

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 12 September 1991

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

OPERATION KEEPER

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

That this House notes the fine work carried out by the South Australian Police Force through Operation Keeper.

I represent an electorate that takes in a part of metropolitan Adelaide that has the highest known number of child abuse cases. Perhaps that is not the kind of information or statistic that we like to talk about in this House; however, the fact that a disturbing number of cases prompted a special police investigation and unit (Operation Keeper) to be set up to come to grips with the problem and to use some innovative measures to deal with it certainly needs to be talked about in this House—hence this motion.

Sadly, too often in the past society has had no desire to talk about abuse in all its forms, whether it be child or wife, sexual or physical; we left it well alone as if it did not happen to us and as though it was not our business. How many times did we have our suspicions about someone being abused? In most cases, a child would be involved, but we did nothing about it for various reasons. In lots of cases, those reasons were of our own making: we did not want to talk about it or notify the authorities; in fact, we pushed it under the carpet and left it alone.

Thankfully, things have changed. Community attitudes have changed sufficiently for the community to want to do something in relation to child abuse. Two factors, which perhaps played a major role in this change of attitude, occurred in 1989 and 1990. Last year's National Operation Paradox phone-in called 'Dob in a Paedophile' prompted a massive response by the community. In conjunction with this, the introduction by the Education Department of its Protective Behaviour Program, a scheme designed to alert teachers to the early signs of abuse and also to encourage children themselves to report incidents, created a similar response.

Reports of child abuse in the north have increased dramatically. There was no evidence to suggest that there had been an increase in the incidence of child abuse in the northern suburbs, but this dramatic increase in the number of reports was sparked off by better public education. At the same time as this was happening, a CIB officer based at Holden Hill (Sergeant John Bean) was in the process of streamlining child abuse investigation procedures. He was subsequently transferred to Elizabeth where this increase in the reporting of child abuse complaints, with a backlog of some 60 to 70 cases and new notifications of about two per day, resulted in cases having a delay of between six to eight months before they could even be investigated—an outrageous state of affairs.

Stemming from of this concern about delays in investigations and the increasing number of reports of abuse emerged Operation Keeper. As I said earlier, most of us in the community did not at first want to come to grips with the horrors of child abuse. Even now, with all the education programs and the resultant publicity, we still cannot come to terms with what the perpetrator has done to the small victim. It is a recognised fact that, in cases of housebreaking, armed hold-ups and so on, we understand that type of criminal activity—but not child abuse, especially sexual

child abuse. Our immediate reaction is to relate it to our own children, especially those of us who have daughters.

Not surprisingly, it is the same with the police. Certain detectives cannot cope with that kind of crime. I have been told that often many policemen, after reading a young victim's statement, lose perspective; they become victim oriented. It is not the kind of detective work that all police can do, despite the fact that detectives who come out of the Police Academy are, in effect, equipped to deal with all types of criminal activity. In the main they can, but in the case of child sexual abuse some detectives just cannot cope with the situation.

It is here that we come to the core of the success of Operation Keeper because, from the very outset, it has involved detectives who are specialists, who can understand people's emotions whether they are the victims, the victim's family or even the offender. They treat people as people. I have been informed that, apart from the 10 per cent who are hard-core paedophiles, in the main the rest are people who have families. They have committed an offence once, regretted doing it, got away with it, and some time later they go down that track and offend again. In the main, when those people are arrested after admitting the crime, they show signs of obvious relief at being found out, because they want to stop it from reoccurring.

If one looks at some of the cases that came through Operation Keeper—and I do not wish to breach any confidentiality by speaking on those particular cases in the House—that is the underlying fact. Mr Speaker, you come from an area which, basically, is under the jurisdiction of Operation Keeper, and I am sure that, had you spoken to those particular police officers, you would have heard the same kind of story. But we have a problem, because after someone has admitted to child abuse and gone through the courts, society expects them to go to gaol, and so they should. However, in many cases, apart from the obvious offender (the father) not wanting to go to gaol, often the victims themselves do not want Dad to go to gaol. It is in this field that Operation Keeper detectives, in conjunction with the Family and Community Services task force of six workers, work so well not only to stop the abuse and undertake the necessary criminal investigation, but also to ease the emotional pain of all those concerned with that particular criminal activity.

The Operation Keeper force consisted of eight officers (four male and four female), which commenced in February of this year. It was originally expected to run for two months. It received an extension for a further two months because of its successes in carrying out these types of investigations. That success can best be summed up in the words of the officer in charge when Operation Keeper was set up. He said, 'I will keep this unit in place as long as I have to.' I have nothing but the highest praise for the dedication of those officers. At times, we all take our Police Force for granted. Too often we only look at those who disgrace the force, and we are quick to criticise.

After talking to Detective Chief Inspector Presgrave, the operation's commanding officer, and Sergeant John Bean and his team, we gain the impression that they will not rest until the level of child abuse is acceptable. I use the word 'acceptable' in the context of its being controllable through prosecution and attempting to bring it down to the level it is in other areas of the State which, I hasten to add, is also far too high.

What has come out of Operation Keeper? Apart from well over 85 arrests covering some 300 offences with 40 investigations still pending, of which it is reasonably expected the majority will result in court appearances, the rest of the

State will benefit also. In March this year the Assistant Commissioner (Crime), Colin Watkins, in an article in the *News* entitled 'More Police for Sex Abuse Fight', was reported as follows:

Assistant Commissioner (Crime) Colin Watkins confirmed today 43 extra staff would be appointed to a range of established and new units to deal with abuse crimes. New staff would undertake a range of experimental investigations aimed at establishing an accurate picture of the extent of crime across the State. Mr Watkins said South Australian police were leading Australia in developing new techniques to tackle crimes of a nature which clearly were increasing everywhere. 'We are very concerned about these (cases of sex and common assault) and have been for a long period of time,' he said. He said the first of the new police positions would be filled at the beginning of next month. The Domestic Violence Unit will receive an additional 20 staff while the Sexual Assault Unit will gain a further six officers. Ten new positions will be created across the department to specifically target crimes involving the sexual assault of children and adults.

What started off at Elizabeth and surrounding areas through Operation Keeper in a very short time set in place a plan to deal with the awful crime of the sexual assault of young children—a plan that would benefit victims throughout the State. I would like to think that the methods pioneered and used by Operation Keeper and its success rate have played a role in the decision that will ultimately, as I say, benefit all South Australians. I urge all members to support the motion and give it a speedy passage through the House.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (CONTROL OF SLAUGHTERING) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Local Government Act 1934. Read a first time.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

We need to go back to the year 1980 when the Hon. W.E. Chapman, as Minister of Agriculture, introduced into this House a package of Bills as a result of the activities of a select committee which looked into meat hygiene and slaughtering. The then Minister indicated that that package of Bills was to license slaughtering and pet food works; regulate the standards of hygiene and sanitation at slaughtering and pet food works; regulate the quality of meat, meat products and pet food; and for other purposes. The introduction of this legislation appears on pages 1748 to 1752 inclusive of *Hansard* of 26 March 1980. As I indicated, a select committee—set up in November 1979—considered these matters. The then Minister pointed out on introducing the legislation:

The Government was anxious, as the whole community in South Australia is now aware, to ensure a meat hygiene standard in this State that was not only established in Statute in the interests of the community at large but established in a form that was acceptable to the industry that would, or may, be affected by such legislation, and in a form that could be implemented and policed effectively and that would provide the services required.

This measure received the approbation of this House and the other place, and so the Meat Hygiene Bill was passed along with the associated Abattoirs Act Amendment Bill, the Health Act Amendment Bill, the South Australian Meat Corporations Act Amendment Bill and the Local Government Act Amendment Bill. Herein lies the problem: that in the passage of the Local Government Act Amendment Bill, in colloquial terms, the baby went out with the bath water.

What happened with the Local Government Act Amendment Bill was that part of this total package repealed from

that legislation a number of provisions that had been available for local government up to that time to manage the activities of slaughtering within its areas. There was full accord that slaughterhouses and abattoirs should be controlled by the Meat Hygiene Act. What was not envisaged at the time, I suggest, was that taking away from local government the opportunity to manage or control slaughtering within its own council areas, more particularly in the urban area and in township areas, prevented it from controlling the slaughtering of animals in suburban backyards.

If it could be shown under the Meat Hygiene Act that a person was slaughtering for the purpose of his own family, that there was to be no sale of the meat and that, within reason, he kept hygienic standards, the council was denied the opportunity it previously had to require that that practice cease. I do not speak of one issue that has been raised with me by a colleague, that of the knackered of large deceased or injured animals, which is a matter of some compassion and of emergency. Should a horse, cow, goat or sheep be injured in a road accident, it will be knackered on the spot by someone who has the responsibility of removing the carcass.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I point out to the member for Napier that this is not a confessional. He may wish to make his own contribution at a later stage about what has happened to him throughout the years. I would not impact on that involvement.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: I wouldn't let you do it, either!

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Perhaps I should advise the honourable member that I still hold registration as a veterinary surgeon, and there are certain other practices that I can still carry out.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Napier is not a subject of the Bill. I suggest that the honourable member for Light return to the subject.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Clause 3 amended the arrangement section of the Local Government Act Amendment Bill that was passed in 1980 by deleting the heading relating to slaughterhouses. Clause 4 repealed Part XXVII (sections 551 to 555) of the principal Act, which related to the licensing of slaughterhouses. I draw the attention of members to the requirements of section 552 (2), as it then existed in the Local Government Act, as follows:

Any person who, without the permission in writing of the council, slaughters any cattle, sheep, or swine within the area except at a slaughterhouse licensed or established by the council, shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding one hundred dollars: Provided it shall not be an offence for a person to slaughter cattle, sheep, or swine at his own residence or farm where the residence or farm is situated within a district and outside a township or is situated outside any area and outside a township and the cattle, sheep or swine are slaughtered for his own domestic consumption or the consumption of persons employed by him.

That passage clearly does not deny the opportunity to slaughter stock on a farming property, but it does deny that practice within a township. Section 552, and having regard to the amendment of section 667 of the principal Local Government Act, which provides the power to make bylaws, emasculated the opportunity of local government to undertake the controls that had existed previously. That section also provided for the repeal of sections 871w, 871wa, 871wb, 871x and 871xa of the Local Government Act which regulated the operation of abattoirs in Whyalla and which has no significance to the mischief we are trying to overcome by this Bill.

The practice of persons causing their next door neighbours problems by slaughtering an animal in their backyard, specifically in country townships but occasionally in

the Adelaide metropolitan area, has been reported in the press. The bleatings of the animals being slaughtered, the stench of the alimentary tract content, the sometimes improper or ineffective burial of the offal, the drying of the skin and, indeed, the blood which congregates in the soil or the gutters of a property have been a source of annoyance and considerable concern to a large number of people. I am not suggesting that it happens on a frequent basis on any one premise, although a recent 1989 example highlighted in the Murray Bridge area. It indicated that, on one occasion in one person's back yard, 12 animals were slaughtered in the one week. It also indicated that it was not an infrequent occurrence for large numbers of animals, particularly pigs and sheep, to be slaughtered in unhygienic circumstances and without the supervision necessary under the Meat Hygiene Act.

That practice certainly occurs in a town I represent (Gawler) and has been the subject of a letter from one resident not only to the Commissioner of Police but also to the Minister for Local Government Relations, the Premier, the Ombudsman and others. The practice still continues and is causing concern. When the local governing body is approached, it cannot do anything about it if it does not find unhygienic circumstances at the time of inspection. If the local government body were to go onto a property and find unhygienic circumstances, under the Local Government Act and under its powers provided by the local board of health, it may take action. However, it cannot prevent this type of practice continuing.

By bringing this Bill before the House, I seek to remedy that loss of advantage that local government has had to suffer. I am suggesting not that the measure is one of considerable import to a number of local governing bodies but that it is a mischief which needs to be addressed. Whilst this matter is not addressed in the Meat Hygiene Act or from other directions, I suggest it is fit and proper for such power to control the action to be restored to the Local Government Act where it had existed previously.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 amends the Act to make it an offence for a person to slaughter any animal in a municipality or township without the written consent of the council. The provision will not apply to a licensed abattoir or slaughterhouse, or to slaughtering that falls within an exemption granted under Part V of the Meat Hygiene Act 1980. The council will be able to give its consent subject to conditions specified by the council. The provision defines 'animal' as meaning, for the purposes of this section, any cattle, buffalo, sheep, goat, pig or deer, or any other animal of a proclaimed class.

For example, that definition will not interfere with the slaughter or dressing of the odd duck, fowl, pigeon, quail or whatever, nor will it interfere with somebody attending to a fish they have caught and brought back onto their own property. Those are matters of small moment and do not incorporate the problems that are directly associated with the size of the other animals, their noise or the amount of blood and offal, etc. I seek the support of all members of the House in making provision for this measure.

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

MEMBER FOR FISHER

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

That this House, having always paid due deference to the monarch and to vice regal representatives, as evidenced in Standing Order 121, and to our oath of office, dissociates itself from

the disrespectful and irresponsible attitude of the member for Fisher to our royal family.

I doubt very much whether members could understand the deep rage I felt on Tuesday 27 June when I read a particular item in the *Advertiser* of that day. The article was headed, 'New call for Australian royal family'. I will quote part of the article, which deals with the Liberal member for Fisher, Mr Bob Such, writing to the Federal Constitutional Review Group calling for the establishment of an Australian royal family. It states:

Mr Such said a 'spare member' of Britain's royal family could move to Australia to begin an Australian line of the family.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: That's insulting!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The Minister in charge of the House says 'That's insulting', and that sums it up as well. Further on the article states—and this is the bit about which I felt rage:

I realise that when I first raised this idea last year, it was the basis of some humour, but I believe it does everything—it has the advantages of both systems, a monarchy and a republic . . .

It was that final paragraph that brought on my rage. How dare the member for Fisher treat our royal family, our sovereign Queen, as a basis of a joke? One thing I was taught as a young lad was that the royal family was to be revered and respected, and we did just that. That devotion—and I can speak only for myself—continued when I answered the call to arms. After donning the uniform and drawing the line in the desert, I was prepared to shed blood and to have my own blood shed because of that respect.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Sir, we have heard this speech before. It is repetition, and that is not allowed under Standing Orders.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: But it is not part of this debate yet. The honourable member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: It is a way of life that I was brought up with, and it is a way of life that my colleague the Minister of Employment and Further Education was brought up with. It is the way of life with which the member for Mount Gambier was brought up and it is that which we hold dear. Those of us who have either lived in England or whose parents come from England have their favourite royal story. My colleague, the Minister of Employment and Further Education on the front bench often talks of his parents and grandparents and their fondness for the royal family.

I am sure he would have no objection to my sharing with the House a story that illustrates the level of allegiance which some of us have and which the member for Fisher so obviously has not, judging by his flippant attitude to the whole question of the royal family. The Minister's favourite royal is the Queen Mother. I found this out only this morning but, on his grandmother's side, there is a direct line to Ethelred the Unready!

The Minister's favourite royal is the Queen Mother who, as all members know, celebrated her ninetieth birthday recently. The story relates to the period of the Second World War, when both the Minister's grandparents on both sides of his family were bombed out. They lived in that part of London which received the full brunt of the Nazi blitz. One family lived in Charlton and one in Lewisham. Within days both those houses were levelled, but who was there the following day? It was the Queen Mother, who was there with those people from that part of London to share with them the disaster that had overtaken them.

She was not going to the hoi polloi or the blue rinse set; she was not running down to Runnymede or Windsor; she was with those Cockneys. Again, I am sure the Minister would not mind my telling the House that one of his grandparents was a dustman and the other was a welder; they were ordinary and common people but there was this

affinity between the royal family and the ordinary folk of the East End of London. No wonder we have this allegiance, love and loyalty that was transferred back to our royal family.

It is something that the member for Fisher, with all his educational qualifications, cannot understand. He just cannot understand the thread that runs through the people of this great Australian nation in relation to the royal family. He had to treat the royal family as a joke, as the basis of humour in order to supposedly get a line in the *Advertiser* the following day. There are thousands of stories like that in my electorate. I know that your parents, Mr Deputy Speaker, were born in the United Kingdom and they could have a royal story. I am sure there are thousands in your electorate, Sir, and in my electorate, who could quote a similar story of the allegiance between the royal family and ordinary people.

Perhaps I was remiss on 15 August 1990 when the member for Fisher first raised the question of grafting a local on to the royal family tree, thereby insulting our Queen, because there was a chance to raise a point of order under Standing Order 121. True, Mr Deputy Speaker, I do not have to say it for your benefit, but it is probably a good idea to refer to it for the benefit of the member for Fisher. Standing Order 121 provides:

A member may not use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to the Sovereign or the Governor nor may the Sovereign or the Governor be gratuitously referred to for the purpose of influencing the House in its deliberations.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, since the member for Napier has graciously alerted the House to the precise wording of Standing Order 121, I sincerely ask you to consider this debate in exactly the light of that Standing Order. I hope it would not be necessary to doubt the member for Napier's intentions in this debate, but I find that many of his references border on exactly what Standing Order 121 seeks to prevent. Personally, I find it offensive and ask for your ruling.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair has had a copy of Standing Order 121 before it during the course of this debate, and it would be quite possible for the member for Napier himself to transgress that—unintentionally I am sure. The Chair has been monitoring the debate to ensure that that does not occur, and I will continue to do so.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Thank you, Sir. I fully expected you to do just that, in your position. I have always been of the opinion that Standing Orders are not just the property of the members of the House; they are also your property, Sir, and I am sure that you will be monitoring my speech closely.

In my opinion, that speech was gratuitous. It was unbecoming and, sadly, I did not take the opportunity then to expose the member for Fisher. Let me remind the House what the member for Fisher said at that time. I will not quote the whole speech, because I do not want to send you to sleep, Sir. He said:

In no sense am I reflecting on the present Queen of Australia, her family, the Governor-General or the State Governors. I believe that the Queen has done, and is doing, an excellent job, as are the Governors of Australia and the Governor-General. I made that quite clear in my Address in Reply speech when I expressed my loyalty to the Queen as well as my appreciation for the work done by the Governor.

Having said that, and having expressed his loyalty to the Queen and told the rest of the House and the people of South Australia that he loved the Queen, what did the honourable member do? Metaphorically speaking, he then kicked the Royal Family in the guts, because he then said—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier is himself in danger of transgressing Standing Order 121

with his language. I would ask him to moderate his contribution to the debate.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I did say 'metaphorically speaking', but I feel deeply about this. Either one is loyal or one is disloyal. Either one treats the Royal Family and all that goes with it—the Governors-General and so on—with true allegiance or one does not. I am putting to the House in what I have said so far that there is no questioning my loyalty; there is no questioning the loyalty of the Minister of Employment and Further Education, and I know that there is no questioning the loyalty of many on this side of the House who will speak on the motion.

However, I say that the loyalty of the member for Fisher is questionable at this stage. I refer to the honourable member's rebuttal of this or his attempt to placate the thousands of people who will receive a copy of this speech when I send it out to the electorate of Fisher and who may come to another conclusion. What did it then prompt? After that 10 minute grievance—and we all know that no-one from the press ever comes in for the grievance debate in which we partake late at night—in the *Advertiser* the following day there it was: 'Hoges and Edna, our true blue royals'. There was a picture of Dame Edna with a crown and sceptre. In fact, I even got a guernsey. I was the nomination of the Leader of the Opposition, and it went so far that I actually went to a solicitor and had a letter sent, because I did not treat the matter as a joke. I will not demean the level of this debate by reading all the things that were said in the *Advertiser* that day.

However, the member for Fisher did not win the day, but what he got was what he set out to get: a bit of publicity. Which sections of the press come in and listen to a grievance debate late at night? I suggest that the member for Fisher actually sent them a copy of his speech, which I find even more reprehensible.

On 28 June this year the member for Fisher again got a mention in the *News* under the headline, 'I'm worth every cent.' I support most of the things that the member for Fisher said in that article.

Mr Such: It wasn't my headline.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Yes, the honourable member says that it was the wrong headline and I accept that. I refer to two comments in that article on which I will hang my argument. The article quotes the honourable member as saying:

I see my work as a chance to serve the community. I am not interested in making money!

The article continues:

He said continual unjustified attacks on MPs would be to the long-term detriment of the community. 'Worthwhile people will be deterred from becoming MPs because they will not take on such a demanding job only to be continually denigrated,' he said.

Whilst I accept the argument put by the member for Fisher, what has he been doing with regard to the royal family? He has been denigrating them! We can think of the thousands of hours that the royal family puts into community work. The member for Fisher is worried about being criticised for the hours he works (and I am sure that he works long hours in the community), but he will dismiss thousands of years of tradition and use it as a cheap publicity stunt. He uses our Queen as the target and that is just not on.

This is a serious motion. On reflection, people who read this speech will understand it. If anyone comes into this place thinking that they will get a cheap laugh-a-minute contribution, that is not so. It is not on, nor will it be. I have too much respect not only for the traditions of our royal family but also for Standing Order 121. I apologise to the Minister for Employment and Further Education if, by chance, I have embarrassed him in disclosing his favourite

royal story, but it is so necessary to show that I am not alone in this place in my devotion.

I am sure that in answer the member for Fisher and others will ask, 'What are you lot doing about a republic?' Well, the two subjects are totally different. I am quite happy with the system that we have now. My attack is not on some sections out in the community that wish to go through an educational argument about whether we should have a monarchy or a republic. That will be decided by the people of Australia and South Australia. However, whilst we have a monarchy—

The Hon. J.P. Trainer: While we've got a monarchy we'll stick with it.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:—as the member for Walsh says, we will stay with that monarchy. For as long as I have the breath to stand up here and we we have continual attacks by people such as the member for Fisher, I will place these motions on the Notice Paper. I urge all members to support the motion and to disassociate themselves from the outrageous behaviour of the member for Fisher and send him back to Coventry as he deserves.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, I believe that several times in his speech the member for Napier has imputed improper motives to the member for Fisher. I do not believe that is in concurrence with Standing Orders. At one stage—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hayward would normally be correct in his reference, but this is a substantive motion. Therefore, the terms of the debate are appropriate. The member for Fisher.

Mr SUCH (Fisher): In many ways it is unfortunate that this House has to spend its time considering this matter. Time is precious in this House. We have had a disgraceful attempt to use the royal family to get a cheap political point. It is the sort of thing that a corgi would not do. A chihuahua might, but chihuahuas are fairly low, small creatures. It is sad that in this community at present we have an economic crisis and unemployment of over 10 per cent—30 per cent for young people—yet the member for Napier can take up time trying to score a cheap political point when the substance of it is truly false.

Members who know me—and they can look at my record in *Hansard*—know that at every opportunity I have expressed my loyalty to the Queen, and I continue to do so. I point out to the member for Napier that I have also served in the Army Reserve in the Psychology Corps. I hope that that corps can make its services available to him, because he may need those services in future.

I utterly and totally reject the inferences, innuendo and allegations made by the member for Napier. I find it disgraceful. My father, who came to this country from Cheltenham in England, would be disgusted that a fellow from that country could stoop so low as to use Parliament for this purpose. He would be absolutely outraged.

The whole matter, in respect of the recent article in the *Advertiser*, was in response to what the ALP was doing through its Federal convention and, in particular, the initiatives of Senator Schacht. Let us not suggest that I am in any way promoting a republic. Quite the contrary, I am suggesting that we should retain the advantages of the present system so that we can continue to have a monarchy in this country.

I do not want to take too long because private members' time is precious, but I should like to emphasise some points in favour of my suggestion. It would preserve traditional and historical links with the current British royal family. It would avoid political Party involvement in presidential

appointments, especially divisive in Australia with its rigid political Party system which can be compared with the United States, which has a more 'fluid' Party system. It would satisfy the need for Australia to be seen as an independent nation with its own resident head of state. It would be constitutionally and legally easier to establish than would a presidential system. Numerous members of the British royal family could be invited to establish the first residential royal family in Australia. It has been done before in Scandinavia in respect of Norway and Sweden in 1905.

It would preserve the clear separation of politics—Prime Minister, Parliament and Party system—from the position of head of state which would be blurred in a presidential system. It would provide a 'family' focal point for the nation. It would allow all Australians to unite behind its own resident monarch, thus providing national unity, stability and continuity 'above the turmoil of day-to-day politics and politicking'. It would still be possible for Australia to remain in the Commonwealth with the Queen as Head of the Commonwealth. This, of course, would also apply to a republic, as I acknowledge. It would not conflict with our Federal system, in that the present State Governors could still represent the Canberra-based resident Australian monarch. It would be less offensive to the Queen and could be planned over time.

The resident royal family would, via offspring, eventually become 'dinkum Aussies' with the possibility of Australian commoners and other royalty from around the world marrying into the family, as has been done in the British royal family. It would avoid the millionaire presidential syndrome, whereby only the rich are likely to gain the position of president, or alternatively the position filled by Party hacks. A resident monarch would replace the position of Governor-General and would not entail extra expenditure.

As I indicated earlier, I do not wish to take up any more of the time of this Parliament. It saddens me that one of the senior members on the other side, just prior to going out to pasture, should use this opportunity to try to denigrate and inaccurately represent the views of someone who is loyal to Her Majesty and who will continue to be so. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

COMMEMORATIVE MEDAL

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I move:

That this House petitions Her Excellency the Governor to strike in the name of the people of South Australia a commemorative medal to acknowledge the valuable role played by the Royal Australian Navy and support groups of other service wings in the Vietnam conflict.

I notice two members opposite leaving the Chamber. They would be disappointed if they did anything other than together. Having been treated to a lesson on loyalty and royalty by the member for Napier, one of those members is leaving at a time when I am quite sure he does not want to hear the remarks I am about to make concerning what I believe to be the scandalous treatment by a succession of Australian Governments of people who served this country in the Vietnam conflict. Like many other members of this House—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mount Gambier is out of order.

Mr BRINDAL: I was involved in the Vietnam conflict, although not as a conscript. With many others I was involved because I was at university at the time and because I was

part of the political process of the day; we were all involved. As members will probably recall, those were days of strong emotion and feeling. Whether you were a university or a high school student, whether you served in the armed forces or in this place, or whether you performed duties at home, every person in this country was involved in some way and affected by that conflict.

In the end, the conflict became unfashionable among the people, and the Government of the day decided, as was its absolute right, to bring serving Australian servicemen back from that conflict. However, the treatment meted out to those servicemen when they returned from that conflict goes to the continuing and constant shame of all Australians. I do not point a finger at the Government of the day; I point a finger at our whole community, including myself. Those people served in that conflict because the elected Government of the day sent them. That is a matter of fact and of public record: the Government of the day elected by the people argued that it was a right and proper thing for those people to do.

Like other Australians before them, such as those who served in the Boer War, the First and Second World Wars and the Korean conflict, they went because their Government sent them, and when they came back their people deserted them. I think that is a disgrace and I, for one, am ashamed of our treatment of those people. So, this motion comes before this House today in an attempt to redress a situation that I believe for too long has not been treated correctly. For too long, this group of people has been treated shoddily and has been forgotten.

As we know, when the conflict ended the troops were not treated very well on their return. It has only been in recent years that the troops have had a homecoming parade. Progressively through those years, I must acknowledge that Governments have done something to try to redress the injustices that many of those servicemen suffered. By and large, those who served on active duty received a Vietnam Medal which was awarded by the Australian Government for service in Vietnam. Before Australia's official involvement in the Vietnam conflict the South Vietnam Medal was awarded by the South Vietnamese Government to military advisers who had served six months in Vietnam. Those were the two medals being awarded, but the restrictions on the medals were many and were quite complex, so there was a situation in which many personnel who served in that conflict never received a medal.

Those people who were denied the medal were particularly support service personnel, especially those who served on the HMAS *Sydney*, which, as members will recall, made many trips to South Vietnam. The fire that occurred aboard HMAS *Sydney* in 1969 in Sydney Harbor was treated very seriously by the armed services and the Government of the day. The security subsequently put around the ship was such as to suggest that it was due to the ship's involvement in the Vietnam conflict. Therefore, to suggest that those who served on that and other ships were not involved in the conflict is really not fair and is not an accurate description of what happened. When HMAS *Sydney* went to Vietnam it was unable to dock in certain places because of the mines that were floated down the river. I am advised that on several occasions the personnel of HMAS *Sydney* had to clear away mines from the ship's vicinity, which I would say put the vessel in considerable danger.

Similarly, the airforce crews who flew from Butterworth to supply logistical support to our troupes in Vietnam, to take them in and bring them out, and to bring out those who had died in the conflict, were also denied the Vietnam Medal. The incongruity of this is demonstrated by the fact

that in 1986 they received from the Minister (Kim Beazley) a Return From Active Service Badge. Although the people concerned received that badge to say that they had returned from active service, they were still denied any medal to show where their active service took place, so there was an incongruous situation where they received a badge to say that they had returned from active service but no medal to show that they were ever involved in such active service.

In the recent Gulf conflict, in which the duly elected Federal Government sent ships in support of the United Nations, the Minister was quite clear in saying that anybody who had spent 24 hours in the Gulf conflict zone would receive the award. That is stark contrast to the situation concerning Vietnam. I must be fair and say that all my advice is that the Minister for Defence is somewhat embarrassed by this whole affair and that, if it was up to him, he would do what those servicemen justifiably want. But it appears to be the heads of the armed services who, for their own reasons, believe these people to be some sort of second-class servicemen and women; that even the desire of the Minister concerning this matter is being thwarted; and that these people are continuing to be denied any form of recognition of the active service which they saw in Vietnam.

The argument put forward by those who are advising the member for Kingston (Mr Gordon Bilney) is that the Vietnam Medal is not favoured because it weakens the honour of the front line troops, and it is for this reason that they are being denied the award. However, it is true that many logistical support personnel who were based in Vietnam and who never saw front line conflict have, by virtue of their stay in Vietnam, already been awarded this medal. There are members who would deny the right of this House to take this sort of action, and I point out to them that South Australia has the right, I believe, under the Constitution, to issue rewards for meritorious service, and some time ago did issue a meritorious service medal. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

MAGAREY MEDAL

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.P. Trainer:

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.

(Continued from 22 August. Page 443.)

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): This motion was placed on the Notice Paper a day or two after the following announcement appeared in the *Advertiser* of 13 August, under the by-line of Ashley Porter and headed 'Women will grace 1991 Magarey Medal count':

Women will be invited to next month's Magarey Medal dinner and vote count for only the second time in South Australian National Football League history.

League officials and Channel 9, which will televise the show live for about 90 minutes on Monday 16 September, last night were reluctant to confirm the break in tradition, but the invitation list is being prepared.

The medal dinner, the SANFL's premier night, will be held for the first time at the Hindley Parkroyal in the city. The guest list is expected to be increased by 50 to 290, allowing about 50 players to bring their wives or girlfriends.

I have previously joined others in the community in focusing attention on the exclusion of women from the Magarey Medal count. Such was the situation almost 12 months ago to the day, on 5 September last year, when I asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport whether he could verify

that the Magarey Medal presentation would once again be conducted in the presence of an almost exclusively male audience unlike the Victorian Brownlow Medal count; and, if so, would he make representations to the South Australian National Football League to remedy this situation if not for the 1990 presentation then at least for future years?

It seems that that has now come about, Sir. However, on that occasion last year following my asking that question, there was a response from Mr Basheer, and that rather disappointed me, I might say. The following day's *Advertiser* (6 September 1990) carried an article headed 'Football Women Still in the Outer', under the by-line of Tim Satchell.

Mr Ingerson: They are all going this year.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: The member for Bragg needs to wake up. This is what the motion is all about, although he has just interjected that women are all going this year.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I was aware last year for personal reasons that they were not, for a similar reason to that which affected the member for Bragg.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Walsh will continue the debate.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: The article headed 'Football Women Still in the Outer' stated:

Should footballers' wives and girlfriends be invited to the annual Magarey Medal presentation night?

The question is now a political one, after the issue was brought up in State Parliament yesterday.

Spouses and girlfriends of footballers traditionally have not been invited to the South Australian National Football League's Magarey Medal presentations.

The medal count in 1981 was the only exception to that rule.

The State Government's Whip, Mr Trainer, yesterday asked the Recreation and Sport Minister, Mr Mayes, to approach the league over inviting more women to the award night on Monday at the Hilton International Hotel and to medal counts in future years.

'In recent years there has been adverse community comment about the absence of spouses, girlfriends and female relatives of the footballers attending the presentation,' Mr Trainer said.

'Several commentators have expressed the view that one of the most appealing telecasts of the Magarey Medal count was in 1981 when the winner, Michael Aish, shared the occasion with a member of his family.'

As I recall, his sister was the person who accompanied him, and it was rather a touching scene on camera when she congratulated him when he won his medal. The commentators agreed with me that that was one of the most appealing telecasts. Possibly, those commentators might believe that last year's was one of the most appalling because of the alleged larrikinism of some present—but we will not say too much about that. The article went on to say:

Mr Mayes said he would approach the league President, Mr Max Basheer, but said it was a matter for the league to resolve.

Mr Basheer responded in that article by saying:

It would double the cost of the night if we had them along.

Note that reference to doubling the cost: I will refer to that remark a little later. The article continues:

Mr Basheer said he was sick of the debate. 'This has been an annual thing—as soon as the medal night comes around, people seem to try and stir up problems for us,' he said.

However, as the article pointed out:

The South Australian Netball Association held its awards night last Monday at the same venue. Husbands and boyfriends were invited, and one guest estimated half those present were men.

Certainly, in women's sport, they do not have the same sexist outlook. The announcement last month that women would be attending the Magarey Medal count this year pointed out the following:

However, there is no question this year's count, the SANFL's 1991 fairest and most brilliant award, will take on a more glamorous look, almost a deliberate attempt to keep up with the

Australian Football League which, for some years, has issued invitations to its players' wives or girlfriends. The guest list is expected to be increased by 50 to 290, allowing about 50 players to bring their wives or girlfriends.

I do not see how that increase of 50 participants could possibly double the cost. You would need to have 50 ladies who were very heavy eaters and drinkers, for an additional 50—taking the total to 290—to constitute a doubling of the cost. Mr Whicker said:

The league has never had a policy of not inviting women to the Magarey Medal count purely on sexist reasons.

Perhaps that is so. I did a bit of library research to try to find a newspaper reference to an instance I seemed to recall from some time ago of a leading football figure who said that he would boycott the Magarey Medal presentation 'if sheilas were allowed to attend'. However, I was not able to find any reference to verify that. It can, however, be said that the South Australian Football League, unlike the AFL did not seem to give the attendance of women the priority it deserves. Mr Whicker said:

It has always been a matter of economics, and if women can attend this year's medal count, it would be tremendous for South Australian league football.

Certainly, one benefit would be if it prevented the Magarey Medal count from deteriorating into a sort of swim-through. The presence of their spouses, sisters, girlfriends and so on might have a moderating influence on any larrikinism that people might indulge in at the Magarey Medal presentation.

Mr Ferguson: It would need to be, with some people!

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: With some people, that may well be the case. It would have a calming effect on those who are, perhaps, overcome by the exuberance of the occasion and who might be a little tired and emotional. However, referring back to last year and to Mr Basheer's comment that it would double the cost, Rae Atkey of the *Adelaide News* responded on 7 September about this economic hurdle. She suggested:

Well, how's this for a revolutionary idea? Get the ladies to pay for themselves.

It may come as a revelation to the hierarchy of the SANFL but women, these days, are doing things other than washing footy gear . . . And quite honestly, they can pay for their own night out.

And they would be quite willing to do so. Preserve us from the time when a woman ceases to enjoy seeing the man in her life receive the accolades of his peers.

When, earlier this week, the South Australian Netball Association held its award night at the same hotel, husbands and boyfriends were invited—and they paid their own way.

Women can do the same.

That's your answer, Max. And just imagine how wonderful it will be next year not having to handball this vexing question.

Following the question that I asked, the Minister corresponded with Mr Basheer and a copy of Mr Basheer's reply on behalf of the Football League was forwarded to me, 'putting the following answers to Mr Trainer's question', as it says. I will not take up the time of the House by reading those, but will read a couple of paragraphs towards the end, particularly because one of them relates very closely to Rae Atkey's suggestion, and says that it was not at all practical. The concluding paragraphs of that letter state:

The evening must be cost effective to the television station as they are the ones responsible for the evenings budget. To add another 250 guests to the list would mean additional expenditure. Neither the SANFL or the television station is prepared to carry the additional expenses. The league does not believe in commercialising the Magarey Medal by charging people to attend.

After receiving a copy of that letter, I wrote to Mr Basheer on 2 November last year as follows:

Dear Mr Basheer,

I have been advised by the Minister of Recreation and Sport of the SANFL's negative reply (through Marketing Manager, Ross Beale's letter to him) regarding my question in Parliament on 5 September about the absence of women guests at the annual

Magarey Medal presentation. There are four comments I would like to make on that letter's contents.

- (i) The VFL/AFL Brownlow Medal presentation for quite some time has accepted the presence of wives, girl friends and female relatives of players, as also have presentations for other competitions and other sports.
- (ii) It is not only more egalitarian and more appropriate to today's world to have women present at the presentation—it also provides more interesting television coverage that can appeal to a wider range of viewers. I am surprised NWS9 is not keen to support the proposal. After all, the scene of 1990 Brownlow Medallist Tony Liberatore, overwhelmed by emotion, burying his face on his girlfriend's shoulder, is the sort of television with which most channels would be delighted.
- (iii) If the sponsors are not able or willing to cover the additional costs of women guests also being present, and if NWS9 does not accept the arguments propounded in (ii) above, I still see no reason why those footballers who are invited guests should not be given the option of bringing a female companion at their own expense.
- (iv) I would also point out that, unless, of course, the new Governor, Dame Roma Mitchell, declines to continue the role played by Governor Dunstan as patron of the SANFL, you will have further attention drawn to this anachronistic policy of excluding women partners by the prominent presence of Her Excellency the Governor as one of only a handful of women at next year's televised presentation. Conversely, Her Excellency's non-attendance would also serve to heighten awareness of this issue!

I trust that between now and September 1991, favourable consideration is given to this proposal.

I sent a copy of that letter to Channel 9 as well as writing to Mr Basheer. I have never received any reply from Mr Basheer.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Maybe, as someone interjected, he is occasionally a little bit rude. However, I do not want to dwell too much on any individual's personality.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Over the past decade or two, the football league collectively has had a history of a rather arrogant attitude towards Parliament and towards members of Parliament. I suggest that the member for Bragg have a talk to some of his colleagues who were involved with the Industries Development Committee a few years ago, in relation to the way in which Mr Basheer, on behalf of the league, made demands for \$800 000 at the time in a manner that was most inappropriate.

The member opposite might like to talk to the member for Albert Park: he could say a few things about the attitude of the South Australian Football League when it came to putting up lights. If the league had not displayed such an arrogant attitude towards the people of the community, it would have had something much sooner that was very close to the compromise that was eventually worked out.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Walsh will return to the topic of his motion.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: With regard to the pig-headed attitude of the South Australian Football League towards the community in general, a hell of a lot of people in the community resent the trek down to 'Pleurisy Park' and would have been much happier had the league been responsive to public opinion and placed Football Park in an area where it was more accessible by public transport. However, I suppose that such things simply stem from the fact that many of those involved with such organisations are out of touch with the ordinary people, such as me, who go to Football Park and sit out in the outer. To a certain extent, I think those administrative people are protected by journalists who never raise difficult questions about matters relating to facilities because I do not think the journalists, for example, would get—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Yes, well, Football Park—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Walsh will return to the topic of his motion.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Mr Basheer did not reply to that letter, just as he did not reply to another one at about the same time in which I tried to express some support for the Adelaide Football Club. He did not reply, but Channel 9 did, as follows:

Dear Mr Trainer,

I refer to your letter of 2 November 1990 addressed to Mr Max Basheer concerning the Magarey Medal presentation, a copy of which has been passed to me. As you are aware, NWS 9 has been telecasting football in this State over a number of years, with exclusive rights for the past two years. Rights to the SANFL coverage include the Magarey Medal telecast. As the SANFL has pointed out, the cost of the production, promotion and catering for the evening is paid by the television station covering the event. Following the 1989 telecast—when some players were unruly and at times the President of the SANFL had to call for decorum—

I wonder what they thought about unruliness last year—

we suggested to the league that an alternative venue be found for the 1990 presentation and that further consideration be given to allowing partners to attend the event. As a result, the ballroom of the Hilton International Adelaide was booked for the telecast and the SANFL were advised that additional space was available for more guests, including partners of officials and players; we proposed that the individual clubs pay for those additional guests. Again referring to the league's letter, they point out that they are responsible for providing the invitation list to NWS 9. The league limit the invitations to league officials, staff, former medallists, league life members, club officials and managers, umpires board and umpires. NWS 9 did retain the right to invite some sponsors and sales staff as guests and we were pleased to include a number of women in this group. In all other respects it was a successful presentation.

If we proceed with coverage of local football in 1991 and if the Magarey Medal telecast is covered in the same manner, I can assure you that we shall again provide an opportunity to the SANFL to broaden the invitation list for the evening. The contribution of women to football is significant at all levels and this should be acknowledged. Moreover, at least half of our potential viewing audience are women whom we do not wish to alienate. I trust this addresses your concerns.

Yours sincerely, Southern Television Corporation Pty Limited.

The letter was signed by Tyrrell Talbot, General Manager. I congratulate Channel 9 for its efforts in pushing the SANFL towards a more enlightened approach and for finally being able to persuade it to admit women. I suppose I must, with some grace, congratulate the SANFL for belatedly seeing sense. I recommend the motion to the House.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I intended speaking and completing what I had to say, but the member for Walsh has introduced matters into the debate other than those included in the motion. I will take the opportunity at a later date to read what he had to say so that I respond fairly to him, in case I misinterpreted any of his comments in the emotion of what was said. I do not think that anyone would not acknowledge that it is a great move by NWS Channel 9 and the South Australian National Football League in their acknowledging the social realities of the twentieth century by admitting women to the 1991 Magarey Medal presentation.

The honourable member took some time to attack the league, and I wondered whether he was congratulating it at all. Most of his speech was made up of an attack on the league and some of its officers who have worked very hard for many years to successfully achieve one of the best football stadiums in the State. I will comment further on that at a later time to ensure that both sides of the argument are recorded. I want the House to realise that it is not just the male dominated sports or groups that have failed to recognise what the honourable member refers to as the

social realities of the twentieth century. For example, I am President of a club which was originally the Sportsmen's Association. It amalgamated with the Democratic Club, and it is now called the Adelaide Sports Club. However, we changed our constitution several years ago to allow females to be members of that club. Until then, it was solely male membership. We asked the Sportswomen's Association, a similar body, to change its constitution to allow men to be members of that body, but it refused.

I cite that example to show that it takes time for people to make changes. Also, we will find in the end that the cost of putting on events like the Magarey Medal count will become too expensive for the people who pay for it, that is, the people who pay for the advertising, and they will either have to have a smaller operation involving a more selective group or a shorter period perhaps with no meal.

Another point made by the honourable member was that, when women were present, there was not quite as much excitement or over indulgence in food and beverage. But I have been at functions attended by men and women, including prominent people in this State, some not too distant from this Chamber, that were the wildest and wooliest events. It brings no credit to the honourable member to say that that is one of the benefits of inviting women to the Magarey Medal count.

A point that the honourable member has not picked up relates to the invitation for a wife or girl friend. A player may have no girlfriend or no mother. I do not believe a father or brother is invited if there is no sister or mother. That is another point the league or Channel 9 will pick up in the future. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

FOOTBALL FACILITIES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Holloway:

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,

which Mr Oswald had moved to amend by leaving out 'congratulates the Government and the Minister for initiating' and inserting in lieu thereof 'notes with concern the time it has taken for the Government and the Minister to initiate'.

(Continued from 29 August. Page 618.)

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I would like to complete the remarks that I began on 29 August. On that date the Opposition spokesman on sport, the member for Morphett, tried to claim credit for the fact that the South Australian National Football League had a trial match in the southern suburbs. In that speech he said, 'The horse was out in the paddock and the Opposition had the running on it.' All I can say is that the horse he was on must have been going round and round in circles.

It was ridiculous to suggest that the Opposition has had any influence in this matter. As I said on 29 August, it is the South Australian National Football League that has control of football. It is the league that determines its destiny and not the Government and even less the Opposition. I could just imagine the situation if the Opposition spokesman on sport were to pick up the phone and speak to Max Basheer and say, 'Look, Max, we have too many football clubs in South Australia. I think we should merge a couple

of them. Also, I do not like your schedule at Football Park this week, so perhaps we should schedule games somewhere else.'

That is quite absurd, yet it is the sort of thing that the Opposition is trying to suggest. Obviously, its solution for football in the south is to build one massive facility in the southern suburbs. Of course, the Opposition has not been willing to say how much money it would put up to do that, but it seems that it is determined to go ahead with one solution regardless of whether or not that is what the people want, whether it would be used and so on.

The fact is that this Government has always been willing to play its part in the provision of sporting facilities, including football, in the southern suburbs. The Government has demonstrated that with the Noarlunga Aquatic Centre and the recently announced synthetic grass hockey and tennis complex at Seacliff. So, the Government *bona fides* are there. The truth is that the reason why football was not played in the southern suburbs until now is that the South Australian National Football League had a policy of rationalisation. I do not intend to blame the league for that; I think it was quite understandable. Prior to last year, there was a lot of uncertainty about the future of football, and the policy of the football league up to that time was that grounds should be rationalised and that, instead of having a series of suburban grounds on which football was played, we should use one or two ovals, such as the Adelaide Oval and Football Park. There we could concentrate all the facilities provided for the public, scheduling games for Friday, Saturday, Sunday and Monday and utilise several facilities.

That was the philosophy that was prevalent amongst the South Australian National Football League and other football leagues at the time. In 1990, Port Adelaide made its bid to enter the AFL competition. We all know the history of that; we ended up with the Adelaide Crows. At the same time we also had problems within the local league. There was a lot of discussion about South Adelaide's finances. That club had a battle to survive; fortunately, it did. We also saw the merger between Woodville and West Torrens to form the Eagles. So, the period of the past couple of years has been one of great disruption for local football. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the South Australian National Football League would be a little wary about taking any new initiatives or moving into any new areas, and that was the reason why it was so reluctant to schedule football in the southern suburbs. Obviously, it wanted to see how things panned out, and I would not blame them for that one bit.

As we have seen, the Adelaide Crows were very successful in their introduction; they have had packed crowds throughout the year and, at the same time, there has been quite an impact on the local league. Obviously, the football league has now decided that the way of the future is to go back to the suburbs and to have suburban football on the suburban ovals, and that is why it scheduled the match on the Bice Oval earlier this year. It was the deliberate policy of the South Australian National Football League to go that way; in the early days it was reluctant to schedule football in the southern region. That was why it was not played there; it had nothing to do with the Government.

What will we do in the future if we are to have suburban football? Obviously, it is not just a question whether we should have a grand new oval at Colonnades. We need to be able to look at all the activities in the southern region to see what is the best way to go. We do have a very good ground at the Bice Oval, with a good surface and, when a few small difficulties were overcome, it was certainly able to cater for the crowd of 10 000 that was down there. We

need to consider seriously whether that or other ovals in the area are useful alternatives before we commit ourselves to the expense of building a new one.

The point is that it is the South Adelaide Football Club and the South Australian National Football League which must decide and determine what is in their best interests. It is then the Government's role to support the league in that, and I have no doubt that that is what this Government will do once the league has clarified the issues and once South Adelaide has determined what is in its best long-term interests.

The other matter I would like to mention is that at the moment an officer of the Department of Recreation and Sport is looking at the sporting needs of the south. It has been decided that what we want is not a centrally located, multi-purpose facility but the development of a series of regional facilities throughout the south, where the people are. There are many residents in the southern suburbs. It is a large, growing area, with the new Seaford development, and we need to look at the total development of sporting activities in that area. Whatever happens at the Noarlunga centre area is just one part of a much broader problem.

So, I would like to wind up by opposing the amendment moved by the Opposition spokesman on sport. There is no basis to it at all. The Minister has been negotiating with the South Australian National Football League, but it was the league's reluctance to give South Adelaide a guarantee that it would schedule matches in the southern area that has been the major stumbling block to league football being played there. Now that the South Australian National Football League has determined the way to go, the Minister has started discussions with the league and the local council, which is an important player in that whole area, and the matter will be resolved, no doubt, in the future.

I oppose the amendment and congratulate the Minister rather than criticise him, as the Opposition spokesman has done. The Minister deserves the credit of this House for the great deal of work that he has done for sport in the southern area. I have no doubt that in future he will do a lot more. I commend the original motion to the House.

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Messrs Allison, Armitage, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker and Becker, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Eastick, S.G. Evans, Gunn and Ingerson, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis, Matthew, Meier, Oswald (teller), Such, Venning and Wotton.

Noes (20)—Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Atkinson, Bannon, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, M.J. Evans, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Heron, Holloway (teller) and Hopgood, Mrs Hutchison, Mr Klunder, Ms Lenahan, Messrs McKee, Mayes, Quirke and Rann.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Atkinson, Bannon, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, M.J. Evans, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Heron, Holloway (teller) and Hopgood, Mrs Hutchison, Mr Klunder, Ms Lenahan, Messrs McKee, Mayes, Quirke and Rann.

Noes (20)—Messrs Allison, Armitage, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, Becker and Brindal, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Eastick, S.G. Evans, Gunn and Ingerson, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis, Matthew, Meier, Oswald (teller), Such, Venning and Wotton.

The SPEAKER: There being 20 Ayes and 20 Noes, I have a casting vote. Before casting that vote, I should like to make a comment to the House. I have an opinion about the nature of the motion before the House and my vote

will be cast on that opinion of the motion, not on any political basis. I want the Opposition to take this not as a political move but as a vote that I make as a member of this House to oppose motions that I think are not in the best interests of the Parliament. I therefore cast my vote for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

MEMBER FOR HEYSEN

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.H. Hemmings:

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.

(Continued from 22 August. Page 443.)

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I will be very brief in summing up this motion. When I moved this motion on 22 August, you, Mr Speaker, will recall that I got into some difficulties because there was another motion on the Notice Paper moved by the member for Heysen. Therefore, some of the arguments that I worked through in relation to that action by the member for Heysen quite correctly were ruled out of order by you, Sir, and I congratulate you for your observance of the Standing Orders that govern the behaviour of this House. Let me recap what this motion is all about.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The member for Heysen deliberately went out of his way to incite certain members of the South Australian community who form part of what I would call, perhaps unkindly, 'the blue rinse set' by telling them that what was happening was not in their best interests. He did this well; so well that he frightened little old ladies living in Burnside, Walkerville and St Peters, and convinced them that what had been passed by the House would cost them dearly. The newspapers were very supportive of what the member for Heysen was agitating about. I often wonder what was the hidden agenda in the minds of the *Advertiser* and the *News*, because following briefings by the Minister's staff they certainly knew that what had been legislated was a fairer and more equitable form of water rating. They knew that, in the main, those people who live in Burnside would pay less than previously, but it suited the member for Heysen's own purposes to go out there and to encourage people to act outside the law.

As I said, he did it well. I have done a little bit of research, and this is the strongest motion I have ever seen in regard to the behaviour outside the confines of this Chamber of a member of this House. This is something for which we should condemn the member for Heysen, because he did not do it in the House; he went out there and played on the fears of those little old ladies in Burnside.

He told the newspapers that he and the Liberal Party had obtained legal advice that what had happened was wrong. Be that as it may, I have yet to see that advice, and I long for the member for Heysen to table it. Not only did he tell those little old ladies in Burnside that he had obtained that advice, but he also said at the public meeting organised by the Liberal Party, 'I urge you to go and get legal representation so that you can challenge.'

An honourable member: That's what he said!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: That is what the member for Heysen said. He did not say, 'Here I am. Out of my own pocket (or out of the coffers of the Liberal Party), I

have obtained this legal advice, and we can make it available to you.' The member for Heysen went out to those little old ladies at the public meeting and gee'd them up; he stirred them up; he frightened them out of their wits; and then he said, 'You go and get a lawyer, and get that lawyer to act on your behalf.' As I said on 22 August, he most likely had his lawyer mates on hand to drum up a little bit of business.

That was then: what has happened since? Another Bill, to which I will not refer, has since been introduced and is going through the normal processes of this House. But what has the member for Heysen done since then? He has stirred up all those old ladies; he has created a furore amongst the general public; and he has caused the E&WS Department to go through a very costly but successful exercise in order to inform the people in the community that what he said was totally wrong.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMING: I am hearing a few interjections to say that that is not true. I hope that the member for Bragg is bearing in mind his new responsibility. If he says that that is not true, I look forward to seeing his name on the list of speakers so that he can defend his colleague and, by golly, his colleague needs some defending, because he has broken the unwritten rules of this Parliament. He has used his position as a member of Parliament and as an official spokesperson for the Liberal Party to give himself some form of credibility. He has gone out and incited people to revolt.

But what has he done since then? He has done nothing whatsoever. He has not continued that line of communication with those little old ladies at Burnside; he has not encouraged them to telephone the E&WS Department hotline; and, in effect, he has not got the campaign going. I know that if I ask how many lawyers have had business drummed up through the actions of the member for Heysen, I will never find out. But I suspect that there are a lot of little old ladies at Burnside who have hocked their family silver to get a lawyer's advice, and when they have had a whole year's water bills they will come to the sudden conclusion that they have spent that money to no avail.

As I said, the member for Heysen has gone to ground. We have heard nothing more about it and, in effect, he has been like a thief in the night; he has slipped silently away. He has done his damage; he has achieved a few bits of kudos; and he has convinced some of his colleagues that he is that rough and tough member on their front bench, and deserves to be kept there. As I have canvassed before, the only purpose of this exercise was to restore his own credibility not only with his Party but also to give himself a bit of personal lift. Well, as the prosecutor, I have given the House irrefutable evidence of the member for Heysen's guilt. In no way can they deny that. The member for Heysen is as guilty as that other Australian, Ned Kelly, and he deserves the same kind of fate. It is up to the House itself to act as the jury and, after due deliberation, to find him guilty. Then, Sir, who will carry out the sentence? If you look at my original motion, Sir, it calls on the Leader of the Opposition to sack him immediately.

In this matter the House, and especially the Liberal Party, has a problem. I do not care whether or not it is the present incumbent who sacks the member for Heysen. By the time this debate has finished, Sir, I very much doubt whether the present incumbent will still be Leader of the Opposition. So, I urge the member for Bragg, if he is Leader of the Opposition when this motion goes to the vote, to show a bit of statesmanship, respond to this prosecutor's case and act accordingly. If, perchance, the member for Coles is the

Leader, I ask the member for Bragg to pass that message on to her. I urge the House to support this motion so that we can dispense with this larrikin who exists within it.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMMEMORATIVE MEDAL

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

(Continued from page 814.)

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): There is precedence for States to issue medals. As I said, South Australia has issued a Meritorious Service Medal. Western Australia issued the Brassey Medal during 1895 and 1901 and the Edem Medal was issued well after the turn of the century, after Federation. New South Wales has issued a number of medals in its own name. Campaign medals belong to the people of Australia and are held by the Department of Defence as custodian until such time as the Government passes legislation for their award on behalf of the people of Australia.

An honourable member asked me privately whether I envisaged that such an award would be only for South Australians who served in Vietnam or for all Australians. I believe that that would be a matter for the Governor to determine in Executive Council. I think that, first, we should look after South Australians. However, the Sydney Medal, which was issued by the City of Sydney, was made available not only to those who served on the HMAS *Sydney* but also to support personnel who served in the Vietnam conflict. I believe that no citizen should ever be a second-class Australian when it comes to serving this nation in any theatre of war. I think that I am quoting correctly the Hon. Mr Gordon Bilney, the member for Kingston and the Minister for Defence, when I quote these words:

No time in the future will ever an Australian serviceman go overseas as second-class.

I believe, for one reason or another, that that is what happened to the support personnel who served this country in Vietnam. I hope that this Legislature, at least, will do something to support these people, and that members will support this motion.

Mr HOLLOWAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

TICKET SELLING FACILITIES

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I move:

That this House calls on the Government as a matter of priority to introduce ticket selling facilities onto train platforms and/or trains to enable commuters to once again conveniently purchase train tickets, and to restore public confidence in the metropolitan train system.

From 26 May 1991, any person found on a railway platform without a ticket will be deemed to be intent on boarding a train and could be fined up to \$500. The impost of this draconian regulation has effectively meant that any person at all going onto the platform could be fined. It means that any visitors to our city who go onto a platform to catch a train, expecting to be able to buy a ticket to get on that train, risk a \$500 fine as a gesture from the Government, a reminder of their visit to South Australia.

It could mean that a mother or father wishing to wait on a railway platform for a child returning from school and disembarking from a train could be fined up to \$500 just for being on that platform. That is the sort of encourage-

ment this Government is giving to people at the moment to use our rail system. The public is sick and tired of these bull-at-a-gate decisions that are being made with absolutely no consultation with those who use STA services.

This sort of decision resulted in over 700 complaints to my office in about a six-week period. Obviously, the Minister should get some sort of message from that. He should not be implementing these changes without consultation. By all means, let us improve the way in which tickets are dispensed to rail users, but these sorts of measures should not and cannot be implemented effectively without a realistic alternative for the purchase of rail tickets.

The Opposition on a number of occasions has advocated that such an alternative could be provided by ticket vending machines. Such machines are used in other States and overseas effectively, without problem, and are very well received by the commuters who use those systems. The statements made at the time of the implementation of this measure were interesting. I should like to quote from the front page of the Messenger Press *Guardian* of 5 June 1991 which, under the headline '80 per cent prepay for train tickets: Minister', states in part:

Most people favour buying their tickets before boarding public transport, says a spokeswoman for Transport Minister Frank Blevins. The spokeswoman said more than 80 per cent of travellers prepay for their tickets.

That means that the Government, effectively, said, 'Damn the other 20 per cent. If 80 per cent are prepaying we will force the other 20 per cent to prepay as well.' The Government has failed to meet or to understand the needs of the travelling public. When this measure was introduced, no signposting was erected at any metropolitan station so that casual users of a train could at least know that if they went on the platform without a ticket they risked a \$500 fine.

That has happened since, but only after complaints were made to the Minister by me and by my colleagues. In a bid to try to sell this ludicrous system, the Minister even had full-page advertisements inserted in the *Advertiser*. I noted that in my electorate—an electorate, I hasten to add, that has eight metropolitan railway stations—there were a number of places from which people could buy tickets: Beach Road Provisions at Brighton, Brighton Stationers, the Hallett Cove-Karrara deli, Hallett Cove-Glacier Park super-deli, Seacliff Cliff's deli or Seacliff Sofia's deli.

Only one of those places is opposite a railway station. There are seven stations with no convenient way of buying a ticket. What is happening is that people are not catching the train; they are starting to use other methods of transport. At the end of the day, that is the method in the Government's madness: it wants to reduce the number of people catching a train. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

PETITION: PUBLIC TRANSPORT

A petition signed by 2 915 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to restore concessional fares on public transport for all full-time students was presented by Mr M.J. Evans.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: WATER RATING SYSTEM

Petitions signed by 2 019 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to revert

to the previous water rating system were presented by Messrs Ingerson and Wotton.

Petitions received.

PETITION: TRAFFIC LIGHTS

A petition signed by 528 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to install traffic lights at the intersection of Main South, Patapinda and Seaford Roads was presented by the Hon. D.C. Wotton.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: EGG INDUSTRY

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Agriculture): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: At the outset, Mr Speaker, I apologise for the length of this statement, but it is on a most important issue. The egg industry in Australia has been highly regulated since 1941 and South Australia, in common with other States, has legislation controlling egg production and marketing administered by a statutory egg marketing authority which, in our case is the South Australian Egg Board. The egg industry in South Australia has been preparing for change since the legislation was last amended in 1987, and the Government has supported a gradual move toward deregulation.

In 1989 the New South Wales Government removed all controls on egg marketing and production and sold the New South Wales Egg Corporation; at the same time it paid \$15 per hen quota in compensation to producers, giving a total bill to the taxpayers of that State of about \$61 million. South Australian producers realised at the time that the deregulation of the New South Wales egg industry had serious implications for the industry in this State. It was also predicted that New South Wales producers would increase egg production and seek markets in other States. This is in fact what happened and considerable quantities of New South Wales eggs have been sold in Queensland and Victoria for some time, and more recently, significant quantities of eggs have been offered for sale in South Australia.

Following the deregulation in New South Wales, the United Farmers and Stockowners and the South Australian Egg Board sought advice from me on this Government's views with respect to moves taken in New South Wales and our attitude to deregulation. I advised that a phased program of deregulation was the preferred course in our opinion and also that we would not be considering compensation payments to producers. Both the United Farmers and Stockowners and the Egg Board considered the Government's view reasonable in the circumstances. Our discussions led to the United Farmers and Stockowners and the Egg Board asking me to consider appointing a working party to consider future strategies for the egg industry. These strategies were aimed at putting the South Australian industry on a competitive footing with interstate producers.

The egg industry working party was formed and recommended that a central grading floor be established to grade, pack and distribute shell eggs and to manufacture and distribute egg products in South Australia. The Government supported this strategy on the grounds that it would provide the industry with an egg handling facility large enough to capture economies of scale in egg handling and enable South Australian producers to compete with producers in other

States. This approval aimed to ensure that all regions of the State were assured of a steady supply of good quality eggs. In July 1990 the board acquired the grading, packing and distribution assets of the two metropolitan grading agents. The board decided to consolidate these at a central egg handling facility at Keswick. This was done to create a central grading floor with sufficient capacity to achieve a scale of economies that would allow our producers to compete with subsidised New South Wales egg producers. The consolidation of these activities with the existing pulping capacity at Keswick is proceeding and is expected to be completed by the end of November.

It needs to be stressed that at the time the board was moving with some haste to complete the acquisition of the two metropolitan grading agents I became concerned about some aspects of the process the Egg Board was following. At a subsequent meeting with the full Egg Board I expressed my concerns to the board. I told the board that while it may have been following the principle of the recommendations of the working party, some elements of the pursuit of those recommendations seemed to indicate a want of sound business practice. The board was told that it should have sought my agreement prior to entering into contracts for the purchases, especially with respect to the terms and conditions, even though under the Act it was not obliged to do this.

The board was also requested immediately to appoint an 'official manager'. Upon consideration of this request, the board sought my concurrence to the appointment of a financial consultant. In December I approved the appointment of Mr David Olifent to this position. Mr Olifent was requested to oversee the preparation, implementation and monitoring of a business plan for the board. Under the existing legislation a formal review of the board is required every three years. This review was completed recently and on Tuesday I tabled a copy for the information of members. This brings us to the critical point that the egg industry has reached in recent weeks. In July this year, New South Wales producers started selling eggs in South Australia. This led to a sharp fall in retail prices and the South Australian egg marketing legislation was challenged in the Federal Court by Bi-Lo. In order to meet the interstate competition, the board reduced wholesale egg prices. This resulted in a drop in the farm gate price. The board and Bi-Lo subsequently agreed on conditions for the regrading of interstate eggs to be sold by Bi-Lo, and the matter has been held over for review by the Federal Court in November this year.

At this time interstate trade in eggs has resulted in a substantial reduction in retail prices in the metropolitan area. Interstate egg producers have been faced with low returns from eggs for at least 12 months and some producers have been forced out of the industry. Rationalisation will occur in the egg industry at a national level over the next few years. On the other hand, it is likely that some of the more efficient farmers will have opportunities to expand their production.

In July this year a formal agreement was also signed at the Special Premiers Conference committing the States and Territories to adoption of uniform national food standards. When these national food standards are applied it will mean that eggs from other States will not have to be regraded before being offered for sale in South Australia, and thus will remove a barrier to interstate trading in eggs. The entry of interstate eggs will mean that egg production controls, which are the cornerstone of the current egg legislation in this State, will be much less effective. Producers will be faced with lower prices for their eggs and, as it stands, the legislation which restricts the number of poultry they can

keep limits their flexibility and their ability to respond to market demands. These recent events clearly indicate there is a need for change and for fairly rapid changes so that the industry becomes competitive and egg marketing arrangements reflect a national rather than a State perspective.

South Australia produces 8 per cent of the nation's eggs with a gross value of production of about \$23 million. I consider it is important that the egg industry is maintained in South Australia. It is likely that in the future, South Australian producers will have to share part of their local market with interstate producers, but I would like to see South Australians retain the major share of the market and also develop markets in other States if possible. In order to improve the efficiency and reduce costs of the post-farm phase of egg marketing, I am looking at options for the industry to take over the egg handling facility from the board. When the transfer has occurred and the facility is operating under new ownership it is the intention of the Government that the egg industry be deregulated. This approach is accepted by industry. Accordingly, I have instructed that negotiations start with the UF&S and the board regarding the transfer of the egg grading and pulping facility to the industry.

Following deregulation consumers would have a freer choice of eggs produced either here or interstate, while it is expected that producers would continue to produce and sell high quality eggs. It would be anticipated that a dynamic and competitive local producing sector will be able to retain the purchasing loyalty of South Australian retailers and consumers. Consumers would also benefit from lower prices resulting from increased competition and from more efficient marketing. The following table, which I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* without my reading it as it is purely statistical, reveals comparative egg price trends in the various States of Australia in recent years.

Leave granted.

EGG INDUSTRY MATTERS

Egg Prices

1. The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) regularly publishes quarterly retail prices for 55 g eggs in all capital cities. 55 g eggs are one of the most popular grades of eggs but grade weight differences among States means that the ABS has to choose the grade nearest to 55 g for price comparisons.

2. Retail prices (cents/dozen) for the main capital cities since September 1986 are as follows:

Quarter	Syd.	Mel.	Bris.	Adel.	Perth
1986					
September	151	178	182	202	171
December	154	169	183	204	168
1987					
March	154	162	183	204	171
June	158	161	181	204	170
September	168	169	181	190	170
December	159	167	181	188	168
1988					
March	165	163	190	183	168
June	186	174	188	183	171
September	206	187	190	200	180
December	205	186	196	203	181
1989					
March	200	183	203	209	180
June	209	192	203	221	191
September	181	193	203	226	190
December	177	192	204	225	193
1990					
March	172	177	205	225	191
June	171	178	204	226	193
September	173	188	205	226	194
December	170	186	203	223	194

3. ABS data is determined from a random sample of eggs from a range of retail outlets in the various capital cities. The data is often criticised by egg producers who maintain that the data does

not reflect the true situation in that it does not give any indication about price variation.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Egg quality standards in this State are applied by producers and are also regulated by the board and the South Australian Health Commission. Measures are in place at packing floors to ensure cracked, misshapen and soiled eggs are removed. Eggs are graded for weight on farms or when they are packed for sale. Deregulation of the industry would still see consumers protected by regulations administered by the South Australian Health Commission. These regulations contain provisions prohibiting the sale of dirty, contaminated or cracked eggs. Egg quality will remain an important matter for producers, who will be competing for markets with producers in other States, and in order to be successful they will have to ensure that their eggs are of the highest quality and that the interval between the farm and retailer is as short as possible. For these reasons, I am confident that the current standards of egg quality would be maintained.

I would like to emphasise the need for rapid change in the current marketing arrangement for eggs in this State, otherwise the initiative will be lost to interstate interests. I would expect that the negotiations I have initiated with industry will result in the successful transfer of the egg grading and pulping facility to producers, and that the transition will result in the formation of an efficient business which is capable of matching interstate competition. I would like to see the negotiations completed by 1 December 1991 and the transfer effected by 1 January 1992.

If the negotiations are not successful, I will seek public tenders for the purchase of the egg handling facility, and, if no acceptable offers are received by the Government, I will examine other options for disposal of the board assets. It is proposed that current legislation will remain in place until the transfer of the trading floor is completed, but I am aware that the regulations, particularly the ceiling on quota, could hinder industry development, and this view has also been accepted by the industry. Therefore, the operations of the current Egg Board will be reviewed and reassessed with every opportunity taken to reduce the costs of the board's operation and to pass on the savings in the form of reduced levies on producers. To this end, the board has already taken the decision to completely phase out equalisation levies from the beginning of next month. I fully support that decision.

I realise that deregulation would also affect consumers and employees at the board. Accordingly, in line with Government practice, I have released a green paper on egg marketing legislation which outlines the background to the legislation and possible options for future regulation of the egg industry for public comment. I now table a copy of that paper. The course of action I have outlined regarding the transfer of the egg handling facility prior to the deregulation of the industry is in line with the recommendations in this report and is in line with the wishes of producers and, in my view, is in the best interests of South Australia.

The Marketing of Eggs Act was enacted as a wartime measure in 1941, and the industry has been highly regulated for 50 years, and since the enactment of quota legislation in 1973 there have been few new entrants into the industry. After deregulation there would be no restrictions on the numbers of hens kept on farms, and producers would be able to develop their farms to take advantage of market opportunities. There would also be opportunities for new entrants to develop special markets, for example, for free range eggs or to meet the need for eggs within their local areas.

I also wish to advise the House that the Chair of the South Australian Egg Board, John Feagan, has resigned for

personal and family reasons. I wish to take this opportunity to thank John for his service to the South Australian egg industry during the time he chaired the board; notwithstanding the critical challenges facing the industry at this time, it is clear that John Feagan devoted himself to tackling them. I can now announce that the new Chair of the South Australian Egg Board will be Trevor Kessell, a former senior executive with the Westpac Banking Corporation and Natwest. Mr Kessell will bring considerable financial expertise to the board. Finally, I also advise that in recent months there have been some changes in the membership of the board. I believe these changes will ensure it is best able to assist industry face the changed conditions of today and the future with confidence.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of Finance (Hon. Frank Blevins)—
Casino Supervisory Authority—Report, 1990-91.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr HAMILTON brought up the sixty-fifth report and the annual report of the Public Accounts Committee for 1990-91.

Ordered that reports be printed.

QUESTION TIME

REPRESENTATION IN ASIA

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. In view of his commitment earlier this year to upgrade South Australia's representation in Asia, what is his response to the serious criticism he has received of the State's representation in Tokyo? The Premier's commitment to upgrade Asian representation was given in his response to the Prime Minister's March Industry Statement and it was one that the Opposition endorsed. The urgency of such action has been highlighted by criticism made to the Premier about South Australia's Tokyo office by an Austrade officer at the Australian Embassy and an Assistant Professor of Management at Keio University in Tokyo.

In their letter to the Premier, dated 31 August, they state that 'the lack of proper representation is costing the State immensely, both in terms of trade and credibility' particularly given the MFP, and that South Australia is the only State 'without realistic official Government representation'. They state that the current South Australian representative in Tokyo 'admits openly that he has his own business interests to take care of and the affairs of South Australia, while taking considerable time, are only part of his vocation'. The letter further complains that the Tokyo office was not aware, a week before the last State election, that the poll was in fact taking place, and could therefore give no advice on postal votes. It also complains that the Tokyo representative had been 'quite impolite and disinterested' in talking to a prominent South Australian development specialist; the office had dissociated itself from the Adelaide-Himeji Week; and the office had no interest in the affairs of South Australian students in Japan.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I did receive the letter to which the Leader referred; of course, a copy was sent by the writers

to the Leader. I take very seriously criticisms of our representation and its effectiveness, but I might say that the writers of the letter, I think, misconceived the nature of our representation in Japan. It is not the role of the South Australian Government or the taxpayers to fund services in Japan relating to electoral matters and issues of that kind. We have an Australian Embassy there with a very large staff, and it is prepared to assist in those matters. It, too, is funded by the taxpayers of this country. In fact, many times it has been alleged, for example, that the office of the Agent-General in London was spending too much time dealing with matters such as tickets to royal garden parties and casual inquiries of that kind and not enough time on the primary purpose of promoting South Australia to aid its business investment and other activities. That is the whole point of overseas representation. Part of that letter misconceives the reason why we would have representation in Japan.

Secondly, it has always been the policy of this Government not to try to establish some sort of mini embassy duplicating functions of Austrade or the Australian Government. Indeed, on many occasions I have publicly been very critical of the way in which, for instance, the Queensland Government (certainly when Mr Bjelke-Petersen was in charge) poured resources of this kind into many centres around the world. I do not know what sort of return they got. It obviously made them feel good.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There is an enormous amount of resentment and opposition to some of the effects of that, as the Leader would be only too aware. Whilst it makes a State feel important that it has its own name up in lights with a fully fledged embassy service, it is enormously costly and an ego trip, quite frankly, that does not aid basic business development. Indeed, it works against Australia's interests by often confusing those people seeking to do business with us as the various States clamour for some kind of attention. I believe that our approach, which has been to ensure that we get the maximum involvement and use from our national representation, is the appropriate way to go. Of course, in some centres we need to provide a supplementation to that and, indeed, Japan is certainly one such place where we provide such supplementation.

We have in the past 12 months substantially upgraded our presence in Tokyo. Far from the criticisms that have been levelled suggesting some kind of diminution of effort, on the contrary we are increasing that effort. In September last year, 12 months ago, we changed from being represented through an arrangement with Elders IXL, as had applied for many years under respective Governments, and established our own office by leasing suitable office space in central Tokyo and securing three Japanese people under contract in that office. That was a major step forward.

We also appointed a special senior adviser in Japan, Mr Mizno Kuroda, a former Ambassador to Australia, a person who is active in the Australia-Japan Association, Chairman of the Japan Foundation and a man highly respected in Japan, Australia and internationally where he has represented Japan in UNESCO. He has agreed to be the South Australian senior adviser, which means that in Mr Kuroda we have someone who is able to get access, and can make representations to us at the very highest level. He has already made a couple of visits here, and the value of his advice in, for instance, pursuit of the MFP project has already been made apparent. I reject the fact that we are not adequately or properly represented in Japan at this time. Having said that, with the increasing activity on projects such as MFP

Adelaide, we will certainly review our Japan-based expertise and, indeed, upgrade it if necessary.

In addition to those resources in Japan, we have upgraded the resources that we operate from here. In the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology we have a Japanese expert, Mr Eric Olsen, who makes quite frequent trips to Japan, again on the basis that if one computes the value of half a dozen trips a year to do targeted specific promotion as against the ongoing cost of trying to maintain a representative full time, it just does not make sense: the economics simply do not work. I suggest that we have extremely effective targeted, cost effective representation, and we remain ready to review it if and when necessary.

I certainly intend to take up one or two of the specifics raised in the letter. I am surprised that an officer from Austrade should write in this instance when in fact the Federal policy of the agency that she represents is to try to ensure that Austrade provides a better representation and obviates the need for many of these services. In fact, she is criticising the very organisation for which she works. I have recently drawn her points to the attention of the Chief Executive Officer of Austrade. As regards Professor Drummond, the co-author, I have no particular comment to make. That is an observation that he makes. However, I will take up some of the specifics, but repeat that, if the Leader is implying that we should move to this full-scale representation, the bill is enormous and the value we get is very small in comparison.

COMMONWEALTH GAMES

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport inform the House of progress made on the Commonwealth Games bid, specifically in relation to support from the South Australian public and his recent overseas trip? I understand that the Minister and the member for Hanson have just returned from Papua New Guinea where they were well received by Oceania. I also understand that the Games bid recently received a big vote of confidence from the public during the Royal Show.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: At the outset, I should like to thank the public of South Australia for their support, particularly during the Royal Show. I also acknowledge the work of members from both sides in both Houses in supporting our Games bid during the Show. I understand that a number of members gave valuable time at the stand in the hall and encouraged people to look at the display as well as volunteer for our future needs for the Games in 1998.

I have great pleasure in saying that, in addition to the coordination carried out by Games staff, the member for Hanson made a significant contribution in getting the booth organised and supporting the volunteers who worked on the bid with him at the Show. Many volunteers came from a variety of sporting organisations throughout Australia and gave their time as well to support our bid presentation. More than 10 000 people have signed the form to offer themselves as volunteers. That is an outstanding number to indicate support for our bid and it augurs well for what we as South Australians are promoting on behalf of our community in this 1998 quest.

It is important that those who have volunteered be assured that their names will be kept exclusively for the use of the bid. There will be no use of those names outside: privacy is assured. We will be calling on them if our bid is successful, and even beforehand, to assist with the presentation of the City of Adelaide as the host city for the 1998 Commonwealth Games.

I think we owe a debt to those people who put forward their names. Certainly, when we made this announcement in Papua New Guinea on Monday to those people attending our reception in Port Moresby, there was a reaction of incredibility. They had not heard of a promotion of this sort and were quite staggered by the number of volunteers who had put down their names to support our bid for 1998. It augurs well for our bid. The support I have had from members, particularly from the member for Hanson as a member of the committee, has been excellent, and the general support of both sides of the House will further enhance the success of this bid. As part of the process to promote our bid, next week the member for Hanson and I will attend the All Africa Games.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: All jokes aside, this is a serious matter. It will form a very important and serious part of our bid process, because this will be our first opportunity to promote our city to the Commonwealth nations of Africa. Again, I wish to thank all volunteers, members and those people who have worked on the booth and the 10 000-plus people who have put down their names to offer their support as volunteers.

STATE BANK

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Why did the Treasurer approve SAFA's \$35.5 million purchase of the head lease on the Citi-Centre building last December? Was it to enable the repayment of a \$30 million problem loan to the State Bank? The Auditor-General's Report released on Tuesday states that the Commissioners of Charitable Funds own the site on which the Citi-Centre was completed in August 1988. While the unimproved land value is \$7.5 million, the most recent valuation of the property by the Valuer-General on 30 June 1991 was \$21.75 million, which is less than two-thirds the price paid by SAFA for the head lease.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Citi-Centre is tenanted by the Government, and under certain terms involved in a long-term arrangement we were required to purchase that building I think by 1994. What was done was simply to bring forward that particular transaction, and the assessment was made that this was an economically convenient thing to do. The owners of the building put forward the proposition, which had a number of implications attached to it, an assessment was made, and that purchase ahead of time and on good terms was made.

INTERNATIONAL DAY FOR THE ELDERLY

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): With more than one-quarter of a million South Australians being over the age of 60, will the Minister for the Aged state what measures the Government is taking to celebrate the occasion on Tuesday 1 October of the inaugural United Nations International Day for the Elderly?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I hope that all South Australians will join in this time of celebration. It should not be confined simply to people who are over 60. After all, who constitutes part of the body of older South Australians depends a little on the viewpoint of those who are speaking. In some countries it is the over 50s, but that would probably mean that certain members such as myself would immediately have to assume a mantle which I am sure we will

wear with pride when we get there but, quite candidly we are not in a great hurry.

In any event, I can indicate that the Government has decided to offer to all South Australians over 60 free access to a number of services that can be readily costed for that day, including: public transport provided by the STA between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. on 1 October; access to facilities under the aegis of the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage—for example, Carrick Hill, the Constitutional Museum in Old Parliament House, the National Motor Museum at Birdwood, and the South Australian Maritime Museum; the Bicentennial Conservatory; and entrance fees for national and conservation parks and Martindale Hall. The Adelaide Festival Centre is already holding two of its regular Morning Melodies concerts for older people on 1 October, and the usual low charge will apply to those.

In addition, the centre will provide free tours, and look at special prices in its restaurants. Proof of age will be the seniors card, but where the seniors card cannot readily be produced the people involved will sensitively consider an indication from the person that they are 60 years or over.

The Government, having given this lead, looks to local government and to commerce to follow that lead. It would be rather nice if local government, where sometimes there is a charge on its facilities, or the private sector, could similarly consider the possibility of waiving some charges on this day, and we look forward to that cooperative effort. A number of organisations have cooperated with us very enthusiastically in the past on this very important day, and it is good that in a time of fiscal constraint we can nonetheless make these concessions available.

SPEAKER'S VOTE

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Would you explain, Mr Speaker, the circumstances under which you would vote against the Government or the Premier and Treasurer in a motion of no confidence?

The SPEAKER: I believe that the question is out of order in that I have no responsibility to this House as Speaker to justify my vote. The question being posed to me is: what conditions would apply to my casting a vote? I do not believe that that is in order.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Are you ruling the question out of order, Sir?

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to finish his question. As I read the question so far—and I will certainly look at it—the honourable member is asking me what conditions apply to my vote as a member of this House and as Speaker of this House. That is my privilege. Currently, a select committee is looking at the rights and privileges of this Parliament. As a member of this Parliament, I claim that privilege and the right to vote as I choose on the matter at hand. The honourable member is asking me as Speaker and as an elected member of this House to indicate how I would vote. That is out of order.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I asked for the circumstances, Sir, but I will approach you with the question in due course.

SEWAGE PUMPING

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Water Resources inform the House of the Government's intention with respect to the planned cessation of the pumping of sewage sludge into the sea from the Glenelg and Port Adelaide sewage treatment works and the proposed piping of

the sludge to Bolivar? An article in this week's *Portside Messenger* quotes a New South Wales marine scientist, Mr Chris Illert, as being suspicious of the Government's motives. The article states:

Mr Illert says he will remain cynical of the Government's motive behind the plan until he sees some evidence of its commitment, such as the blocking of sewage drains into the sea.

The article also states:

He said he suspected any sludge piped to the Bolivar treatment works from Glenelg and Port Adelaide would be pumped into the sea at St Kilda.

It further states:

It's a great master plan (to pipe sludge to Bolivar), the plan is commendable, but I doubt the Government's sincerity.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It is interesting, is it not? I am sure that the member for Hanson, who is always fiercely supportive and defensive of South Australia, will support me in my answer. Mr Illert resides in New South Wales and last visited Adelaide in August 1990. So he is making these value judgments from New South Wales about a program on which it would be fair to say that we have bipartisan support, that is, to remove the pumping of sludge from Glenelg and Port Adelaide into the marine environment to Bolivar. I want to get on the public record once and for all exactly what we are doing. Mr Illert also talks about the fact that he is the only person who is taking an interest in this matter. In fact, he says:

I am the only person I know who is still thinking about the damage 20 years later.

It is interesting to note that the E&WS Department has been monitoring the effect of discharges into the marine environment for about 20 years; in fact, the environmental enhancement program has been based on this longitudinal research study.

As members know, last year the Bannon Government introduced a levy on sewerage accounts to fund a program of environmental enhancement. Of course, one of the priorities has been the protection of the marine environment. I totally reject the claims made by Mr Illert; it is obvious that those claims are quite outrageous. I can give the House and the South Australian public an assurance that we will not be pumping any sludge into the sea at St Kilda or anywhere else. This dried sludge will be put to good use in a number of ways, one of which is as a fertiliser which will be put back into the soil. So, Mr Illert's claim is quite a nonsense.

I am disappointed that the *Messenger Portside* did not bother to check its story before it ran it. It did not contact my office, and it certainly did not contact any of the local members: you, Mr Speaker, the member for Albert Park or the member for Price. It is sad that the *Messenger Portside* is prepared to print this kind of nonsense.

AIR QUALITY

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Planning. Where specifically will the cuts in the air quality branch of the Department of Environment and Planning, announced in the budget, be focused? How will these cuts reflect on the efficiency of the branch to carry out industry emission monitoring and, recognising that the air quality branch is already grossly under-resourced, how can further cuts be justified? I have in my possession an internal Department of Environment and Planning memo which examines threatened cuts to the budget in the air quality branch. In particular, there is the possibility of reductions in the num-

ber of staff required to carry out industry emission monitoring. The memo states:

The air section is grossly understaffed for the functions that it is legally required to undertake. Additional projects that it has been required to undertake mean that the effectiveness of the branch is already seriously undermined. If the Government wants further reductions it must identify those areas it is willing to no longer provide a public service so we can tell the public.

The information contained in the budget demonstrates that these concerns were wellfounded.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am amazed that the honourable member has the audacity to raise this matter when his own Leader this week has been on the public airways of this State talking about the removal of 9 000 public servants. As we have heard—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I forgot about his memory: I thank the honourable member for reminding me. As the Premier clearly delineated in his address to the Opposition's response to the budget yesterday afternoon, it will be very interesting to see where the Opposition will make its cuts in terms of 9 000 jobs. I find it amazing that we are less than a week away from the Estimates Committees—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: They don't like this at all.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order. The Minister will resume her seat.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I raise the matter of relevance. The honourable member's question was about the air quality branch and not what happened yesterday.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The Chair's attention was distracted momentarily, but I ask the Minister to return to the subject.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Indeed, the question related specifically to staffing levels. We are facing the Estimates Committees next week. I will provide for the honourable member the exact details of this and any other questions that he wishes to raise with me in the Estimates Committee. We have allocated at least four hours to environment and planning to ensure that the Opposition will have adequate time to discuss any aspect of my budget.

Let me remind the honourable member, while he is preparing his questions for next week (and I look forward to next week with great anticipation), that we have already put out for public discussion that we are going to move to an environmental protection authority, and many of the issues relating to air and water quality, noise control and waste management and minimisation will be addressed in that way. Funding will be looked at specifically with respect to this whole question of environment protection and control.

It is interesting that the honourable member picks one aspect of one department to focus on when, I have to say, his own Party would probably cut these areas willy-nilly, given the kind of commitment that the Opposition Leader has made to the people of this State.

It will be interesting to hear what the honourable member proposes in terms of meeting the 9 000 job cuts which the Opposition has put on the public record and which, indeed, will pursue. We will be helping the Opposition to ensure that it clearly gives the community the exact information about where we will see these cuts.

The SPEAKER: Several times this week I have had to refer to the length of responses. It is the responsibility of the Chair to make Question Time as effective as possible. Once again, I request that responses to questions be kept as brief as possible. The member for Hanson.

FUNERAL INDUSTRY

Mr BECKER (Hanson): Will the Premier ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Minister for Local Government Relations to investigate certain practices in the funeral industry? Reputable funeral parlours and members of the public have raised serious concerns to me about practices, particularly those of so-called shop front parlours, where bodies are held at other premises. I refer first to Affordable Funerals, which set up on Goodwood Road, Wayville in about August this year. No human remains are kept on these premises. I am advised they are stored instead in a portable refrigerated unit in a warehouse at Mile End. Further, this business is operated by a person who has a police record dating back to 1969 and who has been involved in dubious practices in a nursing home. This parlour is now offering kickback commissions to nursing homes.

In another case involving a company offering pre-paid funerals, a woman who believed she was paying to have her husband cremated at Centennial Park found out this would be done at a country area through a pick up and delivery service. I understand the cost undercutting by less reputable parlours has led to a drop in standards to the point where the coffins are so flimsy that they are splitting open before cremation. I have been advised that two major Adelaide crematoriums will not accept bookings from some parlours unless they are paid cash in advance. The Government has been considering for some time legislation relating to the control of human remains and the circumstances I have just explained justify this matter being given more priority to protect the reputations of reputable parlours and to maintain confidence in the industry.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, I will.

INJURED WORKERS

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister of Labour tell the House what WorkCover is doing to encourage the employment of injured workers?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Spence for his question. Last week—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:—I launched the Re-employment Incentive Scheme for Employers (RISE). The aim is to encourage employers to employ people who have been injured at work in another establishment that does not have the facilities to enable that person to go back to work. Already, six people have been placed in work since that announcement, more than a dozen jobs are being filled and there have been many other offers. The incentive is a subsidy ranging from \$6 500 to \$11 000 a year, depending on the time that the worker has been looking for work and the time involved in getting the worker back into a working situation.

It is part of the rehabilitation process that, when people are injured, particularly in smaller establishments, employers may be unable to offer continuing employment to injured employees because of residual injuries. The retraining scheme will fit people for work elsewhere and the subsidy will encourage other employers to take on these people. It is hoped that, as the scheme becomes a permanent feature of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act and the activities of WorkCover in this State, we will see many more people back in the workplace, having been through the rehabilitation process. Indeed, it gives me great pleasure to come into this place and see that one of the employees

of this Parliament is able to come back to work. I believe that the scheme will ensure that people who have been injured will have the dignity of having a job; that it will give them dignity within the community; and it will certainly give them and their family dignity to know that the breadwinner is going back to work.

SANFL

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Does the Premier agree with the remarks in the House this morning by the Labor member for Walsh that the SANFL has a pig-headed attitude towards the community in general, that the President Mr Max Basheer is occasionally rude, and that over the past decade the football league has collectively had a history of a rather arrogant attitude towards Parliament and towards members of Parliament?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, I do not subscribe to a number of those views—they are the personal views of the member for Walsh, who has expressed them and explained his reasons for such comments over some time. There are some matters on which I agree with the member for Walsh; for example, he has been extremely vocal—and appropriately so—about the Magarey Medal function. I did not hear his remarks, but I imagine that is what he would say. In my experience, Mr Max Basheer can be rude. He was rude in a way with which I thoroughly agreed to the VFL commissioners when they tried to hijack our league. I fully supported him in that rudeness. I am not aware of other rudenesses, but perhaps the honourable member can advise me. Be that as it may, the member for Walsh has a perfect right to express his views, and has done so.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education inform the House of South Australia's employment and unemployment figures as released today by the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I thank the honourable member for his continued interest in the issue of employment. In South Australia we saw an increase in total employment of 6 500 over the month. The number of unemployed fell by 800. South Australia's unemployment rate for August fell slightly by .1 per cent to 10.3 per cent.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: They do not like any positive signs at all in terms of good news.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is not just the whingers but also the spoilers—certainly led by a spoiler. The national unemployment rate remains static at 9.8 per cent and two States have unemployment rates at or above 11 per cent—Tasmania, 11.8 per cent and Western Australia, 11 per cent.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is interesting to hear the venom of the interjections by the Leader of the Opposition. I am surprised by that, because the other night I told his tactical response group, who were out celebrating the fact that he was able to learn his speech off by heart, that I had just been elected Chairman of the 'Don't dump Dale' committee. We agree with the *News*; we want you there. Certainly I welcome the slight fall in the unemployment rate. However, the figures should be interpreted with caution, as monthly

unemployment figures tend to be volatile. The unemployment rate of 10.3 per cent is still too high, as is youth unemployment. The employment trend, of course, is still downwards, but there are now signs that there could be a crucial turning point in the national economy. Therefore, it is critical that business confidence be encouraged, and the Federal Government needs to ensure that this happens.

Dr Armitage interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The member for Adelaide is calling out '30 per cent'; that is about 10 per cent higher than the Leader of the Opposition's approval rating. I am not quite sure what he is going on about. Employment is a lagging indicator, and the unemployed cannot afford to wait for recovery to trickle down. I welcome moves at the national level from the ACTU and the Federal Labor Caucus to restimulate debate about the need to kickstart jobs growth. It is now time for the Federal Government to ensure that there is concerted national action.

In June the South Australian Government issued a detailed 12-point plan of action on the jobs front. Some of our proposals, including Austudy changes, were picked up in the recent Federal budget, but in terms of a concerted, comprehensive national employment strategy the Federal budget was, I am afraid, fairly half-hearted. It is now time for national resolve and commitment to ensure that the unemployed and the most vulnerable do not continue to bear the brunt of this recession. We can discard the interjections of the members of the Opposition who want to run up the white flag on South Australia's future. We heard their solutions: cut off the dole, fake the figures and issue Tasmania's and send them out to forced labour camps.

PATHOLOGISTS

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): My question is directed to the Minister of Health. What will be the financial impact on the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science of the Commonwealth reduction in the current rate paid to specialist pathologists to 65 per cent of the schedule fee; and were any discussions held between the Minister and the Federal Government before the introduction of this measure?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The answer to the second question is 'No'. The answer to the first is that no-one knows at this stage, although a lot of work is being done to try to tease out those costs.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member may be right. We are certainly not in any way relaxed about this. We are certainly very concerned about the impact on the IMVS and are trying hard to clarify the position as soon as we possibly can. I should be only too happy to make that information available to the honourable member when we have it.

LIVE SHEEP EXPORTS

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Will the Minister of Agriculture advise the House of the present situation in relation to live sheep exports from South Australia to the Middle East? Farmers in my electorate and those whom I know from Yorke Peninsula have asked me what the Department of Agriculture and the South Australian Government are doing to revive the live sheep export trade to the Middle East.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The situation in actual figures is that, while South Australia exported 2.2 million live sheep in 1988, that figure had fallen to 529 000 in 1990. So far this year—in other words, for nearly three-quarters of the year—the figure is 306 000, so it looks as though the total will be down even on last year's depressed figure. Normally two-thirds of the sheep which are exported live from South Australia come from South Australia and another third are transshipped into South Australia for transshipment out. That indicates that the live sheep export trade is not faring particularly well at the moment. It is true that the Saudi market is effectively closed to Australian live sheep exports.

It is to be hoped that the Saudi authorities will as soon as possible reach agreement with the Australian Federal authorities on the matter of a joint protocol. Exports to other parts of the Middle East are continuing. Our problem at the moment is that it is proving cheaper for shipments to be made from Western Australia than from South Australia due to the sailing times involved, and that has eroded some of our position even further.

The point has been made about the future. I have clearly said before, and repeat now, that the long-term future for the benefit of sheep farmers in this State is to see a move away from live sheep into chilled meat. Whereas previously the problem was that the cost of air freighting chilled meat was too expensive—in other words, technically it could be done but it would be landed at such a cost that it could not be sold at the other end—that is now being overcome as new technologies are being introduced, particularly with respect to modified atmosphere technologies, which are still somewhat in the experimental phase. The member for Custance shakes his head at that, but a couple of abattoirs in South Australia are experimenting with that technology.

Once they overcome some of the hiccups involved, I anticipate that we will see more prime lamb being able to be exported by modified atmosphere chilling, so that we can get a better price market in the Middle East. The problem with live sheep is that we have been forced into the export of live five-year-old wethers that do not get a prime price in the markets to which they go. They are very much the end of the run and they get a very low return for the farmers in any event. Surely, after the member for Custance's rather good speech yesterday, in which he made a couple of good points, and in which he referred to value-adding, this would be very much in line with what he wants to do. So, I thought he would want to support it.

The point I make is that that is what we should target ourselves towards. I oppose any peremptory cutting-off of the live sheep trade because that would not allow the development of these new markets in the future. Indeed, the State Labor Party supports that very same position: that we should see a transition, a moving away from domination of the live sheep trade to a position of high value and high wealth creating for our economy opportunities of chilled meat.

TRAFFIC INFRINGEMENT NOTICES

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): My question is directed to the Minister of Emergency Services. What action has been taken to stop police issuing invalid traffic infringement notices for speed camera offences, and how many notices have been withdrawn? I have been informed that police are issuing expiation notices to motorists picked up by speed cameras that do not comply with the Summary Offences Act, nor does the form of notice approved by the Attorney-

General on 18 May 1988. I have been further informed that police charged one offender with speeding in a built-up area, when the charge should have been laid under the section of the Road Traffic Act which covers speed cameras, and that the Crown Solicitor has stated that as a matter of urgency the correct offence should be identified on expiation notices.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: If the honourable member will provide me with the details of the case to which she refers, I will have it investigated.

RECYCLING SCHEMES

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Planning. Following a previous question to the Minister concerning strategies for the development of recycling schemes, will she advise whether any financial assistance is available to councils for the establishment of such schemes?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Currently, 17 metropolitan councils have instigated or are proposing to instigate recycling programs within their local communities. As members would be aware, support for recycling is very high within the community. As I explained to the House yesterday, the response to the environmental trial and the joint presence of my three departments support that view. One of the main issues that must be addressed is the whole concept of kerb side collection and recycling collection schemes at, if you like, the community face.

There are two ways in which councils can receive assistance for recycling schemes. The first is through the Recycling Development Fund administered by the Waste Management Commission. This fund receives its money from a levy on solid waste. I must say that even some members opposite have had an opportunity to ensure that their constituents have received the benefit of moneys made available from this fund, but it is there to support local government to get recycling schemes under way.

The second avenue to which councils can apply for funds is the Publishers National Environment Bureau, commonly known as the PNEB Fund, which also has allocated funds for the collection of newspapers. It is prepared to pay about \$20 per tonne for newspapers that are collected. It is administered by the Waste Management Commission, and the moneys from both the PNEB and the Recycling Development Funds have criteria to be met before funds will be made available. In other words, the schemes must be shown to be viable and they must meet the objectives and policy issues of the Government in terms of recycling. I must say that that is not difficult to do, and I encourage all members to inquire of their local councils what they are doing about getting kerb side collection schemes into place and what recycling programs they have for their communities, because the only way we can move forward with recycling is to have the absolute commitment of local government. I encourage them to be involved in this.

BLANCHE HARBOR SHACKS

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Why has the Minister of Lands reversed her decision to allow the sale of previously unacceptable shack sites at Blanche Harbor, which are largely owned and occupied by the constituents of the member for Stuart? In the 17 July edition of the *Transcontinental*, a newspaper circulating in that district, a front page story discloses that the Government would now allow most shack

owners at Blanche Harbor to buy their shack sites, whilst the remaining 30 per cent of the shacks at Blanche Harbor were unsuitable for purchase and would be subject to 40-year non-renewable leases. On 28 August, in the same newspaper, the Minister, in a political back flip, announced that those unsuitable shacks were now available for freehold tenure, thereby raising the question in the mind of many shack owners elsewhere that the Minister has unfairly favoured shack owners in Labor-held seats.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: First, I absolutely refute the claim that I am favouring shack owners in Labor-held seats. I will be very pleased to provide the honourable member with a detailed report and a detailed history—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I have been asked a question, and I will be very happy to provide a full and frank answer to the honourable member.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am always truthful.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I find it interesting that the honourable member finds that amusing. Perhaps he should look at his own record before he implies derision through his hysterical laughter. Perhaps he needs to take his medication! I am prepared to provide a detailed answer to the honourable member on this issue. If the honourable member were serious in genuinely seeking information, he would be aware that this matter goes back a considerable time. It has had the involvement of the Port Augusta council and the previous member for Stuart. Therefore, it would be in the interests of the House for me to provide a full, and detailed historical analysis of this situation. It is complicated, and I will be very pleased to provide that information to the honourable member.

HAHNDORF SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Water Resources provide information on when work will commence on upgrading the Hahndorf Sewage Treatment Works to improve the quality of effluent being discharged from that plant?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Let us come back to Standing Orders and conduct the House correctly.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am delighted to provide that information, and I would have been very pleased if the local member had chosen to ask that question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Good. I am delighted. I hope that the honourable member does. I can see that I will have one of the most interesting and exciting Estimates Committees. This will be my fourth, and I look forward to it. It is a great opportunity for Ministers to put an enormous amount of positive information on the public record. The short answer to the honourable member is that construction is planned to commence in February 1992 and will be

completed by the end of 1993. I remind the House that the plant was installed during the 1970s and services the communities of Hahndorf, Oakbank and Balhannah. The work to be undertaken will significantly reduce the levels of nitrogen and phosphorous in the effluent, and the preliminary cost of this work will be some \$2.2 million. This year, some \$375 000 has been allocated to commence the project.

ADELAIDE CASINO

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I ask the Minister of Finance what significant changes is the Government considering to the Casino Act? When will they be introduced? Are they in any way related to the drop in the Casino's gross gambling revenue? I refer to the annual report of the Casino Supervisory Authority, which was tabled this afternoon, and the reference in its conclusions to a report recently forwarded to the Minister. The authority states:

The recommendations of the report are likely to form the basis of some quite significant changes to the Casino Act and to the present arrangements under which the Casino Act operates.

The report also shows the Casino's gross gambling revenue in 1990-91 as \$432.7 million—down more than \$144 million on the previous year.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I do not think that question has anything whatsoever to do with the gambling revenue of the Casino. I would imagine that the Casino's gambling revenue is down because of the economic climate.

Mr Lewis: When are you going to change the Act?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Any changes to the Act will be considered by the Government at the appropriate time. The question of significance does not arise until such time as the Government has considered the report. I have read the report and I must confess that I did not see anything monumental in the proposed changes. In fact, they seem to me to be pretty mundane. There again, I did not write the CSA's report: it may see things in one way and I may see them in another way. The changes are more of a machinery nature than anything else. There is nothing that will excite the member for Hayward. I was going to say the same about the member for Murray-Mallee, but he tends to get excited about everything.

I do not think that one soul in this Chamber would become excited if all the proposed amendments were brought into this House holus-bolus. However, they certainly have not been considered by the Government at this time. As soon as they have been considered, and as soon as the Government has made a decision and the normal processes have been gone through, a Bill will be introduced, and I will be interested to see what the House thinks of it. However, I think the recommendations are pretty boring.

HOUSING INDUSTRY

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction provide a brief overview of the state of South Australia's housing industry relative to our interstate cousins? Today's media reports claim that South Australia is missing out on an economic upturn in housing. Given that South Australia's track record in housing is traditionally good, it has been put to me that the two statements do not correlate. Will the Minister explain the true position?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am pleased to be able to enlighten members of the House and of the community about our good track record in housing over the past five

years. One must be concerned about articles in the press that tend to talk down the economy. If there is one sector of industry in this State that has performed well over the past two or three years, it is the housing sector. That is due in no small part to the efforts of this Government with HomeStart, where about 40 per cent of new home loans have been initiated and generated by funds provided by the State Government. In fact, some \$500 million has been pumped into our local housing sector. It is a very worthwhile investment for about 8 000 South Australian families to have their own home.

If one looks behind the headlines, one sees that the figure is shallow because it refers to new starts from one month to another dropping by 20, that is, the figure goes from 2 520 to 2 500. I do not believe that a fall of 20 could be described as a significant drop. It hardly requires a headline that implies that South Australia is not part of the recovery. If one looks at the Housing Industry Association report of 25 June, one sees a survey of volume builders in the five years 1986 to 1991. It reveals just how healthy South Australia's building industry is at the moment, whereas New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia showed peaks and troughs and alterations in the order of thousands. In New South Wales and Western Australia 10 000 are contained within the trough to the crest, and that is an enormous change in any housing sector.

In effect, the fall in new starts in one year in those States is up to 57 per cent. That is something that we did not experience in this State, and certainly in South Australia we have shown a steady growth during the time of recession in other States. That has helped our industry greatly in this State. It has helped many other industries associated with the housing sector—for example, the furniture manufacturing and home appliance industries—and it has been an important signal for this State's economy to generate.

I see today that my colleague has announced our unemployment figures, which were predicted to go through the roof—but it is the reverse. Some of the strategies that have been put in place by this Government, particularly in our housing sector, have helped to maintain a very healthy industry and I hardly think it warrants the headline in today's paper.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I have told the industry, and the industry appreciates it because you, as a member, have not been out there talking to them. The industry appreciates what the Government has done. If members talk to people like Bob Day and others from Homestead, they will find that they endorse exactly what we have done as a Government. I would ask people reporting on these issues to give it a proper focus and look at the statistics. This State has had steady growth in the housing industry over the past five years, and it has been an excellent engine-room for this State's economy.

STATE BANK

Mr SUCH (Fisher): Now that the State Bank's annual report has revealed that the State Bank's New Zealand operations made a \$153 million loss last year, can the Treasurer explain why he informed the House that United Bank was operating well and 'there had been a return to profitability following the State Bank's acquisition in June 1990' and that the bank's New Zealand off balance sheet companies were \$36 million in the black?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The United Bank declared its result, I think, on the Tuesday before the Thursday on which

the State Bank result was published. It declared that in New Zealand, obviously, because that is where it is domiciled, and it showed it had made a profit.

LEGAL AID

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): My question is directed to the Minister of Education representing the Attorney-General. Is the Minister aware of comments made by the Family Law Action and Support Group regarding legal aid in a media release dated 12 August 1991, and can he advise what is the situation with regard to this matter? It was stated:

There is no doubt that the Legal Services Commission will no longer be issuing legal aid to litigants but will in future simply be acting as debt collectors, providing this as a service to legal firms.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I was most concerned to hear of those comments that were attributed to that organisation, an organisation I must admit I had never heard of. Nevertheless, if it has distributed information of that type in the community, it is a matter of great concern because nothing is further from the truth. We are well served in this State by the Legal Services Commission. It is a joint Commonwealth-State funded venture and it is regarded as being the best provider of legal aid in the country. The commission will continue to provide the excellent services that it has, both in-house and by allocating briefs to legal practitioners in private practice. I will obtain a fuller report on this matter from my colleague the Attorney-General to assist the honourable member to allay the fears of constituents who might be alarmed after having heard these comments.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council intimated that it had given leave to the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner), the Minister of Tourism (Hon. Barbara Wiese) and the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage (Hon. Anne Levy) to attend and give evidence before the Estimates Committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill, if they think fit.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 8 October at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

PRIVACY BILL

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to create a right of privacy and to provide a right of action for an infringement of that right; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill seeks to give effect to what this Government regards as a significant and highly desirable reform.

Background

This Bill originally arose as a private member's Bill on motion of the member for Hartley. The Bill is based on legislation which was first proposed in 1973-74 but was unsuccessful at that time. This Bill is similar to the earlier Bill in so far as it creates a right of privacy and specifies the circumstances in which that right is infringed. The 1974 Bill foundered because it did not detail necessary exemptions for certain bodies. Under the current Bill, clear exemptions are provided for members of the Police Force and any other person vested by statute with powers of investigation or inquiry. The Bill also clearly exempts action taken to detect insurance fraud and reasonable inquiries into the credit-

worthiness of a customer. The Police Force, financial institutions and credit providers should not be required to rely on defences and, accordingly, have been made exempt from the provisions of the Bill.

In November 1990 the Bill was referred to a select committee of the House of Assembly ('the committee') for consideration. The terms of reference of the committee were as follows:

That a select committee be established to consider deficiencies or otherwise in the laws relating to privacy and in particular—

(a) to consider the terms of a draft Bill prepared by the Parliamentary Counsel on the instructions of the member for Hartley entitled 'an Act to create a right of privacy and to provide a right of action for an infringement of that right; and for other purposes';

(b) to examine and make recommendations about specific areas where citizens need protection against invasions of privacy;

and

(c) to propose practical means of providing protection against invasions of privacy.

The committee took oral and written submissions from interested parties in the course of its deliberations. Although mindful of the views of some organisations that the Bill may impose restrictions on the exchange of information for commercial purposes, the committee considered that the Bill should be adopted, with modifications.

The recommendations of the committee are as follows:

1. that a general right of privacy and a right of action for an infringement of that right be created;

2. that the draft Privacy Bill 1990 be adopted in a modified form;

3. that 'person' should be clearly defined to include bodies corporate;

4. that the proper detection and prevention of insurance fraud should not be impeded by the draft Bill and that an exemption for the insurance industry, such as that provided for police, bodies with certain statutory powers, financial institutions and credit providers, should be included in the draft Bill;

5. that a person who engages an agent should be vicariously liable for the authorised acts of that agent in the event that an action for invasion of privacy is proceeded with under the draft Bill;

6. that the exemption provided to police, bodies with certain statutory powers, financial institutions and credit providers acting in the ordinary course of business be wid-

ened to provide similar recognition to credit reporting agencies;

7. that privacy standards, similar to the Australian Journalists' Association's Code of Ethics, be incorporated into regulations to assist in determining whether a breach of privacy has occurred in matters involving both the electronic and print media;

8. that private nuisance should be included in the general concept of invasion of privacy;

9. that all courts should be vested with the power to grant injunctive relief in cases of private nuisance;

10. that an exemption should be included in the draft Bill in respect of sections 10 and 11 of the Noise Control Act 1976;

11. that the draft Bill should be limited to intrusions of privacy as defined in the draft Bill but that in the future it may be appropriate to broaden the legislation;

12. that the Privacy Committee of South Australia continue to operate and help individuals who claim that Government agencies have violated their privacy;

13. that the draft Bill should provide for regulations that would detail standards for the appropriate handling and storage of information;

14. that the defence of public interest in the draft Bill be amended to require a court to have regard to the views of relevant bodies, that is, the Privacy Commissioner and policy statements of the Minister, in making an assessment of what the public interest requires in the circumstances of the case;

15. that the definition section in the draft Bill be extended to define invasion of privacy by electronic data processing and information technology;

16. that the matters raised by the Disability Complaints Service be referred to a joint meeting of Commonwealth and State Ministers to arrive at a set of standards to ensure the protection of aged, infirm or disabled individuals and that if this resolution is not forthcoming further consideration be given to amending the draft Bill.

The Bill

The Bill has been duly amended in accordance with the recommendations of the committee. As previously stated, the Bill provides a right of action for infringement of a right of privacy. The Bill provides that a right of privacy is a tort actionable (without proof of special damage) by the person whose right is infringed. The main features of the Bill are as follows:

- exemptions are provided for members of the Police Force and any other person vested with powers of investigation of inquiry.
Exemptions are also provided for insurance agencies in the detection of fraud and commercial organisations carrying out reasonable inquiries into the creditworthiness of a customer and in passing that information on to other commercial organisations;
- the right of privacy created by the Bill can be infringed either by a natural person or a body corporate. (The wording of clause 3 (5) is slightly different to that considered by the committee. The committee unanimously agreed that a company should be able to be sued if it infringes a person's privacy. It is felt that the slightly amended wording better reflects the committee's concerns in this respect);
- an action for infringement of a right of privacy must be commenced within two years from the date on which the infringement occurred;
- it is a defence to an action for infringement of a right of privacy to prove that the infringement was necessary for or reasonably incidental to the protec-

tion of the lawful interests of the defendant or the conduct of actual, contemplated or apprehended litigation.

It is also a defence to show that the infringement was justified in the public interest or that the defendant could have raised a defence of absolute or qualified privilege if the action had been for defamation;

- the court may grant any remedy (including injunctive relief) available in an action for tort, award damages for distress, annoyance or embarrassment and order the delivery to the plaintiff of anything made or used for the infringement by the defendant or in the defendant's possession or control as a result of the infringement.

In this last respect, the Bill is quite unique. In addition to covering personal and business affairs, the Bill covers actions for private nuisance at common law. At the present time, the Supreme Court is the only court with inherent powers to grant injunctive relief. As a consequence, the present common law right of citizens to institute action for private nuisance is severely restricted by the extremely high costs of a Supreme Court action.

At the present time people are simply referred to mediation services to conciliate in situations where, for example, adjacent trees cause damage to property or where properties are under threat from smoke or dust pollution. The Bill gives the local courts injunctive powers, meaning that a person suffering minimal damage can now go to the Small Claims Court and obtain not only monetary compensation but also injunctive relief. The Small Claims Court has a monetary limit of \$2 000, but parties are not entitled to legal representation as of right. Consequently, for small claims dealing with private nuisance, invasions of privacy will be dealt with expeditiously and at minimal cost, utilising existing structures.

The committee was concerned by the number of examples of invasion of privacy by the media. In response, the committee concluded that the relevant part of the journalists' Code of Ethics ought to be incorporated into regulations made under the legislation. The committee anticipated that claims of invasion of privacy made against the media should be determined by reference to the journalists' Code of Ethics.

However, the committee was very careful to note that no impediment or restriction should be placed on the proper investigation of the affairs of bodies like Beneficial Finance, the State Bank, SGIC or other legitimate targets and that there is a proper role and function for investigative journalism.

The committee stressed that its concern in respect to the media was simply to ensure that the media respect private grief and personal privacy.

The committee also stated that it was not the intention of the Bill to impede the creation of data bases, but rather that an avenue of redress should be provided if information is abused or inaccurate information is held and then transferred to third parties. The committee took the view that, where appropriate, individuals should always have the right to have access to data collected and be given the opportunity to correct it.

Since the report of the committee, a number of people have made comments concerning the Bill, including representatives of various media organisations. Many representatives of the media have been critical of the provisions of the Bill, but only the Australian Journalists' Association appeared before the committee to provide comment during the deliberations of the committee. No other media organisation chose to appear before the committee, despite adver-

tisements in many newspapers inviting comment on the Bill.

The Government believes that the principle of a right of privacy is correct. However, constructive comment about the Bill from interested parties is welcomed.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 is an interpretation provision.

- 'Commercial organisation' is defined to mean a person or body of persons carrying on a profession, trade or business.
- 'Non-domestic premises' has the same meaning as in the Noise Control Act 1976.
- 'Records' is defined to include records in electronic form.

Clause 3 creates a right of privacy.

Subclause (1) provides that a person has a right of privacy.

Subclause (2) provides that a person infringes the right of privacy of another if (and only if)—

(a) that person, without the express or implied permission, of the other person—

(i) intentionally intrudes on the other's personal or business affairs in any of the following ways:

- by keeping the other person under observation (either clandestinely or openly);
- by listening (either clandestinely or openly) to conversations to which the other person is a party;
- by intercepting communications to which the other person is a party;
- by recording acts, images or words of the other person;
- by examining or making copies of private correspondence or records, or confidential business correspondence or records, of the other person;
- by obtaining confidential information as to the other person's personal or business affairs;
- by keeping records of the other person's personal or business affairs;
- by publishing information about the other person's personal or business affairs;
- by publishing visual images of the other person;
- by publishing words spoken by or sounds produced by the other person;
- by publishing private correspondence to which the other person is a party, or extracts from such correspondence;

and

(ii) the intrusion is, in the circumstances of the case, substantial and unreasonable;

or

(b) that person harasses the other person, or interferes to a substantial and unreasonable extent in the personal or business affairs, or with the property, of the other person so as to cause distress, annoyance or embarrassment.

Subclause (3) provides that if a person intrudes on another's personal or business affairs in a manner described in subclause (2) (a), and the circumstances are such that it

would be reasonable to suppose that the other permitted the intrusion, the permission will be presumed.

Subclause (4) provides that a right of privacy is not infringed—

- by anything done by a member of the Police Force in the course of his or her duties or by any other person vested by statute with powers of investigation or inquiry in the course of exercising those powers;
- by anything reasonably done by an insurer or other commercial organisation, or a person acting on behalf of an insurer or other commercial organisation, for the detection of fraud;

or

- by a commercial organisation or a person (including a credit reporting agency) acting on behalf of a commercial organisation in carrying out reasonable inquiries into the creditworthiness of a customer or potential customer or in passing on information relevant to that subject, on request, to other commercial organisations.

Subclause (5) provides that the right of privacy created by the measure can be infringed either by a natural person or a body corporate.

Clause 4 makes an infringement of a right of privacy an actionable tort.

Subclause (1) provides that the infringement of a right of privacy is a tort actionable (without proof of special damage) by the person whose right is infringed.

Subclause (2) requires an action for infringement of a right of privacy to be commenced within two years from the date on which the infringement occurred.

Subclause (3) makes it a defence to an action for infringement of a right of privacy to prove—

- that the infringement was necessary for, or reasonably incidental to—

(i) the protection of the lawful interests of the defendant or a person on whose behalf the defendant was acting;

or

(ii) the conduct of actual, contemplated or apprehended litigation;

- that the infringement was justified in the public interest;

or

- where the infringement arose from the publication of material—that the defendant could, if the action had been for defamation, have successfully raised a defence of absolute or qualified privilege.

Subclause (4) provides that in determining whether an infringement of a right of privacy was justified in the public interest, the court should have regard to any material relevant to that issue published by State or Federal authorities established in Australia to protect privacy.

Subclause (5) empowers a court, in an action for infringement of a right of privacy—

- to grant any remedy (including injunctive relief) available in an action in tort;
- to award damages for distress, annoyance or embarrassment arising from the infringement;
- to order the defendant to deliver up to the plaintiff anything made or used for the purposes of the infringement or anything in the defendant's possession or under the defendant's control in consequence of the infringement.

Subclause (6) empowers a court to grant an injunction to restrain an apprehended infringement of a right of privacy where no infringement is established but the plaintiff estab-

lishes reasonable grounds to apprehend such an infringement.

Subclause (7) provides that injunctive relief may be granted by a court under the clause even though the court would not normally have power to grant injunctive relief in an action for tort.

Subclause (8) requires a court, in determining the nature and extent of any remedy to be granted for an infringement of a right of privacy, to have regard to—

- the effect or likely effect of the infringement on the health, welfare and social, business or financial position of the plaintiff;
 - the conduct of the plaintiff and the defendant both before and after the infringement, including any apology or offer of amends made by the defendant, or anything done by the defendant to mitigate the consequences of the infringement;
- and
- any other relevant factor.

Clause 5 deals with the application of the measure.

Subclause (1) provides that the measure does not apply in relation to noise from non-domestic premises.

Subclause (2) provides that the measure binds the Crown.

Subclause (3) provides that the measure does not take away from any right of action or remedy existing under any other measure or law.

Clause 6 deals with privacy standards.

Subclause (1) empowers the Governor to make regulations—

- laying down standards for the protection of privacy to be observed by organisations (in both the public and private sectors) that keep records of information relevant to the personal or business affairs of others;
- laying down standards for the protection of privacy to be observed by—
 - (i) journalists and others who collect information for publication by radio, television or in printed form;
 - (ii) publishers of information by radio, television or in printed form.

Subclause (2) provides that breach of a standard laid down under subclause (1) is evidence, but not conclusive evidence, of the infringement of a right of privacy created by the measure.

Subclause (3) provides that a regulation under the clause cannot take effect unless it has been laid before both Houses of Parliament and—

- no motion for disallowance is moved within the time for such a motion;
- or
- every motion for disallowance of the regulation has been defeated or withdrawn, or has lapsed.

Dr ARMITAGE secured the adjournment of the debate.

WRONGS ACT (PARENTS' LIABILITY) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Wrongs Act 1936. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill seeks to implement a recommendation made by the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act Working Party in its interim report in October 1988. An earlier Bill, the Wrongs Act Amendment Bill (No. 2) 1990, was put to the Parliament in October 1989 when it lapsed because of the prorogation of Parliament and again in February 1990 when it was defeated. The Bill was then referred to a select committee for its consideration. This Bill has been amended in accordance with the recommendations of the committee.

The Working Party on the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act recommended that consideration should be given to imposing some measure of responsibility on the parents and guardians of young offenders. Parents who can be shown to have taken little or no responsibility for their children should not be able to escape complete responsibility for the actions of their children. It is the Government's perception that this is a matter of community concern which needs to be fully examined by the Parliament.

Traditionally, a parent has not been held responsible for the acts of his or her child, although parents may be held personally rather than vicariously liable for torts committed by their children. Liability may arise because the parents authorised the actions of their child or because they have not reasonably controlled their child. The usual case in which parents are held personally responsible for torts committed by their children is where a child injures somebody while playing with a dangerous article such as a shanghai, gun, dart or such like.

The law in South Australia, and the rest of Australia, is in contrast to that under some civil codes of Continental Europe. For example, Article 1384 of the French Code Civil provides:

The father, and the mother after the father's death, are responsible for the damage caused by their minor children residing with them. The aforesaid responsibility is imposed unless the father and mother can prove that they could not prevent the act which gives rise to that responsibility.

The working party did not recommend the adoption of the continental approach. Rather the committee recommended that where a court is satisfied that the acts or omissions of the parents or guardians of a child under fifteen have materially contributed to the criminal conduct of the child, the court should be empowered to order the parents or guardians to pay so much of the damage incurred by the child as is fairly attributable to the acts or omissions. It was recommended that the institution of such an action against the parents or guardians should be in the civil courts. The age of 15 was chosen to coincide with the age at which children are under no compulsion by law to attend school.

The earlier Bill was a refinement of that proposed by the working party which on further examination proved difficult to implement.

The new section 27d makes a parent joint and severally liable with the child for injury, loss or damage resulting from a tort where the child is also guilty of an offence arising out of the same circumstances, if the parent was not, at the time of the commission of the tort exercising an appropriate level of supervision and control over the child's activities.

It is a defence to a claim against a parent to prove that the parent generally exercised an appropriate level of supervision and control over the child's activities. Thus, those parents who are responsible will not be liable for the injury, loss or damage caused by their children.

The Bill, as above outlined, was considered by a select committee, established on 11 December 1990. The committee was asked to consider the following matters:

- (a) the Wrongs Act Amendment Bill (No.2)
- (b) measures whereby parents and guardians can be held responsible for any injury, loss and damage caused by children for whom they are responsible and in particular:
 - (i) under what conditions parents and guardians should be held responsible, and
 - (ii) what form such responsibility should take.

The committee concluded that the principle of the Wrongs Act Amendment Bill (No. 2) 1990 was a necessary legislative change to ensure that victims of vandalism and the community generally were adequately compensated for damage suffered. However, the committee recommended that the Wrongs Act Amendment Bill (No. 2) 1990 be modified.

The recommendations of the committee are as follows:

1. that parents be made jointly and severally liable with their child for the injury, loss and damage resulting from the criminal acts of their children, aged 10-15 years, if at the time of such acts the parents were not exercising an appropriate level of supervision and control over the activities of the child;
2. that the Wrongs Act Amendment Bill (No. 2) be modified;
3. that consideration should be given to the institution of a screening process, either before a judge or magistrate, to assess whether leave should be granted to proceed with a civil action for damages. It is considered that leave should not be granted in certain circumstances, that is if it can be shown that adequate compensation has been made to the victim or will be made as a consequence of orders against the child;
4. that if leave is granted and an award of damages is made against parents, consideration be given to increasing the court's powers to fix payment of the award by instalments with further powers to vary the amount of the instalments upon application of the party ordered to pay the instalments;
5. that it be mandatory that parents attend at children's aid panel sittings and at court hearings in which their children are involved. It is recommended that penalties attach to non-attendance without proper cause;
6. that the current powers available to members of children's aid panels be better utilised so that offenders appearing before the panels be dealt with in a manner which is relevant to the seriousness or nature of the offence;
7. that the family group conference, at present operating in New Zealand, be implemented in the South Australian context as an alternative way in which the victim and the offender can resolve the matter of compensation without seeking redress through the legal system. It is considered that this form of victim/offender conference may take more account of cultural differences, for example the Aboriginal notion of the extended family sits more easily here. This could be incorporated in the process for granting leave referred to in recommendation No. 3 above.
8. that the current sentencing option under section 51 (i) (ab) of the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act be used by the courts to ensure that perpetrators of 'graffiti art' and vandalism be required to compensate for the damage done. This should lead to offenders being required to assist in the cleaning up of the damage caused to property;
9. that it is inappropriate that the Director-General for Community Welfare or the Minister of Family and Community Services be subject to the provisions of the Bill

when a child is placed under their control or guardianship pursuant to the Children's Protection and young Offender's Act or the Community Welfare Act.

The Bill has been amended in accordance with recommendations 3 and 4 of the committee. The purpose of a screening process, as recommended by the committee, is to assess whether leave should be granted to pursue an action against a parent or parents.

Recommendation 4 enables the court to fix payment by instalments which might enable a victim to receive compensation who may not have if the parent or parents could not afford a lump sum figure.

Recommendations 5-7 will be considered as part of a proposed review of the Children's Court practices and procedures. Recommendations 8 and 9 do not require any amendment to the earlier Bill.

This Bill incorporates recommendations 3 and 4 of the select committee.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for commencement of the Act by proclamation.

Clause 3 inserts a new section that makes a parent of a child who, while under 15 years of age, commits a tort, jointly and severally liable with the child for injury, loss or damage resulting from the tort, but only if two factors exist, namely that the child is also guilty of an offence arising out of the same incident and the parent was not, at the time of the commission of the tort, exercising an appropriate level of supervision and control over the child's activities. Subclause (2) provides that the child must have been convicted or found guilty of the offence or the court before which proceedings under this section are taken must be satisfied beyond reasonable doubt of the child's guilt.

Subclause (3) gives a defence to a parent who can establish that he or she generally did provide, as far as reasonably practicable, an appropriate level of supervision and control over the child's activities. Subclause (4) provides that a parent cannot be sued except with the leave of the court in which the action is to be taken. Subclause (5) provides for payment of an order for damages against a parent by instalments. An order for payment by instalments can be varied on the application of the judgment debtor. If default is made in payment of an instalment, the whole amount outstanding becomes due and payable. Subclause (6) limits the liability to the natural or adoptive parents of the child. Subclause (7) provides that this liability will only arise in relation to torts committed after the commencement of this amending Act.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on motion to note grievances.
(Continued from 11 September. Page 790.)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I rise to speak in this grievance debate and draw attention to the disdain—one might almost call it scant regard—that the Government has for the affairs of the Parliament. It is constantly exhibiting such by its failure to fulfil the proper role of both ministerial responsibility and responsibility to the Parliament by not bringing back answers to questions. I draw attention in particular to the activities of the Premier who, at a time when he must surely rue the day that he failed to take heed of information given to him and to the House in respect of the State Bank and, more recently, of SGIC, was not prudent

enough to pick up the information abroad and available to everybody. The dogs in the street were barking it, yet the Premier did not know about it or did not want to know about it.

More recently—in fact on 14 August (page 169 of *Hansard*)—I drew the attention of the Premier to the fact that he had made a promise to the people of South Australia through this Parliament that in reporting the 1990-91 year, the SGIC would be required to make certain that its directors and senior staff properly listed their directorships and interests. On 14 August, when that request was made, the Premier said that he would look into the matter and, in fact, on 29 August 1991 (page 621 of *Hansard*), the Premier stated:

If he is prepared to provide that detail and the basis for that statement, I will have the matter investigated. I am not varying the answer that I gave to this House on 14 August.

It was to the effect that it was expected of SGIC that the requirements would be fulfilled. With all the resources available to the Government, by 12 September—two weeks after that commitment was given by the Premier that he had not varied his answer, that he had been warned that there was some serious question about what was on the record of the SGIC—we still have no response. The Premier might say, 'But the honourable member did not pass on any information to me'. I passed on the information by way of the question and alerted the Premier to the fact that there were grave variations between the information contained in the SGIC report and that which had been promised.

With the scant resources available to the Opposition, what do we find? I do not have an exhaustive list by any means, but we find a large number of variations. Page 34 of the 1990-91 SGIC annual report purports to list all the members and officers of the governing body of a body corporate as the date of the report, 16 August 1991. Company interrelationship searches conducted only a week earlier on 7 August indicate that officers' undeclared directorships include the following: Mr Gerschwitz was a director of Bouvet Pty Ltd and Bennett & Fisher Ltd; Mr Stanley Lien was a director of Molit (No. 25) Pty Ltd, Molit (No. 18) Pty Ltd, Amaro Pty Ltd, Techflo Pty Ltd, Demaser Enterprises Pty Ltd and Bouvet Pty Ltd; Mr Robert Bruce was a director of Bouvet Pty Ltd and possibly also Outback Oil Company N.L.; Mr Brian Jones was a director, and a great list followed.

It adds up to a considerable number that were not shown in the report. For example, regarding the information that has been sought by the Opposition, without going to interstate registers, we find that 49 unrecorded directorships were held by Mr Vin Kean as at 7 August. The full documentation has been made available to the Premier relative to that matter and others to which I have referred. I come back to the point at which I started: the Government, through its most senior officer, the Premier, is treating the whole parliamentary system with disdain, failing miserably to be accountable and to give credence to what is a recommended and normally expected Westminster responsibility.

I hope that in the Estimates Committees that are about to commence the Ministers will recognise the importance of accountability and will give direct and fulsome answers, because I can assure any one of the Ministers that, if they fail to fulfil their responsibility to the parliamentary system, eventually the Opposition will find out errors and expose them. It does no credit at all to the Labor Government in this State to be operating in this manner. I was asked quite recently, 'What can the Labor Party do to help the people of South Australia?' It was a one-word answer: 'Resign'. Members opposite have certainly shown that they should seek no other end to their involvement in this State than

resignation, because of the manner in which they are treating the parliamentary system, let alone the populace of South Australia.

I want to pay tribute to the San Francisco General Hospital Medical Centre, more specifically the Oncology Department, which is responsible in America for information relative to world AIDS, more particularly to AIDS in America. I had the opportunity to visit that clinic in 1987 when I was in America, and I receive on a quarterly basis a document called 'AIDS FILE'. In the most recent edition (volume 5, No. 3, Summer 1991) they pick up the fact that epidemiology of AIDS and heterosexually transmitted HIV in women has brought into relief an unfortunate aspect of the whole AIDS issue which had hitherto been unrecognised. It states:

AIDS and AIDS-related complications have been reported as one of the five leading causes of death in women in several major metropolitan cities on the east coast. As of spring 1991, 17 730 cases of AIDS in adult or adolescent women have been reported to the Centres for Disease Control, which is 10 per cent of the total number of adult cases of AIDS in the United States.

Now comes the king hit or the point that it is really necessary to bring out:

More than half of these cases have been reported since 1989. When I was at the clinic in 1987, it was indicated to me that when first encountered they believed 'it was the dirty man's disease'. When, shortly afterwards, they found that they had a 69-year-old nun and a five-year-old child with the disease, they recognised that they were dealing with something different again. As a result, they came face to face with the reality of transmission by blood transfusions, faulty syringes, needles and so on. I take the opportunity to draw to the attention of the House this strange new turn.

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I want to take this opportunity to refer to some of the matters that have been raised during the past couple of days regarding the budget, and I want to relate them particularly to matters of concern in my own electorate to start with and later to matters concerning the environment portfolio. Many people throughout the State are devastated as a result of the ramifications of this budget, mainly because of the effect that it will have not so much on people today but on our children and their children who will be paying for this budget and the misappropriation of funds through the Bannon Government.

I remind the House that at present we are looking at an annual cost of \$220 million to cover the Government's mismanagement just on interest alone. That is not paying anything off; that is \$220 million on interest alone. Consider what that money could have been spent on to overcome a lot of hurt and problems that people are experiencing in this State at present.

I want now to refer to what has happened in the Stirling council area in recent times. Members will be aware of the problems that have been recognised in the Stirling council as a result of the 1983 Ash Wednesday bush fire. I am aware that a select committee of another place is considering this matter and that it is not appropriate for me to go into detail, other than to say that the extent of the Government's involvement in the whole saga must be brought to light. An enormous amount of information has been brought before the select committee over the past 10 months and an enormous amount of material has been presented in evidence. I would only hope that, as a result of that evidence, the Government might take some appropriate action at the right time.

Let us consider what has happened since 1989. Before May 1989, of course, the council was prepared to continue fighting the claims in court. Then we saw an almost brand new council elected, with only one previous councillor remaining. Soon after that the council found that it had spent about \$1.7 million on legal fees, and the court was about to go to London to hear evidence from an expert witness. Whether the new council was aware of the material that had been collected is not known. Its major concern then was to stop the huge legal costs and to settle the claims. I was very much aware of strong concern in the district that the people had paid enough and that costs might escalate even further with no end in sight.

The Minister for Local Government Relations, Ms Levy, proposed the fast track process, and that was agreed to by the council in June. Mr Ted Mullighan, then QC, was appointed to investigate the claims and determine a settlement figure. However, that process was brought to an early end by the Government, and Mr Mullighan admitted that he did not have sufficient time to examine claims in detail.

Looking at what has happened since the settlement was reached and the discussions that followed about the council's capacity to pay, eventually in June 1990 it was determined that a \$4 million debt should be picked up by the people of Stirling. A \$4 million debt, over 15 years, taking into account interest, would amount to \$12.7 million. That is the amount that the people of the Stirling council district have to find to pay back to the Government. Is it any wonder that there is concern and anger in that district when the residents look at what has happened as a direct result of the Government's mismanagement, particularly in relation to the State Bank, SGIC, Scrimber and so many other instrumentalities, and find that on top of having to pay back \$12.7 million in respect of the Stirling council they now have to consider \$220 million a year on interest alone? I can understand that anger and concern. The Government, and particularly the Premier, should be ashamed of the situation that they find themselves in.

Another matter of concern relates to a Dorothy Dix question that the Minister of Water Resources answered today in regard to the sewage works at Hahndorf in my electorate. Before doing that, I point out that I was interested to learn from the Minister's ministerial statement the other day that \$10.2 million has been raised in the first year of the establishment of the environment enhancement program. That program has been funded by the sewerage levy. We learnt, when the fund was first announced, that it would cover all sorts of costs and it was to do all sorts of things. I was interested to learn that \$10.2 million has been raised in the first year but that only \$2.9 million has been spent. I do not know what has happened to the rest of it. I guess the Minister will indicate at a later stage what is going to happen. In that same ministerial statement the Minister made much of the fact that \$742 000 was spent on sewerage works in the Adelaide Hills. The total cost of the estimated work for the Adelaide Hills sewerage is \$22.5 million.

On numerous occasions, the Minister has indicated to this House that one of the Government's highest priorities is to rectify the problems in the watershed catchment area. It has been recognised time and time again that one of the major problems as far as the catchment is concerned relates to the amount of effluent entering the watercourse. In answer to a question that I asked, the Minister made perfectly clear that she and the Government would give a very high priority to this matter. It is pleasing to see in the budget that an estimated \$22.5 million is to be spent. However, we then learn that \$742 000 is to come from this particular program

to which I refer and that only \$1 million will be spent this year on that important priority.

The people of the Hills are, on the whole, very responsible in what they do as far as the pollution of watercourses is concerned. More and more pressure is being placed on landowners in the Hills, the majority of whom accept that some hard decisions have to be made. They understand why we need to take more precautions with respect to the amount of chemicals, etc. that enter the watercourse.

A number of regulations are being brought down, and the majority of people in the Hills, having been told that they must be responsible, are adopting a responsible attitude, but what I suggest is the major problem is that a number of properties have still not been connected to the treatment works. On something that was supposed to have a very high priority, there will be an expenditure of only \$1 million, which I believe to be totally inappropriate. In answer to a question today, the Minister referred to money to be spent on the Hahndorf sewage treatment works. Members know that currently effluent runs straight into the Onkaparinga and then into the reservoir, but only \$375 000 will be spent on that project.

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

Mr HERON (Peake): A few weeks ago with a few of my backbench colleagues I had the pleasure of attending a demonstration of a drug education program for primary schoolchildren. The demonstration was put on by the Life Education Centre in one of its mobile classrooms, and I must say that I was most impressed by the display. Programs such as this can only enhance better lifestyles for the young children of South Australia.

Although principally aimed at preventative drug education, the Life Education Centre program provides a total perspective on lifestyles generally. It includes friendship, a sense of community, safety and medicine, needs of the body, communication, nutrition, family and role models, media and influences, body structure, decision-making, and saying 'No' to drugs with the option of retaining friendship.

Children should not only be educated about legal drugs but also about the problems associated with the use of illegal drugs. The program teaches children to take pride in themselves. It presents facts that allow them to make a clear judgment about the effects of drugs and alcohol. The children are taught the importance of sleep, exercise and nutrition, and to be careful with medication and moderate with alcohol. They are taught to avoid the problems of drugs and tobacco, and how to resist social and peer pressure from friends and the media.

The aims of the Life Education Centre of South Australia are: to encourage a positive and responsible attitude towards a healthy lifestyle; to provide information about the effects on the body of drugs, particularly alcohol, tobacco and medicines; to provide information to increase the awareness of the body, its structure and function and how its balance can be affected; to provide the opportunity to analyse the pressures exerted by peer groups and the media; to encourage development of the skills necessary to understand and overcome the pressures that influence abuse of the human body; to encourage the study of skills necessary to understand and overcome the pressures to limit the uniqueness and potential of human beings; to provide support, resources and the stimulus for teachers within their health program and other associated curriculum areas; and to act as a community model emphasising the cooperation between Government, community based organisations and business.

Life Education Centres are staffed by qualified teachers from the South Australian Education Department. They visit primary schools in mobile classrooms equipped with video units, a talking brain and healthy food models. This technique clearly shows children that whatever they put into their bodies will affect the way they function. Each mobile classroom costs about \$125 000 to build and equip. Already this marvellous program reaches 18 000 children a year in South Australia, which is only 20 per cent of our primary schoolchildren.

The Life Education Centre will be holding a national public awareness and fundraising initiative called 'Smile for Life' in November this year. Part of this campaign will be an ultra-marathon run from Darwin to Adelaide by runner Murray Cox. Murray will run 3 261 kilometres to raise money for the Life Education Centre of South Australia, and to try to set a world record. Children will run with Murray along the Stuart Highway from Darwin to Adelaide. Schools en route that will participate in the run are Kulgera, Oodnadatta, Marla, Coober Pedy, Glendambo, Andamooka, Roxby Downs, Woomera, Port Augusta and Port Pirie.

Some children will travel 200 kilometres by bus to run five or 10 kilometres with Murray Cox. At Lower Light, on the Port Wakefield Road, the Life Education Centre will open the run to individual members of the public, and school teams can run 50, 25 or 10 kilometres into Adelaide with Murray. The marathon is scheduled to end at 11 a.m. on Friday 22 November at the Adelaide Town Hall. A reception will follow at the Adelaide Town Hall and it is hoped that a world record will be set.

Parents, teachers, local councils and business houses are all supportive of drug education programs. Sessions of the program are made available for parents through the school communities, and these sessions are held in the vans so that the parents can experience the environment in which the children work, participate in small segments of the children's program and discuss drug and alcohol issues with the life education teacher. Class teachers are also involved in the programs and they are given a resource pack of references when participating in a staff meeting.

It is not for me to tell members of this House the programs that have been set in train to educate our young people about the dangers of drugs. These dangers have been well exposed for many years and will still happen from time to time, but those programs have not fulfilled our requirements. So, the Life Education Centre is starting with the younger groups in our primary schools so that they can be brought up with an awareness of drugs and of the dangers that drugs can have on their small bodies.

This program, as well as this fund-raising exercise, which will be conducted in November this year, will also go nationwide. I ask all parents, the community and members of this House to get behind this marathon run and this day of smiling for the young kids to make sure that they are brought up in a lifestyle which others may have been denied. I know that drugs are a problem that we have not remedied, but in this way we can assist all the young kids of the future to become aware of the dangers of drugs to their own bodies.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Today I had the misfortune to get the usual kind of answer from the Minister of Lands, regardless of the topic involved. Today it was about shacks in the member for Stuart's electorate. Shack owners who are lucky enough to have a shack in Blanche Harbor, where their sites have previously been unacceptable and therefore unsuitable for freeholding, have now been given privileged exemptions by the Minister.

I will give some background to this. I note the look of amazement on the face of the member for Stuart. By the time I have finished she will understand exactly what she has achieved and what the Minister has done. Seventy per cent of shack owners at Port Augusta were given the opportunity to buy their shack sites in July following State Government approval of the Blanche Harbor management plan. The remaining 30 per cent of shacks were determined as unacceptable under that plan. The owners of these shacks have been offered a 40-year non-renewable lease, which can be transferred only to their families. That was until the back flip by the Minister of Lands. Two weeks ago the member for Stuart—Mrs Colleen Hutchison, that is—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must refer to the member by the electorate title and not by name.

Mr LEWIS: Thank you. The honourable member announced that the Minister had approved the deletion of the clause that had prevented the resale of these shacks. I received calls in my office from irate shack owners from all over the State denouncing the Minister's action as giving favours to Labor members (particularly this Labor member) in trouble or for some other reason. Why is there one set of rules for Blanche Harbor and another set of rules for the rest of the State?

Mr McKEE: I take a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. In relation to Standing Order 128, dealing with repetition, has not this matter been raised during Question Time?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! That relates to another debate. This is a separate debate. The point of order is not upheld.

Mr LEWIS: The shack owners' saga has gone on for years. I know that members opposite are pretty testy about this. It started with the inverted snobbery of the Dunstan era, but the Liberals reviewed that and changed it while in office between 1979 and 1980. The member for Chaffey, who is in the chamber now, was instrumental in doing that. There were three categories: those who were offered freehold, those who were given life tenure because they were considered unacceptable for anything else, and those given 40-year leases. The incoming Labor Government then withdrew completely from the 40-year group. Only two groups remained: those given freehold and those given life tenure.

Mr Graham Parry, spokesperson for the Shack Owners Association, said that he did not know why the Minister had reintroduced the 40-year tenure and is happy to be on the public record as saying so. One wonders why the only area in South Australia in which this has occurred is Blanche Harbor. Surely, the Minister and the member for Stuart are not trying to shore up her personal shaky electoral standing or otherwise divert public attention from some bad news that she has had locally. What on earth has made the Minister change her mind, to the detriment of shack owners in the rest of the State? I use as my basic information on this matter front page stories in the *Transcontinental*. The article of 17 July states:

Welcomed: Announcing the news last week, member for Stuart, Mrs Colleen Hutchison, said she felt she had achieved 'one of her major goals' in representing her new constituency.

In the past, the land was leased from the Lands Department. The private means that 70 per cent of the shack owners can now purchase the land on which their shacks are situated. The remaining 30 per cent of the shacks have been determined as not suitable under the plan. They are the unacceptable ones. On 28 August a further article states:

Shack owners now have the option to sell: Shack owners whose sites are deemed unsuitable for freeholding under the new Blanche Harbor shack management plan now have the option to sell their shacks. Member for Stuart, Mrs Colleen Hutchison, announced

yesterday that Lands Minister, Ms Susan Lenehan, had approved the deletion of the clause which prevented resale of these shacks.

Under the shack management plan handed down by Ms Lenehan, about two months ago shacks deemed unsuitable were given a 40-year lease which was transferrable within family.

At the last Shack Owners Association meeting, shack owners expressed their concern about this to me,' Mrs Hutchison said.

The problem that exists is many of these shacks have been done up really well as an asset.

But these shack owners don't have the right of re-sale. Some have no kids and some, the kids don't want the shack.

The only options they had was to relocate or pull the shack down. I've been lobbying the Minister to have this clause deleted and she notified me (on Monday) of her decision to allow re-sale.

Turning to another matter in the honourable member's electorate, it is high time that some truth and fact were presented for the public benefit in the Port Pirie rare earths refinery debate. It behoves the local member to do her job in this respect and provide her constituents with factual information on which people can base their opinions. It is fact that the residues from this plant do not represent a hazard to public health any more than visiting any of the granite islands at Victor Harbor or, for that matter, living at Moana Beach or any other place where there are white sands containing monazite, which is thoracic—

An honourable member: Or on the steps of Parliament House.

Mr LEWIS: —or, more particularly, in a ministerial office in the Parliament House basement, which is surrounded by granite blocks. The background radiation to which people, animals and plants are exposed in any of those situations to which I have just referred is of the same order, and much less than the background radiation at normal levels in totally natural environments in other places on earth, where human beings live and where there are plants, animals and bacteria, etc. such as southern India, Italy, Hawaii and the Middle East.

Further, we as human beings desperately need rare earths for our super-efficient electric light bulbs to reduce the amount of electricity that we have to use to obtain the same measure of lighting, for our super-efficient electric motors and the construction of their miniaturised magnets, for the hard ceramics that we use in mechanical equipment and other industrial processes, and the like.

Why has the honourable member not provided the people of Port Pirie all that information instead of allowing that bunch from the kamikaze left—the grotty greenies, as I call them—to continue to perpetrate the myth that there is some likely damage or risk to their health and that of their children in allowing that plant to proceed?

When will the negative and grotty greenies grow up? They are negative and they are grotty in the way in which they continue to insist we do things in a less efficient manner than we ought to. We ought to get on with the job and do something positive for the environment, for South Australia and for a good many unemployed people and, more particularly, we ought to do something positive for the world, and positive for a good deal—

Mrs Hutchison: Why don't you have a positive attitude?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: I am delighted that the honourable member has entered the debate at this point, although I realise she is out of order. The tragedy is that she is not on the public record as having said anything about it to lay to rest the kind of lies that are being told in her electorate by others. She ought to provide information to her constituents so that their fears can be laid to rest.

Mrs HUTCHISON: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: the honourable member is referring to me as 'she'; I do not believe that is correct under Standing Orders.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: All members should refer to other members by electoral titles, although occasional references in that form are permitted.

Mr LEWIS: Sir, I will withdraw and call her 'it'.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): One is able to comment about virtually anything in this debate. I know that my colleagues, the members for Newland and Adelaide, would be keen to make a contribution. I am interested in the method by which the Estimates Committees operate. I find the method unacceptable—in fact I find it personally insulting—but we never seem to be able to change the system. I estimate that it probably costs in excess of \$100 000 to prepare the books that are distributed to us for use during the Estimates Committees. It is ridiculous to think that this Parliament could make an assessment—whether it be done by Government backbenchers or Opposition members—of a Minister's department or departments from those books when they are first made available on the Thursday, only days before the Tuesday when they will become the subject of scrutiny by Estimates Committee members.

Each Estimates Committee consists of six parliamentarians, who study those books which contain limited information. The books must also go out to other people in the community who may have some interest, knowledge, advice or ability to help research particular areas. Those people have to come back the next Tuesday and make effective use of all the time and money that is spent producing the books, on paying for all the staff who are in Parliament, plus the time the members use in that operation. The number of public servant hours put into producing these documents must be enormous.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: I say to the honourable member's interjection that, if he had listened over the years—and he does not generally do that—he would know that I have raised my concerns about the operation of the Estimates Committees every other year. I do not believe we receive the information we should. The system does not provide the opportunity to do that because, if a Minister wants to give long, protracted answers about how wonderful they are in carrying out their duties and how great their public servants are who serve them as they do in answers to questions in this House, rather than answer the question or provide information, they are allowed to do so. When a Minister does promise to provide information, it can take months and, in some cases, in excess of a year. Even then one may not get all the information one has sought; the question may still not be answered. The only way the system can work is for this material to be available earlier—and, if that means putting off the Estimates Committees and having an earlier budget, so be it. However, to have the Estimates Committees at this time is just not on.

I accept the point that it was my Party that introduced Estimates Committees—but they should be conducted properly. We have had the experience, the time and the opportunity to assess the system, and we all know in our own mind that it does not work to the benefit of South Australians. The system does not work so that members of Parliament can truly challenge how and where the money is spent. The sort of time span involved makes it impossible for the system to work properly, unless we tell the Ministers to give an answer and then shut up.

We should have some method to make sure that Ministers' responses are short and brief. If we do not adopt that approach we will perpetuate a practice which, for a majority of the time, is a waste of public money. Surely we are not on about that at a time when our State has been plunged

into massive debt—a debt that our parents and our grandparents would not even have dreamed of. Not even the group of parliamentarians who retired in the 1970s would have dreamed that we would plunge into a hole such as the one we are now in. We are perpetuating a system that we cannot challenge.

Recently I wanted to know from the Premier—and he would have had an opportunity to answer this, he would have some knowledge of this matter—whether some of the contracts for coaches at the South Australian Sports Institute were invalid according to two Crown Law opinions. I also wanted to know whether the money had been stopped by Treasury; and whether an inquiry was conducted into misappropriation and maybe even nepotism. However, there was no response. I believe without doubt that the Premier and the Minister would have known that answer.

The system is wrong. I will give another example of just how ridiculous the situation is. Only a few moments ago I received in my mail box a short note which says:

The South Australian Health Commission information supporting the estimates blue book will not be available until Friday, 13 September 1991. A copy will therefore be posted to each member's electorate office.

At this stage, the last sitting day of Parliament before the Estimates Committees, the material is still not available. Indeed, some members of the Estimates Committees may not receive this information until next Monday. If it is posted tomorrow, the members for Mount Gambier, Chaffey and Stuart will be unlikely to receive it until Monday. I know that the Minister of Health's Estimates Committee is on Tuesday. The point is that that Estimates Committee will be in session before some members even receive the supporting information.

One has to say that that cannot be condoned in a system where we are attempting to get more information and make sure that departments operate more effectively, efficiently and properly, especially at a time when we have a Premier who says, 'I did not know the State Bank was going down the drain. I did not know that SGIC was going down the drain. I did not realise that Scrimber was going to go through \$60 million, and I did not realise that we were going to do millions of dollars in New Zealand—I was at arm's length.'

Surely that should convince any of us that the system is wrong. We must have access to the Ministers—whether they are Liberal or Labor—and the public servants, but we cannot do that under the present system, and that is ridiculous. My colleagues know my reaction to this: I have told them that they are wasting their time trying to research and follow matters through with only limited information given, and it has to be limited in these circumstances. When we consider the money and time spent on putting together the information, and when we consider the result obtained, we can see that it is nonsensical and that is certainly not an effective use of money.

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I recently received a letter from the City of Tea Tree Gully. I would like to speak about the contents of the letter and then pick up specifically the issue of graffiti. Signed by the City Manager, the letter from the council states:

At its meeting held on 30 July 1991 council resolved:

That letters be forwarded to the local members of State Parliament advising that council is of the opinion that perpetrators of graffiti (regardless of their age) when apprehended by police should be held responsible for the costs of removal of graffiti and the cost of restoring the surfaces of any structures to which graffiti has been applied.

Council further asks that the local members seek to introduce legislation to enable the necessary changes to the existing law to allow for council's resolution to be brought into effect.

Graffiti in our suburbs continues to be a costly abuse of property, costly to the community and its residents, and costly to the public across the State. The City of Tea Tree Gully in 1990-91 spent almost \$40 000 of the local community budget repairing vandalised property and cleaning the scribbles of the immature from public property.

I must admit to being continually amazed by those allegedly responsible adult persons amongst us whose publicly expressed opinions support graffiti as an art form. Graffiti, which enrages all but the offenders, is pure vandalism, an indiscriminate act of abuse against public and private property. To support and promote graffiti as an art form is to encourage minors and others to break the law. It should be apparent to all but those who do not wish to see that antisocial behaviour patterns, once created, and aided and abetted by supportive comments and lack of deterrents, unleash further acts of vandalism.

In recent months the STA in the Tea Tree Gully area has experienced gross acts of criminal intent by youths whose behaviour patterns have developed to the point that violence and assaults have become a daily occurrence. Bus operators out of the St Agnes bus depot were constantly under seige by gangs of youths plying their childish scribbles to all exposed areas of their buses—inside and out—including the seats. Unsuspecting passengers using those seats would be unaware at the time that their clothing had been stained by the ink from felt-tipped pens or from the chemical discharge from aerosol cans. I ask those people who believe they have sympathy for the rather romantically phrased 'frustrated artists' and who believe they are promoting the arts to consider the passengers who bring to the notice of the bus operator that vandalism is occurring and who are verbally abused with gross obscenities and, even worse, are threatened with future retribution.

Bus operators have indicated to me their constant frustrations and feelings of helplessness to deal with situations of harassment and intimidation applied by youths who are aware of their total immunity to any form of relevant prosecution. As well as breeding a generation of immature scribblers more suited to the pre-school age group, we appear to be encouraging a jaundiced-bully characteristic. Very rarely do the vandals and the bullies act on their own. They work in groups and are supported by their own numbers. They feel secure surrounded and supported by the group. When a bus operator walks to the back of a bus to challenge one of these vandals, he or she may be outflanked as the youths place themselves strategically on seats at the back of the bus deliberately to prepare for this confrontation.

Let me identify some of the incidents reported in recent times. Youths have urinated in a bus. Youths have lit flammable material with cigarette lighters and have thrown it out bus windows. Foodstuff has been rubbed into seats and debris has been placed on the busway. Missiles have been thrown at buses on the busway. On 2 July a bus operator radioed for assistance. Several youths had gone quite berserk. Four seats were destroyed and thrown out of the bus windows. On the Saturday evening prior to that incident, 18 seats were either lost or destroyed in various incidents. Members can take 'lost' to mean that seats were physically ripped from their mountings and thrown from the buses out of the windows.

Is it any wonder that bus operators are totally frustrated and feel helpless to deal with the cretinous behaviour exhibited on an on-going basis by juveniles? Is it any wonder that stress is the main feature of sick leave within the STA? And yet, for all the harassment and intimidation that bus operators face, they defiantly and proudly point out that South Australia's public transport is capable of claiming to

be one of the best in Australia and that the O-Bahn busway is unsurpassed. However, this potential is seriously undermined when drivers and passengers are placed at risk. It is no wonder that bus patronage is declining. As an organisation the STA needs to review its strategies to provide back-up support and protection for drivers and passengers who are placed at risk by the actions of the minority of juveniles who indulge in wanton and destructive acts of vandalism and violence.

This spree of violence reached a disgraceful climax at the beginning of July when a bus driver at the Modbury bus interchange was attacked by a gang of youths when he tried to detain them until police arrived. He was kicked in the head when he radioed to police after finding three youths defacing the bus's interior with felt tipped pens. The attack followed a series of complaints that I had received from bus operators who were concerned for their safety. They felt that passenger convenience and safety was being threatened to the extent that the public would no longer use public transport, and that they were not being given the support that they needed from their STA employers. At that time I called for the Minister and the STA to take immediate action to support their employees and fare paying public passengers. A special STA and police squad was formed at the St Agnes bus depot to fight hooliganism and vandalism on metropolitan buses.

The squad comprised a guard dog, four STA transit officers and two senior constables. The decision to form the squad followed a meeting between union representatives, the STA and bus operators which took place 48 hours after I spoke out condemning the STA bosses for ignoring the plight of its workers. The formation of the squad was indeed welcome, particularly since the immediate response from the STA spokesman to my request for support was that nothing more could be done to make buses safe and that it was a societal problem, which made incidents of this kind inevitable. Such a reply to these ugly incidents was disgraceful and not worthy of the State Transport Authority. I had hoped that the introduction of the squad would mean that responses to bus drivers calls for help would be quicker and ensure the protection of drivers and passengers from these unprovoked and organised attacks but again, just a fortnight ago, a bus driver told me of his nightmare trip to the city from the Tea Tree Plaza interchange and how he received no help from the Transit Squad.

The trouble began after eight youths got onto the bus at about 10 p.m. and started to trash the bus, scrawling graffiti and ripping out the seats. One of the group flipped the rear vision mirror so that the driver could not see what was going on behind him. The other passengers all got off the bus at the next stop, wishing the driver good luck while he phoned for assistance. He was advised that Transit Squad officers would be waiting for him when he reached the city. Meanwhile, the louts were hurling seats out of the windows of the vehicle onto the O-Bahn track and, by the time the bus reached Adelaide, they had managed to get rid of 16 seats in this way. Unfortunately, the officers from the transit squad were nowhere to be seen and, as a parting gesture, the louts tried to kick in the bus doors as they departed. The driver had not tried to detain them because he was aware of the lack of support by the Minister and the STA for drivers in such a predicament.

One of the drivers informed me that three other drivers are facing court charges, one for removing a person who allegedly had urinated in the bus. Both the Minister and senior STA officials need to look at the situation on buses, particularly late at night, in regard to the safety of passengers and drivers alike. Quite obviously, the placement of extra

transit police in any given area, without management strategies to ensure minimum response reaction to incidents, is as ineffective as not having a Transit Squad at all in a given area. Of equal importance, all members of the community wish to see adequate penalties handed down to those who commit these criminal acts. This is indicated again by the letter I received from the Tea Tree Gully council.

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

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I will take this opportunity to make a few comments on the recent budget. The Government and the Premier deserve to be congratulated on a budget that is right for the difficult economic situation in which we find ourselves. I guess that the three elements facing the Government in addressing the budget were, first, the severe recession in which we find ourselves where revenue is down in the traditional areas of stamp duty and taxation; secondly, over the past four or five years the State has faced a series of cuts in Commonwealth funds to the States and the Commonwealth has been transferring responsibilities to the States; thirdly, we had the difficulties of the State Bank. With those three factors, there would have been the temptation to raise taxation.

I am pleased to say that the Government's response was to tighten its belt in administrative areas. It was able to provide basic services and indeed in some areas such as the Police Force, to which the previous speaker referred, the Government was able to increase its expenditure. It was able to do all this and cover all those problems without any tax increases. What is more, the Government was able to cut payroll tax for the first time in 20 years. That was an entirely economically responsible solution to the present difficulties. Any increases in taxation would have deflated the economy further and had an effect on unemployment. This budget paid correct recognition to the problems of unemployment whilst still leaving the debt per capita lower in real terms than when this Government came to office.

Members opposite have made a number of comments during the debate and all have criticised the budget and shown wonderful hindsight regarding the problems. Unfortunately, they did not give us the benefit of their hindsight three or four years ago when the State Bank legislation was before this place.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr HOLLOWAY: Certainly there is no record of amendments moved by the member for Murray-Mallee to the State Bank Legislation at that time. Certainly, his colleagues did not move any. In fact, all insisted that the Treasurer not be able to interfere in the day-to-day operations of the bank. The only policies that we have heard from the Opposition in the debate so far is it would sell off the State's assets, including the State Bank, SGIC, gas pipelines, forests—in fact, anything at all that can be sold. It really is an Attila the Hun policy. Just as Attila the Hun was unable to come to grips with the Roman empire, his solution being to go out and burn, sack and pillage, as he was unable to deal with the sophistication of the Roman empire, the Leader of the Opposition cannot come to grips with the situation. It is far too sophisticated an approach for him to try to deal with the difficult economic problems that we face: his solution is to get rid of it all, sell it off. Alan Bond has been mentioned in the debate.

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

Mr HOLLOWAY: If the honourable member wants to enter the economic debate, I will be pleased to discuss these issues. Alan Bond at one stage in the late 1970s wanted to come into this State, to take over Santos and to get control

of our gas pipeline. Fortunately at that time Hugh Hudson, the Deputy Premier of the Labor Government, was able to block that takeover. We can imagine the difficulties we would be in today if Alan Bond had taken control of Santos and the gas pipeline. Hugh Hudson was vilified by the Liberal Opposition at the time. It now wants to go back and sell off our gas pipeline. That is the record and reality of the Liberal Government. That is how it performed when in office and that was its attitude towards entrepreneurs.

All members opposite have overlooked the fact that, for every dollar lent by the State Bank, a dollar was borrowed by private enterprise. Members opposite tell us that Governments cannot run businesses, but all the non-performing loans the State Bank relate to the private sector—the sector which it is saying can run the State better than can the Government. The Opposition's solution to economic problems is privatisation. It does not seem to have learnt anything. Privatisation is an outdated philosophy. One only has to look at post-Thatcher England to see what people think about it now. In England, the money has been spent, the assets have been sold and the cupboard is bare. Is it any wonder that the Tory Government in England is facing defeat at the next election? For 10 years it squandered the assets of that country and now there is absolutely nothing left.

We also had the fraud of the Leader of the Opposition that the ownership of the State Bank could be kept in South Australia. If he was to flog it off, as he claims he would. He says that it would be brought by South Australians. Experience in the United Kingdom and elsewhere shows that that is quite untrue. In the United Kingdom all the bodies that were sold off to the private sector are gradually evolving into monopolies being taken over by other sectors of the economy. In many cases they have replaced State monopolies with private monopolies, with no benefit.

The Leader of the Opposition is saying that we should sell off all these assets in the current environment. What an economically stupid policy that would be. First, the economic impact would be deflationary. If we were to sell the State Bank to the South Australian community for \$1 billion now, that money would have to be taken out of the economy and would further depress it, thereby pushing unemployment to new levels. Further, it would be a fire sale in the current climate, because any assets sold off would be sold for a much lower value than could be achieved in different circumstances. Not even Premier Greiner in New South Wales is stupid enough to sell off a bank that early.

We also need to take some perspective on the problems that face the State Bank. We have had some amazing descriptions by members opposite about the size of this \$2.2 billion injection into the bank's capital. We have had it compared with the number of railway sleepers in the country. The member for Hayward talked about how many loaves we would get onto Football Park. We had somebody talk about how many minutes it was since Julius Caesar was born. We had hours and hours on this figure. The fact is that about \$30 billion throughout Australia is missing in the banks as a result of what the entrepreneurs have done to the economy over the past 10 years. We should not feel very happy about that, but we need to get some perspective on the size of the problem.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HOLLOWAY: We have had amazing descriptions by Opposition members about the size of the problems, but they have been unable to contribute anything positive during the debate about how they would go. The member for Coles told us about SAFA. That, apparently, is the new

Government body to be under attack. The member for Coles was attacking the liabilities of SAFA, being concerned that the borrowings would be used for investment. I checked the Auditor-General's Report to get some details on SAFA. SAFA has liabilities and assets of about \$20 000 million. What are the equity investments about which the member for Coles is so concerned? The total investments, which include many bank letters of credit and so on, amount to about \$2 billion. But the equity investments, about which the member for Coles was concerned, amount to \$279 million. Of that amount, \$247.1 million is in SAGASCO Holdings.

Enterprise Investment Trust, about which the member for Coles was so concerned, has a total value of \$31.3 million. It also contributed \$2 million profit. It is less than .1 per cent of the total liabilities. The member for Coles is saying that this will bring SAFA down; all these investments will destroy SAFA; yet they represent .1 per cent or less of the total liabilities of SAFA. Members opposite have no credibility on economic policy. They have not made a single suggestion as to how they would deal with these matters. They have no credibility at all. The comments of the member for Coles are more to do with her leadership ambitions than with any economic credibility that she may have.

I look forward to the day when perhaps we might get some sensible suggestions from the Opposition on how we should grapple with some of the problems that face us. All we have had is a whole lot of rhetoric and information on how many loaves would fit on to a football field and how that relates to \$2 billion. However, we have had nothing on how they would address the problems. The fact is that, when the budget was delivered by the Premier, members opposite were very impressed by it.

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

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I am disappointed by the contribution that we have just heard because, until now, I had thought that the member for Mitchell was as intelligent as his qualifications would lead one to believe. Unfortunately, the member for Mitchell has clearly not done what intelligent people do, and that is to look at all facets of every argument. The member for Mitchell, in his argument analysing the recent budget, has forgotten to include the fact that all the things that he has mentioned have merely been covered by the State's going to the bank and borrowing more money. That is not clever and it is not sound economic management. In fact, it is straight out stupid. For an intelligent person to overlook such a vital part of an argument is disappointing, particularly as some of the more recently elected members of the Labor Party come from a background somewhat different from the traditional Labor background. They now come from educated spheres; they are less concerned with representing the workers than whether they split infinitives and use correct or incorrect grammar and pronunciation.

Having looked at these things through rose-coloured glasses, the member for Mitchell, who talked at great length about private entrepreneurs and how they have lost money, made a most important omission from his speech. Let us all agree with the member for Mitchell: a number of private entrepreneurs have lost a lot of money. They range over all States and, indeed, over New Zealand, when one considers companies like Ariadne and so on. However, what the member for Mitchell has clearly omitted to add—which one would have expected him to include in the argument as an intelligent person, because it is the denouement of what he was saying—is the fact that those companies and entrepre-

neurs, Bond, Skase, Elliott and so on, have all been judged on their performance, which was not good, and they have all gone. Not one of those entrepreneurs, about whom the member for Mitchell has just regaled the House with having lost money, is still in charge of the shop. They have all gone. The only entrepreneur in Australia who has lost not millions but billions of dollars, and who is still in a position of responsibility for the loss of those billions, is the Treasurer. That is a fact. Unfortunately, it is not included in the supposedly intelligent argument of the supposedly intelligent member for Mitchell.

Another interesting scenario in relation to all those private entrepreneurs is that they were playing with private money. Not one of those people had a State guarantee. Not one company which lost money and to which the member for Mitchell referred had a State guarantee. In case the member for Mitchell and members opposite are a little uncertain, by 'State guarantee' I mean that the taxpayers would pick up for the failings of the entrepreneur at the top. Not one of those entrepreneurs had a State guarantee other than the failed private entrepreneur, the failed ultimate guarantor of all the State Bank disasters, of Scrimber and so on—the Treasurer. He is the only one left and he is the only one who was silly enough to give a State guarantee and ask the taxpayers to fund his failings.

What does the Premier and Treasurer say when he is asked about these failings? I am amazed by what the Premier and Treasurer, supposedly an intelligent man who has a number of qualifications, said. Yesterday, when asked about Scrimber, he said, 'If only it had not gone wrong, we would have been able to provide hospitals. If only it had not gone wrong, we would have been able to provide more houses. If only it had not gone wrong, we could have provided more police. If only Scrimber had not gone wrong, I would not be in this disastrous situation. If only the State Bank had not gone broke, I would not have been forced to go to the people and ask for more money. If only the State was not in such a disastrous position financially, I would not have had to tell the people that they each owe \$4 524.' If only, if only, if only! That is nothing short of *Alice in Wonderland* economics. It is a disgrace for the Treasurer to have contemplated saying such a thing when there are so many disasters clearly to be laid at his feet.

If only Scrimber had not failed. If only the Minister had taken responsibility. If only SGIC had not had the put option on 333 Collins Street. If only the State Bank had worked. If only it had not gone from being this wonderful star in our firmament which since 1984 has contributed what will be wiped out in one year in interest payments because of the failings of this Government. If only it had worked. I am appalled that the Treasurer, with all his intelligence and qualifications, cannot come up with something better. If only it had worked!

I wonder whether the Premier and Treasurer will tell this to small business, which is failing left, right and centre. Let him walk down the streets of my electorate in the central business district, along Melbourne Street, Prospect Road, Main North Road, Jeffcott and O'Connell Streets. Let him walk through the North Adelaide Village and tell all those people who have struggled to make a go of it, 'I'm really sorry that you've had to pay these disastrous rates and taxes, but if only Scrimber had worked you wouldn't have had to lose your family home; if only Scrimber had worked you wouldn't have had to take your kids away from their school; if only Scrimber had worked you wouldn't have had to sell your car; and if only Scrimber had worked and if only the State Bank had not gone broke you would have been in a better financial situation.'

Let the Premier tell that to people on hospital waiting lists. Let him go down to the Royal Adelaide Hospital and tell that to the people who have been waiting for years for an operation. Let him tell that to the people in outpatients. I would like to take him down there some time. I extend an invitation to the Premier to come with me to the outpatient orthopaedic clinic at the Royal Adelaide Hospital at any time and tell these people in wheelchairs, 'I'm very sorry that you can't get an operation for another two years, but if only Scrimber hadn't gone wrong we could have given you a hospital bed and done your operation.'

Let the Premier come with me to the urology clinic where people cannot get their prostates taken out for two, three or four years, which means that they must get out of bed seven and eight times a night. Let him come down there and say to them, 'Look, I'm really sorry, we can't do this, but I want to say to you that if only Scrimber hadn't gone wrong you could have had your operation two years ago.' I invite the Premier to come with me; I would love him to see the state of things. Let him say this to people in the community who are suffering. He says, 'If only, if only, if only.' Let him tell the people, 'If only Scrimber hadn't gone wrong, we could have done better. If only SGIC had been better managed, we could have done better for you. If only the State Bank hadn't gone wrong, we could have helped.' For a Premier and Treasurer it is an absolutely appalling response and an abrogation of his duty. He must do better for the people of South Australia than to claim weakly, vainly, in a lacklustre fashion and tiredly 'If only things were better'. What a disgrace!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): This is the final speech in the Appropriation debate. I summarise the Government's performance as pitiful. Members on the Government side would not even support their Premier. In an extraordinary display of lack of support, we did not hear from them. We heard from two speakers in the form of the member for Napier and the member for Henley Beach. The Heckle and Jeckle of this Parliament carried the standard for the Government. What a disgrace that the only support that the Premier got was from two has-beens.

Under the circumstances, I would have thought that there would be many more people in this hour of need, when the Government needs them most, in there behind the Premier, giving him the support that he so desperately needs to cling to government for at least another year. But we did not hear from one of them. We heard from the Premier in his incapacity as Treasurer outlining the great problems that this State will have to see its way through. We did not hear at all from Dr Who, the Deputy Premier, during this debate.

I know that the Premier got a little excited. He was a little overcome with emotion when he called me a jackass and other members on this side of the House galahs. I think that on one occasion he even accused me of being lazy. It was rather interesting for me to see the performance of the Premier, who has obviously lost control of himself and, indeed, the whole of his parliamentary Party.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: You mean Pinocchio.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes, Pinocchio: his nose gets a little longer every time he stands in this House, because even yesterday he did not tell the truth to this Parliament. During this debate, the Premier did not get support from the Great Pretender, the Minister for Fruit and Veg, the person who would be king; not one iota of support did he get from the Minister of Agriculture. He did not get any support whatsoever from Teddy, the advocate for independent schools;

not one iota of support did he get from the Minister of Education during this debate. And he could have done with support. He is clinging valiantly to a budget that simply has not stood up to scrutiny and will not stand the test of time.

The Premier did not get support from Popeye, our tugboat operator, not one iota of support. We know how capable the Minister of Transport can be, but not once did he stand up and support his Leader in this House. I would have thought it appropriate, even though we know that he is going through very difficult times, that he would at least give support to the Premier and Treasurer of this State.

We did not see any support from one of the snakes in the Parliament who is commonly called Marco Polo; we did not have any support from the Minister of Recreation and Sport for his Leader. Although he was away for part of the debate, he did not enter into it later. The Premier did not have any support from Jaws or the Murray Mouth, as the member has been called affectionately on a number of occasions; we did not have any support from the Minister of Water Resources for the Premier and Treasurer of this State in his hour of need. We did not have any support from the Minister who was in charge of Scrimber and who has caused enormous problems in relation to the State budget—Blunder Klunder.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have been fairly lenient with respect to the application of names and words to members, but the dignity of the House is the responsibility of the Chair. I therefore ask the Deputy Leader to keep that in mind in this debate and to refrain from denigrating members on either side of the House.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I take your reproach seriously, Sir. I was just demonstrating to the House that it can be dished out on both sides. If people on the other side simply cannot take the heat and wish to denigrate members on this side, they should get out. The Premier and Treasurer of this State should get out; he cannot stand the heat, so he should get out. He should resign because he has demonstrated his incapacity to debate properly, to answer questions properly and to operate under pressure. He then started to malign members on this side of the House because he found it beneficial to do so. I thought it would be a just lesson for members to see that it can happen on both sides of the House. I take your warning very seriously, Sir, because I do not think it brings great respect to this Parliament if we carry on in this fashion. However, sometimes members must be reminded of their responsibilities.

I was talking about support for the Premier and Treasurer. Leaving aside the matter of whether his Ministry got behind him in a full-blooded fashion, obviously there are some fairly important areas of neglect in relation to the total performance of the Government in this debate. I do not need to remind members—they can read the contributions that have been made by those who supported the Premier. However, rarely in those contributions did we see the support which the Premier needed and which was so necessary to shore up his position. What has been demonstrated during the Appropriation Bill debate is the first sign that the so-called Labor team is starting to crack and wilt under pressure.

I refer to the contribution made by the Premier. In my nearly nine years in this Parliament, it was probably the most pathetic effort that the Premier has put before us. Everyone understands that he is pretty capable on his feet and that normally under difficult circumstances he can perform quite admirably. He failed the House badly, and I ask members on the Government side to reread his contribution if they are in any doubt as to his lack of capacity.

For 20 minutes he fumbled the ball. He read out extracts from the Keith Conlon show or from a newspaper: that was over half the contribution from the Premier and Treasurer of this State.

He did not have the capacity of a new idea. He did not have the capability to stand up and debate the issues that were being put forward on their merit. He had to get his monitoring unit—which may be put out of business by the new Privacy Bill—to rush around and give him some examples of what the Leader had said here and there. In the process he demeaned himself because, if he wishes to debate the merits of whether we should privatise the State Bank, SGIC, Scrimber, Woods and Forests or any other area, let him debate it in the House. Let him as a responsible Premier and Treasurer stand up in the House and debate it on its merits, tell us where the flaws are and how he will combat that, given the circumstances.

So, for 20 minutes he wandered, slipped and slithered, trying to discredit the Leader. In what the Leader said are some simple concepts that have to be grasped by the people of South Australia: we have to get better, look at ways in which we can be more efficient, and rid ourselves of those institutions that now have no place in Government. We have to become smarter and better in the way in which we do things so that we can give people a chance, make this State competitive and improve the employment opportunities of the people of this State.

The Premier, in his contribution of 35 minutes, of which 20 minutes was spent meandering through the transcripts of the proceedings of radio stations, did not tackle that at all. The only criticism that came out of the whole contribution—and it was very minor—related to some items that were contained in my contribution. If the Premier believes that this State has a future—I hope that he does—he will have to adopt the Liberal program. We are not fussed. We will not be concerned if the Labor Party should adopt our program because it is the way ahead and will make the difference. It should be emphasised that, if we can save \$1.5 billion, that recurrent cost of \$147 million, that is being borrowed, will be covered. Therefore, we would not be mortgaging our kids' futures in the way in which we are today.

The Premier made a mealy-mouthed statement about his contribution from ETSA, to the extent to which he has used ETSA as a milking cow. He did not get it right in terms of net and total assets but, more importantly, when we talk about the electricity authority the Premier has to make three decisions. If he believes that the institution or authority has made a profit he can do one of three things: he can have the money retained for expansion and future contingencies; he can provide a better-priced good; or he can declare a dividend for the Government. On this and past occasions he has declared a dividend for the Government and forced ETSA to borrow more money. That is crass economics because businesses out there are becoming uncompetitive because of the price of electricity here in South Australia. Households in this State are paying amongst the highest prices for electricity in Australia. If the Premier had any feeling for the people and businesses of this State he would not have declared a dividend but would have ensured that money would have gone back into ETSA so that the price of electricity would have fallen, we could have become more competitive and had more jobs.

The Treasurer said that I was wrong in quoting a 2.5 per cent inflation rate in my budget contribution. That is the level of inflation that was struck by the Treasurer himself. Every journalist in town who was at the briefing was told unequivocally that the underlying assumption of the budget

was that we had struck a CPI or inflation rate of 2.5 per cent, and that it had been struck strategically to stop cost overruns. If the Premier and Treasurer of this State does not even know what his own documents and officials are saying it is time he gave up and resigned. Again, he has failed to understand the import of the decisions that he made in respect of the staff that he so willingly and easily put on during the 1989-90 splurge in public employment. He did not stick to his June 1987 Public Service freeze or achieve any savings through GARG.

The Treasurer may have tried to convince the public that he is saving jobs, but we had 2 400 extra jobs during that period, and 3 300 jobs were put on since the freeze was announced. The only response that we have had from the Premier on that fantastic effort is that he will slightly reduce the public sector numbers, and he has quoted a figure of 1 095 full-time equivalents. He has tried valiantly to suggest that the Opposition in some way will reduce public sector employment wholesale with its figure of 9 000, but we know what the turnover figures are and what can be achieved over a long period. Large numbers of staff are tied up in those financial institutions that we wish to be in the private rather than the public sector.

If a Premier resorts to saying things such as that the only contribution of that 800 charges was penile implants he should be condemned for the statement, but I suggest that he is rather playing with himself and the State's future if that is the only level of criticism that he can find in the process. I would look at the contribution from the Premier because it is one of the worst contributions that we have ever seen from a Premier or Treasurer of this State. It is a contribution of which he would not be proud, and I am sure that his members are not proud of it, given the lack of support that we have seen from them in this House.

Motion carried.

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

That the proposed expenditures for the departments and services contained in the Appropriation Bill be referred to Estimates Committees A and B for examination and report, by Tuesday 8 October 1991, in accordance with the timetables as follow:

Estimates Committee A

Tuesday 17 September, at 11.00 a.m.

Premier, Treasurer, Minister of State Development, Legislature
 Legislative Council
 House of Assembly
 Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee
 Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works
 Joint Parliamentary Service
 State Governor's Establishment
 Premier and Cabinet
 *Department of Premier and Cabinet
 Premier and Minister of State Development,
 Miscellaneous
 Treasury
 *Treasury Department
 Treasurer, Miscellaneous

Wednesday 18 September, at 11.00 a.m.

Deputy Premier, Minister of Health, Minister of Family and Community Services, Minister for the Aged
 South Australian Health Commission
 *South Australian Health Commission
 Family and Community Services
 *Department for Family and Community Services

Thursday 19 September, at 11.00 a.m.

Minister of Education, Minister of Children's Services
 Education
 *Education Department
 Minister of Education, Miscellaneous
 Children's Services Office
 *Children's Services Office

Friday 20 September, at 9.30 a.m.

Attorney-General, Minister of Corporate Affairs, Minister for Crime Prevention
 Attorney-General's
 *Attorney-General's Department
 Court Services
 *Court Services Department
 Electoral
 Attorney-General and Minister for Crime Prevention,
 Miscellaneous

Tuesday 24 September, at 11.00 a.m.

Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Fisheries, Minister of Ethnic Affairs
 Industry, Trade and Technology
 Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology,
 Miscellaneous
 *Department of Industry, Trade and Technology
 Agriculture
 Minister of Agriculture, Miscellaneous
 *Department of Agriculture
 Fisheries
 *Department of Fisheries
 Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs

Wednesday 25 September, at 11.00 a.m.

Minister of Transport, Minister of Correctional Services, Minister of Finance
 Office of Transport Policy and Planning
 Road Transport
 *Department of Road Transport
 State Transport Authority
 *State Transport Authority
 Correctional Services
 *Department of Correctional Services

Thursday 26 September, at 11.00 a.m.

Minister of Housing and Construction, Minister of Public Works, Minister of Recreation and Sport
 Housing and Construction
 *Department of Housing and Construction
 South Australian Housing Trust
 *South Australian Housing Trust
 Minister of Housing and Construction and Minister of
 Public Works, Miscellaneous
 Recreation and Sport
 *Department of Recreation and Sport

Estimates Committee B

Tuesday 17 September, at 11.00 a.m.

Minister of Employment and Further Education, Minister of Youth Affairs, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, Minister Assisting the Minister of Ethnic Affairs
 Employment and Technical and Further Education
 *Department of Employment and Technical and Further
 Education
 Office of Tertiary Education
 *Office of Tertiary Education
 Minister of Employment and Further Education, Minister
 of Youth Affairs, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and
 Minister Assisting the Minister of Ethnic Affairs,
 Miscellaneous
 *Office of Aboriginal Affairs

Wednesday 18 September, at 11.00 a.m.

Minister for Environment and Planning, Minister of Water Resources, Minister of Lands

Environment and Planning

Minister for Environment and Planning, Miscellaneous

*Department of Environment and Planning

Minister of Water Resources, Miscellaneous

*Engineering and Water Supply Department

*Minister of Water Resources—Miscellaneous Lands

Minister of Lands, Miscellaneous

Auditor-General's

Thursday 19 September, at 11.00 a.m.

Minister of Emergency Services, Minister of Mines and Energy, Minister of Forests

Police

*Police Department

*Country Fire Service Board

Minister of Emergency Services, Miscellaneous

Mines and Energy

*Department of Mines and Energy

*Department of Woods and Forests

Tuesday 24 September, at 11.00 a.m.

Minister for the Arts and Cultural Heritage, Minister for Local Government Relations, Minister of State Services

Arts and Cultural Heritage

*Department for the Arts and Cultural Heritage

State Services

Minister of State Services, Miscellaneous

*State Services Department

Wednesday 25 September, at 11.00 a.m.

Minister of Labour, Minister of Occupational Health and Safety, Minister of Marine

Labour

*Department of Labour

Marine and Harbours

Minister of Labour and Minister of Occupational Health and Safety, Miscellaneous

Thursday 26 September, at 11.00 a.m.

Minister of Tourism, Minister of Consumer Affairs, Minister of Small Business

Tourism South Australia

*Tourism South Australia

Minister of Tourism, Miscellaneous

Public and Consumer Affairs

Minister of Consumer Affairs and Minister of Small Business, Miscellaneous

*Works and Services (Payments of a capital nature)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): As I recall, on the past three occasions I have drawn attention to the fact that the supplementary *Hansard* of the Estimates Committees has been between three and 5½ months late in being submitted to the House. In saying that, I make no reflection whatsoever on the staff of *Hansard*, who religiously provide the services this House requires. Indeed, in many cases the Ministers have fulfilled their requirement by making information available to *Hansard*. However, it is the production of the document that is not being followed through as it ought to be. I sincerely hope that we will see the supplementary *Hansard*, which provides the answers to questions promised by Ministers during the Estimates Committees, no later than the end of October.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I put on the record my dismay at having only just a short while ago received our program estimates and supporting information for this budget, which was formerly provided at the same time as other budget papers. It gives all members of this place,

regardless of their political persuasion, the opportunity to make the Estimates Committees more constructive and effective than they could otherwise be if the Government refused access of members to that information until this late stage.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning): I note the comments from members opposite, and they will be considered.

Motion carried.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I move:

That Estimates Committee A be appointed, consisting of Messrs D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Holloway, Matthew and Trainer.

Motion carried.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I move:

That Estimates Committee B be appointed, consisting of Messrs P.B. Arnold, De Laine, Hamilton, Hemmings, Heron, Ingerson and Such.

Motion carried.

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable—

(a) the clauses of the Appropriation Bill to be considered by Estimates Committees: and

(b) Estimates Committees to ask for explanations on matters relating to estimates of receipts.

This is the same motion that was adopted by the House last year. It enables the Estimates Committees to consider the clauses of the Bill and also the estimates of receipts, which is an important addition to the process.

Motion carried.

CLEAN AIR (OPEN AIR BURNING) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I pay tribute to a man who lives in Port Pirie and who has done so for the whole 64 years of his life. The man to whom I refer is Mr Bill Jones. Bill Jones was born in Port Pirie in January 1927. He is married to Heather, and he has two daughters, Allison and Andrea. He was educated fully at Port Pirie West Primary School, Port Pirie High School and the Port Pirie Technical College. He is currently the Managing Director of Flinders Travel Service at Port Pirie. Prior to that, he was employed with the Broken Hill Associated Smelters in Port Pirie from 1943 until 1981.

I will refer specifically to Mr Jones' services to local government. Bill Jones was actually elected to local government in 1963 as the councillor for South Ward, a position in which he spent four years. In February 1967 he was elected as an alderman to the Port Pirie City Council, a position he held for 12 years. From 1979 to 1989 he was the Mayor of Port Pirie. Indeed, he was a very high profile mayor during that period and he carried the Port Pirie banner to all parts of the nation and also overseas. He was always extremely proud of his city, and wherever he went

he always had that sense of pride about the place in which he was born.

After his stint as Mayor, which was for 10 years, for reasons of ill health Mr Jones decided that he should try to minimise his services. He took on the position of alderman on the Port Pirie City Council for two years, and he recently retired this year from the council, mainly due to ill health, I am very said to say. During his time with local government, Bill Jones was for 10 years the Spencer Gulf Cities Association's delegate on the State Executive of the Local Government Association of South Australia, which is an important position that he filled extremely well.

From 1981 to 1991, Mr Jones was the Port Pirie City Council delegate to Murray Valley league region 7. For one year, from 1990 to 1991, he was the Local Government Association of South Australia representative on the South Australian Tourism Industry Council. From 1985 to 1991, he was Chairman of the Port Pirie City Council—South Australian Housing Trust Joint Venture Committee. From 1983 to 1986 he was a member of the Local Government Association of South Australia Sesquicentenary Committee. For two years, from 1986 to 1988, Mr Jones was a member of the Local Government Association of South Australia's Bicentennial Committee.

From 1980 to 1983, Mr Jones was the Port Pirie City Council representative on the Iron Triangle Study Group. In 1948 he was a foundation member of the Board of the Lealholme Aged Persons Home. In 1989 he was honoured by the South Australian Housing Trust and the Port Pirie City Council in the establishment of W.G. (Bill) Jones Estate, Senate Road, Port Pirie, a senior citizens cottage project. This was something on which he worked very hard. I believe it was an honour that he deserved. From 1988 to 1991 he was the Port Pirie City Council representative on the Port Pirie Development Committee, a committee which has done much work to promote development in the area.

For a stupendous period of 31 years, from 1954 to 1985, Mr Jones was the Port Pirie news and sporting correspondent for the Australian Broadcasting Corporation for which he was awarded the Charles Moses medal for services to the ABC. From 1969 to 1979, for 10 years, he was the Port Pirie news correspondent for the *Advertiser*. From 1964 to 1972 he was the stringer for *Newsweek Magazine* (USA) and, in 1967, he founded as editor the *Flinders News*, which is a regional, throwaway paper for people of that area.

Bill Jones was very much involved in the travel industry, hence he is now Managing Director of a travel service in Port Pirie. In 1971, he founded the Flinders Travel Service. In 1990, he was appointed the South Australian travel industry member to the travel compensation fund. In 1990, he had the rather unusual honour of being elected the first male honorary member of the Women's Australian Travel League. We can see that Bill Jones was heavily involved in a lot of areas. In 1962 he visited Canada as a member of the Australian team selected to attend the Duke of Edinburgh's Commonwealth Study Conference and, in 1964, he was awarded a Leader Award by the United States Government to study industrialisation, local government and the media in the United States.

From 1970 to 1980, Bill Jones represented the Australian lead and zinc industry on the Metric Conversion Board's metallurgical committee. One can see the heavy workload that Mr Jones undertook. He was also involved in a number of other activities. In 1983 he was made a member of the Order of Australia (AM) in the Australia Day honours for services to local government and the community: again, a very well deserved honour. In 1963, he was appointed as a justice of the peace. In fact, he was not just an honorary

justice: he was a practising justice of the peace. He is a life member of the Association of Apex Clubs, a member of the Port Pirie Lions Club, an honorary member of the Port Pirie Rotary Club, an honorary member of the Port Pirie Jaycees, a life member of the Port Pirie Football League, a patron of the Port Pirie Bowling Club and a patron of the Sporting Association of Port Pirie, which I might add does a lot for the young sports people of Port Pirie. He is also the patron of the Port Pirie and Districts Automotive Restorers Club, a committee member of the Port Pirie Diabetes Control through Community Education Committee and he is also the Port Pirie liaison representative for the South Australian Committee for Employer Support.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

Mrs HUTCHISON: He has served the community for 28 years, and I take the point made by the honourable member. He was often very forceful in his opinions, and he stood by them whatever. I honour him as a wonderful citizen of Port Pirie and, indeed, of South Australia. Bill Jones has really shown that, for someone from a regional provincial city, he can carry the banner worldwide for the city and do it extremely well. I think that his retirement from local government on 6 May 1991 was a great loss to the city of Port Pirie and, indeed, to the Local Government Association of South Australia because of the work he has done for the local government body itself, as well as his own area of Port Pirie.

His service to the community has spanned 28 years, as I mentioned, and it has not been just lip service that has been paid to the community: it has been genuine service because of his great belief in Port Pirie and in the way that Port Pirie can go ahead. He has been very proud of that community, and he continues to be proud of it.

I am sorry to say that Mr Jones recently had a stroke. I am sad to say that but I felt that I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a truly great man not only of Port Pirie but of South Australia. I hope against hope that Mr Jones will come through this illness. I know he has the total support of his family and of the community in Port Pirie because of what he has done for them. Even when he is ill he is still thinking about the community and worrying about what the Port Pirie Development Committee is doing about projects already on its books. I am sure that when Bill Jones gets over this illness he will still want to participate in some way and do something for the community he loves and in which he has lived for the whole 64 years of his life.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): This evening I would like to make reference to a proposal which I put forward nearly three months ago and which I am delighted to see the Government has adopted. The proposal was that a committee be established to start planning now for the celebration of the centenary of women's suffrage in 1994. You, Mr Speaker, would know of that because you were included in the correspondence that I sent out in July this year to the President of the Legislative Council, the Speaker of the House of Assembly, the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Australian Democrats and to the National Council of Women asking for us all to get together to start planning now for what is an important political celebration in the life of South Australia and for what could also be an important cultural celebration with some economic benefits to the State. I am pleased to advise the House that you, Mr Speaker, and your colleague the President responded positively and quickly. The Premier responded to me in a letter I received this morning, dated 9 September—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: More than three months!

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: It is nearly three months that the Premier has had to consider the idea.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: With all the resources available to him!

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: With all the resources available to him, as the member for Light says. The Premier thanked me for my letter and says that the Government will be pleased to participate in and coordinate these activities and to establish a committee to plan for the year's celebrations. Members might like to know who the Premier suggests should be on that committee and also that he recognises the need to establish subcommittees. The Premier states:

I propose that a steering committee comprising the following be formed as soon as possible:

Chairperson—

who would be an eminent woman, and names are currently receiving consideration—

Nominee, Liberal Party of Australia
 Nominee, Australian Democrats
 Nominee, Australian Labor Party
 Nominee, Women's Electoral Lobby
 Nominee, National Council of Women
 Nominee, United Trades and Labor Council
 Commissioner for Equal Opportunity
 Director, Women's Studies, University of Adelaide

That seems to me to be the basis of a worthwhile and representative steering committee, each member of which would have a lot to contribute in the way of ideas, knowledge and suggestions for the success of the celebrations. As members would know, whilst South Australia was not the first place in the world to legislate to give women the vote—that distinction goes to one or two States in the United States and New Zealand—South Australia was the first not only to legislate for women to have the vote but also to enable them to stand as members of Parliament.

It was many decades—five decades, in fact—before that opportunity was taken advantage of, and even then there was a legal challenge. However, the Supreme Court of this State confirmed that the law did provide for women to stand for Parliament. South Australia led the world in the emancipation of women in the nineteenth century, and the Act was a pioneering achievement of such importance that we should celebrate the centenary in effective ways. I want to suggest that as 1994 is a Festival of Arts year it would be an appropriate theme or perhaps subtheme for the festival to pursue the notion of women's emancipation and the influence that emancipation has had on our lives, our culture, our political structures and our economy. I myself will be writing to the Director of the Festival (Mr Christopher Hunt) to suggest that he adopts this theme. I would be surprised if he were already aware of the centenary, because it is something that is perhaps not even known by many South Australians, but I will suggest that he adopts this theme and invites women playwrights, musicians, artists, poets and authors to prepare now for what could be a magnificent celebration in artistic form.

I would also like to see the tourist industry closely involved in starting now to plan to promote 1994 as the year of women's conventions in this State. Even the tourism industry may not be aware how important a venue Adelaide could be to women from other countries and States who recognise that the achievements of this State make us an ideal place for women's conventions. There are many women's organisations, particularly in the United States, where women's organisations have a long and distinguished history, which would like to visit South Australia in order to hold what may be an annual, biannual or triennial conference. When I visited Washington last year I anticipated a

much more overt evidence of feminism in politics and society than I found. It seems to me that South Australia has a lot to teach American women about the pursuit of goals in terms of achievement—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: You are a living example.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I thank the member for Napier for his tribute. I suspect that, if this centenary were properly promoted, it could mean a great deal to the economy of this State in terms of tourism, and I am pleased to see the Minister for Environment and Planning nodding her head in agreement. The other obvious ways in which this centenary could be celebrated would be at local community and local government level and through State-wide women's organisations. Parliament itself may even contemplate a re-enactment of at least portions of the women's suffrage debate. It was not one Bill but many.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: It would be most appropriate if the member for Henley Beach were to grow a beard. I wonder which member of the House would like to take the role of Charles Cameron Kingston, Sir Edward Stirling and others who were supportive of the measure? I feel sure that many women in all Parties would want to participate. The role of Rose Birks would be sought by many women in the Liberal Party and the role of Mary Lee would be eagerly sought by women in the Labor Party or trade union movement.

I simply acknowledge my satisfaction that the Premier has responded so positively. He says in his letter that he will be contacting me again in the near future to discuss the proposal and he would like the committee to be established as soon as possible. I have not yet heard from the National Council of Women, but I feel sure that it will be supportive of this proposal. The sesquicentenary and bicentenary years showed us that two or more years of planning is required to do a job properly. We have the better part of two years and a bit more. The actual date of the enactment of the Constitution Amendment Bill was 18 December 1894. The Bill received royal assent in March 1895, and the first opportunity for women to vote was in the State election of 1896. There could possibly be even more than one celebration.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Yes, a lot of members opposite will be well and truly out of this Parliament, and many of those who are left amongst members opposite will be sitting on this side of the House. No-one will rejoice more than I when that day comes.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): It is fair to say that Australians are not stupid, and neither do I believe that Eric Ristrom of the Taxpayers' Association of Australia is stupid. Whilst I have been critical in the past of articles appearing in newspapers, on this occasion the article in the *Advertiser* of 17 July headed 'Libs accused of bid to "buy" silence' underlines the extent to which the Liberal Party and its supporters are prepared to go in order to introduce a consumption tax in this country. The article in the *Advertiser* by David Walker in Canberra states:

Taxpayers' Association chief Mr Eric Ristrom yesterday accused the Federal Opposition of trying to buy his silence over a consumption tax. He said an Opposition representative had phoned him some months ago to see if he would help the Opposition write a consumption tax he 'would buy'. 'That offer was refused because it was a political way of trying to buy silence,' Mr Ristrom said.

What a damning indictment of the attempts by the Liberal Party in this country, aided and abetted by members opposite, to support a consumption tax. It is a gross dishonesty

and shows that the lengths to which the Liberal Party will go to try to introduce a consumption tax are absolutely boundless. The article continues:

Last night, shadow Treasurer Mr Peter Reith denied the Liberal Party had asked Mr Risstrom to write the Opposition's consumption tax policy, accusing the association chief of distorting the truth.

I know whom I would believe. Mr Risstrom acts without fear or favour; he is not frightened to express his opinion, and has laid it out for all to see. I was equally impressed by an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* of 18 July (page 19) in which Mr Risstrom puts forward a case against the tax. It states:

Australians are not stupid. A recent nation-wide poll has confirmed two-thirds of voters are firmly against having to pay a consumption tax on the necessities of life.

The article goes on:

He [Peter Reith] intends to do a smoke-screen exercise at the same time by cutting Government spending and leaving more for you to pay privately. That trick was played on New Zealanders, who faced two years later not only a 25 per cent hike in their new-fangled indirect tax but income tax increases as well.

For most of you there would be an incredible personal cost, some of it very nastily hidden, and there'd be no economic windfall to help you weather the financial drought. The campaign is based largely on unsubstantiated comment. Sadly, I suspect they believe what they're saying is fair dinkum.

Opposition Leader John Hewson is probably starting to feel a chill wind blowing.

There is no doubt that the community at large is demanding that the Liberal Party bring down its policy on the consumption tax. People have the right to know what percentage they would have to pay. Similarly, they should be asking that the Liberal Party give a commitment that, if it ever gets into power federally, it will not increase the amount of the consumption tax. It is a con job and will be brought in at a low rate. The Liberals are torn; they do not know what to do and what percentage to adopt. I again refer to the *Advertiser* of 18 July which states, in regard to John Hewson:

Recently he admitted it would be difficult or impossible to compensate the elderly living on fixed incomes.

That is delightful! If you do not kick the workers in the guts, you kick those who can least defend themselves. The article goes on:

The consumption tax idea is particularly harsh on the elderly, not all of whom are social security pensioners. They've lived, worked and saved in a time of relatively high income tax rates. In retirement, when their taxable incomes are down, cuts in personal tax could never compensate for the higher living costs.

They may have saved enough for 10 years of extra living; but with a 15 per cent consumption tax the money runs out 18 months early.

What would be taxable? The Opposition says there's about a 7 per cent indirect tax charge in prices now. That is not true for most people because about 75 per cent of what most people spend their money on isn't subject to sales tax now.

There is no tax on basic food, clothing, medical and dental expenses, health insurance premiums, fares, telephone, electricity, gas, school fees, house rent and home purchase.

So it goes on. I was looking at another article that I picked up headed 'Cassandra. Senator Peter Walsh.' He talks about some of the problems.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Indeed, as my colleague the member for Henley Beach says, I have cut out just about every article that I can find on consumption tax. I intend to bore it right up Liberal Party supporters in that regard. It will be interesting if they start taxing the private schools. If they are not exempt from VAT or GST, there will be a huge backlash, especially from the Catholics and many private schools. How are they going to explain why pensioners should pay 15 per cent tax on groceries when paper entrepreneurs pay nothing for Geelong Grammar school fees? This article states:

Some might argue that people who send their kids to private schools make fewer demands on the taxpayers than those who send their kids to Government schools, and therefore they should not get a double whammy. . . If your kids live at home you pay VAT on their food, bedding, etc. which you avoid if you send them away.

It goes on about private health insurance, funerals and graveyard monuments, which will be taxed. The article states:

There can be no doubt that conceptually this is consumption expenditure.

A good logo to put on the back of a car would be, 'People are dying to pay consumption tax.' Then we would have it on weddings; then we would have it on transport and entertainment; then we would have it on rent, household insurance and car insurance. It is interesting that we should have the bleating and cries from members opposite about increased charges on comprehensive and third party insurance premiums yet here we are—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park will resume his seat. The member for Coles is out of her seat. She is now in her right seat. Is it a point of order?

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I think I heard the word 'lie', but I might not have heard correctly. If I did—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I believe the honourable member should withdraw the word 'lie' if he used it.

The SPEAKER: If the word 'lie' was used, it will be withdrawn. I did not pick it up.

Mr HAMILTON: Absolutely not. I did not use that word.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 8 October at 2 p.m.