HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 14 February 1991

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

DRUGS

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I move:

That a select committee be established to inquire into all aspects of the production and marketing of illegal or prohibited drugs in South Australia.

I have moved this motion because the public is sick and tired of the Government's lack of resolve to come to grips with the drug problem in South Australia. If the Government refuses to respond to this motion through the Minister of Emergency Services and allows it to drop off the Notice Paper, it will prove to the people of this State once and for all that the Government has no real concern for the health and suffering of its people or in bringing the criminals involved to justice. If that is the case, the drug laws of this State should be changed dramatically to reflect the Government's attitude.

In moving this motion, I know that I have the full support of the Chief Inspector of Police in charge of the Riverland division because I discussed the matter with him prior to making the decision to proceed with this motion in the House. As an indication of the public's concern, I refer to a letter which was forwarded to the Premier from the Renmark/Paringa Drug Awareness Committee, as follows:

As Secretary of the Renmark/Paringa Drug Awareness Committee, I have been directed to write to you following discussion at one of our recent meetings. The discussion concerned calls by the New South Wales Parliament for a Federal royal commission into drug activities in that State. Further to this, the member for Mildura in the State of Victoria has suggested that such an inquiry ought to extend to Victoria, and I believe the Opposition in South Australia has also called for extensions of such moves into South Australia. In view of the close knit and contiguous geographical aspects of the major drug growing areas of Australia, our committee believes that an inquiry would only be effective if the three States were involved. Further, the effectiveness of the police forces to crack down on the higher echelon of illegal drug activities is continually being frustrated, which in turn destroys the morale of honest citizens in small communities like Renmark and Paringa . . . Your support to establish a tri-State inquiry into illicit drug activities is sought please.

That committee has been operating for quite some time, endeavouring to bring its real concerns to the attention of the public, the Government and the police.

Let me go back to 1982, when a drug investigation operation was set up in the Riverland, based on a model developed by an assistant commissioner of police. It was known as Rivergrass. Until 1985, it was assessed every six months; after October 1985, it was assessed every 12 months. In 1986-87, I understand that the project was more successful than the Drug Squad in Adelaide. One detective from the CIB was appointed to run Rivergrass, and a uniformed officer was seconded.

The purpose was to gather information and conduct inquiries to locate crops and apprehend offenders. A clear picture of a network of organised crime within the area has been built up and a direct connection has been established between the Riverland and organised crime in Adelaide, Melbourne, Sydney and Griffith. It has been suggested that the Riverland is one of the largest cannabis growing areas in Australia and, as a result of the running of the operation, other criminal offences were being detected. However, police headquarters has now abandoned the program and it has been incorporated within the normal CIB operations. I raise this matter at this stage in relation to Operation Rivergrass because it is now defunct. As it has been terminated, I believe that now any reference can be made to that operation because it is no longer operative.

There appears to be a lack of resolve by the Government and the police to stamp out the illegal trade which, rightly or wrongly, leads to claims of police involvement. As a result of public pressure, an investigation was carried out by Superintendent Barry England of the Internal Investigation Branch, who worked in close cooperation with the Renmark and Paringa committee. However, since completing his report, Superintendent England has been transferred from the Internal Investigation Branch to the Drug Squad. Since that time no-one seems to know, or wants to know, anything regarding that investigation, and no report has been made.

It is fair to say that people in the Riverland are sick and tired of the lack of action and would welcome an open public inquiry. The Government has to make up its mind where it stands in relation to the impact that drugs are having on the community. Turning a blind eye to the criminal activities of those involved in the production and marketing of illegal and prohibited drugs in South Australia will do nothing for the standing of the Police Force or the Government in this State.

We are all aware of the hard times that are being experienced by law-abiding citizens and the fact that going through these hard times is all the more reason why the public has reached the point where it is sick to death of criminals making a fortune out of this illicit trade, with the Government showing little or no concern. I refer to an article in the *Advertiser* of Monday 11 February 1991, headed 'State drug toll prompts police plea for help':

Twenty-three young South Australians have died from drug overdoses in the past 18 months, prompting a passionate police plea for the public to help battle illegal drugs—especially through Operation Noah.

We are all aware that Operation Noah was conducted yesterday. I am not aware of the outcome or the number of complaints made to the police on that occasion. The article continues:

Superintendent Edwards said police were convinced there was a direct relationship between the illicit drug trade and a whole range of criminal activity.

The drug trade was thought to be a major reason for the growing number of house break-ins and armed robberies.

What Superintendent Edwards is saying is perfectly correct: that people involved in using these illegal drugs have to pay an enormous amount for them and, naturally, the only way that they can acquire the funds necessary to support their habit is by house break-ins and stealing. That has a direct implication for every South Australian, particularly the elderly, many of whom are living in fear at night of being broken into and not knowing exactly what their fate will be.

The Stewart report into Operation Noah, which was undertaken a year ago, clearly indicated a lack of resolve on the part of some police officers to do their duty and the failure of the Government to take appropriate action. Although the Stewart report has never been released officially, some of us have had the opportunity of reading it, and it has created grave concern in our minds as to the well-being of the Police Force. The fact that the Government is doing little to come to grips with that problem puts every responsible law-abiding police officer in jeopardy as far as the community is concerned.

There is a need for a select committee. The terms of reference should be sufficient to determine the impact of drugs on the community, to seek specialist medical evidence

on the impact of drugs on the health of the community, to make recommendations on changes to the drug laws in this State and to determine the extent or otherwise of police involvement in drug activities in this State. If the Government does not support the establishment of a select committee, it will be a clear indication to the criminal element that it is an open go in South Australia and the public will be forced, as a last resort, to take action through the ballot box at the next State election. I commend the motion to the House.

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

STATE BANK

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, all executive salary packages of the State Bank and associated companies' employees worth in excess of $85 000 per annum be listed in the State Bank annual report to Parliament, in line with publicly listed companies' practice and recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee.

We go to great lengths in relation to dealing with corporate salaries in this country. There is no doubt that in the past few years many company executives have looked after themselves extremely well. I have a copy of a statistical table from *Australian Society* of December 1990 entitled, 'What they Earn: Directors and Top Managers in Australia's largest 23 corporate groups.' As it is purely statistical, I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard.*

Leave granted.

WHAT THEY EARN: DIRECTORS AND TOP MANAGERS IN AUSTRALIA'S LARGEST 23 CORPORATE GROUPS

	Total remuneration of directors of all group companies			Directors' average remuneration for holding companies			Remuneration for the 10 highest paid executives in the group		
	Total remuneration		Growth rate	Average remuneration		Growth rate	Total salary		Growth rate
	1988 $'000	1989 $'000	%	1988 $	1989 $	%	1988 $	1989 $	%
BHP	32 692	37 858	15.8	240 765	311 000	29.2	9 180 000	8 100 000	−11.8
CRA Ltd	11 150	13 837	24.1	158 400	159 083	0.4	3 240 000	3 470 000	7.1
BTR Nylex Ltd	3 944	8 864	124.7	92 143	171 625	86.3	1 950 000	3 460 000	77.4
National Aust Bank	4 066	5 583	37.3	102 077	119 000	16.6	2 530 000	3 140 000	24.1
Westpac	24 621	21 349	−13.3	63 625	77 625	22.0	6 320 000	7 540 000	19.3
Elders IXL	28 839	40 269	39.6	199 059	307 647	54.6	3 900 000	6 440 000	65.1
ANZ	25 800	25 200	−2.3	93 750	135 294	44.3	4 330 000	4 830 000	11.5
Coles Myers	5 807	5 729	−1.3	195 600	196 625	0.5	4 930 000	4 530 000	−8.1
News Corporation	10 895	19 964	83.2	726 333	1 247 750	71.8	14 880 000	24 110 000	62.0
CSR Ltd	2 513	3 373	34.2	158 000	106 250	−32.8	1 950 000	2 010 000	3.1
Western Mining	2 137	3 613	69.1	109 818	144 000	31.1	2 050 000	3 000 000	46.3
Pacific Dunlop Ltd	1 392	1 625	16.7	101 615	111 615	9.8	2 980 000	3 060 000	2.7
MIM	1 707	1 839	7.7	101 750	102 182	0.4	1 920 000	1 990 000	3.6
Brambles Industries	1 178	1 265	7.4	93 333	119 889	28.5	2 380 000	2 810 000	18.1
Boral Ltd	3 444	4 549	32.1	64 667	85 800	32.7	2 050 000	2 320 000	13.2
Lend Lease Corp	2 818	3 288	16.7	160 571	251 273	56.5	3 250 000	4 000 000	23.1
Amcor Ltd	1 376	1 784	29.7	103 538	132 923	28.4	2 080 000	2 490 000	19.7
Comalco Ltd	4 825	5 076	5.2	259 333	224 000	−13.6	1 920 000	2 040 000	6.2
Adelaide Steamship Co.	1 687	1 911	13.3	231 400	272 000	17.5	1 420 000*	1 670 000	17.6
Woodside Petroleum	1 003	1 130	12.7	55 722	70 625	26.7	2 020 000	2 480 000	22.8
Pioneer International	4 954	6 218	25.5	134 462	159 417	18.6	2 890 000	2 050 000	−29.1
TNT Ltd	23 460	20 346	−13.3	581 053	457 889	−21.2	12 290 000	10 810 000	−12.0
Goodman Fielder Wattle	10 641	11 060	3.9	169 000	153 000	9.5	2 470 000	2 680 000	8.5
Total	210 948	245 730	16.5	193 973	237 037	22.2	92 930 000	109 030 000	17.3

* Only five executives included for Adelaide Steamship since only five in 1988 received in excess of $80 000 p.a.

Mr BECKER: The table lists the salaries paid to directors of all group companies of BHP, CRA Limited, BTR Nylex, National Australia Bank, Westpac, Elders IXL, ANZ, Coles, News Corporation, CSR, Western Mining, Pacific Dunlop Limited, MIM, Brambles Industries, Boral, Lend Lease Corporation, Amcor Limited, Comalco Limited, Adelaide Steamship Company, Woodside Petroleum, Pioneer International, TNT and Goodman Fielder Wattie. That is an idea of the strength of these companies. Before I saw that article, I had undertaken a considerable amount of research from company reports into the various salary packages paid to the directors of these companies.

It is interesting to note that in 1990 the highest paid director in BHP received somewhere between $1 270 000 and $1 279 999. In Elders IXL, the highest paid director earned between $1 435 000 and $1 445 000. So, we find that, in the large entrepreneurial companies, the directors look after themselves extremely well. In Western Mining Corporation, the highest salary in 1990 was between $605 000 and $614 999 per annum. In Adelaide Steamship Company, the highest paid executive received a salary in the range of $1 205 000 to $1 214 000. The highest executive salary in the Cooperative Building Society, a South Australian organisation, was somewhere between $250 000 and $264 999. In the News Corporation, the highest executive earned between $12 735 000 and $12 744 999. That figure is gross, but it gives an idea of the salary packages paid in some of these companies.

It is also interesting to note that 1 058 employees of News Corporation earn over $85 000 and, of the directors, eight earn or receive more than $1 million per annum. Is it any wonder that the public are furious when they hear of these salary increases, particularly for entrepreneurs who have now seen their companies run into huge financial difficulties and have cost Australian shareholders, bankers and financiers somewhere in the vicinity of $8 billion in the past 12 months? That is why in November last year I asked this question of the Premier:

How does the Premier justify the doubling of the remuneration of the former Managing Director of Beneficial Finance last year to over half a million dollars and will he reveal what remuneration package has been given to the new Managing Director, Mr John Malouf, in the light of the Public Accounts Committee's recommendation that such remuneration packages should be disclosed?

I am pleased that I received an answer to that question on Tuesday 12 February wherein the Premier advised:

Beneficial Finance has a Compensation Committee (consisting of directors) which approves remuneration packages for senior management of the corporation. These packages are established after taking into account market rates of compensation in line with other financial institutions and the performance of the individual. The former Managing Director of Beneficial Finance was entitled to a bonus on performance.

Hell, if he was entitled to a bonus on performance, he should pay them. The reply continues:

The substantial profit made in 1989 resulted in him being entitled to a large bonus. Of course in a year of loss, no bonuses would be payable. The new Managing Director is on a remuneration package substantially less than that of his predecessor. This information, together with remuneration paid to the other directors, will be disclosed in the 1991 Annual Report. In relation to loans, the interest cost and fringe benefit tax related to staff loans are charged against the compensation package.

In relation to the question of State Bank fees, because we are trying to find out what was going on in that regard, the Premier advised me:

Directors' fees paid by the bank to its directors are determined by the Governor under the State Bank of South Australia Act 1983.

That means that the Governor in Executive Council and, therefore, the Government, the Premier as Treasurer, approves the salary packages to the directors of the State Bank. His reply continues:

The basis for setting directors' fees are detailed in reply to Question on Notice number 145 tabled in the House on 4 September 1990.

The bank has a compensation committee consisting of the Chairman, the Deputy Chairman and the Group Managing Director which approves remuneration packages for senior management of the bank. These packages are established after taking into account market rates of compensation in line with other banks and the performance of the individual. Fees for directors of subsidiary companies are also approved by the compensation committee.

In the past, it has not been the practice of the bank to disclose information relating to the remuneration of senior executives, nor is it required to do so. The board, however, has agreed to supply this information in the same format as required under legislation relating to companies. This information is currently being compiled and will be included in the bank, half year statement of results.

I am absolutely delighted that the Government has acceded to my request, and I commend the motion to the House.

Mr FERGUSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

REGIONAL RAIL SERVICES

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I move:

that this House:

(a) deplores the decision by the Commonwealth Minister for Land Transport to close South Australia's regional rail passenger services by the end of 1990;

(b) believes the decision to be in breach of clauses 7 and 9 of the Railways Transfer Agreement 1975;

(c) seeks clarification from the Commonwealth Government about the fate of our regional rail freight services;

and

(d) calls on the State Government—

(i) to employ all possible legal avenues to ensure that South Australia is not reduced to being the only mainland State without regional rail services;

and

(ii) to investigate and confirm long-term options for ensuring that regional and rural areas of South Australia have access to efficient and effective passenger and freight transportation services in the future.

I would emphasise that this has been an issue about which I have been vitally concerned for the past 16 years during which I have been in Parliament and which I will continue to pursue to what I hope will not be the bitter end but the sweeter end should the Federal Government decide to reverse its current apparent obvious intention to close down the services and at least experiment with something better than that which we currently have, which is virtually nothing as far as rail services are concerned.

I refer members to comments I made in this House in 1975. Incidentally, my maiden speech was on the Railways Transfer Agreement Bill, and not on the Address in Reply as is customary, simply because this Bill came on early in the session and I was vitally interested in the outcome, because I campaigned in Mount Gambier in 1975 on this very issue—the sale of the railways to Canberra. I was among the few who disputed the transfer. I was simply representing the point of view of my electors, as I continue to do. In my maiden speech, I said:

People in South Australia, especially at Mount Gambier, believe that the State Government is far more likely to be sympathetic towards country districts than the Commonwealth Government would ever be. Furthermore, the State Government is that much more readily accessible to Mount Gambier than is the Commonwealth Government. We would have a very small voice in Australian politics but a relatively important one, we hope, in State politics.

Towards the middle of my comments, I expressed some reservation when I said:

I question whether the State Government would be willing to contest the legality of the agreement it is asking us to approve against any possible future contrary action by either the Australian Government or the Inter-State Commission. Would it stand up for South Australia's rights when it came to the question?

They say that you have twenty-twenty vision in hindsight, but I suggest that 16 years ago I predicated that some adverse effects would be felt by country areas. Of course, the metropolitan system in Adelaide (the STA) is subsidised to the tune of about $130 million when the Federal Government is invoking the user pays principle in order to close down the country rail passenger services.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: If the honourable member knew how much money goes into my city bus service compared with the STA in Adelaide, he probably would have made that comment privately rather than in the House. I could develop a whole new debate on country passenger subsidies for buses. However, very rarely does a State Government fail to take on a Federal Government that is depriving it of services, especially when it has a sound legal base (that is, the statutes that have been enacted between the South Australian and Federal Governments) in order to do so.

I believe that the South Australian Government has been derelict in its duty until relatively recently, when the Premier and the Minister of Transport were brought to the barriers to protest to the Federal Government about this possible closure. In fact, the Minister of Transport, 18 months ago, actually seemed to be speaking in favour of the closure, saying, 'If it doesn't pay, well, it will have to go.'

The Premier was a late entry into the field to defend the situation, and I simply refer members of the House to the fact that, once again, it is the rural community of South Australia that is on the receiving end of a fairly hard stick, in this instance wielded by the Federal Government. I do not believe that the State Government has done sufficient early enough or even more lately to defend the situation and to protest. We were reassured by the then Premier (Hon. Don Dunstan) that the Act and the regulations contained sufficient conditions to enable South Australia to carry out an effective protest should there be any closures or should any other action be taken that had not already been agreed upon. I suggest that the State Government was

being derelict in its duty in not taking action much more quickly to defend the plight in which country people find themselves.

The Premier—and I give him justice—has, over the past few weeks, been providing me with copies of his correspondence with Bob Brown, the Federal Minister for Land Transport, and the Prime Minister, just as I, in turn, have kept members of the House apprised, either through debate or by representation at meetings, of the representations I have made to the Prime Minister and to Mr Brown, and to the Premier and to the State Minister of Transport on this issue.

I must admit, on perusal of the letters that I have recently received, that they are moderate and temperate; they seem to lack any vehement protest which I sincerely hoped for when I was making representation to the Government to support our actions. As a result, a relatively mild case has so far been put forward. I would like to see a much stronger and more vociferous case put to the arbitrator (once he is finally appointed) in order for the South Australian rural community to be very strongly represented—for their point of view to go forward very strongly. This applies not simply to country members who have already done their part but also to the Government itself.

Whilst I say that country members have done their part, I would also remind the House that contained here in *Hansard* is the member for Eyre's speech on the South Australian rail transfer agreement. He was very antipathetic towards the sale of the country railways because he felt that it would have an adverse effect on his community. However, the then member for Stuart (Hon. Gavin Keneally) said that South Australia should pay the Federal Government to take over the railway system. That was a strange attitude for a country member of Parliament.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: It was one of his weaker moments.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Well, during that speech he also said that my presence here in the House was an accident which would soon be remedied—and 16 years later here I am and there he is. Perhaps the member for Napier is right: it was one of his weaker moments. I suggest that it was only the relatively recent meeting of mayors which was held in one of the conference rooms in the House with the Premier, the Minister of Transport and members of Parliament who were vitally involved in this issue which finally alerted the Premier himself to the fact that country people were dissatisfied with the attitude of the Government towards the rail closure and towards the inactivity that had been the order of the day rather than the activity that we had expected.

I believe that over the past 15 or 16 years there has been an inexorable and deliberate scaling down of services by Australian National. In 1975 I travelled for the first time—and it was to prove for the last time—on one of the sleeping cars between Adelaide and Mount Gambier. There were only two such cars, and they subsequently burned out as a result of accidental fires. Significantly, Australian National made absolutely no attempt to replace those cars and to retain an attractive aspect of the service, because the trip from Mount Gambier was, after all, some 12 or 13 hours and people did avail themselves of the sleeping car. No depreciation provision was made then, nor has it been made in all the 30-odd years that those Bluebird railcars have been used.

Trains were slow in the early years. More recently the service was quickened up to between seven and eight hours on average. Unfortunately, the speeding up of the service served also to have a large number of small country townships lopped off so that the stops would not entail further time loss. By this time, of course, the cars themselves were much more prone to breakdown. In fact, breaking down on the trip from Mount Gambier to Adelaide was more the norm than the exception. Cars, buses and taxis have been used intermittently to transport people who were victims of those breakdowns from the breakdown spot along the line to their various destination points. Of course, that incurred considerable additional expense and certainly considerable additional extra time. Inconvenience occurred in the depth of winter and the height of summer, and people suffered in those extremes of temperature when being transferred from cars onto the rail side to await the emergency transport. Often during summer and winter the air-conditioning—the heating and the cooling—failed.

Brake failure was not unusual. The failure of the car electric motors was not unusual. By the time the cars were 25 or 30 years old, they were then too weak to pull the trains through the Adelaide Hills, so additional trains had to be fitted to them in order for them to be able to carry out the journey, pushing or pulling through the Hills. As a result, the user pays principle, which was being promoted for rural trains but not for the STA, I believe created artifically inflated costs, because of the high cost of repairs, the cost of emergency transport, and the cost of those additional railcars needed to get the Bluebirds to their destinations. These things were being built into the costs, whereas a new, properly maintained railcar would not have had any of these problems. It would have got to and fro in the minimum of time and with a minimum of inconvenience and cost.

I understand that the line hire from Adelaide to Mount Gambier was estimated to be about $1 million, which ANR debited against the passenger services, and the passenger cars would have depreciated the line very little compared to the heavy freight cars which were passing over it. That was another example of artificial inflation of costs: more wear and tear from freight than passenger rail. Advertising by ANR was poor, often erroneous, and on occasions wasteful because incorrect information published in expensive glossy advertising had to be scrapped. I understand there are lots of advertising blurbs lying around in a printer's office, possibly in the South-East, which were never used because the prices for travel were incorrectly printed. The costs changed between printing and getting it out to the public.

I sense that the intent to close down the railway lines has been long held. In mid 1980 an internal memo from ANR to progress the closure of the Blue Lake was certainly distributed at an administrative and executive level. In my office I have a copy which was sent to me and which I quoted at the time. This was strenuously denied by the ANR executive, but it was obviously patently true, because by August of last year the Blue Lake service had closed down, despite the fact that the Federal Minister, Bob Brown, said that he had not authorised the closure of the Blue Lake service at that stage. That was 21 December 1990. He went on to say that he would consider its future again when he had received the report of the arbitrator in accordance with legal requirements. There was no mention, of course, of the Broken Hill, Port Augusta, Whyalla service; he was not looking at those again, which is all the more sad. Those denials, of course, have in fact been met by the fact that the Blue Lake service closed down and buses replaced it from August 1990 onwards. Of course, those buses do not serve all the towns which used to be served by rail. From Naracoorte to Bordertown you have Bangham, Wolseley, and Frances townships which are completely missed by the

new bus service. So, they have certainly missed out completely.

South Australia will be one of the few States, if not the only State, on mainland Australia with no rural passenger rail services, whereas new cars have been provided in Queensland, Western Australia and New South Wales. South Australia is being neglected by ANR and by the Federal Government.

There are some details that I would like to put into *Hansard* regarding sections 7 and 9 of the Act. I would also like to put details to the House regarding the quality of the South Australian submission, which will be critical to the survival of the Blue Lake and other rail services, and possibly a plea to the Federal Government at least to try one or two new cars on the South Australian rail services. If they do not bring in the business which we in the country think they will, then transfer these cars to the Federal lines, which can certainly do with upgrading. I had a look at the Ghan last Thursday and, while there are a lot of lovely new Budd cars made in Australia, I believe by Comeng, there are some old dilapidated, antiquated and rusty cars with blisters of rust on the hoods which might well be replaced. If everything else fails, perhaps cars made for country rail services in South Australia could ultimately be diverted to the Ghan and other services.

It would not be a loss to the Government if it wanted to experiment at least for six to 12 months. As I said, there is considerably more detail that I would like to put into *Hansard* for submission ultimately to the arbitrator. Therefore, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PHOTOGRAPHIC DETECTION DEVICES

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That the regulations made under the Road Traffic Act 1961 relating to photographic detection devices made on 14 June and laid on the table of this House on 2 August 1990 be disallowed.

These devices obviously have a role to play. However, the Police Department has become an agent for the State Taxation Office as collectors of revenue. I have no doubt that instructions have been given to the Police Department to maximise the number of people issued with these dreadful on-the-spot fines. As a member who was talked into voting for this provision some years ago, very much against my will, let me make it clear that I have grave reservations about the desirability, necessity or credibility of having these sorts of devices operating in South Australia, because it puts tremendous power in the hands of people who like authority. When we put uniforms on some people, unfortuantely in many cases they lose a sensible perspective on how they should conduct themselves.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GUNN: The honourable member is obviously speaking from experience. That may be how he conducts himself, but it is not how members on this side conduct themselves. We have a responsibility to ensure that laws passed by this Parliament are implemented in a fair, reasonable and sensible manner. The law is never meant to be enforced in a harsh, unreasonable or unfair manner. I believe that the Police Department is using these devices and on-the-spot fines improperly. It is concentrating far too much on that aspect of policing and is neglecting to deal with other more serious matters such as controlling drunks and louts who are harassing ordinary people, smashing into their houses, disturbing their peace and generally interfering—

Mr S.G. Evans: And assaulting them.

Mr GUNN: Yes.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I certainly am not. When driving down the road at any time one sees police cars stopping people all the time.

Mr Atkinson: What causes more deaths?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: The honourable member will have the opportunity to make a contribution later and should not be attempting to contribute now, contrary to Standing Orders. If he wants to support this, he can do so. I will not. I am exercising what is my proper responsibility in bringing to the attention of this House my concerns about these matters. Too much in the way of police resources is allocated to this activity. More ought to be made available to deal with the drunks who are harassing people, vandals, uncontrolled Aborigines and others around the State. I make no apology for saying that. One has only to step out onto North Terrace on nights when this House is sitting to see evidence of this. The staff of the Parliament have been told not to use the side door because of these hobos. We have situations in my electorate at Ceduna where people are being harassed. Yet, there are plenty of police available to be armed with radar cameras and electronic devices, with amphometers and all sorts of things—and that is because they collect revenue.

Mr S.G. Evans: And they are not on dangerous parts of the road.

Mr GUNN: No, and there is no hassle for the police. It is easy, it is simple. But it takes police resources to send two officers to arrest 20 or 30 louts throwing stones, breaking into people's homes and generally disrupting the peace and quiet of the area. Then there are other agencies of the Government, such as community welfare and legal aid, agencies which protect these scoundrels who harass law-abiding citizens. It is a great hassle for the police, and I do not blame them for being frustrated and absolutely sick of dealing with these louts, but the Government should provide the resources to deal with them. The most effective way to deal with some of these louts is for the police to give them a whack under the ear and a kick up the backside and set them going. That is what should take place, and 98 per cent of the public agree with me. It is only these community welfare types and other do-gooders and hangers-on, who are a blight on society, who do not want anything done about it.

People are absolutely sick of these louts. The Government has been weak. The Attorney-General is as weak as water on this subject—he was nearly run out of Port Augusta. I have invited him to come to Ceduna to tell the people why they are booked for not having a light over their number-plate when louts can smash over 900 windows in one year and break into the school. When the police come to interview the culprits, they are told by Legal Aid that they do not have to answer any questions. However, there is plenty of money to whip out and issue a few of these tickets.

The Police Commissioner, when he appeared before the Budget Estimates Committee, told me that people would get warnings. A number of letters have been written, but not enough warnings have been issued. Some poor fellow who is taking his family out for a quiet drive, and who does not even realise that he is breaking the law, gets a $150 fine. Those people cannot afford those sorts of tickets—it is quite disgraceful. The police are overzealous in these areas, and I have a series of questions that I will put to the police. In many cases, police officers become quite aggressive and arrogant, because they think they are a law unto themselves.

I am most annoyed about this exercise and I believe the emphasis should be changed and the public should be protected. A couple of weeks ago, at about half past eight, I was driving through Whitmore Square on the way to my office here when a drunken fellow tried to get into my car. He terrorised and frightened two ladies alongside me.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Did you whack him one?

Mr GUNN: I was very tempted. If he had got in, I would have. The police ought to be there to deal with these people. A No. 9 boot is the way to deal with them. These people are a law unto themselves because they know that they have all these State Government support facilities. I have a lot more to say on this subject, so I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PRAWN COLOURING

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr M.J. Evans:

That the regulations under the Food Act 1985 relating to prawn colouring, made on 20 September and laid on the table of this House on 10 October 1990, be disallowed.

(Continued from 6 December. Page 2453.)

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): This motion can be supported on legal grounds, but I am not sure it can be supported on medical grounds. It is in relation to this latter area that I will address my initial remarks. This motion raises the issue of the current attitude of the House to the addition of food colourings to food for human consumption when that addition is for purely cosmetic purposes. There is a separate argument about the addition of preservatives and other chemicals to food, primarily for their preservative characteristics. However, when one discusses the addition of colourings for purely cosmetic purposes, as is the case here, then the public debate is opened up.

We have to be aware that in the eyes of the medical profession tartrazine is not considered to be a very dangerous chemical as far as colouring agents are concerned. Indeed, it is widely used in the food industry. In fact, tartrazine, which is the chemical dye used to colour prawns, is used generally and legitimately in bakery goods, including icing and decorations, sweets and confectionery products, cordials, syrups, toppings, custard mix and custard powder, dessert mix, flavoured milk, fruit-flavoured spreads and fillings, gelatine dessert powders, ice cream and ice confectionery, imitation fruit, jams and jellies, pastrycook fillings, sauces and pickles, and soft drinks and soft drink products. Given that jellies and soft drinks may well contain tartrazine, albeit in limited quantities, children are exposed to this product every day of their life. A vast percentage of the products on supermarket shelves contain tartrazine and children will have a large intake of that substance, whether or not they eat prawns.

This motion is the subject of disallowance in relation to the use of tartrazine in prawns. Members should also bear in mind that other things that we eat contain chemicals. For example, tripe is bleached, bacon is coloured with nitrates, smoked fish contains annatto and fish roe is coloured. As I said initially, this motion raises for public debate what our attitude will be in relation to substances that are added for cosmetic purposes.

Let us consider what the department is hoping to achieve with this regulation. It is saying that it will allow the colouring of prawns with tartrazine to give a cosmetic colour so that South Australian prawns can be sold on the east coast of Australia.

On the eastern coast, the public has been educated to purchase prawns only if they are pink. That demand is not present in South Australia. The South Australian market does not care whether prawns are pink but, if we are to sell prawns to the Eastern States, they must be coloured. Therein lies the legal argument. In New South Wales, it is illegal to sell prawns that have been coloured with tartrazine; so, if we allow the Government to implement this regulation, we are saying that we agree with prawn producers colouring South Australian prawns with tartrazine for sale in the markets in the Eastern States, and that is illegal.

That is not supportable and, on that evidence alone, the House should support the member for Elizabeth's motion to disallow the regulations. To do otherwise would be to condone an illegal action. It could be suggested that we should allow the prawns to be coloured here and that it would be up to the New South Wales authorities to lower the boom on the import of prawns into that State, as they would be entitled to do. That would not be a popular move.

Tartrazine is fairly safe medically. It has been used in the United States since 1916 and the figures produced in Australia as late as 1969 state that, in Australia, the acceptable daily intake of tartrazine is set at 7.5 milligrams per kilogram of body weight. Given the dozen-odd foods containing tartrazine which I mentioned earlier, the consumption in this State of tartrazine is only 10 per cent of that figure. For it to be argued that the colouring of prawns by tartrazine will adversely affect public health is a specious argument. Indeed, the addition of tartrazine to prawns on the South Australian market will be so insignificant when compared with the amount of tartrazine ingested daily by South Australians as to be of no real concern.

Those people in the community who are concerned about the adverse behavioural reaction of food additives will say that ample evidence suggests that tartrazine causes behaviour problems. The medical evidence given to the Subordinate Legislation Committee suggests that it is a grey area, that it is more of an emotional issue. The figures submitted to the committee indicate that possibly 1 400 people in the State could have allergic reactions to tartrazine. Those 1 400 people already ingest tartrazine every day and, even if we disallowed the colouring of prawns, they would continue to ingest tartrazine. If we admit that tartrazine is deleterious to public health, and it should not be allowed in prawns in an infinitesimal percentage, the other products which I mentioned at the beginning of my speech should have the tartrazine removed from them, as well.

Should tartrazine or other colourings be added to food for cosmetic purposes? One must answer 'No'; it is difficult to answer any other way. Some foods need preservative but, if food has to be doctored with colour to sell it, that is a different matter. No-one knows whether, in the long term, colourings have an adverse effect. No sound medical evidence was presented to the committee, from my reading of it, which suggested that the addition of tartrazine to prawns will increase the risk to public health. There is some evidence to show that more than 1 000 people could suffer a reaction to it, but no-one is in a position to quantify that reaction. Tartrazine is used heavily in a wide variety of foods for cosmetic purposes and, with respect to public health generally, it does not have an undesirable impact.

As a Parliament, we have to decide, on the legal side of the argument, whether we should support legislation which allows prawns to be marketed interstate with a dye to colour them which is illegal on the other side of the border. It is a difficult decision, because tartrazine is a relatively harmless colouring agent. But, measuring everything together, I come down on the side of supporting the member for

Elizabeth because, until such time as New South Wales or the other eastern States change their regulations to allow tartrazine to be used and sold as a colouring agent, it is difficult to put in train here legislation that will be in conflict with the law across the border.

No doubt other members may care to make contributions on what they believe is the impact of colouring agents on the adverse behavioural reactions of children. Some colouring agents do have this impact. There is ample evidence, through the World Health Organisation and other bodies, that some additives cause behavioural problems. I say 'some additives', not necessarily tartrazine which does not seem to come into too much conflict. It is a difficult argument; it is not black and white. However, putting all the factors together, I believe there is some justification for the motion to disallow the regulations. I therefore support it.

Mr McKEE (Gilles): I am a member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee before which this matter came prior to Christmas. We received several submissions, both in writing and in person, from different members of the community, and called witnesses as well. The first witness was a lady representing concern in the community about the effect that tartrazine would have on children. In particular, she was concerned about children who suffer from a hyperactive disorder. The basis of her argument was that tartrazine, which is contained in many foods today, would have an adverse effect on those children. Following her submission, we received a representation from the Prawn Fishing Association, which presented a case based on the attractiveness of using tartrazine to enable it to sell its product not only in this State, but interstate.

In view of the concerns expressed by the Prawn Fishing Association and the worries of people about the health effect of tartrazine on children the committee decided to seek advice from a medico. Therefore, we contacted the Senior Medical Officer to the State of South Australia, a doctor who has had long experience in the Northern Territory both in private practice and in representing and making submissions to Governments on a range of issues. The doctor's submission basically agreed that tartrazine is being used as a colouring agent in many different types of food today. He also pointed out that sugar has been dyed to the acceptability of the human palate since the thirteenth century. We also dye butter which, over time, has become an acceptable colour for us to use. I think that the correct colour of butter is dark brown, which would probably be unacceptable from the aesthetic point of view. So, colouring food is nothing new. The good doctor pointed out to the committee that tartrazine does not have any medical mal-effect on members of our society, that it is widely used, and that he could see no reason why, from a health point of view, we should not allow tartrazine to be used in the colouring of prawns.

The arguments forwarded by the Prawn Fishing Association were based purely on a mercantile point of view, involving a concern about the industry and for markets. The question has previously been raised that the New South Wales market will not allow dyed prawns to be sold. If the practice were stopped of using tartrazine to dye prawns in this State and they were suddenly put on the market in the colour in which they were caught (which I think is white, even after cooking), I think it could affect the acceptability by the public over so many years. When people go to the fish shop to buy prawns that are pink or red, they have naturally assumed that that is the natural colour and they have become used to it.

Even if the colouring is stopped only in South Australia, you will find that the market will drop off. People will not accept it, because somehow or other it looks different, and it is just not what they have grown used to. Bearing in mind the medical evidence that it is not harmful to us, the Subordinate Legislation Committee agreed to take no action on this matter. In fact, I might point out that an overwhelming majority of the committee supported the use of tartrazine.

If we find that the markets are dropping off even in this State, because of a non-acceptance of a different colour for an old product, we are going to see some very harmful effects on the prawn industry, not only people involved in Spencer Gulf and operating from Adelaide, which in itself is already under review, as we know, but also those involved in the prawn fishing industry based in Port Lincoln and the western parts of the State. As those people stand to suffer from a reduced market, it is important from the point of view of revenue for the State and of jobs in both the Port Adelaide and West Coast regions that they continue to have the freedom to dye their products, also based on the medical evidence that there does not appear to be any harm coming from the practice of dying food and using tartrazine. As I pointed out, the Subordinate Legislation Committee overwhelmingly voted in favour of the use of tartrazine based on medical evidence.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): This is a more important proposition than I feel members in this House realise. We are talking about the livelihood of the prawn fishermen in South Australia. I think nearly every member in this House in recent months has had deputations from the prawn fishermen in relation to the financial problems they are having within their industry. The problems that have occurred as a result of a decision by this Parliament to reduce the number of prawn fishing boats in the gulf, with the remainder of the prawn fishermen, by way of a levy, having to make up the difference in order to buy out those boats, have now put the industry under severe stress.

I have certainly received a deputation from the prawn fishermen who live in my electorate, and I am sure that nearly every member in this House has in recent months received a similar deputation. So, the proposal is not something which at this stage, taking into consideration the fact that we are now in a deep recession, we should rush into. I have some sympathy for the argument put up by the member for Morphett and I can see that in the fullness of time there ought to be a phasing out of tartrazine. However, by the same token, there may be a way of replacing that particular colouring substance with a substance which is acceptable to those people who have problems with that chemical. We should explore that suggestion before we drop the guillotine down on the prawn fishermen.

I believe that the New South Wales Government is having a second look at the situation in that State. The New South Wales fishery is producing a designer prawn. They have produced a hybrid prawn which is a cross between the King prawn and the Tiger prawn. The larger prawns are becoming very expensive in the fish shops in Sydney, and the Tiger prawns are not acceptable to everyone in the community, so the New South Wales fishery has produced this hybrid prawn which may or may not be successful, depending on whether it can be reproduced. All members, particularly those from the agricultural industry who are dominant on the other side, would know that it is not always possible to reproduce a hybrid species. The New South Wales Government is looking at this proposition at the moment and may well find that it is possible to use artificial colouring in that State. I do not think that this is a regulation that we should knock out immediately.

I believe there needs to be further inquiry, particularly with the prawn fishermen themselves. I would not want to see Parliament wipe out this industry. Many people are employed in this industry, and it is very surprising to learn of the number of people who rely on those who are employed in the industry, so the domino effect would be quite great. I hope that at this stage Parliament will be prepared to leave the regulation as it is and perhaps the matter could be taken up with either the Minister of Health or the Minister of Fisheries to have a second look at what may or may not be done with the problem that some people perceive so far as artificial colouring is concerned.

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

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. Jennifer Cashmore:

That this House examine the economic, environmental, social and cultural impact of the proposed multifunction polis and examine and make public all commitments so far entered into by the Government, all costs to be incurred by the Government and the specific timetable proposed for development of the project,

which Mr De Laine had moved to amend by striking out all words after 'House' and inserting the following:

welcomes the opportunities created by having Adelaide nominated as the site for the multifunction polis and notes the approval of the Commonwealth Government for the next stage of the project involving a detailed environmental assessment of the Gillman site, an estimate of the infrastructure costs of the project and the methods of financing them, an investigation of potential business opportunities, an assessment of the impact on the social fabric of Adelaide and South Australia, and a collaborative community consultation program between the South Australian and Commonwealth Government. This House supports the work of the management group chaired by Mr Ross Adler, and looks forward to the publication of its report.

(Continued from 15 November. Page 1932.)

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): When I last spoke on this subject in November last year, I said that this motion of the member for Coles, supported by the member for Light, was a thinly disguised attempt to provide a platform to criticise—and I use the word 'criticise', not 'examine constructively'—the whole concept of the MFP. It was to be used as a sounding board to continually carp at and criticise something which I think is one of the most exciting and innovative projects that this country has seen for many years.

In fact, it sums up the attitude of some members opposite—although not all—that, if it is new and exciting, knock it. If it has not been done before, they do not want to know. Sadly, that is a part of the anti-development lobby in this State, sponsored in many ways by the member for Coles and some of her colleagues.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: The white feather brigade.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The Minister of Employment and Further Education says 'The white feather brigade', and I think that aptly sums up the type of action that has been taken by the member for Coles. Let us look at one part of the multifunction polis which was picked up by the amendment moved by my colleague the member for Price. I well remember late last year the debate that went on in which everyone, in effect, supported the concept of a world university. A world university is a key part of the multifunction polis. It will not be a fourth campus in the traditional sense. It will not be another Flinders or Adelaide, and it will not compete with existing universities or take away their resources. We are all aware that at the moment the existing traditional universities in this State, in fact all over Australia, are saying that a lot of the resources they have enjoyed in the past are being taken away, and I fully support their stand in this regard.

The world university will be a consortium of the existing three State universities in cooperation with the State Government and several overseas universities. So, it will aim to attract a world-class faculty with visiting specialist lecturers giving master classes and short courses. That is something that we really want. There has always been a complaint that all the best brains in Australia are attracted to the United States, the United Kingdom, Europe and other parts of the world where, in many cases, they are paid more money.

Mr Ferguson: And the eastern States.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: As my colleague the member for Henley Beach says, they are also attracted to the eastern States. We will be bringing the best brains into the world university, and the spinoffs will be tremendous. Yet what has been projected by members opposite is a message of doom and gloom and, because it is an initiative of this Government, because it is new and because it is different, they are all getting on the bandwagon and trying to knock it to pieces. It will be an integral part of the current Government's policy of exporting higher education to South-East Asia. Already that in itself is an exciting concept of further and higher education in this State. Too often I think the Minister responsible does not receive the plaudits due to him in relation to this matter.

The MFP theme is that the new settlement should be integrated with the whole of Adelaide. The MFP is probably the best chance we have to deal with health problems around the whole area of Gillman, Port Adelaide and the LeFevre Peninsula. No-one denies that there are problems in that area, that it has been neglected over the years and that it has been used as a dumping ground. Mr Speaker, I know it is quite close to your own electorate and that you have had a very personal involvement in the whole project. Whatever your view on the MFP, you must agree with me that the Government has embarked on extensive community consultation with all sections of the community—not just the residents, but the health workers, social workers and industry. It has done all of that.

The working party, headed by a most prominent South Australian, is gathering all these different views and feeding them back to the Government, which is coordinating them with other Government agencies. The end result is that the area in which you live, Mr Speaker, the LeFevre Peninsula, could well become the dress-circle of Adelaide. It could become the elitist area. However, members opposite, because they do not understand it, because they do not want this State to move forward in the twentieth century and because they want to continue to see us as a backwater, want to use this House as a permanent rostrum so that every week they can send forth their anti-development message.

They can take down the flag of development. They do not want to make South Australia great. In fact, I would not be at all surprised if the amendment were defeated and the motion carried; although I have faith in this House that we will win the day. Members opposite would be calling for a royal commission on the multifunction polis because they do not agree with it.

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

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): The member for Napier has given us an extraordinary outburst for a man who is a member of a Government that has not only

maintained what he describes as the backwater status of this State by comparison with others in terms of economic performance but helped to flush the State down the drain to the tune of $1 billion. For any member of that Government to have the nerve to stand up and criticise the Opposition for failure to recognise the potential of the future strikes me as being hypocritical in the extreme.

Since this motion was put on the Notice Paper, more evidence and information has come to light, it is true, but a great deal more needs to be examined by the Parliament. It is not enough to have reports, consultative committees and feasibility studies on a project as vast as this without the Parliament itself being involved. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

CLARE-MINTARO SUPPLEMENTARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Venning:

That the minutes of evidence of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation relating to the District Council of Clare-Mintaro State heritage supplementary development plan, laid on the table of this House on 24 October and 7 November 1990, be noted.

(Continued from 13 December. Page 2741.)

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Min for Environment and Planning): I have no problem with this motion to note the evidence of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, but at that point I would part company with the member for Custance in terms of some of the comments he has made about the process and about the correctness of the interpretation of the facts. It is important in the interests of good debate that I put on record in a historical perspective what has taken place so, with your indulgence, I should like to do that briefly.

In 1988 a steering committee was established to oversee a conservation and tourism study of Mintaro. The steering committee included the Mayor (Mr Bob Phillips) and the Chief Executive Officer (Ian Burfitt). In August 1989 the draft supplementary development plan was prepared, and council requested that it be placed on public exhibition. In October-November 1989 the supplementary development plan was placed on exhibition with section 43 coming into interim effect.

To overcome, in some way, the community's concerns about lack of consultation, the exhibition period was made longer than usual, opportunities for personal interviews were provided and a consultative committee, which included two representatives of council and two representatives of the Mintaro community (nominated by the council), was formed.

In February 1990 a public hearing was held at Mintaro. In April 1990, the Advisory Committee on Planning recommended an authorisation draft which included many amendments based on the submissions that were presented to me as the Minister. In June 1990 I personally visited the District Council of Clare. I also personally went and looked at the whole of the Mintaro area, and I discussed some of the issues that had been raised by members of that community, and indeed by members of the Clare council. Unlike the member for Custance, I believe that that was a very positive and cooperative meeting. A number of undertakings were given by me, and these were subsequently met.

I advised that I would forward the authorisation draft to the council for comment. This is not the normal process, but I felt that there had been less than adequate consultation previously. I fully and openly acknowledged that, and I had also written to all the residents of Mintaro apologising for that lack of adequate consultation and remedying that situation. Unlike the churlish approach of the member for Custance, I believed that things could be done better, and they were. I took this a step further and was prepared to send to the council the draft document for its comment.

The council indicated to me quite categorically that it would respond within a week of receiving this particular authorisation draft. Subsequently, in June 1990, the supplementary development plan and other documentation was forwarded to the Clare council. In August 1990 council then alleged that it had not received the supplementary development plan. So, the department sent a further copy—two copies then had been sent. In September 1990 council's comments were received and some further amendments were made to the supplementary development plan. In October 1990 the supplementary development plan was forwarded to the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, to which I think the honourable member alluded in his speech (and I think the date from memory was about 26 October). In November last year the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation requested that a proposal be included so that the SDP would be reviewed after one year of operation.

They are the facts of the matter. That is exactly what happened in terms of the time frame. I have said and will say again that I apologised for a hiccup in the consultation. In fact, I had spoken to the honourable member's predecessor and informed him what was happening. I informed the local member about the situation. I then personally visited Clare and Mintaro. One wonders what else a Minister for Environment and Planning could have done under the circumstances.

Cordial meetings were held. I gave undertakings. Every one of those undertakings was adhered to. I do not believe that there is widespread disenchantment at council level. There may well be one or two individual people, but I do not believe, in my meeting with individual councillors, that there is widespread dissatisfaction. A number of points have been raised both here and in another place with respect to this matter. I agree with the remarks that were made in another place, that Mintaro is an absolute gem and that it should not be spoilt by excessive and tasteless commercialism.

I put to the House that the reason why tourism has contributed to the renewal of vitality at Mintaro is that tourism and its related development has been based on the heritage qualities of the town: the very things that this Government is seeking to protect and preserve for posterity are the very reasons why there has been a revitalisation of the historic area of Mintaro. It is because of this that we are determined to ensure, in close working consultation with the residents and the local council, that this continues into the future.

The supplementary development plan policies make clear and public what exactly my response in relation to the proposed developments will be. In other words, we will be giving people clear guidelines about what sort of development can and cannot take place. All around the State this is the kind of thing that people are welcoming. It provides certainty for those residents and developers. The SDP incorporates innovative guidelines in a sketch form, clearly demonstrating the approaches that should be used in the conservation of buildings in Mintaro.

I am not sure whether the residents have received it, but I saw the draft pamphlet which I asked the department to prepare—a clearly understandable information brochure to be delivered to every resident in Mintaro setting out clearly

what it means to live in a heritage town and what it means in terms of alterations, extensions and future development. I do not believe that any Minister could have done more to communicate to the residents the importance of what we have done, and also to communicate clearly to them exactly what the ground rules were. I would have thought that this would be welcomed by the member for Custance, and I am disappointed that he has chosen to behave in this uncharacteristic churlish manner.

As a result of the concerns over consultation during the study period, the following steps have been undertaken. The exhibition period was extended longer than normal; the opportunity for personal interviews with officers of the department was made available to Mintaro residents; a consultative committee that included two representatives of council and two Mintaro residents was established; and a copy of the proposed authorisation draft of the SDP was forwarded to council prior to its submission to the joint committee—again, a break with past practice and tradition in an attempt to be able to say that we really were listening and that we cared about the responses from the council. All these things were additional to the procedures described in the Planning Act. In other words, they were over and above what the Minister was required to do under the Planning Act. The SDP that is about to be authorised has been amended substantially from the draft that was put on public exhibition.

I want to conclude on two points. The first is the point made by the member for Custance about the need for aerobic waste disposal in preference to a septic tank system. I remind the honourable member that this would be determined by the central board of health. The additional costs are not about $4 000: I am reliably informed that the cost of an aerobic system is about $2 500 to $3 000. I also wish—

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: If we are to preserve and protect the underground water supplies, it might well be that that has to be the price paid, but again the decision will be taken by the central board of health.

Lot 40 is in an area zoned primarily residential development; it is not in the designated town centre of Mintaro. Further, it is important that I totally and absolutely reject the point made by the member for Custance when he said that the SDP was unnecessary, a waste of taxpayers' money and carried out insensitively without anything like adequate consultation and was in fact bureaucracy at its dictatorial best. I reject those accusations totally. The evidence that I have placed on the record refutes completely the emotive statement made by the member for Custance.

Indeed, the SDP is vital if we are to preserve some of the remnants of our history, of our heritage and of our culture, and if we are to give clear guidelines to the residents of Mintaro about what they can and cannot do. I think I have demonstrated that there has been over and above the normal level of consultation. I have personally visited the area and I personally signed letters to the residents on two occasions. I am now distributing a brochure to these residents clearly outlining the guidelines. I ask the House to note the tabling of the evidence and to reject, in spirit, the quite unfair and unjust accusations that have been levelled at me and the department.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I followed the Minister's speech with interest, especially regarding the comments she made to me. I accept her apology to the people of the District Council of Clare in relation to the lack of consultation. All debate aside, this SDP was not handled very well. I will comment on the way in which the Minister handles her portfolio. You have covered, Madam, many of the problems that arose previously, particularly in terms of letting the people of Mintaro know what is going on. That did not happen previously. The fact that the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation accepted the matter only on a temporary basis was proof that it was not handled very well. I am not a churlish person: I am doing my job, and I believed that the people of Mintaro were not kept properly informed at the time. That council, a professional council, is aware of the gem it has in Mintaro and is also aware of the promotion and protection that is required.

I simply wish to highlight the fiasco of this SDP. I acknowledge and welcome the Government's revision of the SDP process that has been put in place. I pay tribute to the Clare District Council for its diligence and sensitivity towards this heritage area of Mintaro. I appreciate its professional attitude, especially towards tourism in South Australia's best kept secret, that is, the Clare Valley. I hope that SDPs, particularly those relating to Kapunda and Balaklava, in the future have a speedy and unhindered passage through the bureaucracy. I ask that the House support this motion.

Motion carried.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 December. Page 2751 .)

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): In claiming the traditional rights of the lead speaker in opposition to the motion, I assure honourable members that I will not overly delay the House. I understand there is at least one further honourable member who wishes to speak in the debate and I will try to ensure that the honourable member is able to get the call before the luncheon break. I remind members that, if this Bill is ultimately proclaimed into legislation, I will be the Minister responsible for its implementation. I will examine the issues raised by speakers in favour of the Bill and reaffirm the position of the Government.

Let us be very clear right from the start what the member for Hayward and his supporters are attempting to achieve with this Bill. This is not, as they claim, about the principle of parliamentary control or a humane concern for the safety and security of women in this State. I believe it is a blatant and clumsy attempt to undermine termination of pregnancy services in this State, to stop the pregnancy advisory centre from going ahead and to make gains for the anti-abortion lobby by undermining the intent of the 1969 legislation.

Some people do not seem to care for the safety of women at all. If they had their way, illegal abortions would again occur in this State. If they were really concerned about the health of South Australian women, they would be supporting the Government in its effort to improve existing services. The member for Hayward has told us that he wants to deny women's rights to choose to have a pregnancy termination in a stand-alone clinic. I believe that his aim is much broader than that—that his aim is to stop improvements in South Australia's services because basically he is anti-abortion.

The member for Adelaide, his colleague, blames the Government for not accepting its responsibility to provide a first-class service with ready availability, anonymity, proximity to public services, independent budgeting and management, and with specifically appointed staff, yet he indicates that he will vote for this Bill and, in so doing,

attempt to undermine the Government's efforts to provide such a service in the only feasible way open to it.

In his speech, the member for Spence drew a distinction between early and late terminations of pregnancy and rejected the Pregnancy Advisory Centre for the supposed 4 per cent of terminations that are performed 'late for no medical reason'. I think that we should get the facts straight. In South Australia it is medical practice that, in keeping with World Health Organisation guidelines, terminations are performed only up to 20 weeks unless there is a grave threat to the health of the woman or the foetus itself is malformed. The handful of terminations that are performed after 20 weeks—in 1989, there were 13, or .3 per cent of the total—were for these grave medical reasons.

Another distortion favoured by the member for Spence is to talk of abortions up to seven months. I will not bore members with the technical details of the length of the gestation period for our species, but let me simply point out that a pregnancy is 40 weeks long, and 20 weeks is exactly half of that period, so the correct time in months is actually 4½. The honourable member suggests the number of mid-trimester abortions and distorts the reasons. Terminations performed in this State between 14 and 20 weeks are performed primarily on the ground of potential damage to the foetus, 81 (or just under 2 per cent of the total) being performed in 1989. In 1989, another 93 South Australian women and young girls were financially assisted to travel interstate for mid-trimester abortions up to 20 weeks. These procedures were required for a variety of reasons, including the fact that several of those involved were schoolchildren themselves.

Mid-trimester abortion is typically the refuge of very young women who may experience difficulties with recognising a pregnancy and seek and receive assistance, and women who experience an abnormal pregnancy. There are also those women whose decision is made late because of changes in their circumstances, such as being widowed or divorced, or because of late diagnosis of pregnancy or delays in access to services. These are all difficult cases, and decisions are not made lightly either by the women or by their medical advisers. Clearly, in these situations a punitive approach is anything but the answer. I am pleased to advise members that a limited second trimester service has been established recently at the Queen Victoria Hospital on a temporary basis pending the establishment of the Pregnancy Advisory Centre.

What are the grounds for the Bill? One of the lessons of parliamentary experience is that it is really quite difficult to write legislation that achieves one thing while purporting to have quite different objectives. The ostensible reasons that the member for Hayward gives for this Bill are, first, to uphold the intentions of the Parliament and, secondly, to ensure the safety of services. Not surprisingly, given the basic duplicity of the Bill itself, neither of these grounds stands up to examination.

What was Parliament really on about in 1969? It is clear from the *Hansard* of the day that Parliament went to considerable lengths to ensure that the practice of abortion in South Australia would be publicly accountable and ethical. For example—and this is a typical comment from the debates—the Hon. Mr Edwards is reported in *Hansard* of 28 October 1969 as saying:

> If abortion is legalised, I am sure we will have some unscrupulous doctors who will capitalise on the situation, making money out of it and not worrying whether or not an abortion is necessary.

The requirement that abortions be performed in hospitals was based clearly on two considerations: first, to prevent unscrupulous doctors from profiteering and thus evading the intention of the law; and, secondly, because it was then the accepted medical standard that abortions should be performed in hospital. The establishment of a day surgery unit with full public and legal accountability goes against neither the intentions of the Parliament nor the letter nor the spirit of the law.

To suggest that the parliamentarians of the day foresaw the development of day surgery units and sought to prevent abortions being performed in them is absurd. The PAC will be a public service, under the control of a well-qualified board of management, and all the required monitoring and reporting requirements will be met. The staff will be salaried or sessional, and there will be no profit motive at all.

The other furphy that we must lay to rest is the allegation that the establishment of the PAC under the auspices of a hospital is some sort of machiavellian plot to evade having to bring a regulation to lay on the table of this House. A large range of possible sites for the PAC were investigated, including sites on hospital grounds. None of them was feasible, while the Mareeba site is ideal—and I remind members that it is on property controlled by the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in an appropriate setting with other health services. Those who support this Bill are simply casting around for reasons to object to the PAC.

The member for Spence objects to the requirement of this Bill that separate prescription would be required for a PAC on the grounds of the main Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Yet he states that not separately prescribing a PAC on other property controlled by the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is somehow an affront to the intregrity of the Parliament. As I have already said, Parliament did not foresee the development of day surgery.

Much has been made of safety and related matters. The safety of a freestanding facility must be examined. The Furler report recommended that termination of pregnancy should be provided in facilities separate from hospital departments of obstetrics and gynaecology, with separate administrations and budgets, with specifically recruited staff, in purpose-built facilities and with a capacity to provide a comprehensive pregnancy advice and termination of pregnancy service.

The supporters of these amendments make much of the fact that Furler also said (not in a recommendation but on page 69 of the report) that there can be some benefits from locating PACs in hospital grounds. The reason given in the report is the relative anonymity for patients who might otherwise be exposed to abuse and invasion of privacy. The Mareeba site will provide similar anonymity, because of the shared nature of the facilities and the layout of the site. Mareeba will allow for independent administration and staff recruitment and will provide the opportunity to give this issue the special attention it needs and has never had in this State.

I refer briefly to reasons for day surgery. This issue was raised by the member for Adelaide: why it is not possible to simply improve the coordination, timeliness, and availability of public hospital services. The simple fact is that a termination is a minor procedure in surgical terms, involving no incision and requiring only about 10 minutes to perform. It does not require hospitalisation in the majority of cases, and cannot be afforded priority within major public hospitals where it must compete against other services for which the specialised skills and equipment of a major hospital are truly necessary.

Let me remind members that terminations have been performed in freestanding services interstate for at least 16 years and that in Australia there is a total of 35 freestanding day surgery units performing a range of procedures. Termination of pregnancy is a short, safe procedure well suited

to a day surgery situation, and that is why it is common practice in most States of Australia.

The member for Spence accuses the Government of 'seeking to take abortion into the side streets away from the mainstream of medical ethics which resides in the major public hospitals'. Surely that is a twisting of reality. Does the honourable member mean to suggest that country hospitals, private hospitals or indeed the whole of general practice are unethical? The mainstream of medical ethics has supported the move of appropriate procedures to day surgery, and the PAC will have the full range of accountability and ethical safeguards. What of emergency facilities? What has been stated and implied so far is evidence of a complete lack of understanding of current hospital and medical practice. The member for Hayward has taken this misunderstanding and misinformation to the extent of including definitions in his proposed amendments which are completely meaningless. The member is attempting to create a means of disallowing the Pregnancy Advisory Centre by defining 'abortion clinic' as part of a hospital and defining 'hospital' as a place which has live-in facilities and emergency facilities for the treatment of complications arising from anaesthesia or surgery.

I think the honourable member should have taken technical advice before drafting these amendments, because he would have discovered, before wasting our time, that his definitions are quite out of touch with current medical practice. There are several points that must be made here. First, the PAC will have facilities to accommodate patients overnight. These facilities will not, in practice, be used very often, because they will not be needed. But should they be required they will be available.

Secondly, his attempt to define only hospitals as having emergency facilities is quite wrong. The common understanding of what is meant by hospital emergency facilities comprises: an anaesthetic machine, facilities to assist breathing, a defibrillator, an emergency trolley with appropriate drugs, intravenous equipment and fluids, monitoring equipment including pulse oximeter and ECG, and staffing sufficient in numbers and experience to deal with emergency situations. The PAC will have these facilities.

The planned PAC emergency facilities are on par with, if not better than, many private hospitals and country hospitals presently providing termination of pregnancy. In an emergency, such as cardiac arrest, wherever it happens the immediate aims of intervention are to resuscitate and maintain the airway until the person is moved to a hospital with appropriately specialised staff, equipment, operating theatres and intensive care facilities to deal with treatment and continuing care to achieve stabilisation.

This is the current practice no matter where the emergency happens, whether in a private hospital, a country hospital, a day surgery, such as the new Sportsmed Centre, a GP's consulting room or in the supermarket. For such an emergency, the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and Flinders Medical Centre have the most comprehensive facilities. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital provides this back-up service for surrounding health services including private hospitals. It has developed efficient working relationships which ensure the quickest and safest handling of emergency situations. It is well able to provide this service for the PAC should it ever be required.

I conclude with reference to retrievals. Country hospitals do not have these intensive care facilities close by, yet 15 country hospitals provided a total of 282 terminations of pregnancy in South Australia in 1989; 212 of these were provided at regional hospitals and the remainder (70) at subregional (39) and other (31) hospitals. If distance from the intensive care facilities of the three hospitals were really such a crucial safety issue, we would have to stop any surgical procedure using general anaesthetics from occurring anywhere other than in these three major teaching hospitals.

The PAC is ideally located, given its proximity to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The Woodville Road railway crossing is not expected to provide any barrier to this access, despite the fuss that is being made. Although this crossing is used by passenger trains to and from Adelaide every 10 minutes during peak hours and every 15 minutes at other times, the maximum closure for any passenger train is 45 seconds, and for freight trains (which use this line infrequently), the maximum closure time is 1½ minutes.

St John Ambulance reports no difficulty with access to any of the railway crossings in the metropolitan area. There have never been any complaints from ambulance drivers in getting to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital via the railway crossing in question. Other railway crossings are available, for example, Kilkenny Road.

It is important to remember that in South Australia complications occur in only .8 per cent of cases, and most of them are minor. It is estimated that transfer to hospital from the PAC would be needed for less than .3 per cent of cases or less than five a year. Even these would mostly not be life-threatening situations. The inconsistency of this Bill is obvious. If the PAC cannot provide abortions safely, then neither can most non-teaching hospitals. If safety standards are so high for abortions, what about all the other, more complex, procedures being done every day in those hospitals, particularly country hospitals? Surely those patients require equal standards, or are abortion patients so special that all our normal safeguards are inadequate? Would the member for Hayward have us shut down most of the South Australian health system?

This Bill is a botched attempt to achieve anti-abortionist aims, and it scatters unintended consequences and implications around the health system because of the costume of medical concern in which it is dressed. Its author reminds me of a story told by the Hon. Mr Potter, and reported in *Hansard* of 20 November 1969, of the Irish mother who, having listened for some time to a young celibate priest who was instructing her in the duties of motherhood, said 'I wish to God I knew as little about it as he does.' Unfortunately for the member for Hayward, knowing little is not sufficient in this case, and his Bill cannot be supported.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): We really need to look at the historical perspective to see how we got into this situation and how the debate has proceeded. I am not talking about the 1969 Act, I believe it was, which allowed legal abortion under certain regulations in South Australia; I am talking about the politics of the past 12 to 14 months. I hold the view, which is often expressed in many instances, that history is always repeated the second time as a farce. I think that that amply describes how this whole procedure has come about.

There is no doubt that after the last State election the member for Mitcham thought that he could go out and trawl with a rather large net and net a couple of members who would cross the floor and vote with the Opposition, with embarrassment for the Government. That policy failed, as indeed have many other policies that he has pursued and many other tactics that he has tried in the 14 months that I have been here. However, it was to be tried again as a farce. The only way to describe this proposal is just that—a farce.

However, it is obviously taken quite seriously by many members opposite. It is taken so seriously that I have noticed

this week—I do not think it has come to the attention of many members here—that there seems to have been some promotion for the second proposer of this motion. I notice that he has moved further down to the front benches. In the class of 1989, the interesting contest is how quickly one can get on to the front bench and move along. I am not going to take this issue—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will draw his remarks back to the motion.

Mr QUIRKE: Of course, Mr Speaker. I take this situation much more seriously than many of my colleagues who realise that it is just about promotion. This whole exercise of trying to trawl a net over here to bag one or two of our members shows the difference between the two sides. We seriously debated the issue. On the question of abortion, there are many differences on this side of the House. However, we were told by the Opposition earlier that over there there is no difference at all. They have all come at it from different angles and they all just happen to agree with the proposal. Yet over here we are not supposed to have the conscience vote. They are supposed to be the small 'l' liberals in here, with individualistic characteristics, but they all happen to think alike; they all happen to agree with it.

Many things happened in the winter recess last year. On 27 September, we noticed in the *Advertiser* an article headed 'Mareeba row not finished'. I quote from that article:

> The row over the controversial Mareeba abortion clinic is poised to erupt again, when a Liberal backbencher attempts to amend the State's abortion laws.

I think that the member for Mitcham had better watch for some ambition over there to jump more than one seat in front. The member for Hayward obviously wants to move farther along and play leapfrog with some of his colleagues. The article further states:

> Mr Brindal's bid to block the clinic has been strengthened by the Woodville council's legal challenge over the Government's bypassing of normal planning procedures.

Again, the article states:

> The Opposition had hoped Mr Atkinson would support the motion because of his concern about late abortions, but Mr Atkinson refused to cross the floor, on the grounds it would not be acted upon by the Government. Mr Atkinson claimed it did not address the heart of the issue, the 1969 amendment to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

So then we have the farce. The farce is that somebody reads the newspaper and brings in a poorly drafted attempt to achieve that end.

I have a great deal more to say on this issue, and it will not be just a few remarks. I think that this whole thing needs to be exposed for the political sham that it is. On 18 October, in the *Advertiser* again, under the heading, 'Abortion Bill today', we see:

> The Liberal member for Hayward, Mr Mark Brindal, said last night he expected the complete support of his parliamentary colleagues when the vote came.

Debate adjourned.

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

NATIVE VEGETATION BILL

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House the appropriation of such amounts of money as may be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

STATE BANK

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I now table the Deed of Indemnity between myself as Treasurer and the State Bank of South Australia entered into on 7 February 1991, and the subsequent letter dated 8 February 1991 varying that indemnity in one particular.

QUESTION TIME

STATE BANK

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Treasurer. Following my request on Tuesday urging action to secure any State Bank or Government files which may be relevant to the royal commission, will the Treasurer say what action he has taken and when? I ask this question in view of a telephone call a member of my staff received late this morning, the content of which I immediately conveyed to the Treasurer. In that call, a person purporting to be a State Bank middle manager, with detailed bank knowledge, in a very distressed tone, informed my staff member that his files containing information about sensitive bank loans were being removed this morning for shredding by officers in the business development area of the bank and that other loan files were also being shredded while bank staff attended a stop work meeting.

In raising this matter, I acknowledge that a member of the Treasurer's staff contacted my office at 1.40 this afternoon to provide some information in response to my earlier call to the Treasurer. However, I have proceeded to ask this question because I believe this matter ought to be put on the public record.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I agree with the Leader of the Opposition: it is an important matter. I am very happy to clarify the situation and explain the action that was taken. On 12 February I received a letter from the Auditor-General, which states:

> I refer to the terms of reference for my appointment to conduct an investigation pursuant to section 25 of the State Bank Act of South Australia 1983. I understand the proposals for a royal commission are now being examined. Pending the settlement of proposals for a royal commission I have continued to take steps to protect and preserve, in so far as may be within my powers, all documentation relevant to the terms of my appointment. I herewith request your assistance to ensure that all documents relevant to the terms of my appointment are dealt with in a manner which ensures that they will be available to me or my authorised officer(s) for the purpose of my investigation or the establishment of a royal commission.
>
> In examining the terms of appointment, it is apparent that documentation held by the Treasury Department, the South Australian Government Financing Authority (SAFA), and any relevant documents that may be in your possession as Treasurer and/or Premier, would fall within the abovementioned category.
>
> I have issued a summons to the State Bank, pursuant to the powers invested in me under section 34 of the Public Finance and Audit Act 1987. A copy of that summons and accompanying letter dated 11 February 1991 is attached for your information. I have also today written to the Managing Director of Beneficial Finance Limited requesting from him a written undertaking to protect and preserve all relevant documentation. A copy of that letter is also attached.
>
> I do not have the authority pursuant to the State Bank Act or any other legislation to direct entities other than the bank to comply with the requirement that I have directed to the bank.
>
> Accordingly, I would appreciate your assistance in directing the Treasury Department and SAFA to ensure that any documentation relevant to the notice of appointment is protected and preserved and is made available to me or to an authorised officer upon request.

In response to that letter, I have minuted, to both the Director of the Department of Premier and Cabinet and the Under-Treasurer, a reference to the royal commission and the Auditor-General's inquiry under section 25 of the State Bank Act. The reference states:

> It is obviously essential that any files which may be required by either the Auditor-General or ultimately the royal commission

not be removed or altered in any way. Could you please ensure that any area of Government which may have relevant files is instructed to this effect and that a detailed and accurate record is kept of the movement of any of these files.

Mr D.S. Baker: When is that dated?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is dated 13 February. Those arrangements are in place and those instructions have been issued. In terms of the commission, of course, it is a criminal offence if documents are maliciously or otherwise destroyed or withheld in those circumstances.

In relation to the matter raised by the Leader, he did telephone me with the message which he had received through a State Bank officer and which he has just reported to the House. Immediately I contacted my executive assistant and asked him to pursue this matter at once with the bank or wherever appropriate. At the time I was involved in a meeting but came out of the meeting to take the Leader's call, and took that action before resuming it.

I understand that in consequence the Chief Executive Officer of the State Bank has today issued a specific guideline to make quite sure that it is understood in the bank that with the imminent issuing of a royal commission the integrity of any documentation which may be required as evidence for the royal commission must be preserved. This, I understand, follows a directive that has already been issued in consequence of the Auditor-General's notice. I will read into the record the advice that I have just received by fax from the Chief Executive Officer:

With the imminent issuing of a royal commission it is important, as I have mentioned in previous advice, to preserve the integrity of any documentation which may be required as evidence in the royal commission.

As you would all be aware, an organisation such as ours would very quickly disappear under a mountain of paper if we did not make active use of our shredders and other document disposal. It is important, however, in the circumstances of a royal commission, that we be particularly cautious about any document that is destroyed.

I am seeking some guidelines that will enable us to continue to run our business and destroy surplus or redundant documentation as is our normal practice. For prudence, until I have that guidance, I ask staff to be particularly cautious about any shredding or other forms of document destruction so that there is no possibility any document which would fall under the possible heading of 'evidence' could be destroyed.

I emphasise that, while shredding is standard business practice, particularly where clients' confidential information is involved, we must be mindful, in the face of a royal commission, of public misconception. As soon as definitive guidelines for document destruction are determined, I will disseminate them widely.

All I can say from my point of view is that the gravity and importance of this situation has been communicated. Action has been and was taken in consequence of the Auditor-General's directive, and will be reinforced in this way. To the best of my ability I will ensure that that is complied with.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Walsh.

ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY FOOD CONTAINERS

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning indicate to the House what steps are being taken to encourage fast food companies to switch from polystyrene foam containers to more environmentally friendly food containers?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I personally, and I believe this Government, would like to see Australia's fast food industry become totally polystyrene free. I remind the Parliament that South Australia already leads the nation in introducing regulations prohibiting polystyrene foams of any sort containing CFCs. I believe that the next step is to encourage Australia's fast food companies to make a complete switch from polystyrene foam to more environmentally friendly materials.

I have already written to the Chairman of McDonald's Australia Limited urging that the chain follow the example that has been established by its parent company, which has decided—and I believe has already implemented the decision—to switch from polystyrene foam containers to cardboard containers. When one considers that the McDonald's outlets in the United States number some 4 500, one recognises that that is quite a remarkable achievement. I congratulate McDonald's for this very positive initiative.

I have received a reply from the Chairman of McDonald's Australia, and he informs me that in Australia the company is already undertaking research and examination to see whether it can switch from polystyrene foam to a more environmentally sound product such as cardboard. It seems to me that we now have to ask other fast food companies to follow this initiative, because there will be two benefits for the environment: first, of course, is that it will be an environmental plus for our rubbish dumps; and, secondly, in terms of establishing a segment of the recycling industry, we will have an outlet for Australia's wastepaper stock.

STATE BANK

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): In response to his answer to a previous question, I direct a question to the Treasurer. Has the Treasurer received advice that documents were shredded today? Will he ascertain who is responsible? What does he intend to do to assure himself that no documents that were destroyed today, or previously, had relevance to the royal commission?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will certainly follow up those matters in the time available to me. As could well be understood, I have not been able to do any more than place before the House the information that I have done, which is the immediate response today in answer to the query that was directed to the Chief Executive Officer. One would judge from that response that, if there was any such shredding activity, it was in relation to duplicate or surplus paper. But that is certainly a matter that needs to be pursued, and it will be as and when appropriate. I will bring back a further report to the House.

AWARD SUPERANNUATION

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Can the Minister of Labour inform the House whether he is aware that the Federal Opposition spokesman on retirement incomes stated that the Liberals would end award superannuation? An article entitled, 'Liberals would end award super', on page 1 of the *Melbourne Age* dated Thursday, 7 February 1991 stated:

The Opposition spokesman on retirement incomes, Senator Alston, in a speech to be given in Canberra today, states the coalition would introduce legislation to stop the Industrial Relations Commission being able to grant across the board increases in superannuation.

An honourable member: Get up to date with what is going on.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

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

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I am fully aware of the proposal by the Federal Liberal Party to end award superannuation. This step would be an attack on the process of extending important superannuation benefits to ordinary working people and their families. Superannuation is a key element in the Federal Government's strategy to achieve higher living standards for people—

Mr S.G. EVANS: I rise on a point of order. Mr Speaker, I believe that this matter has no relevance to this House at all. It is a Federal matter and I believe that it has no relevance to this House.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is of the opinion that the results of that action could have effects upon the State under the responsibility of this Minister and, subject to the response given, I will allow it.

Mr S.G. EVANS: On a further point of order, Mr Speaker, every action that a Federal Government takes has an effect upon a State, but that does not necessarily make it relevant to the State.

The SPEAKER: That is so. Under Standing Orders a Minister or any member of this House can be required to respond only to an area of responsibility to this House. The Minister of Labour has a responsibility to this House in the area of superannuation and working conditions under his labour portfolio. As I said, I will listen to the response. If it strays from his direct responsibilities to the House, I will withdraw leave.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Superannuation is a key element in the Federal Government's strategy to achieve higher living standards for people who have retired, which is vital, given our ageing population. Before 1986, it is estimated that only 40 per cent of the work force were in receipt of superannuation. Eighty per cent of Australian workers are covered by awards, and by the end of 1990 up to 85 per cent of those workers—including many blue collar workers—had supperannuation entitlements. The Federal Industrial Relations Act has been amended recently to strenghthen the provisions on the enforcement of award based superannuation. Award superannuation forms an important part of the ACTU national wage case claim with proposed increases of 1 per cent effective from July 1991, 1 per cent effective from May 1992 and 1 per cent effective from May 1993.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to relate this information directly to his response.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I will do that, and for the benefit of the member for Davenport I will explain the close connection that superannuation, which is provided in the awards of the State Industrial Commission, would have if unfortunately the Liberal Party were elected in Canberra.

The member for Davenport has forgotten, or perhaps has never known, that the wages and conditions set for South Australian workers follow the decisions in national wage cases. The superannuation decisions in the Industrial Relations Commission and its predecessor, the Arbitration Commission, clearly set the standards that have applied in South Australia. The South Australian commission is following mirror awards of the national commission which provide for superannuation. I suggest that the member for Davenport should ensure in his electorate that, in respect of all employers who have obligations under State awards to provide superannuation, they should pay, because a number of employers have seen fit not to pay.

When there has been a catastrophe with a particular worker, the employer has found himself liable for considerable payments for which he has made no provision. I am advised of one particular case where an employer, who decided not to pay into a superannuation fund as he thought it did not apply to him and did not want to pay, finished up bankrupt. Of course, that had the effect of denying that worker and his family superannuation benefits, so that is a short-sighted attitude to adopt.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: It is all right for members opposite to make noises about this. They profess to look after the interests of little people in South Australia, but what they are really saying is that they do not want the little people to have provision for their old age.

STATE BANK

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Will the Treasurer ensure that the terms of reference of the State Bank royal commission are sufficiently wide to examine any potential conflicts of interest surrounding State Bank loans in respect of properties and companies controlled by State Bank senior executives? We have in our possession documentation that raises serious concerns with respect to one such company, Colac Proprietary Limited.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As the honourable member would be aware, the terms of reference of the royal commission are under discussion and consideration at the moment. We hope that those terms of reference will be drawn up comprehensively and appropriately so that all matters that need to be canvassed will be canvassed. As part of that process, we have invited the Opposition to have an input into the terms of reference and, in addition to the document that was supplied to us on Tuesday, my colleague the Attorney-General, who is working on this exercise, has already had discussions with the Opposition. As soon as we are in a position to announce the terms of reference, the scope of the royal commission will be apparent.

However, in saying that, I would like to make two points. First, the commission must be properly constituted and we must ensure that all aspects are covered, particularly such connection with the Auditor-General's section 25 inquiry—whether or not that should continue or be taken up by the royal commission—the number and nature of the commissioners and various other legal matters. We cannot jump into this in a half-cocked manner; therefore, I make it quite clear that the Government does not see itself working to a timetable for the establishment of the royal commission but it is ensuring that as quickly and appropriately as possible those things are done. If they are not, there is no point in having a royal commission. That process is under way and obviously questions such as the honourable member's will be included for consideration.

The second point that I would like to make about the royal commission, which I think is very important indeed, is that customers and clients of the bank must be assured that the royal commission will not, in public, ventilate affairs that are appropriately the prerogative of those clients and customers and their banker. That should provide no inhibition to the discussion and consideration of the issues which have been raised.

However, I make it quite clear that as the Government sees it, either the terms of reference of the royal commission or the *modus operandi* of the commission itself should provide for that. It is quite obvious why that must be the case—because there are so many clients of the State Bank, particularly most of the significant operators in our South Australian economy, who are not themselves the subject of investigation or inquiry. They must feel absolutely assured that it is not their business dealings that are under consid-

eration but the processes, management and information aspects of the State Bank operations. Therefore, I welcome the opportunity given by the honourable member's question to put that very clearly on the record. My understanding is that the Leader of the Opposition would also support that aspect and, if required, provide that assurance. I think it is essential that it is.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT HOT WEATHER POLICY

Mr McKEE (Gilles): I direct my question to the Minister of Education. Does the Government have a policy to deal with school attendances on very hot days such as the first day this term when the temperature reached 43 degrees centigrade?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The Education Department does have a hot weather policy to cover those days when the temperature exceeds 36 degrees. Students can be dismissed one hour early when the estimated maximum temperature is 36 degrees. If the Bureau of Meteorology forecasts that the temperature will reach 38 degrees or more then students can be dismissed at 12.30 p.m.

These guidelines for early dismissal also take into account particular factors in a school, for example, whether or not the school has air-conditioning. Other local circumstances, such as school bus runs or other transport options, are also taken into account. These arrangements are determined in consultation with parents to ensure that they can make suitable plans to have children supervised when they are dismissed early.

So far as staff are concerned, they remain on duty on days of early dismissal. All students whose parents are unable to make appropriate arrangements for early dismissal—and it must be acknowledged that these days many parents are in that situation—are provided with supervision by the school until the normal dismissal time. The hot weather policy is explained in an administrative instruction, issued by the Education Department to all schools. Parents should contact their local school if they have not yet given the school written permission for their children to be dismissed early on very hot days.

STATE BANK

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Was the Premier consulted before the termination package for Mr Marcus Clark was finalised? On Tuesday the Premier was requested to give information on Mr Marcus Clark's package. Does he have an answer yet?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There would seem to be a second question there. In relation to the question that was actually asked—was I consulted as to the package—when the Chairman advised me that Mr Marcus Clark was to resign I made the point to him that it should be in accordance with Mr Marcus Clark's contract: there should be no special or other conditions connected to it, and the Chairman assured me that that would be the case.

PRIVATE HOSPITAL AT PORT AUGUSTA

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Can the Minister of Health inform the House whether any proposal has yet been received for a private hospital to be established at Port Augusta and provide any other information associated with such a proposal?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The short answer is that no proposal has been received. However there has been exchange of correspondence, both with me and with my officers. Most recently, as I recall, I wrote to the Acting Town Clerk of Port Augusta, that was at the end of January, when the Town Clerk must have been on annual leave. The Health Commission has been contacted about this matter by the municipality, by people associated with the hospital and, indeed, by interests who are keen to see a private hospital built in the town.

My information is that one of my senior officers wrote back, at least to one of those interests, and there was further correspondence to my office. I indicated in that further response that it would be difficult for me or for the Health Commission not only to comment but to give any support without a specific proposal before us. That proposal has not yet been forthcoming. It may or may not be. I cannot assist the House more than that.

There has been some enthusiasm on the part of our teaching hospitals for the possibility of closer association with existing private hospitals or the setting up of private hospitals on the campus of one or other of those hospitals. Members will be aware that the Health Commission has cleared the way for a close association between Flinders Medical Centre and Ashford Hospital in relation to certain aspects of cardiac surgery. In addition, it is known that Flinders would be interested in the construction of a private facility on its campus. That is one of the matters that was canvassed in earlier correspondence with the Port Augusta council in relation to this matter. Until such time as I or the Health Commission have a specific proposal before us, we do not think it is appropriate that we should give any particular indications of support.

STATE BANK

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I direct my question to the Treasurer. Referring to the answer that he gave to my colleague the member for Bragg, are we to infer that Mr Clark was paid up to the middle of 1992, which was the period of his contract, and can we have a copy of that contract tabled?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In answer to a previous question, I said that I will get those details from the board, if possible. That request—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Premier please resume his seat. There is a Standing Order relating to repetitive questions. In the *Hansard* of Tuesday there is an undertaking, and there is also a convention of a time lead on the response to questions. Whether two days is enough is for Parliament to decide. However, there was an undertaking and there is a tradition to stand by that. I think that two days to cause this uproar in Parliament is a short time. The honourable Premier will finish his answer.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I have nothing to add in the light of your statement.

HOUSING TRUST RENTS

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction advise the House on the progress of the introduction of Australia Post collection of Housing Trust rents? On 23 October last, in answer to a question I

asked on this matter, the Minister indicated that the aforementioned authorities were close to agreement. This morning I received an inquiry from a constituent in Pedlar Street, Seaton, who asked what progress has been made and when the matter will be finalised.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Albert Park for his question. He has been very interested in this issue, obviously on behalf of his constituents, and has previously raised the matter of South Australian Housing Trust rental collection. I am pleased to say that negotiations with Australia Post are going very well and they should be finalised in the next few weeks when we may see this service implemented. The trust hopes to see the implementation of this service through Australia Post by 1 May. I am pleased to advise the member that he can inform his constituents that 1 May 1991 will see Australia Post acting as an agent for the Housing Trust.

Not only will the trust be able to offer that service through Australia Post but we want to be able to offer the direct debit process from social security at the same time. In fact, those people who find it difficult, because their mobility is affected or because of other commitments, to make payments through an agent of the trust will be able to use Australia Post or the direct debit process. That will be a voluntary arrangement. We have been negotiating directly with Senator Richardson's department to have that arrangement put in place by the end of the year.

That will be of significant benefit to trust tenants. Australia Post collection will provide a much better service to our 63 000 tenants. There will be some 490 locations for rent payment throughout the State compared with the 60 now available through counter service at 16 trust offices and 44 agencies. From 1 May we will see a very clear indication from the community that the service will be improved through the provision of 490 new collection areas. This will provide trust clients with a significant service, as will the direct debit facility. That will be a direct benefit to us in terms of administration costs and has been built into our cost-saving program as part of the Housing Trust's contribution to the Government agency review committee. I am pleased to inform the member for Albert Park of these initiatives and, with his support and enthusiasm, we will see Australia Post on 1 May introducing the collection scheme as well as the direct debit process.

STATE BANK

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Will the Treasurer advise whether any of the State Bank's senior executives were paid bonuses or other remuneration linked to the business they wrote, irrespective of its profitability? In each of the past two years the State Bank's total assets grew by about 40 per cent to a total of some $21 billion. We have been informed that large asset growth bonuses paid to senior executives were not included in the salary details made available by the bank during the past week.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am aware that a bonus scheme was or is in operation at the State Bank. I do not have the details of it, but certainly I will make some inquiries of the board.

AUTOMOTIVE TARIFFS

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology outline to the House the current state of play in the automotive tariff debate and the implications it has for South Australia should the Federal Government adopt the Industry Commission recommendations?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his very important question. The stage has now been reached where the Industry Commission has submitted its report to the Federal Government and it is in the process of considering that matter. It is possible that it will make a statement on the matter in combination with the industry statement expected in the first half of March. We are concerned about the recommendations of the Industry Commission. I advised the House previously on actions we have taken in putting a State Government viewpoint on behalf of South Australia and we have indicated that the initial proposal being floated for a zero tariff base was totally unacceptable. We indicated that the Industry Commission draft report proposal for a 15 per cent tariff by 1995 was also unacceptable in terms of the industry, and we now believe that the modified report is still a very serious threat to the future of the automotive industry in this country.

The modified proposal is for a 15 per cent tariff base by the year 2000 plus the retention of the by-law affecting the Australian automotive component industry. We are firmly of the view that 25 per cent is the lowest level to which the tariff should be reduced by the year 2000. We have argued that if that were the case we would achieve a maintenance of pressure on the automotive industry in this country to effect the necessary reforms to make it internationally competitive. That pressure must exist—we accept that.

Indeed, a 25 per cent base would be a reduction from the present level of 40 per cent tariff, and the tariff by 1992-93 of 35 per cent. So, a significant reduction will be achieved. To meet the requirements of that, and to remain viable in the Australian market, Australian automotive producers will have to improve their productivity by 1 per cent per annum greater than the figure that will be achieved by the Japanese automotive industry over this decade. That in itself is a major pressure point, one that we believe should be applied.

However, the industry commission proposals would require that the Australian automotive industry improve its productivity by 3 per cent per annum in excess of what the Japanese industry will be achieving. Our argument is that that will not lead to investment decisions being made: it will lead to disinvestment decisions being made, and as a result the automotive industry will be a shadow of its former self by the end of this century. That would put at serious risk many jobs throughout Australia. Some 60 000 people are employed in the Australian automotive industry and its related components. In South Australia, if the multiplier effect is taken into account, we face a real threat to in excess of 20 000 jobs by the end of the decade.

Because of the seriousness of that, we have been holding a series of briefings. Earlier this week I briefed industry leaders in South Australia. Invitations were extended to spokespersons of other Parties, and I was pleased to see that the Democrats in another place were represented. This morning I briefed the South Australian members of the Federal Caucus indicating our point of view. We have also briefed some Federal Ministers on this matter, and we are maintaining contact. Of course, the Premier has been doing a lot of work in this regard and I, likewise, will take all avenues available to me to pursue this matter.

It is essential that we continue to put the case that manufacturing in this country is important and that the automotive industry is an important part of manufacturing. The way to recognise that is to put judicious pressure on the industry to become internationally competitive, not pressure that will see it wiped out with massive disinvestment and job loss.

STATE BANK

Mr SUCH (Fisher): Will the Treasurer now provide a list of all beneficiaries of the 58 off balance sheet companies, trusts and partnerships that the State Bank Group admitted to late last year, together with full details of directorships and any directors' fees and other entitlements paid?

Despite his pre-Christmas assurance to the House, the Treasurer has yet to answer the member for Hanson's question without notice of 11 December 1990 which requested this information. Since that time, company searches have revealed the existence of the company First Pacific Mortgage Proprietary Limited with majority ownership by Beneficial Finance and its then off balance sheet company Kabani. Early directors of First Pacific Mortgage (initially called Simcal Glen Limited) included the new Managing Director of Beneficial, John Malouf, and former Beneficial executive, Eric Reichert. In 1988 First Pacific Mortgage's four directors were John Baker and Manob Chakravarti of Beneficial, as well as Robert Andrew-Smith and Peter Carkagis. In that year two of the four directors were paid between $80 000 and $99 000, and one between $140 000 and $149 999. At least one Beneficial executive received a substantial payment from an affiliate in addition to his remuneration from Beneficial.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will certainly check out that matter. I understood that some reply had been furnished to the honourable member regarding the question referred to but, if that is not the case, or if that information was inadequate, I will certainly chase it up.

PORT LINCOLN ABORIGINAL ORGANISATION

Mr HERON (Peake): Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs advise whether or not the Port Lincoln Aboriginal Organisation has been successful in its bid to lease or purchase the Wanilla Forest west of Port Lincoln, which, I understand, it intends to use for enterprise developments?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I thank the honourable member for his question, and I am sure it is a matter that will be of interest to our friend and colleague, the member for Flinders, who has had an interest in this area. I am pleased to detail to the House that the State Government has approved the handover of ownership of Eyre Peninsula's historic Wanilla Forest to the Aboriginal Lands Trust.

The 692 hectare eucalypt forest will be leased from the trust by the local Port Lincoln Aboriginal Organisation. The State Government, and I am sure every member in this House, recognises the importance of trying to assist with training and developing an enterprise culture in Aboriginal communities. We also recognise that the key to Aboriginal advancement is jobs, in particular, jobs that affirm Aboriginal cultural identity. Therefore, it is important to assist Aboriginal people to become more economically independent through encouraging a range of employment initiatives.

Wanilla Forest was established in the 1880s in order to foster native timber production and to provide a nursery for the distribution of plants to West Coast farmers. In mid-1988 the Woods and Forests Department decided to end commercial operations at Wanilla and seek expressions of interest for the future management of the area. I am pleased to record the very strong support of the Minister of Forests and his department in assisting the Port Lincoln Aboriginal Organisation in its plans to fully utilise the forest for the employment and training of local Aboriginal people.

State Cabinet has approved the purchase of the forest from the Woods and Forest Department, and ownership will be vested in the Aboriginal Lands Trust. I have a great deal of confidence in the Port Lincoln Aboriginal Organisation. It currently manages some 17 projects and it is a most enterprising organisation. The fact that its wages budget has grown from about $68 000 back in 1985 to more than $400 000 today shows its success in developing jobs for Aboriginal people.

The organisation has developed a management plan for the Wanilla Forest with an aim of providing 30 jobs for Aboriginal people within five years. They will be involved in a range of forestry operations—treated and untreated posts, wood chips, firewood and nursery operations—conservation projects and the operation of an information centre and tea rooms.

STATE BANK

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): Can the Treasurer confirm that SAFA's unusual purchase of the leasehold rights to the Citi Centre building last December enabled the developers to repay a State Bank loan of $30 million, and is this not further evidence that the Treasurer knew that the bank was in trouble before January this year?

The *Advertiser* of 21 December 1990 reported that the South Australian Government Financing Authority (SAFA) made a surprise purchase of $35.5 million of the Citi Centre ground lease. The deal is not one which falls within the corporate objectives of the central borrowing authority, and the SAFA Assistant Manager, Mr Harding, told the *Advertiser* that the investment in Citi Centre was a one-off decision.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The answer to the question is 'No.' The reason for that transaction was to take advantage of the market conditions and, on favourable terms, ensure that a condition could be met earlier. In fact, there was an obligation on the Government to purchase the Citi Centre, I think in 1994. Mr Speaker, I could take this question on notice, but I will deal with it in this form. So, that obligation to purchase would occur at a particular time. The conditions in the market were such that an offer was made in relation not to the State Bank but to others involved in the Citi Centre which made it desirable and opportune, and a good financial deal, to bring that purchase forward. Indeed, that is what has been done.

LYELL McEWIN HOSPITAL

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Following the resumption of orthopaedic surgery at the Lyell McEwin Hospital, is the Minister of Health in a position to report to the House on the provision of ear, nose and throat surgery at that very fine hospital?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Since 1988, when orthopaedic surgery was discontinued at the Lyell McEwin, resources have been available to be put into ENT. Some of those resources are now going into the orthopaedic surgery service which is now proceeding. It is important that there be a position in the northern suburbs that will ensure the future of ENT surgical services for that area.

The Royal Australian College of Surgeons has a regional training committee on otorhinolaryngology and there have been some discussions with that committee whose services, incidentally, perhaps should have been called upon in this place on Tuesday and Wednesday, but that is another matter. As a result of advice from that committee, the Lyell McEwin and Modbury hospitals are preparing a joint sub-

mission for a training position, and one would hope that things will flow from that. But, in any event, knowing the honourable member's interest in what I agree is a very fine institution, I will endeavour to keep him and the House informed.

WORKCOVER

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Can the Minister of Labour confirm that the very large blow-out in WorkCover's administrative costs could be attributable in part to the high increase in rent paid to the State Bank, which owns their new accommodation? Will he reveal to the House WorkCover's full leasing expenses as well as its other accommodation expenses?

The WorkCover Corporation is located in the Henry Waymouth Building at 100 Waymouth Street, Adelaide. In its 1989-90 annual report, WorkCover claims its accommodation expenses have more than doubled over the 1988-89 figure to a leasing cost of $2.3 million, while the other operating costs associated with the lease of that building have more than tripled to $3.3 million. Members will realise, if they have perused that report, that the other operating costs were not specifically enumerated. Can the Minister please enlighten the House?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The matter of WorkCover has been the subject of considerable scrutiny in this House and I thought the member for Mount Gambier would have realised that, when the WorkCover organisation moved into the Henry Waymouth building, it was also the culmination of bringing into that organisation a considerable number of people who used to work for the State Government Insurance Commission. I am sure that members will recall—

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: If the member for Mount Gambier is patient, he will get his answer. Members will recall that when WorkCover was established three years ago the State Government Insurance Commission was contracted for a period to establish claims and payment. I think that that contract was terminated in April last year, when WorkCover itself took over that task, so one could imagine that the work force of WorkCover would increase considerably as a result. Consequently there would be an increase in rent, because WorkCover would be responsible for the placement on the floor area of more people than had been there before. However, I will get details of the exact differences for the honourable member. My advice is that the Henry Waymouth Centre was leased by WorkCover at very favourable rents at the time it undertook that lease in comparison to other city properties it could have leased.

DUCK HUNTING

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Planning. Can the Minister outline the chief elements of the Government's recently announced policy on duck hunting?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I did not realise that this was such a humorous topic, but I am delighted to see the interest from Opposition members. As the Minister responsible not only for environment and planning but also animal welfare, I can assure members opposite that I have a very deep understanding of the many and varied issues relating to this topic. About 12 months ago, I established—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The front bench of the Opposition will come to order—I cannot hear the answer to the question.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Some considerable time ago, I established a task force to advise me so that I could then take a policy proposal to my Cabinet colleagues with respect to this whole question of duck hunting. It is not putting too fine a point on it to suggest that this is an emotive topic. There are in our community people who feel very strongly one way or another about this issue.

I am delighted to inform the House that I brought together some very disparate groups with publicly stated positions, such as animal welfare organisations and the South Australian Field and Game Association, together with the Police Force, and representatives of my department and other Government agencies. The task force—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I have the next 10 minutes, Mr Speaker. If I cannot be given the courtesy—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The result of the very positive and cooperative work undertaken by this task force culminated in a report which I released on behalf of this review committee which I—and I think the vast majority of South Australians—believe is a very reasoned and balanced report, upon which the Government has made its policy decisions.

On 3 December 1990, I announced the Government policy with respect to the future practices of duck hunting. The controls that have now been announced, and, in fact, negotiated with the South Australian Field and Game Association and the conservation movement, are that future duck hunters will be subjected to compulsory TAFE courses and examination in duck identification. I remind the House that this is current practice in Victoria. These programs and courses will be developed in consultation with members of my department, the conservation movement and the South Australian Field and Game Association. Lead shot will be phased out over the next two seasons. Hunting fees will be increased by 50 per cent in the coming year, and 50 per cent of the fee collected will be redirected to the rehabilitation of existing Crown wetlands.

In addition, as Minister of Lands, I have instigated a review on two levels, the first being a review of the allocated Crown lands to see how we can identify those areas that could be established as new wetlands. Some of those new wetlands may well be eminently suitable for duck hunting, and some may need to be incorporated into our national parks system. Secondly, we will review the Crown wetlands, again to establish those wetlands that most appropriately may be incorporated into the national parks system and those lands whose future use for duck hunting can be negotiated with the South Australian Field and Game Association. I believe that this Government has produced a balanced and reasonable policy that has widespread support in the South Australian community.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): Will the Treasurer supply to the Parliament by next Tuesday—3½ working days hence—a list of the addresses of all properties bought and sold by SGIC for each of the past five financial years and thus far in 1990-91, indicating the purchase or sale price of each property?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That question ought to be listed on the Notice Paper. It is not a question without notice and it indicates the farcical way—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —in which the Opposition is treating this whole exercise.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Will the Minister of Youth Affairs provide to the House details about the project to be undertaken by young people in the Youth Conservation Corps?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I thank the honourable member for his question. Of course, I think that all of us would be aware of the very strong interest that young people have in conservation and environmental issues. That has certainly been evidenced by the hundreds of young people to whom I have spoken at meetings around the State. We are trying to harness the interest in conservation and environmental issues in terms of getting unemployed young people back into training, education and jobs. The first intake of the conservation corps was launched last month by the Premier and the internationally-renowned environmentalist, Dr David Suzuki.

The unique aspect of this program is that it will not only harness the energy of the young people to whom I have referred, help our environment and raise community awareness of conservation issues but, in the process, will enable them to upgrade their skills so that they can get those jobs to which I referred. The program incorporates about 50 per cent formal training in a TAFE college and 50 per cent on-the-job training. Students will leave the program not only with improved competency in numeracy, literacy and communication skills but also with accredited modules from TAFE courses in areas such as horticulture, natural resource management and gardening and greenkeeping.

Dr Suzuki said that he was very keen to recommend this type of program to Canadian provincial Governments and, indeed, to the Federal Government of Canada. The first two projects are already underway: one at Canunda National Park, which I understand is in the electorate of the Leader of the Opposition in the South-East, and one at Para Wirra Recreation Park. In the Para Wirra Recreation Park the project will focus on the Para Wirra Study Centre and will include revegetation methods such as weed eradication, seed collection and plant propagation.

Two trails will also be developed using the theme of interrelationships in the environment. Erosion control will be an important aspect of the trail development to minimise the impact of people in the area. The Canunda National Park project will extend a walking trail along the cliff area. A pamphlet based on the theme of coastal vegetation will be developed as an interpretive facility for the trail. I am certainly pleased to have the very strong support of my colleague the Minister for Environment and Planning and, of course, support from a number of internationally eminent environmentalists such as Paul Erlich as well as Dr David Bellamy, the British conservationist, and the Tasmanian Green member of Parliament, Dr Bob Brown.

I am also interested to hear that a number of other State Governments will take up similar projects and that the New South Wales Opposition has pledged $10 million as part of its election platform. I am sure that the program will enjoy the support of both sides of the House. I am certainly pleased to announce that the next scheme to be developed will involve Aboriginal youth in a conservation project in a rural area.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SUPERANNUATION INVESTMENT TRUST

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): Will the Treasurer explain why SASFIT purchased nearly 4 million convertible notes in Interchase and why it has now agreed to loan the debt-ridden Queensland property developer up to $44 million, and is this to enable Interchase to service its $170 million debt to the State Bank and other key lenders? The South Australian Superannuation Investment Trust (SASFIT), through which the Treasurer invests public servants' superannuation contributions, last year doubled its holding of $2.25 convertible notes in Interchase Corporation Limited at the same time as the Queensland property developer posted a $114 million loss. The *Financial Review* last week reported that SASFIT was to lend up to 80 per cent of a five year $55 million loan to Interchase as well as allowing $120 million of Interchase's convertible notes to be interest free. An independent report by Grant Samuel and Associates says that the deal is 'barely adequate' and that Interchase 'will remain overgeared and there must be a significant chance that further liquidity problems will arise in the future'.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am advised that SASFIT was involved in this investment during the period 1987-90. It invested $9 million in 4.5 million convertible notes of Interchase, two million of which were purchased in 1989-90. I point out that SASFIT is not alone in participating in this investment, the main asset of which is the Myer centre in Brisbane. Other note holders include AMP, National Mutual, Nomura and NRMA. I think one can therefore see it as an authentic and appropriate transaction for a number to be in. I understand that it has particular benefits for SASFIT in terms of its overall portfolio.

Interchase is in difficulties because it is highly geared. Its rental income is not sufficient to service its debts. The Myer centre has seen a drastic reduction in its value, along with all the other properties around Australia that have seen such a reduction. Despite its sound trading performance—I understand that it is trading well—its value has reduced quite sharply in the current circumstances. Because SASFIT regards it as a fundamentally well placed investment, one that over time will definitely bounce back and return value, it took a lead role in devising a rescue package to enable the centre to trade through its present difficulties. Part of that was to commit itself to a further loan facility of up to $24 million, provided another commitment was made. I understand that is the basis on which that investment is being preserved and maintained in the current climate. I would imagine that, in terms of SASFIT's overall investment objectives, that is a very sensible action for it to take to ensure that its investment is fully required. In fact, it is protecting its money.

I should like to make one final point in relation to SASFIT, which is not a Government financial institution. SASFIT invests the contributions made by members of the State superannuation scheme. Those contributions, made by employees of the State Public Service, go into the fund, which in turn is invested to return value. The performance of SASFIT, which is examined every year in the Estimates, has been very good in comparison with other similar trusts, and I hope that it will continue to do so. But I stress again that SASFIT is not under the direction of the Government and is not managing taxpayers' money; it is managing the contributions of those employed in the Public Service.

WATERWORKS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 February. Page 1920.)

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): The Opposition does not support this legislation, I do not support this legislation and I am sure that the vast majority of my constituents do not support this legislation. Morphett has a good cross-section of the community. It has a range of salaried incomes, self-employed people, superannuants, pensioners and retirees. This legislation will impact on every one of them in the form of back-door taxation, assets tax or property tax. I do not care what this Parliament ends up calling this legislation and the tax attached thereto; the reality is that it is an assets tax—a tax that is imposed on people who are unfortunate enough to be living in properties with a value of more than $111 000.

Many people in my district are asset rich because they have been living in their properties for many years. Those properties have appreciated in value. By natural inflation those properties have reached the stage where they qualify for this tax. The people who live in these houses do not have money. They may be asset rich by the definition of this Government, but they are not income rich; nor do they have many assets on which they can call to pay for this legislation. My constituents are extremely concerned about this direction and they object strongly to it.

As was pointed out by another member last night, it is purely a case of misguided socialism, the Government of the day deciding to tax who it perceives as the rich living in houses valued at more than $111 000 so that people living in houses valued under $111 000 do not have to pay. We cannot call that social justice—a hackneyed expression that the Labor Party puts around—because the vast majority of people in the western suburbs live in houses that are valued at over $111 000 purely because of inflation. I could take the Minister to dozens of homes in the Glenelg area for which elderly people paid £12 000 to £15 000 but with inflation the value of those houses is now more than $111 000, and those people qualify. There is no earthly reason why a Government should try to claim a wealth tax on those people. Some have no money in their bank accounts and rely on their pensions. If they are superannuants who do not qualify for the benefits that other pensioners get, they rely on their superannuation cheque. They are not rich people, and for the Government to try to bring them into its net is outrageous. The Government deserves to be condemned and I hope that will be reflected in the ballot box at the next election.

Regarding small business, I understand that the Hon. Hugh Hudson, as author of the report submitted to the Government, included benefits and recommendations that could help the commercial sector. The Government has chosen to ignore the input of the Hon. Hugh Hudson in terms of commercial rating. The Bill does very little to assist in relation to property markets or to help people to find tenants. Already in the metropolitan square mile of Adelaide there are many buildings without tenants because of the downturn and depression that has hit the financial sector of this country. Those involved in the letting of those properties are having extreme difficulty finding tenants, and the situation is not being helped by the fact that, when a person takes out a lease, rates and taxes are superimposed on that lease. I understand that Mr Hudson put forward proposals that could have provided some sort of relief for the tenants, but the Government has not addressed them in the Bill. This Bill does nothing to help those people at all.

The member for Davenport also raised an interesting question in regard to the taxing and water rating of properties held under mortgage. Many people, young couples in particular, have purchased a house which they consider their 'own' for well over $111 000—up to $140 000 or $150 000. They have little equity in it and have a huge mortgage. Sometimes when I hear of some of the commitments that young people put themselves into I am astounded, but as far as the Government is concerned the value of the property is in excess of $111 000. Those people are now considered wealthy by the Minister and come under the definition of such and will therefore be taxed. I assume that a person with a house valued at $150 000 with only $40 000 or $50 000 equity in it will be caught up in this wealth tax or assets tax that this socialist Government will impose on them.

In winding up the debate I ask the Minister to refer to unit holders on strata titled blocks which have only one water meter. Will the Minister explain what will happen with the rating of these units so that I can circulate her reply around my district? For example, with a block of 10 units all individually valued at around $90 000 with a common water meter for the whole property, the value of the whole property is about $900 000. If under the Act the mean value of the property is set at $111 000, does that mean that an additional property value rate will be struck on the difference between $111 000 and $900 000, or will each individual unit be treated as a separate entity and not be subject to an individual additional property rate? Alternatively will each unit have to bear the expense of putting in separate meters so that they will be treated as separate properties for water rating purposes to avoid the additional property rate? The other day I spoke privately to the Minister about this matter. I have had 12 to 14 individual approaches on this issue from unit owners or land agents in the district, and I would appreciate the Minister's giving a considered reply so that I can inform my constituents.

I commend the excellent contribution made in this debate by the lead speaker from the Opposition, the member for Heysen. He summarised extremely well the Opposition's position and our concerns. In deference to those who still wish to speak, I will conclude my remarks by saying that I do not support the legislation.

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): When the scheme was first mooted it was deemed to be fair and equitable and in line with the user-pays principle. The user-pays principle was accepted by most people in our community, and most of our citizens are fair and rational. They considered it difficult in depressed conditions to argue the principle of user pays. Therefore, a rationalisation of our water rating system which was fair and equitable and which endorsed the user-pays principle would have been accepted by the people of this State, I am quite sure. Unfortunately, this has not happened. Instead, the elderly in their retirement will be penalised for maintaining their family home and, as victims of inflated market values, young families who are continually put at risk by this Government's policies will also be penalised. The young families will be penalised whether or not the mortgage held by the bank happens to be three-quarters of the equity value of their property.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mrs KOTZ: The people to whom I am referring are not wealthy—neither the elderly on pensions nor young families. Young families, struggling to pay their mortgages cannot conceivably be classified as wealthy. Yet, this Government, through this totally iniquitous Bill, has reclassified, on the whole, the average citizen as wealthy. For

those reasons, this is not a wealth tax, as some of my colleagues have stated: it is a deprivation tax. This Government deprives its citizens of their standard of living in an attempt to fill the State Treasury's ever deepening, bottomless, current revenue pit. I will read into the record one of many letters that I have received from constituents who are highly concerned about the effects of this Bill. This letter comes from an elderly pensioner.

The resident was reacting to an advertisement placed in the *Advertiser* by this Government. He has highlighted a specific section of the article. Regarding the charge on capital value over $111 000, the article states:

> This is intended to recover the much higher costs associated with the level of service provided to higher value properties.

The gentleman's reaction to that article in his letter to me was:

> This statement is absolute hogwash. The suggested charge is absolutely discriminatory. In my own situation, which is one of majority, my house is valued over $111 000, my neighbours are less. The service to our homes is the same, and has been in service for approximately 30 years. It costs no more to connect to our house than it did theirs. After all they [E&WS Department] are quick to tell you their responsibility finishes at the meter. Once again another shot at pensioners. Do pensioners realise that, no matter what their allowance has been, their concession will now end at 138 kilolitres: from then on they will pay full price? This is definitely a tax unwarranted.

The gentleman refers to the concessions for pensioners, and I hope that the Minister, when she replies to this debate, will be able to explain whether the pensioner concessions will be looked at, or whether concessions will cease at 138 kilolitres?

This Bill purports to affect only residential properties, and superficially this would appear to be true. However, I am learning quickly that truth by this Government dangles by a tenuous thread. The question of residential properties appears to be: when is a residential property residential? Obviously, that question could best be answered by owners of certain rural properties.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mrs KOTZ: I can tell the member for Hartley that the answer to that question—

Mr Groom interjecting:

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

Mrs KOTZ: —is that that occurs when a rural property is reclassified as a residential property specifically to catch extra properties so that the water rating system can apply. This Government was not satisfied with the catchment area of citizens who are reclassified as wealthy; it has also ensnared those whom this Bill tells us will not be affected.

A person who will be affected by the reclassification and who is on a rural property has also written a letter stating that they do not have a daily mail delivery; they have been rated 'country' in terms of the fire service to the area; there are no sewerage facilities available; and their water is second rate and continually discoloured.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: They must live in the Hills.

Mrs KOTZ: They do live in the Hills. Their local council has zoned their property as rural. However, the E&WS Department, interpreting this Act, will reclassify that property. The past annual allowance of 536 kilolitres will be reduced to 138 kilolitres and there will be an added cost of 86c for each $1 000 over and above a property value of $111 000. So, this makes an absolute nonsense of the statements that I listened to by members of the Government in this House yesterday, namely, the members for Stuart and Henley Beach, who castigated Opposition members for stating that only residential properties would be affected by this Bill. I think we can all know who, in fact, got that wrong. Perhaps the Minister could explain to those people on rural properties why their properties are now being reclassified.

Social justice is the catchcry of this new system of fixing water rates, but I suggest that this Government has lost sight of the true meaning of social justice. The provisions demonstrate clearly that social justice, as interpreted by this Government, is not a component of this Bill. In a country that has supported home ownership as an historical and present-day reality, and in a State that has proudly postured both nationally and internationally the efficiency of our housing and construction industry, this Bill places on the record Labor's adherence to socialism, which denies the principle of private ownership and which denies the principle of private enterprise. This Bill should clearly state to all South Australians that, if they dare to achieve a certain standard of living, they will be penalised by this Government. They will be penalised by this socialist Government in an attempt to bring them down to a benchmark standard where no person shall have more than their neighbours.

To those people whose present residence falls below that benchmark of $111 000, I would suggest that, if they indulge in a sigh of relief because they have eluded this latest revenue-raising tax, they do not spend the extra dollars saved at this time but budget those dollars in preparation for their next water bill, as I predict that property values will rise and many more property owners will find that they have been elevated to the status of 'wealthy'. Therefore Robin John B. Hood can steal from them legally, but not to return equity and support to the disadvantaged or the needy but to prop up a Government in its financially dying stages. This is a Robin John B. Hood swansong tax, and I do not support the Bill.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I oppose the measure. Almost 100 per cent of my electorate is affected by the introduction of a property or asset tax. The measure is a reintroduction of the land tax principle on the home, and it is not acceptable that the Government can talk about social justice when people in my electorate just happen to have bought properties 40 or 50 years ago that today are valued at about $200 000 or $300 000. Those people have the same rights as pensioners and superannuants in the western suburbs or, indeed, any Labor electorate.

This social justice concept is geared purely and simply to the major Liberal seats, particularly my electorate of Bragg. It is unfair and unreasonable that the Minister should introduce a system that deliberately penalises people who have been willing to save and then spend their money on homes and properties in the eastern suburbs. In terms of social justice, it represents a transfer by this Government from the so-called wealthy, who live in my electorate, to the so-called poor who live in the western suburbs. Mentioning 'so-called wealthy' I would like to put on record—

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Have you seen the table?

Mr INGERSON: They will not be better off. The Minister's system totally underestimates property values and increases especially in the Burnside area. The increases involving the eastern suburbs will result purely and simply from the proximity of those properties to the City of Adelaide and this will make the provision a totally unjust tax on these people. There is no doubt that the pensioners and superannuants in my electorate who get no larger income are significantly disadvantaged compared to pensioners and superannuants living in the hard-held Labor seats. This results simply from the fact that 40 years ago they chose to exercise their right to live in the eastern suburbs of Adelaide.

In the past week I have had brought to my attention four examples of property valuation increases of about 45 per

cent involving people who are superannuants. The water rates structure to be implemented from 1 July will mean a 40 per cent increase in payment for people on fixed incomes from superannuation and pension benefits. This is not a social justice package: it is purely and simply a wealth tax geared to the eastern suburbs and, in particular, to the Liberal Party in this State. The procedure has nothing to do with being fair and reasonable and is purely a wealth tax as far as I am concerned.

I cannot understand why the Government cannot simply sit down and calculate a system on a user-pays basis. If the Government is serious in saying that this system is aimed to encourage people to reduce their water usage, why does it not implement a straight-out user-pays system? If significant numbers of people in the community are disadvantaged, let us have a proper social justice system that affords pensioners and superannuants, wherever they live (be it in the eastern or western suburbs or at Elizabeth or Noarlunga), the same treatment based on the amount of water they use.

That is the case in respect of electricity where we provide a subsidy for those people Governments believe deserve a subsidy. However, this proposed system is deliberately designed to ensure that people in the eastern suburbs cop the burden of the total tax. It is a disgraceful tax. The Minister said earlier that members of my electorate would get significant advantages.

On 1 July I will invite the Minister to a meeting in my electorate so that she can explain that to many of the people who will be paying increases of more than 40 per cent on their water rates when they are using no more water than they have used for the past two or three years. Their only problem is that they happen to live in reasonable sized cottages and developments in the eastern suburbs, in my electorate. I oppose this Bill.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I, too, oppose the Bill for the many reasons already outlined by my colleagues in this place. I pay tribute to the member for Heysen for his clear enunciation of the difficulties we would face if this system was brought into force in South Australia. The Minister does not understand the system that she is attempting to introduce. When I raised this matter and there was a follow-up after a newspaper report, the Minister could not answer the questions and asked former Minister Hudson to fill in for her subsequently on a radio program.

The system is complicated, and it is not something that can be easily explained, because it depends on a number of scales and on a relationship between the use of water and the value of property. There are a number of things wrong with the system and they have already been outlined. Whether we call it a wealth tax, a property tax or an assets tax, it creates divisions in its own right. The provision requires everyone with a property valued over $111 000 to pay a tax, because they have an expensive piece of dirt.

So, we could call this the dirt tax or the dirty tax, as that would probably be the most realistic assessment of what it really is. Whether we hark back to the days of John Cornwall when he was talking about his Robin Hood tax, or consider the economic dilemma now facing South Australia, the potential for abuse of this tax is mind-boggling.

The Labor Government has been quoted often as saying that its initiatives are to achieve some element of social justice. I ask the Minister and her advisers: is it socially just for people on pensions and superannuation to be taxed according to the value of their property because that value happens to be over $111 000? Furthermore, under this scheme these people will not receive a rebate on their excess water bill which they presently receive, because they are using over 140 kilolitres of water a year.

It is a complex matter. The 60 per cent rebate does now not apply in the same sense as it has applied in the past. We know that there are flaws in the existing system; we have always recognised that, and it was the subject of considerable debate prior to the last election. But, what we do not want is a 'them and us' tax, a tax that provides a standard rate for property valued under $111 000 and an escalating rate for property valued over that amount.

A number of people in my electorate are in what might be termed necessitous circumstances. Being now well beyond the recognised age of retiring, they live on pensions or superannuation and do not have a great deal of money to meet their bills. Generally, they keep within their water allocation. However, their property is worth a very large sum of money because they live in what is classed as inner-city or medium-city areas, and under this scheme they will have a surcharge on their property each year.

As these properties are often quite large and have to be well watered, they will also have to pay an excess water bill, and they will not get a rebate on that. Is it a user-pays system—no. Everyone would recognise that businesses will still pay on their property value. So, we have the ludicrous situation of a person who owns a car park being required to pay $110 for the privilege of having water that the car park does not need. There are many examples of office blocks which use perhaps a kilolitre or so of water a year to flush the toilets. That is a minuscule amount compared to the property valuation, as everyone would recognise. There are some anomalies and inequities in this system.

We knew that when Mr Hudson set his mind to work, given his history with the Labor Party, he would dream up a scheme which was biased and which suited the socialist needs of particular people in his Party. He had a good eye in this regard to the natural and latent philosophy of his previous constituency. And this is what we have: a formula cobbled together by a former Minister of this place. I oppose the Bill fundamentally because of its flaws, and more so because this measure will provide for the Government, which is cash strapped because of its abysmal economic performance and management, an avenue to raise extra taxes.

We know that the next tax is but a proclamation away, so the surcharge could be escalated in a very simple fashion. A pseudo land tax or property tax could be implemented very easily. My resentment of this new measure was not as strong some weeks ago because I felt that it contained some elements of merit, although I was opposed to it. Now that we have had the dramatic revelations about the State Bank crash and the demise of the budget, I am violently opposed to the proposition.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): To make the issue quite clear, I point out that I am rising to support the protests expressed by my colleagues and by members of the general public who have had far more time over the past few months to analyse the true impact of the Hugh Hudson report than I did when Mr Hudson asked me, as shadow Minister, to join him for a cursory briefing of his paper, I think it was about half an hour, immediately prior to the public release of that paper in the Minister's company. During that briefing, Hugh gave me assurances that 80 per cent of the public of South Australia would be unaffected or beneficially affected by the changes in rating and that, in fact, very few people would be adversely affected because they would have the opportunity to reduce water consump-

tion and, therefore, come to the median rate which they paid previously.

All in all, I accepted Mr Hudson's assurances and, within an hour of being briefed by him, I stated publicly that I saw no real problems associated with the paper. He also gave me assurances that small business would not be adversely affected by his report. Since then, my colleagues and I have had a chance to look at the mathematics, and one point stands out glaringly, and I do not think that it has been made by any of my colleagues. Mr Hudson gave assurances verbally and in his paper that the base rate of $111 000 would be inflated each year, I assume by the CPI rate. The glaring flaw in that argument is that, two years ago, the Federal Treasurer, becoming increasingly alarmed by the escalation of the CPI, removed from the CPI the very component which was increasing the rate rapidly, that is, mortgage interest rates.

Mortgage interest rates have not come down in proportion, as they were expected to do. They are still running at between 14 per cent and 15.5 per cent for long-term, set mortgages. A rate of 13.75 per cent can be obtained, if you are lucky, but only for a short term. The value of houses and the interest rate are keeping the market high throughout Australia. The claim that housing costs in South Australia would fall or have fallen over the past few months does not seem to have been met, when one looks at the real estate pages. The end result of that is that the additional factor which was introduced into this report—the social justice factor—will not necessarily work, as Hugh Hudson and the Minister claimed it would.

One of the aims of the report was to blunt the point of the electoral hook in marginal and strong Labor-held seats in South Australia. My colleagues and others have claimed that the tax which will be imposed on people who own houses worth more than $111 000 is a form of wealth tax. I think that is an erroneous assumption because a lot of the complaints I am receiving from Adelaide residents and from residents within my own electorate are from people whom I assume to be traditional Labor supporters. They are certainly not wealthy and they will be hit heavily by this tax.

A large number of these people are pensioners, who are not on escalating, indexed incomes but on fixed incomes. They may have had a modestly priced house but the value of their house has increased considerably and they are now sitting in a bracket in which they will be adversely affected by Hugh Hudson's and the Minister's charges.

In other words, the mathematics behind Mr Hudson's report and behind the Minister's assumptions cannot be sustained by an analysis of the real estate market and an analysis of the cost of homes currently occupied by a great many old-age pensioners with fixed incomes. Therefore, the suggestion that this is a wealth tax is erroneous. It is a form of property tax aimed at a relatively small proportion of the population, according to the Minister, but I believe it will be addressed to a substantial proportion of the South Australian public. I am therefore finding it increasingly difficult to support the claims made in that report, although, as I said initially, I accepted the Minister's point of view. The mathematics since then have not allowed me to carry on with that support.

There are also special problems with the South Australian Housing Trust, already almost destitute of cash because of Federal Government restraints, and that problem does not seem to have been specifically addressed. It is part of the social justice issue addressed by the Minister, but it is not helping the South Australian Housing Trust a great deal. The Housing Trust seems to have no way of addressing the problem of excess water rates within individual tenancies, and all in all I agree with my colleagues that there are major flaws contained within this legislation. I therefore oppose the Bill.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I support the measure.
The Hon. D.C. Wotton: What is the measure?
Mr De LAINE: The Water Resources Bill.

Mr McKEE (Gilles): I also support the legislation proposed by the Government. I draw an analogy with a statement made by the economist Kenneth Gallraith the other day in relation to the Middle East war. He said some of the poorest people in the world were fighting this war; why should the rich not pay for it? There is a big similarity in our society today, where there are a number of people, particularly in my electorate of Gilles, who are struggling in the unemployment area, with children to be raised, with many costs in providing for their families and one of those costs, of course, is the provision of food on their tables and water in their houses, etc. If you are going to provide water to the State, it has to be paid for equitably, and I believe that those people who are in a position to pay for it should put their hands in their pocket and go ahead and do it.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I oppose the Bill in the strongest terms. The Bill is just what the Hon. Dr Cornwall was speaking of many years ago: the introduction of a social justice tax to put a tax on property according to value and having a cut-off point where it would not apply below a certain figure. That is exactly what the Hon. Mr Hudson has done with this recommendation. It is part of the socialist plan, as always has been. It is a tax, and a tax on people's borrowings. If a person chooses to spend money on holiday trips, boats or expensive motor cars, the tax does not apply. However, it does affect those who want to try to secure their future and buy a home, which they believe is suitable for them. There may be two people working and they take out a high mortgage while they are both working. The home is worth well over $111 000; it could be as high as $200 000. There could be as much as 60 per cent of that or more owed as a mortgage. Because they have two incomes they can afford to pay it. But suddenly the Government says, 'We will tax you on your borrowings; we will tax you on your debt,' and that is exactly what is happening in this case.

Small business will be affected adversely by this proposal. We know that a lot of people who live in areas that vote Liberal are industrious and tend to provide for their future. Some of them are Labor supporters and they provide for their future by choosing those areas to live in because they see their home as providing some security for the future. If they have to sell it when they are too old to live on their own resources and under their own capacity and if they have to move into a hostel or other accommodation or if they need intensive medical and nursing care, which nowadays is very expensive, they make that choice and they are penalised for it when they are trying to take a burden off the State for the future—that is the truth of it.

I make no bones about my case. I purchased two properties: I took an easement over one and I added part of that property onto the property on which I wanted to build a home. I did that deliberately to avoid paying Government water rates because I foresaw the sort of attitude that has prevailed within the department and this Government. So, I say quite clearly that, in many cases, this is a tax on people's debts. They do not own their home (although they may hope to own it for future security), yet they are taxed at a higher rate because it happens to be worth more than $110 000. I oppose the Bill in the strongest terms.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I oppose this Bill. It is quite clear that the arguments against it have been put very effectively by my colleagues. I want simply to speak on behalf of the people I represent who live in the eastern and north-eastern suburbs of Adelaide, principally in the local government areas of Burnside and Campbelltown and some in East Torrens. I can tell the Minister that well over half the property owners in the electorate of Coles will pay more for water in the next financial year under this new property tax that has been imposed by the Minister because many of them live in houses worth more than $110 000.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: What are they paying now?

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I will come to that, and I will tell the Minister what they are paying now. I checked with the Department of Lands and found that most of the properties in the city of Burnside are valued at over $110 000. The Minister would know also that the city of Burnside contains one of the highest levels of ageing population in the metropolitan area. This means that they are asset rich but cash poor property owners and that an enormous number of people are on fixed incomes who, as a result of this impost, could well be forced to leave properties where they have lived their whole lives.

If the Minister knows anything about social disruption and personal health, she will know that that is not a good outcome for any community, but inevitably it will be one of the effects of this tax. To put the case succinctly, my best course is to read a letter from a constituent who lives on Magill Road, Magill. The graphs attached to his letter show that since 1978 his water allowance has decreased and that he has tried to reduce his water consumption in the same period.

He points out that, after an initial learning period from 1978 to 1980, his rate of reduction in annual usage declined very slowly. He states:

> Property valuation movements have nearly balanced the increasing price of water, so that our allowance too has fallen very slowly. However, we have always been in a condition of excess consumption. The financial incentive to save water has operated throughout—with modest success. Therefore I doubt the value of price manipulation as a means of encouraging saving—at least as practised so far. If the Government had tried an aggressive policy of increasing its real cost (for example, faster than property values have moved) the result might have been different. According to E&WS information sent to consumers in 1988, 62 per cent of householders were then in the same condition as us (paying for excess use). It would seem obvious that this could have been raised by charging more per kilolitre.
>
> Instead of using this demonstrably fair, consumption-related approach, the Government has introduced a property tax! For 1990 on the new system (assuming we use 1 000 kL) we would pay $1 056 for 'water' of which $265 (the property tax) has no connection at all with water use! Our actual outlay on the present system will be $812. The clear message I am getting is: subdivide. If six town houses of value $111 000 were put on this property, with a total usage of 1 000 kL, the cost for water would be $751.20. No change in usage but $300 less in water charges. What an extraordinary outcome for a scheme to save water!

I have received a further letter from the same constituent pointing out that the E&WS pamphlet gives no indication that the price will do any more than continue the trend of water costs in recent years. In that case, there will be no greater incentive to save water than exists now. He points out that people soon forget about a one off price increase. He states:

> When the shock of the property tax component has been absorbed, decisions about water use will be governed by the incremental cost (how much can I save by not using the next kilolitre?). So if I guess right about the future costs of excess water, consumers who already pay for excess use will have no more inducement to save than under the present system . . . The property tax aspect of the new method and the secondary importance of reducing consumption is clear from this consideration.

In short, the Minister's statements about water conservation are seen to be shallow when it comes to the practical application of this tax, and the inequity and injustice of it as it affects the people I represent, whose incomes are not necessarily in what the member for Henley Beach described as the dress circle bracket—a somewhat obnoxious description for people who happen to live on hillsides.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Yes, silvertails and so forth. I would like to introduce the Minister and the honourable member to some of the pensioners and people on fixed incomes in my electorate, and I would like them to see the effect that this tax will have on the lives of those people in the future.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Water Resources): I want to start by thanking the considerable number of members who have participated in this debate. In the time allocated to me, I will not be able to address every single point that each member has raised in the debate. However, I want to start with a couple of observations. It would not be unkind of me to suggest that the contributions by the members of the Opposition, with probably one or two exceptions, have singularly shown a lack of understanding of both the intent and effect of the Bill.

Members interjecting:

The Hon S.M. LENEHAN: We certainly will see. The Opposition will not be able to continue its campaign of fear and scare tactics once people get their accounts and once they understand the new system and how it operates. To that extent, I do not intend to continue on that tack. Much has been said about wealth tax, added-value tax, property tax and about the burden that is to be imposed by the Bill. This is simply and unequivocally untrue. I want to clarify a couple of aspects of this matter.

First, for all non-residential properties, including not only industrial and commercial properties but also hotels, motels, boarding houses and flats, there will be no change from the present system. We have members standing up giving a diatribe about what BOMA might or might not be talking about when this Bill is not even addressing the issues of commercial, industrial and non-residential properties.

Residential properties are subject to this new system and it is widely accepted that a two-tier sytem of charging provides the most equitable basis. The cost of making a service available is not proportional to water use. I do no know how many times I have to say (either in this House or in the public arena) that the Government does not seek to obtain any additional revenue by this measure. A criterion specified to Mr Hugh Hudson was that, at the end of the day, it must be revenue neutral. I believe that in fact revenue will be reduced under this system, and I will explain why in a moment. Revenue will certainly decrease if a reduction in consumption occurs. The member for Coles stated that there is no incentive for conservation, but she is totally and absolutely incorrect and I will explain why.

Opposition members talked about a number of people being worse off, in particular, pensioners and people on a fixed income. We heard that again and again. This is not the case, because these people can save on their water usage. Anyone with a property valued at less than $111 000 will be unaffected or will save. Just to indicate the statistical support for the point I am making, I refer to an analysis that has been undertaken by the department. People who have properties valued at below $111 000 by the Valuer-General will pay no more if they use exactly the same amount of water. There are 278 677 assessments in this category, which is 62.3 per cent of the current properties

assessed receiving assessments from the E&WS Department. Some 59 103 assessments (13.2 per cent) relate to properties valued at less than $111 000. These people will actually pay less for their water, on current water usage from last year to the coming year. That makes a subtotal of 337 780 assessments and represents to 75.5 per cent of all properties currently receiving a bill from the E&WS Department for the provision of water.

Let us consider what happens to those people who own properties valued at more than $110 000, who will, indeed, pay less. Did any member opposite have the integrity or, may I suggest, perhaps the intelligence to ascertain that many of their constituents with properties valued at more than $111 000 will pay less? These tables have been available. There are 38 205 properties (8.5 per cent of assessed properties) in relation to which owners will pay less. Those who will theoretically (and I want to get this point into *Hansard*) pay more, and given that we look at the present system—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I remind the member for Murray-Mallee that it is based almost entirely on property values. So, looking at the system—and we are moving up the valuation scale—there are 71 343 properties (16 per cent) in relation to which, theoretically, people will pay more if they use exactly the same amount of water as they used last year.

But you cannot take just that simple statistic: you have to look at what it means. Let us look at a couple of examples. First, I will use the example the member for Adelaide cited. I took the opportunity last night to provide him with this table and to show him that what he was suggesting about his constituent was quite erroneous. The member for Adelaide has a large number of constituents with fairly highly valued houses, and many of those constituents are older people, who have a very small amount of water use.

I am very conversant with the situation of the electorate of Adelaide, because the previous member for Adelaide brought it to my attention time and time again and was one of the great supporters of my moving for a fairer and more equitable system that actually picked up the circumstances of pensioners and people on fixed superannuation incomes. The example given to Parliament last night was of a person with a property valued at $218 000. The table I have has a figure for $220 000, so we will err on the side of conservatism: instead of looking at $218 000, we will look at a property valued at $220 000. At the moment, that pensioner, that couple or that small group of people living in that house would, under the current valuation system (whereby valuation is primarily the means of ascertaining their bill and their water allocation) be allocated 462 kilolitres.

Let me remind the House that the average usage of water in South Australia for a dwelling is 150 kilolitres. These people have 462 kilolitres whether they use it or not. If the residents were to reduce their water consumption to 150 kilolitres, which is the average, they would save—they would not pay more, but save—$167.16. Going across the table, if these people were to reduce their usage to 350 kilolitres, which is still a perfectly adequate amount, they would still be saving in the vicinity of $7.16.

I want members on this side to know that I will not be saying to members of the Opposition, 'I told you so' when they find that the vast majority of their constituents will be paying the same or less. Large numbers of their constituents live in very highly valued houses. Let us look at the amount of $500 000. How many members on this side have constituents with $500 000 houses? Not many. But many people in such areas as Springfield would have properties worth $500 000. Let me read into *Hansard* what will happen to those properties.

A property worth $500 000 will currently have a water allowance of 1050 kilolitres of water, irrespective of what it is used for or of what the need is. I imagine that a constituent with such a property would not be found in the honourable Speaker's electorate. There would not be too many such constituents, but there would be in the electorates of members opposite. For such a resident there would be a reduction if he used less than 650 kilolitres of water.

A person living in a house worth $500 000 could still use 650 kilolitres of water a year and save on their current bill. We have heard absolute nonsense from members of the Opposition. They did not bother to seek briefings if they did not understand what we were proposing. The member for Heysen had a briefing. What does that say about him? I leave it to the intelligence of members to draw their own conclusions.

I want to talk about the member for Heysen and give an example of those who have been talked about as being worse off. We heard about the case—I now have a copy of the letter—of Mrs Harris. This was quoted by the member for Heysen. Talk about a lot of misinformation! For instance, this customer does not pay $8 per week for water rates; she pays $150.20 annually, which equates to $2.89 per week for water rates. Her average—I have this as a printout and I would be delighted to provide it to the honourable member—over the past three years is 262 kilolitres. If she continues to use that amount each year, she will effectively save $2.36 annually on her water account. However, she would be in a position to achieve greater savings by using less water. She could save up to $100 annually if she used 136 kilolitres per annum. I point out that Mrs Harris receives a concession of $85 every year, so she pays only $2.89 per week for her water rates. She was used as an example of how this Government is driving pensioners and those on fixed incomes out of their houses. What a sham and nonsense!

The member for Chaffey referred to the sure availability of water from the Murray River. He asked why a conservation based pricing system was needed at all: why worry about conservation; that is not needed. He went on to compare this Bill with the situation in Perth. I do not intend to take up the time of the House on that matter, but I will provide the honourable member with a private briefing about the situation in Perth, because it is not as he painted it.

The availability of water is recognised. This new system is not directed solely at conservation for the sake of conservation; it is aimed at encouraging our customers to recognise the cost of providing water and to regulate their usage in line with economic reality. I should have thought that every Opposition member would have supported that principle. Therefore, in the long run this proposal will lead to water being less expensive for all in real terms, because it will lead to costly new works to expand the water supply being deferred in some cases for many years. The pay-for-use system in Perth was not responsible for its revenue deficiency; the problem was caused by restrictions due to drought. It is a shame that the member for Chaffey did not pursue this example through to the end.

The member for Murray-Mallee advocated a system where payment would be based on standards of service and water usage with different levels applying to different zones. While acknowledging that this is an option, there is no doubt that some zones will be significantly disadvantaged. Most water

authorities throughout Australia have opted for a system which provides for uniform charging.

The member for Flinders and other members raised an issue relating to rural living. The intention of the Government is that in all cases the relevant criteria will be the predominant use of the land. If people are living on hobby farms and they are primarily and principally residential, they will be predominantly residential and will fall within the new system. Where the level of primary production or other activities predominate, the current rating system will continue. I have an amendment on file which will clarify that system. Some comparisons have been made with the provision of other services, such as electricity. I understand that ETSA has introduced an access charge.

I wish to make two further points. First, the member for Morphett asked me to clarify the situation as he and, indeed, a number of members on this side of Parliament have strata title units in their areas. Strata title units will come under the new system and those which are not will remain under the current system. For example, if 10 units are valued at $90 000 each giving a total valuation of $900 000, each unit holder will pay the access charge, namely, $110. For the $110 they will receive, as part of their access, 136 kilolitres of water. In most cases that is a very adequate amount, as units generally do not require huge amounts to water gardens and for other activities. They will then pay only $110 if they use 136 kilolitres of water. Each unit will be allocated 136 kilolitres, so for 10 units we are talking of 1 360 kilolitres, bearing in mind that there is one meter.

When the 1 360 kilolitres is exceeded, what happens now will happen in the future: the strata title body corporate will be sent an account for the excess water to be charged at the rate, after 1 July, of 85c a kilolitre and the units will be billed equally for the excess. I do not believe that in that case the unit holders will be worse off: rather, they will be better off. It will depend on the valuation of the individual strata title unit, the size of the block and so on. We believe that they will be treated almost as they are treated at the moment. I hope that that clarifies the point raised by the member for Morphett. There appears to be a misunderstanding about what the system is doing.

Mr S.G.Evans interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I will clarify this point I hope for the last time. The honourable member has had his opportunity.

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: You are holding up the proceedings. I was going to give a brief summary. The honourable member has interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order. I ask the Minister to come back to the subject.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am sorry that I was distracted, Sir. A number of points need to be made. The new system is theoretically revenue neutral. We will probably find that we have less revenue under the new system because for the first time people in high property value areas where the system currently is based almost entirely on property values will have an opportunity to reduce their bills.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: You can have it here. It is a pity that the Deputy Leader was not here to hear my explanation; again, he has made a complete fool of himself in showing his lack of understanding of the Bill, but none of us on this side are surprised by that. We have a system now based almost entirely on property values. For the Opposition to say that anybody with a property valued above $111 000 will be worse off is blatantly misleading and a blatent untruth. It is not the case.

Secondly, I have said consistently that the E&WS and I as Minister will be amending the $111 000 threshold level for property values in line with the movement in valuations in this State. Generally speaking—and unless there is some amazing change—that has always been upwards. So, this nonsense about creeping brackets and that somehow we will discriminate against people who want to improve their houses is arrant nonsense. For the first time in this State we have a system that includes an element of property valuation and, further, a conservation ethic, an ethnic which says, 'You can control the size of your account by reducing the amount of water you use. Surely it is not beyond the wit of people living in the western suburbs, for whom the Opposition has an enormous brief, to go into the Water Advisory Unit in the E&WS Department and seek advice on cutting down water usage with sprinkler or drip systems, shower roses and so on.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Artificial concrete.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Again, the honourable member displays his ignorance. From all the evidence, there will be no lessening in the greening of Adelaide. In fact, I believe the greening of Adelaide will increase and continue, and indeed that people will pay less for their water because they will use it more prudently and more wisely. What a sad day it is for this Parliament that an Opposition could not, for the first time in their lives, have some vision, be able to look into the future and see that we must get to a system which has running through it a conservation principle and that of an access charge for the services that are provided. I commend the Bill to the House, and I urge the House to support it.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (22)—Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Atkinson, Bannon, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Heron, Holloway and Hopgood, Mrs Hutchison, Ms Lenehan (teller), Messrs McKee, Mayes, Quirke, Rann and Trainer.

Noes (22)—Messrs Allison, Armitage, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, Becker, Blacker and Brindal, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn and Ingerson, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis, Matthew, Meier, Oswald, Such, Venning and Wotton (teller).

Pair—Aye—Mr Klunder. No—Mr Chapman.

The SPEAKER: There being 22 Ayes and 22 Noes, I cast my vote for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: A number of recommendations in the Hudson report which he hoped would be implemented are not contained in this legislation. As the review was undertaken in regard to both water and sewerage rates, can the Minister say when further legislation will be introduced in the Parliament?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I assume that the honourable member is talking about the proposal to move to trade waste charges. We are the only State in Australia that does not have trade waste charges. There is widespread support for our moving to that. I have indicated publicly that we would look at introducing trade waste charges from the beginning of 1992, but we would need to amend our Sewerage Act to implement that. I will be looking for the cooperation of the Opposition when we come to implement a trade waste charging system.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: As I have announced publicly on a couple of occasions, we aim to introduce trade

waste charges from the beginning of 1992. We would be looking at amending the Sewerage Act in the next session. That matter is not included in the package of measures now because we have had to identify carefully those who are discharging into the sewerage system. We need to negotiate with industry in terms of appropriate levels of trade waste charges and we need to look at what is happening around the country so that we have charges that are fairly comparable around Australia.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—'Insertion of Division I of Part V.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: In the discussions that I had with the honourable Mr Hudson, he expressed certain concerns. The Minister has an amendment which I presume will cover this point.

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

Page 1—
Line 20—Leave out 'median' and insert 'threshold'.
Lines 24 and 25—Leave out these lines and insert—
'used primarily for residential purposes but does not include—
(a) a hotel, motel, boarding house or hostel;'
or
(b) a building comprising two or more flats;'.
Page 2—
Lines 26 to 31—
Lines 1 to 14—Leave out the definition of 'residential land' and insert the following definition:
'residential land' means ratable land on which a residential building is situated but does not include land—
(a) on which a hotel, motel, boarding house, hostel or two or more flats are also situated;
or
(b) that, in the opinion of the Minister, is used primarily for non residential purposes:
Lines 27, 29, 32, 38, 39 and 41—Leave out 'median' and insert, in each case 'threshold'.

I do not have to remind the mathematicians in this Parliament what the word 'median' means. That word is not appropriate in this legislation: it was not meant to be a median value but a threshold value. In statistics the median value is the value at which half the number lie below and half the number lie above. So, in a strict mathematical interpretation, if we were to keep the word 'median', what we would find is that we would have to move it around so that half the properties were under $111 000 and half the properties above. In fact, 76 per cent of property valuations in this State lie below $111 000 and the remainder lie above. Therefore, it is much more appropriate to use the word 'threshold', and that is why it is being changed.

In relation to the amendment to lines 24 and 25, it was felt that we needed to clarify the situation so that everyone understood what premises would remain under the current system and what premises would move to the new system. In relation to the amendment to lines 27, 29, 32, 38, 39 and 41, wherever the word 'median' is used we are substituting 'threshold'.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: When I was briefed by the Hon. Hugh Hudson—and I hope I am not misquoting him in bringing this matter forward—he expressed a very real concern that hobby farmers had been caught up under this system, and he referred particularly to new section 65a (1) *(c)* (iii) (B). I understand his concern and seek further clarification. From what the Minister said, a property that genuinely might be regarded as being a hobby farm but does not involve primary production will come under the new system. I hope I am not misrepresenting Mr Hudson, but he expressed some concern about that, especially about the many bushfire-prone areas in the Hills that would be severely disadvantaged because of the necessity to irrigate a lot of the land.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: In outlining my amendments I omitted explaining the amendment to page 2, lines 1 to 14. If it is a hobby farm on which people produce or grow things for market and that is considered to be the major use, that property would remain under the current system, which is based almost entirely on the valuation of property. However, if it is primarily a residential property, the property would move to the new system with the access component and the property component, and the residents would pay for the water that is used.

I am not sure that I understand the point raised by the honourable member about bushfire-prone areas. As Minister responsible for national parks and wildlife, I am aware of the duty to protect the private landowner whose land is next to a national park and also to protect the integrity of the park, and that clear firebreaks are produced and vegetation is kept down. In case of fire, there is a need for water on the property, but I was not aware that people are watering all the time. Most properties in that category have their own storage tanks on site, as well as a reticulated system. I am not sure how such people would be disadvantaged. There is potential for them to be advantaged, so I am interested in what the honourable member has to say.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Because of the SDP that has been introduced, people with properties in the foothills and inside and outside the hills face zone cannot subdivide land. Given the fire danger, a lot of these people have determined that they should irrigate their land, and I can give the Minister a number of examples of people who are using mains water for that purpose. When I spoke to Mr Hudson about that, he indicated his concern about the people in that situation getting caught up under the new system. I merely bring it to the attention of the Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his explanation. I was not aware that people are irrigating their land as a bushfire prevention measure, but I do not represent constituents in that area. The second part of the amendment was framed because of some grey areas concerning dwellings on hobby farms. The term 'hobby farm' has a totally different meaning for just about everyone with whom I have spoken. The reason why the words 'in the opinion of the Minister' have been included is to enable what I consider to be a sensible or commonsense approach to ascertaining whether a property would be best advantaged by remaining under the present system in the sense of determining its primary use.

The idea was not to draw more properties into the new system because many properties coming into the new system will pay much less. The idea was to look only at residential properties—not hotels, commercial areas or industrial properties. It is one of those areas that can be looked at sensitively to determine what is the best decision for a range of options, including fire protection. A property that is generally not used for any other purpose than as a general domestic residence would come under the new system. However, for some of the areas referred to by the honourable member, it would probably be more appropriate for them to remain with the old system, and I give him my assurance that that is the way it will be dealt with.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Where is the definition of 'threshold'?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I refer the honourable member to any standard English language dictionary, although I could read out the definition for him. I am not being facetious, but I would have thought that most people would understand the meaning of the threshold value.

Mr S.J. Baker: Will you tell us what you think it means?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I do not have to tell the honourable member what I think it means.

Mr S.J. Baker: You don't know.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I do know exactly. The threshold value means the value fixed by the Minister by notice in the *Gazette* under section 65c. It is that valuation, if you look at new section 65c. Instead of the median value, it will be the threshold value and it goes on. At this point the threshold value is $111 000. I have given—

Mr S.J. Baker: You have just failed the test.

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

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: We can stay here all afternoon as far as I am concerned. I have said on a number of occasions that, if the valuations generally increase, the threshold value will increase. I think that is the answer which members opposite have looked for, because they made the assumption that the threshold value would be fixed forever. If the threshold value increases, that advantages people in terms of their valuations increasing, because it maintains the relativity. Think about it: it maintains the relativity.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Bragg is out of his place and out of order.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: So if you increase the threshold value, it is the valuation at which .76 cents in the dollar cuts in. It makes sense that that valuation should increase with the general increase in valuations of properties, otherwise—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I have given a public commitment. It is publicly acknowledged. I will give it again if it is necessary: every year, in line with the Valuer-General's determination, we will amend the valuation. I do not know how I can be clearer. I honestly think that members of the Opposition have lost their grip or their faculties. I will say it again: every year, in line with the information which the Valuer-General will supply to me, I will reassess the threshold value at which the property valuation of .76 cents in the dollar per $1 000 of property value will start to become operative. Is that clear?

Mr S.J. BAKER: We have an extraordinary explanation of 'threshold'. I can understand 'median'—it is very simple. It is the mid point. So, if we had 500 000 properties, the 250 000th property would be the median. That is a very simple and straightforward calculation. What does 'threshold' mean? We say we are on the threshold of a new era. What does that mean?

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: It means we are going to have a new watering system.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Yes, we are going to have a new watering system.

An honourable member: We're going to have a new Minister!

Mr S.J. BAKER: And we are going to have a new Minister—exactly right. We have nothing definite when we talk about a threshold, and that is why I have told the Minister that we need a definition. We need something that says it is related to water consumption, or is a given formula which will provide, within the confines of the legislation, some certainty about the system. The Bill contains nothing to indicate what the threshold actually is. It could be the threshold of anything. It may be the threshold of when people first use water. The clause is quite incompetent, and it should be knocked out. The Minister should be able to give the Committee a better explanation.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: That just indicates the abysmal lack of mathematical knowledge of the Deputy Leader. He talks about a median value. If we were to make a simple calculation to divide it half way, we would have to rank each property in order from property one to property 450 000. Imagine the enormous amount of work to rank in order every property in this State. Can you imagine thousands of little bureaucrats rushing around the department with computers, ranking from property one, at the lowest value, to property 450 000. Then you take a median point and say, 'We will cut in at that value.' The threshold value is the entrance value.

This is where the system starts to come into play. We have chosen the figure of $111 000 in terms of property valuation for this coming year. I have said that that valuation will be moved in line—generally upward—with the average valuations ascertained by the Valuer-General. I do not believe that I can explain that more clearly. The fact that the Opposition has no mathematical skills at all is not something for which I take responsibility and I am amazed that the Deputy Leader, who purports to have all this amazing knowledge, is so ignorant of the facts.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I want to make one point, which I tried to make to the Minister, and that is that she has no say other than while she is in office. Her word means nothing; it does not mean a thing.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: What about you?

Mr S.G. EVANS: My word does not either because, if I promise what the future will be and I leave here, it will mean nothing. The only time that the Minister's word can be applied is while she is in office. Her interpretation of what the future will be does not mean that it will apply in practice—that is the point. She may say, and I agree, that that is her intention—whether or not she sticks to it does not matter—but it goes no further than that.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I think that we will be a lot better off now because we have the Concise Oxford Dictionary in which the word 'threshold' is defined as 'the plank or stone at the bottom of a door of a dwelling house or church'. That helps us considerably!

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Yes. 'Threshold' is defined also as a 'limit below which a stimulus ceases to be perceptible'. I do not think that that is what it is about. It is defined further as 'a limit below which no reaction occurs'—that might be it—or 'a minimum dose of radiation producing a specified effect'. I think that the word 'threshold' is a very poor term that has been adopted by the Minister, because it could mean anything.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I will clarify the position finally. The word 'threshold' on its own does not have relevance to this Bill—it is used with the word 'value'. So, the 'threshold value' is the value at which property charges will start to take effect. I find it amazing that the Opposition cannot understand this clearly.

Amendments carried.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I want to pick up the point raised by the member for Davenport. The Minister's second reading explanation states:

> The new system provides considerable flexibility as there can be independent changes to the access charge, the median value [which is now the threshold value], the rate in the dollar for the property value component, the water allowance and the price per kilolitre.

I want to emphasise what the member for Davenport said because that is the major concern of the Opposition. By notice in the *Government Gazette*, the Minister, whoever that may be, may fix all of those charges in any way that the Minister wishes. I believe that it is totally inappropriate that, despite objections by the Opposition, we should bring down this legislation with no opportunity for us to determine what those charges are likely to be in the future. I believe that it is totally inappropriate, and that is one of

the major reasons why the Opposition opposes this legislation.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I have not actually had this researched, so I will err on the side of being a little cautious. It is my understanding that none of the legislatures in this country actually fixes by primary legislation the actual charges. In this State, we do not fix the electricity charges in this Parliament. We do not fix a whole range of other charges.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: We fix the method of charging.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I believe that that is what we are doing here, fixing the method of charging. It is quite appropriate for the elected Government of the day, who will be accountable to the people, to have that responsibility. Members know that, when I increase the cost of water, I do so underneath the CPI figure. If the Opposition gets into power in the next four, six or 10 years, and were to have massive increases in water rate charges, they would face the people and would be accountable to them. Surely that is what a democracy is all about. You do not have a Parliament fixing every single charge each year. We would be doing nothing else. The Parliament would be totally bogged down. This is totally consistent with other water authorities in other States. I will have it checked (and as I qualify this) but it is my understanding that no other Parliament in the country actually fixes by primary legislation the water rate charges.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister indicate exactly what is meant in proposed new section 65d (2) under 'Water allocation' on page 3 where it provides:

> The notice may fix different water allocations in respect of different classes of residential land.

What does the Minister really mean by 'different classes of residential land'?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: This relates to the whole question of flexibility. The reason it is there is that we have opted for a system where, for simplicity, everybody has an access charge and a fixed amount, so everybody has the 136 kilolitres. In the future, it may be more appropriate for some areas to be able to have that flexibility to fix different water allocations for different areas. For example, maybe some country areas will require more. It would also mean, perhaps to pick up the hobby farm example, that if it was determined that it was important for those people living in the bushfire-prone areas in the hills to have access to more water—

The Hon. H. Allison: You are making this up on the run. You should have known this.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: This is quite incredible. The point I am making is that this is in here to provide flexibility in the very cases which the member for Heysen has raised. From time to time there will be circumstances and situations where there will need to be some administration through a commonsense flexible approach, and to say that we will never have that is absolutely quite ridiculous. That is the reason it is there. It is certainly not being invoked or used under the system that we are proposing to implement in July, but in a number of years it may well be that that is looked at with respect to the whole question of fire safety.

Clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (4 to 10) and title passed.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Water Resources): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (22)—Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Atkinson, Bannon, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Heron, Holloway and Hopgood, Mrs Hutchison, Ms Lenehan (teller), Messrs McKee, Mayes, Quirke, Rann and Trainer.

Noes (22)—Messrs Allison, Armitage, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, Becker, Blacker and Brindal, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn and Ingerson, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis, Matthew, Meier, Oswald, Such, Venning and Wotton (teller).

Pair—Aye—Mr Klunder. No—Mr Chapman.

The SPEAKER: There being 22 Ayes and 22 Noes, I give my casting vote for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): During this grievance debate I wish to explore the possibility of the introduction of compulsory third party property damage insurance. In recent months I have been encouraged to do this because of the findings of the New South Wales Public Accounts Committee. The Chairman of that committee has, from time to time, issued press releases suggesting that it would be possible to introduce legislation in that State to provide for compulsory third party property insurance for approximately $100 a year. The latest press release along these lines was put out on Tuesday 10 July 1990 and was reported in the *Daily Telegraph* of that date.

The problems of uninsured motorists being involved in motor vehicle accidents would be well known to every member in this Parliament. I would doubt whether there would be members who, at one stage or another, have not been approached by their constituents, complaining about the fact that they have been involved in an accident where the other person was uninsured and have thus not been able to recover costs for any of the amounts involved. Indeed, some people have been quite rude in their rejection of any claim. Mr Phillip Smiles, the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee in New South Wales, has stated:

> It is iniquitous that a motorist who has been responsible for causing hundreds or even thousands of dollars worth of damage to another person's motor car or other property is permitted by law to contribute almost nothing to its restoration.

Mr Smiles said that he had been advised recently of a case where the driver responsible for the accident told the innocent party, 'Don't expect anything out of me; I only carry compulsory third party insurance'. That is a familiar situation in South Australia.

Mr Smiles stated in the New South Wales House of Assembly on 19 April 1989:

> My concern has been raised by the issue of third party property damage associated with motor vehicles. On a number of occasions since I came into this place, constituents have approached me in deep distress because, although on our roads there is an opportunity for innocent people who are hurt in accidents to claim against the negligent party for their injuries, when damage is caused by one motor vehicle to another, those who choose not to take out comprehensive or third party insurance can look at the innocent driver of a severely damaged vehicle and say, 'Sorry, I am bankrupt', or, 'Sorry, I have no money.'
>
> On four occasions this year constituents have approached me in my electorate office and have said that, following accidents where they contributed not one iota to the negligence, and where their motor vehicle suffered thousands of dollars of damage, they were met by a guilty driver with a comment, 'Sorry, no money' or, 'Sorry, I am bankrupt.' In other words they were met by the statement, 'Tough.' This is quite unacceptable.

I am sure that members on both sides of the House would have come across this situation from time to time in their own electorate office. Prior to entering office in 1979, the then shadow Minister of Transport, Mr Dean Brown, made an election promise that, if he was a member of the Liberal Party elected to office, it would introduce compulsory third party property damage insurance. The booklet that was sent out by the RAA earlier this year made a notation of some of the problems, as follows:

- Responsible motorists who fully insure their cars are understandably outraged when hit by an uninsured driver. They are often required to pay an excess or lose their no claim bonus
- Uninsured, innocent drivers are equally outraged when they are hit by other uninsured drivers who are unable to meet their accident repair obligations
- Some uninsured drivers—quite possibly driving an average family car—who are at fault in a collision with a gleaming Rolls Royce or a spirited Porsche, may find themselves paying for the results of their poor driving for many years to come
- A surprising number of motorists are ignorant of the difference between full comprehensive insurance, third party property damage insurance and third party bodily injury insurance.

Some motorists think their vehicle is not worth insuring and do not recognise the financial dangers of not having liability protection.

Some motorists wilfully drive vehicles unregistered and uninsured—even for compulsory bodily injury.

That certainly summarises most of the problems. The Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee in New South Wales, Mr Smiles, made the following points:

In most countries throughout the Western world there is some sort of compulsory insurance scheme providing compensation for both personal injury or damage arising out of the use of a motor vehicle.

In Canada there are 'modified no-fault' schemes. In the United States of America there is the general recognition that, if a driver is to be let loose on the roads, he or she should be 'financially responsible'—that they should be able to pay for any damage they might cause through the use of a motor vehicle.

The NRMA claims that 'compulsory laws fail to reach a significant number of drivers'—for example, out-of-State drivers, drivers of unregistered vehicles, hit-and-run drivers, DUI drivers and those driving stolen vehicles.

However, the scheme throughout much of Europe, resulting from a directive adopted by the European Parliament aimed at standardising motor insurance throughout EEC member states, requiring all persons suffering injury or damage arising out of the use of a motor vehicle, including uninsured and unidentified vehicles, to be able to be compensated. The European scheme ensures:

- cooperation between insurers through mandatory participation in self-regulatory bodies;
- minimal Government interference;
- cost advantages gained through direct negotiation of disputes between third party and insurer and between insurers;
- benefits to consumers in terms of cost and service produced through market competition.

Members would be aware that the Royal Automobile Association of South Australia is opposed to compulsory third party damage insurance because that organisation suggests that it would open up a virtual Pandora's box of administrative problems and skyrocketing costs. The RAA has put forward an argument against compulsory third party property damage insurance, and, briefly stated, that organisation argues that the current comprehensive insurance scheme would be destroyed and the administration of claims and policies would be more complex. Liability settlement disputes will arise and create costly and protracted settlement of claims, not to mention prolonged delays in vehicle repairs. There would be an increase in minor, frivolous and even fraudulent claims. The inability of innocent parties to recover all their losses would still occur. All drivers would pay the same premium and this would mean that good drivers would pay for the bad. No scheme will remove uninsured motorists from the road.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I wish to draw to the attention of the House the critical and difficult situation that wheat growers in this State and nation are facing. This is the time of the year when they are preparing to sow the 1991-92 crop. Due to the excessively low prices that they received for last season's crop many of them—I suggest the overwhelming number—had a negative income from grain growing. That, coupled with the disastrous situation in the wool industry and reduced returns, means that many of these people are seriously considering not sowing a crop.

This State and nation relies heavily upon exports from this important industry. Unless some firm and positive action is taken in the next few weeks, the economic damage that will be done to this State and nation will be horrendous. The Wheat Board will lose traditional markets because it will not have sufficient wheat to continue in those markets which it has built up over a number of years. This country has been able to sell wheat during difficult times because it has always produced a very high quality product. We have had a system of orderly marketing, organised through the Australian Wheat Board, which could guarantee supply and quality, and it has proved to be an outstanding success.

We have had the most efficient and effective grain growers in the world, and they have been of great benefit to this nation. They do not want handouts and do not expect to make excessive incomes—they only want the opportunity to survive and earn a reasonable income. The current arrangement where they received $95 a tonne last year is such that when one deducts expenses many were lucky to receive $75 per tonne. A farmer growing 2 000 tonnes of wheat in 1988-89 would probably have had a reduction in income of some $130 000. No-one can survive when faced with that sort of situation. It would be interesting to know what long-term effects will be thrust upon the economy of this State if something is not done.

Earlier this week I wrote to every Federal member of Parliament in South Australia requesting their urgent attention to this matter and urging that they support a minimum first advance for wheat for the forthcoming season of $160 per tonne. We can argue about whether it should be $150, $160 or $170, but it is essential that there be a reasonable floor price for the forthcoming year. I understand that last night a well attended meeting was held at Wudinna, a traditional wheat-growing area in the electorate of Flinders which is very near to where I live and which is well known to me. I understand that a motion was carried without a great deal of dissent, calling on farmers not to sow a crop unless they are given a guaranteed income; otherwise in many cases they will face a substantial economic loss. I will give an example to the House: a farmer advised me that he normally sows 4 200 acres and has about 1 100 sheep. He put the whole program through the computer and, based on an average year, he would make a loss of $29 000 on current prices. No-one will commit themselves to that sort of loss unless they have some guarantee.

In 1989-90 the wheat industry was worth approximately $574 million to South Australia. That is one of the most significant industries in this State. To understand what has happened, I refer to the estimated real prices that farmers have received over the past few years. In 1988-89 the all-up price was estimated to be $241 per tonne. In 1989-90 it was $230 and, for the immediate past year 1990-91, it was estimated to be $165 per tonne. The graph has gone down. It was estimated in recent economic information put out by Lumleys that last year saw almost an 18 per cent reduction in the price of wheat. These farmers are in a situation where they are looking for some assistance and for the ability to be able to continue to play an important role in

the future economy of this State and nation. We in this State have always been a significant producer of wheat. We export 13 million to 14 million tonnes from Australia each year. It is interesting to note the tonnage of wheat produced in this State. In 1988-89 South Australia produced 1.3 million tonnes of wheat and in 1989-90 it produced 2.7 million tonnes.

If South Australia produces approximately 2 million tonnes a week in the forthcoming year, that would be a significant contribution to the economy. However, the costs are rising and the effects of the Iraqi war and the loss of that market are adding to the problem. Iraq has been one of the major buyers of our wheat. Currently, debts of some $600 million are owed to the wheat industry by Iraq. No responsible person differs with our view to be involved in Iraq. However, the wheat industry cannot be expected to bear the full cost of that operation because the insurance arrangements, when they are eventually paid to the industry, will leave a considerable shortfall.

I call on the Premier and on the Minister of Agriculture to make the most strenuous representations to the Minister for Primary Industries and Energy, the Treasurer and the Prime Minister because people, particularly those in marginal and semi-marginal areas, are having not just second thoughts: they are also assessing their situation, because many of them will have to borrow the money to sow the crop. If they are in a position where they will not be able to repay that loan and make some profit, they will not sow the crop. It is not a matter of someone getting up and bleating about the farmers, about whingeing cockies and other terms by which they are describe: it is a matter of the most grave significance to the welfare of all citizens in this State.

There will be a massive drop in employment; there will be a lack of jobs in rural areas; and it will continue to an unnecessary decline in rural areas. We must accept that there is a need to support industries in this country. I do not support, and never have supported, the policy of 'let the market determine' or the free-trade nonsense of certain people who have for too long been studying economic theories at university. I do not support the concept that we should destroy the motor industry in this country, because we have a responsibility to ensure that our own citizens are protected and that they have jobs to go to. It is all very well for people to advocate economic policies without regard to the human effects of those policies. I believe in a system of intervention in the economy—I always have—because it makes economic sense when we are protecting our own citizens. The first responsibility of any Government, whether it be State or Federal, is to put in place policies to assist efficient industries. In my judgment the wheat industry has been exceptionally efficient. The idea that we are part of the international economy may be true, but the international economy is not based on a level playing field.

The EEC, the United States and Canada are subsidising their industries because they are social programs. There is a need in this country for a sensible balance with a social program to protect Australians so that they can be employed. One of the steps is to give a guaranteed first advance for wheat in this country. Those advocates who say that we should just let the industries fall by the wayside have no social conscience, and no responsibility, and I believe they are acting contrary to the best interests not only of the short-term but also the long-term future of this State and nation. This relates not just to this industry but to the motor car industry and a number of others.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Last year, I watched with a great deal of interest the media coverage in relation to road accidents. Quite properly so, the media gave prominence to the large number of injuries and, indeed, fatalities on our roads. This is an enormous cost not only in relation to the loved ones who have been killed but also to those who have been left behind. I looked—and I looked hard—through the media last year for some indication as to their concern about work safety. I must say that I was disappointed, to say the least, at the very small coverage that the media has given to injuries in the workplace. For every person that is injured or killed on our roads, five or more people are injured at work.

An honourable member interjecting:

For many years as a union official, and before that as an employee within the railways industry, I was appalled at the number of my workmates who were thrown on the scrap heap because of their injuries or disabilities. Often they had to wait many years for compensation but in the interim their colleagues took up collections on the job to look after them.

The media could play a greater role in addressing the problem of injuries in the workplace. The Government and the trade union movement have and are addressing it as well. Much more could be done through the strong support of the media. If there were a fivefold increase in people injured or killed on the roads, there would be a media outcry with large headlines. Television and talkback radio commentators would be talking daily about such an outrageous situation, saying that we ought to be doing more.

In my experience over many years I cannot recall a great deal of effort being put in by the media to address these problems. More is the pity, because of the enormous resultant cost to the community. Let me put aside for a moment the human tragedies, traumas, loss of life and suffering of families who have to contend with the cost of these injuries and caring for injured people either at home or sometimes in institutions. The cost of rehabilitation, hospitals, medical services and transporting people is huge and the media could play an important role in addressing this problem.

I refer to some of the garbage in newspapers, especially the sensationalism of trivial events that can gain headlines on page 3 or 5 (the odd pages—the most prominent newspaper pages), yet one is lucky to get even a run in relation to an injury or death in the workplace. Invariably, it appears in a little obscure corner somewhere, and that is a sad state of affairs. I was particularly taken by the First World Conference on Accident and Injury Prevention and its Manifesto for Safe Communities, which states:

> The increasingly rapid changes to and expanded use of technologies pose new challenges to public safety. Technologic changes often cause new safety hazards or change the groups exposed to hazards. Governmental policies must minimise the hazards of new technologies and develop methods to modify technologies when they cause increases in injury. Governments are urged to develop international policies for safety which limit the adverse effects of changing technologies on injury rates in other nations. Politicians and administrators at the community level, with the assistance of other levels, should develop policies that support accident and injury prevention programs.
>
> Safety is greatly influenced by corporate and business interests, non-governmental organisations and community groups. They should be encouraged to adopt policies which will preserve and promote peoples' safety and should coordinate with and cooperate in the implementation of governmental policies. Labour unions, commerce, industry, academic associations and religious leaders all have important opportunities to act in the health and safety interest of the community.

I could not have put it any better. I believe there is a very important role for communities and the people I mentioned to play, coming together more to address these matters. I was particularly taken by an article in the *West Australian* of 12 January which, in part, states:

Young people are being sent into the workplace like lambs to the slaughter because of poor training, according to the National Safety Council.

The council said many employers were still refusing to provide on the job training to prevent workplace accidents.

National Safety Council Executive Director, Dr Pat Copping, said Australia had one of the worst occupational health and safety records in the Western world.

I think that that is a damning indictment. I have listened with a great deal of attention over the 11 years I have been in this place, and I believe that very few members opposite have addressed the problem of work safety. That was illustrated in this House earlier this week during debate on the legislation then before us.

There are human tragedies, loss of life and injuries occasioned to people on the shop floor. I have seen it in the industry in which I have worked—a very dangerous occupation where machinery is involved and with one slip you have gone underneath, and that is it. There was very little training when I first came into the railway industry, and many other occupations are similar. The rural sector has its problems as well, as I know the member for Eyre would agree. However, I believe that this Parliament should be paying more and more attention to these problems, because indirectly we all pay, be it through the hospitals, insurance, rehabilitation or in burying our loved ones.

I was particularly taken by the fact that teenagers were 20 times more likely to be seriously injured or killed than those who had been at work for at least nine months. There is a need for all of us, particularly parliamentarians, to address these problems. I know that the Minister on the front bench has a commitment in this area. However, I believe that all of us should be addressing this problem.

Motion carried.

At 5.29 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 19 February at 2 p.m.