HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 17 November 1988

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

FREIGHT COSTS

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I move:

That this House urges the Federal and State Governments to immediately set about removing the onerous cost burden imposed by legislative protection of the inefficient onshore and offshore transport industries on rural export industries, and the rural communities which depend upon them in particular, all other export industries and the national economy in general.

If we allow the present situation to continue, there will be a continuing acceleration in the number of export industries that fail. The situation to which I refer has become an institutionalised form of inefficiency that makes the mind boggle. The current situation has destroyed the viability of so many industries which might otherwise have made substantial contributions to the overall level of prosperity and to employment opportunities in Australia.

It is clear that many industries exist on a reduced scale of operations, because they cannot compete effectively with either overseas produced goods, which do not have to suffer the impact of this cost structure, or goods which are substituted to avoid the cost structure. Even the number of people directly involved in the lobbying to continue this, as I see it, irresponsible and artificial cost structure would be increased if only those unions and industries for which they work would wake up and allow real market forces and fair and equitable rates of payment for wages, goods and services to apply.

Let us look at some examples of the kind of thing about which I speak. I point out that it costs $72 per tonne to ship milk powder from Tasmania to Taiwan, but it costs $82 per tonne to ship that same product on the ferry from Tasmania to Melbourne across Bass Strait. That is an incredible $10 difference—more than 10 per cent. If one looks at the number of operations involved, one can see that no more work is required to get a tonne of milk powder over the wharf on to the export vessel and on to Taiwan than is the case with getting the same product over the wharf—in fact, probably less work is required—on to the inter-island ferry system.

Notwithstanding that fact the ferry from Tasmania to Melbourne costs well over 10 per cent more for freight than would be the case if it were going to Taiwan. How can that be? It is simply because of the inefficiencies of the Australian shipping industry that carries it. In this instance that is directly related to the incompetence of the management of the line and the greed of the workers. In the opinion of most Australians to whom I speak, the workers demand far more than is just and reasonable. I am sure the majority of Australians would have the same opinion if they knew about the conditions of work and services for those employed on this merchant fleet.

Mr Peterson interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I did not say it was not. As the member for Semaphore would know, the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission is not set up in law—and this is the stupid part about it—to make sensible decisions in the economic interests of this country. It is set up in law simply to settle disputes. Ever since I entered Parliament nine years ago I have been pleading for substantial amendment to arbitration commission legislation requiring it (not just inviting it, but requiring it) to take account of the economic impact of its decisions and the effect on the availability of jobs and the cost structure that will result in relation to goods and services produced by those who get the so-called benefits of the commission's decisions.

They are not benefits they are 'disbenefits'. They destroy jobs in industries because the cost of providing goods must be increased by an amount similar to the cost to an employer to keep an employee for a year, whether it is wages per hour or salary per year, and other conditions of employment including sick leave, recreation leave, rostered days off or whatever else they want, plus a flagpole or some other goddamn thing that is irrelevant. Workers make unreasonable demands and tell the bosses, 'You have got to give it to us', and the bosses say, 'No.' That automatically leads to a dispute, an ambit claim is taken to court and the workers end up getting more money. There is no more work and no more productivity. Who pays? The exporters pay because everybody else passes the cost increases down the line. It is the public of Australia who pay for the decisions made between employers and employees and churched in this unholy marriage in the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission.

As I have said, that not only destroys the jobs of the people who make the decisions with the bosses on that basis but also reduces the capacity of the economy to use the goods and services provided because they are more expensive for each unit of output. It destroys the capacity of the Australian economy to develop in a way which would enable more people to be employed, and it also destroys the viability of a lot of industries that might otherwise have been able to exist. I have canvassed the points that I think—

Mr S.G. Evans: They export jobs—not goods.

Mr LEWIS: We are certainly exporting jobs because we make the cost of our own jobs too high and that makes it possible for other people and industries in other places to provide it much more cheaply and efficiently. Then the politicians here and in the Federal arena find it imperative that they bow down to the demands made in the broader community that understands that it costs less to get goods overseas than it does to get them in Australia. It makes it possible for goods to be procured overseas, albeit with the tariff barriers, bounty schemes and such like. No such economic policy has ever been a formula for success and a formula for a healthy economy in any country in the world, in either the Eastern Bloc or the Western Bloc, in which it has been practised.

Just because one wants it to be so and just because a union secretary says that it will be so, and that it is just that workers get paid a certain amount, will not make it so. We do not belong in a world which enables anyone who happens to have the power and the might to say that the world is flat and make it flat. That is about the level of understanding, logic and commitment which comes from those people who argue for these ridiculous excessive payments to employees in these closed shop industries. Ultimately, it destroys the viability of jobs in those industries and the industries themselves to the detriment of the entire economy. I can give chapter, book and verse example of that and I propose to do so. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

X-RATED VIDEOS

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I move:

That this House expresses dismay at the Federal Government's decision not to ban X-rated videos and calls on the Premier, as

Federal President of the ALP, to persuade the Federal Government to reverse its decision.

I am very pleased that the Premier, in answer to a question from the Leader of the Opposition, has already expressed his concern about the X-rated videos being available in this State as the Commonwealth Government did not ban them. In fact, I believe that for once there is a motion on the Notice Paper that will receive bipartisan support, and it is pleasing to see that. I compliment the Premier in this respect for taking that stand, and I noticed a letter to the editor (there might have been more than one) also complimenting the Premier. However, it is interesting to note the Premier's current position, because many of us in this House will remember a debate in a previous session as to whether or not the ER category of video should be allowed into this State.

Extensive debate ensued and, if my memory serves me correctly, the vote in this House was entirely along Party lines, with the Government (the Labor Party) voting to introduce the ER category and the Opposition categorically opposing it. The matter then went to another place for debate and I must pay a compliment to a former member of the other place, the Hon. Lance Milne, because it was Mr Milne who took a stand as an Australian Democrat (not supported, as I understand it, by his partner the Hon. Ian Gilfillan) and would not allow the ER category to be introduced into this State. He put forward his views and, as a result, the issue was defeated in the other place. A conference of managers followed, and I was pleased to be one of the representatives of the House of Assembly on that conference. The Government was still insisting that the ER category be introduced and, by implication, suggesting that the X category was okay. Thankfully, because we were nearing the end of the session, the Government finally decided to accede to the position of the Opposition and Mr Milne and the introduction of the ER category was disallowed. History has shown that all other States supported the South Australian position.

It is most interesting to note the Premier's statement the other day in answer to a question from the Leader of the Opposition. The Premier said:

I feel very strongly about this matter. South Australia was the first State to ban so-called video nasties in 1984, and X-rated videos have been banned in this State since March 1985.

I will not quote him any further, but the record has now been set straight: initially, the Government was in agreement with the ER category and the concept of X-rated videos. So, what is the situation really all about? I have with me a copy of the annual report of the Classification of Publications Board for the year ended 30 June 1987. Amongst other things, that annual report details the various categories used for the classification of videotapes for sale or hire. I will not go through the General or Parental Guidance categories, but I would like to outline the situation as it applies to the M, R and X categories. The M category is suitable for persons 15 years and over and includes:

Material which is considered likely to disturb, harm, or offend those under the age of 15 years. While most adult themes may be dealt with, the degree of explicitness and exploitativeness of treatment will determine what can be accommodated in this classification. Language: Crude language which is excessive, assaultive or sexually explicit is not acceptable. Sex: Depictions of discreetly implied sexual activity. Violence: Depictions and realistic and sometimes bloody violence but not if gratuitous, exploitative, relished, cruel or unduly explicit. Other: Depictions of drugs use if not advocatory.

The R, or restricted, category for those 18 years and over comprises:

Adult material which is considered likely to be possibly harmful to those under 18 years and possibly offensive to some sections of the adult community. Language: May be sexually explicit and/or assaultive. Sex: Implied, obscurred or simulated depictions of sexual activity; depictions of sexual violence only to the extent that they are discreet, not gratuitous and not exploitative. Violence: Explicit depictions of violence, but not detailed and gratuitous depictions of acts of considerable violence or cruelty. Other: Depictions of drug abuse if not advocatory.

Then there is the X, the extra restricted, category, again for those 18 years and over:

Material which includes explicit depictions of sexual acts involving adults but does not include any depictions suggesting coercion or non-consent of any kind.

It is very interesting to note the brief summary of the X category; in fact it is not nearly as explicit as the M and R categories. We assume that violence is not to be shown in the X category, but there are depictions of sexual acts involving adults, hopefully not due to any coercion or non-consent. I would love to know how a person viewing the video is supposed to know whether or not the persons were forced into the act. Obviously, the film makers will not show the behind the scenes action. So, we do not really know whether or not that is occuring.

My personal view is that we should be very concerned about the Restricted and M categories and I will refer to that later. It is disturbing, as the Premier has agreed (and as, I therefore assume, the Government has agreed), that the X category should be allowed when we are trying to maintain certain minimum standards within our society. The availability of X category videos does not help that at all. We note that the Premier said that X rated videos are banned—illegal in South Australia. He also said that it is also an offence to allow any child to view X or R rated videos. That is fine, except that, as was pointed out in quite a few articles last week when the Federal Government's decision was announced, the mail order system from Canberra—and it would appear that about $2 million worth of videos are coming into this State—is alive and well. In fact it has been stated that a certain Mr John Lark is one of the key people involved in the export of X rated videos interstate. People in this State should be quite clear that it is an offence for them to import those videos and view them.

The mail-order system is such that most of us would appreciate that it is almost impossible to police. I do not think that people would want mail being opened up because packages similar to videos could well be something else, and I know how I would feel if mail of an ordinary nature was interfered with. It comes back to the Federal Government's taking action in this respect. It will be held responsible, yet the Prime Minister did a cop-out on this issue. I will quote from an article by Matthew Abraham headed 'All coy over X-rated videos', in which he said:

Some MPs are already talking of having a vote on whether there should be a conscience vote.

This refers to Labor MPs. The article continued:

This coyness extends to the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke. When I asked him at a press conference on Thursday for his personal opinion on X-rated movies, he replied 'Good try' (Hawkespeak for 'I'm not going to answer your question').

Reference to Hawkespeak reminds me of *The Comedy Company*. The article continued:

He then said it would be raised in Caucus and 'I'll be having what I have to say there and will be registering my position there where it should be registered.'

The Prime Minister must be congratulated on this cop-out. He is a pagan socialist. He certainly knows when to open his mouth, so he does not have foot in mouth disease. However, it is despicable that the leader of this country is not prepared to give his view on X-rated videos. He is frightened because he knows that among discerning people in the community, those who want to protect the standards of this nation, this issue will create a backlash against his

Government. It shows the Prime Minister up for what he really is: too scared to speak his mind on issues that have a moral effect on society.

I turn now to the Federal parliamentary committee which considered the question of X-rated videos. It appears that, once again, the Labor Government was shrewd enough to appoint someone who would not have his mind changed by any evidence that came before him. The Chairman of the committee was Sydney Labor backbencher Dr Dick Klugman, a doctor of medicine. It has been suggested of Dr Klugman that he was not interested in listening to the evidence as such—that his mind was well and truly made up before the committee heard evidence. Dr Klugman's own relaxed position—he says he finds dirty videos extremely boring but concedes that they turn some people on—has been criticised by some members of the committee. One MP said:

> You could have written his draft half an hour after the committee first met. He was determined to have his own way and everyone else could go and get stuffed.

The Hon. T. Chapman: This is pretty rugged stuff that you are having recorded in Parliament.

Mr MEIER: This is in relation to Dr Klugman, the ALP member for Sydney, who was Chairman of the committee that was supposed to evaluate whether X-rated videos should be for general consumption. It does not take much imagination to appreciate that he voted in favour of retaining X-rated videos.

The Hon. T. Chapman: Are you suggesting that that Labor member reflects the opinion and position of other Labor members?

Mr MEIER: It is pleasing that the Federal President of the ALP, the Premier of this State, has clearly come out against—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: Mr Speaker, I think I heard what the member for Alexandra said.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Yes, I would certainly like to hear what he said, because I took it as being a reflection on members on this side of the House. I would like that clarified.

The Hon. T. CHAPMAN: With your permission, Sir, I am happy to do so.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold that point of order.

Mr MEIER: As I was saying, it is pleasing that the Federal President of the ALP has a different view and I certainly hope that his lobbying will be intense and that the Hawke Government will change its attitude on this issue.

Many members would be aware of some of the arguments raised against explicit sex videos and the negative effect that they appear to have on society generally, on the family and, in particular, on women. I have looked up some of the articles to which I referred in earlier debate going back to 1983 when a lot was written about this matter, and I must compliment the *News* which at the time conducted an intense campaign against the ER category. The *News* made its position very clear about this matter, running article after article about how such videos could affect our society. It referred to specific incidents, and it is to be complimented. I am sure that the *News* feels the same way today.

I was interested to read in the *Advertiser* at that time an article which related to a group of women which had come together because they had been sexually harassed. Many things were said in that article about the way these women viewed the actions of certain men, but time will not permit me to go into that in full detail. The point that I particularly raise is quoted in that article, as follows:

> One complaint made to the switchboard recently came from a woman who had answered an advertisement for a car detailer. She was told at the interview that part of the job would be to have sex with all her male workmates. She did not take the job.

This Government, the Federal Government and all members of Parliament should be working against that type of situation to ensure that such exploitation is stopped and that things such as X-rated videos which might promote thinking along those lines are prohibited, because society will not benefit from those videos. I refer to another article in the *News* in which two reporters interviewed various people. The report states:

> Video pornography could introduce whole new spheres of 'acceptable' social behaviour, including bestiality, child pornography and bizarre violent acts.

I am well aware that bestiality and child pornography are not allowed in X-rated videos and that violence has been taken out, but we are talking about video pornography in general. The article continues:

> The pyschologist added it was in the nature of human beings to be stimulus seekers and it was in the nature of the marketers of pornography to provide new stimulus.
>
> 'So, as one form of pornography becomes acceptable, another form is sought until that also becomes acceptable. It is in these areas that the public needs to be provided with protection from this material,' he said.

I must say to that psychologist, 'Hear, hear!' That is exactly what this debate is about today. To round off, I wish also to refer to an article from that time which detailed aspects of a film called *Turkey Shoot*, which was about life in a future society. The article states:

> During a rape scene the first 'victim' of the night exclaimed 'It's terrible' and stumbled from her seat, heading for the door, never to return. It was soft stuff compared with what was to come.

The person who organised the screening said afterwards:

> *Turkey Shoot* was listed and sold as an M-rated film—for mature audiences only. It was not an R-rated film, on the higher scale of the danger list.

I make that point because we are dealing with X-rated videos. There is no question about that, but it appears that many M-rated and R-rated videos also provide excessive violence and scenes which do not help our society and which are not the types of things that we should be promoting.

I refer to the Truro murders and the book entitled *It is a Long Way to Truro*. If any member has any thoughts about whether pornography has or has not a positive effect on our society, they should read this book, because it explains very clearly how the key person who was responsible for those murders was absolutely obsessed with pornography and took out his obsession on his victims.

That is the type of thing that this House must stop. It is the type of thing that Federal Parliament must stop. It is a great tragedy, in 1988, that the Hawke Labor Government has decided to allow X-rated videos to be sold throughout Australia by mail order—even though officially they are illegal in this State. I urge all members to support my motion.

Ms GAYLER secured the adjournment of the debate.

HON. J.R. CORNWALL

Notice of Motion: Other Business, No.5: Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy to move:

> That this House condemns the Premier for his support for the return of the Hon. J.R. Cornwall to his Ministry.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That this Notice of Motion be read and discharged.

Notice of Motion read and discharged.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Leader not to respond to the out of order interjections coming from the other side.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 November. Page 1235.)

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): I have been seeking to obtain information on this Bill from the Attorney-General's office but, as the House would appreciate, that has been difficult over the past week. For that reason, and because I believe that the debate will benefit from the figures that I want to obtain, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

MERCHANT SHIPPING FLEET

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Peterson:

That this House supports retention and expansion of the Australian merchant shipping fleet as a vital component of our future development as an island trading nation.

(Continued from 3 November. Page 1236.)

Mr De LAINE (Price): I support the motion. The member for Semaphore and I share in our electorates the port of Adelaide and the facilities and infrastructure pertaining to South Australia's vital shipping industry. With the advent of superior land transport systems and air cargo transport many thought that the days of shipping as a means of cargo transport were over. However, nothing could be further from the truth, and gradually people have come to realise that in many ways shipping is still the best way of transporting goods from one country to another.

My perception of the situation is that the future of shipping is very bright indeed. Australia is a great trading nation; in fact, it is the twelfth largest trading nation in the world and the fifth largest exporter, in gross tonnes. This is probably surprising to many people, considering Australia's relatively small population.

On paper, everything should be in our favour as a trading nation. We produce large quanities of export cargo, for example, primary produce, minerals and manufactured goods, and we have a need to import large quantities of overseas goods. We are the world's largest island continent and we are geographically isolated. All of these ingredients should set up Australia as a major world maritime power—but we are not.

Australian flagships carry only a paltry 4 per cent of exports and imports—4 per cent is a disgrace. This means that 96 per cent of our cargo is carried by foreign flagships. Over $5 billion goes out of Australia each year in payments to these foreign shipowners, many of whom operate ships under flags of convenience and are loyal to no flag, no country or international shipping law. Other shipowners operate substandard ships where seamen from developing countries are exploited and underpaid by thousands of dollars, often being kept in poor conditions in their ships.

Panama is one of the world's favourite havens for ship registration purposes. At present, Panama has over 12 000 ships from many countries registered with it. Its ship safety record throughout the world is absolutely atrocious. Many Panamanian vessels are in shocking condition. Apart from the safety aspect of ships which are often in poor condition and which put the crew and cargo at risk, sometimes such ships provide disgusting living conditions for the crew on board. Rats, cockcroaches, and spiders are commonplace. Often stoves and ovens do not work and there is no running water in bathrooms or toilets. Often lifeboats and electrical hoists do not work.

Added to this is often inadequate food, and what food there is on board is of poor quality. Moreover, crews on these ships are often paid wages as low as $60 a month. Certainly, there is no way that Ausralia can compete with such conditions—neither should it—because this is disgraceful. The recent Industries Assistance Commission inquiry into Australian coastal shipping seeks the removal of the coastal provisions of the Navigation Act which would open up the Australian coastal shipping trade to overseas ships and guest labour. This must be resisted at all costs.

If the Australian coastal provisions of the Navigation Act were deregulated to allow cheap foreign shipping to carry coastal cargo, the likely effect would be that up to 5 000 Australian seamen would lose their jobs and up to $200 million in wages would be lost. There would be the corresponding loss in tax payments to the Government, and about another 500 jobs have been estimated to be lost in related industries, such as ship repair work and other services to shipping.

In regard to the IAC, there is no question that like other industries in Australia the Australian shipping industry needs restructuring not only to become more efficient but also to accommodate new technology and methods. This fact is accepted to varying degrees by employers and unions alike. There are cases where the IAC has gone over the top at times, but generally there is consensus about what needs to be done in our industry in Australia, and Australian shipping is no exception to that. However, I would refer to the case of the motor vehicle industry restructure which has been in operation for some years. That involved massive job loss in the industry, and following on the heels of that massive job loss has been the installation of high tech equipment.

I was interested to note that one reason advanced in the IAC report for the motor vehicle industry restructure was the intention to bring down the price of motor vehicles. Therefore, I refer to the prices of vehicles since the restructuring to show that that is not correct. In 1985 a Holden Commodore Calais standard six cylinder manual model retailed at $22 957, yet less than three years later in 1988 the same vehicle retails at $31 265, an increase in less than three years of $8 308.

It is obvious to me that whilst the IAC may have had good intentions of reducing the price of vehicles, it has not worked. Either it has made more profit for the manufacturers of the vehicles or we have traded jobs for expensive high-tech equipment and machinery.

Australia's sea-going unions and their members generally accept that restructuring is necessary for survival of our shipping fleet and industry. They have taken a very responsible attitude to the situation, as unions usually do (contrary to what members opposite often say in this House), and are cooperating in a very positive way to become more efficient and competitive. The shipping and associated unions realise that an efficient shipping industry, while including fewer crew on individual ships, will ultimately mean more ships overall, which means more jobs overall.

So, the unions are at the forefront of major changes to how ships operate. These changes will mean a reorganisation of crew duties so that people will work as a team and, in

conjunction with a reduction in the number of unions, this will avoid a lot of old demarcation disputes, making the operations cheaper and more efficient. Better career prospects for seafarers, new training programs and fewer crew will result.

The Maritime Industry Development Committee has been working very hard in this area through discussions and negotiations and has achieved a reduction, in one case from 35 to 21 crewmen—a positive contribution proving their sincerity in making shipping fleets viable in Australia. It has been suggested that the cost of Australian crews is the reason for the decline in the Australian shipping industy, but I make two points which refute that view. First, Australian crews account for only 14 per cent of average operating costs; and, secondly, the costs of an Australian Maritime Industry Development Committee manned ship are in line with other OECD countries; in fact, an Australian vessel crewed by 21 men would be less costly than that of 16 men on a Japanese ship.

One major concern is the continued reduction in the number of vessels by the Australian National Line—the nation's carrier and onetime largest coastal ship operator. ANL badly needs a large capital injection to rebuild its fleet. Also of concern is the loss of a further seven Australian trading fleet ships of 150 gross tonnes and over during the past two years. The total Australian fleet two years ago was 100 vessels, 67 of which were coastal vessels and 33 overseas vessels. Unfortunately, now two years later the number has been reduced to 97 vessels, 63 being coastal and 30 being overseas vessels. It is vitally important that as a trading nation we have a viable and healthy shipping industry in terms of not only employment of Australians but also assisting the overall economy.

Another important factor is that, because of our vast coastline and geographical isolation, it is essential to have a complete shipping industry involving the operating of ships, ship-building, crews for those ships and service facilities—repairs—and so on, all of which could be quickly utilised, if necessary, as the member for Semaphore mentioned in his contribution, for the defence of our nation. It is absolutely vital that Australia's shipping fleet be not only retained but also expanded to an appropriate size in relation to our world ranking as a trading nation. I congratulate our State Government in particular on its efforts over the past 18 months in attracting more shipping to South Australia, particularly to Port Adelaide.

Only a couple of days ago it was announced that South Australia will get a major increase in container shipping between Port Adelaide and Europe. The additional cargo involved will be worth at least $400 million to South Australia each year. From January an extra 18 ships a year from Europe will call at Port Adelaide, and that is very good news.

The improved shipping links will also increase trade between South Australia and Europe by at least 5 per cent, to bring in another $40 million a year. This will mean that ships will unload European imports worth millions of dollars that otherwise would have been landed in Melbourne and freighted back to Adelaide. The Port Adelaide landed cargo could be collected the next day, instead of it taking between 11 and 40 days to reach this State from Melbourne. The volume of goods coming from Europe to South Australia handled directly at Port Adelaide will rise from 40 per cent to 90 per cent, and this is also good news for the South Australian economy.

South Australian exporters will also be able to load goods directly onto container vessels bound for European ports instead of forwarding them to Melbourne for loading. The European decision to bring extra ships into Port Adelaide follows 18 months of negotiations and approaches by delegations from the Government and South Australian industry. I congratulate the Premier and the former Minister of Marine (Hon. Roy Abbott) on taking this initiative and, over the years, negotiating to achieve this result for South Australia. It represents a major contribution to the expansion of the nation's shipping industry and the section that will be is based here in South Australia, and it augurs well for the future.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOTOR VEHICLE INSURANCE

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D.C. Wotton:

That this House calls upon the Government to take the necessary steps to have third party property insurance on motor vehicles made compulsory as a matter of urgency.

(Continued from 10 November. Page 1436.)

Mr TYLER (Fisher): I congratulate the member for Heysen on moving this motion and indicate my support in principle. However, at a later stage it is my intention to move an amendment to this motion that will not substantially alter the thrust of what he seeks. I have personally considered this matter in the past; it is ALP policy, and if it could be done the Bannon Government would have implemented the scheme. Unfortunately, it has some practical problems that I believe need to be investigated further.

The need for third party property insurance to cover damage to vehicles caused by uninsured drivers who are unable to meet their liabilities has been impressed on the Government and the Minister in the past. I know that members of Parliament, particularly the member for Price, have raised the matter in this place previously. In my previous occupation as a policy adviser to the Minister of Transport I looked at this question in some detail. The difficulty facing a Minister in pursuing a matter such as this is that, although it appears to be a very attractive and simple proposal, insurance experts in the past have assured me that the proposition rapidly becomes more complex in its implementation, to such an extent that the benefits are outweighed by the disadvantages.

That is very simple for me to say and it could be seen as a cop-out, but the body representing insurance companies in this State (the Insurance Council of South Australia), the body representing motorists (RAA), and the compulsory third party bodily insurer (SGIC), all oppose the introduction of compulsory third party property insurance.

They all believe that third party property insurance should be encouraged but that it should remain voluntary. No other State or Territory has managed to implement any comparable scheme. The main ground for not proceeding has been cost. If a third party property scheme was to be made compulsory, I am told that insurance companies would no longer be able to screen out bad risks as a way of keeping down premiums. If the scheme was to be fair and comprehensive, there would need to be protection against the hit-and-run driver. This would require the setting up of the nominal defendant process, which would be open to abuse, with the temptation to ascribe blame for self-responsible accidents—for example, backing into a gate post, to the unknown hit-and-run driver. These petty frauds would be very difficult to police.

Technically, the scheme would be expensive to manage in terms of covering costs of litigation, because of the absence of any arrangement whereby companies could oper-

ate knock for knock insurance agreements. For all these reasons, insurance experts state that premiums for the compulsory scheme of third party property damage could be much higher than those presently available voluntarily. This creates a system whereby some drivers could wind up paying almost as much for compulsory property damage as they pay presently for the full comprehensive cover, and they would be the real losers.

In 1988 no Australian State requires drivers or owners of private motor vehicles to carry insurance cover against property damage liability. At present, the person who suffers motor vehicle property damage has two main choices: he can either bear the loss himself through his insurer or his own financial reserves, or he can seek to make another person liable for the damage, according to the common law principles of negligence.

If this second option is available, compensation can flow only if that other party has adequate financial reserves or accessible insurance. Such an unregulated system relies heavily on the financial responsibility shown by drivers and car owners. However, it should be noted that Australia, by adopting these practices, is out of step with almost the entire Western world. The world-wide proliferation of motor vehicles has been accompanied by the development of a variety of schemes for the regulation of motor vehicle use since the Second World War. A number of overseas jurisdictions have established systems by which persons suffering injury and/or property damage as a consequence of a motor vehicle accident are adequately compensated. In Australia, such measures have been confined only to the personal injury area.

For instance, in the United States, as in Australia, the regulation of motor vehicle insurance is a matter for the States. In most States in the US the concept of fault remains at the heart of motor vehicle insurance law, although a few States have introduced a limited no-fault personal injury scheme based on a set scale of benefits. The common thread running through all States in the US is the concept of financial responsibility. This concept limits the right to enjoy a motor vehicle to the driver/owner's capacity to satisfy a damages claim in negligence against him or her. In other words, a person who uses or owns a motor vehicle has a responsibility to other citizens to make good any damage caused by him or her as a result of that use and ownership.

That same owner/driver will require his or her own first party insurance to meet his or her own damage bill if caused as a result of his or her carelessness or negligence. Legislation in each US State sets out the minimum level of financial responsibility which an owner or driver must be able to prove. Minimum amounts are set in relation to three risks: an amount for bodily injury to or death of one person resulting from any one accident; an amount for bodily injury to or death of all persons resulting from any one accident; and the amount of damages to property resulting from any one accident. Subject to these requirements, property insurance is supplied by private insurers acting in competition. Market forces thereby determine underwriting practices.

I am not convinced that this is the way to go because it would discriminate very much against the young and the less affluent in our community. However, I note that in the United States there is good competition for underwriting this scheme. In South Australia we have only one insurance body which takes on the responsibility of insuring against bodily injury. I know that a lot of private companies have opted out of this market because of the fear of being lobbed with a very high damages claim. The sky is the limit in bodily injury.

I believe that it would be much easier for companies to be involved in the setting up of third party property, as the damages costs are much more predictable. The Common Market scheme in Europe has been operating for some time and, under treaties entered into in 1959 and 1973, all members of the European Economic Community agree on the desirability of compulsory motor vehicle liability insurance and on universal principles governing liability for damages caused by vehicles. In 1983, the European Parliament adopted a directive aimed at standardising motor insurance throughout member States. The directive required that all registered vehicles of member States be insured up to specified minimum levels for both personal injury and property damage. Central to the scheme is the necessity for reciprocal arrangements to exist between member States as a means of streamlining interstate travel and commerce.

I believe that the situation in Australia is that once one State moves in this direction most other States will follow. However, I am mindful of the European experience in that we must have uniform property damage for our vehicles across the board, across all States. I believe that this could be looked at on a national level. However, as I indicated at the beginning of my contribution, this remains ALP policy. I am personally committed to it and I have spoken at length with the Minister of Transport and I know that he, in principle, supports the concept of compulsory third party property insurance. I believe—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Lewis): Order!

Mr TYLER: Obviously, the member for Heysen has not been listening because, as I said at the beginning of my contribution, the member for Heysen deserves to be congratulated for bringing this important matter to the attention of the House. This is what private members' time is all about. Mr Acting Speaker. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

FIBRO CEMENT ASBESTOS

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

That this House condemns the actions of the Minister of Labour who, in conjunction with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Occupational Health and Safety Commission, is proceeding to require the licensing of contractors involved in the removal of fibro cement asbestos after formal proceedings of the Occupational Health and Safety Commission were circumvented and meeting records falsified to bulldoze the measure through.

(Continued from 10 November. Page 1440.)

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I have pleasure in supporting the member for Mitcham's motion. This industry has suffered considerably at the hands of the present Government. A Bannon Government directive that written Government approval must be obtained for demolition of buildings containing asbestos was slammed by the Opposition on 25 July 1988. In that statement we claimed that the union-inspired Big Brother mania was persisting in South Australia and that the Government move followed the United Trades and Labor Council proposal that such work be carried out only by licensed contractors. We predicted a massive increase in the cost of demolition.

Once again, the Minister has bowed down to union dictates and has advised unions that all contractors engaged in demolition work involving asbestos must have a letter of approval from the Department of Housing and Construc-

tion. Of course, the whole secret of the operation lies with the Department of Housing and Construction. The present Minister has been very kind in rewarding his old friend, Jack Watkins, after his performance in this House when the last Liberal Government was in power. Asbestos powder was thrown over quite a number of members in this place, including me. We saw the present Minister running around like a lame duck, half blotto, not knowing what was going on. He set up the whole thing. The Liberal Party was disgusted at that behaviour. Jack Watkins has now been rewarded and is one of the most powerful influences in this State as far as the asbestos removal industry is concerned.

Union officials have been advised to ask to see the letter from the department when inspecting demolition work sites. In other words, one cannot do any demolition work unless the Gestapo come along and ask to see that letter. Of course, if there is no such letter for the contractor, that site will be declared black. It is not on! It is certainly not on for a Government to bring in this sort of operation.

We have no complaint about the desire to provide a safe and healthy working environment for those working with asbestos. However, appropriate legislation already exists to cover such work sites. The union inspired and Government backed interference in a further section of the building industry is absolutely scandalous. It represents the degree to which Trades Hall will govern Government policy. The union interference in this building industry has already led to the formation of the Asbestos Removal Association. Membership of that association will cost companies an annual fee of $2 000 as well as 1 per cent of the company's turnover for asbestos removal. It is unparalleled in the history of this State that a public servant—a person representing the United Trades and Labor Council—has the power to demand that members of the industry join an organisation, pay a fee of $2 000—which is no small fee—and then contribute 1 per cent of turnover. That currently represents about $70 000. This person, who is employed by the Government, will earn a commission for his services for the United Trades and Labor Council.

We have often heard stories about the Mafia. They are amateurs compared to this. The Gestapo in Europe started this type of operation in the 1930s. Of course, that eventually led to World War 2. I would not like to see that happen. Somehow, sometime, we must stamp out the Gestapo tactics that are being used in the building industry, in particular in the asbestos removal industry. Of course, the Government has a vested interest in this. Any income earned by the United Trades and Labor Council goes into the ALP slush fund. The policies relating to this industry are being dictated by a person who violated the rules of this House during the Liberal Tonkin Government. It was an absolutely disgraceful performance.

I have copies of the licences that are required for companies in this industry. One needs an asbestos removal licence, a licence covering the production of waste of a prescribed kind, a licence to collect or transport waste for a fee or reward and a depot licence from the South Australian Waste Commission. Now one also needs a licence from the Department of Housing and Construction. Is it any wonder that the industry is up in arms at the proposed Government's regulations?

The member for Mitcham referred briefly to a letter from the South Australian Health Commission to Mr Hedley Bachmann, the Director, Department of Labour, dated 11 October 1988, I believe that that letter warrants a more detailed explanation. In regard to the relative health hazards of exposure to asbestos cement sheeting. It states:

After perusing the code of practice and guidance notes produced by WorkSafe Australia, there appeared to be a good practical approach to the handling and removal of asbestos cement sheeting. Although the proposed procedures were conservative, there was evidence of a practical approach to the whole subject of asbestos cement sheeting, whether it is handled, and/or removed.

Detailed environmental monitoring has been carried out interstate, and records collected with regard to asbestos sheeting and the demolition process, and although approximately 25 per cent of the monitoring cases were between .1 fibre and 1 fibre per ml, I consider that by adherence to the national commission's code of practice for the safe removal of asbestos, the procedure will not pose a threat to health.

That is interesting: the Senior Specialist Medical Officer, Occupational Health and Radiation Control Branch of the Health Commission, states that the procedure will not pose a threat to health. The letter continues:

It should be recorded that the membrane filter method of the measurement is not accurate at these lower environmental levels and that all fibres which have the configuration and measurement of asbestos are counted—then the levels are inflated thus providing an additional safety margin.

It is my contention that if this State adheres to the national code of practice, then asbestos cement sheeting does not constitute a health hazard neither to the removalist, handler nor to the general population.

It is now apparent that controlling dust has eliminated the risk of pulmonary asbestos, and when one realises that the average asbestos lung load for an urban dweller is approximately 200 000 000 fibres, then the one fibre theory does not come into contention. Asbestos is a hazardous substance, is a proven human carcinogen but, if treated with respect, does not present a major health risk.

The way to deal with the problem is by way of education and implementation of the codes of practice, with severe penalties for non-compliance. It would seem to be a pity that the national code of practice which, after all, is the product of several years of deliberation by a tripartite committee, cannot be incorporated as a regulation in the State legislation.

A more sensible and practical approach to the problem could be developed along two lines:

First, a survey of demolition sites should be carried out with on-going asbestos monitoring, and objective conclusions drawn from this survey.

Secondly, the development of a program of education and inspection by the appropriate authorities, with an assessment of efficacy after twelve months. Thus it would enable the individual demolition contractor to demonstrate his competency to the Department of Labour.

The CSIRO, in its Building Research newsletter (Volume 12, No. 4, February 1988) under the heading 'Asbestos in the home' states:

In recent years, the popular media has often highlighted the health risks associated with asbestos products in a sensational way. Taken in perspective, the risks associated with asbestos in home building products are trivial compared to other everyday risks, except when the products are disturbed by dust-generating procedures such as sawing or sanding. Asbestos is now rarely used in building products. However, in the past it was extensively used in many products, for example:

- asbestos cement sheets (flat and profiled), roofing shingles and flue pipes;
- some plaster patching compounds and some textured paints;
- vinyl floor tiles and backing of some linoleum floor coverings; and
- asbestos insulation used for hot water pipe insulation and in domestic heaters and stoves.

The article explains the safe ways of removing asbestos products. By using special tools and keeping the products wet, the worker can be protected from any possibility of inhaling asbestos fibres. A very good friend of mine died as a result of asbestosis. It was one of the cruellest deaths I have ever seen and it was cruel to see him battling the illness over many years. In fact, the claim for workers compensation is still being pursued, some nine years after his death. He worked in the industry and was a good, keen, conscientious, hard worker. I believe very strongly in safe and healthy work environment practices, but I will not support the continuing effort of this Government and the harassment by Mr Jack Watkins in insisting that the indus-

try must have this or that licence. Jack Watkins controls almost every contract of demolition in this State.

Members interjecting:

Mr BECKER: As I said, when one individual can blackban a company and stop its employees from earning a livelihood—

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr BECKER: I am terribly sorry, the member for Albert Park knows damn well it is not nonsense. Watkins has companies involved in the asbestos removal industry absolutely scared stiff because, if they want to continue to work, they must pay $2 000. They have all joined the Asbestos Removal Association. They are paying $2 000 a year and 1 per cent of the turnover of their business. This is absolutely disgraceful. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

CRIME STATISTICS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Oswald:

That this House condemns the Government for allowing a dramatic increase in crime since it assumed office in 1982 and calls on the Government to explain why it is that with the reduced numbers of prisoners serving custodial sentences there is still overcrowding in prisons and why it is that police morale has taken a buffeting and the operational resources given to the police to fight crime, bring criminals to justice and prevent crime have not yet had an impact on the crime rates.

(Continued from 10 November. Page 1442.)

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I welcome the opportunity to speak in this debate. I must say that it is shades of 1979, when I look at the contribution of the member for Morphett—

An honourable member: Was it successful?

Mr HAMILTON: Yes, it was successful. It was a filthy, disgusting, rotten campaign—one that was rather interesting.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: And the jackals howl; indeed they do. It is rather interesting to remember that when I came into this place I had the temerity, if you like, to raise a number of questions with the then Tonkin Government about law and order. I will show, in due course, the comparison of what took place in terms of law and order and the response that I received from the Tonkin Government. I was told in relation to many of the questions I asked that because of the time and expense involved in collating the information, it would not be made available. So much for the interest by the then Government in providing information to members of this Parliament on law and order issues.

In coming to the issues, I want to be fair to the member for Morphett, who first made his contribution on Thursday 10 November (page 1461 of *Hansard*), followed by my address. For the edification of members opposite and for those people of South Australia who read *Hansard*, I refer to my contribution, which is recorded on pages 1460 and 1461, and to the manner in which this Government has addressed the question of law and order in this State. I refer to the diatribe of the member opposite, who when talking about this Government, stated:

Two irrefutable conclusions can be drawn from this: first, the revenue created by these expanded activities has assisted in balancing the State budget.

He is talking about red light cameras and speed detection equipment. Let us have a look at the record in terms of the cost to the community and in terms of road crashes. An article in the *News* of 20 June of this year states that crashes cost $5.9 billion in Australia and, because this Government has addressed these issues in terms of problems on the roads, members opposite complain about it when it suits, I will come back to that later on.

Let us have a look at it in terms of court sentencing. This is one of the issues that is raised time and time again in terms of sentencing in the South Australian courts. I have had a particular interest in this area ever since I was elected to Parliament on 15 September 1979. In the budget Estimates Committees on 15 September this year I said the following to the Attorney-General:

Changes were made some time ago to provide for appeals against the severity of sentences handed down by the judiciary.

I went on to ask the Attorney-General to elaborate, and the Hon. Chris Sumner replied:

There are two issues. One is the matter of Government policy and the legislation passed by Parliament with respect to penalties. For the most serious offences in this State, there are very severe penalties; mandatory life imprisonment for murder and life imprisonment for rape and armed robbery. In addition, the courts can refuse to set non-parole periods if the matter is considered to be serious enough. That means that very severe sentences can be handed down by the courts within the scope of the legislation that currently exists.

The member for Morphett has tried to fool the public at large by saying that this Government has gone soft on crime. To the contrary: that is not the case, as I have just demonstrated. The Government has introduced legislation and provided the courts with the tools to impose heavy sentences on people who commit such offences.

Ms Gayler: And getting results.

Mr HAMILTON: Indeed, as my colleague indicated, we are certainly getting results. The Hon. Chris Sumner went on to say:

Of course, in recent times the courts have indicated their abhorrence of certain crimes. The sentence in the Von Einem case was a 36 years non-parole period, which means the earliest possible release for that individual would be after 24 years, and recently other heavy sentences have been handed down as in the murder case of Miss Hewson. That is a recent case where a long non-parole period was handed down. The courts have the capacity within the legislation to impose severe penalties if they think it is justified. Further, the Government promoted increases in penalties for drink driving offences.

I have already made reference to that on pages 1460 and 1461 of *Hansard*. In terms of appeals, the Attorney-General indicated:

Since Crown appeals were introduced in early 1982 there have been 121 appeals. Of those 121, 60 have been allowed in whole or in part, 37 dismissed, 20 abandoned, convictions quashed or leave refused and four are pending. As to Crown appeals against sentence, that is not a matter directly involving the Government. The Government does not make decisions about whether Crown appeals are to be taken, either relating to the leniency of the sentence or otherwise.

I have a particular concern in my electorate because, recently, a member in another place mentioned the death of a father and son in my electorate. The woman involved was unaware that she was entitled to make representations to her member of Parliament to appeal against the sentences handed down by the judiciary. Noting what I perceived to be insufficient penalties for the death of those two people, I sought out the address of the woman and advised her of her entitlement under the law. As a consequence, the woman came to see me and I made representations to the Attorney-General about this matter long before the subject was raised publicly in the newspapers and in Parliament.

Another matter that I will address concerns comparable figures. It is interesting that, once again, the member for Morphett has been grossly dishonest in the manner in which he has thrown figures around in this place. I do not question the figures provided by the police, but I do question the manner in which the member for Morphett has selectively

and dishonestly used those figures. I quote from the *Australian Society* of April 1987, as follows:

Crime continues to make headlines. But there is a gap between the media's view and the available evidence, according to criminologist Paul Wilson.

The article continues:

If national rape statistics require sensitive interpretation then State figures have to be handled with kid gloves. The South Australian media made much of the fact that the institute statistics portrayed a rate of rape in that State well above the national average.

This is the guts of the issue. The article states:

But these statistics could well be inflated because South Australia has a broader definition of rape than most other States, a definition that includes rape in marriage and rape of males.

The point here is that although in South Australia and elsewhere rape is at unacceptably high levels and that each case is a tragic reflection of Australian male attitudes towards women, the publicised police figures may reflect the fact that, at long last, victims are asserting their undeniable right to be taken seriously when they are raped—and are increasingly taken seriously.

That is the issue. The reality is that members opposite have dishonestly used some of those figures. I express my total abhorrence of rape. For the life of me I cannot understand what a male would get out of it. Members opposite have chosen deliberately to whip this up into an issue. I am not saying that there is no concern in the community. There is concern in the community as I have indicated from the first time I stood in this place—and I am on record repeatedly since 1979 addressing the question of law and order in this State. The reason is quite clear: people come to me and express their anger at the manner in which their homes have been broken into or whatever crime has been committed. These complaints occurred consistently when I was in Opposition and since the Labor Party has been in Government I have constantly addressed this issue.

I have a great deal of pride to be able to stand up and say that, in spite of all the matters the Liberal Party had the opportunity to address when it was in Government, when one examines the record—and I refer to the statements I made earlier as recorded in *Hansard* on pages 1460 and 1461 of 9 November—it will show quite clearly that this Government has done more in terms of law and order for this State than the previous Government; there is no question about that.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I was waiting for the member for Mitcham to interject. I have bated him constantly. The reality is this—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Lewis): The member for Albert Park will desist from that practice.

Mr HAMILTON: It is rather interesting, if people take the time, to study the facts. This Government has actively encouraged people to report crimes against a person every time they occur. Let us consider the Neighbourhood Watch program. In November 1983, who stood in this place and asked the Government to consider introducing the Neighbourhood Watch scheme in this State? I know who did that—I did. That program has provided over 117 Neighbourhood Watch schemes in this State. That is another reason for the increase in the amount of crime reported in South Australia. Quite clearly the initiative has been taken in this place by members on this side of Parliament.

It is interesting to reflect on the number of speeches on law and order made by members opposite—very few. Because a little bit of research has been done by them and we are leading up to an election, they take the view, 'Let us regurgitate 1979'. I am looking forward to the stocking masked bandit resurrecting his head in this community.

The honourable member then referred to the question of juvenile crime. I have often heard matters relating to this referred to by members of the Police Force and, indeed, by people whom I have doorknocked in the community that I represent. They have many concerns about this question. However, at this stage, because of my undertaking to speak for only 15 minutes, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

POVERTY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Robertson:

That this House acknowledges the steps already taken by the Federal Government to eliminate poverty in Australia and urges it to continue its assault on the causes of poverty and inequality in this country.

(Continued from 10 November. Page 1446.)

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): I am happy to join in support for the member for Bright's motion. In introducing the motion a fortnight ago, he gave an analysis of the reforms of the tax system that have been undertaken by the Federal Government in order that the tax burden be shared more equitably by all taxpayers in Australia—all wage and salary taxpayers and all taxpayers in the business category—and that, indeed, all people playing a major part in the economic development of Australia contribute according to their means. This major reform has resulted in a considerable amount of revenue being added to the total revenue available to the Commonwealth. As a consequence of these reforms, and the additional revenue, the Federal Government has been able to embark on some major structural changes relating to the nature of our society and our community. This is leading towards alleviating some of the causes of poverty which arise due to the nature of the inequalities that are part and parcel of our mixed economy.

Strategies do exist for reducing the level of poverty and for increasing the opportunities for all Australians to partake of the benefits of this great country. These strategies are having an impact at both State and Federal levels. They are not being developed on an *ad hoc* basis. Over the past three or four years, Labor Governments, at both State and Federal levels, have developed comprehensive social justice statements, strategies, programs and plans, which are designed to ensure a fairer Australia or, in the terms of the motion, 'to assault the causes of poverty and inequality in this country'. In other words, there has been a renewal of the war on poverty. There has been a renewed effort to eliminate the causes of poverty, to eliminate the lack of opportunity, to eliminate the high cost of housing and the cost of raising children in our community.

The strategies at both the State and the Federal level are designed to overcome the structural disadvantage that is faced by many people who are on low or fixed incomes, the disadvantage that is faced by those people who have little education, the disadvantages that are faced by people with few skills or people who have no house or home that they can call their own. These are some of the issues that are addressed in the documents that are now part and parcel of the Government's financial accounting system presented at budget time in both the Federal Parliament and the various State Parliaments.

The Federal Government's budget is an enormous $78 billion, and about one-third of that is returned to the community in terms of income support maintenance payments or income redistribution as exercised by the Federal Government. Another third of the Commonwealth's revenue is distributed to the States to pay for the services that they have legislative and statutory responsibility for, as well as

those services which in policy terms the States believe are important for the local community.

The other third of the Commonwealth budget is allocated to the maintenance and provision of its own services, the services which under the Commonwealth Constitution the Federal Government is obliged to provide. Let me consider the one-third of all Federal Government revenue from the total $78 billion being allocated to the community by way of income support and income maintenance. I am talking of a figure of about $26 billion. That has to be allocated in accordance with a deliberate policy to ensure that all Australians have access to the opportunities and advantages that this country has to offer.

The cornerstone of the Federal Government's philosophy of a just and fair society is based on four main features: first, equity in the distribution of economic resources; secondly, equity of civil, legal and industrial rights; thirdly, a fair and equal access to essential services such as housing, health and education; and, finally, and perhaps most importantly in a long-term sense of giving people a feeling that they have a stake in the future of our community, the opportunity for participation by all in personal development, community life and the decisions that affect this community.

Those fundamental notions of fairness, equity, obligations and rights underlie the social justice program being pursued by the Federal Government. They underlie the way in which that $26 billion is distributed to individual Australians around this country who, for one reason or another, are unable to participate as fully in this society as they ought to be able to. Therefore, it is important to establish within that income distribution and redistribution system a set of priorities and, indeed, the priorities themselves are determined by the principal causes of poverty and the principal causes of inequity.

They include access to employment, access to housing and the costs associated with maintaining a family. These costs have resulted in substantial payments and allocations by the Federal Government to education and training programs to ensure that people—in this case young people on the one hand and, on the other hand, people whose jobs have disappeared as a result of changes being made in our industrial environment—are able to get the education and training that will provide them with access into the job market. They have resulted in programs designed to ensure that those people whose housing costs are absolutely beyond them are able to get back into the housing market, either by way of purchase, if that is their wish, or by way of renting in the public housing market, if they so desire.

Both the Federal and State Governments believe that no more than about one-third of a person's income should be taken up by housing costs, irrespective of the nature of the income. The support payments provided both by the Federal and State Governments are designed to move along the track towards ensuring that housing costs do not form an unnecessarily heavy burden on individual Australians, because there are so many other things that their limited income must cover.

The other major contribution being made by the Federal Government is in terms of family assistance packages and income support for children. Related to this is, of course, the active and positive support being given by the Federal Government to the provision of child-care places. No doubt exists that the largest group of people in poverty is single parent families with dependent children. The most recent financial support package—the family assistance package—has been directed to that group. About a year ago a major financial initiative was taken by the Federal Government amounting to some $500 million, designed to provide an extra financial benefit to those families with dependent children and in positions of extreme poverty. That program has been taken up by families right across Australia including, of course, families in South Australia.

It has been possible to identify these families by virtue of the fact that they are either on very low incomes as a result of being in poorly paid employment or they are on fixed incomes as a result of the major breadwinner of the family being on one or other of the Commonwealth financial benefits. Those people have been appealed to directly to take advantage of the extra financial support provided to them. However, poverty is not just about lack of income but also about lack of opportunity. Several major programs are being undertaken by the Federal Government to overcome the issue of access to opportunity. Opportunity is often a determinant of one's educational, income and locational status. There are also other determinants of access, traditionally regarded as race and gender.

The programs that have been undertaken by the Government have targeted these areas of traditional neglect. The programs which provide women with an opportunity to get back into the work force and which are designed to ensure that women have access through TAFE courses or a range of post-secondary courses to either increase or hone their employment skills are bringing many more women back into the work force. This is an extremely important exercise.

Similarly, young people whose education has not entirely equipped them for easy admittance into the job market now have access to a continuing range of jobs to re-orient whatever skills they have into the areas of employment where there has been substantial growth. These two programs to which I previously referred are picked up in the State initiatives in trying to address inequality of opportunity. Initiatives are being taken by the State Government, particularly in the TAFE sector, to redirect both women and younger people into the growth areas of our economy—tourism and hospitality.

From recent discussions I have had with people involved in the hospitality area of TAFE, I understand that it is one of the most popular areas for student enrolment, with substantial waiting lists. There is no doubt that young people in our society wish to avail themselves of what they see as tourism and hospitality related job opportunities that are part and parcel of South Australia's future.

The other types of programs that are being pursued by the Federal Government to overcome this poverty of opportunity relate to Aborigines and people with language difficulties. These programs are set out in a brief and summary form in Budget Paper No. 10 which was circulated by the Prime Minister as part of the 1988-89 budget in a document entitled 'Towards a Fairer Australia'. I commend this document to members. It will enable them to obtain an overview of the way in which the Federal Government, with a deliberate and planned strategy, is trying to address the financial, structural and educational causes of inequality and poverty in this country.

Last week in his contribution the member for Morphett referred to and criticised some actions of the State Government and suggested that such actions contributed to increasing the number of people who are in poverty in this State. I also refer members to a document entitled 'The Budget and the Social Justice Strategy' that was part of the State budget. Listed in that document are 170 initiatives totalling $25 million which are being taken to overcome some of the same financial, structural and educational courses of inequality, disadvantage and poverty in this State. The document indicates that many people in South Australia, as well

as elsewhere in the country, now live on their own or live as single parent families.

The level of poverty tends to increase with the number of children that single parent families have. The report indicates that some 15.5 per cent of families with dependent children had only a sole parent, who was responsible for those children's financial support. The programs in the State Government's social justice strategy address many programs similar to those of the Federal Government, so it is a concerted Australia-wide program to overcome the causes of poverty and disadvantage in our community. Again, I commend that document to members.

Two other documents I think are worth referring to in closing. One is the document put out by the Department for Community Welfare, entitled 'Help for People on Low Incomes in South Australia'. It lists the variety of concessions and financial support which are available for people in South Australia and which are part of the substantial financial contribution made by the South Australian Government to alleviate the problems of people who cannot meet all their bills. Similarly, the social security system puts out a guide to the income maintenance systems which it provides, to ensure that those people who cannot pay all their bills (whether they be for housing, education, transport or anything else) are able to obtain support.

I believe that, in the words of the member for Bright, the Federal Government is attempting to eliminate poverty and should be urged to continue its assault on the causes of poverty and inequality in this country. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES REVIEW BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 8 September. Page 729.)

Ms GAYLER (Newland): This Bill, which was introduced by the member for Eyre, essentially concerns applying an additional layer of scrutiny over public authorities in South Australia and, in particular, scrutiny as to whether they should exist, their cost, their effectiveness and efficiency, their structure, and whether there is any overlap with other Government agencies.

The Bill as drafted potentially covers all Government departments and a very wide range of statutory authorities, such as the South Australian Housing Trust, ETSA, the Environment Protection Council, the Ethnic Affairs Commission, the Office of the Commissioner for the Ageing, and so on. Presumably, the idea is that bodies like these could, under this scheme, be challenged as to their very existence.

The Bill poses a solution to some unstated problem, according to the Opposition spokesperson. It poses another committee of members of Parliament that this time would be from the Upper House. I refer to a Statutory Authorities Review Committee of the Legislative Council. That committee would allegedly assist the Government in the scrutiny of the efficiency and effectiveness of public bodies. The very idea of the Legislative Council or a committee of the Council (which itself is constitutionally debarred from introducing money Bills, from proposing expenditure, or from scrutinising the annual State budget through the budget Estimates Committees) in my view is mildly ridiculous. The idea of the Legislative Council, with the numbers to defeat any move of an elected Government of the day, actually helping the Government to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of Government operations is more than mildly ridiculous.

I should put on the record my own credentials on this matter. Members may recall that I was the author of Australia's first comprehensive report on deregulation. In 1980, during the period of the Tonkin Government, I undertook an investigation and set out a plan of action for improving the scrutiny of legislation and of statutory bodies, set up under statute, and their regulatory regimes. With some satisfaction, I can report that considerable and consistent progress has been made, beginning with the Tonkin Government during the period 1980 to 1982, and continuing under the Bannon Government, reaching right into longstanding statutory bodies such as the Egg Board, the Potato Board and others. Similarly, at the Commonwealth level, such moves of review, reassessment and abolition of various bodies have been underway. One which has recently been the subject of heated Party and political debate is the Wheat Board.

All these reviews of statutory bodies have resulted in the shaking up of a number of organisations. One that comes to mind is the Country Fire Services Board which, following a review on that occasion by the Public Accounts Committee, was extensively revamped. Another result of the review, reassessment and scrutiny was the repeal of a now growing list of outdated Acts.

In addition, we have seen a total rewrite, or a beginning of rewriting, of a number of very important and very substantial Acts of Parliament. The best example in that category that comes to mind is the South Australian Local Government Act, which is progressively being rewritten. That wide range of reviews and adjustments to bodies, legislation and regulations amounts to considerable achievements and the program is continuing.

In addition to those that I have mentioned, the South Australian Government has introduced a new sunsent provision for all regulations on the books. This means that a program of systematic review of regulatory regimes has commenced in this State. I had an initiating part in that effort and I reported fearlessly on the appropriate ways and means to commence that exercise. I am not taking part in this debate to defend each and every Government department or statutory authority, or to shield any of them from appropriate scrutiny.

However, it is incumbent upon a member who proposes in legislation such as this, to establish a new and expensive body which will oversee Government operations, and which proposes a shift in the delicately poised balance of power and responsibility in the Parliament, to do so with a well argued case and thorough consideration. It is incumbent upon a member proposing such action to devise a constructive and effective proposal and to ensure that the proper rules of the Chambers of this Parliament are not jeopardised by half-baked or half-smart propositions. I do not believe that the arguments presented in support of this Bill satisfy those requirements.

In essense this Liberal Party Bill provides for an Upper House committee with an equal number of Government and non-government members to have open slather in relation to any aspect of Government or statutory body operations. It would be a super body of the Legislative Council; an over-arching body which would cover the same ground as the present standing committees—the Public Accounts Committee, the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation and the Public Works Committee.

An important feature of the present parliamentary standing committee structure is their composition. Their com-

position recognises and reflects the number of elected Government members in this State. In each of the parliamentary committees that I referred to, the Government has a majority of members in recognition of constitutional reality and the fact that, of necessity, the elected Government must be able to effectively govern and not be unduly thwarted or have its measures deadlocked.

The membership of the Public Accounts Committee is drawn entirely from the House of Assembly. Membership of the Public Works Standing Committee and the Subordinate Legislation Committee is drawn from both Houses of Parliament. None of the standing committees that this Parliament has seen fit to establish draws its membership solely from members of the Upper House. It is curious, to say the least, that the Opposition's Bill proposes a committee of only the Legislative Council to deal with such wide-ranging matters, and that it have equal numbers from both sides of the Council. That would virtually guarantee a situation of constant deadlock on controversial issues of the day or on issues on which major political Parties disagree.

I would have thought that, if the Opposition was serious about a new standing committee which could do a real rather than a political job in assisting Government and ministerial scrutiny of public authorities, it would have honoured the forms of Parliament in relation to standing committees and money matters. I would have thought that the Opposition would propose a standing committee of the House of Assembly or, at the very least, a joint committee of members from both Houses of Parliament. And I would have thought that it would recognise, in the balance of numbers of such a new committee, the longstanding Westminister tradition in ensuring appropriate Government numbers on such a committee. I conclude that the member moving the Bill is not really serious in his intentions because of the defects that I have mentioned. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of Health (Hon. F.T. Blevins):

South Australian Health Commission—Report, 1987-88.

QUESTION TIME

LEGIONNAIRE'S DISEASE

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): Can the Minister of Health say whether it is true that the first case in the latest outbreak of legionnaire's disease in Adelaide was identified six weeks ago and, if it is, why was no public announcement made before yesterday? This disease has a 30 per cent fatality rate and South Australia has had more cases than other parts of Australia over the last decade. The location of the present outbreak is the southern suburbs, where the previous fatal outbreak occurred in January and February 1986 when two people died and there were 12 confirmed cases.

On that occasion, no public announcement was made until several weeks after the first serious case was indentified and the Minister's predecessor (Hon. Dr Cornwall) subsequently admitted that this had been a mistake. Early warning of an outbreak would ensure that potential sources of the disease, especially large air-conditioning units and hot water systems in shopping centres, hospitals, aged homes and community centres regularly visited by the public are immediately checked; and that general practitioners are alerted to watch for symptoms.

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: I do not have the date for which the honourable member is looking. I am satisfied that the Health Commission acted at all times efficiently and in the best interests of public health in South Australia. As the Leader would know, it takes some time to confirm this disease. If he has any specific allegation against the Health Commission or if the Leader is saying that the Health Commission has acted negligently and alleging that individual officers in the Health Commission did not act properly, he should say so clearly. I can certainly get the date for him, but I am convinced that the Public Health Division has done everything required of it.

Mr Lewis: So are we.

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: I am pleased to hear that. The public announcement was made by Dr Scott Cameron after informing me yesterday morning. It was appropriate to make a public announcement and I said. 'Go ahead. That is fine by me.' Yesterday, the media had the opportunity to attend a press conference called by Dr Scott Cameron. They did so and asked him all the questions. If the media considers that further questions require answering, I am sure that Dr Scott Cameron would be only too pleased to accommodate the media at another press conference. I shall pass on the relevant parts of the Leader's question to Dr Scott Cameron and I am sure (I know that the Leader is sure because he knows the gentleman) that Dr Scott Cameron will answer any further questions frankly and competently.

BABY CAPSULES

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Can the Minister of Transport respond to claims that baby capsules that are used to protect youngsters in motor vehicles are causing neck and back problems for parents? Interstate newspaper reports indicate that physiotherapists are concerned that, because of their positioning, baby capsules used to protect youngsters in motor vehicles are causing an increasing number of back and neck complaints.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I certainly hope that there is no evidence that would suggest that because less than five minutes ago I said 'hello' to the new addition to the Mayes family, and she was in a baby capsule. The combined weight of a capsule and a baby would not be so heavy, I believe, as to necessarily cause any threat to either parent when placing a capsule containing a baby in a motor vehicle. To my knowledge, there is no evidence to this effect in South Australia, but I am aware of the article to which the honourable member has referred. So, I am aware that physiotherapists in New South Wales are saying that in certain circumstances the continual lifting and depositing of a capsule containing a baby can have a deleterious effect upon the back, neck and shoulders of a parent and, in most cases, I expect that it would be the mother.

I think everybody would agree that, if an adult lifted a capsule containing a baby and placed it in the middle of a back seat without actually sitting on the seat or sliding in and thus protecting themselves and their back, they might place themselves at risk. If in fact some people are suffering from such an injury, I suggest that they either put the baby close to the left hand door (although it is much safer in the centre of the back seat), or sit on the back seat and place

the capsule in the appropriate attachment. Baby capsules have been an enormous success. They offer great protection to babies, and the legislation has been of great protection to young children.

The ultimate responsibility is to protect the interests of those members of society who are unable to protect themselves. I am sure that I have the absolute support of all parents when I say that. However, if there is a problem in South Australia with back and shoulder injuries as a result of the placement and removal of baby capsules in motor vehicles, I am not aware of it. If there is, parents can take action to reduce the potential for such injuries. I will refer the matter to the Road Safety Division for its officers to consider and, if further information can be given to the member and the House, I will be only too happy to do so.

LEGIONNAIRE'S DISEASE

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister of Health. Following the last fatal outbreak of legionnaire's disease in the southern suburbs of Adelaide early in 1986, has the Government established any guidelines for regular checking of places used frequently by the public, such as shopping centres and hospitals and, if so, what are the guidelines? If guidelines have not been established, why not, and when were checks instituted in relation to the latest outbreak?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: I will get those details for the honourable member.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs APPLEBY (Hayward): I direct my question to the Minister of Health. What action has been taken by the South Australian Health Commission to locate the source of the outbreak—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Housing and Construction and the honourable member for Murray-Mallee are both out of order. The honourable member for Hayward.

Mrs APPLEBY: —of the rare strain of legionella bacteria which has recently been reported in South Australia, and particularly those persons who have been affected by the bacteria—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: I hope you have better luck than I did, June.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs APPLEBY: —and can the Minister provide a contact number for those members of the general public who seek information about the cause of the infection? Further, can the Minister reassure the people in the area concerned that the water is safe for drinking purposes?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has just had to reprimand the Minister of Housing and Construction and the honourable member for Murray-Mallee. The Chair should not have to similarly reprimand the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: I understand the honourable member's concern, given the location of her electorate. To answer her last question about drinking water first, there is absolutely no evidence, according to the Health Commission, that legionnaire's disease can be contracted from drinking water. I am advised that it is an airborne disease and that it cannot be transmitted by person-to-person contact. Those who have been in contact with people with the disease have no fears. There is certainly no problem in drinking water.

An information desk has been established at the Environmental Health Branch with a telephone number for people to ring should they feel the need for more information or if they have information to give. That telephone number is 218 3629. I would appreciate any publicity that can be given to that telephone number both to reassure people and for people to assist the Health Commission with information.

As regards attempting to trace the source of the infection, I point out that it is extremely difficult to do so. There is usually a common cause in such outbreaks, but it is extremely difficult to locate that common cause. However, a team has been put together to look at the area and to try to pin down the cause. The team has visited the houses of people affected, interviewing them and conducting tests. The Engineering and Water Supply Department is taking large sample collections from water supplies in the affected areas and the Health Commission is notifying and contacting local doctors in the area to see what information can be gleaned from them and to give advice on recognising legionnaire's disease in patients and what to do with any cases.

All over the world this disease is considered to be very difficult to pin down because the bacteria are widespread at very low levels in very many locations. It has not been determined why that suddenly creates a cluster of new cases. Health authorities throughout South Australia and the world are working extensively to pin down the cause of the disease.

The Hon. T. Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: I would not have thought that the member for Alexandra would find it necessary to interrupt.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition—he wins some, he loses some. In summary, to reassure the member for Hayward, there is no problem with drinking water, there is a contact phone number which I hope will be made widely available, and the health authorities in this State are doing everything they can to isolate the source of the disease and to take care of those who have contracted it.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING DIVISION

The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE (Coles): In his capacity as Minister responsible for the Government Printing Division, will the Minister of Transport say whether the Auditor-General is investigating two recent transactions involving the division and, if so, why? If not, is the Minister aware of serious concerns within the printing division about these transactions and will he have them investigated?

The first transaction relates to the purchase by the Government Printing Division of a second-hand, five-colour Hiedelberg printing press from Consolidated Graphics Corporation. The Opposition has been informed that the Government paid more than $1.2 million for this press. The second transaction involves the sale by the Government to the same company, Consolidated Graphics Corporation, of an almost new four colour Hiedelberg speed press. We have been informed that the sale price was about $600 000.

Industry concerns are based on the belief that the Government paid far too much for the press it purchased from Consolidated Graphics and accepted much less than the real value of the press it sold to this company. Estimates from

people within the industry are that these two transactions have shortchanged taxpayers by as much as $600 000.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I would like to know from whom the honourable member has received this information, because I believe it to be totally false. I do not believe that the industry at large has made that judgment. The Government did purchase a five-colour press. It intended to purchase a new five-colour press at considerably more expense than the one it purchased. The purchase price provided considerable savings to the Government which, in turn, sold the four-colour press for which it no longer had any use.

The purchase of the five-colour press made the Government Printer's capacity to undertake the work which the Government requires of that division much more effective, economical and beneficial to the taxpayers of South Australia. I am not aware of the cricitisms that the honourable member said have been expressed in the community. I am aware that at least one or two people in the general printing community seem to be fighting a vendetta against the previous Government Printer, and that matter is being dealt with.

If the honourable member went outside and made some of the comments that she is retailing second-hand from some people within the industry inside this Parliament, I suggest that that would be at her risk. I am not aware that the Auditor-General is inquiring into that sale or purchase; however, because the honourable member has asked the question I will check out this matter with him. I say quite clearly that I have total confidence in the advice given to me as Minister not only by the Government Printer but by the Acting Director-General of the Department of Services and Supply, and in the actions taken by the Government to purchase that five-colour press. If I can, I will check out for the honourable member the source of her information, although I would prefer that she gave it to me rather than my having to check out who is saying these things about the Government and the Government Printer. When I have the information, I will provide her with a report.

TEACHING STAFF CUTS

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): Can the Minister of Education advise the House whether teacher numbers have been cut by 500 and whether $6 million has been added to the Education Department's administration budget? These claims have been made in recent Liberal Party election advertisements that appeared in newspapers.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question and I must say that I was very concerned to learn of the advertisement which was placed in the local press by the Liberal Party and which contained these quite falacious allegations about the Education Department in South Australia and our education system generally. To denigrate a very fine education system in that way is counterproductive to responsible government in any form. It is incredibly hypocritical of the Opposition to claim that there is a reduction in the teaching staff in our schools when the Liberal Government in New South Wales, as one of its first acts, reduced the teaching force by 2 000 teachers.

In the recent elections in Victoria the Liberal Party in that State announced that it would also slash teacher numbers by 2 000 teachers. The costings of the respective Party's election promises were published in the Melbourne *Age*. The estimated savings from teacher cuts under Liberal Party policies in Victoria amounted to $70 million for that promise. One can see the enormous impact that conservative Parties have in fields like education when they infrequently come to office.

The reality is that in South Australia since 1983 enrolment declines of over 20 000 students have occurred in our schools because of well-known demographic factors. The projected decline in 1989 will free up 180 teacher positions and every one of these teacher positions will be retained to further improve the quality of education. This will bring to 830 the number of teaching positions kept in the school system in the six years to 1989, despite massive enrolment declines.

As to the Education Department's administration expenditure, it is most important that the issue be explained and clearly understood by the community. The administration expenditure of the department has not increased by $6 million in the terms expressed in the Liberal Party's advertisement. A number of budgetary decisions have been taken over recent years. Many were introduced to improve accounting practices. In 1988-89, for example, the budget increase is largely caused by the transfer of the cost of Government owned accommodation, that is, teacher housing and departmental offices, amounting to $5 million, to the Education Department; the transfer of the cost of the Auditor-General's services to the department; and to increases in costs previously transferred, for example, registration and third party insurance on the many vehicles owned by the Education Department.

The imposition of these cross charges is in line with the Government's thrust to ensure that the department's accounts more accurately reflect the full cost of its operations. If I recall correctly, they were initiatives of the Tonkin Government to provide that degree of accounting in our public accounts. The remainder of the increase is attributable to the full year effect of salary increases for administrative staff. So, to suggest that that is an increase in the cost of the administration of the Education Department in the way implied in that advertisement is very irresponsible and incorrect. As I said, it is a direct attack on our fine education system. The reality is that the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures show that South Australia is well ahead of the national average of 14.7 students for each teacher. In 1989 the education budget in South Australia sets a new standard of 12.9 students for each teacher in South Australia.

INTEREST RATES

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Will the Premier say whether his Government agrees with forecasts that home loan interest rates are likely to rise again in the near future and will stay at these high levels well into next year? If so, does the Government intend to introduce a scheme to alleviate the hardship for home buyers in the same way that it did imediately before the 1985 South Australian election? Forecasts of a further 1 per cent rise in home loan interest rates in the near furture would mean an increase of $90 a month in repayments on the average loan in South Australia over the past 12 months.

These increases are occurring at a time when real disposable incomes are continuing to fall. They therefore place a much greater burden on families on average wages than on the previous two occasions when the Premier has believed State Government action was necessary to support home buyers. Before the 1982 South Australian election, when interest rates were 2 per cent lower than they are now, the Premier on a number of occasions called for taxpayer funded support for home buyers. In 1985, for a period of four months surrounding the last State election, he introduced a

scheme for building society borrowers with the promise that under continuing Labor Governments the pressure would come off interest rates.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is very hard to predict the interest rate outlook, but I would agree that at the moment the pressure is upwards. I hope that it does not go up too far or for too long. At the macro-economic level I think everyone would agree that the Federal Government has had a major problem. The economy has been surging strongly; there is growth in jobs; and, in fact, income and the numbers of people with access to disposable income are increasing. Indeed, there is a very good outlook in that respect.

On the other hand, our balance of payments has not been corrected: interest rates have been rising, and so has the dollar, which I note, after a slump yesterday, strengthened again today. That is not good news for our manufacturing industry. And it is not good news if the Commonwealth is going to use these measures to try to restrain demand, because that means the upward pressure on interest rates will continue.

As far as housing loan interest rates are concerned, in South Australia we have a very competitive situation; in fact, our loans are at a lower level than the national level. Yesterday during Question Time I think I mentioned the action of the Commonwealth Bank in pinning a loan rate in South Australia below that which it would offer customers in other more overheated sectors of the economy. That is a real benefit to South Australian borrowers, and I hope that that sort of competitive pressure will remain. This Government, following that experience referred to by the honourable member, has in place a number of mortgage relief schemes and special assistance packages in terms of the structuring of housing finance.

My colleague the Minister of Housing and Construction often makes statements about those schemes and the way in which they operate, and publicises their availability. Obviously that safety net, which has to be very much needs based because we cannot as a Government simply go against the whole tide and make unilateral changes in interest rates generally, is available provided the various criteria are met. I urge those in difficulties to look at the details of it or to contact the Minister's office for such details.

OLYMPIC GAMES

Mr RANN (Briggs): My question is directed to the Minister of Recreation and Sport. Is the South Australian Government backing Sydney, Melbourne or Brisbane in the bid to be the Australian host of the 1996 Olympic Games? Have there been any negotiations towards enabling Adelaide to host some of the events? I understand that the 10 member Australian Olympic Federation will, this afternoon or this evening, determine which Australian city will compete to stage the 1996 Olympic Games following a vigorous and sometimes heated campaign between Sydney and Melbourne.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Synchronised interjections are not a recognised Olympic sport. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Briggs for his question and his interest in this matter. I am sure that members will be waiting with interest to hear the decision on this matter. We have offered our support to the Victorians in their bid, and we have done so after extensive discussions and negotiations with the Victorian Minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Not many members on the other side seem to be supporting Mr Elliot. As I have said, we have had discussions with the Victorian Minister, who visited South Australia several weeks ago, and I have written to him outlining the basis of our support. Fundamentally, we believe that we can offer certain benefits as regards the Olympic Games if they are staged in Melbourne.

Those benefits include the opportunity to support pre-games events which are now prominent as part of the Olympic schedule. In this regard, we would consider such sports as hockey and cycling as part of the pre-games build-up. Also, we have negotiated with the Victorians for South Australia to be considered as part of the Greek team games within the Olympic Games themselves, such as soccer, where the competing teams group play in certain venues. We believe that we can stage some of these events successfully in South Australia to support the Melbourne bid.

In considering what the Victorians offer, one must carefully consider the stage of development. We have had a chance to consider that and discuss it with our South Australian representative on the Olympics Committee, and the Victorian bid represents an advanced stage. Their proposals as to accommodation and access to the various venues are highly developed. Having had the opportunity to discuss this matter with our representatives, I believe that Melbourne is further advanced with its capital superstructure than is the Sydney proposal. If the situation developed where Melbourne was awarded the Australian bid, the matter would go to the international committee and strong benefits would flow across the border into South Australia.

Part of the package that would interest all South Australians would be the opportunity to develop joint tourist packages with Victoria. The Premier has received communications from the Melbourne Olympic Bid Committee, which has offered that very option to us, and the Victorian Tourism Commission would work with Tourism South Australia to develop the packages that would attract or persuade those people attending the Olympics, both as spectators and as participants, to visit South Australia and enjoy the many delights that this State offers tourists.

On the basis of our exchange of letters, obviously it is important for the South Australian community to know that we have thrown our support behind the Victorians, given their undertaking to support part of the games and pre-games events being staged in South Australia. The package would offer joint development of tourism facilities and opportunities in this State. So, I am delighted to say that we have offered that support and I hope that in its deliberations the Olympic Committee can find its way to support the Victorians so that South Australia can gain significant benefits from that decision.

POLICE OFFICERS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Can the Acting Attorney-General say when the Government will decide whether to pay the cost of police officers recently acquitted of a series of actions that arose from National Crime Authority investigations? I understand that the Police Association now faces legal costs totalling $126 000 arising out of these various actions. Those actions related to charges faced in Adelaide and Sydney by an Assistant Commissioner, charges against a Detective Sergeant and the demotion of four Drug Squad detectives. In a letter to the Editor published in the *Advertiser* this morning, the President of the Police Association states:

> Approaches to the Government for reimbursement have so far fallen on deaf ears.

This is despite the fact that police general service orders stipulate that 'the Government will meet reasonable costs and expenses where an officer has been acquitted or where the courts have found there is no case to answer'. I understand that the Police Association first applied in April for Government assistance with these legal costs, and many police officers are drawing the comparison between the delay in the Government's response to the association and the Government's immediate open cheque book approach to the damages and legal costs faced by the former Minister of Health.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I understand that this matter is under consideration by the Attorney's office and advice is being sought from the Crown Solicitor in this matter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: There is established policy in this area and I understand that these matters are in a category outside of that established policy. For those reasons, further and detailed consideration is required.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

TAB SUBAGENCIES

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): Does the Minister of Recreation and Sport intend to have inspectors, on occasions throughout the year, examine hotels with TAB licences? Constituents have complained that some hotels are giving very poor service to people who attend to place a bet, and the areas provided for betting are very seldom cleaned on a daily basis.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for raising this matter. I know that many members would be concerned if this situation has developed in TAB sub agencies. Reflecting on the extent of their development, about 167 subagencies have been approved for public access in various locations, including football clubs and hotels. If the honourable member endeavoured to place a bet during Melbourne Cup week, he probably would have had some difficulty at his local subagency. A similar situation applied with my local subagency. So many people wished to place a bet on the Melbourne Cup that one had to queue for service.

If this situation is developing at subagencies within the honourable member's electorate, I am certain that the TAB would be concerned because that would discourage people from investing on the TAB. If that situation has arisen, I am more than happy to ask the TAB to investigate the matter. Officers are allocated to investigate and analyse applications, and we have proceeded fairly rapidly with improving the system of accreditation for subagency establishment. I will certainly refer the matter to the Chairman of the TAB and have him immediately investigate it, and I will report back to the member and the House on the result of those investigations.

ASH WEDNESDAY BUSHFIRES

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Because of the many unanswered questions relating to the package put before the Stirling council by the Minister of Local Government earlier this week concerning the 1980 Ash Wednesday bushfire claims, will the Premier give an assurance to the Stirling council and ratepayers that the Government regards this package only as a basis for further negotiation and not an agreement which is in any way binding or requiring council approval at its meeting next Tuesday night? Last Monday, the Minister of Local Government released some sketchy details relating to a package which she described as 'a solution to the Stirling council's bushfire claims crisis'. In part the package proposed that the financial responsibility for the damage payments be shared between the Stirling council and the wider local government community.

However, there is considerable concern on the part of Stirling ratepayers, because of the absolute uncertainty of the final damages liability, and there are strong suggestions that the final liability, which may not be known for some months, will far exceed the $15 million which has been assumed for the purpose of the Government's proposal. It is also now very obvious that many other councils are far from happy about a reduction in grants received for vital services in their own districts as a result of funds being allocated to the Stirling council from the Local Government Grants Commission, an action for which approval has not been gained from the Commonwealth.

There is real and genuine concern on the part of Stirling ratepayers that a gun is being held at the head of the council to approve the package next Tuesday night so that it is tied up without an opportunity for answers to be given to a number of important questions being put by ratepayers. It is also strongly felt by ratepayers that this package in its present form enables the Government to bail out without any financial commitment leaving the Stirling ratepayers and other councils to carry a totally unacceptable financial burden.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The council and local ratepayers called on the Government to put forward a plan of action, and that has been done. It is far more than sketchy: it is quite detailed. However, I concede, as would the Minister of Local Government, that a number of details have to be worked through as we reach a final solution of the financial problem. In its essentials, the plan is workable and I repeat the assurance that was given to ratepayers: there is no hidden new impost for them in this plan of action. The Government believes that it is attainable.

As to the quantum of damages that may eventually be assessed, I do not think that any of us knows precisely what that will be and I do not think that it is productive to guess about it at this stage. Having said that, I point out that it is important that the Stirling council gives some indication as to whether it supports the overall thrust of that proposal; in other words, whether it supports in principle the elements that have been proposed and is prepared to work to see the plan implemented. The Government is looking for that sort of undertaking and it would be a very constructive initial step and one that would be of great relief to the ratepayers.

I reject the distinction that has been drawn and the suggestion that a local government authority, which is confronted with a major financial problem, can turn to the community via the State Government and that the community via local government generally of which it is a part has no role to play. That is wrong in principle. It was certainly considered so in 1980 by the Government and Cabinet in which the honourable member sat in the aftermath of this particular event. That was the position that was taken then, and I presume that the honourable member concurred with it.

I reject some of the bases of criticism given by the honourable member. We believe that a workable plan that will not impose further burden on the ratepayers has been devised. We would like the Stirling council to accept that in principle and get down to the finer detail. Incidentally, I am still waiting on the honourable member to show a

little bit of leadership in his area—he is a ratepayer—by urging those who are withholding rates to pay them as soon as possible because the cash crisis of the council can only be exacerbated in this situation. It would be better for everyone to say, 'Okay, we will pay the rates that have been legally fixed by the council and then at least we are in a position to say that we have discharged the obligation that the council has sought in this financial year, and we will see where we go from there in the context of the package that has been offered by the Government.'

COORONG AND MULLOWAY FISHERIES

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Fisheries adopt the suggestion of the member for Chaffey and establish a Government backbench committee to investigate regulations under the Fisheries Act which are brought before Parliament? In this House on 18 August, the member for Chaffey moved a motion disallowing a regulation relating to the Coorong and mulloway fisheries, stating that the Minister puts forward regulations that he has not properly considered and about which he has not properly consulted with the recreational and professional fishing fraternity. He proposed that the Minister try to overcome these problems by establishing a Government backbench committee to examine the proposed regulations.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: This question has been put before the House by the member for Chaffey. To accuse me and the department of not consulting with the industry as a whole is absolutely outrageous. Because the honourable member has a boat and occasionally goes up the river with his mates in the Liberal Party, he thinks he is an expert on fisheries. I can tell him that he ought to go and look at his own supporters, because a number of his prominent supporters, who are fishermen in the industry, say that he is a lost cause, and hopeless, and have given him away—he is not worth a crumpet. If we look at what the honourable member has achieved in his brief period as shadow Minister of Fisheries, we see a big fat zero—nothing! He is absolutely hopeless in this area.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: He is silent, silent. Never had a question from him. This Government has done more to establish proper management and ensure the protection of our fishing resource than any other Government. When we came to government we found that members opposite had left the fisheries area in a totally disorganised state. The fisheries had been exploited beyond recovery and we had to come in and restore the gulf, the southern rock lobster fishery and others by instituting management schemes.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Mount Gambier can speak about this, but he did not have the courage to come out and support the buy back scheme. He had to duck and weave and get his colleagues to run the select committee in order to get the buy back scheme under way. For the member for Chaffey to suggest that we have not consulted the industry is totally outrageous.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The net result of these interjections is disorder. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Thank you, Mr Speaker, that probably represents the Opposition. The consultation that took place in relation to the mulloway fishery, in particular, and any of those management schemes that this Government introduced was very thorough. In October 1986 the Government released the green paper on the mulloway fishery with particular reference to the Coorong Lagoon. That was released for public discussion by the whole community.

We also put forward a press release requesting public comment on the options outlined. That was the first major release which invited the public to make comment. There were 29 submissions received by the South Australian Department of Fisheries from organisations including the South Australian Fishing Industry Council, the South Australian Recreational Fishing Advisory Committee, the South Australian Fishermen's Association and the South Australian Sport Fishing Association, and there were numerous individual submissions.

Between October 1986 and December 1987 representatives of the department attended numerous meetings with the South Australian Fishing Industry Council, the South Australian Fishermen's Association and representatives of SARFAC to discuss details of the proposal contained in the green paper. In particular, the options contained in the green paper were discussed with the recreational fishing sector during meetings with the Recreational Fishing Liaison Committee and at two meetings of the Lakes and Coorong Liaison Committee, a professional representation group.

I put it to the House: how on earth can the honourable member say that there was no consultation in relation to the Coorong and the mulloway fishery? It is an absolute joke for him to come in here and suggest that. If the Director of Fisheries had gone into any further consultation process, he would not have had time to devote to any other aspect of his job. He consulted with the industry inside out. The honourable member continues to respond, as he does so often, to a small lobby group which comes in with a sectarian view and to demand that the Act be changed and the regulations struck out. If that occurred the whole fishery would be exploited, distorted and completely denigrated to a point where it would be beyond recovery.

We have seen the ability and capacity of the honourable member to handle these issues! Professor Copes was requested by the fishing industry itself to prepare a report. He was asked to come over here and we provided the opportunity. He not only reviewed the prawn fishing industry in Gulf St Vincent but looked at fisheries management as a whole. He concluded that South Australia is leading the world in fishing industry management and that is very important to note. Those schemes that we introduced—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Victoria has been very patient with his colleagues, but he knew, when the select committee looked at the southern rock lobster buy back scheme, that the logic of the Director of Fisheries and the industry in support was the way to go. We are beginning to achieve the very results that we expected, and we will see a restoration of the fishery and that industry in the not too distant future. It is economically necessary that we achieve that restoration. In contradiction of his colleague who sits down the front—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: That is another one—abalone, indeed! That is another story, and I could go on about it all day, but I will not. I will resist the temptation, other than to say that for the member for Chaffey to act as he does is totally irresponsible. We have proven that we can manage the fishery; we will continue to do so, and we will do that in consultation with the industry, irrespective of the comments of the honourable member.

ADELAIDE CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mr MEIER (Goyder): When does the Minister—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Goyder has the floor.

Mr MEIER: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. When does the Minister of Health expect that the shortage of beds at the Adelaide Children's Hospital will be alleviated in view of the fact that operations are now being cancelled virtually at a minute's notice. In its latest annual report the hospital board has referred to the bed shortage, with bed numbers now down to 165 open on a daily basis, more than 100 less than what the hospital was approved for in 1982.

The number on the waiting list has increased from 462 in 1984 to 907 at 30 September this year. Over half these children are waiting for ear, nose and throat surgery, an area in which, I have been told, the delay can be up to nine months. Two children of a constituent of mine were affected by this deteriorating situation last week. They live near Balaklava. One is a girl aged six years, a spina bifida child, the second is a boy aged eight years. Both had been booked to have operations last Tuesday and were to have been admitted on Monday.

However, just as they were about to leave their home on the Monday—indeed, they were just walking out the door—their parents received a telephone call advising that the operations would have to be cancelled because no beds were available. I have been told that such cancellations are now by no means unusual at the Adelaide Children's Hospital and that they are of increasing concern to the doctors. In this case, the parents, because of the condition of their daughter, have been frequent visitors to the hospital, and they have told me that they are becoming increasingly frustrated with sitting in queues for two to three hours for outpatient treatment.

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: I have already made an announcement in the House and elsewhere that at present we are negotiating with the Commonwealth Government to open 16 more beds at the Adelaide Children's Hospital. That is not news, but I am quite happy to state it again. As soon as a number of those beds can be financed under the hospital enhancement program—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: I beg your pardon?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is Question Time, not dialogue time. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. There is a very real problem at the Adelaide Children's Hospital. No-one is denying that. The problem will not be solved by throwing money at it. It is not as simple as that. It is a combination of things, including the availability of surgeons, theatres and nursing staff and, of course, the availability of beds.There is also a regional problem in that parents are bypassing other hospitals to take their children to the Adelaide Children's Hospital when they could be quite competently taken care of at Modbury, the Lyell McEwin or, indeed, a number of our country hospitals. The member for Goyder would appreciate that, as would the member for Mount Gambier and a number of other members who represent districts in which country hospitals are located. This matter involves a whole range of complex issues. I had a meeting this morning with representatives of the Adelaide Children's Hospital and the AMA and I thought it was very productive indeed. It is relatively easy to overcome an immediate problem.

That is not difficult. It requires no creativity; it does not even require a great deal of brain. All it requires is an injection of funds. In the short term that will keep everybody quiet. However, the way in which the Adelaide Children's Hospital functions and is operated needs examining. In no way does anyone wish to change the aims and objectives of the hospital, but it has been doing the same things in the same way for too long.

Mr Meier interjecting:

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: The member for Goyder says he hopes that I can fix it. I can tell him that I cannot fix it alone. Some of the problems lie within the administration, and those I can do a great deal about; but some of the problems involve the doctors and the way in which they view the hospital and fulfil their individual roles. They agree with me. I cannot do anything about the doctors' attitudes and approaches; they can do that themselves, and they have undertaken and are very keen to do that. They claim that this is the first time anyone has asked them to look at themselves, their roles and their methods of operation. They are very pleased and have reacted very favourably. I need the doctors to assist in solving the problems that we can say our doctors generated.

That is not the whole problem at the Children's Hospital; the whole problem is that we are doing things there today in the same way we did them 100 years ago, and that is just not appropriate or good enough. The doctors have assured me that they will cooperate in the procedures we are going through. If we open 16 beds tomorrow that will relieve the immediate problem and get it out of the headlines, but it will not solve the problems at the hospital: in three months time they will be back.

Mr Lewis: What is the problem?

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Minister resume his seat for a moment. It is obvious when Ministers rise to reply to a question that they have two or three points they intend to make, but they may think of other things to supplement that material. All the interjections coming from my left merely encourage the Minister to supplement his material and will lead to a reduction in the number of questions that can be asked during Question Time. I ask that interjections cease. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: The only response I give to the member for Murray-Mallee's interjection 'What is the problem?' is to refer him to the earlier part of my reply.

CAMDEN CAMPUS

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): Can the Minister of Employment and Further Education give the House any information on plans the Department of TAFE may have for the Camden Community Centre? A number of rumours are abroad in the community, primarily that there will be a complete closure of all facilities at the Camden venue. I am aware that Kingston TAFE has made alternative arrangements for the women's studies course, but I am also aware that the community centre and the child-care facility at Camden are recognised as being a very important aspect of that course. What is planned for the Camden campus?

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question, which is certainly related to an earlier matter raised by the member for Hayward concerning the women's studies course being conducted at the Camden campus of the Kingston College of TAFE. A proposal has been put to me by the Department of TAFE to close the Camden campus of the Kingston college from the end of 1988, and I have accepted that recommendation. All

the present course work undertaken there will be relocated to other TAFE facilities. I can assure members that the women's studies course, for example, will be better provided for with the new arrangements in 1989 than has been possible with the way things have been structured in 1988.

Of course, the closure of the Camden campus of the Kingston College of TAFE legitimately raises other questions, and has raised concerns in the community which supports the Camden Community Centre, which is a very impressive community centre managed and run by a very active community group. They asked to see me about that matter, so I met a deputation from that centre this morning and assured them that, although closing the Camden campus of the Kingston College of TAFE will see much of the site disposed of by the Department of TAFE, the Government does not intend to dispose of that part of the land occupied by the Camden Community Centre. In fact, it would be separately titled from that. I also undertook to have further investigations conducted into whether there should be added to the allotment of land on which the centre is based the brick toilets adjacent to the boundary or whether a more appropriate solution might be to relocate the more modern temporary toilets elsewhere on that site onto the Camden site rather than incorporating the brick toilets within the community centre area. That would depend on the better cost alternative of those two propositions.

There are also questions about car parking arrangements, but I could not give the deputation answers to those questions because some of them need to be sorted out. What must be acknowledged is that the Camden Community Centre has had rent free use of that site for some time and, in dedicating this land for further use by the Camden Community Centre, the Government would naturally desire to get a financial return in terms of either purchase of the land or rent for the site.

I understand that that is beyond the means of the Camden Community Centre and its own financial running, so I have said that we will further pursue that matter to see what other funds may be available, for example, from special grant programs under the Federal Government or from local government with respect either to some assistance for the purchase of the site for dedication to the Camden Community Centre or with assistance toward the rental costs of the site. However, I assure those associated with the Camden Community Centre that the land on which it is leased will continue to be available to it. The other land, the remaining part of the site which is not occupied by the centre or which is not already the subject of transfer to the Childrens' Services Office for the child care centre there, will be disposed of following the closing of the Camden campus of the Kingston College of TAFE.

CHLOROFLUOROCARBONS BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

RACING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LOCAL PUBLIC ABATTOIRS ACT REPEAL BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LIFTS AND CRANES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SUMMARY OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 29 November at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

COOPERATIVES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 November. Page 1350.)

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): The Opposition is cooperative in this matter. It has no reservations about the Bill. The substance of our regard for the Bill's impact can be found elsewhere in *Hansard* in the remarks made by the Hon. Mr Trevor Griffin in another place. The Opposition supports the measure.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I thank the Opposition for its cooperative support for the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

POWERS OF ATTORNEY AND AGENCY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 November. Page 1319.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): The Opposition supports the Bill, which makes three amendments to the principal Act. The first amendment clarifies the position as regards the enduring power of attorney. First, there is the case of a person who will have the power of attorney when the document is signed, and the second case concerns the position when legal incapacity occurs. The document in question may not operate until a person suffers a legal incapacity to conduct his or her own affairs and the enduring power of attorney then comes into force.

The second amendment deals with a technical difficulty under the original Act. There is a problem when a power of attorney is overriden, a classical example being when the Guardianship Board intervened. In such circumstances, section 11 of the principal Act, passed in 1984, provides that a number of matters must be seen to by a person when certain aspects of a power of attorney are contested. The question has been raised whether the person having the power of attorney and then being relieved of it must comply with section 11.

Thirdly, the Bill deals with the problem of ensuring that the interests expressed in a will are maintained or that the directions concerning a person who has the power of attorney but also has specified benefits in the estate are adhered to. We could well have a situation where the person acting under the power of attorney could circumvent the wishes of the estate. Under the provisions of the Act it is not quite clear whether the person so aggrieved should have some right of redress. That corrects that situation.

I will make two brief comments about the Bill. First, I am a little concerned that we are clarifying this issue about the enduring power of attorney. I am dissatisfied in the sense that we have not clarified it before. The Minister well knows that since the 1984 Act came into being a number of standard forms have been on issue in the Lands Titles Office, and people can use those forms to make out an enduring power of attorney. In the past year about 40 or 50 people have come to my office asking for an enduring power of attorney. A major reason for this is that they are absolutely scared that the Guardianship Board will intervene on their behalf if there is no standing document which expresses their wishes in this regard.

If there is a problem, how serious is it and how valid are those powers of attorney that have been issued between 1984 (or whenever the Act was proclaimed) and now (or when the amending Bill is proclaimed)? Has there been a legal challenge which casts some doubt about those documents that were registered previously with the Lands Titles Office? I would be very critical of the Minister if a standard document has been issued under his direction since proclamation of the 1984 Act and there is a legal technicality preventing us from acting in the cases presently under discussion.

Secondly, I raise the matter of the Guardianship Board. I have mentioned that little institution before. It has done irreparable harm to people in South Australia. It has assumed responsibilities which it is not entitled so to do. Does this Bill facilitate the Guardianship Board's taking a greater interest in people's affairs, notwithstanding that an enduring power of attorney document might be registered with the Lands Titles Office? From the second reading explanation, it is quite clear that the deficiency seems to be that the Guardianship Board, or the Public Trustee in this case, cannot ask the previous power of attorney to supply relevant documents to it when it takes over the estate.

Thus, it seems to me at first glance that this amendment will enhance the ability of the Guardianship Board to continue on its chaotic path of ruining people's lives, as it has done with two of my constituents, and it has made life difficult for another two. I know that my colleague in another place raised this same problem with regard to at least 10 people who approached him with grievances against the Guardianship Board. I know that this has been a matter for concern and I know that the Attorney was addressing new guidelines for the Guardianship Board.

Thirdly, in his response, could the Minister indicate what has happened to the new guidelines under which the Guardianship Board is to operate? They must be clear and unequivocal. We cannot have the situation that arose in the past where the Guardianship Board, on its own behalf and because of some jumped up bureaucrat or because some nurse has become a little excited about certain arrangements, committed a person to having their estate taken over by the Public Trustee. We cannot have a situation where the Guardianship Board makes certain recommendations affecting the livelihood of the relatives of the person concerned. On a previous occasion I brought to the attention of the House the cases with which I am dealing, so I do not intend to mention them again. There are some serious concerns about the way the Guardianship Board operates. With those few words, and depending on the answers supplied by the Minister, the Opposition supports the second reading.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I thank the Opposition for its indication of support of this measure. I am not quite clear as to the precise points that the honourable member has raised but I will try to ascertain the detail of his concerns during the Committee stage. I think they are of a general nature, so they are probably matters that I can comment on in a general way rather than give a specific analysis or opinion on a particular set of facts.

As the honourable member has indicated, these amendments provide for some improvements in the Power of Attorney and Agency Act of 1984, and they have come about as a result of requests from the Public Trustee and others in the community who have pointed out to the Government certain anomalies with respect to this legislation and have suggested ways in which it can be improved. With respect to the matter of enduring power of attorney as raised by the member for Mitcham, I understand that there were several cases where a protection order was made under the Mental Health Act and the Public Trustee was appointed administrator and the protected person had executed an enduring power of attorney in favour of the third party. In some cases it may be necessary for the Public Trustee to revoke the power of attorney as a matter of urgency. The trustee was concerned that, by revoking the power of attorney he would be unable to seek the remedies contained in sections 11 (1) *(a)* and *(b)* of the Power of Attorney and Agency Act.

It is clear that one of the orders available to the courts can be made only when the power of attorney is still in existence. However, it is by no means clear that the application may be made only during the currency of the power of attorney. The enduring power of attorney provision has been drafted in this way so that the matter can be put beyond doubt and these rights can continue in the circumstances described in the amendment.

With respect to the criticisms that the honourable member makes about the Guardianship Board, I must disagree with him. It is not an easy jurisdiction to administer. Parties associated with an estate being administered by the tribunal under this legislation often have very strong feelings. The honourable member has previously made similar criticisms in this House. I can only repeat what I have said on those occasions, that often information is not in the possession of all parties to these matters for obvious reasons, so it is easy to form distorted views of the decisions that are brought down. At times these decisions appear to be, on the surface, harsh and unfeeling, but closer examination shows that in the great majority of cases they are in accordance with the requirements of the law and the responsibilities vested in that tribunal. I commend the Bill to all members.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Enduring powers of attorney.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: When will this Bill be proclaimed?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The Bill will be proclaimed quite quickly, but I cannot give an exact date. Regulations do not need to be prepared under this measure, therefore proclamation will be made quickly.

Mr S.J. BAKER: If section 6 of the principal Act must be clarified, I suggest that there is some contention about the provisions of that section. Although I am not sure when the Act was proclaimed, I presume that it has been operating since late 1984 or early 1985. Section 6 (1) of the Act provides:

> An enduring power of attorney may be created by deed expressed to be made in pursuance of this section or containing words indicating an intention that the authority conferred is to be exercisable notwithstanding the donor's subsequent legal incapacity, or in the event of the donor's subsequent legal incapacity.

They are important words. All the forms that I have seen and signed in recent times have on the front page the wording contained in this clause. Why is this amendment needed? If there is a legal problem, will it affect the powers of attorney that have been, and will be, signed up until the amending legislation is proclaimed?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Powers of attorney prepared pursuant to the provisions contained in the 1984 Act are still valid. This clause clarifies a point with respect to the legislation as is described in the second reading debate in another place. It does not strike down the existing powers of attorney.

Mr S.J. BAKER: If the Minister gives a clear, unequivocal guarantee that the 1984 provisions are the same as those contained in these amendments and that there is no legal difficulty with the powers of attorney that have been, and will be, signed up until the date on which this Act is proclaimed, I will be satisfied. If the existing provisions are working well, why do we need to change them? If by changing the provisions some concern is reflected on the validity of those thousands of documents, a lot of people in South Australia will be in strife.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Rather than strike fear into the heart of every person who has a power of attorney, as the honourable member seems intent on doing, I will read to the Committee what has already been read into *Hansard* with respect to why this Bill seeks to amend section 6 (1) of the Act.

Mr S.J. Baker: It says that it is for clarification.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: That is right. Section 6 (1) of the Act is recast to make its meaning clearer. The substance of the section is not changed.

Mr S.J. Baker: Give us a clear guarantee.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Robertson): Order! The member for Mitcham has had three questions and three interjections—the fourth strike is out.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: It depends on each document that is prepared, so it is not possible to give absolute guarantees and undertakings in the broad terms that the honourable member seeks. The intention of the legislation is very clear and I repeat that it is being recast to make its meaning clearer, but the substance of the section is not changed.

Clause passed.

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Applications by beneficiaries of the will of a deceased donor.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: If it makes it easier for the Guardianship Board to use the Mental Health Act to take away the rights of a person who has made out a power of attorney, I question what we are doing here today. I have read the legislation and I understand that there must be some guarantee to the beneficiaries that their benefit in the estate will be preserved. However, can the Minister say whether this will allow the Guardianship Board, because of its greater power, to go back to the person who is exercising the power of attorney to reveal all? Is the Guardianship Board in a stronger position than before?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: As I have said many times, it is wrong to cast the Guardianship Board in that light. The honourable member has a jaundiced view of the work of that board. It is not a matter of whether the board is in a stronger or weaker position. It will not be in a different position in exercising its jurisdiction. The tools with which it is empowered to make its decisions are enhanced by this new provision. Hopefully it will enable it to be more effective, which should be the measure of its achievements.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I wish to refer to two matters. Members who were here in November 1984 may or may not remember that I attempted to amend the Evidence Act in relation to publishing in the *Government Gazette* the names of people which are suppressed from publication by the courts. I moved that amendment on the basis that it would allow for some discretion. The amendment was submitted to the House but was rejected on behalf of the Government by the present Minister of Education, who said that the Government wanted the position to remain as it was.

I clearly understood the Minister's comment to mean that the Government Printer was obliged to publish in the *Government Gazette* people's names which were suppressed. I do not know why, but the names are no longer published. I have referred back to the *Gazette* of 27 October, but I will go back further to see when this practice began—I believe it was in very recent times. The Act has not changed, my amendment was rejected, but all that is published now is a letter of the alphabet.

I do not object at all to the practice, but I do object to the rotten principle whereby members in this place reject a proposition and say it is not on and then find a way of bending it. I do not know whether this practice correctly interprets the Act, but I was told clearly at the time that that was not the case. That is all I will say about this matter at the moment. It shows that double standards apply and that the Government is not prepared to accept a principle when it suits it. Someone may correct me and say that the court ruled that those names shall not be printed in the *Government Gazette*. There can be no other let-out in terms of this accusation.

The same thing has happened to me several times in relation to several issues: the Government says that something cannot be done but at a later date says it can be done, that it is a great idea. This happened in relation to underage people drinking in a public place; the present Minister of Education representing the Minister in the other place said that certain things could not be done, that they were

not practical. Two years later the Government introduced its own Bill which embodied the same confounded proposal.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: Not across the State.

Mr S.G. EVANS: Under age drinking in a public place occurs across the State. The Government brought before the House a Bill to stop people under the age of 18 years drinking in a public place throughout the State. Yet, the Minister who brought the Bill into this House says that it did not apply across the State. He cannot even remember that. He is talking about bans in certain places. That is another piece of legislation to which I was not referring.

The other matter I want to raise is that in 1985 a Bill was brought before the House to amend the Prevention of Cruelty to Dumb Animals Act. It represented a complete rewrite. At the time this Bill came before the House there was public outcry because it provided for penalties of up to 12 months imprisonment and a $10 000 fine for anyone caught catching fish and being cruel to them. The Government set up a committee under the leadership of Mr A.M. Olsen, a former Director of Fisheries. This committee was to look at whether or not fish could feel pain. The announcement was made on 1 May 1985 and an article appeared in the *Sunday Mail* of 5 May in which Mr Olsen had one or two things to say. He said:

> You've got to look at legislation that will minimise stress and pain in the fish's last moments.

I suppose we should do that for all of us, not just fish. The article continued:

> The Environment Minister, Mr Hopgood, temporarily has excluded fish from the tighter cruelty legislation until he studies recommendations from Mr Olsen's committee due to report later this year [1985]. The committee would be responsible for updating research carried out on the subject since the 1979 Medway report was published in the UK.

The report further stated:

> Chairman of the working party that strengthened the cruelty legislation, Mr David Watts, said fish's brain function would be studied.

Of course, that would be a magnificent study as fish do not have a brain as we know it! The article continued:

> The new committee needed to find out whether fish had the ability to read chemical reactions in their bodies.

I doubt whether they can even read, let alone read chemical reactions.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Only if they had glasses.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I am not sure whether they would wear glasses; they have fish eyes and it may be an advantage to not wear glasses. The article continues:

> Mr Olsen hit out at critics of the setting up of the committee. He said some had 'gone off at a tangent'.

I ask you: who went off at a tangent? In 1985 the Hon. Don Hopgood set up a committee to investigate the sensory perception of fish to pain.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: What was the finding?

Mr S.G. EVANS: Enthusiasm was scaled down because, as they got into the story, they ran into a few bony problems. I thought I would ask a question of the then Minister of Lands who was handling the matter. On 24 February 1987 I asked the Minister whether the study into sensory perception of fish had been completed and, if so, when would the report be tabled. I received this response:

> The report has not been finalised because of difficulties in obtaining information from overseas.

Apparently our fish did not have enough brains to work on, we had to go overseas. It continued:

> A report should be presented to the Minister of Lands by the middle of the year.

That was in 1987. We are now at the end of 1988 and we have not received a report. Therefore, I ask the Minister of Lands (Hon. Susan Lenehan) to ensure that the report comes before Parliament so that we can look at it and find out whether there is any merit in its recommendations or whether we were all conned at the time to spend a bit more taxpayers' money while the enthusiasm for the subject really scaled down to nothing.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): It is fair to say that since I have been in this place, on numerous occasions I have raised the question of traffic control measures in my district. I must say that we have been served well since 1983 under this Government. However, one matter that has caused considerable problems to my constituents is the Port Road, Cheltenhan Parade, old Clark Terrace (now West Lakes Boulevard) intersection. In common with many constituents I have had to wait and suffer at that intersection on my way into to the city, especially in peak hours. During peak hours, one finds it is not uncommon for three or four changes of lights to occur before one can turn right from West Lakes Boulevard into Port Road. Sooner or later that situation will contribute to a fatality.

Over many years I have witnessed (and I admit to being guilty of this practice myself) people travelling over Port Road, doing a right hand turn into Cheltenham Parade against south bound traffic and turning left back into Old Port Road in their haste to get to the city. On a number of occasions I have appealed to the Minister—and I do so again now—to look at this intersection. There is no doubt that, with increased traffic flows, there is a need for right turn arrows at the intersection. My file on this topic goes well beyond 1985.

On 12 July 1988 I received correspondence from the Minister (and I thank him for that) in reply to correspondence that I sent to him on 5 May and 27 May requesting information pertaining to the Port Road, Cheltenham Parade, West Lakes Boulevard extension intersection. The Minister's reply states:

> Recent records of traffic flows on Clark Terrace/West Lakes Boulevard at the Port Road intersection are as follows:
>
> 1 June 1988, 14 800 vehicles per day
>
> 20 January 1987, 12 500 vehicles per day (low due to holiday period)
>
> 9 April 1984, 13 000 vehicles per day.
>
> These figures are estimates of two-way flow and have been based on the results of 11-hour manual turning counts.
>
> The June 1988 turning count was taken over the 11-hour period 0700-1800 hours and showed 2 237 vehicles turning right from West Lakes Boulevard into Port Road.
>
> Accident statistics (by accident severity) for this location, for the years 1984-1987, are provided below.

Statistics are given for 1984 to 1987 and indicate that there were 89 accidents, 24 injuries where people were not hospitalised, three injuries where people were hospitalised and no fatalities. I am thankful that there were no fatalities. Finally, in his last paragraph the Minister states:

> As the intersection is operating satisfactorily in terms of delay times, it is not proposed to install a separate right turn phase at this time. However, as previously advised, the Highways Department will continue to monitor traffic activity at this intersection.

This week I received two more representations from constituents requesting that these turn right arrows be installed. One letter is from Mr Fred Stewart of West Lakes, who wrote to me as follows:

> I write with concern to ascertain if there is any way you can help in solving a problem of traffic at the West Lakes Boulevard-Port Road corner. The main area of concern is what I feel is the urgent necessity to install a green arrow turning light for traffic turning from the Boulevard into Port Road crossover and then in to the city.
>
> It has developed not only in a delay of two or three light cycles before a vehicle can finally turn in to the 'up' traffic of the Port Road but a dangerous intersection for traffic heading from Cheltenham Parade crossing straight over and turning into the down traffic of Port Road.

Quite often there is a long queue of vehicles on Cheltenham Parade and West Lakes Boulevard, waiting for the Port Road traffic lights (for up and down traffic) to change. This cycle is unnecessarily long for Port Road traffic and often there are not any vehicles going up or down the Port Road when queues are waiting for the change of lights.

Furthermore the Boulevard road traffic has increased dramatically as an alternative to using Frederick Road or Tapleys Hill Road to get on to the Port Road, thus causing this dangerous build up on this problem corner. Football Park functions also make the corner chaotic for people travelling back towards the city.

I would therefore appreciate it if you could take this matter up with the Minister concerned, stressing the urgency for some action, as a major accident is inevitable if the problem is not soon rectified. I might also add the Port Road end of West Lakes Boulevard is becoming a problem, being so narrow with the now increased traffic.

Both the above situations are a topic of discussion and concern with residents and people travelling from West Lakes and surrounding areas to the city via the route causing the problem. Your urgent action, whatever you can do, to speed up alternatives to the present traffic signals would be much appreciated by all users of this intersection.

Similarly, I received correspondence from another constituent, Mr Allan Eylward of 115 Botting Street, Albert Park, in which he said he had written to the Minister (and supplied me with a copy) detailing his concerns. I have thick files on this matter. Certainly, I am well aware that the Minister has been most helpful in the past, as was his predecessor, on this issue. However, I believe that there is a need for action and I seek from the Government an indication as to when it is proposed to install turn right arrows at this intersection.

I am also aware that the remainder of the West Lakes Boulevard extension (phase 1 has been completed), the old Morley Road to Port Road extension, must be completed at some time in the future. Again, I appeal to the Minister to provide information to my constituents about the likely program for this road widening. I am not being hungry about it: I am merely seeking some timetable so that I can indicate to my constituents when they can reasonably expect this road to be widened, West Lakes Boulevard to be completed and the right turn arrows to be installed. I point out that since 1969 under the West Lakes (Indenture) Act promises have been made by successive Governments that the West Lakes Boulevard extension will be completed.

I congratulate the Government on what has happened thus far. Nevertheless, I look for some indication of when the remainder of the widening of the boulevard and, more importantly, the turn right arrows will be completed. I know that the Minister has constraints placed on him, but I believe it is important for me to once again raise this matter in Parliament in the hope that favourable consideration will be given to what I consider to be a justified request not only in relation to local residents but also for those who visit Football Park and the facilities provided around the West Lakes waterway.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Today I will summarise the remarks I have been making recently about rural poverty wherein I have demonstrated to the House by reference to statistical information and other factual evidence that poverty in this country is to be found in its worst and most depressing form in rural communities. I have used the various district council areas in my electorate to illustrate that point without referring to any other part of the State.

I acknowledge that other parts of the State—the electorates of the members for Eyre, Flinders and, indeed, Goyder and Custance—have similar situations. The disposable income of households, so my thesis has been and the facts show, net of transfer and interest payments on loans made by those families who conduct a business to obtain that income, is less than that of a single mother on a supporting parent's benefit. I have made the point and I make it again emphatically: families on pensions and benefits of various kinds (called transfer payments by economists; they are living on funds from public revenue sources) living in urban settings have access to an increased number of non-cash benefits that increase their disposable household income still higher than the household incomes of rural people to which I have referred. Those benefits include concessional or free access to a range of things like the school dental service, public transport, public hospitals for outpatients treatment, concessional water rates, and so on.

Mr Acting Speaker, you would know that there is no public transport in the areas I referred to in my earlier remarks. In many of those households there is no reticulated water other than water collected from the roof of the dwelling and stored in tanks or pumped from the ground to overhead tanks by wind pumps or other pumping apparatus. That situation must be redressed. There has to be a way in which this Government recognises the points I am making and addresses them in a positive way.

It is not good enough to say that these people took their chances and they have to put up with what they get. It is no fault of theirs. They are harder working than people on similar income levels in urban settings. Most of them are harder working than the majority of people living in urban settings who have jobs of their own. They must undertake more domestic chores to sustain their households than people in urban settings. Moreover, the amount of work they do to win their meagre cash income is greater than in urban households.

I put to the House today not so much a chronicle of the evidence that supports my contention that the problem exists—and not so much a list of why it has existed—but propositions of a positive nature which can address it. The people who live in those localities are, by and large, more successful innovators than those who live in urban areas. After all, they have lived through two rural reconstruction cum farm shake-out type schemes that have largely depopulated their communities. They were the people who could survive.

It was loudly trumpeted by the Government of the day that they could and would survive; that they had the ability and had demonstrated it over and above those who were reconstructed out of rural enterprises and/or their dependent service industries somewhere else in the world. What we must do is ensure that they have at their disposal the means by which they can provide to their children the opportunity for gainful employment. That does not mean job subsidy schemes or anything of that kind. What we must do is look at the ways in which those children, instead of being encouraged to go into urban settings with which they are unfamiliar, can be encouraged to stay in rural communities. We must look at ways of keeping as many of them as possible in the communities in which they wish to remain.

We need schemes like the one I am vigorously promoting and have always tried to promote in rural areas, that is, one of self-employment and self-help. A particular example is the MEDO (Mallee Enterprise Development Organisation) scheme based in the five District Councils of Lameroo, Pinnaroo, Peake, Brown's Well, and Karoonda-East Murray which will raise share capital as subscription from the savings of established families in those localities and not only using that money to support the development of local new enterprises (where someone has a good idea and rigorous management analysis shows it to be viable) but also encour-

age banks to lend, and guarantee such loans, to those new enterprises and entrepreneurial initiatives.

I have previously pointed out that this Parliament should recognise the sociological environment in which these people do not feel particularly disadvantaged—their great disadvantage is their lack of cash. They are materially very poor but they have a strong *esprit de corps* much greater than one would find in low income metropolitan suburbs such as Smithfield Plains, for example. We should establish a few Housing Trust homes in each of those communities. After all, the people who live in them—single parents or otherwise—may well have higher incomes than have people in the rest of the community already living there. My figures show that beyond doubt.

A few Housing Trust homes would bring children from outside into those communities. That would be a healthy experience for those children when compared to the life chances they would have of developing normal, healthy attitudes in a place like Smithfield Plains (and I do not mean to be terribly unkind to that area or to the people who live there), where clearly the rates of criminal activity and other aberrational behaviour among even juveniles is worse than it is in the rural areas I refer to. That would benefit not only the children who would come with their families but also the children already there.

It would sustain the numbers of children in the schools and prevent depopulation of the professionals who are essential to service those communities, including teachers, health care providers, and so on. It would ensure the continued viability of those essential infrastructure components in such communities. Moreover, it would enable us as a Parliament, and thus compel the Government, to retain instead of remove school dental services. What is more, it would enable us to retain hospitals instead of ripping them off and destroying their capacity to treat the people who put the bricks and mortar together to create them.

We should also consider more seriously and more compassionately the need for sufficient road funds to enable them to commute between where they live and where they may engage in community activities. They simply do not get a fair go at present—there are too few of us in this place who represent such communities. None of us can change the complexion of the Government because our seats will not change hands.

It is therefore neither just nor fair for the Government of the day of whatever political persuasion simply to say, 'It doesn't matter to us politically. It will not win us—or lose us—the next election, and we therefore need not pay attention to it.' We must in all fairness, in the name of justice and equity, address that question and that problem and thereby ensure that we can retain that population in those communities, provide it with that broadened economic base and uplift everyone's prospects of a better future than is the case at present.

Motion carried.

FIREARMS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendment No. 1 to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

BIRTHS, DEATHS AND MARRIAGES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

At 4.2 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 29 November 1988 at 2 p.m.