents—and indeed mine, who also from time to time use that stretch of road—just where it is on the program, when it will be commenced and when it will be finished.

NATIONAL GAS STRATEGY

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): My question is directed to the Premier. Is the Government developing a response to the Federal Government's discussion paper for a national gas strategy? Does he agree with the conclusion in the discussion paper that there needs to be reform to enable unrestricted gas pipelines throughout this country between the States, and what is his attitude to the discussion paper's goal of developing a national gas pipeline grid?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This question would more properly be directed to my colleague the Minister of Mines and Energy. Unfortunately, he is not in the House today. I would be confident that we are developing a response, if we have not already done so. Certainly, so far as South Australia is concerned, we have been taking a leading role in the attempt to break down artificial State border barriers

which prevent the proper and economic distribution of that vital resource within Australia.

As the honourable member would know, only very recently the Minister and I were involved in a ceremony with the Queensland Premier which saw Queensland gas, which had been steadfastly protected by the previous Bjelke-Petersen Government—quite against the national and, I suggest, Queensland's interests—being made available to South Australia and New South Wales. We are undertaking similar negotiations with the Northern Territory Government, but they have had a fairly shaky passage. At one stage it looked as if we would be able to clinch an agreement, but then we were told by the Northern Territory Government that that was not the case.

However, discussions are continuing and we have certainly indicated that we are strongly of the view that the resources in that part of the world should be used where they may most effectively be used. To the extent that the Federal Government's approach to a national gas policy can reflect that, we will be able to support it.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: VARIETY CLUB BUSH BASH

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr D.S. BAKER: The question asked by the member for Stuart today bears all the resemblance of an outrageous allegation put to me last Tuesday by someone from the media when they rang me at my office. I asked the person to read the details to me over the phone, and of course I denied any knowledge of the incident at all. When it was alleged that there was a police report, I attempted to ring the Police Commissioner to ascertain whether the allegation had any basis in fact.

I was unable to speak with the Police Commissioner, but I spoke with the Deputy Commissioner. He phoned me back within a few minutes and said that there had been an incident at Magic Mountain, which I think was reported in the paper. At no stage was I involved in that incident. At no stage was my name mentioned in any report, and what was read to me over the phone and what the member for Stuart read to this House today was a total fabrication.

I should explain to the House exactly what I was doing on the Variety Club Bush Bash and exactly what happened with respect to my involvement. I was asked by the Chairman of the Variety Club Bush Bash whether I would like to be the club's guest for several days during the event. I explained that I was unable to be there the whole time because Parliament was sitting. I was asked officially whether I would like to be involved for the first couple of days and on the last weekend for the final evening dinner.

The bush bash is run by the Variety Club, and it raises some \$600 000 a year for underprivileged children. I accepted the invitation, which was to be with the Chairman of the bush bash in his car—which was a service car and not one of the bush bash cars. He asked me whether I would like to be a passenger in one of the cars if that were possible, and I said I would be very happy to do that. When I got to the start of the event on Saturday morning the Chairman said that there had been a late withdrawal from one car and he asked whether I would care to meet the owners of the car and the team participants. He said that, if I liked, I could join that crew.

I met those people, and I was ecstatic to find out that the car was sponsored by Greening Australia. The car, No. 18,

was called 'The Green Machine', and it was also sponsored by the Woods and Forests Department, which I thought was very appropriate. I joined that team as a passenger. When we were about to leave Colley Reserve at Glenelg I was asked, because I am now more city based than country based, whether I would like to drive the car for the first 50 kilometres on a good road, because it might give the team more publicity. I agreed to that. I did drive the car—very expertly, I thought—onto the ramp, got the publicity they required, and we proceeded to the bush bash.

About two miles from Glenelg, on Anzac Highway, I was waved down by a police patrol. They said that it was a breathalyser test. I was asked to pull over and blow into a mechanism. If I could not make the mechanism whistle, the fine for the car would be \$10. The mechanism was a party whistle, which I blew into as hard as I could. Even though I am a politician, I could not make it whistle. Subsequently, the car was fined \$10. Each car was pulled over by this 'breathalyser' station, which was a good stunt to raise money for the police and for whatever charity they sponsor.

I duly successfully drove my 40 or 50 kilometres that I was allowed, and I was then unceremoniously pushed into the back of the car and became a passenger. From memory, we were next pulled over in Balaklava by police officers and residents. I think their greeting was, 'You are welcome in this town, but if you want to get out it will cost you.' So, we then gave to whatever charity they were raising funds for. It was a very pleasant occasion. The next stop was for lunch on the Quorn Oval.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader's time has expired. Do you seek leave to continue?

Mr D.S. BAKER: Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

Mr D.S. BAKER: We were one of the early cars—not due to me, but as a result of the expert driving and navigating of the owners of the car. We had our lunch and, like many other cars, we decided to go on. We were welcomed by police officers at Quorn, as had happened two or three times earlier during the day, who asked all cars to wait. By this time it was about 1½ hours after the first car arrived, and some people were agitated at being held back for so long, because normally cars were allowed to leave in the same order in which they arrived.

The rumour was that the police wanted to make some announcement, but that they were waiting until the chief marshal arrived. As more and more people arrived and were waiting, there were some quite serious allegations floating around amongst the crowd: that Magic Mountain had burnt down because of a flare at the start, that Adelaide Airport had been closed because of that and that serious injuries had been caused to several police officers during that incident. Those rumours were becoming stronger and stronger as more and more cars arrived. With three or four hundred people having a good time and wanting to be part of the bush bash, one can imagine how some of those rumours grew bigger and bigger. The general consensus was that this was probably another stunt by the Quorn Progress Association, or whatever charity was in the town, and that no doubt by the payment of a small but not insignificant fine the cars would be allowed to leave. Still they waited.

I do not know how many other people went over, but I said to a group of people who were becoming concerned about some of these rumours, 'The most sensible thing to do is for me to go over and ask the police officer whether we are going to be held here long, for how long and what is going on.' I duly walked over. I did not have to introduce myself to the police officer, who was most courteous. I

think I would have said, 'Is this another fund-raising stunt, because I am hearing some very bad rumours?' He said, 'I am sorry, Sir. This is most serious. There was a problem at the start with the flares and we are holding all cars here until you are spoken to by the chief marshal of the bush bash.'

I went back and everyone waited until the 80 cars got in, and we were held up for about two hours. The chief marshal then explained the seriousness of what had happened at the start. All people who had flares in their cars or had let off flares were asked to come forward. Those people duly came forward with their flares. At no stage were there any flares in the car in which I was a passenger and at no stage did anyone in that car let off any flares. The police acted in a very sensible manner. I think everyone was stunned that something had gone amiss at the start. The most important thing on which everyone agreed was that at no stage did anyone want to bring into disrepute the bush bash and the people involved in it, who were only out there raising money for charity. The bush bash then went on.

I must say that this sort of baseless allegation stops all of us, as politicians, becoming involved in anything that raises money for charity or in any public function. It makes it impossible for the Premier or for anyone else to become involved when this sort of rubbish can be brought forward in this House. I could not care less for myself—it is a baseless, scurrilous allegation—but I hope that people understand the damage that this sort of nonsense can do if it gets down to the gutter and the political level.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEDICARE

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Dr ARMITAGE: I believe I have been misrepresented. Earlier in Question Time the Minister of Health, in response to a question, indicated that he had read in *Hansard* that I shared the Premier's view on the \$3.50 Medicare charge going up to \$5. First, I challenge the Minister to show me where I have said this. I have said that Medicare has been described by the Federal Minister of Health as one of the ALP's proudest social achievements. I also said that not one member opposite had said anything about the changes to Medicare. I further said that Medicare is a universal cover system, but what it provides is universal access to waiting lists. I did not use the words attributed to me by the Minister. Whilst I understand his acute sensitivity about this matter, I would ask him to be more accurate in future.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: HON. TED CHAPMAN

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I move:

That one month's leave of absence be granted to the member for Alexandra (Hon. Ted Chapman) on account of ill health.

Motion carried.

JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Family and Community Services): I move:

That a select committee be established to examine—

- (a) the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act and the effectiveness of its operation;
- (b) the administration of the Children's Court;

- (c) the resources devoted to the juvenile justice system and their effectiveness;
- (d) the adequacy of custodial and non-custodial programs for juvenile offenders and the extent to which the services provided by Government agencies and the Children's Court can more closely be integrated;
- (e) the problems of truancy; and
- (f) such other matters which relate to juvenile justice.

As periodically occurs, concerns have recently been raised from various sections of the community, media and judiciary over the effectiveness of our juvenile justice system. Attention has been drawn to delays in court hearings, the efficacy of rulings, high rates of repeat offending, and the volume of young people dealt with by children's aid panels and screening panels, indicators of a system that is not fully serving the needs of the juvenile or of society.

Most western societies, and indeed all States of Australia, need to search for new ways for dealing with crime. In many ways the system we work under today in South Australia is the same as it was 100 years ago, in that prosecutors, welfare workers and magistrates (since 1971, judges as well), all follow the traditional British justice model, as modified from time to time to reflect prevailing community attitudes. For many decades we have tended to rely exclusively on what has been termed criminal justice reactions—more police, heavier sentences and expanded prison and correctional programs.

Australia's current annual investment in law enforcement alone is estimated at well over \$2 billion. In South Australia we can justly boast more police *per capita* than any other State, and in recent years we consistently have devoted more resources to police, courts of criminal jurisdiction and corrections than the Australian National Grants Commission Standard. In the juvenile area we have been most innovative. We have increased penalties and instituted community service orders to allow courts to order offenders to clean up graffiti and to repair vandalism. We have established local community-based crime prevention committees to develop initiatives for specific problems in their locations.

Our record in South Australia is very good. Yet, despite this, our crime rates have continued to climb in much the same way as those of other States. Media attention has focused on young people's acts of vandalism, graffiti, car thefts and violence on public transport. There remains, rightly or wrongly, a community perception that the juvenile justice system is not responding effectively to such behaviour; that, instead of forcing youths to accept responsibility for their offending, it is letting them off.

Of particular concern in this context is the perception of 'soft' treatment meted out to hardcore, repeat offenders, and claims that they are treating the system with disdain. Yet, in a given year, only about 4 per cent of South Australians under the age of 18 years appear before a court or children's aid panel. Figures over the past five years suggest that approximately 85 per cent of children appearing before aid panels make no subsequent Children's Court appearances, and that approximately 96 per cent of all South Australian youth has no occasion to appear before courts or panels at any time.

Crime has been no respecter of political ideology. Social democratic Governments and conservative Governments throughout the world and, indeed, in Australia have had to confront the same problem. In the final analysis, crime is a community concern for which Government and community solutions must be found. We all need to become aware of the need to find new ways to deal with crime. In August 1990, the eighth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders passed a comprehensive resolution on preventing urban crime. In

the preamble to that resolution, congress delegates from over 140 nations unanimously expressed their conviction:

That a successful program to reduce crime cannot be based solely on the police and criminal justice system and that it must be matched by an active prevention policy which includes means of reinforcing common values so that personal and community responsibility regarding crime is acknowledged, as well as social and community development (programs) and the reduction of opportunities for offending.

This reflects the importance of, first, traditional methods and, secondly, prevention policy, in particular designing out crime and, thereby, reducing opportunity, and reinforcing common values of personal and community responsibility. The resolution went on to emphasise the importance of institutions in society and the role of citizens. In particular it noted:

That it is the task of Government and other sectors of society to facilitate the development of local and national prevention programs; that prevention must bring together those with responsibility for planning and development, for the family, health, employment and training, housing, social services, leisure activities, schools, the police and the justice system, in order to deal with the conditions that generate crime.

A number of countries with which we would feel very familiar, including England, France, The Netherlands, Sweden, Canada, New Zealand, Belgium and Germany, as well as countries with which we trade significantly, like Japan and many of the countries of (what used to be) the Eastern bloc, spoke as with one voice in supporting this resolution. The sentiments that underline their unambiguous consensus support through this resolution on preventing urban crime, were that:

1. The community has an important role to play.
2. Just spending money on the criminal justice system is not on its own going to be effective.
3. No matter how much is spent on law enforcement or how rapidly courts commit offenders to prison, crime will continue to grow,

All Governments, legal thinkers, policy analysts, law-makers and police are generally in accord with these sentiments and are developing similar programs. In South Australia we also need therefore to re-examine our juvenile justice system. We need, in conjunction with the community, to determine how can an inhabitant, citizen or resident respect and observe the laws that express the underlying values of the community in which they live. Individuals need to see themselves as full and equal members of that community, not to feel rejected or excluded or that society is not doing its utmost to find ways of prevention of their alienation from the mainstream community.

At the same time, we need an effective system of deterrence, a system that will be seen in the eyes of the community as effective. The select committee will therefore seek substantial input from the community as well as from Government and non-government agencies and organisations. It is intended for the select committee to hold public hearings where practicable, which means reporting by the press to ensure the community is fully apprised of the workings of the select committee and to maximise community participation.

At the same time, the select committee will not prevent the Government from time to time making announcements of reforms or changes to meet immediate needs or implement strategies or policies presently under consideration in relation to our juvenile justice system. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on the question:

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

(Continued from 21 August. Page 413.)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I take the opportunity in this grievance debate to give both a bouquet and a brickbat. The bouquet is for the initiative that has been taken by a group of people in the Barossa Valley to commemorate the 150th anniversary of European settlement in that area. Members will recall from the early history of South Australia that the South Australian Company was extended when the Angas family became very involved in activities in the Barossa Valley.

Shortly afterwards, the area was also populated by a number of dissidents from Prussia and other areas of Germany, who were the advance group of German migration. In 1992 it will be 150 years since that development commenced, and a group of people, including members of both the English and the German groupings, plus others who have become part of the Barossa population, have commenced meetings for the purpose of developing a series of events during 1992 to commemorate this quite important part of South Australia's history.

It is interesting to note that Mr Colin Angas (a great-grandson or perhaps great-great-grandson of the original Angas family) and Sir Condor Laucke (Lieutenant-Governor of this State) have accepted dual patronage of the group that is to be formed. The former President of the Lutheran Church in Australia, Pastor Grope, is to lead the committee that is formulating activities for 1992, and they have called for assistance from a wide group of people throughout the Barossa area.

It is too early to say exactly what will take place during that period, but it is initiatives such as this that are of tremendous importance not only for the heritage value, the historical value, but also for the purpose of giving people the opportunity to visit a prime tourist area of the State and to take part in a number of the activities that will follow.

I know that my Federal colleague, Neil Andrew, like me and like the chairmen and mayors of the councils directly associated with the Barossa Valley, has pledged support. I have communicated to the Premier the fact that this event is to take place, and I look forward to a wide involvement of the populace of South Australia in that important sesquicentenary event for the Barossa Valley. Undoubtedly there will be a number of opportunities for people to express their interest relating to the industry of the area, the historical churches and the importance of tourism. I have no doubt that the wineries, which are the major industry in that area, will play their part in this overall program.

The next matter to which I refer—and it is fortuitous that the Minister of Labour is on the frontbench at the moment—is WorkCover. Indications have been given to all members that they may give evidence to the select committee which, apparently, is meeting not particularly frequently. Although some people have had applications to appear and give evidence before the committee for many months, they still have not been given the opportunity to do so. My concerns are not only with WorkCover and its various aspects: what concerns me greatly and, I believe, other members of the House as a result of experiences in our electorate offices is the grave difficulty faced by a number of people who are being rehabilitated in getting into a program or, once they get into a program, in being taken

seriously or assisted seriously. I recognise that this is a slight against those who are providing the service, but it needs to be said.

I draw attention to the plight of one young lady who is a constituent of mine and who was recently advised in writing—and I have a copy of the document with me—that it would be necessary for her to make 70 applications for a job each week. This constituent lives in Roseworthy, a country town not far north of Gawler; Roseworthy is not isolated but it is away from the centre of the city. Therefore, if she makes these applications by telephone, she will be involved in country to city telephone expenses; if she makes these applications by post, she will be up for at least seventy 43c stamps a week, plus the time spent in preparing the applications.

While the organisation that was giving her instructions had on previous occasions assisted by photocopying and preparing some material for her to distribute in the process of obtaining a job, that assistance has now been withdrawn. How can a person who is receiving a benefit, who is still in difficulty because of an injury and who has a number of other associated costs in attending interviews—if interviews are granted—find the time and the dollars and cents to lodge 70 applications for jobs a week? I make a further point: as soon as the prospective employer becomes aware that the problem is a back injury, the opportunity for an interview is markedly reduced—almost to zilch—and there are all sorts of problems directly associated with that.

This is not an isolated incident. I know that other members are aware of similar experiences. I am aware of other people who are in the system and who seem to be on a treadmill, getting nowhere fast. Members on both sides of the House recognise that there is a difficulty. They supported a motion in this House to set up a select committee to address some of these issues. They indicated clearly to the Minister, the department, WorkCover and anyone else who would listen that they have a genuine interest in finding answers to a number of these difficulties, yet we appear to be stymied.

At one stage we had the name of a person in WorkCover who would take inquiries from members of Parliament and try to provide answers in a short time. That situation no longer exists. We send in our information through the channel that was suggested in the past, and in many cases we get no answer. We ring for the person who, we are told, has been given the responsibility of providing an answer, yet they do not return the telephone call, and I fully appreciate that they do not return telephone calls because they are flat strapped with the amount of work that is expected of them. But, by the same token, if the system is supposed to be working to give succour to those who are in difficulties and who have had to resort to an appeal to their member of Parliament, action ought to be taken.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): In addressing the Supply Bill yesterday I spoke about the entrenched nature of the Public Service, the changing nature of our society and the need to look at both. In that context I wish to further develop that theme in this grievance debate, especially as it relates to the Supply Bill in terms of the application of Government money for the payment of those paid from the public purse.

I, and I hope other members of this House, but certainly many members of the community, have experienced growing concern at some of the anomalies that we see apparently developing among the pay scales of those who are paid from the public purse. Perhaps we can start with semi-government authorities and statutory authorities. I am divulging no confidence when I confirm in this House that

people such as the Chief Executive Officer of the State Bank was receiving many hundreds of thousands of dollars a year. I believe that many other people working for what really are semi-government authorities or statutory authorities as the Chief Executive Officers are receiving similar sums. I believe that that is a situation that must be deplored, and deplored on good grounds.

We live in a parliamentary democracy, and all the business of government falls under the aegis of this place. The principal person bearing the responsibility for the Government of the day is the Premier, with his Ministers, and they act in an executive capacity for all members of this House. Therefore, I find it somewhat incomprehensible that the chief officer of this State, the person on whom all the responsibility falls—the Premier of South Australia—can earn considerably less—and I say ‘considerably less’ intentionally—than people who basically work for him on behalf of the State. That the Managing Director of the State Bank, that perhaps the person in charge of the Grand Prix Board and that people of like ilk can earn so much more than the Premier of South Australia, who bears the entire responsibility for the running of this State, must be open to question.

In like vein, I am somewhat perplexed by what appears to be the unravelling revelations concerning pay structures awarded by the Industrial Commission under the award of the Municipal Officers Association. I, along with many other members I am sure, was intrigued to learn of the alleged salary paid to the Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation of the City of Adelaide. I was not pleased to learn that that gentleman apparently receives a pay scale and package that exceeds that of the Premier of South Australia.

In looking at the restructuring of the Public Service, its departments and the people who serve the State, it must be necessary to look at the levels of pay for such people. It strikes me that, if the Premier of South Australia is on a certain pay level, those who work under him in any capacity at all should not exceed that, certainly not by the amounts currently being paid out of the public purse. I believe that the salaries of senior officers of councils, who are paid under the award of the Municipal Officers Association, are linked to the rates collected by those councils. That is a dangerous practice in any institution but especially in a level of government. Indeed, if we were to link the salary of the Premier or any member of this House to the taxes we collect, the public might cynically believe that taxes would go forever upwards for no other reason than to see those officers benefit.

Whilst I do not accept such a cynical view, many people who live in my electorate have suggested just that to me with respect to the Municipal Officers Association. They believe that those officers have a vested interest in seeing that rates do not go down but, in fact, that the expenditure of local government is ever on the increase. Therefore, I believe that, not only statutory authorities and the Public Service but also the third tier of government (local government), should be looked at so that there is parity between the pay scales of all three levels of government.

I note that, with respect to the State and Federal Governments, officers working at those levels for various departments in the Public Service receive about the same pay. I believe that it is time that the salaries of officers working for the Local Government Association should be equated to the level of pay of other officers employed in the Public Service at both State and Federal levels.

The chief argument I have heard put forward by others as justification for what I consider to be the exorbitant salaries paid to some of these people is, ‘Well, if we don’t

pay these levels of salary we won’t be able to attract the right people to the job.’ I put to this House that the whole of our society relies for its well-being on a healthy economy and that a healthy economy relies on the generation of wealth. Any analysis of the sort of society in which we live will clearly indicate that the generation of wealth is almost entirely in the hands of the private sector. It is by the labour of individuals in the private sector that wealth is generated. It is a function of Government—indeed, a duty and a responsibility—to create an environment in which the wealth of the people increases through a healthy economy.

That being the case, I and most or even all members on this side of the House believe that it is not the Government’s job to be involved in competition with the private sector; rather, it should create the conditions in which the private sector can thrive. Does it matter whether we lose from the Public Service people trained and versed in the Public Service to help in the private sector towards the creation of a healthy economy? I would say that it does not. No matter what the private sector may pay its employees, I do not think that factor should affect what the Government pays its employees.

The great danger in what has happened is evidenced not by the ordinary workers in the private sector but by some of the activities in the corporate boardrooms and the pirates or cowboys that have inhabited those boardrooms from the end of the 1980s. It is abhorrent that any board of directors or chief executive officer can virtually grant for themselves an exorbitant salary from a public company on the ground that they hold shares in every other company. I believe the Commonwealth Government should look carefully at that issue.

I have no objection to the owner of a private company making such profits as he can from the sale of his product, goods or services, but I do have an objection—and a very strong one—to people who are, after all, the custodians of public money, granting themselves through public companies exorbitant salaries and pay packages by the manipulation of shareholder’s funds, I believe that something should be done about that. I believe that the Government should not take that particular excess of the private sector as its example in setting salaries for its officers and that it should set salaries commensurate with the salary paid to the chief person of this State on whom all responsibility falls: the Premier of South Australia.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I think it is about time that members of Parliament started to do something about the standards in this place. On two occasions today there have been instances of denigration of members of Parliament, and it is time that we as a group looked at our performance. In the first instance, this morning the use of language, which whilst not unparliamentary was quite derogatory to the honourable member concerned, was unnecessary and could have been avoided. This afternoon in Question Time a quite scurrilous question was asked with virtually no answer being given and requiring a personal explanation by the Leader. That sort of behaviour takes this Parliament to the lowest level it can reach.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: If the member opposite would like to ask the honourable member concerned whether he has ever received a personal letter from a certain person and ask him to table it here, he would have a clear answer. If we expect the public to listen to what we are about and to respect us as individuals instead of rating us at this very low level, we should observe reasonable standards. Members opposite know what I am talking about, and I believe

it behoves all members on both sides of the House to accept that. I would now like to talk about some nonsense put forward by the Government in relation to water rates.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We will improve the standards and have order.

Mr INGERSON: In the past few days in this House I have listened to some of the answers to questions and debate put forward in relation to water rates. The two areas on which I would like to comment today relate specifically to matters of accounting that affect my electorate. The first matter relates to the retrospectivity charge. We heard today that the new billing system was to apply from 1 July. The legislation specifically provided that the new system would apply from 1 July this year.

However, constituents in my electorate are having their bills back charged to 1 January this year, using the new system. We have complained publicly, and a special meeting was called in my electorate by the Burnside council at which the 500 people in attendance complained about that retrospectivity. That is one issue that my constituents are very concerned about. They accept very begrudgingly that the new system is a wealth tax, a tax on ownership and a tax on property—all three combined. Whilst they do not like it, they are prepared to wear it and wait until the new Government is elected and changes it to a fairer user-pays system. However, they object to what I call their being misled by the Government in relation to this back charge. As I said earlier, a member opposite clearly said today that the new legislation would operate from 1 July, and that is how it ought to be.

Any person who used an excess amount of water prior to 1 July should pay for it at the old rate. Anyone who uses an excess amount of water after 1 July should pay for it at the new rate: it is as simple as that. That is one of the major complaints of the people in my electorate. I have a very large number of people in my electorate who are aged and on pensions or who are superannuants, all of whom maintain that this wealth tax that has been imposed upon them is unfair. Whilst members opposite may say that it applies only to 14 per cent, involving people who live in the eastern suburbs—a percentage which we question and do not believe but which is indicated in the Government's brochure—it just so happens that it applies to almost 100 per cent of my electorate. My constituents think, as do I, that the system is unreasonable, and we will continue to complain until we get the changes that we believe are warranted.

I want now to refer to the massive one page advertisement in today's paper about WorkCover in which the Premier clearly is being threatened by the union movement. If he makes any attempt to change the WorkCover system, he should look out because they will make sure that the members concerned—and I assume they are referring particularly to the member for Florey—will not be re-elected to Parliament. Whilst I do not object to any group, union or employee organisation inserting advertisements arguing against either Government or Opposition policies, it is fairly scurrilous when the union movement goes so far as to threaten the Government of the day that if it makes any change they will make sure that certain members are not re-elected. That attitude must be condemned. I found the next advertisement far more amusing and interesting: inserted by the Public Service Association, it says that 'WorkCover is bankrupt' is a myth, and then it states:

Far from it—WorkCover has investments approaching \$500 million.

What they have forgotten to tell the public is that WorkCover has debts of \$750 million. In other words, it has an

unfunded liability of \$250 million. Again we see the union movement—in this case the PSA—using half the story to advance its argument. It is a pity that it does not state the true facts, that it is basically bankrupt because there is an unfunded liability of \$250 million. As I said in explanation to a question today, it is losing approximately \$12 million per month. That means that, if there is no change, by the end of 1992 the unfunded liability will be of the order of \$400 million. The article further states, 'WorkCover is sending employers broke'. However, it adds that the average cost per employee has decreased.

Two years ago the average levy on employers was 3.2 per cent and today it is 3.8 per cent. More importantly, last year \$60 million extra was taken from employers in this State, at the same time as the unfunded liability went from \$160 million to \$259 million. If the employers had not put that extra \$60 million into the scheme, instead of the deficit blowing out by \$130 million it would have blown out by \$210 million. So, it is nonsense that WorkCover is sending employers broke, and the article's response to that statement is just further nonsense. In fact, it is sending many people broke, and many people come into my office saying that, if it does not change, they will close their business, and more people will then be out of work in this State. The article further states, 'WorkCover is a bloated bureaucracy'. Prior to WorkCover's being set up, approximately 240 people administered workers compensation in this State: today there are 600.

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

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I will refer to a few matters of concern to me. First, I draw attention to the absolutely ridiculous way in which the Government is attempting to provide a second-hand vehicles compensation fund at the expense across the board of all dealers in second-hand vehicles. The ridiculous part about it is that, whereas the Government wishes to provide some protection to consumers, the people who wish to buy second-hand vehicles, it cannot bear to tell members of the general public that they ought to be wary when buying something, and it finds itself doing what it has done ever since it came to office, taking a sledge hammer to the problem. It is a simple, blinkered arithmetic approach. The Government expects—indeed, demands—that, in addition to the licence fee, every second-hand motor vehicle dealer must pay \$150 into the second-hand vehicles compensation fund to cover such events as the failure of the Medindie used car sales group in recent times, so that members of the general public are protected from that eventuality.

Whether or not we agree that there ought to be some protection for members of the public, or otherwise provide a *caveat emptor* or *caveat venditor* (if you are the seller using a second-hand motor vehicle yard in which to sell your car on consignment), I do not believe that this is a fair and reasonable way to raise money for that fund. It is clear to me that the fairer way would be to require members of the general public, whenever they put themselves at risk of losing their car or buying a car which does not belong to the person selling it to them—when there is some other unfortunate consequence of their deciding to trade vehicles—to pay a certain amount on each transaction sufficient to raise the funds that the Government requires. Instead, the Government has decided to require the dealers to pay \$150 each year when they apply to have their second-hand motor vehicle dealer's licence renewed.

That is a tragedy because it hits small dealers providing a service in a small rural community very hard indeed.

They may make only one or two sales a year, nonetheless they represent an important part of that community by providing the people who live there with a service they would not otherwise enjoy. Three dealers in my electorate have not renewed their second-hand motor vehicle licence because they refuse to pay the iniquitous charge of \$150. If a dealer were to handle only two second-hand vehicles a year in the retail market, the cost is \$75 on each. The large dealers in the city who can afford to pay that fee could set aside a dollar in respect of each transaction. Dealers in the city who sell hundreds of vehicles a year should make a contribution more in proportion to the number of clients they have—buyers and sellers—compared with country dealers. Of course, country dealers will have to increase the price of their vehicles to cover this additional fee.

To charge the dealer a straight fee, regardless of the volume of throughput, is wrong. The fairer way is to require a levy of a dollar or so on each transaction to finance the compensation fund. I understand why those dealers are objecting, and I understand their sense of outrage, but the Government does not. As I have said before, the Government either does not think about or does not care how it affects people in the less populated communities of South Australia who have committed no crime whatever. Indeed, they provide this State with a great service in that their efforts contribute a great deal to the production of goods, which we export from South Australia to provide us with prosperity.

Why should the Government require fruit growers at Mypolonga to contribute to the cost of monitoring an outbreak of fruit-fly in Strathalbyn? That strikes me as being very blinkered thinking—no lateral thinking is involved at all. The Government ought to do two things: first, establish that there are no fruit-fly extant of the Strathalbyn area; and, secondly, in the process, establish in its trapping program that there are no fruit-fly in the Mypolonga fruit growing area in my electorate. The Government is requiring fruit growers in Mypolonga to contribute to the cost because it says it is to the benefit of the fruit growers at Mypolonga. That is piffle! It may incidentally benefit the people of Mypolonga, but the greatest benefit is that we will be able to continue to sell South Australian produce overseas, whether it be from Mypolonga or anywhere else that is certified free of fruit-fly.

Therefore, it is a legitimate charge on the public purse and should not fall on the incidental fruit growers of that district. It strikes me as being very unreasonable. The measure has not been thought through fairly or carefully, and the Government ought to reconsider its position for a miserly few thousand dollars. When there is an inflated dollar and depressed prices, a few thousand dollars mean a lot to the fruit growers and their families, but it means very little in the overall expenditure context of the Government's budget.

Another problem which affects the people I represent is WorkCover for casual labourers. At present, if a casual labourer decides to find secure income during this time of recession—it is depression in my electorate—the 'clever' thing to do is get a job and allege that an injury occurred on the job after being there a few weeks to establish the rate of pay being obtained. They can then go off on compensation without loss of income, without the need to travel to and from work and without the need to look for work—much the same as the riggers on the Myer Remm site who are still getting \$900 a week. That situation is crook, and the Minister must address it. There must be greater incentive for injured workers to get back to work: there is none at present. These people think it is better to fake an injury or inflict a deliberate injury and get full pay for no work

during the recession. The same problem occurs with superannuation in that the funds are lost when they are taken from the wages of the itinerant worker. It is said that all the contributions that have been paid into that fund have been used up in administration charges—

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

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I refer to an earlier incident in which an honourable member set out to malign another member of this House. It is a pity that people allow themselves to be used as tools to try to unfairly denigrate the character of another person. One can assume that it is done for political purposes. Further to what was said by the Leader of the Opposition in his personal explanation, I make the point that what we heard today from the member opposite was an example of something that was unwarranted and unjustified from a person who I believe—as do other people—has a very pleasant nature and who has shown no vindictiveness in her attitude in the past.

Obviously, she found herself in a position where, because she happens to be of a particular sex, she could raise the issue, and soften the blow and still get the message across. There is no doubt in my mind that it was planned. The Minister who took the question was organised and came back with a very responsible approach. He said he had no knowledge of the incident but would have an investigation or inquiry carried out. It is a subtle way of attempting a nasty and unwarranted slight against someone. Of course, the idea is that, if mud is thrown, it will stick.

I want to refer to a recent announcement by the Minister of Transport that more buses should be made available to serve Aberfoyle Park, and so on, using Blackwood Railway Station as an interchange. That is great, and I am sure all people in that area appreciate that, except those who travel by train at peak hours—unless the Minister also makes sure there is either more carriages or more trains. In other words, there must be more seats for people because at peak hour those trains are already overcrowded. It is no good putting on more buses to deliver passengers to the Blackwood Railway Station unless there is more capacity on the trains in those peak hour periods. I hope the Minister takes note of that. I am sure his minders will pick up my comments and pass them on to him through the system.

I am also concerned about the Blackwood recreation centre, a community recreation centre with many volunteers helping to run it and very few paid staff. There have been problems there with youths who abuse people while they are playing sport. For example, last week while badminton was being played two youths interfered with the games. They were affected by either drugs or alcohol. The people in the teams believed that it was more likely to have been alcohol, which cannot be obtained on the premises. When a responsible citizen, a doctor, approached the two of them and said, 'You must stop this', they gave him a mouthful of good old Australian abuse including the suggestion that they had carried out certain acts with his wife, that his wife was not very capable of that activity, and they made other quite scandalous comments to him and to others. Eventually they were removed from the building. Later the people inside the centre heard some noises. Going outside, they found that these youths had deliberately set about damaging motor cars to the extent of thousands of dollars.

I understand that after the incident was reported it took 50 minutes for the police to get from Darlington to the Blackwood recreation centre. When we want an ambulance, it can get from Mitchell Park to Blackwood in five to seven minutes. The Blackwood ambulance station has been closed

and the facilities have been taken down to the plains, but I understand that is the time it takes. In a case like this, when people felt threatened by individuals, surely the police could have arrived more rapidly. I raise the matter with the Minister in the hope that he will see what can be done about it. I realise that today he is unwell with severe 'flu or a wog infection. People should be able to play competitive sports without such intrusions and threats. Society really must tighten up on the people who cause the trouble.

I want to raise the plight of one section of the rural industry on which none of us really spends enough time in this tough period. I refer to vegetable growers and, to a degree, the fruit growers, although prices have been better this year than last year for apples and some of the other fruits. Of course, it helps the Government's figures with regard to the cost of living. The grower is getting ridiculous prices for his vegetables. Unfortunately, the middle people—the wholesalers and retailers—are not passing on the benefits of the low prices that the grower is receiving. It appears that they arrive at a figure that they want to make per kilogram on potatoes, carrots or cabbages. It does not matter about the price at which they buy; they still add on that same monetary value, not a percentage. It is slightly different with the big operators when they want to crush one another, whether it be Coles, Woolworths or any of the others. They will use the efforts of the grower to give a benefit to the community, at the same time exploiting the grower. However, they do not do that all the time.

There is no doubt that in the main the grower is exploited. If we carried out an investigation into this exploitation, we, as a Parliament, would be amazed at just how cheaply vegetables could be sold if the low prices paid to the growers were reflected in the retail prices. I have friends in the retail fruit and vegetable trade who would not like to hear me say that, but it is the truth. Potatoes are as low as \$60 per tonne to the growers—but the price needs to be \$180 per tonne for him to break even for the year. There are huge costs and losses to those people this year. I hope that, through public pressure and articles in the media through investigative journalism, pressure will be brought to bear to highlight how growers have been exploited by what we call the middle people—the wholesalers and the retailers. I can understand why people in the citrus industry were concerned recently and even now for similar reasons, including subsidised imports of extracts, and so on.

Another point relates to a big stand of mature pine trees nearly adjacent to the Belair Railway Station, but they are situated in the Belair National Park as it is now called. I wrote to the Minister—and I waited a long time for a reply—asking what was to happen to those trees. I knew that they were going to get the chop. Last week, I got a letter from the Minister informing me that they were all to be cut down in the next two years. I make the point, at this time of talk about greening Australia, whether it is in the Belair National Park or anywhere else, that a tree is a tree. If they are mature trees—and we are encouraging people to keep mature trees—why cut them down in the national park? They are nowhere near the main conservation part of the park; they are in a tight little corner adjacent to the railway station. I think that we should preserve them.

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

Motion carried.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Finance): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

I thank all members for their contributions which ranged far and wide. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition started off in Moscow and others finished up in Louisiana.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It was a powerful speech and it obviously had the desired result. There were obviously far too many points for me to respond to at this stage. I am sure that the House has taken note of all the points that were made by members. I am sure that Ministers, in particular, will take note of those points and will respond to them in writing and in detail where a response is appropriate. Traditionally, the Supply Bill in the South Australian Parliament is a formality and I am sure that all members will support the third reading.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

SOVIET UNION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Brindal (resumed on motion):

That this Parliament rejoices in the deliverance of constitutional government in the Soviet Union from the communist *coup d'etat*.

(Continued from page 436.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I will speak but briefly to the motion. I am delighted with the message we are sending out by, presumably, the unanimous approval of this House. It is appropriate that we should stop and cheer, and give thanks for the events of the past 24 hours, because we have all lived under a cloud for the past 40 years. With the arrival of glasnost and perestroika, most people felt that the world had a chance.

As a parent of young children who are now teenagers, I had some severe reservations about the future they faced in the world for a whole range of reasons but, principally, because of the question whether they could have a peaceful coexistence with their overseas neighbours. It is a very small world, so if there is strife on an international scale it will eventually spread to Australia. We are not immune.

Even leaving aside the matter of my own private demands and my needs for security for my children, it would be wrong of me not to express the wish that all people in the world could live in peace. The Russian bear has been overshadowing the world for 40 years, and the changes that have taken place in Russia and flowed through to the other countries that made up the Soviet bloc have heartened all people throughout the world. Without that change there was never any prospect of peace, whether hostility was created through deliberate intent or just through misunderstanding.

I was somewhat relieved as to the future of my family when those changes took place and, of course, I was appalled when the *coup d'etat* occurred and President Gorbachev was deposed. It is a great day. Although we have not returned to the comfort zone, because change will be quite traumatic and the best will of all those concerned will be tested, at least we have taken another step forward rather than stepping back into the past to all the terrible things the world has done to itself over a long period of time in the name of ideology, self-interest and of factors associated with the proliferation of communism. I endorse the sentiments of the motion.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I support the motion. Every South Australian who has been involved with immigration and with the development of our State over the past 50

years would be cheering today at this very important event in the Soviet Union. I support it, and I am very thrilled that it has occurred. Those people who live in the Baltic States have spent most of their lives worrying about their children. I am pleased for them in particular that this very important event has occurred. I support the motion and hope that all members of the House will do the same.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I wish to contribute to this debate for several reasons. First, I want to commend the member for Hayward for his sharpness of mind in having made it possible for us, through the application of the Standing Orders of this place, to bring on this motion so that at this early opportunity we can place on record our sentiments of joy in approving what has occurred, distressed though we may be that it was ever necessary for us to do that.

The second reason is simply that, in company with the member for Elizabeth, I had the good fortune just over two years ago to be in Russia as well as in some of the republics and to see first hand the way in which people live. More particularly, we witnessed the change in attitudes that was occurring in consequence of glasnost and perestroika. Young people seemed to be more optimistic, and the children were contemptuous of what appeared to be the determination of people committed to the use of uniforms and jackboots to measure their tread, monitor their lives and prevent them from doing anything of which they, the uniformed, disapproved.

Whilst there, we witnessed the momentous first sitting of a Parliament of the Soviet republics and the joy that was obviously abroad in the streets, where people in groups of not just three or four but eight or a dozen walked down the streets going about their business, but all clustered around one individual who happened to have a transistor radio, listening to the proceedings of the Parliament.

In our hotels we saw on television the proceedings of that Parliament, and, in a House where over 2 000 members could assemble, there was not one vacant seat. There was absolutely rapt attention to the proceedings of that institution, although it was nothing like we have in terms of Standing Orders to give members freedom to speak, and so on.

Nonetheless, it was representative of a new direction. At the same time, I recall thinking, since I had seen it on a smaller scale in other countries, that the military would not tolerate it; it would see that its power and position of privilege was under threat. It had the guns and, sooner or later, would be tempted to assert its authority to regain control of its empire, and not to allow the democratic process to determine the direction of society and the fashion in which people conduct themselves as individuals within that social fabric.

It did happen but, fortunately for all of us on God's earth, it failed. In consequence, it has given us all great cause to be delighted and to join with the people of all the republics and, indeed, with people around the world who seek for their populations, their fellow men and women as citizens wherever they are, the freedom to move, to say, to think and to do whatever they wish, subject always to the rights of others as determined by law made in a democratically elected forum under statute establishing the rights of others.

Finally, as the member for Bragg did, I rejoice in the freedom of those oppressed peoples in several of the republics of the USSR. They can now enjoy the freedom they should never have had taken from them. Whether that increases the measure of responsibility they as a nation or as individual members and citizens of that nation must

accept does not matter. I am sure that, like us, they will feel much more incentive to go on living, raising their families, doing the things that others amongst their number are prepared to pay for and enjoying the right to trade with the rest of the world in goods and ideas.

The idea of democracy has taken a long time to be understood. It is not an opiate for the masses, nor is it a sop. Democracy is the only way we can govern a society effectively and in perpetuity. I commend the motion to the House, knowing that it will receive unanimous support.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I thank all members who have contributed to this debate. There were some very interesting contributions. I thank particularly the member for Spence for seconding this motion which is now before the House. I think that all members know that the member for Spence has had a deep and abiding interest in this matter and has rushed out at every opportunity to see the news, as I know have many other members. I thank everybody for their contribution.

I particularly thank the Minister of Ethnic Affairs for bothering to come in and contribute to this debate. I acknowledge the validity of some of what he said. I accept his point that a constitutional Government as we know it is perhaps not part of the USSR even today. I add that the *coup d'etat* was unconstitutional even in terms of the limited constitution which the USSR itself espouses.

I acknowledge that the Minister of Ethnic Affairs, who I know has a deep and abiding commitment towards the plight of minorities wherever they are found in the world—and I commend him for the stance that he has taken in this Chamber and other forums over very many years—also pointed out that it is the spirit of the motion that we are addressing and that the USSR is, hopefully, once again pointing in the same direction.

I sincerely apologise to any member of this House who believes that I have been guilty of a procedural discourtesy towards any other member of this place. That was not my intention. I believe that this is an important matter and as you, Sir, so rightly said, the House has expressed an opinion on it. I hope that that will not cloud the vote on this issue. I commend the motion to the House. I thank members who have commended me for moving this motion. However, I believe that I deserve no credit. It is and should be a motion of this House as much proposed by every other member as it is by me.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Transport): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): The *News* of Thursday 15 August recorded an interview with the Leader of the Opposition. I will not deal with the interview which, in the main, was about his low popularity. However, I will cite one statement of the Leader of the Opposition, as follows:

After Hewson, I was the next one to come out and say, 'We have got to get out and sell this consumption tax. You might be unpopular in the short term but if you stick to your plan and avoid pulling stunts you will get there.'

It is that matter I would like to address. I have placed on record in this place that it is the prerogative of any member of this House to say exactly where they stand in regard to a consumption tax. Most members on this side—I think I

could say all members on this side—are violently opposed to a consumption tax. There have been quite a few debates over the past few weeks, and I am sure there will be more debate over the next two months, about this iniquitous tax. The Leader of the Opposition said that, if we want to prove to the community that something is good, we have to go out and sell it.

In the Address in Reply and the Supply Bill debate I did not hear one word from members opposite who are heeding their Leader's call. I as a member of the Labor Party, and because I have made my views known about a consumption tax, was sent a document entitled 'The Liberal and National Country Parties' Key to a Fair Taxation System, a Goods and Services Tax, Brief No. 1, by Senator Margaret Reid, Senator for the ACT'. That was obviously sent to me so that I was aware of the other side of the issue. I was always brought up to look at both sides of an argument before I came down with a decision.

I will not quote from this document, because I do not think it is worth the paper it is printed on. However, I will say to members of the Opposition that, if they do not have a copy of it, I will gladly make one available—I will even run it off under my own photocopying allocation—so that they can at least have the guts to stand up, as their Leader does, and support a consumption tax. I think I know why Liberal Party members in this House do not support a consumption tax.

I have already placed on record how much a Mercedes Benz four door saloon would cost me if I were ever to go down the track of being one of the silvertails; I could get it for something like \$91 000. But, if Mr Hewson were in power and the consumption tax were in place, that car would cost me \$37 000 less. I have already gone into that in the Address in Reply debate. Perhaps that is one of the reasons it is the constituents of members opposite who drive a Mercedes Benz, not our constituents. Let us look at the luxury goods which are currently taxed at 30 per cent under our current sales tax system but which would be cheaper under the Liberal Party's consumption tax.

Sir, if you wanted to buy your wife a fur coat, you would get it much cheaper. If you wanted to adorn your wife with jewellery, you could get it a lot cheaper. Further, watches, clocks, diamonds, most cosmetics, electronic appliances and photographic equipment would be cheaper. They are not the things that my constituents would buy. Now that the Minister has given them Saturday afternoon trading, they would not say, 'Let's go down to Johnnies and buy an expensive fur so that we can go into town.' The kind of people whom I represent, Sir, and the kind of people whom you represent, just cannot do that kind of thing.

However, the goods that would be significantly dearer under a consumption tax would be the things that your constituents, Sir, and my constituents need to survive in this cruel world in which we live. Almost all white goods, household appliances, furnishings and carpets—all the things that young couples who are moving into a new home would need—would be significantly dearer under Hewson's consumption tax.

We can imagine how those residents in Burnside who are screaming like stuck pigs because they will have to pay possibly an extra \$3 or \$4 a year for water will scream about a consumption tax. It would be another fur for their wives, another luxury Mercedes Benz in their garage. It would not do your constituents, Sir, or my constituents, any good: it would certainly do the member for Bragg's constituents a world of good.

It does not end there. I have yet to hear from the member for Flinders, whom I recognise as one of the two represen-

tatives of the rural community. Members opposite may represent some rural communities but certainly in this House they do not stand up and fight on behalf of those communities. One can argue that travel on country buses is quite expensive at present. How much would bus travel cost if there were a consumption tax? There would be a 15 per cent rise, at least, in the cost of bus and train travel to Adelaide for rural people. Let us consider the things for which rural people have to pay. Most telephone calls for country people are STD, and 15 per cent would be added to the cost if a consumption tax were imposed.

One could argue that the cost of telephone calls is high enough as it is. Can you imagine someone in a rural community wanting to make an urgent telephone call to Adelaide? He cannot get it at off-peak rates, so he makes the call with a 15 per cent increase. It does not end there. My colleague the member for Albert Park talked about the cost of a funeral. The Liberals would even put 15 per cent on funerals.

In this brief we have been delivered a furphy by Senator Margaret Reid and the Liberal Party that the cost of bringing in the consumption tax would be cheaper than the current system. Take the experience of the British, who have had the VAT system for 10 to 15 years. Let's face it: the Brits are pretty good at extracting blood out of a stone as far as taxation is concerned. I know, because I spent a few years working my fingers to the bone and giving most of it to the Government. The British Government must pay 2 per cent of its yield on VAT. To bring in the VAT it cost 2 per cent of the revenue yield. That is about four times what it cost to collect each dollar of sales tax in Australia. So, the Liberals cannot tell us that it will be cheaper; it will cost a lot more to bring in a consumption tax.

I always believe that if you are going to buy something you must be able to know what it is, what it is all about, what it will cost and what you are going to get out of it. You do that when you buy a motor car. I know, Sir, that you do not buy a Mercedes Benz; you are like me and you buy a good old cheap Ford. But with a consumption tax, there is nothing. Dr Hewson and the Leader of the Opposition are saying to the community of Australia, 'Trust us. We will give you a consumption tax.' They make no comment about how much it will cost and how many more public servants will be needed.

Again, if one looks at the British experience, one sees that they had an army of taxation people somewhere out in the country occupying almost a full county, and their sole job was to extract taxes from the British public. That group of public servants increased by almost one-third to enable the consumption tax to be administered. I, and most members of this House, know that, because until now not one member opposite has heeded the call of their Leader. As I go, I will draw attention to something else that the Leader said. He said, 'After Hewson, I was the next one to come out and say that we have to get out and sell the consumption tax.' They have not done it and I think I have exposed to the House why. If members opposite believe what their Leader says, they should go out and sell the consumption tax.

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

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): Although it is not my intention to refer very much to the previous speaker's comments, I just want to say that, at the appropriate time, that honourable member will find that plenty of people will support and promote the cause of a lower income tax and a completely new tax structure, which may or will include

a goods and services tax. In the end result, our country may be able to compete with other countries. Also, those who at present deal in cash—big businesses which rip off the system and which pay very little tax—will then pay an inappropriate amount of tax and those on lower incomes will receive enough benefits to compensate them for any losses that they have incurred.

The honourable member was so foolish—and I use that term because he used it against me last week along with the word ‘utter’—to suggest that, because one drives further in a bus or a car, one pays a bit extra. However, he failed to make the point regarding the sales tax on tyres and motor vehicle parts and, if one dispenses with most of the other forms of tax, the huge tax on fuel can be modified so that motoring will not be one cent more expensive for rural people than it is now. In fact, it may end up being a lot cheaper, so I think the honourable member is being foolish when he goes down that path.

I want to refer, first, to the builders’ licensing system, about which I get quite annoyed. I was brought up in that industry and still have some connections with it through people who work in it. When there is a bit of a crunch in the economy, there are those ‘fly-by-nighters’ who live off the system and go insolvent. They have borrowed too much or have not been good business people, having not collected what was owed to them, and they suddenly find themselves insolvent.

However, some of these people will use somebody else’s licence to stay in the industry. You can drive past a building allotment which has a sign showing ‘Joe Bloggs, licensed builder’, but it is actually Bill Brown who is building the house, using Joe Bloggs’ licence and most probably paying a fee to use it. However, Joe Bloggs has already been proven not suitable to be in the industry. I believe we should set out to make sure that the penalty for this offence is to be banned for life from holding a licence in the industry. All they are doing is exploiting the industry. A heck of a lot of them are out there at the moment using someone else’s licence to stay in the industry because they cannot get one themselves due to their failure in some area, especially those who are insolvent.

Mr Ferguson: They should be put in gaol.

Mr S.G. EVANS: No, I would not do that. I just say: rule them out of the industry. Do not let them carry a trade licence. They use somebody else’s general builder’s licence but still have a trade licence of their own. I would not mind if they kept on in their own trade and did not go into business, but they go into business using somebody else’s general licence. If they are caught, we should take away all their licences and tell them they are finished in the building trade.

Mr Ferguson: They should be sued also.

Mr S.G. EVANS: If they are insolvent, they cannot be sued, so the honourable member’s interjection means nothing in relation to my argument. It is a serious situation and should be looked at carefully. These people are only exploiting the industry, and we, as legislators, should be conscious of that.

Also with respect to insolvency, not just in the building trade but right across the spectrum, each member of Parliament would know of people who have been declared insolvent. However, even while things are being wound up, some start up a business using their marital partner’s name for the business, or they are able to operate if they do not book up goods in their own name.

Mr Ferguson: Or use trust companies.

Mr S.G. EVANS: Or they use trust companies, as the honourable member suggests. I know of one of my constit-

uents who failed in a particular business. However, the next minute they were in a new property at West Lakes, driving around in a brand new Rover motor car—and all this within nine months of their business becoming insolvent. The subcontractors who worked for that person lost everything, including their homes, but for a few tools and a bit of furniture which they were allowed to keep under the Bankruptcy Act.

So, these people pull all the others down, and it is disgraceful that that is allowed to continue. We should say to people who are declared insolvent that they cannot get back into business in any way, shape or form for a considerable number of years. They have failed once, and they ought to go to work for wages and learn that, if they save their money, they may be successful. However, they go into business, buy flash cars, go to the golf club once a week, socialise in clubs and expensive places to all hours of the morning, go on trips, draw money where they cannot be caught, exploit the business and start up again.

I know of one case where a person was declared insolvent in three different businesses during the past 12 years. Each time he dragged down many other people. I find it unbelievable in this modern day that we are prepared to allow that practice to continue. I would support any move to make it tougher for people to get back into business or to be able to use a partner’s name in business if they are the main operator.

Another area of exploitation to which I will refer occurs more often in the ethnic community than those who have lived here for most of their life or who came to this land many years ago. That is in the area of social security—a Federal matter. In some rural pursuits—in particular, market gardening, but also in some small businesses such as shops—they have a couple of children who have left school. They could be 17 or 18, even 25 or 26 and they could be out working. But they work the system to prove that they cannot get a job. They get social security but they help mum and dad out for nothing on the farm, growing vegetables and the like, to the detriment of other genuine producers, and they rig the system. They work for mum and dad on the farm, in the shop or wherever.

That is nothing more than exploitation of the system. I do not care how tough the Federal Government, whether Labor or Liberal, gets in making sure people front up to ensure that they are genuinely trying to get a job and not abusing the system. Maybe we have to look at their signing a statutory declaration that they are working for somebody for nothing. If they work for a close relative on a regular basis, we should look at whether they are earning an income by not paying board or something. At least they could be taxed on what the board value would be. I know that that is hard when they work for the family unit, but why should they exploit the system, which is what they are doing?

I am still waiting for the Minister of Transport to agree to a school crossing at the Coromandel Valley Primary School. I hope that approval is not delayed until such time as a child or adult is seriously injured or killed. Likewise, on the main road at Blackwood between Chapman Street and the Pizza Hut area, I hope that we can get a crossing for elderly people who have to cross four lanes of traffic: it is not possible to judge that distance easily. I know that it costs money but that community deserves to have some money spent, as has been spent in other areas. They deserve a pedestrian crossing at these two points.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I take up the theme that was started by my colleague, the member for Napier, in relation to the consumption tax. This tax would be

introduced should the country be unfortunate enough for the Liberal Party to be successful at the next Federal election. A consumption tax is a general, indirect tax on consumption. It is a multi-stage tax and it is levied on every transaction at all levels of production and distribution. I agree with my friend from Napier that we have not heard much from the Liberal backbench, even though the call has gone out from the Leader that they should go out and sell this taxation. It is no wonder that they are not out selling it, because it is a tax that will bring the wrath of the public down on their heads.

The tax is commonly known as a goods and services tax or a value-added tax (VAT). Very few details about this new tax have been provided by the conservative Opposition Party except that it will replace the wholesale tax system that is currently used in this country. Under our present system, which does not include a tax on services, goods are taxed at three rates: 30 per cent on luxury items such as furs, diamonds, jewellery and top-of-the-range cars.

A rate of 20 per cent is levied on alcohol and cosmetics. A rate of 10 per cent is applied to goods such as furniture, sewing machines and snack foods. It is important here to point out, especially for the benefit of those members on the other side of the House, that sales tax is not levied on essential food items, children's clothing, education and medical services—just to mention a few.

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I am glad to hear an interjection from the member for Newland, because I have yet to see her stand up in this House and defend the goods and services tax. Certainly, as soon as she does I will make sure that the people in her electorate get a copy of her speech. She knows that, if she gives a speech in this House on the goods and services tax, she will not be here after the next election.

The sales tax system, under Labor, places the highest rates on goods at the luxury end of the market. On the other hand, a consumption tax treats all goods equally. It does not discriminate between bread and yachts. So, if her Party is successful, every time the member for Newland's constituents go to the local delicatessen to buy a loaf of bread they will have to pay a 15 per cent tax. The tax would have to be at 15 per cent to work.

Indeed, the good Dr Hewson in the past few days has let the cat out of the bag by suggesting that the tax on all our goods and services will be about 15 per cent. On the other hand, a consumption tax treats all goods equally and does not discriminate. It does not discriminate between fruit and diamonds nor between education and luxury cars.

If the Liberals are successful in this State or in the Commonwealth, those people who are in the unfortunate position of having to pay fees to go to university or to a higher education institution will find themselves having to pay not only the university fees that are now set but also an additional 15 per cent on those fees that are already levied.

All goods, including services, will be taxed at the same rate. So what will happen if a goods and services tax is introduced? The price of food, clothing and all services will rise by the amount of the tax imposed, while the price of luxuries, the majority of them imported, will fall.

Then there is the economic strategy of the Liberal Party—a luxury goods led recovery. It shows just how much the Opposition is out of touch with the working men and women of Australia if the Liberal Party intends to reduce the price of diamonds and then claim that it is concerned with restoring Australia's economic wellbeing.

Supporters of the consumption tax, the Leader of the Opposition, included, argue that this method of taxation is

much fairer than the system already in place. They claim that it will provide people with more choices and lead to more equitable outcomes. Let me talk about equity for just a moment. My understanding is that equity is about a fair distribution of the tax burden across the community. But a flat-rate tax on all goods and services does not lead to such an outcome.

Under a consumption tax system, low-income earners and families with dependent children spend a large proportion of their income on necessities such as food and clothing. It can be said that a goods and services tax is regressive because it imposes relatively heavier tax burdens on low-income earners and families with dependent children. The Liberals' claims of fairness and equitable outcomes are an absolute nonsense and, as far as providing more choices, I can see only one choice available should they be elected. Most ordinary Australians will have no choice but to spend more of their incomes on the basic necessities of life, while pensioners and social welfare beneficiaries will have little choice except to cut back on food.

The people of this country should rise in opposition to this proposed tax. It is clear that it constitutes little more than another weapon in the Liberal Party's armoury to mount an attack on the working people of Australia. Superficial speeches with promises of cuts to personal income taxes and of compensation for people on fixed incomes are made by those who are eager to see this tax implemented. Throughout my research, however, I have been unable to find any ironclad guarantees regarding just which marginal rates will be cut and, if so, by how much.

We are also told that such reductions in marginal income tax rates will increase our incentive to work. We will apparently become more productive and industrious under a GST. I find it difficult to see how such an outcome can result. It is impossible to avoid paying this tax since, under this system, all goods and services will be taxed. What is gained through cuts to income tax will be given back via the tax on consumption. We will not be better off. We will not be able to avoid paying this tax so I fail to see how our incentive to work will be increased.

My argument is supported by the Australian Catholic Social Welfare Commission in its discussion paper on the consumption tax, when it states:

All taxes which reduce net real wages adversely affect work incentives . . . it is fallacious to think that only income taxes do so . . . a 10 per cent consumption tax is equivalent to a 10 per cent tax on income . . .

And, on the subject of compensation, I would like to refer to an article in the *Australian* newspaper from August last year, as follows:

. . . the question of compensation for low-income people has been dismissed by the Shadow Treasurer, Mr Reith, as a mere detail to be decided later.

Mr Reith continued to evade the question of compensation in an interview in the November issue of the *Bulletin* when he was asked how he would compensate those on fixed incomes. He became, once again, evasive and vague. Since this question has yet to be answered, I urge the voting public to treat these promises with suspicion. Overseas experience illustrates the inherent inflationary problems of a consumption tax. When the New Zealand Government introduced a flat rate consumption tax of 10 per cent in 1986, the country's inflation rate leapt from 11 per cent to 18 per cent.

Motion carried.

At 4.58 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 27 August at 2 p.m.