HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 2 April 1987

The SPEAKER (Hon. J.P. Trainer) took the Chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

LIBERAL HOUSING POLICY

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): I move:

That this House condemns and totally rejects the recently announced Federal Liberal Party's policy on housing, which would ensure the annihilation of the public housing programs in South Australia and, further, the House believes that the scrapping of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement would result in a severe downturn in the building industry and a consequent massive increase in unemployment.

'The Federal Liberal Opposition virtually plans to wipe out Australia's public housing programs with a policy that would strip $1 300 000 000 in cash from the States.' So said the Adelaide *Advertiser* of 13 March this year in reporting the newly released Federal Liberal housing policy. On the same day, the *Melbourne Age* reported that a Federal Liberal Government would privatise the Department of Housing and Construction and abolish Federal funding for public housing. It further stated that, although the Liberals plan to retain the First Home Owner Scheme, this could be handed over to the private banks. 'Mr Beal's policy means that he would preside over the abolition of his own department.' the *Age* observed.

Under the heading 'Public housing to be slashed by Coalition', the *Financial Review* of 13 March reported that a Federal Coalition Government would make budgetary savings by slashing public housing and construction spending, mainly through the abolition of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. This scheme, established in 1945, is described by the *Financial Review* as the foundation of public housing of disadvantaged groups, including Aborigines, pensioners, and disabled people. The *Australian* stated that the Federal Opposition was risking a confrontation with the States over the proposal to end the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, while the *Sydney Morning Herald* commented that the abandonment of that agreement would mean a big cut in public housing, in rental aid for the aged and Aborigines, and in crisis accommodation. The reaction to the Federal Liberal policy was the same throughout the Australian media and I believe it will be the same throughout the Australian community when the grim reality of what the Federal Liberal Party is proposing is fully understood.

I now wish to examine some of the other aspects of a policy that would have a disastrous effect on public housing, especially in South Australia. The Liberal policy would prevent the States from nominating Loan Council funds for public housing. Over the past four years South Australia has nominated 100 per cent of its Loan Council funds for housing. In actual financial terms, public housing funds received from the Commonwealth Government during the 1986-87 financial year totalled $173.5 million, made up of about $72.5 million in grants and $101 million in Loan Council borrowings.

In South Australia, the State Government's funding commitment comprised 83.2 per cent of total housing funding. That is $362.7 million out of a total of $435.8 million, including the $101 million from Loan Council funds. I fully support the Premier's view that, if South Australia were denied the opportunity to nominate Loan Council funds for housing, this would have a disastrous effect on the housing industry and would create enormous social pressures for those 40 000 applicants who need public housing.

Another of the recently announced Liberal policies is the retention of the First Home Owner Scheme with an emphasis on families. It is interesting to note that, as reported in the *Financial Review*, the First Home Owner Scheme narrowly avoided abandonment. Early drafting of the statement planned to abolish the scheme, but it managed to survive. That is hardly a firm and principled commitment, and I am sure that it is not very reassuring to the thousands of Australians seeking to buy their first home.

I will await with great interest a clear explanation by the Opposition of how it intends to place greater emphasis on families. Will it be to the disadvantage of couples without dependent children or single applicants? I pose that question because, since the inception of the First Home Owner Scheme and in the period to the end of June 1986, 18 904 applications were approved and, of those, 10 586 households did not have dependants; that is, 56 per cent of all successful applicants did not have dependent children. Obviously, a significant majority of these applications would be from young couples who are desperately striving to purchase their first home. Is the Opposition saying that these couples should have children before applying, when many young couples are making a conscious choice to work and save for their first home before starting their family? Would the implementation of the Opposition's policy to favour families discriminate against single people who meet the required criteria? Surely families with children should be given additional assistance to obtain housing, but not to the disadvantage of young couples and single applicants.

This housing policy of the Federal Liberal Party will be known as the most regressive and destructive housing policy ever put forward by any major political Party in this country. It will be shown to be destructive because, as my motion states, it will annihilate the public housing programs which (let me remind the House) include the Rent and Mortgage Relief schemes, the Home Ownership Made Easier scheme, the crisis accommodation program, Aboriginal and pensioner housing programs, as well as the general programs of the South Australian Housing Trust and the Emergency Housing Office. This policy would also see the end to thousands of jobs in the housing and construction industry. The Minister of Housing and Construction in South Australia has estimated that this will be of the order of 10 000 jobs lost to South Australia alone.

The policy is regressive in that it turns the clock back 50 years. Mr Beale, in releasing the policy, spoke about the Menzies era. Is he not aware that the world economic situation has changed and that he cannot go backwards to another era—to another age? The housing industry itself does not support the Federal Liberal Party policy. A spokesman for the Housing Industry Association stated in the *Financial Review* of 13 March:

We have some concerns about the absorption of public housing into general funds. Since the scheme has been the mechanism by which all Australians have the opportunity of obtaining decent shelter, if they were to be absorbed then the priority would be diminished quite substantially.

That statement was made not by a member of the Labor Party but indeed by a spokesman for the Housing Industry Association. The Australian Housing Council, which comprises a broad representation of the building industry and the financial lending institutions of this country, has publicly rejected the Opposition's housing policy. State Housing Ministers from around the country have condemned the policy. The New South Wales Housing Minister (Mr Walker) stated:

It could well mean no more earmarked funds for pensioners, Aborigines or people with disabilities. In short, there will be no guarantee that all Australians will have equal access to housing.

The Victorian Housing Minister (Mr Wilkes) described the Opposition's housing policy as a 'disaster' and said that it offered nothing to thousands of Australians struggling to meet their housing needs. The South Australian Minister of Housing and Construction (Hon. Terry Hemmings) was quoted in the *Australian* as saying:

The abolition of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement would spell disaster for the housing hopes of literally hundreds of thousands of people.

While Mr Beale states that he wants 'to return to the prosperity of the Menzies era and to ensure the provision of more rental accommodation and more flexible public housing', the policies which he has announced would see the annihilation of the public housing programs that are now in place. The Federal Minister, Mr West, commented publicly that the Federal Government's role in housing and construction would be decimated, and he went on to describe as particularly callous the proposal to abolish the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, which is the Federal Government's major program to help those in need.

This policy is nothing more than a cynical confidence trick by a desperate, divided and decimated Liberal Opposition. It does not have the support of the States, the housing industry, or the financial housing lending institutions, and even the conservative media are united in their opposition to the policy. But it will be the Australian people who will make the final judgment about this housing policy. I believe not only that they will condemn it as being destructive and regressive but also that they will pass the same judgment on the Opposition at the next Federal election.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I never cease to be amazed by the paranoid drivel that we get from time to time from the honourable member and others in her Party. Every time the Liberal Party or the coalition releases a policy document we are subject to nothing but paranoid abuse.

Members interjecting:

Mr BECKER: At least we do not have all the factions like you have such as the middle and the centre left. Members opposite do not know to which group they belong; they have more factions than there are branches of the TAB. They are unreal.

An honourable member: Don't you worry about that!

Mr BECKER: That is what Joh says, too—it is what I would expect from cobweb bench. However, there is no doubt that the best way to introduce spirited public debate is to release a policy document, and one can always rely on the Labor Party to kick it and condemn it and, of course, to misrepresent the true facts.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr BECKER: Being negative, as the member for Murray-Mallee says, is quite right. We had three years of that between 1979 and 1982 when the Liberal Government did its utmost to develop and stabilise the situation in South Australia and to improve the economic situation. All we got then was sabotage by the unions and the union sponsored members in this House. Look at what we have seen today—policy statements. We have seen condemnation of the coalition policy by persons representing the various unions within the housing industry. One could almost say it is BLF sponsored. That is the position that we have got to. To enable me to truly respond to the drivel that we have heard, I will seek leave to continue my remarks later. Before I do, I move to amend the motion, as follows:

By removing all the words after 'this House' and inserting 'deplores the honourable member for Mawson's misrepresentation of the Federal Liberal Party's policy on housing'.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

Honourable members: Yes, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Does the member for Hanson assure the Chair that he will bring up his amendment in writing?

Mr BECKER: Yes, Sir. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

INTEREST RATES

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That this House roundly condemns the Federal Government for their high tax and high interest rate policies which are crippling Australia.

My only regret is that I have not quite strong enough words in my motion to express my disgust at the track record of the Hawke Labor Government, which of course is Whitlam revisited. 'Crippling' is hardly the word. This nation is on its knees as a result of the depredations of those people who are masquerading as a Federal Government in Canberra at this very moment. We have a film star with his new perm at the head cavorting around the countryside on this appeal to seek re-election. Any problems that the coalition may have will pale into insignificance, I suggest, at the time of the next election when the real issues confronting this country, which are addressed in this motion, namely, the exorbitant levels of tax that are levied on the public and the record levels of interest rates that are besetting anyone who has borrowed any money at all, will come to the consciousness of the public.

Despite all the media hype and politicking in relation to efforts of Bjelke-Petersen in Canberra, it is not far below the consciousness level of the public. The fundamental problems besetting this country are addressed in this motion. We have just heard this hypocritical drivel from the member for Mawson about housing. What has happened to housing in this country is that the Federal Labor Party has instituted an interest rate regime which is the highest to ever have occurred in this country in real terms.

Not many people in this day and age can afford to buy a house for cash. Very few people could go along and say, 'I want to buy this house and here is the cash.' By far the vast majority of people—90 per cent or more—have to borrow money. I do not know whether the member for Mawson was referring to a Housing Trust home but, in view of the new privatisation policy embraced by the Labor Party, it is no wonder that the Housing Trust cannot sell its houses. The reason why the trust has sold only about three houses is that nobody, whether they live in a Housing Trust home or elsewhere, can afford to pay the interest bill, so let us not hear this hypocritical nonsense about the policies of the Opposition in relation to the massive problems which beset this country. They are a result of the efforts of Treasurer Keating, who does not even pay his income tax; he does not even send in a return. What credibility does the Labor Party have when, to use the Treasurer's term, he is rorting the system? He says that he lives away from home, but he has a house in Sydney which has no furniture and is not even habitable.

Let me set the background to this sham of a Federal Labor Government whose tax and high interest rate policies as well as record overseas indebtedness have bankrupted this country. Let us get to the bottom line. Who is running this country? Who dictated this tax policy? It was not our

friend, Mr Keating, who is rorting the system, but rather it was his masters.

Ms Lenehan: The same old speech.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We have heard a deal of repetition—I had better not use unkind references. All I can say is that the member for Mawson's mouth (I will be generous and will not use the description I had intended for the member for Mawson) works overtime. I am far too kind. She is from the south. If members can make a rhyme out of that, they have got it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair would appreciate it if the Deputy Leader could return to the subject of his motion.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I thought that I was right on it, but I will try to make it a little clearer for you, Sir. Let me set the background to this so-called tax reform. Of course, we have Treasurer Keating on the tax cart, as it was called, along with his mate with a new hairdo, Prime Minister Hawke, with silver grey coiffured hair, on the cart.

An honourable member: Jealousy won't get you anywhere.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not have to have a perm—it is natural. Off they go on the tax cart. Rightly or wrongly, they were going to introduce an indirect consumption tax and numerous newspaper references told us that option C, the indirect tax, was the way to go. That is what Keating wanted.

Mr Ferguson: Mr Howard believes that, too.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course he does. The trouble was that they had not bargained not getting on side their real bosses, Mr Kelty and Mr Crean, from the ACTU. They had different ideas and, if they had had half a wit, they would have quietly got on with the Kelty package without all the hoo-ha and embarrassment of the tax summit and the embarrassing defeat that that involved for Treasurer Keating. They would have had far less trouble. Let me remind particularly members opposite of what Kelty said back in February 1985. We recall that the tax summit was held mid-year. To his so-called bunch of socialist comrades when speaking to a socialist group (and I forget the name—I will get to it when I cite the reference), Kelty made a statement to which the following reference is made:

> The union movement's strategy for 1985 was outlined at the weekend by the Secretary of the ACTU, Mr Bill Kelty, who put the Federal Government on notice.

Mr Ferguson: You need to have your glasses checked.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: My glasses are fine. I can assure the House that I will read perfectly accurately the report concerning what Mr Kelty said to his socialist mates, as follows:

> Mr Bill Kelty put the Federal Government on notice about what was expected from the prices and incomes accord in the Hawke Government's second term. Mr Kelty said 'no proposition' that resulted in an increase in the tax burden would be acceptable to the ACTU at this year's review of the tax system.
>
> He also foreshadowed a push by the ACTU for a Government crackdown on perks—such as company cars, expense accounts and education fees enjoyed by executives—and an expansion of the taxation 'pot' into currently non-taxable areas. Mr Kelty's frank speech was before a seminar organised by the Socialist Forum, a discussion group consisting of former Communist Party members and current ALP members, predominantly of the left wing.

We well know that one of the problems that the Labor Party faces is that, when the communists got the stitch in Australia, they decided they could not get much political clout under the red banner so they joined up with the Labor Party and, unfortunately, they were welcomed with open arms. That is what Mr Kelty spelt out to his mates in the Socialist Forum in February. I suppose one thing we could say about Treasurer Keating is that he is a glutton for punishment. He drove his cart headlong to the tax summit thinking that he could get option C and indirect tax up and running, but it was not long before the wheels fell off the cart and we were confronted with headlines such as 'ACTU gracious in beating Keating'. That article stated:

> The ACTU secretary, Mr Bill Kelty [the gracious winner] went to some lengths in his final speech at the tax summit yesterday to praise the Treasurer, Mr Keating.

He was magnanimous in victory. It further stated:

> 'Mr Keating had tackled tax reform in a totally honest and persuasive way,' he said.
>
> 'It would have been highly unlikely that, together with other groups, we would have advanced one significant step had it not been for Paul Keating,' he added.

In other words, poor old Keating finally had to realise that the wheels had fallen off and that he had been done like a dinner by his policitical masters, as he always is. The article further states:

> The references to Paul Keating the statesman—

and remember that he was the world's greatest Treasurer at one stage of the game, until he forgot to fill in his tax return, I suspect—

> in a summit full of section interests were commiserations for an equally gracious loser. The past few months have been a battle between the Treasurer's determination to implement the Government's preferred tax reform option and the ACTU's equally determined opposition to the 12.5 per cent consumption tax that was its key element.

So we have the tax package which, of course, coming from the ACTU, is based on envy and the notion of 'Let us get hold of the so-called wealthy.' What is the end result? The end result is that the tax package has decimated the car industry of this State as well as the wine and citrus industries, and there has been precious little real opposition from the Premier of South Australia. What has been the Bannon stance in all of this: he backs the Treasurer all the way. Banner headlines: 'I back Keating all the way—Bannon.' It reads:

> The Premier, Mr Bannon, today took a dive into electoral deep water by launching a spirited defence of the Hawke-Keating economic policies. He sounded one note of warning—that the Federal Government must not allow interest rates to escalate further.

What credibility does a State Premier have in these circumstances, when he backs these policies all the way? The fact is that these taxes have had an absolutely disastrous impact on one of the basic industries that has kept the economy of this State in any sort of shape since the Second World War—the car industry. Mitsubishi, which had a success story, is plunged into a loss situation this year, all as a result of this tax reform.

What an abuse of the word 'reform'. This so-called reform has plunged this nation into an economic decline which equals and, indeed, may well surpass that of the great depression. Let us look at all of the indicators which would point to the state of the economy in this nation and in this State. What about the crocodile tears we got from the Government about the unemployed? 'The tragedy of unemployment' we got day in day out in this place, because they thought there were a few votes in this issue. Twenty five per cent of our school leavers cannot get jobs. Whose fault is that? That is directly laid at the feet of this present Federal Government which has presided over the onset of a depression in this country which all of the indicators show as being as disastrous in its effects as the Great Depression.

We hear from the member for Mawson about the housing industry. The South Australian Government pumped a lot of money into housing to try to generate activity but, of course, this cannot go on indefinitely. It pumped in $100 million in this year's State Budget. It borrowed $100 million to prop up a works program. That has turned into over $300 million when it has to be repaid in 1992.

What has that done to the long-term stability and economy of this State—short-term measures?

We have asked the Government about this wonderful deal with ETSA. The Premier cannot even get up in this House and tell us the details of this wonderful deal. All we know is that it has some cash in hand at the moment. Perhaps that will help pay off the claims of the bushfire victims. What will be the story 25 years down the track? The Government is very short on that sort of detail. Get a bit of cash in hand now and worry about the future when they are gone. What is the end result of these profligate policies? This nation ranks alongside Third World countries in terms of overseas indebtedness.

I read an article last week about overseas nations' international indebtedness, talking about countries which owed $75 billion, $50 billion and $90 billion. Australia is left off the list: we owe $100 billion, but we are in the category of the Third World countries which are insolvent. That sum has escalated dramatically. I do not know how on earth members opposite have the gall to get up here and move motions such as that spoken to by the member for Mawson in the past few minutes, condemning the policies of an Opposition which at least will have the stomach to tackle the fundamental, underlying problems of this nation, when the record of their colleagues in Canberra is so appalling! They are led by the would-be film star Prime Minister who thinks he can con the public. He ran out of credibility about 18 months ago.

I can tell members opposite that the Labor Party has consistently trailed. The poll that counts is the poll which indicates that if there had been an election during the past 12 months the Labor Party would have lost with the same sort of thrashing it got when Fraser was first elected, except for the last couple of months when the Joh factor entered the scene. Do not let members be fooled. At no time, if we look back through the last 10 or 12 years of public polling, has any Government been so consistently unpopular over a 12-month period and consistently facing defeat as has the Hawke Government. Do not let members worry about the film star stakes, the permed hair and the popularity of the Leader. Let them look at which Party would win an election.

Their socialist mate Lange in New Zealand won an election with an 13 per cent approval rating. Members are trying to make some deal about the personal popularity of the Leader when their socialist mate in New Zealand had a personal popularity of 13 per cent but won an election. The polls indicate quite clearly that if an election had been held in any month during the past 12 months Hawke would have been rolled, in fact steamrolled. Do not let us kid ourselves that his film star hairdo will save him.

The SPEAKER: Order! This psephological philosophy is very interesting, but I ask the Deputy Leader to come back to his contribution.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am glad you are enjoying it, Mr Speaker—I am enjoying delivering it. All the hoo-ha and phony motions that the Labor Party here trot out to try to cash in on the Joh factor will not count for anything. When the chips are down, it is the people who are trying to buy homes, whether they are Housing Trust homes or otherwise, despite the crocodile tears from the member for Mawson, and who are looking at interest rates of 16 per cent, as are those in business or on the land—

Mr Robertson: They went down a quarter per cent in the last 24 hours.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Big deal! Is that what has happened to interest rates on homes? One can never get two economists to agree. I heard an economist from Flinders University saying that it is all malarky, that they will go up anyway. What is a quarter per cent in 24 per cent to a farmer who has to walk off his property? What baloney! The tax regime instituted by this Government and the record interest rates, give or take a quarter per cent, are killing the housing industry, the rural industry, and the small businessman and jeopardising the jobs of people who work in large enterprises, and putting them out of work. Nothing the Labor Government here or the people who masquerade as a Government in Canberra can say will gainsay the facts. Those facts will be impressed on the electorate come election time and the Labor Party will be past history.

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

AUSTRALIAN FILM CORPORATION

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I move:

That this House condemns the Federal Liberal Opposition's proposal to abolish the Australian Film Corporation.

The Federal Liberal Party's plan for its first 100 days in office has been leaked. The Australian *Financial Review* of Monday 23 March 1987 states:

The plan says that while many cuts should not be announced before an election—apparently because of public outcry—they should be planned in detail beforehand.

What hypocrisy! Don't tell the electorate what you are going to do to get into office, and then kick the guts out of them after! That is what they are saying in relation to the film industry.

It is quite clear, when one looks at the history of the Australian film industry in this country, that we have seen a bipartisan approach to the industry by successive Federal Governments under Gorton, McMahon, Whitlam, Fraser and the current Hawke Labor Government.

Mr Lewis: Set it up, get it going and sell it off.

Mr HAMILTON: I will ignore the inane interjection from the member for Murray-Mallee. He should go out chasing rabbits, because he would probably do a better job of that. For 15 years we have witnessed outstanding success from the direct input into the Australian film industry by successive Federal Governments of different political persuasions. The Liberal Party's attitude demonstrates an appalling ignorance and a denial of the vital role and activity of the Australian Film Corporation during the past 15 years. It shows a great deal of ignorance of the vital role that the corporation has played in coordinating the activities of the industry, including script development, equity investment and backup guarantees, much of which members opposite do not really understand. It is interesting to witness the deafening silence from the other side now, when we know there is huge support in the community for the film industry. I turn to a *Bulletin* article of 9 July 1986—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: The honourable member will have a chance to speak in a minute. He does not have any manners. Keep quite and contain yourself!

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will provide protection, if it is required. The honourable member should direct his remarks through the Chair.

Mr HAMILTON: I welcome your protection, Sir The *Bulletin* article states:

More than eight in 10 electors believe the Federal Government should continue to give financial support to the Australian film industry, a special survey by the Roy Morgan Research Centre finds. The survey also found that most Australians (88 per cent) believe Australian films increase international awareness of Australia, while 72 per cent believe Australian films help Australia's

export trade and 83 per cent believe Australian films help increase the number of tourists and visitors.

That resulted from surveying an Australia wide cross-section of 1 577 electors on the weekends of 15-16 and 22-23 June. I am quoting in part from this article, which continues:

The table below shows 81 per cent of electors surveyed said that the Federal Government should continue its financial support to the Australian film industry, 12 per cent said it should stop it and 7 per cent were undecided. The strongest agreement for the Government continuing its financial support for the Australian film industry came from Australian Democrats (86 per cent) followed by ALP supporters (82 per cent)—

and this shows just how out of touch is the Opposition in this State, as well as nationally—

and Liberal—NP supporters (81 per cent).

In other words, 81 per cent of Liberal Party supporters say, 'Leave the Australian Film Corporation alone. We are happy with what is taking place.' There is no evidence to suggest—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Murray-Mallee is in a position where he can approach the Chair and ask to be added to the speakers' list. He should not try to make a complete speech by way of interjection. The member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: And he is also a fool to boot, Sir, because he does not know a great deal about the industry. I would welcome it if he takes the opportunity later in private members' time to discuss this very important issue. I do not believe that members opposite (apart from one or two) have ever been down to the Film Corporation studios at Hendon and spoken to people there. I can recall the member for Hanson some years ago advocating in this place selling off the South Australian Film Corporation to his mates (and I would like to canvass that matter at another time). The member for Hanson was put back in his box very quickly when he was challenged on ABC TV by John Morris from the South Australian Film Corporation. If ever a man looked a goose on television, it was the member for Hanson when John Morris cut him to pieces: he sliced up the member for Hanson into little pieces and the honourable member was made to look like a babe in the woods.

Mr BECKER: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I will not allow members to use untruths in this House.

The SPEAKER: Order! What is the point of order?

Mr BECKER: I object to the member for Albert Park's remark that I was made to look like a goose: it is untrue and I take exception to it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Hanson and the member for Henley Beach to order. It would be most unfortunate if, at the very time that the member for Hanson has requested the protection of the Chair, the Chair was forced into a position of having to name him. The member for Hanson has objected to a term used by the member for Albert Park. Although the term is not unparliamentary, the member for Hanson finds it offensive. The Chair conveys the member for Hanson's request to the member for Albert Park that the term be withdrawn.

Mr HAMILTON: Far be it from me to deny your request, Sir, so I withdraw. Maybe he was a goose, but I will not pursue it. It is rather interesting to look at the Australian film industry's contribution to this country. According to estimates published by the Australian Arts Council the value of the total supply of goods and services to the Australian economy provided by the film industry in 1983-84 was in excess of $529 million.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I wish that fool would be quiet. The total salaries and wages bill for the industry in 1983-84 was an estimated $131 million. Employment in the industry, as revealed in the 1981 census was: motion picture production, 3 097; motion picture film hiring, 744; and motion picture theatres, 4 519. That makes a total of 8 360. It should be noted also that the video boom since 1980 may have resulted in substantial changes to these figures.

According to the ABS, the average weekly household expenditure in August in 1984 included the following: hire of video cassette tapes 66c; membership of video libraries 5c; and cinema admission charges 53c. With 5 039 200 housholds in Australia, the total annual expenditure would thus be as follows: hire of videos $172.9 million; membership of video libraries $13.1 million; and cinema admission $138.9 million. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a table showing how the various film authorities have been funded by the States.

The SPEAKER: Do I have the honourable member's assurance that the material to be incorporated is entirely statistical?

Mr HAMILTON: Yes Mr Speaker.

Leave granted.

FILM AUTHORITIES FUNDED BY THE STATES

	82-83 $m	83-84 $m	84-85 $m	85-86 $m	86-87 $m
Film Victoria	1.23	3.16	5.47	4.19	3.65
NSW Film Corporation	1.80	3.12	3.12	4.67	4.10
Qld Film Commission	1.02	1.19	.52	1.29	N/A
SA Film Commission	.84	1.02	1.61	2.15	2.12
WA Film Council	.27	.50	.51	.51	.51
Total	5.16	8.99	11.23	12.81	10.38

Mr HAMILTON: Returning to the foundation of the Australian Film Corporation, in 1970 the Federal Government established the Australian Film Development Corporation to provide financial assistance for film production. In May 1975 the functions of the AFDC were absorbed into the Australian Film Commission which has been formed under the Australian Film Commission Act 1975. The AFC was created with the following brief:

To encourage, whether by the provision of financial assistance or otherwise the making, promotion, distribution and exhibition of Australian films. In other words, to create a stable and self-sufficient film industry.

Financial assistance in the form of grants, loans and investments is available for script development, production and marketing of feature, documentary and short narrative films, telemovies and TV mini-series. The production division, Film Australia, produces programs commissioned by Federal Departments and authorities, and programs that illustrate and interpret aspects of Australia and on subjects of interest to Australians. The AFC also provides operating subsidies to publications, organisations involved in exhibition, distribution and the development of a film culture and to video organisations associated with public access television.

It is interesting to note the sum that has been invested in the development and promotion of films in Australia and, more particularly, the impact that the Australian Film Corporation has had on the promotion of Australian films overseas. One such film which is relevant at this time and which has been promoted by the Australian Film Corporation is *Crocodile Dundee*. The impact of that film in many overseas countries has been remarkable indeed. In this regard I could also refer to *Robbery Under Arms*. In order to deal

in detail with this aspect, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

LAND TAX

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

That this House urges the Government to immediately launch an inquiry into the impact of escalating land tax charges on the small business sector.

(Continued from 19 March. Page 3552).

Mr TYLER (Fisher): I wish to contribute to this debate only briefly. The motion urges the Government to immediately launch an inquiry into the impact of escalating land tax charges on the small business sector. I do not believe that I should waste the time of the House in paying much attention to this motion because, once again, the member for Mitcham is about two years behind the times. He obviously cannot recall what occurred in August 1985 so, for his benefit, it is worth repeating. At that time, the first major review of land tax for small business was carried out by the Bannon Government and, as a result, 76 000 of the 100 000 taxpayers who would otherwise have been eligible to pay land tax were exempted. Up to 14 000 other taxpayers paid less tax in the 1985-86 financial year than they did in the previous financial year.

People owning land valued between $40 000 and $80 000 were mainly affected by the new land tax charges. Essentially, the change in August 1985 simplified the land tax scale, reduced the problem of bracket creep and exempted all people owning land valued up to $40 000. People with land valued in excess of $40 000 but less than $80 000 paid zero plus 0.4 per cent. People with land valued in excess of $80 000 but less than $120 000 paid $160 plus 1 per cent, and after that it snowballed on a sliding scale. This cost the Government approximately $8 million in 1985.

Mr Lewis: Piffle!

Mr TYLER: The member for Murray-Mallee says 'Piffle'. I am referring to the 1985-86 budget, which is on the record. Small business greatly welcomed those exemptions. In the last budget the scales were indexed to compensate small business and people paying land tax for the increase in property values. That cost the State another $11 million. In two years, we have seen a $19 million reduction in land tax. Small business has welcomed that and I hoped that the member for Mitcham would have acknowledged that point.

That cannot be taken in isolation. When we add exemptions from payroll tax, we can see that there have been significant improvements for small business in this State. I know from my experience in my own electorate that small business people are very supportive of the Bannon Government and appreciate the Premier's interest in the small business sector.

Members interjecting:

Mr TYLER: Opposition members always complain and harp about taxation levels in South Australia, but we do pretty well compared with the other States. In fact, we are fourth on the list and I will refer members to what occurs in other States. In the 1986-87 estimates, Victorians paid $926 compared with $685 paid by South Australians. Comparing South Australia with a State about the same size, like Western Australians, they pay $752 compared with the $685 paid by South Australians. If we took notice of the Opposition, there would be no taxation in this State and no services. Opposition members call continually for a decrease in taxation levels in the State but, on the other hand, they call for new services. In the previous Parliament, the Opposition Leader kept talking the whole time about reducing taxes, charges and the size of government. On the other hand, in relation to my electorate the then member for Davenport, Mr Brown, committed an Olsen Government to spending $240 million on reopening the MATS plan. It was just not on—it was pie in the sky stuff.

Mr Duigan: They need him back.

Mr TYLER: They certainly do need him back, as the member for Adelaide points out, because they are looking very thin.

Ms Lenehan: Very tatty around the edges.

Mr TYLER: Yes, very tatty around the edges, as the member for Mawson points out. So, it is absolute nonsense for the member for Mitcham to believe that he is leadership material. He has a fair bit to learn, and he must look at what is really happening in the State and listen to small business.,

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr TYLER: In fact, as the member for Henley Beach says, the member for Mitcham will probably make it; he would probably make a very good Leader of the Opposition, and that is where he will probably stay for many years to come. There is no need for the House to adopt the motion. The Bannon Government has been acutely aware of the problems of small business. Two years ago, acting on advice that it received, the Bannon Government introduced some major reforms. It is interesting that the previous reforms in modifying land tax occurred in 1977-78. So, when the Bannon Government came to office in 1982 and looked at the small business sector, it decided that that was an area on which is should concentrate. It certainly acted and will continue to act on behalf of small business in South Australia.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

RETIREMENT VILLAGES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Becker:

That this House demand the Premier immediately introduce legislation to abolish land tax on all owner occupied retirement village units commencing this financial year.

(Continued from 19 March. Page 3553.)

Mrs APPLEBY (Hayward): In moving this motion demanding that the Premier immediately introduce legislation to abolish land tax on all owner occupied retirement village units commencing this financial year, I believe that the member for Hanson has responded with his usual gung-ho approach to what is an anomaly, placing residents at a disadvantage as compared to living in their own home or principal place of residence. The member for Hanson said that this issue first came to his attention in November last year. I must say that, if I was a constituent of the member for Hanson, I would be most concerned that it took him so long to catch up with issues that are of vital concern to the wellbeing and peace of mind of people whom he represents in this Parliament.

For some time now the Government has given priority to the matter of the adequacy of legal protection and rights in respect of tenants of retirement villages. The Bill now before another place is in response to issues that have been raised. On behalf of my constituents, and in response to representation from other areas of the State, I have spoken in this House on several occasions about the anomalies that exist, including the concessions from which tenants are excluded, particularly in commercial retirement villages.

I put to the House that there is a package of anomalies which go hand in hand (land tax is only one of them) and which cause a disadvantage to an estimated 2 per cent of our ageing population who choose resident funded retirement villages as their home. Resident funded villages provide the tenant with a deed of licence to occupy, and no security of tenure. Developers of these villages level charges for land tax equitably between licence holders based on the number of units and as a charge on maintenance billing, irrespective of the amount of common ground or other structures on the land title. I think that members of this House are capable of identifying the unfair practice that this suggests.

Further, the developer holding the title can trade on the valuation of the total property development where the tenant has no security of tenure. Those tenants who in other circumstances would be identified as living in their principal place of residence and would be eligible for council rate concessions are also excluded from this, and again are levied a proportion per unit of the total charge to the owner/developer. The same circumstances relate to E&WS charges in respect of eligibility for concessions.

Practices of management in respect of resale of units left vacant by death or tenant relocation have produced a number of examples of disadvantage suffered by tenants and/or their next of kin. Planning approvals, promotion and contracts and administration practices are some of the issues requiring some attention. It is true that the church or non-profit organisations operating such villages are already exempt from land tax. However, the commercial developers who have entered the field over the past couple of years have placed a different perspective on the issues that I have outlined. It is this latter group that has been the basis for concern in respect of the tenants and the anomalies that have come to light.

The member for Hanson has isolated the issue of land tax, when in reality there are a number of issues. I am sure that, given the circumstances that the tenants of such retirement villages find themselves in, they would deem the Government less than responsible if it did not take an overall interest in determining actions on all issues affecting tenants and developers in ensuring that no group or person is denied their rights and security. The Retirement Villages Bill which the Attorney-General has introduced in another place seeks to address and clarify legal rights in particular, determining security of tenure and thus assisting in providing a clear determination of what can be identified as the principal place of residence.

In turn, this should ensure that tenants have access to concessions such as land tax to which many have had access prior to selling their home to taking residence in retirement villages on a deed of licence for their investment which, at this time because they have no security of tenure, excludes them from concessions and places them as responsible by the developer for a total share of land tax, council rates and E&WS charges, while the owner/developer holds the asset of the land title and all development on that title. I therefore seek to amend the member for Hanson's motion in the following way. I move:

That all words after 'House' be left out and the following words be inserted in lieu thereof:

This House urges the Government to address with urgency documented anomalies which at present cause disadvantage to tenants of resident funded retirement villages and, further, the House congratulates the Premier for the announcement that land tax exemptions are to be addressed in the context of preparation for the 1987-88 budget with changes operating from 1 July 1987.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I second the amendment.

Members interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: The stupid comments that are coming from the other side of the House are typical of comments from people who are ill informed about a subject.

Members interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: Above the shouts of the Opposition (it has been very difficult to hear), I state that this is a very serious subject about which members ought to be concerned in relation to their own constituents. Because of the interjections I am taking longer than I expected to take and, the more interjections that come, the longer I will take. So, if members want the opportunity to speak, they ought not to interject. I am concerned about the way in which the member for Hanson has promoted this issue.

The member for Hanson is putting all of the blame at the feet of the Government. If one has a look at his proposition, one can see that. That is one of the reasons why I am supporting this amendment. The liability for land tax rests with the owners of the land. Although the residents may regard themselves as owners of the units in the sense that they have paid for the right to occupy the units exclusively as their places of residence, the legal owners remain the people responsible for the land tax. I know that the member for Hanson will not get preselection if he starts talking out against the developers, those people who are making—

Members interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I understand your position. I can understand the position of the Liberal Party—why members of that party would stand behind the developers and those people who are making loads of money from these retirement villages. The real blame should be sheeted home to the people who actually own those retirement villages. They are the people who are liable to pay the tax.

The SPEAKER: Order! There has been a substantial amount of interjection this morning during private members time, which the Chair has tolerated because it has basically been good natured banter. However, the level of interjection at the moment is becoming disruptive, and I ask the House to come to order on that basis. The member for Henley Beach.

Mr FERGUSON: I thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. Whether the Liberal Party likes it or not, or whether the member for Hanson likes it or not—and his debate so far has shown an absolute lack of concern at the way the developers are tackling this problem—the legal responsibility for the payment of this tax is with the developers. The amount of money that some of these people are being asked to pay on a weekly basis so far as these retirement villages are concerned is absolutely disgraceful.

I hope that the member for Hanson addresses this problem, because I have had phone calls from people in his electorate who are talking about having to pay $70 a week after having an outlay of their own investment money of between $60 000 and $98 000 put into these properties. Having made that sort of investment, they are now being asked by these promoters to pay $70 a week out of their own pensions. That is absolutely disgraceful.

Mr BECKER: On a point of order, the honourable member is getting the issues confused. He is talking—

The SPEAKER: Order! What is the point of order?

Mr BECKER: He should either tell the truth to the House or say nothing.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order, and I caution the member for Hanson about vexatious and frivolous points of order. The member for Henley Beach.

Mr FERGUSON: The member for Hanson has already threatened me this morning. He is going to do all sorts of terrible things to me—I am not sure what—and I suppose this is part of the activity with which he threatened me.

Mrs Appleby interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I agree with the member for Hayward that I ought not to worry too much about it. I want to bring some reality back to this debate, and some of the blame which ought to be sheeted home to the developers of these retirement villages ought to go back there. Members of the Liberal Party—although their preselection might be threatened if they take this on—ought to be able to stand up in this House and provide some of the truth, at least, because sheeting home this proposition to the Government, as the member for Hanson is trying to do, is quite wrong and irresponsible. If we have a look at the present legislation we will see that there is a provision in the Land Tax Act exempting retirement villages under particular circumstances. These include:

That the land be owned by the association and that the whole of the net income, if any, of the association be applied for furtherance of its objects and not for securing a pecuniary profit for the association. Where the land is owned by the company, however, retirement villages fail to qualify for this exemption.

If a retirement village has the whole of the profit ploughed back into it, then there is a land tax exemption, so all that the developers have to do is arrange a situation where all the money gathered is put back into a village for the benefit of the people in that village and there will be no land tax. I certainly hope that, from here on, instead of the member for Hanson getting up here and hammering the Government and sheeting home the blame for land tax to it, he will come back to the people who should accept responsibility for it—the developers. They are running around South Australia at the moment with the help of members of the Liberal Party circularising residents of villages and asking them to write to their local member of Parliament, the Premier or their nearest local Labor MP. I have been receiving correspondence along this line.

What developers ought to be looking at is the amount of the weekly payments that they are asking these people to pay at the moment: they are certainly unfair. The Government is concerned about what is happening and about the inadequacy of legal protection for retirement villages. The Liberal Party did nothing about this matter when in office, although it had plenty of opportunities to do so. It refused to look at the matter, or to do anything about it because it was frightened of some of the people promoting some of these villages.

There is currently a Bill before the Parliament to regulate the operation of retirement villages and to protect the rights of residents. Once Parliament has considered that Bill the separate issue of land tax exemption should be examined. The Premier has promised to do so and I am sure in the coming budget something will happen along these lines. In the meantime I wish that all members of the Parliament would accept their responsibility, as they should, and point out to people that land tax should be paid by the owners of these developments and is not necessarily the responsibility of the residents.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): The honourable member for Hayward's blind defence of the Premier, who has failed to answer correspondence on this issue after it was raised by the member for Hanson some considerable time ago, is really no defence at all. The position is that a lot of people are suffering here and now as a result of an action which has come out of the blue as a result of land tax costs escalating during the currency of this Government. This situation is a current concern because it is seriously affecting retired people who are on a fixed or reducing income. This added financial burden is causing them a great deal of mental stress and is seriously affecting their way of life.

The amendment put forward by the honourable member, obviously with the concurrence of the Premier, is not good enough. The only word in her amendment that I can agree with is 'urgent', because it is an urgent matter. It is not a matter which can wait until the 1987-88 budget, because so far as these people are concerned it is a problem that is real to them now. This is not a matter of tens of dollars but of hundreds of dollars in a number of circumstances. This situation has been allowed to develop because of the aggregation aspects of the Land Tax Act. The Government, having been alerted to the problem, has failed to react. It is not too late between now and the conclusion of this session of Parliament to provide a retrospective situation for those people who are in a serious and perilous financial circumstance. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

LOW INCOME EARNERS

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Lenehan:

That this Parliament congratulates the Government, and in particular the Minister of Housing and Construction and the Minister of Health and Community Welfare, for the initiatives and programs implemented to support low income earners and those in receipt of pensions and benefits.

(Continued from 26 February. Page 3196.)

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): The motion I moved on 26 February congratulated the Bannon Government on the initiatives, programs and legislation introduced to assist and support the many groups in the community who are disadvantaged. At that time I particularly referred to the housing industry and the Government's housing policies and programs. Today I want to look specifically at the areas of health and community welfare programs and initiatives that have been introduced to support the aged, youth, Aborigines, disabled, migrants, and women. Specifically, the wide range of services offered by the South Australian Dental Service has been extended to secondary students up to and including the year in which they turn 16. Treatment has now been extended to all students in years 8 and 9 and to approximately half of the State's year 10 students. The full program will be complete for our bicentennial in 1988.

In the 1985 calendar year the School Dental Service treated 165 093 preschool, primary and secondary school students—an increase of nearly 20 000 or 13.6 per cent over 1982 numbers. The South Australian Dental Scheme has substantially contributed to the improved dental health of our children which is now among the best in the world. Presently 70 per cent of children in South Australia require no treatment at the time of a routine checkup. The benefits of this scheme to low income families, sole parents and pensioners who support children are obvious.

In the field of adult dental health, many of those pensioners and low income earners who were previously treated at the Adelaide Dental Hospital are now being treated at community dental clinics much closer to their home. The number of adults treated by the various community clinics rose by 46 per cent to just over 22 000 in the last financial year—an increase of 800 per cent over 1982. The Adelaide Dental Hospital also underwent capital improvement in the last financial year with the completion of the $500 000 Oral and Maxillafacial Surgery Clinic.

The pensioner dental scheme, which allows patients on the waiting list at the Adelaide Dental Hospital and the community clinics to have dentures provided by a private dentist or clinical dental technician of their choice, has since 1982 given more than 40 000 South Australians access to new dentures.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: I can assure you that, if you do not have teeth or if you need them replaced and cannot afford it, it is a very important matter. While discussing the support that this Government has given to pensioners and low income earners, mention must be made of the South Australian spectacle scheme. This scheme has expanded its eligibility criteria and now dispenses about 64 000 prescriptions for spectacles each year. The cost to each patient was about $20 against the full cost of the spectacles. Since the inception of the scheme in 1982, an enormous number of spectacles (in fact, about 250 000) have been supplied.

Many other initiatives and programs have been introduced by the Bannon Labor Government in the area of health and welfare, including the joint Federal-State Home and Community Care program. The South Australian Government was the first State Government to sign the Home and Community Care Agreement with the Commonwealth Government, and new funding under the scheme will increase from $3.9 million this year to an estimated $5 million over the next three financial years as the States move to full dollar for dollar funding with the Commonwealth. This program aims to help elderly people and the young disabled to achieve the greatest degree of independence and to remain in the community without having to enter an institution for care.

We must also acknowledge the support that the Government has given in the area of sexual assault and rape. Over the past two years the Government has tripled funding to the Sexual Assault Referral Centre at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and has created new positions in this area, including that of a coordinator. At the same time, an extra position of social worker has been funded at the Adelaide Children's Hospital. An additional $200 000 has been allocated in the Health portfolio for staff increases to child victims of sexual assault. Within the Department for Community Welfare, child protection remains a top priority and, despite the difficult budgetary situation, 14 additional child protection positions have been funded in the current financial year. These positions, with support staff and eight new positions for crisis care, represent additional full-time funding of $588 000 in community welfare.

Briefly, I wish to refer to the advances made by the Bannon Government in respect of adolescent health. In this respect, I commend the Government on the establishment of the Second Storey Adolescent Health Centre in Rundle Mall. Further, women's health centres have been a significant factor in addressing many of the problems that have been experienced by women in the community and, in this regard, I am delighted that one such health centre has been created within the southern community at Christies Beach.

Although many of these programs and inititatives are not provided exclusively for recipients of low incomes or for people receiving pensions and other benefits, as well as their families, they certainly provide extremely valuable and necessary support for such groups. I commend the Bannon Labor Government on its initiatives especially in the area of housing construction and in health and community welfare. These initiatives have been implemented to support low income earners and those in receipt of pensions and other benefits.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

CARGO CONTROL

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Peterson:

That this House calls upon the Federal Minister for Industry, Technology and Commerce to modify the proposals by the Australian Customs Service to introduce an integrated cargo control and clearance system in order to protect South Australia's employment and economic future.

(Continued from 26 February. Page 3202.)

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): The proposals of the Australian Customs Service to clear Adelaide cargoes in Melbourne will have the effect of removing any official control whatever over their movement and make the goods free to be warehoused or relocated at the desire of the importer. In August 1986, Australian National and V Line, which control the railway line between Adelaide and Melbourne, announced the introduction of a super freighter service between Melbourne and Adelaide to provide a non-stop containerised freight service between the South Dynon railyards in Melbourne and Mile End, and presumably Islington, in Adelaide.

Further to the 1985 Australian Customs document on this proposal to change the system, in November 1986 the Australian Customs Service released a new paper containing new options on the proposals for change. The original proposals made the point that the objective of the changes was to reduce the cost by improving the flow of information and to improve the paperwork, as well as the physical control of imported cargo.

The later paper added a further objective and that was to upgrade the identification and control of high risk cargo, for example, that relating to contraband and drugs imported into the country. Nobody can argue with that sort of logic or the proposal: we all wish to support that. However, the overall rearrangement as suggested in these papers is definitely a matter of overkill and has serious ramifications for South Australia.

It is interesting to note the opinion of people involved in the industry as to the effect that these changes will have if they take place. The Customs Agents Federation of Australia summarised its opinion, as follows:

> Customs agents are anxious to see a complete electronic control and clearance system established as early as possible.

That indicates that there is no resistance at all to constructive change and to a system that will improve the overall flow of cargo. Another point made by the federation was:

> With due respect to the people involved, we believe that the current options proposed indicate little understanding of a customs agent's business or waterfront procedures and no regard for the longer term social and economic consequences of the proposal.

I have spoken before about the totally uncaring attitude of interstate and Federal bodies, and that is illustrated by the insular, uncaring Ministers in Canberra who do not care about Adelaide and South Australia and who work in company with ivory tower bureaucrats who do not care about this State, either. All they care about is their own little area of responsibility and their own offices. They want to make their own job easier and do not care about the effects of their decisions. One of the proposals put forward concerned reducing costs, but the customs agents say that that will not happen. The report from which I am quoting states:

> Under the latest proposal, costs to importers would not be reduced but increased.

That is a very positive statement. Another point was:

Optional port lodgment will be economically disastrous for States other than New South Wales and Victoria and will change the traditional interface from customs/agents to customs/importers.

That means that they will work directly with the people importing rather than through the agents. The report states further:

Gateway port clearances will centralise import functions to Sydney and Melbourne. It will delay delivery of cargo and increase costs. It will result in under-utilisation of regional port and airport facilities and services. The Customs Agents Federation is dedicated to the concept of electronic clearance of cargo but it must be a system that is workable, commercially economic and not simply a money saver for the Government with a net expense to the nation.

Despite all of these protestations to the Customs Service regarding its intentions for gateway port clearances, if physical delivery of cargo is to be possible under the revised system, it is inevitable that the total interface between customs and the shipping companies will gravitate to the gateway port at the cost of feeder ports. To illustrate what the effect will be, the Customs Agents Association of South Australia, in a report on the effects of the Australian Customs Service proposed integrated cargo control and clearance system, stated:

Certain elements of the customs proposals are laudable but the implementation of some of the proposals as a whole will have significantly deleterious effects on South Australian port and airport operations, related business and, consequently, the State economy . . .

Much of South Australian manufacturing industry and commerce relies on the viable local international port and airport facilities currently available to them. A vital part of the operations of these South Australian facilities is the handling, examination and distribution of cargo trans-shipped via other ports and airports (e.g. Melbourne, Sydney).

Port Adelaide and Adelaide Airport International cargo operations contribute significantly to the South Australian economy—in excess of $200 million per annum.

Recognised potential for expansion of international trade through Port Adelaide and Adelaide Airport has led both Commonwealth and State Governments to continue to invest heavily in providing and enhancing these facilities—

for example, the second container crane at Outer Harbor, which was opened only the other day—

Private enterprise continues to invest millions of dollars each year on facilities and equipment required to service this international trade; the State Government and its agencies (including the Department of State Development) are heavily involved in attracting new industry and commerce to set up operations in South Australia (for example, the proposed submarine construction project) and these frequently require viable local port and airport facilities. Further development of State resources will depend on the continuing existence of these facilities.

Media reports attributed to customs stating 'it will be more economical for importers who will no longer see their goods sitting on the wharf for up to three weeks awaiting customs clearance' do its own administration a great disservice. Innovative procedures introduced last year have reduced customs clearance times, in most cases, to hours, not days, and customs are to be congratulated for their initiative.

Such delays have nothing to do with customs procedures and are due entirely to the problems of the maritime industry recently addressed in the Report of the Shore Based Shipping Costs Inquiry. This report showed little enthusiasm for coming to grips with the problem, and it seems that entrenched systems will remain.

That is true: most of the delays occur at the unloading port interstate. The report continues:

Enshrined in current customs proposals would be the need for importers to accept overseas drafts and make payments for duty some 12 to 14 days earlier, on average, than at present, with a commensurate delay before such cargo becomes available in Adelaide in normal circumstances . . .

The customs proposals have the potential to seriously disadvantage South Australian importers and exporters by: reducing port operations, including the possible closure and/or consolidation of existing container depots, and the possible non-viability of the Outer Harbor container terminal; scaling down and/or closure of various port and airport related service industries . . . costing the State economy in excess of $30 million through losses in personal wages, business income, under-utilisation . . .

So, those are the things highlighted by the people involved, the customs agents. The Minister of Marine established the South Australian Ports Liaison Advisory Committee. That was formed by the Miniser at his request to advise him on the state of the port, changes to be made, future progress, and the state of things generally. That committee reports directly to the Minister of Marine on this cargo clearance system. I shall refer to only parts of a report that was submitted, as I do not have much time, as follows:

The South Australian Ports Liaison Advisory Committee (SAPLAC) supports the Australian Customs Service's intent to further restrict the entry of contraband into Australia. However, these enhancements will also facilitate customs' wish that all cargo be cleared at the port of discharge as opposed to the present system of movement of cargo under bond to the port of destination with clearance at that port. Further, an inherent part of the customs' proposals is the option to enter information and clear cargo for goods destined for any port from any authorised computer entry terminal in Australia.

The second of these proposals is the Australian National and V/Line intention to put their Adelaide-Melbourne operations on a more commercial footing. This is to be done by restricting services to railhead to railhead (Mile end to South Dynon) operations and by the introduction of superfreighter services.

I shall be pleased to give any honourable member here who wishes to read it a copy of the report. The report indicates the risk to our port operations, the container depots, and that type of operation. As a result of all the concerns expressed by the people who recognise the dangers in this State, a report was produced by the Department of State Development in December 1986. The report was entitled 'A study of the potential economic impact on South Australia of a proposal by the Australian Customs Service to introduce an integrated cargo control and clearance system and future Australian National Rail services'.

After the matter was raised and publicised, something was finally done about it. Credit must be given to the State Government, because a report by the Department of State Development states:

The economic impact on South Australia of the original ACS proposal for an integrated cargo control and clearance system is estimated to be:

Additional costs to business of between $5.9 million and $6.9 million per annum.

The loss of 753 jobs (319 direct, 434 indirect).

A fall in local economic output of between $15 million and $20 million per annum as measured by forgone wages and salaries and some loss of business profits . . .

A significant long-term impact on the region of Port Adelaide.

A reduction in the State's competitive ability to attract investment and promote exports.

(a) SA will become more vulnerable to interstate industrial disputes—

which will be the case on the waterfront in relation to transport industries—

particularly in areas related to the inspection and clearance of goods and containers by the ACS.

(b) SA will also become more vulnerable to interstate pricing of work related to customs inspection . . .

This is our own State Government finally presenting this report which outlines the risks. What was said earlier and was ignored came to be proved as fact. The situation is that, if we do not do something about it, we will really be in trouble. As I have said before, it will be the final straw that will break the camel's back and this port will become a second grade port. The manning is decreasing all the time and waterfront labour is also decreasing. It is at risk of being classified a B grade port now. All the parties except the Australian Customs Service and the Federal Minister for Industry, Technology and Commerce can see that there

are dire problems ahead for South Australia if their proposals are proceeded with without amendment.

On page 11 of that same report it defines 2 042 jobs directly involved in the import and customs clearance of goods. It details specific areas. In the container depots and terminals there are 174 employees; ancillary container services, 25; Australian Customs Service in this State, 332; customs agents and forwarding agents (shipping), 130; customs agents and forwarding agents (air), 20; local carriers, 120; shipping companies and agents, 110; marine surveyors, 10; bond and free stores, 10; stevedoring companies, 30; quarantine service, 50; Department of Marine and Harbors, 781; wharf labourers, tugmen, etc., 200; and airlines, 50. These are the areas of employment that are directly at risk.

In addition, there are unquantifiable jobs that will be threatened. I have a letter from the Port Adelaide Retail Traders Association which was sent to Mick Young, the Federal member, and it states:

> It appears ironic that on the virtual eve of the opening of the new Customs House in our hard core area announcement is made of this new plan to streamline operations of the customs service. There is really no need for the writer to tell you of the effect this scheme will have on many families from many avenues in our area.

The fact that the association should take the trouble to write indicates its concern. I notice that, in an attempt to resist this move, some members of Parliament from Queensland have raised questions, and made some comments in Federal Parliament. I have not seen one word about South Australia's Federal members having attempted to do the same thing. Not one word has been written in the newspapers or, from my perusal, in Federal *Hansard*. As a matter of fact, people who are involved have said that they have been ignored by Federal South Australian Labor members of Parliament.

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I have not seen anything from the Liberal members, either—not one word. If these people will not look after our interests, who will? I do not see too many Federal members taking an interest in this—they are too intersted in other matters. It seems to me that employment and the future of this State should be the predominant interest of this State Parliament and the Federal Parliament. I think that Federal members should be condemned by this Parliament for their lack of interest.

I support the moves by the State Minister of Marine, who has now taken the initiative and has made protests to Canberra. I am well aware of what he has done, because he has liaised with me, and I appreciate that. We are making our voices heard, and I ask members on both sides of this House to urge their Federal members to put more pressure on the Federal Government and the Minister to have this proposal reviewed. We cannot afford it. This State has many problems, and we do not need this area of our economy kicked in the guts. If this goes ahead, that will happen. So, I ask for the support of all members for this motion and I hope that I get it.

Mr De LAINE (Price): This is a classic example of a Federal Government department trying to impose its will on an important sector of Australian commercial life without due regard to the devastating effects the policy may have on the economics of the States and, more especially, in South Australia. No-one in his right mind supports drug running. In fact, the evil forces in our communities who trade and profit from the weaknesses—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If I could just interrupt the honourable member: I assume that he is seconding the proposition of the member for Semaphore.

Mr De LAINE: Yes.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr De LAINE: In fact, the evil forces in our communities who trade and profit from the weaknesses of others should suffer the full brunt of the law and be denied their freedom for the term of their natural lives. But this does not give the Australian Customs Service an unfettered right to ride roughshod over the lives and livelihoods of thousands of people in industries associated with this import-export trade. Drug trafficking must be stamped out and every conceivable means available should be exercised to bring the culprits to justice, and in this respect I fully support the general thrust of the Australian Customs Service plans for an integrated cargo control and clearance for both sea and air movements of container cargo, especially inward cargoes.

However, while the need exists for the Australian Customs Service to streamline its computer control methods for the handling of container cargoes from both marine and aerial sources entering Australia, one wonders whether their proposals are too far-reaching and perhaps their real motives are not being revealed. The Customs Service must not be given an opportunity to establish a foothold for centralised computer controls that could spell doom for hundreds of customs agents and their many thousands of employees, plus loss of employment for persons associated down the line with cargo handling.

Primarily, I am interested in looking after South Australia's interests, but in this instance the customs proposals extend far beyond our borders and directly impact on Queensland, Western Australian and Tasmania, which means that practically everybody living outside what are known as the two gateway ports—Melbourne and Sydney—will become second-class citizens with no effective say in how, when or why particular action has been taken regarding their container cargo.

Not only will effective control be lost, but the additional costs for South Australian consumers will become a needless burden they will have to endure. Effectively, South Australia will be at the mercy of the more powerful Melbourne and Sydney businessmen who, if they so desire, can manipulate freight charges to suit themselves to the further detriment of South Australians.

The ACS proposals have the potential to seriously disadvantage South Australian importers and exporters; reduce port operations, including Outer Harbor Container Terminal (leading to possible non-viability); container depots (closure and eventual consolidation to one depot); scaling down or closure of port and airport related service industries, including customs agents; shipping offices and agents, international freight forwarders, local carriers, bond stores, providoring, stevedoring, engineering and other support groups, with considerable detrimental effect on the Department of Marine and Harbors and other State and Commonwealth Government departments.

The financial loss to the South Australia economy will be in excess of $30 million per annum through losses in personal wages, business income, underutilisation and reduction in value of assets, Government income lost through diminished port operations, and a flow-on to the entire community of all those things. The direct cost to both State and Commonwealth departments will be at least $7 million per annum in the following areas: income tax forgone, unemployment benefits provided, and State and local taxes forgone. Also, there will be a substantial monetary and socioeconomic cost to the entire community. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

RESIDENT TENANCY OFFICERS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Becker:

That this House request the South Australian Housing Trust to reconsider the position of all resident tenancy officers previously located at various Housing Trust group of flats.

(Continued from 19 March. Page 3556.)

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Housing and Construction): I move to amend the motion as follows:

Leave out all words after 'this House' and insert 'endorses the South Australian Housing Trust's efficiency measures which seek to enable the trust to continue to provide the high standard of public housing in a most equitable and cost efficient way'.

The problem of removal of residential officers in trust walk-up flats or medium density complexes has been getting quite a lot of space in the newspapers recently. The member for Hanson was at the forefront of whipping up that objection to the trust's removal of residential officers. I have been patiently waiting for about four weeks for the member for Hanson either to ask me a question on this matter or, when he moved the private member's motion, to put forward a case as to why the South Australian Housing Trust should retain the residential officers in Housing Trust complexes.

However, when the honourable member made his very lengthy contribution last week it consisted almost entirely of letters from residents in those complexes who said that they did not want that service to be discontinued. The member for Hanson, who is supposedly fighting on behalf of those people, did not provide one cost benefit analysis of why we should retain those services. All he had was a series of letters. Not one area was referred to where the trust would be able to provide that service in an equitable way.

On the other hand, the member for Hanson, ever since I have known him in this Parliament, has always whinged about the excessive number of public servants in the State Government. He says that we should reduce the number of public servants. In fact, when I announced the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless initiatives by this Government, what did the member for Hanson say? He said that it was a stunt to provide work for underworked public servants! That was his attitude, and it was a complete insult to the Public Service and to what we were trying to do in the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless. The member for Hanson does not understand what this is all about—equity. I do not expect the member for Hanson, or indeed members of the entire Liberal Party, to know what equity is about because, as far as they are concerned, if you have a privilege and write enough whingeing letters to your local member of Parliament, that member will go in fighting for that service to be maintained.

I realise that if one has a privilege it is hard for the Government to take it away and for one to lose it. However, I have been telling this Parliament and the public of South Australia that in the current difficult financial climate the trust must critically review its entire operations to ensure that its resources are used efficiently and equitably. The trust is undergoing a funding squeeze in terms of its demand for its services compared with the resources that are available to it.

I am sure that the member for Hanson would agree with me that there have been cutbacks in funding to the South Australian Housing Trust. That is the fault not of this Government but in the main that of the Federal Government. I again remind the member for Hanson and the Liberal Party that the decisions made by the Federal Government the other day, while they indicate real problems for housing in this State, are nothing compared with what their Federal Liberal colleagues would do if they ever had the chance to govern from Canberra. The member for Hanson should be well aware of that.

All the measures that we are taking, the productivity that the trust is undertaking and the work involved in actually finding where we can produce the best services for trust tenants are bound, in certain cases, to affect people. I have announced increases for trust tenants—20 per cent in real terms over the next three years. Not one Government in the whole of Australia has ever really picked up the problem of a trust deficit and made such a decision. It was a courageous decision. I will give the Opposition credit that it supported this Government when it made that decision.

We also let our trust tenants know what their rents would be over the next three years. Again, no other State Government in this country has ever done that. However, when one looks at equity, one sees that the member for Hanson is demanding the maintenance of what only 8 per cent of trust tenants are getting. What the member for Hanson does not realise is that over 2 100 walk-up flats in this State have been built and administered by the South Australian Housing Trust, and only 900 of them have residential officers. More than 5 600 medium density units have been built by the trust, only 144 of which have residential officers.

The member for Hanson is saying that, because historically a very small percentage had those people, they should continue and be paid for by the rest of the trust tenants spread over this State. On grounds of sheer equity, that is not on. We have said in removing these residential officers, that we are not taking away a service. Rather, they will not just get that personal service. Although they will have to ring up, they will still continue to get that service.

The other point that the member for Hanson forgets (I am sure that he has the intelligence to know this, but that he conveniently forgets it) is that the trust does not have a bottomless pit of money as it had in the early days to provide services to the tenants. My colleague the Minister of Labour represents a seat that has a high number of Housing Trust homes in it, the same as has my electorate. In the early days officers went around encouraging tenants to do this and, although that was all very good in the early days, in today's economic climate it is just not on.

The trust is in the business of providing housing. It is not a welfare agency; it is not responsible, in effect, for the safety of the tenants. That is a police matter. The trust just builds houses. It is not there to wet-nurse tenants. That might not sound very good to the member for Hanson, but it is a fact of life. The trust exists to provide housing. In the early days it used to wet-nurse tenants and almost lead them by the hand so that they could pay their rent. That is no longer on. However, at least the Labor Government did it. The Liberals would have loved to do it, but when it came to office it did not dare do it.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I hear an interjection that the Liberal Party cares about people. Its Federal colleagues would throw public sector housing out the window. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

QUESTION

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard.*

EXOTIC FISH

In reply to the **Hon. P.B. ARNOLD** (18 March).

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: In response to the question asked by the honourable member, I would advise that the Fisheries officer concerned was acting in accordance with the regulations for the control of exotic fish and diseases under the Fisheries Act 1982. His visit to Mr Miller's shop followed advertisements inserted by Mr Miller in the *Advertiser* regarding the sale of prohibited fish. At all times during the visit to Mr Miller's shop, the fisheries officer concerned conducted himself in a courteous manner and in no way threatened Mr Miller. In fact, the officer concurred with Mr Miller's request to call his solicitor on two occasions and was quite prepared to speak to the solicitor himself. Mr Miller also had in his possession statements prepared by his solicitor which were read out to the fisheries officer.

Following the removal of the prohibited species from Mr Miller's premises, an officer from the Crown Law Department rang the department and advised that, due to a delay in preparing amended regulations to the scheme of management for exotic fish and disease, the present regulations were not valid. Accordingly, the fish were duly returned to Mr Miller forthwith (the following day) in good condition. The department accepts that an unforeseen error occurred in its interpretation of the regulations that applied at the time. The officer concerned acted in good faith in accordance with the underlying purpose of the regulations to protect the South Australian aquatic environment from the introduction of feral fish populations and diseases.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon):

Remuneration Tribunal—Report relating to Ministers, Officers and Members of Parliament.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: TROTTING

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: As a result of statements made in the House by the member for Bragg concerning further allegations within the trotting industry and in particular the Trotting Control Board, I sought a full report on the matter and now submit the following information which should clarify the many inaccuracies raised by the Opposition spokesman in his last-ditch attempt to cause disruption to the harness racing industry. This latest round of allegations originates from a letter sent to me and a copy to the member for Bragg from the Managing Director of the Institute of Drug Technology—the former analysts employed by the Trotting Control Board. In order for the following information to be fully understood, I seek leave to table a copy of that letter.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister does not need leave. He may proceed.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: That letter is available for members' perusal. Taking each numbered paragraph of that letter in order, I submit the following comments:

1. The former Chairman of Stewards (Mr Broadfoot) initially opened negotiations with the IDT without the knowledge and concurrence of the Trotting Control Board.

2. Mr Broadfoot approached the board for approval for the IDT to conduct pre-race drug testing only on a trial basis during the 1984 Inter Dominion series.

3. The Trotting Control Board accepted Mr Broadfoot's recommendations to introduce the pre-race drug testing trials during this period.

4. The IDT did make available two analysts and the pre-race testing van and equipment for a period of two weeks in February 1984.

5/6. The statements made by the IDT in this paragraph are not correct. When the Trotting Control Board became aware for the first time that swab samples were being sent to IDT and not the AJC in Sydney, an investigation was launched. It was discovered that Mr Broadfoot had, once again, without the knowledge or concurrence of the board, arranged the change of laboratories. Further, board records show that the commencement of the change was February 1985, not February 1984, as claimed by the IDT.

In addition, I am advised that the Secretary/General Manager of the Trotting Control Board commenced duties in December 1984. It is his belief that Mr Broadfoot, during this phase of the new appointment, made the change in laboratories from AJC to IDT. The Secretary/General Manager advises me that he was not aware of the then existing arrangements and did not query why a change of laboratories had been made. As previously advised by the board, it was only when the matters of Columbia Wealth and Batik Print arose that the board became aware the IDT, and not the AJC, was analysing their swabs.

7. This paragraph is an accurate statement of the findings of the first swab of the horse Columbia Wealth.

8. This paragraph is an accurate statement of the findings of the first swab of the horse Batik Print.

9. The first part of this paragraph records the finding that the second, or independent analysis, of the Columbia Wealth swab was negative.

The second part of this paragraph confirms the decision made not to proceed with the testing of the second sample of Batik Print, to be correct. IDT states, 'dexamethasone degrades with a half life in less than four weeks'. Hence, Dr Batty's concern on 1 July 1986, when he indicated that the possibility of the second sample of Batik Print being positive would be remote. Batik Print's sample would have had to have been re-frozen and held for another seven days (from 1 July), making a total of 43 days from when the swab was first taken. During that period of 43 days the second sample would have been defrosted twice—this in itself causes rapid dissipation.

In addition, the second or independent analysis of the Victorian horse Keystone Adios was performed on 23 June 1986. Whilst the official notification of that test may not have been communicated to the Trotting Control Board until late July or August, the board did receive verbal advice of the result prior to its meeting on 1 July 1986.

This verbal advice resulted from a telephone call to Mr Demmler (trainer of Keystone Adios) from his independent analyst, who was present on 23 June 1986 at the IDT laboratory. Mr Demmler subsequently rang Mr Justice (trainer of Columbia Wealth) who in turn advised the Trotting Control Board. In addition, news of the negative result of the second analysis of the split sample from the Victorian horse, Keystone Adios, was published in the Victorian *National Trotting Weekly* on 27 June 1986—five days prior to the Trotting Control Board's meeting. Members will recall that it was at this meeting of 1 July 1986 that the decision was made not to proceed with the second analysis of Batik Print. This decision was, of course, supported by the results

of the Columbia Wealth case, the Victorian case and the above concerns expressed by Dr Batty—the IDT analyst.

10. Records show that on Monday 30 June 1986 the Secretary/General Manager spoke to Dr Batty (IDT). Dr Batty advised that the second sample taken from Batik Print was defrosted on that day in preparation for analysis. Dr Batty advised that the independent analyst appointed to represent Batik Print's trainer (R. Mickan) was unable to be present on that day. Trotting Control Board records show that Mr F. Galbally, QC (Mickan's counsel), had arranged for a stay of time until the following Monday.

Any suggestion that Frank Galbally, as a 'ploy', deliberately arranged to defer the independent analysis of Batik Print's sample does not stand up to scrutiny, in the light of further facts which have been provided by the Trotting Control Board. These facts are:

(i) Mr Broadfoot wrote to the connections of Batik Print on 13 June 1986 stating that the swab sample taken from Batik Print on 24 May 1986 had contained a drug, and that an inquiry will be scheduled at a date to be fixed.

(ii) Mr Galbally, QC, acting for the trainer R. Mickan (Batik Print) wrote to Mr Broadfoot on 20 June 1986 requesting precisely what drug, if any, was detected and stating that trainer R. Mickan desires a sample of blood and urine for independent testing.

(iii) Failing to hear from Mr Broadfoot, Mr Galbally sent a telegram requesting a reply to his letter of 20 June 1986—hardly the action of a person wishing to delay testing of a reserve sample.

(iv) Mr Broadfoot replied that day, 25 June 1986, advising Mr F. Galbally that his request for an independent analysis was approved and asked that arrangements be made for R. Mickan's independent analyst to contact IDT so as to examine the swab sample.

On 1 July 1986—six days later—the board made the decision not to proceed with the second analysis based on the evidence as detailed earlier. IDT's Managing Director states, under paragraph 10 of his letter, 'IDT is one of the premier drug analysis laboratories . . . The performance of IDT has been greatly superior to that of the AJC . . .' These statements emanated from the test results of a comparative study of the IDT and AJC laboratories in late 1985.

I am advised by the Trotting Control Board that there has been some disagreement with the results of this study. Dr Ashelford (AJC Sydney) contested the results of the test. Dr Ahselford said that the results of the test had been made public with the motive of getting the Victorian Racing Club's business. Asked if he was saying that the comparative study somehow was slanted in favour of the IDT, Dr Ashelford said, 'That's something that could be taken upon the results couldn't it, if you wished to?'

Dr John Bourke, veterinary steward of the Victorian Racing Club, said, 'The comparative test was not in my view an accurate indication of the capabilities of the two laboratories'. Mr Ray Alexander, Secretary/General Manager of the Australian Jockey Club, said that the report was unfair and had not shaken the committee's confidence in the laboratory. It is of interest to note that all thoroughbred racing clubs in New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania continued sending their post-race swabs to the AJC, Sydney. Western Australia and Queensland have their own laboratories. As at December 1986, the number of post-race samples analysed per week were: AJC, 200 per week and IDT, 30 per week.

In conclusion, I quote from the Report of the Racing Industry Drug Control Working Party, submitted to the Minister for Sport and Recreation, Hon. Neil Trezise, MP, State of Victoria, December 1986:

> It is an unfortunate fact that in the past dissemination of information between laboratories has been on a very limited basis. International conferences of racing veterinarians and analysts have helped disseminate information, however, within Australia and, particularly within Victoria, there has only been a limited exchange. This is not in the best interests of the industry. This situation appears to have arisen because of the fact that the laboratories at present see themselves as being in competition with one another.
>
> Further, in any laboratory other than a dedicated racing laboratory, there exists the possibility of a conflict of interest between what would benefit the organisation and what would benefit racing. The working party recommends that a dedicated racing laboratory as outlined should be established.

So, it can be seen that even the Victorian Racing Industry Drug Control Working Party could not recommend that the IDT be used as the central swabbing laboratory in that State. It is clear that once again the member for Bragg has not done his homework on this matter.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Pathetic! Weak!

QUESTION TIME

SAOG

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Has the Premier had discussions this year with a Mr S. Higgs, a Director of the Sydney banker and broker Dominguez Barry Samuel Montagu Limited and, if so, did those discussions canvass, amongst other things, the South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I cannot recall specifically. It could well be that I saw Mr Higgs in a courtesy call (as it were) at the time that the State Development Department undertook the consultancy relationship. I cannot say what was canvassed, but it was purely a courtesy call to introduce the group to me as Premier. The fact that I cannot really remember the specifics of it indicates that that was its nature.

TRAIL BIKES

Mr TYLER: Will the Minister of Emergency Services urge the Police Department to provide the necessary resources to police officers stationed at Darlington to enable them to pursue trespassers on Highways Department land? I was approached by a constituent last year concerning the problems caused by trail bike riders illegally using Highways Department land at O'Halloran Hill. These problems concern the noise and disturbance to residents and the damage to Government property.

At that time I approached the Minister of Transport and was informed on 6 October 1986 that the Highways Department had 'undertaken the installation of barriers and signs at major entry points onto departmental land. In addition, police officers and departmental personnel will make inspections of the area and persons on the land will be warned and instructed to leave immediately'.

I am now informed by my constituent that, although barriers and signs have been installed, trail bike riders have not been deterred. My constituent feels that police have been unable to catch offenders because they do not have suitable transport, and offenders can easily get away. My constituent suggests that, if police themselves used trail

bikes, they would be able to catch offenders and, further, that perhaps this need happen only occasionally to deter offenders.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: There is little doubt that a judicious arrest now and then might do wonders from a deterrent point of view. I am aware that there is a problem in this area. In fact, from time to time I think it has also been of concern to the honourable member's next door neighbour, the member for Bright, because it sometimes extends west into the area immediately behind Hallett Cove. I will certainly take up the matter with the Commissioner of Police. The whole idea of police officers on trail bikes chasing trail bike riders sounds a little like a Mack Sennett comedy. However, I can understand the concern of the honourable member's constituents about noise from such devices. We will see what can be done about upgrading the policing effort to try to control the problem.

SAOG

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: My question is to the Minister of State Development and Technology. Did the brief discussion with Mr Higgs, of Dominguez Barry Samuel Montagu include discussion of a range of options for the future of the South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation, including selling shares in SAOG to the public and seeking institutional investment in SAOG? If not, what is the purpose of the advice that the Government has sought?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I take it that in her question the member for Coles assumes that I have met the person in question. The answer to that is that I have not met the person in question and that I have not had a brief presented to me. I was scheduled to meet such a person when he came to Adelaide, as the Premier did in a courtesy call introducing the principals of Dominguez Barry Samuel Montagu to the Government, now that they have been retained by the Department of State Development. Unfortunately, my meeting was unable to proceed because another event I was involved in precluded me from attending, and I had to send my apologies at the last minute. However, it was a formal courtesy visit. No brief was to be presented at that meeting and the discussions alleged by the member for Coles did not take place.

COWANDILLA PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr PLUNKETT: Is the Minister of Education aware of the development of existing facilities at the Cowandilla Primary School and the work and planning by the school community in utilising the valuable school resources as an excellent example for other schools to adopt? On visiting the school I was pleased to hear from the Principal (Dennis Vance) that, even though Cowandilla is an old established area, the numbers at this school are being retained and are holding stable, which is not always the case in some older areas. I was also pleased to meet on that day people of different nationalities, such as the Vietnamese (some of the boat people), as well as people from France and Hong Kong, and last night I informed the House of the various nationalities of residents in the area. This meeting occurred while I was inspecting the Cowandilla Language Centre. The dental clinic on the site is a magnificent idea. Children associate themselves with the school and have no fear of attending the dentist because it is on site. The children play in the area—

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. What the member for Peake is saying is all very interesting, but it definitely comes into the category of comment and is therefore not admissible in asking his question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Government backbench to order. I call the Minister of Labour to order. The matter of comment is one that has been causing the Chair a great deal of concern in recent days of the sitting. The Chair has shown a great deal of latitude to members. If the Chair was to rule out of order any question that contained comment, hardly a question would be left during Question Time. However, the Chair must uphold the point of order of the member for Coles that in this case the amount of comment was fairly extensive. I ask the honourable member to return to the explanation of his question.

Mr PLUNKETT: I apologise if I have upset the member on the opposite bench. The dental clinic treats 1 449 children from 11 different venues. I would also like to congratulate people for excellent—

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order Sir, may I ask you to consider the remark just made by the member for Peake and rule once and for all whether his stated intention to comment is indeed comment?

The SPEAKER: I must uphold the point of order of the member. I ask the Minister to reply to that part of the question that has been presented to date.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The honourable member may have been commenting, and it is certainly the sort of comment which I like to hear, but which perhaps I hear all too infrequently in my education ministry. Indeed, what the honourable member has described to the House is an example of one of the very many excellent things that are happening in schools in South Australia at the initiation of the Education Department. The Cowandilla Primary School had declining enrolments in an ageing inner suburban area of Adelaide and has now been rejuvenated as a school community by a number of measures that have been taken, one of which was to locate from the central city area to that primary school the language centre which will now become known as the Cowandilla Language Centre. That is a secondary school program for recently arrived migrants and refugee children. To place them in a school community setting, as the honourable member said where there is in existence a number of important services including the dental clinic, has given new life to that school community and to all the programs that now operate from there.

The Government, in its 'back to school' policy, has similar proposals for many other centrally located units of the department that are occupying sometimes very expensive rental space in the city and in other unsuitable locations. To return those services into school communities, in conjunction with teachers and normal school programs will, I believe, extend and improve and further develop these important programs.

I am able to advise the House of that in the instance of the Cowandilla Primary School, and I congratulate the staff and all those who have been involved in it, particularly the parents. A number of important public meetings have been associated with this initiative, and I am pleased to see that very real progress and a spirit of cooperation has been achieved.

DOMINGUEZ LTD BRIEF

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: My question is directed to the Minister of State Development and Technology. When, specifically, did his department give a brief to Dominguez

Barry Samuel Montagu Limited, when does the brief expire and does it require this banker and broker to provide advice to the Government on specific public assets like the South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation and the commercial activities of the Woods and Forests Department, or is it a wide ranging brief to assess the future utilisation of all public assets and their potential for commercialisation/privatisation?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Department of State Development retained Dominguez in this financial year on a six month trial basis. That was towards the end of last calendar year. It succeeds a former relationship that was had with another major financial company which was a longstanding retainership prior to that. The brief is a general one to seek advice on matters and to seek opinions from them on various matters. It does not specifically touch upon either of the areas raised by the member for Light. It is a general brief for general advice to the department relating to corporate matters, financial matters and others matters of economic interest that are within the purview of the Department of State Development. The points raised by the honourable member were not specifically mentioned in any brief. It is a retainership of a service which is a follow-on from a previous service that was maintained with another company prior to Dominguez.

MURRAY RIVER SYSTEM

Ms GAYLER: Following the recent meeting of the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council, can the Minister for Environment and Planning advise the House whether the Queensland Government of Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen has agreed to take part in combined Federal and State Government efforts to combat salinity and environmental problems along the Murray River system? Also, can the Minister inform the House of the key changes under the recent historic agreement between three States and the Commonwealth?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The area of the Murray-Darling Basin, which is in Queensland, is larger than the land surface of Victoria. However, over a long period of time the total amount of water contributed to the Murray-Darling Basin from this vast area is only about 6 per cent of the total run-off. Nonetheless, in times of monsoonal activity and high flood there can be considerable volumes of water from Queensland entering the system.

The Queensland Government has never shown, so far as I am aware, any interest in being a signatory to the present Murray River agreement. I do not want to comment further on that. Nor has the Queensland Government, so far as I am aware, shown any interest in the present Murray-Darling Ministerial Council, except to this extent: an invitation was extended about a year ago for the Queensland Government to have some involvement in that council and at the meeting held in Adelaide—the second of the two meetings—an officer was sent with observer status. An invitation was extended for either that or another officer to be similarly involved at last week's meeting in Melbourne, but that invitation was not taken up. I leave honourable members to draw whatever conclusions they can from that matter.

As to the second part of the question, I will comment on it only briefly, because it has been the subject of much press exposure. Last week's agreement with the Commonwealth and the other States means that we will be inviting this Parliament to consider legislation later in the year for the amendment of the Murray waters agreement to take into account the new initiatives concerning the extension of that agreement to the whole of the Murray-Darling Basin.

The new area will involve advisory services to the three State Governments and the Commonwealth Government in relation to land use, irrigation matters and those sorts of things away from simply the rivers and their tributaries, and of course the new commission will have to take this advice into account in its ongoing water management decisions. I should make the comment that no decision has been taken that would in any way derogate from the existing agreement. All the rights and entitlements that this State has under the existing agreement will be carried into the new agreement.

We believe that there are substantial advantages to this State in the new commission being able to give direct advice, particularly to the upstream States, in relation to land management, salinity management and irrigation activities. We believe that this is a very important breakthrough with the other States and the Commonwealth.

PRIVATISATION

Mr S.J. BAKER: Will the Premier explain his interpretations of 'commercialisation' and 'privatisation', highlighting the differences, as he sees them, between the two?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: Whatever it is, the Premier seems to have embraced it with unusual fervour of late. Let me explain. Yesterday the Premier gave this interpretation of 'commercialisation':

> It means identifying those skills, services, intellectual property and other resources that the Government has and trying to make some money out of them.

That was the definition given to us yesterday. In other parts of the world this is recognised and defined as 'privatisation'. When the British Government decided to reduce its majority shareholding in British Petroleum to a minority one, through a sale of shares to the public, the British Labour Party accepted it as privatisation. Even our own Prime Minister (Mr Hawke) is now embracing the concept with his support for selling off Australian Airlines and his commitment to put a privatisation policy to the 1988 ALP Federal Conference.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If members would cease interjecting it would assist the Chair in assessing whether or not the honourable member was introducing comment or debate.

Mr S.J. BAKER: However, there has been media comment that the Premier is reluctant to use the word 'privatisation' because of the way he and the Government exploited the anti-privatisation campaign at the last election and because public sector—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member seems to be introducing comment and debate. As the Chair is of the view that he has asked sufficient of his question and given sufficient of his explanation to make it clear, I call on the Premier to reply.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. You ruled twice that the member for Price was commenting, after it took the Opposition to draw that fact to your attention. Now, in midstream you intend to chop off the member for Mitcham. All I ask is for some consistency in your rulings from the Chair.

The SPEAKER: In response to the point of order, the questions asked by the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Coles, and the member for Light were all completely in order as were the questions asked by the members for Newland and Fisher. The question asked by the member for Peake, however, was not in order and, when it was

drawn to my attention by the Opposition, leave was withdrawn for the honourable member to continue further with his explanation, and I then called on the honourable Minister to reply. The Chair is of the view that members to date have expressed the opinion that the Chair should enforce more strictly the Standing Orders and practices of the House with respect to comment and debate attached to questions, and that is exactly what the Chair is doing.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, your attention was drawn by a point of order from this side, not of your own volition, to the fact that the member for Price was commenting. After delivering a lecture to the House, you upheld the point of order and you allowed him to continue. Those rules are not applying to the Opposition. You jump in on the Opposition and say that the question is finished. All we ask is fairness and consistency, but we have not had it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not accept that as a point of order.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. and I ask for your direction as to when something becomes comment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: In the explanation of my question, I said, 'However, there has been media comment,' and I was explaining what that media comment was. Whenever a member stands up in this House and says, 'Someone has explained to me,' 'Someone has informed me' or 'It has been put to me,' is the same principle applied as that which you have applied in this case?

The SPEAKER: Could the member for Mitcham make clear to the Chair what he was quoting?

Mr S.J. BAKER: It is a fact that there has been media comment, and I said, 'However, there has been media comment . . .' It was during the statement commencing with those words that you said I was commenting. However, I was merely reiterating things that had been told us. I now ask whether, in principle, if a member passes on in an explanation anything that has been said to that member, you would rule that out of order.

The SPEAKER: That is an extremely vexed question that the Chair will take on notice. These more complicated aspects of what constitutes debate and what does not have concerned me for some time. During recent weeks, the Chair has indicated that it will try to bring the House back to the practices which existed in the past and which have been moved away from in recent years. That will not be an easy task and I ask for the tolerance of members in achieving that aim. In the interests of tranquility, I will allow the honourable member for Mitcham to proceed a little further with his explanation.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will repeat the relevant paragraph:

> However, there has been media comment that the Premier is reluctant to use the word 'privatisation' because of the way he and the Government exploited the anti-privatisation campaign at the last election and because public sector union officials will not have a bar of privatisation in any form.

In asking the Premier to clarify the differences, as he sees them, between commercialisation and privatisation, I remind him that in the rest of the world privatisation is accepted to mean a range of options for transferring assets between the public and private sectors such as selling only parts of Government operations, rather than the whole, as has occurred with Amdel.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on the Premier, I will read out for the benefit of members Standing Order 124, which states:

> In putting any such question, no argument or opinion shall be offered, nor shall any facts be stated, except by leave of the House and so far only as may be necessary to explain such question.

It is the view of the Chair that the majority of questions asked in recent months have not met the requirements of that Standing Order. Debate or comment does not simply involve an admission that the member involved is commenting. Debate can also consist of facts. A member can state half a dozen facts and string them together in succession so that that in itself constitutes comment or debate. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am certainly not reluctant to use the word 'privatisation'. I use it frequently to say that I do not support the concept. I am using it in the sense that it was used by the Opposition before the election in 1985 in referring to the selling of Government assets either in whole or in part in order to gain some one-off advantage which then is dissipated elsewhere into the Government system. This Government rejects that and continues to do so. I draw a distinction between that and what I believe is the quite proper use of Government resources, intellectual property and facilities to make money for Government and therefore for the community. That is commercialisation and that is what we intend to do.

Members interjecting:

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

PIPERONYL BUTOXIDE

Mr ROBERTSON: Is the Minister of Agriculture aware of the recent information released by the Environmental Protection Agency in the United States that the chemical piperonyl butoxide, a component of many insect sprays, has been found to cause tumours in laboratory animals? What steps have been taken to investigate the claim, and what action would the Minister contemplate if the claim proved to be substantiated?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Bright for his question as most members of the community would be interested in the issue. I was not aware, until he raised the report of the U.S. EPA regarding piperonyl butoxide, that it is used in many of the common household insect sprays and that there has been a quite extensive investigation by a number of agencies throughout the world into its potential carcinogenic capacity. For example, the International Agency for Research on Cancer in 1982 concluded that the available data did not provide evidence that the chemical is carcinogenic to experimental animals. No data on humans was available. The available data provided no evidence that the chemical is likely to present a carcinogenic risk to humans.

Given the honourable member's concern and the information presented by him representing what is being undertaken by the Environmental Protection Agency in the U.S., it is incumbent on us to pursue this through the National Health and Medical Research Council. I understand some extensive tests are already being conducted by that authority, and we would hope that those tests can either support the finding of the International Agency for Research on Cancer or, if not, that we can further investigate whether there are any carcinogenic effects as a consequence of the use of this chemical in common household insecticide sprays. I thank the member for his question because, in drawing it to my attention, it brings the issue before these agencies as

well. Not wanting to alarm anyone, I believe that it is important to note that the Australian agencies and most of the international authorities have not concluded that there is a carcinogenic effect.

TORRENS ISLAND POWER STATION

Mr GUNN: In view of the report on the 7 o'clock ABC television news program last night, will the Premier say whether the lease agreement for the Torrens Island power station is to proceed and, if not, why not? On the ABC last night, Ric Jay said:

> The Government confirmed today that not a single investor is now directly interested in the new Torrens Island deal.

This deal was signed on 5 June 1986—almost 10 months ago. The lease commenced on 15 September 1986—more than six months ago—and the first repayment of $35.3 million was due from Lashkar Limited more than a fortnight ago. All of these dates were before the Opposition started asking questions about this deal, showing that suggestions by the Premier that we have frightened off investors are completely untrue, as they were legally bound to this agreement long before the matter was raised publicly.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not sure of the extent to which the words quoted are the member's or the television reporter's. I did not confirm that there was not a single investor interested. On the contrary, the transaction is proceeding, and I hope that it will be successfully accomplished. I said that, if it has been jeopardised, or if future transactions are jeopardised, it will be at very great cost to the State; and it will be because of the way in which the Opposition has raised this matter.

In relation to the dates concerned, that matter was dealt with when I tabled the details of the transactions, including reference to the fact that the date of operation would be on those dates or at whatever period thereafter that the parties agreed. These matters require the complex drawing of legal documents. Until that is accomplished, the actual payments do not fall due. That was all explained, and I am sorry that the member did not pay close enough attention to that.

SELF-EMPLOYMENT VENTURE SCHEME

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of State Development and Technology investigate a number of complaints made to me by one of my constituents about his application for assistance under the Self-Employment Venture Scheme? I was recently approached by a constituent aged 40 years who has been unemployed since August last year. He put in an application for assistance under the Self-Employment Venture Scheme in February this year and states that he was told that he would have to wait up to six or seven months before being notified of the success or otherwise of his application.

My constituent further states that he was told that there are several thousand applications and that the number of staff in the department handling the SEVS applications had been reduced. My constituent has asked me:

> Why not allow applicants to go straight to the new Enterprise Incentive Scheme—

which is a Federal Government funded scheme—

> if the Self-Employment Venture Scheme is operating under pressure?

My constituent further states that he desperately wants to get off unemployment benefits.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In answer to the question of why people cannot go to the new Commonwealth Employment Incentive Scheme, that scheme is delivered in each State as a result of a Federal/State agreement. The delivering body is the Office of Employment and Training in South Australia with its Special Employment Initiatives Unit which is responsible for, among other things, SEVS. It is not true to say that the amount of administrative support for SEVS has been reduced.

The Special Employment Initiatives Unit does have a number of programs, and support for that unit has been maintained. It is true to say that normal processes have to be completed with respect to applications. There are certain initial criteria that must be met, such as a person being unemployed, the viability of the business and the fact that the proposed business would not be in direct competition with established businesses unless it was introducing a new or novel approach or, alternatively, unless there was unmet demand in that sector of the economy.

I strongly doubt that the member's constituent was told that there are thousands of applications, because none of the advice given to me suggests that there have been thousands of applications. In fact, one problem with what by and large has been a very successful scheme has been the relative paucity in the number of applications that deal with viable business alternatives. So I strongly doubt that particular point. However, I will certainly have that matter followed up by officers of my department and provide a further report to the honourable member.

It is true to say that there have been some concerns about the SEVS guidelines, and some people have said that they are either too restrictive or they do not provide adequate support. As a result of that, and from approaches to the department by applicants and also by my request, the matter was considered by the Office of Employment and Training in consultation with the Small Business Corporation. That corporation is represented on the advisory committee that vets SEVS applications. As a result of joint consultation between the SVC and the Special Employment Initiatives Units, they have submitted to me some proposed changes to the guidelines and other operating features of SEVS and I have today approved those alterations. Those alterations include, among other things, a lifting of the financial limit of the grant, or the low interest or no interest loans that are given to applicants. It was previously $5 000 for groups and $2 500 for individuals, and that has now been increased to $6 000 and $3 000 respectively.

The guidelines also have been amended to allow access to the scheme by those people who are *bona fide* unemployed but not registered for unemployment because, for various personal reasons, they refuse to register. Previously, they were ineligible; they will now become eligible. It also brings into possibility for funding proposals that do not normally fit within the strict guidelines of SEVS and also fall beyond the guidelines of support by the Small Business Corporation; in other words, they fall into an abyss where there is no support available.

The new guidelines allow for such particular projects to be considered by the Special Employment Initiatives Unit, subject to them not limiting access by legitimate applications that meet the full guidelines. Those special cases will now be able to be entertained for consideration, whereas previously they were not. A number of other amendments were made to the guidelines, and I will be happy to supply any member of this place with a copy of them. I have them with me today and can get necessary photocopies for members.

Certainly other minor changes have been made. There have been corrections to the language of the guidelines; it is now non-sexist. There have been other changes to certain necessary reporting legislation and changes to the names of departments referred to (because it is now under the Office of Employment and Training, not under the Department of Labour). These are felt to be necessary changes as a result of the comments that have been made over recent months. I repeat again that they are the result of consultation by the Small Business Corporation with SEVS.

The other matter is that it takes time to assess any application. A project officer must talk with the applicant in the first instance and determine whether there is any likelihood of viability of the proposal. Then there must be contacts with relevant Government departments to determine whether necessary regulatory things and other features are being addressed, and that takes time. Then there must be an assessment of the matter by the advisory committee which must approve or make recommendations on all applications. Then the advisory committee may have to have further consideration of the matter, including possibly calling the applicant in to directly discuss the matter with him or her.

A lot has to be gone through. I do not believe that it normally takes six months for applications to be processed. However, a necessary amount of time must occur. As to the particular case in question, if I can obtain any further advice for the honourable member on investigation, I will keep her informed.

SAOG

Mr OSWALD: My question is directed to the Minister of Mines and Energy. Has the Government had any discussions with the board of the South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation about SAOG's current financial structure? What action is being taken as a result of those discussions? Does the Government intend to make any changes to the financial structure of SAOG?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: It is better if I speak for myself in this matter, as part of the Government, because obviously I am not necessarily aware at any time of what every member of the Government is doing. I think that the honourable member would be prepared to concede that. I have not had any discussions with the board. However, as part of my responsibility, I am looking at all the bodies for which I have responsibility to see whether they are performing in accordance with the Government's requirements by way of its policy.

ADELAIDE BUS STATION

Mr DUIGAN: Will the Minister of Transport advise the House of the status of any investigations that have been made into the facilities at the Adelaide bus station and whether any improvements are planned to take account of the amenity to be afforded to bus travellers, as well as taking account of the new size and design of interstate buses?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. For some time—when I was Minister of Tourism and Local Government, and now as Minister of Transport—I have been very much aware of the feeling, which I share, that the existing bus depot is quite inadequate. Because of that a committee was established with representation from the Department of Transport, the Department of Tourism, the Adelaide City Council, the Tourism Advisory Committee, and the bus proprietors who operate from the depot, to see what improvements might be agreed on.

The Adelaide City Council is the lessor of that property. The committee met on many occasions over a fair length of time and a report has been prepared and submitted to all the bodies involved in the inquiry. Unfortunately, there was not an agreement as to the future of the amenity that should be provided there. I have sent the report to my colleague, the Minister of Tourism, for her to consider and to advise on what action, if any, the Government can take. I should reinforce that the property is owned by the Adelaide City Council and operated by private enterprise. Because of that, I expect the role that the Government could play would be an advisory one only. I will be happy to ascertain for the honourable member the current status of the work completed and whether there is any prospect, as one would hope there should be, of an improved facility at the Franklin Street bus depot.

PRAWN FISHERY

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Fisheries say whether it is the Government's intention to continue allowing prawn boats that have been voluntarily withdrawn from the Gulf St Vincent and Investigator Strait prawn fishery to continue fishing?

Mr FERGUSON: On a point of order, Sir, this legislation is before the House, and in fact we have distributed before us from the Legislative Council amendments to that legislation which will affect the question that the member is putting to the House.

The SPEAKER: I did not hear all the question from the honourable member, but I believe that the point of order from the member for Henley Beach is correct. If the legislation referred to has come from another place and is now before us, he cannot base his question upon it.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. You have previously indicated, as have Speakers before you, that a matter which is specific to a Bill that is in the possession of the Parliament is not permitted to be questioned, whereas a matter of day-by-day activity of the particular industry—

The SPEAKER: Would the honourable member repeat his question so that I can determine whether or not it is of a procedural nature?

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Is it the Government's intention to continue allowing—because that is what the Government is doing at the moment—prawn boats that have been voluntarily withdrawn from the Gulf St Vincent and Investigator Strait prawn fishery to continue fishing?

The SPEAKER: It is a very fine line in some cases between procedural aspects of a Bill and the actual content of the Bill. The Chair is of the view that the question does actually deal with the content matter of the legislation and would be anticipating debate that may take place in a short while. I must therefore rule it out of order.

POLICE RESOURCES

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Can the Minister of Emergency Services say what additional resources will be provided to the Police Department so that it can implement the new marijuana laws? In a statement reported in the *Advertiser* on 24 March the Minister of Health was quoted

as saying extra resources would be provided to the police to operate the new system of on-the-spot fines for personal possession of marijuana. The Opposition has been informed that so far the Police Department has received no notification from the Government of what resources will be made available. I am personally aware that no resources for measuring the offensive product are available.

Funds are required to purchase sets of scales to weigh marijuana in cases where there are disputes over quantity, for additional staff to process the infringement notices, for printing of the notices, and for the production of a video to inform officers on how the new laws are to be applied. It has been estimated that the cost must approach $100 000 and, if this program has to be funded from within original Police Department budget allocations, it will put further strain on departmental resources, which are already stretched to the limit; according to sources within that branch.

In further explanation, I was made aware the other day of the difficulties and frustrations being experienced by the police in their attempts to enforce this law. The police were anticipating that scales would be made available. I am informed that no scales are available to date, nor have any been ordered for that purpose. In the meantime, in order to apply themselves to their duty, police officers will be required, for example, to estimate whether an offender has 25 grams or 26 grams in his possession, thus bringing them into another category of fines. A further ridiculous element of the law as perceived by the police has been drawn to my attention wherein a dealer in marijuana could have two deals of 25 grams on his person—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Alexandra is currently debating the matter.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: With respect, Sir, I am purely bringing to the Minister's attention the difficulties that his officers are having at the moment, as it has been put to me directly by the police officers concerned. There is no debate. I recognise the limits—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair's attention was distracted as a result of discussions with the member for Chaffey concerning the previous ruling by the Chair. As a result, I heard only part of the honourable member's explanation. However, its length and his eloquence seem to suggest that he was making a speech on the subject to the Assembly. I ask the honourable member to restrict himself fairly firmly to the amount that is required (and I quote from Standing Orders) 'as may be necessary to explain such question'.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Having had that direction, Sir, I will withdraw from any further explanation. I am sure that the Minister has the message. Certainly, I know that the police have the message.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has made himself quite clear, as is usually the case.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: In regard to the resources available for this matter, first, it is necessary for the infringement notices to be printed. That has been done. Therefore, there is no question about a lack of resources for that matter. Secondly, specially sealable bags are to be provided. They have been ordered, but whether they are actually in the possession of the police at this stage I am not sure. So, there is no argument about resources there.

There then remains only the matter of scales. It is not necessary to provide individual police officers or individual police stations with scales. The question of weighing arises only where there is a dispute. In that case, the matter will be handled exactly as it is now. At present, if it is necessary for evidence to determine the amounts of the controlled substance that have been detected, it is bundled up and sent off to the Department of Services and Supply where the appropriate division can weigh the evidence on its scales and then make that information available. Exactly the same procedure will apply.

Mr EDDIE SOLOMON

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister representing the Minister of Corporate Affairs ask his colleague to make the investing public aware of the activities of a Mr Eddie Solomon? The *Advertiser* of 30 March, on page 11, reported that in the New South Wales Parliament last week the Attorney-General (Mr Sheahan) referred to Mr Eddie Solomon as 'the man the law cannot stop'. Mr Solomon has circularised small business in South Australia seeking investment in a series of companies which suggest that a high tax-free return would be made available to the investors. Any investigation of Mr Solomon's claims would lead the investigator to have grave doubts about Mr Solomon's ability to fulfil his promises. There does not appear to be a law—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Henley Beach is, I believe, falling into the same error as the honourable member for Alexandra.

Mr FERGUSON: I apologise to the Chair. I have only one sentence to go. It has been put to me—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Defiance of the Chair could lead to a different sort of sentence. The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I assure the member for Henley Beach that honesty always pays. I appreciate the fact that the honourable member has raised in the House, for the attention of members, the activities of Mr Solomon, and it is important that potential investors in South Australia be aware of the experiences in other jurisdictions with respect to this person's activities. I shall be pleased to refer the question to my colleague and to obtain further information from him for the honourable member.

JUVENILE CRIME

Mr INGERSON: Will the Premier, as a matter of urgency, establish the joint parliamentary committee on law and community security that he promised before the last election, and will he ask that committee to examine juvenile crime in South Australia immediately? Before the last election the Premier made a series of commitments on law and order policy, but many have yet to be acted upon. They include the following promise (and I quote from the Premier's election policy speech):

> We will . . . establish a joint Party committee of the Parliament to act as a focus for continuing vigilance and reform in this crucial area.

Figures included in a *Bulletin* article published yesterday on street crime reveal an urgent need to act on escalating rates of juvenile crime in the State. These are Australian Institute of Criminology figures and are the latest available for comparative purposes. They show that South Australia has the worst rate of any State for juvenile crime involving serious assault, robbery and car theft and our record in relation to burglary is the second worst. An examination of figures in the annual reports of the Police Commissioner reveals the following facts about rates of juvenile crime between 1981-82 and 1985-86. In this period, when South Australia's population increased by only 2.1 per cent, total cleared offences involving juveniles increased by 9.1 per

cent; drug offences involving juveniles were up 119 per cent; drink driving and related offences increased by 16 per cent; motor vehicle thefts by 71.8 per cent; and cases of wilful damage by 31.5 per cent. The 1985-86 Police Commissioner's report also states that relatively large numbers of juvenile offenders were recorded for breaking and entering, 57.9 per cent; total larceny, 48.3 per cent; and motor vehicle theft, 58.2 per cent.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If one of the purposes behind the honourable member's question is to suggest support for this bipartisan approach, I welcome it very much indeed. It is obviously essential that, if we have such a joint committee, the members on it approach the problem on the basis that this is a common community and social problem that one does not tackle across political lines but cooperatively. That was certainly the thrust behind the policy that we announced. My colleague the Attorney-General has the matter in hand, but at this stage I cannot announce a specific timetable. However, we would hope to see this established.

The problem is not made easy when we see the way in which crime is often made into a political football. Some members opposite (and I do not include the member for Bragg in this although, as a result of his incredible assertions and the way in which he has handled the trotting industry, I suggest that it is just as well that he is not legal affairs spokesman for the Opposition), including members of the front bench, try to sensationalise these things, and the shadow Minister in another place is notorious for some of his attitudes in this regard. We can only suggest that a committee such as this cannot work unless there is a genuine desire on the part of all members to cooperate. That is certainly one of the things that my colleague is ascertaining.

PORT ADELAIDE TRAFFIC

Mr De LAINE: Is the Minister of Transport aware that petrol tankers and large heavy trucks are creating major problems by travelling through the heart of Port Adelaide instead of using the Grand Junction Road extension to bypass this already congested area, and will he investigate the possibility of preventing this unwanted and dangerous practice?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: No, I was not aware, and I thank the honourable member for bringing this matter to my attention. There is a problem in that the roads to which the honourable member has referred would be Port Road and its extension into Commercial Road, an arterial road on which heavy traffic is allowed. I believe that a bypass, the extension of Grand Junction Road, was constructed with the intention of better servicing the needs of heavy transport and other port facilities.

My predecessor as Minister of Transport (now Minister of Marine) took up this matter personally with the oil companies and the heavy vehicle industry to try to get a voluntary decision to bypass the heart of Port Adelaide. That seemed to work fairly well for some time, but obviously that voluntary agreement has broken down, otherwise the honourable member and his constituents would not be expressing concern. I will take up the matter again to see whether the agreement that was reached with my predecessor can be extended so that the honourable member and his constituents can have a better and safer use of the roads that go through the centre of their commercial area.

MILLIPEDES

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister of Agriculture say what action the Government is taking to effectively control millipedes in this State? Over a considerable number of years, I have brought to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture and of Parliament the problems associated with the unchecked spread of millipedes. Action has been called for, but to no avail, with the result that in certain areas the millipedes are in plague proportions. Members of the public who experience problems with the smelly little grubs in the food pantry, in the wardrobe, and in the baby's cot, etc., have told me of the considerable stress that is being caused to families and indeed the general public.

The other night in debate I was informed by way of interjection from members on both sides of the House that the spread of the millipede had now reached many sections of the metropolitan area. While concern is expressed about any disadvantage it causes to people in these areas, it is feared that until millipedes appear on the bedroom ceiling of members in marginal seats no real action will be taken by the Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister need not answer on the last part of the question which was clearly comment.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: What the honourable member said was not at all factual. The Government has been taking action on this issue of urban nuisance. For the honourable member's information, I point out that millipedes have now reached Unley. Research is being undertaken by the Department of Agriculture, and we have set aside almost $300 000 this financial year as part of an eradication project through using a parasitic fly being explored by Dr Bailey in Portugal in an attempt to remove the nuisance that the Portuguese black millipede is causing the South Australian community. We know that Dr Bailey is progressing with his research in Portugal which is running parallel to research at Northfield. He is gathering a collection of flies to run trial tests on the millipede.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The honourable member has never been much of a scientist, so I will not explain what it might mean. The Government is doing everything possible through the work of Dr Bailey in Portugal, with parallel work being conducted here, to ascertain whether the parasitic fly will eradicate the Portuguese black millipede.

CARRICK HILL

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That—

(a) this House resolve to approve, in accordance with the requirements of section 13(5) of the Carrick Hill Trust Act 1985, the sale by Carrick Hill Trust of that portion of the land comprised in Certificate of Title Register Book Volume 2500 Folio 57 that is marked 'A' and shaded in red on the plan now laid by me before this House;

and

(b) a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting its concurrence with the resolution of this House.

Since the establishment of the Carrick Hill Trust, plans for the development of Carrick Hill aimed at realising the full potential of the house, gardens and proposed sculpture park have been put into place. As is often the case, there have been many levels of expenditure, in particular on security, which have only been able to be assessed in the light of experience, and the trust has devoted much of its time to identifying possible sources of finance to support the development.

By way of background, I would remind the House that the bequest of Carrick Hill to the people of South Australia by the late Sir Edward Hayward and his first wife, Lady (Ursula) Hayward, was one of the finest in the history of this State. It included not only a superb collection of works of art and antiques and a house with historic fabric, but also an extensive garden and grounds of some 39 hectares. These grounds are largely bushland and afford spectacular views of the city. The Carrick Hill Trust Act states, among other things, that the functions of the trust are to administer, develop and maintain Carrick Hill for all or any of the following purposes: as an art gallery for the display of works of art; as a museum; and as a botanical garden.

Carrick Hill was officially opened by Her Majesty the Queen during the 1986 Festival of Arts as a Jubilee 150 major project. Over 45 000 visitors have now attended Carrick Hill. Since inception it has been proposed to develop a sculpture park in the extensive grounds, this idea having been recommended in both 1974 and 1984 reports on the development of Carrick Hill. The concept has been extended by the Carrick Hill Trust to take in all the grounds.

In November 1984, in my second reading speech for a Bill for an Act to establish the Carrick Hill Trust, I said:

> The sculpture park will provide a superb site for the public exhibition of sculpture by leading South Australian, Australian and overseas artists, and will add another dimension to this fascinating complex. It represents an exciting new initiative in the Government's visual arts policy and will become a unique cultural and tourist attraction.

The Hayward bequest included a collection of 10 bronze sculptures by the outstanding British sculptor Sir Jacob Epstein. One of these Epstein sculptures, 'Mother and Child', was placed in the garden by the benefactors. It was the first work to be permanently sited in the new sculpture park. Since then, three other sculptures have been added permanently, including the gift from the Okayama Prefecture in Japan of a Japanese sculpture.

The Carrick Hill Trust strongly supports the view that the sculpture park will be one of the most exciting features of development and has adopted, as a matter of priority, a policy for the acquisition of sculpture by leading Australian and South Australian sculptors. By seeking support through gifts and sponsorship, the trust hopes that it will be able, in time, to extend its acquisitions to include works by sculptors of significance from other countries, as well as Australia. In relation to funding, the Government has provided some $2.278 million for Carrick Hill development and operations—$1.066 million recurrent and $1.212 million capital (including interest on the capital). The trust has also embarked on a comprehensive sponsorship program and has generated income from functions held on the property. However, it is clear that without a capital fund on which to draw for acquisition and development purposes, the development plan will not be achievable.

Accordingly, the trust has requested that they be given approval by Parliament under subsection (5) of section 13 of the Carrick Hill Act to sell a limited section of the property which is, by its position and layout, effectively surplus to its development requirements. The net proceeds would be placed in a trust account, the income from which would be devoted to the acquisition of works of art and the development of Carrick Hill. To this end, the trust has provided a detailed submission and cost estimate for the development and sale of land in the eastern corner of the Carrick Hill property off Oakdene Road. It is estimated that the net surplus from the proposed development would exceed $1 million. The land in question is 2.7 hectares and comprises 6.8 per cent of the total land available at Carrick Hill (39.5 hectares). The land proposed for sale is a distance from the house and separated by an existing housing development. Hence the loss of the area of land will not impair the amenity of Carrick Hill nor hinder its potential for further enhancement as a tourist attraction.

Naturally, the proposed development of the land will be subject to the normal procedures of planning approval by the Mitcham City Council. In requesting that this motion be placed before both Houses of this Parliament, the trust is merely taking the first step towards a final plan for development of the parcel of land in question. I would like to congratulate members of the trust on their initiative and the work they have done to date. Having examined the proposal, the Government concurs with the trust's proposal and I urge the House to support it by passing this motion in the terms contemplated by the Act.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE secured the adjournment of the debate.

POLLUTION OF WATERS BY OIL AND NOXIOUS SUBSTANCES BILL

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Marine) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act relating to the protection of the sea and certain waters from pollution by oil and other noxious substances; to repeal the Prevention of Pollution of Waters by Oil Act 1961; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this Bill is to incorporate into this State's legislation Annexes I and II of the International Maritime Organisation's International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships 1973 (commonly referred to as MARPOL), to repeal the Prevention of Pollution of Waters by Oil Act 1961, and to provide for continuity of provisions in that Act which are not superseded by MARPOL.

The Prevention of Pollution of Waters by Oil Act 1961 provides for, amongst other things, certain matters arising out of the International Convention for the Prevention of the Pollution of the Sea by Oil 1954. This Convention has now been superseded by MARPOL, which comprises five annexes. Annex I—Regulations for the Prevention of Pollution by Oil—and Annex II—Regulations for the Control of Pollution by Noxious Liquid Substances in bulk—are compulsory for adopting countries, and the Commonwealth has incorporated these provisions in the Protection of the Sea (Prevention of Pollution from Ships) Act 1983. This Act also provides that its provisions will apply to State waters pending introduction of State legislation.

The Australian Transport Advisory Council has agreed that all States should take early action to incorporate Annexes I and II of the Convention into their respective State legislation, using as a basis, the model Bill prepared under the auspices of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General. Victoria and Western Australia have already done so.

The Bill incorporates Annexes I and II, apart from the ship construction provisions which more appropriately fall within the ambit of the Marine Act. These latter provisions are included in the Marine Act Amendment Bill 1987, which supplements this Bill.

This Bill also incorporates those provisions of the Prevention of Pollution of Waters by Oil Act 1961 which are not superseded by MARPOL. These provisions relate to discharges occurring other than from ships, removal and prevention of pollution and recovery of costs, and other matters.

This Bill accordingly ensures that State authorities will be able to administer the MARPOL requirements as they apply to this State. It enables laws of a uniform nature to apply to ships using our ports and has been developed to provide that the provisions that have been applying to State waters are replaced by new legislation that reflects the enormous growth in the maritime transport of oil and the size of tankers, the increasing amount of chemicals being carried at sea and the growing concern for the environment.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure.

Clause 3 sets out the definitions of a number of terms used in the Act and also provides that terms used in the Act and in the Convention have the same meaning (being the meaning applicable under the Convention).

Clause 4 provides that the Act binds the Crown.

Clause 5 provides that this Act is in addition to and not in derogation of any other law of the State.

Clause 6 provides for delegations under the Act.

Clause 7 is a further interpretative provision.

Clause 8 provides that the discharge of oil or an oily mixture from a ship into State waters is to be an offence. An offence does not occur if the discharge is for safety reasons, occurs as a result of unintentional damage to the ship or, in the case of an oily mixture, is for the purpose of combating specific pollution incidents. In accordance with the Convention, there are also other discharges from oil tankers or ships that do not constitute offences.

Clause 9 provides for the non-retention on board the ship of certain oil residues to be an offence and also provides for the manner of discharge of oil residues from a ship to a shore reception facility.

Clause 10 requires the master of a ship to give notification of a discharge of oil or an oily mixture. Provision is made where the master is unable to give a notification or the ship has been abandoned. Reports on a discharge may be required and may be admitted in evidence for a later prosecution.

Clause 11 provides for certain ships to have oil record books, and for the manner in which and the time within which entries must be made in the book.

Clause 12 makes it an offence for false or misleading entries to be made in an oil record book.

Clause 13 provides for the retention and inspection of oil record books.

Clause 14 sets out the definitions required for Part III, of the Bill, dealing with pollution by noxious substances.

Clause 15 provides for the application of Part II and Part III where a mixture contains oil and a liquid substance.

Clause 16 provides for the regulations to declare categories of noxious liquid substances.

Clause 17 provides for the regulations to declare Appendix III substances.

Clause 18 makes it an offence for bulk liquid substances to be discharged from a ship into State waters. Again, an offence does not occur if the discharge is for safety reasons, occurs as a result of unintentional damage to a ship or is for the purpose of combating specific pollution incidents. Other categories of discharges also do not constitute offences if performed in accordance with the Act.

Clause 19 provides that certain liquid substances are to be treated as oil and subject to Part II.

Clause 20 makes it an offence to fail to report a discharge of a liquid substance.

Clause 21 provides for trading ships proceeding on intrastate voyages and carrying liquid substances in bulk to have cargo record books.

Clause 22 makes it an offence for false or misleading entries to be made in a cargo record book.

Clause 23 provides for the retention and inspection of cargo record books.

Clause 24 provides for regulations to be made in relation to Regulation 8 of Annex II (relating to cleaning of tanks).

Clause 25 is an interpretative provision required for the purposes of Part IV.

Clause 26 makes it an offence to discharge oil or an oily mixture into State waters from a vehicle or apparatus. Various defences are provided.

Clause 27 provides for the notification of a discharge and the provision of reports.

Clause 28 is similar to provisions contained in the prevention of Pollution of Waters by Oil Act 1961, and makes provision for action to be taken to combat pollution from discharges.

Clause 29 allows the Minister to recover costs and expenses reasonably incurred in taking action under the Division.

Clause 30 provides that costs recovered by the Minister are, until paid, a charge against the ship, vehicle or apparatus from which the discharge occurred.

Clause 31 provides a right of recovery where a person has expended money or paid for the Minister's costs and expenses in relation to a discharge that was caused by another person or arose from another person's neglect.

Clause 32 provides for the manner in which notices may be served under the Division.

Clause 33 sets out the powers of an inspector under the Act.

Clause 34 empowers the Minister to establish, or arrange for the provision of, oil reception facilities.

Clause 35 controls the transfer of oil between sunset and sunrise.

Clause 36 provides for prosecutions for an offence to be brought at any time.

Clause 37 provides for the service of summonses.

Clause 38 is an evidentary provision.

Clause 39 provides for the Minister to appoint qualified persons to be analysts for the purposes of the Act and for certificates of analysts to be received in evidence.

Clause 40 provides for no liability to attach to an inspector.

Clause 41 provides for the making of regulations.

Clause 42 provides that orders made in pursuance of the regulations are subject to disallowance by Parliament.

Clause 43 provides that the regulations or orders may prescribe matters by reference to other instruments.

Clause 44 provides for the repeal of the Prevention of Pollution of Waters by Oil Act 1961.

The schedules contain the Convention and related materials.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

MARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Marine) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Marine Act 1936. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill seeks to incorporate into the Marine Act, the ship construction provisions contained in Annexes I and II of the International Maritime Organisation's International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships 1973, commonly referred to as MARPOL.

This Bill supplements the Pollution of Waters by Oil and Noxious Substances Bill 1987, which incorporates the majority of the provisions of Annexes I and II of the MARPOL Convention.

The ship construction provisions more appropriately fall within the ambit of the Marine Act than the proposed Pollution of Waters by Oil and Noxious Substances Act.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure.

Clause 3 makes consequential amendments to the arrangement provision of the principal Act.

Clause 4 provides for a new Part VA to the Act relating to International Conventions. The new provisions being inserted by this Bill relate to the application of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships 1973. New section 125a sets out various definitions required for the new Part. The Part is to apply to trading ships that proceed on intrastate voyages, Australian fishing vessels and pleasure vessels. New section 125b is an interpretative provision. New section 125c provides that the regulations may make provision for giving effect to certain regulations of Annex I of the Convention. Ministerial orders made pursuant to those regulations are to be subject to parliamentary disallowance. New section 125d provides for the issue of ship construction certificates. Subsections (1) to (4) of section 125e provide for notice to be given where the construction of a ship, in respect of which a certificate is issued, is altered or where the ship is damaged.

Subsections (5) to (7) provide for the cancellation of certificates. New section 125f provides for ships, in respect of which a ship construction certificate is issued, to be surveyed periodically. Section 125g provides that certain ships may not begin a voyage unless a ship construction certificate is in force for that ship. New section 125h relates to the use of expressions used in the Convention relating to noxious liquid substances. New section 125i provides that regulations may make provision for giving effect to regulation 13 of Annex II of the Convention; ministerial orders may again be made. New section 125j provides for the issue of chemical tanker construction certificates. Section 125k provides for notices to be given when the construction of a ship is altered or the ship is damaged and the cancellation of chemical tanker construction certificates in certain circumstances. Section 125*l* requires ships, in respect of which a certificate is issued, to be surveyed periodically. Section 125m provides for certain ships not to begin a voyage unless there is in force in respect of the ship a chemical tanker construction certificate. Section 125n provides for the making of regulations.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

LIQUOR LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (1987)

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Liquor Licensing Act 1985. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This amendment alters the method of licence fee assessment for holders of producer's licences under the Liquor Licensing Act 1985. Holders of those licences may sell to liquor merchants or the general public any liquor (beer, wine or spirits) which they have produced.

When the Act came into operation on 1 July 1985, it provided that annual licence fees for producer's licences and other wholesale licences would be a percentage of the gross amount paid or payable otherwise than by liquor merchants for the sale of liquor (not being low alcohol liquor) during the preceding financial year. At that time, virtually all of the liquor produced under producer's licences was wine or brandy.

In August 1985, following the introduction of Commonwealth sales tax on wine, the Bannon Government altered the basis of fees for producer's licences to give relief to winemakers. The licence fee was set at a fixed annual prescribed rate (currently $100), so that 'cellar door' sales of wine and brandy would not be included in the amount upon which licence fees were assessed.

Following introduction of this relief, five beer brewers have obtained producer's licences. These include the South Australian Brewing Company Limited and Cooper and Sons Limited, as well as three companies which operate 'micro breweries' attached to hotels. In the case of the latter three breweries, beer is supplied exclusively to the hotels so they would not be affected by this proposal as they provide beer only to liquor merchants.

The two larger breweries, however, supply beer to persons other than liquor merchants, although these sales comprise a very small portion of their total sales. This proposal would mean that the value of those sales will be included in the amount upon which an annual licence fee is assessed. This will place them in the same position as when the relief for wine and brandy producers was introduced in August 1985, and removes the unfair competitive advantage they have over brewers in other States who sell liquor in this State through wholesale liquor merchant's licences and so attract licence fees based on these sales other than to liquor merchants during preceding financial years.

It should be stressed that it will still be the case that no sales of wine, brandy or any low alcohol liquor, nor any export sales of any liquor, by holders of producer's licences will attract licence fees. It is proposed that the new method of assessment will first apply to the 1988 licence year.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides that the measure will come into operation on 1 January 1988.

Clause 3 inserts a new paragraph *(c)* of subsection (2) of section 87 of the principal Act. The amount of the licence fee for a producer's licence will be 11 per cent of the gross amount paid or payable otherwise than by liquor merchants for the sale of liquor (not being wine, brandy or low alcohol beer) during the relevant assessment period. The prescribed

minimum fee will continue to apply in cases where the licensee is a wine or brandy producer.

Clause 4 makes consequential amendments to section 93 of the principal Act.

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

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT (STATUTE LAW REVISION) BILL

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Labour) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1972. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

It provides for statute law revision amendments to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1972. It is part of the continuing program of statute revision being carried out by the Commissioner of Statute Revision under the Acts Republication Act 1967.

The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1972 has been heavily amended since it was last reprinted in a consolidated form in 1975. Furthermore, the Act is the working document for all people who are involved in industrial affairs in this State. Accordingly, some time ago the Commissioner of Statute Revision prepared a schedule of amendments to the Act to bring it into a form suitable for reprinting. This schedule was submitted to the Industrial Relations Advisory Council and in turn considered by a working party of that council. After due consideration, agreement was reached on a set of amendments for a Statute Law Revision Bill. These amendments are primarily intended to delete unnecessary matter, replace outdated provisions, revise poor or antiquated drafting and include gender-neutral language. The passage of this legislation will result in an Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act that is in a form appropriate for reprinting in 1987. The reprint will undoubtedly be of great benefit to all people who are involved in the industrial affairs arena. Finally, the Bill is not a measure for effecting substantive changes to the Act. It is presented simply as a statute law revision exercise and should be accepted as such.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure.

Clause 3 provides that the principal Act is amended in the manner set out in the schedule.

A schedule of amendments forms the bulk of the Bill. These amendments constitute an extensive revision of the principal Act so as to bring it to a form that is suitable for reprinting.

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

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (1987)

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Correctional Services) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Correctional Services Act 1982. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The object of the proposed new section 37 of the Correctional Services Act 1982 is to obtain greater security in prisons through improved searching procedures. There is no doubt that the use of illicit drugs has become in recent years more prevalent throughout society and prisons have not been immune to this unfortunate development. Substantial steps have been taken in prisons to ensure that drugs are not introduced through contact visits, but the existing legislation prevents correctional officers from detecting such introduction of drugs to the greatest extent possible. At present, whilst prisoners are required by law to remove their clothing for the purpose of a search, correctional officers are unable to visually examine the mouth and other bodily orifices in order to ascertain the presence of illicit materials. It has been brought to the Government's notice that this deficiency has caused management problems relating to the behaviour of prisoners after illicit drugs have been introduced into prisons.

The Government accepts that in the current age appropriate contact between families and prisoners is important for the management of prisoners and their subsequent resocialisation. Consequently, it is not a solution to take steps to close off such opportunities for contact. Rather, the prison managers require the ability to ensure that proper and thorough searching can be performed under appropriate guidelines. The current proposal will make it an offence for a prisoners who refuses to open his or her mouth or to refuse to adopt particular postures which will facilitate the visual examination of the body. It is proposed that reasonable force may be applied to ensure compliance with such requirements, except that the use of force will not extend to the situation where a prisoner refuses to open his or her mouth. In addition, any search must be carried out expeditiously and in a way which is designed to minimise humiliation to the prisoner.

This measure should not be considered in isolation. Regular search of cells and common areas by officers and by the Dog Squad takes place in all prisons. These measures will be continued together with consideration being given by the Government to other possible measures which can be taken to minimise the receiving or introduction of illicit drugs into prisons.

It is proposed that clear procedures will be laid down by the Department of Correctional Services in relation to the circumstances under which the proposed powers for correctional officers will be able to be excercised.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 substitutes section 37 of the Correctional Services Act 1982, which provides for the searching of prisoners in correctional institutions and their belongings. Subsection (1) restates the existing provision in relation to when a search may be conducted but subsections (2) to (4) give greater detail as to how a body search should be carried out. At least two other persons must be present during a search and they must be of the same sex as the prisoner (except in the case of medical practitioners). A prisoner may be required to open his or her mouth, to strip or to adopt particular postures for the purposes of the search and rea-

sonable force may be applied to secure compliance with such a requirement. However, force may not be used to open a prisoner's mouth except by, or under the supervision of, a medical practitioner, and only a medical practitioner may actually search an orifice of a prisoner's body. Subsection (5) provides that a search must be carried out speedily and undue humiliation of the prisoner avoided.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

AUSTRALIAN MINERAL DEVELOPMENT LABORATORIES (REPEAL AND VESTING) BILL

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy) brought up the report of the select committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence. Report received.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I move:

That the report be noted.

I remind the House that the purpose of the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories (Repeal and Vesting) Bill is to provide for the restructuring of Amdel to obtain an injection of funds of the order of $3.6 million. That funding will allow for the reduction of Amdel's current debt, allow for expansion that should ensure the continuance of employment of the Amdel work force and the viability of the enterprise. Additionally, the proposed new board arrangement should help to sharpen up Amdel's performance in the business sector.

No witness who appeared before the committee contested this approach, which is contained in the Bill considered by the select committee. Nor did any of the witnesses suggest that it was an unsound business approach or that it was the wrong solution. On the contrary, in the main, this was one area where all witnesses involved in this aspect of the evidence concurred. However, it should be noted that some witnesses objected to the proposed method of obtaining the necessary injection of funds. For example, the Public Service Association gave evidence to the effect that another solution should be used to provide the reference injection of funds. It suggested that in its view (as contained in one of the consultant reports) a lease-back arrangement might well have provided a more suitable solution to the funding question.

I can inform the House that the Government did not proceed along that path as a result of advice received by Amdel from the ANZ Bank. That approach took into account the nature of the building at Amdel—a constructed laboratory type building—and it was considered unlikely that any advantage could be gained in raising the equity money that I have referred to at any cheaper rate than standard borrowing (which is one of the problems faced by Amdel and with which this Bill is designed to assist). A proposition was put to the committee by Mr Bill Mitchell, who appeared on his own behalf. Apparently, he is a very erudite gentleman: he is a lecturer in economics (as I understand it) at the Flinders University, he has an honours degree in commerce, and he is currently expecting a PhD in business. Mr Deputy Speaker, at this stage I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PARKLANDS

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's resolution.

FISHERIES (GULF ST VINCENT PRAWN FISHERY RATIONALISATION) BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had insisted on its amendments Nos 2 to 5 to which the House of Assembly had disagreed, and that in lieu of its amendment No. 1 it had made the following alternative amendment:

Page 2, after line 20—Insert new clause as follows:

3a. (1) A licence is not transferable until 1 April 1990 but after that date may be transferred with the consent of the Director.

(2) The Director must consent to the transfer of a licence if—

(a) the criteria prescribed by the regulations are satisfied; and

(b) an amount is paid to the Director representing, in the Director's opinion, the aggregate of the licensee's accrued and prospective liabilities by way of surcharge under this Act less any component of that aggregate liability referable to future interest and charges in respect of borrowing.

(3) Where the registration of a boat is endorsed on a licence that is or is to be transferred, that registration may also be transferred.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I move:

That the House of Assembly do not insist on its disagreement to amendments Nos 2 to 5 and that the alternative amendment by the Legislative Council in lieu of amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: The amendment from the Legislative Council is in line with the objective that we tried to achieve by way of amendment in this Chamber in that it recognises the need for transferability. Although transferability has been delayed to 1 April 1990, the amendment recognises that people in this State who are out in the real world, being productive (whether farmers or fishermen) have their capital tied up in the assets of their boat and licence, and must have the right to transfer, otherwise the family could be left destitute.

We support the contention of the Legislative Council, and are prepared to accept that transferability be deferred until 1 April 1990. I now ask the Minister whether it is the Government's intention to continue to allow continued fishing by vessels which have offered to voluntarily withdraw from the prawn fishery? On 31 December last year, the Government cancelled the permits of the two Investigator Strait fishermen, and they were not able to continue fishing. I believe that we have a situation in Gulf St Vincent where the Minister has accepted one offer for $600 000 and two other offers in the vicinity of $730 000. The Minister now has effectively removed five of the six boats that he wanted to remove from the fishery, but at least two of the three boats that have offered to retire voluntarily are still out there going their hardest. If that is the case, it is totally in conflict with the purpose and objectives of this legislation. People in the industry want to know how long this state of affairs will continue.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I think that probably all members of Parliament would prefer to avoid this type of legislation when endeavouring to introduce management arrangement in a fishery. However, because of, I think to a large extent, the lack of cooperation in the past, we were forced into this situation. I am pleased to say that we are now getting good cooperation from people in the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery. I am delighted to acknowledge the efforts of the President and Secretary of the Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery Association in their attempts to resolve this important issue. I put on record my thanks for their cooperation in the way in which we have dealt with each other over the past six months. I think that that has been a

highlight of the whole exercise and it is a good omen for the future of the fishery.

I also thank the Director of Fisheries and the staff, the Manager of the fishery (Mr Bob Lewis) and the members of SAFIC who played a part in supporting this legislation. I know that we are not all agreed on the outcome, but I think that the outcome is a satisfactory solution. I would have preferred to have seen in this Bill non-transferability for an extended period, but what we have achieved with the amendment from the other place is a satisfactory solution for the good of the fishery in the long term in relation to our concerns we had, as a State, and my concerns, as Minister of Fisheries and mortgagee in the scheme of financial arrangement proposed in order to buy out the existing licences.

This is quite historic in terms of this fishery, and provides a good benchmark for future cooperation in other fisheries. We are only part way down the track in dealing with some of the major problems in our resources. However, it has been a significant achievement, and I am delighted to have been part of it. We also have to look at the resource effort currently going on. I share the honourable member's concern about what is going on out there. As soon as this Bill is passed we will institute the provisions as quickly as possible, both in relation to the administrative process and through consultation with those fishermen. Whether or not we can remove them until the Bill is proclaimed and we have legislative prohibition to institute the arrangements is a matter for consideration. We will do that as quickly as possible, and I hope that we can get that in place in the next few weeks so that the resource is not under further stress from the additional fishing effort put in out there.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Surely it would have been good management on the part of the Minister, the Director and the department for any person submitting an offer for voluntary withdrawal to have voluntarily withdrawn at that point, subject to acceptance—

The Hon. M.K. Mayes interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I am talking about sound, sensible management. We are talking about trying to protect the resource.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I am talking about sound, sensible management. It would have been easy for the Government or the Minister (if he had given it enough thought in advance) to say that, once a person submits an offer to withdraw from the industry, until a decision is made on it, that person would be automatically withdrawn from the fishery. That would be in line with the action that the Minister took in relation to the two Investigator Strait fishermen, who did not have any option whatsoever; they were out as from 31 December last year.

I see this as no different. I believe that it is a pity that this is drifting on and there is great conflict between those who are remaining in the fishery and who would have to pay out those who are going and those who are leaving the fishery and the industry and who are out there going their hardest, as flat as a tack, and squeezing out every last bit they can. This is just not on. I think that it is extremely poor management on the part of the Minister.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thought that we could do this with some air of cooperation and with a spirit of success. Obviously, it is hardly for the Opposition to sit over there and criticise me for achieving this monumental step in getting the fishery in order, because part of the problem has been your lack of management when you were in Government. One of the major problems we inherited was your decision about triple rigging.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister should address the Chair.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am sorry, Mr Chairman. We were saddled with the incompetence of the former Government. They now stand up here, after slowing the Bill down—a process they followed through—and throw the blame back on the Minister. What a pack of hypocrites!

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Light is biting the cherry.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Minister will resume his seat. This Committee will be conducted in the way in which all Committees of the Parliament will be conducted. I will not have this ruckus going on while the Committee is in session. Every member has the opportunity to speak if they so desire, although I hope that does not happen. We will conduct this Committee as it should be conducted. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Thank you for drawing my attention to the fact that I should be addressing the Committee through you, Mr Chairman. I will do so. Obviously, the Opposition cannot live with the fact that we have made a major step in fixing up this issue. It has not played any part in that. In fact, its part has basically been to slow down the process. Had it not played that part, we probably would have had the whole management scheme instituted well before the fishery was opened and the proposal considered. I think it is a magnificent achievement as a result of cooperation, and the Opposition obviously finds it difficult to digest because it has been no part of it. That is part of the reason why we are placed where we are today—trying to achieve an appropriate and proper management scheme.

The Opposition heralds the rights of the fishermen, and says that they should have transferability. Here is a right that it would have removed from the fishermen, when they have a perfect right to go out to the fishery; there is no legislation in power to manage it, and no legislative support for the Minister to institute a scheme of management which would prevent them going out. It is totally different from the Investigator Strait situation where the experimental licences are renewable annually. The Opposition ought to get its facts together, sit back and see that we now have an organised fishery management scheme in place for Gulf St Vincent.

Mr GUNN: It is unfortunate that the Minister has a relatively short memory. The facts are that for 14 of the past 17 years the administration of the Fisheries Department has been under the control of the Labor Party, not the Liberal Party.

The Hon. M.K. Mayes: But you buggered it up.

Mr GUNN: To claim that the Liberal Party—and I will not use the Minister's term—has messed up the situation is an absolute nonsense and cannot be justified by any facts. There is one basic principle that the Liberal Party stands for: treating people fairly and protecting their rights. We make no apology for having these amendments placed in the legislation. The Minister was warned in the debate which took place over a considerable amount of time that we would do everything in our power to convince the Upper House that these amendments should be inserted. This once again has demonstrated the need for a system of two Houses of Parliament. We therefore make no apology for fighting for the rights of people to transfer their licences. If we allowed this Minister to go down that track, the livelihood and superannuation of people in every other fishery that we have in South Australia would also be under threat. Will the Government do the same thing to taxis, to hotels, to those with fuel licences? It was therefore wrong in principle.

The other thing that concerns me (and I protested previously about it) is that it would be unwise for Parliament to transfer a discretion to a public servant. I am not making any reflections upon the current Director, but I believe that the only person who should have that right is the Minister, because he is directly answerable to the Parliament and to the people. If it was not so important to have this legislation passed, I would attempt a further amendment and divide the Committee as many times as possible because, in a democratic society, it is the Minister (even though the Minister in many cases is advised by the Director, and obviously one would get better advice from the Director; in this case I probably think one would) who is answerable to the Parliament.

However, an important principle is involved. I believe that we should not go down that track. The House can censure the Minister and question him, but it would be quite improper to do that in relation to a public servant. I have no disagreement with the manner in which the current Director administers his department. Under great difficulties, I think he does a particularly good job. However, as a matter of principle, provisions of this nature should not be in legislation.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I do not think we want to go down that track. For the Minister's benefit, I repeat that I can assure him that every time he brings to the Parliament measures to take away people's rights to transfer from an industry and have some reward for their efforts he will have a fight on his hands. Although I could say a number of things, I will not do so, as a select committee is awaiting the member for Chaffey and me. I have placed my concern on the record.

Motion carried.

DANGEROUS SUBSTANCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

AUSTRALIAN MINERAL DEVELOPMENT LABORATORIES (REPEAL AND VESTING) BILL

Adjourned debate on motion to note select committee's report (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 3813.)

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy): When I sought leave to continue my remarks, I was referring to the fact that Mr Bill Mitchell, who appeared before the committee as a private individual of some stature with respect to his qualifications, did not disagree in any respect with very much of what the Bill will allow in the future of Amdel. In fact, during the question and answer portion of his evidence, Mr Mitchell agreed with the need for the funds: that that was a reasonable thing for business prospects in the future structure of Amdel. However, he disagreed with the way in which the funds were to be provided. He said that they ought to be provided by the Government. When the Bill was introduced, the situation with respect to the Government's view of that proposal was made clear to the House.

The evidence from the Public Service Association, which was quite detailed, could be said to have been well thought out and a well prepared case. Certainly a number of assumptions were made and ideological and philosophical statements were put forward with which one might have a different view. However, one could also agree that the Public Service Association was allowed to have those points of view. It might have been better for the Public Service Association's case if it had actually come clean a little more and agreed that the point that was vexing them perhaps more than any other was that they stood to lose some 46 members. I do not quarrel with their concern about that but, if that had been made clearer, their evidence to the select committee might have had a little more validity.

My point in raising that matter is that the Government approached this matter with concern for the future of Amdel and to ensure that employment within that body continued and could have a chance of growing. Clearly there will be an opportunity for persons to be members of unions or associations. However, the Government's concern should not extend specifically to ensuring that memberships concerned might not necessarily change.

The question of membership and future coverage should be addressed by the bodies concerned in the way that these matters are normally handled. One other aspect of the evidence received related to alleged hazards at the West Thebarton site of Amdel with respect to alleged radioactive materials that were said to be stored incorrectly. Access to them by unauthorised entry to the premises was a matter of concern.

As a result of those allegations having been made publicly, I drew them to the attention of the Minister of Health and the Health Commission, which is the organisation that is correctly concerned with the proper operation of a licensed site such as that existing in Thebarton. The commission carried out some measurements and was able in the main to assure me—the committee has a copy of that report—that any 'hazards' at that site are of an extremely low level and that the site is conducted in a proper manner in accordance with the requirements of the Act.

There was one instance of a reading somewhat above normal, which resulted from the proximity of some drums of material which subsequently have been removed from the site. If it could be said that a hazard existed, the committee is able to assure the House that that is no longer the case because, as can be seen from our report, the committee took the opportunity to visit the site to allow members to see for themselves the situation with regard to this matter.

During its visit committee members had access to the necessary radioactivity detection equipment—a dose rate meter—which was available to the committee and, indeed, carried around most of the time by a member with complete freedom and access to check out readings anywhere within the site. At the same time the committee learnt that some laboratory sized radioactivity experimentation work that takes place there relating to Roxby Downs is carried out in a separate laboratory which, it is true, is in part of the main building, but in which certain restrictions apply. The people concerned are competent and fully aware of the requirements relating to handling such material, which is of a very low level, anyway.

The correct procedures are followed. The residues are treated in the chemical ways laid down. They are drummed and subsequently returned to Roxby Downs for storage or disposal in the prescribed manner.

The suggestion that children might obtain access to the site outside working hours was of some concern to the committee, although the instances cited were quoted as being somewhat infrequent. However, the committee took the allegations seriously, and I can say as the Minister concerned with minerals and energy that I have requested Amdel to examine this aspect to see whether the entry about which we were told does take place and what can be done, as far as is humanly possible in this area, to prevent it happening again. The point is not only that the hazards in the area could be radioactive (although they would be of an extremely low level) but also that children should not be able to gain entry. Also, as on any other site, there could be physical hazards that might cause the children to be injured.

A more organised and descriptive sort of evidence was given to the committee by a number of persons associated with Amdel. I am sure other members of the committee would agree with me that the written and verbal evidence given by Dr Brian Hickman from Amdel was of an extremely high quality. The literature provided enabled the committee to easily understand the details of the proposal, the background to Amdel and its hopes for the future as expressed in the literature; this was extremely acceptable. We were able to get an assurance from the Chairman of the Amdel board, Mr Bruce Webb, who is not unknown to most members of the House from the various categories of appointment that he has held in South Australia over the years, the proposal contained in the Bill had the unanimous support of the board. The board believed that it was in the best interests for the future of Amdel, its expansion and its employees.

Two members of the public came before the committee. When those two persons—Messrs Judd and Grey—first appeared we were somewhat sceptical of their approach and manner. However, I think I am speaking for all the committee when I say that, throughout their evidence and under some fairly rigorous questioning by a number of committee members, the committee observed that they were genuinely concerned and that many of their fears—the record shows this—concerning possible radioactivity hazards at the site had been allayed as a result of a visit that was organised by my office when these two gentlemen first complained about their fears.

They were conducted all over the site at Amdel and were allowed to see the situation for themselves. Indeed, their attention was drawn to areas where low level radioactive material—ore, and so on—was stored. It was a little sad that there was one fly in the ointment which emerged during evidence, in that Mr Judd appeared to be a person who would be very difficult to convince as to the integrity of people in relation to protection and safe working at the site.

If I remember the evidence correctly, Mr Judd said that he would not accept Amdel's figures of monitoring. He was loath to accept Health Commission figures of monitoring at the site and, under further questioning, he suggested that perhaps interstate figures provided by unnamed persons on a monitoring basis might satisfy him. I believe that that is a sad attitude. I do not believe that anyone here or many people in the community would be willing to say that the Health Commission's record in this area and in health generally was not first class. Commission officers are professionals. They use high quality instruments and their findings should be respected as being of an independant nature with respect to monitoring carried out at Amdel. I am prepared to say that people might feel justified in having some suspicion of regulation and monitoring. However, I think that on reflection those two gentlemen, particularly Mr Judd, might decide to accept in future the fact that the commission has played a good role in the area in South Australia and is correctly operating in accordance with the relevant protection Act.

As all members who have served on select committees know, one can get quite interested in the evidence and the people who give it, and can come back to the House almost forgetting what the aim of the committee was and almost overlooking the fact that the passage of the Bill involved is an important matter. Possibly one of the best things that I can do now is to conclude and thank members of the committee for their attention to the matter over a short time—about 12 meetings were held in just over a week.

That was quite a number of meetings for members to fit in with their commitments. All committee members gave their best attention to the matters in hand. I thank our Secretary (Mr Gordon Thomson) who was involved in the organisation of the work and in ensuring that witnesses appeared on time. I commend the select committee's report to the House.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I am happy that the report be noted. In particular, I should like to note a couple of pieces of evidence that I thought were useful. I have no argument with anything that the Minister has said and I do not want to have a row with him, but I want to put the record straight. I thought that the United Trades and Labor Council and the Public Service Association put the record straight in coming to terms with the double-speak of the Government and with what this Bill is all about. Suddenly, we hear the words 'restructure' and 'commercialisation'. They have materialised out of the air, but we know perfectly well that what is happening to Amdel is exactly the same sort of thing that the Liberal Party, prior to the 1985 State election, suggested might happen to a few other Government instrumentalities. At no stage did we suggest that the major oil and gas interests in South Australia be sold: we suggested something that is similar to what the Government is doing in respect of Amdel.

The present Government was happy to label that 'privatisation', so what are we on about here? There is no doubt in my mind or in the minds of the Government's backers, the UTLC and the PSA, about what the Government is on about. So let us get rid of all this gobbledegook that we have been getting day in and day out from the Premier and his Minister about the Government's intention in this exercise. Let me quote briefly from the fairly extensive evidence of the PSA just to put this matter to rest. A document, entitled 'The PSA's basis for concern', states:

> This proposal to privatise Amdel is of much concern because it challenges fundamental values we uphold.

There it is in black and white. Later, the document states:

> A more detailed understanding of the PSA's views on the role of the public sector, privatisation and commercialisation are contained in the appendix containing extracts from our State budget submission 1986-87.

Later, the following statement appears under 'Privatisation':

> Privatisation involves the transfer, sale or gift of public sector activities in whole or part to the private sector.

That is what this Bill is all about and that is our understanding of 'privatisation'. Admittedly, it has been difficult for the Government, because, along with the UTLC and the PSA, it canned that word during the 1985 election campaign. Later, the document from the PSA states:

> A substantial component of the push for privatisation is not based on economic grounds but is unashamedly ideological—reflecting the desire to minimise regulation, fragment trade union power—

an important point—

and base consumption on capacity to pay rather than equity and need. At the ideological level, the PSA clearly believes that equity and need are basic principles which the Government must be guided by.

I have been a little puzzled about where the Premier found the new word 'commercialisation' but I have found out: he picked it up from the PSA. He thinks that he will con the PSA into thinking that what the Government is on about in respect of Amdel and what it is obviously on about in respect of certain other Government instrumentalities has suddenly become 'restructuring' or 'commercialisation'. This is what the PSA said about that:

On the positive side, the State Government is encouraged to develop the commercial aspects of its operations without sacrificing the needs principle. Vital flexibility in the budget process can be achieved outside of taxation increases, if revenue potential is exploited. Indeed, it is desirable and legitimate for Government to foster these revenue raising areas of its enterprise as a source of financing essential programs which have no independent revenue. It is more efficient (in an economic sense) to raise revenue by providing goods and services in the market at a price than through taxation.

What they are on about there is the Government getting more and more involved in commercial operations but, unfortunately, the PSA overlooked that it is the private sector that pays the taxes. The PSA says, 'Let the Government get more involved in commercial operations so that it can raise revenue and then it will not have to raise taxes.' That is an absurdity, but I am not here to have a row with the PSA: I merely wish to place on record what the Government intends in this matter.

Many witnesses appeared before the select committee and most of them made sense. In the event the UTLC found it inconvenient to appear before the committee, probably because that would have been embarrassing both to it and the Government. However, at the eleventh hour the UTLC sent the following letter:

The council apologises for not being able to be represented before the committee on 30.3.87 at 11.15 a.m. In the alternative, we submit the following brief submission. We strongly urge the committee to recommend that the Bill not be proceeded with. This has been our private advice to the Minister which involves our concern over what is seen as a privatisation move—

nothing about commercialisation or restructuring—

and subsequently our public position in supporting the thrust of the PSA's public campaign.

So, the UTLC is in bed with the PSA, which is not surprising: they are all brothers and comrades. The letter from the UTLC continues:

We believe that the alternative propositions placed over the years before the Government could have been taken up and still can be. We are aware of the substantial and detailed submissions made by the PSA to the Minister and to this committee and indicate our support for them. Our submission thus now highlights some key issues, but which have not been seriously addressed to our satisfaction. Please contact me if you have any questions. Yours sincerely, (Signed) C.D. White, Assistant Secretary.

That evidence was useful and, if it did nothing else, it exposed the hypocrisy and the gobbledegook of the Government. Having clarified that matter, let me say that the committee met harmoniously. We had excellent witnesses. The Managing Director of Amdel, at short notice, provided a complete resumé of what Amdel is all about. The Liberal Party has long been in favour of injecting profitability into enterprises, especially if public funds are involved, so in principle we do not object to what the Government proposes in this instance.

Indeed, it exactly mirrors what the Liberal Party proposed during the 1985 State election campaign. However, for base political motives it suited the Government's performance to grossly misrepresent what the Liberal Party was on about. I can understand the PSA being miffed: in fact, it is probably scandalised because the Government has doublecrossed it. After all, it spent all that money getting the Labor Government re-elected and the UTLC helped with the Labor campaign, yet here the Labor Government is off on a privatisation kick which obviously will not end with Amdel.

Expert witnesses from the Energy Division of the Department of Mines and Energy, as well as the Director of Mines and Energy, appeared before the select committee. My only concern, if I had one, is about the composition of the board. It seems to me that Amdel's fame has been achieved as a result of its excellent mining innovations and its work with the mining industry, but there seems to be a significant dilution of mining interests in the new board.

We have heard much about Amdel getting into other areas of expertise, but I am not sure how far it will go. Amdel has been involved in forensic work and in other activities, but its basic connection has been with minerals, and it has had a connection, not even tenuous, with the mining industry. So, it seems to me that, with the abolition of the current structure and the formation of a board where only one member will be directly connected with the mining industry, the emphasis may be away from the activities of Amdel from which it has made its name well known not only in Australia but overseas. Having said that, the Opposition is perfectly happy to note the select committee report and to see that the passage of the Bill is not further delayed.

Mr. S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): First, I congratulate the Chairman on the way in which he conducted the proceedings. The second comment I wish to make is that this is privatisation, let more of it happen, but let us cut out the hypocrisy.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I support the motion. A couple of comments must be made. First, the Chairman tabled the report provided to the Australian Labor Party State Council meeting. It was also stated in the committee that it was carried without dissent at the ALP State Council meeting. That contrasts with the obvious politicking of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I can understand that that is his wish—we are all political animals—and he wants to be seen to be creating a bit of dissension if he can and being a bit mischievous. I understand the honourable member. I have been around the traps and around this place long enough to know when he is making a bit of mischief. However, it flies in the face of the statement he made that the Labor Party is in the pocket of the trade union movement or *vice versa*.

That is not the case. There is a mutual respect between the organisations and as a member of a union I understand that there will be conflicts between the administration of a particular trade union and the Government of the day. I do not see it as an embarrassment to the Government for a union organisation to express its views very forcibly. There was no dispute, and the Leader of the Opposition gave evidence that he supported it and asked whether a need existed for injection of moneys in Amdel. I noted his support for that proposition. I will not delay the House: suffice to say that I too would like to congratulate the Chairman on his handling of the committee and thank the Clerk for his assistance.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy): Briefly, I refer to page 75 of the evidence and the Deputy Leader's concern about the future compositions of the board. That was answered to a degree by the present Chairman of the board when he stated:

Provided you have a good background of technical people—

speaking of the board—

within the organisation and some influence on the board, survival is often a matter of knowing how to run your financial affairs to support the dedicated technical people.

In answer to a member of the committee he then stated:

I understand your concern, but at this stage I feel the influx of business skills is as important as the technical skills.

I suggest that with the passage of time we will be wiser and there may be a need for some other change which can no doubt be made at the appropriate time.

I will incorporate in the record some information that could be useful for people who read reports of committees. The item of detection equipment that the committee used when on site at Amdel in Thebarton was a Nuclear Enterprises Ltd portable dose rate meter, type PDR1. It had a scale of 5 microrads per hour up to 10 millirads per hour. Its equivalent would be .05 micrograys per hour up to .1 milligrays per hour. The equipment was calibrated by the Health Commission in September 1986 and is checked every 12 months. It is useful to incorporate those facts because the readings we obtained on that instrument were most often the background level in the area; only on some occasions was it exceeded and it was well below the prescribed limits.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—'Superannuation.'

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I move:

Page 2, lines 23 to 27—leave out subIcause (2).

Subclause (2) in that clause would have provided an additional right to Amdel employees who were not members of the South Australian Superannuation Fund as at 1 December 1986. That was not intended and in fact was inserted in error in the Bill. The committee took advice on the subject that the removal of this by way of amendment would not affect all other existing rights by way of superannuation entitlements. In accordance with the requirements and that which has been agreed, I ask the Committee to support the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (8 and 9) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LIFTS AND CRANES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 1 (clause 3)—Leave out the clause.

No. 2. Page 2, line 9 (clause 4)—Leave out 'an approved' and insert 'a prescribed'.

No. 3 Pages 2 and 3 (clause 8)—Leave out the clause.

No. 4 Page 3, line 12 (clause 9)—Leave out 'and'.

No. 5. Page 3 (clause 9)—After line 16 insert the following:

and

(c) by inserting after subsection (3) the following subsection:

(4) A regulation prescribing or incorporating a code of practice in relation to the election, construction, modification, maintenance or operation of cranes, hoists or lifts will not be made except on the recommendation of the Minister after consultation with the Chief Inspector and a representative from the Lift Manufacturers Association of Australia and the Master Builders Association of South Australia Incorporated.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be disagreed to, and that the following alternative amendment be made in lieu thereof:

Clause 8, page 3, after line 8—Insert the following:

(4) An approved code of practice or the variation of an approved code of practice is subject to disallowance by Parliament.

(5) Every approved code of practice or variation must be laid before both Houses of Parliament within 14 days of notice of its approval being published in the *Gazette* if Parliament is in session or, if Parliament is not then in session, within 14 days after the commencement of the next session of Parliament.

(6) If either House of Parliament passes a resolution disallowing an approved code of practice or a variation of a code of practice then the code of practice or variation ceases to have effect.

(7) A resolution is not effective for the purposes of subsection (6) unless passed in pursuance of a notice of motion given within 14 sitting days (which need not all fall in the same session of Parliament) after the day on which the code of practice was laid before the House.

The suggested alternative amendment has been circulated. The Opposition's amendments moved in another place are not acceptable to the Government as they would require codes of practice to be given the same legal status as regulations.

A code of practice provides industry with a practical guidance standard that provides options and alternatives to meeting varying situations. This flexibility cannot be achieved if codes are to be prescribed by regulation (which would have the effect of making them mandatory). However, the Government accepts the principle of parliamentary control over codes of practice issued pursuant to the Lifts and Cranes Act and, accordingly, proposes an amendment to provide for their review by Parliament in line with the approach adopted under the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986.

I think the Committee should understand that a code of practice imposes a lesser obligation on employers and employees than is the case with regulations. The idea is to simply give a guide which is to be adhered to in the work place as much as is practicable. As the Committee would be aware, with regulations it is the law and it is mandatory. In all situations that may mean that people will be breaking the law when all they are doing is going about their business in a safe way; whereas under a code of practice that would be acceptable behaviour. So codes of practice are appropriate and effective. If they become mandatory, problems will be created at individual work sites. The final draft of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act which emerged from Parliament contained a provision similar to the alternative amendment in my motion.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister's proposed alternative amendment is accepted by the Opposition. The Opposition was looking for a way for Parliament to scrutinise the codes of practice. During the second reading debate I said that we did not want unilateral decisions made by Government in matters such as this where ultimately the courts would have to decide whether or not a person was conforming to the code of practice. I believe that the solution contained in the motion is more desirable than the Opposition's amendments. If the industry finds that the code of practice is not in its best interests, it can inform the Opposition of that fact and an appropriate course of action can be taken. I approve of the amendments and support them.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendments would make the Bill unworkable.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): Mr Deputy Speaker, you have been heard to say, in your capacity as member for Henley Beach, that people paying land tax—in particular developers—should pay that tax and that they are really ripping off people. In making those strong claims against developers, Mr Deputy Speaker, you were displaying an attitude which is quite typical of socialists: a hatred against people who use initiative to develop. However, that situation does not extend to developers working on a project like the ASER site, or promoting some massive project in the Hills face zone, which makes an hypocrisy of the Hills face zone planning legislation. Socialists then see a benefit in walking hand in hand with developers because they think that money will be coming into the State from other places and that it will jack up an economy that they have placed in trouble.

Land tax is a burden to small business people. Mr Deputy Speaker, for the member for Henley Beach to argue (as he has been heard to do recently) that a developer should carry the cost of land tax and should not add it to the cost of an overall project is absolute stupidity.

Mr Groom: It is a capital cost.

Mr S.G. EVANS: Of course it is a cost, so it must be passed on. Is the member for Hartley suggesting that that would be the case in the running of his legal practice? Is he saying that he would not pass on to clients the capital cost of running his business in the form of purchasing or leasing all sorts of office equipment? If I went to the member for Hartley for paid legal advice, I am sure he would not tell me that that is the way to run a business (however, he might volunteer that information to me because he would not have to worry about the result). The member for Hartley knows that the capital cost of running a business must be taken into account when a business charges for its services or, in the case of property, the rental charge. There is no alternative. If that is not done and the capital costs were high, the business would become insolvent. That sort of attitude from a person who has studied law is absolutely ludicrous.

I now turn to a delicate matter that I raised in this House yesterday. At the outset, I point out that I am not an advocate of racial discrimination. In fact, since yesterday members on this side have told me that they have been receiving similar queries, and I would be amazed if that is not the case with members opposite. I refer to low interest loans, who is getting them and where the money is coming from. I have not finished following this through, but I have learnt the area possibly causing concern in the community is the Commonwealth First Home Owner Scheme, which the State Government administers through its agent the State Bank.

Under the scheme people can borrow money for as low as 5½ per cent interest. I have been told that the figure is as low as 4 per cent, but I have not been able to verify that. It could be that the State Government pays the Federal Government only 4 per cent for that money. I do not know, but it is something that we can find out later. The money is available to people in the low income group who are over 30 years of age and, if they are married, have an income of $440 per week or less (and if they have children the income can be higher). The maximum amount that they can pay for a property is $72 000, and the maximum amount they can borrow is $48 000, which they can borrow at 5½ per cent interest. It increments at a rate of 1 per cent per year if the borrower's income allows for that. I have learnt that people coming from Vietnam are being very well advised.

As soon as they arrive they are told to get their name on the list. I do not blame the welfare people, the State Government welfare people or their relatives (before they leave Vietnam) for advising them of that. It is a fact that the biggest percentage of people applying are from that particular background. The waiting time is eight to 10 months, with a limit of 54 loans a week. Australian born and other people should wake up to the fact that that money is readily available. They should not complain to their MPs that a group of people just arrived from another land can buy a low priced home at a low interest rate which they cannot get. They should wake up that this is available if they want to buy a first home.

With the Commonwealth Government's $6 000 for the First Home Owner Scheme, $54 000 is available for people in that category ($6 000 as a grant and $48 000 at 5.5 per cent). Australian born people in the low income group need to wake up because that 5.5 per cent (against the 15 per cent or more that most people are paying for $48 000) works out to about $5 000 or $6 000 a year in interest savings. These people who have not woken up to it could get in on this scheme. I found out from an agent who suggested to me that he had lost out on a contract that it is starting to create, because of the capital gains tax that the Federal Government has applied, a black market scheme. If a house is on the market for $78 000 to $80 000, a low income family can raise, through family and friends, money that could have been earned through a second job or whatever but not declared to the Department of Taxation, and this money can be handed to a relative to pay to the owner of the home. The house is then taken out of the hands of the agent, the owner is paid an amount behind the scenes to put the price of the home below $72 000, and these people are then able to get a low interest loan, because the home is in that bracket.

What is happening now is what occurred after the Second World War, when we tried to fix the price of homes. My plea to those who are losing their farms and paying 20 per cent or more interest is to not get angry with the Vietnamese or others who are using this scheme. Unfortunately, farmers cannot obtain this low interest money as they have already bought their first home. That is the injustice of the system. A farmer who has had a property in his family for generations suddenly finds that the bank interest is starting to knock him around because of low prices for rural products and he has to pay 20 per cent or thereabouts for money. He then finds that others on low incomes, some who have just arrived from other lands, can get money at 5.5 per cent. Those farmers in that rural industry should not get angry. It is unfortunate that that is how the rules are presently written.

I can understand the anger of someone who is going to lose their farm, home and everything while the person they are talking to has got money at 5.5 per cent to establish a home. However, they should remember that a lot of these newcomers congregate and help one another out. They work together, and have done this in communities for years. They are able to put their assets together and help one another, and Australian families do not do this. I will follow up on this matter later.

I make the plea to South Australian low income groups to wake up and use the system. The newcomers know how to do it because they are well advised as soon as they land. However, Governments do not advise Australian born low income groups how to use the system and make use of the money that is available. I make this plea so that that may occur.

Mr GROOM (Hartley): Several months ago there was a great amount of publicity revolving around the Liberal Party's new word 'incentivation'. What has happened to incentivation? In fact, the Special Minister of State actually released the Liberal Party's incentivation policy when he received prewarning of it and was able to tell the press about it. However, as reported in the *News* on 6 February, Senator Messner, when he launched it—it was rahter like a new brand of petrol—at the Caltex Service Station at the corner of Richmond and South Roads, Keswick, said:

> ... incentivation, an amalgamation of the words 'incentive' and 'motivation', is the latest political buzz word and is aimed at promoting the Federal Opposition's campaign to package itself as an alternative Government, able to restore incentive to the taxation system and motivation to the work place.

Mr Minchin, who I think is the State Director of the Liberal Party, said that the posters would go up in the next week or so in the metropolitan area and would stay up for about a month. He said that the word was sure to catch on, and that it 'grows on you'. In fact, Senator Messner added:

> I am incentivated. I always have been.

The word 'incentivation' has not grown very much. It has not added anything to the English language and we have not heard very much about it over the past couple of months since it was released. I understand that it arose from an analysis conducted by the Liberal Party's public relations firm. It hardly grows on you! I think that everyone thought, when the Special Minister of State released it, that he was doing it in jest. However, at that time they were quite serious about it, but what has occurred? We have heard nothing more about incentivation. In fact, judging from the performance of members opposite they ought to get incentivated. That is the message one would have thought could have got across.

The campaign was also launched nationally by Mr Howard. When Mr Howard wrote to me back in August last year asking for money for the Liberal Party's campaign he never mentioned anything about incentivation. In fact, he went on to talk about a five point plan. I am pleased that I did not take up his offer to donate various sums of money to him at that time, because none of this five point plan has been implemented or looks capable of being implemented. He said that the Party's five point plan was industrial relations reform, more incentive for effort and risk taking, less taxes, reduced Government interference, greater recognition of the crucial role of our export industries, and reduced union power. We have heard nothing about its policy since that time. Nothing has unfolded in respect of any of this five point plan. What we have seen is total turmoil and no incentivation on the part of the Liberal Party opposite.

Of course, John Howard, as members might recall, is the same person who was in the Rundle Mall in November 1985 before the State election predicting a win for John Bannon. He was certainly right on that occasion, but he is unlikely to be right about where he is going in the future. He told me back in August 1986 that he was going to be Australia's next Prime Minister. You have no hope of being Australia's next Prime Minister with a record like John Howard had when he was in Government (when he was the Federal Treasurer). I was interested in a report put out by Senator Maguire comparing the various records of Mr Howard when he was the Treasurer and the record of the Hawke Government when in office. On virtually all points the Hawke Government comes through with flying colours. It is certainly true that there needs to be further growth in the economy and that further measures need to be taken, but it is quite clear that Australia, under the Hawke Government, has been on the path of recovery. Take the number of unemployed persons. When one compares the number of unemployed, under Mr Howard in January 1983 it was 66 200, and that figure fell to 59 500 under Mr Hawke in January 1987—a drop of about 6 700 in comparable figures.

The unemployment rate has improved. It was 11 per cent when Mr Howard lost office and it came down to 9.2 per cent in January this year—a drop of 1.8 per cent. Youth unemployment likewise has improved under the Hawke Government. It was 30 per cent in the 15 to 19 year age group in January 1983, and it has dropped to 24.6 per cent under the Hawke Government, taking January 1987 figures, for that age group. That is a substantial drop of 5.4 per cent. The CPI was 10.7 per cent in 1982 (members might have forgotten Mr Howard's record), but it is now down to 9.3 per cent, and it is expected to drop to 6 per cent by the end of the year. Again, that is a positive on the part of the Hawke Government.

Other figures include building approvals for new dwellings which, in January 1987 under the Hawke Government, were 9 783. Going back to January 1983, the figure was 7 972—quite a significant difference. There has been a substantial improvement in new dwellings under the Hawke Government. Probably more importantly as a factor, because it can affect our international position, is the number of working days lost through industrial disputes. Under the Hawke Government, taking the 12 months to October 1986, only 41 200 days were lost through industrial disputes, compared with 91 100 in the 12 months to October 1982, when Mr Howard was at the helm with Mr Fraser in the Liberal Government. That is quite a dramatic drop in the number of industrial disputes, and that advances Australia's position internationally. It makes us a much more stable market. Contracts and orders are more likely to be fulfilled.

On all these indices it is quite clear that the Hawke Government is streets in front, yet Mr Howard would have us believe otherwise. You do not hear anything of his record. He never discloses it in any of his material. Certainly in the letter that he sent me he never disclosed who he was or what his past was. He pretended that Australians were being hit by a new Labor generated fringe benefits tax, and he went on about the Liberals' new five point plan for industrial relations reform. The absurdity of the Liberal Party's industrial relations reform package is well known—more incentive. When one looks at his record, one sees that he has no hope of delivering. The Liberal Party is in turmoil as a consequence of the antics of the Queensland Premier, who wants to become Prime Minister, although he has had a setback. He was out there telling the media that he would be Australia's next Prime Minister, with some package of a flat tax of 25 per cent.

The National Party also wrote to me asking for money. Mr Sinclair wrote to me in about August 1986, when he sent out a standard letter to everybody. However, he never mentioned anything about a flat tax of 25 per cent in that proposal, because everyone knows the absurdity of a flat tax and whom it would hit. When one looks at Sir Joh's record, one sees that Queensland in January this year had the highest unemployment rate of all the States—10.3 per cent, when the Australian average was 8.2 per cent. It had the fastest growing Public Service. Despite all the talk about small government, Queensland is big government.

State and local government employment grew more than 24 per cent in the six years to 1985, nearly twice the national average. It is the fastest spending State. When we are trying to dampen and control inflation, Queensland is going off the boil with a spending increase of 6.8 per cent compared to the national average of 4.3 per cent. Despite the talk of lowering taxes, Sir Joh's State-sourced revenue grew 7 per

cent in the six years to July 1986, compared with the national average of less than 4 per cent. What a ludicrous record! These people want to be at the helm of Australia and run Australia the same way that they run Queensland.

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

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): The tax crush in this country must end. If we are to achieve an end to the tax crush, we will have to do something about cutting waste in government. We are moving now into a pre-election phase at the Federal level, and I do not think it would hurt to have placed on the record in this Parliament some of the absolutely abhorrent examples of waste that have occurred under the Federal Labor Government in its last term of office. It has handed out money and wasted it like no other Government has done since the heady days of the Whitlam era, and it must stop. Parliament may be interested in some examples, and I will place them on record because I know that members on both sides would like to use the list in their discussions around the electorates so that people can see what sort of waste has gone on with our socialist Government in Canberra.

We have all heard or read in the paper of various examples, and these are just a few for the interest of all members. A total of $1 million has been squandered by the Federal Labor Government due to bureaucratic bungling of an Adelaide project for disabled people—one of the worst examples that I believe has been turned up for some time. The Adelaide Work Preparation Program, which helps mildly intellectually disabled people find employment, was to be moved from its premises at Underdale in the interests of centralisation. The program was established by the Federal Government in a disused factory in 1983 at a cost of $600 000.

Three years later, the facilities were to be demolished. Because the building is leased, the factory must be returned to its original state at a further cost of $70 000 to the taxpayer. The facility included a $30 000 institutional kitchen which has barely been used. The program would move partly to new prestigious premises in Pirie Street which attract a rent of $35 000 a year, and to a depot in the western suburbs at a cost of about $80 000 rent in the first year and $30 000 to $35 000 a year thereafter.

While the Underdale facility costs $73 000 a year to lease nearly 2 500 sqare metres, the new premises will cost $115 000 in the first year and $70 000 a year thereafter for about half the space. The Underdale facility also has more than 400 square metres of unused space which could have been sublet at $15 000 a year, making the net rental of Underdale a mere $58 000 for more than 2 000 square metres. This is a total loss to the Australian taxpayer by this bureaucratic bungle of something in the region of $1 million.

I will also give the House a few more examples. A $33 254 research grant was handed out for studying the social and environmental impact of roadsides. About $800 000 of taxpayers' money has been given in the form of research grants for projects which, to put it mildly, are just a scandalous waste of the money of every taxpayer in this State. Members should realise that we in this Chamber are also contributing.

A project listed as Motherhood in Ancient Rome received $3 250; seventeenth century shipbuilding techniques and methods of recording hull structures received $45 000; functions of prehistoric South-East Asian stone tools received $40 984; preschool children's attention and interaction with the ABC's *Playschool* received $8 000. The sex differences in solving mathematical problems received $15 000.

Mr Groom: What is the matter with that?

Mr OSWALD: I would like the member for Hartley to stand up in the next grievance debate and say how that $15 000 will be used in determining the sex differences in solving mathematical problems. I have a modest level of intelligence, but I do not understand what they are hoping to achieve with that one. Another project was the input/output structures of household productive activities, which received $27 465, and one on the confessions of pre-Reformation England received two grants totalling $6 250. There was the transformation of masculinity in four Australian subpopulations, which received $23 000.

Members interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: I do not know what is wrong with it because I do not understand it. I doubt that anyone in the Chamber understands why that $23 000 of taxpayers' money was handed out. We then had a design for the Office of the Status of Women which received a grant of $11 000 to enable it to design and develop a special surfboard for women. Also, we have had the $200 million cost overruns on the new Parliament House. That was due purely to mismanagement and an appalling record of industrial blackmail and disputes.

Next, we have the Australia Japan Foundation grant of $12 000 for the translation of Bob Hawke's biography. What is the value of that to the Australian community? There is also the Footscray swimming pool project fiasco, which involved an original CEP grant of $1.97 million and a final pay-out of $5.3 million. The Department of Foreign Affairs had an annual rent bill of $258 000 for the residence of Australia's Ambassador for Disarmament, Richard Butler. We then had Australia Council grants of $52 000 to the deregistered Builders Labourers Federation for artists and muralists, and another $8 272 for the Food Preservers Union for leadlight and ceramic classes.

The Department of Science's Australian Research Grants Scheme included $3 250 for a study of motherhood in ancient Rome and a $45 000 grant for a study of seventeenth century shipbuilding techniques. In relation to the Office of Youth Affairs, there was a grant of $5 000 for the National Network of Young Lesbians and Homosexual Men's Conferences. Then we have the Commonwealth invalidity rip-off which accounted for a large part of this year's pay-out of $320 million in invalidity pensions to former Commonwealth public servants. The International Year of Peace program saw grants such as $14 000 to the Movement Against Uranium Mining for a peace sculpture. There was then a $17 000 grant to study the economics of the Domesday Book; $15 200 to produce an economic catalogue of Roman women from 201 BC to 210 AD. What good is that study to Australian taxpayers?

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: The member for Hartley seems to support these grants in his interjection. I am pleased to see that he shakes his head, because no sensible member could possibly support the grants that the Federal Labor socialist Government is handing out. I am pleased to see that the member for Hartley agrees. We also had a $20 000 grant to research a social history of eighteenth century English barristers.

Members interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: It seems to be important, according to the member for Hartley, and I am sure that it has some historical significance somewhere—but not in these hard times. Perhaps in the heady days of the Whitlam era one could justify that sort of nonsense, but certainly not in the difficult days of financial constraint that we are now experiencing.

There was also a $5 500 grant to study the relationship between Roman emperors and lawyers between 27 BC and 235 AD, and a $7 000 grant to study German white collar workers before the First World War. What on earth does that mean to us? We also had a $5 840 grant to study women's emancipation in Japan, and a $41 410 grant to study the history of the Australian Labor Party. That was followed by a $8 242 grant for a study on the Marxist history of Britain since 1688. Finally, we had a $15 516 grant for an analysis of the Irish Parliament in the eighteenth century. I close my case. If ever there have been blatant examples of how a Federal socialist Government squanders taxpayers' money, surely those examples justify our complaints.

Motion carried.

At 4.55 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 7 April at 2 p.m.