

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 21 February 1989

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.P. Trainer)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

## QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 5, 12, 31, 107, 112, 142, 144, 163, 168, 169, 175, 176, 178, 193, and 228.

## PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for the Arts (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

State Theatre Company of South Australia—Report, 1987-88.

By the Minister of Employment and Further Education (Hon. L.M.F. Arnold)—

South Australian Institute of Languages—Report, 1988.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

District Council By-laws:

Kingscote—No. 28—Kingscote Airport.

Lower Eyre Peninsula—No. 4—Caravans.

Millicent—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties.

No. 2—Taxis.

No. 3—Streets.

No. 4—Garbage Containers.

No. 5—Council Land.

By the Minister of Public Works, for the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Commercial and Private Agents Act 1986—Regulations—Licensing.

Commercial Tribunal Act 1982—Regulations—Jurisdiction and Register.

By the Minister of Public Works (Hon. T.H. Hemmings)—

West Terrace Cemetery Act 1976—Regulations—Fees.

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

Chiropodists Act 1950—Regulations—Elections and Registration.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: POLICE FORCE

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier)**: I lay on the table a copy of the directions of His Excellency the Governor to the Commissioner of Police concerning the control and management of the Police Force, and seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD**: His Excellency the Governor in Executive Council has issued directions to the Commissioner of Police pursuant to section 21 of the Police Regulations Act 1952. The directions provide for the establishment of an Anti-corruption Branch in the South Australia Police Force and its operational and reporting parameters.

The establishment of an Anti-corruption Branch follows the recommendations of the July 1988 report of the National Crime Authority arising from its investigations in this State. The report dealt with a series of operational matters and allegations which had come to the authority's attention in

the course of its activities in this State, or had been referred to the authority by the Commissioner of Police.

In addition, the report raised some concerns about the adequacy of previous investigations and measures that existed to identify corrupt practices, and to investigate allegations of corruption within the South Australian Police Force. In its report the authority makes a number of recommendations in relation to dealing with the issues of police corruption.

A central component of the Government's response to the report was the establishment of an office of the National Crime Authority in South Australia. The NCA Adelaide office will deal with operational matters and allegations arising from the July report and a number of other sources. With the securing of the NCA office in Adelaide, the Government has now moved to implement the National Crime Authority's recommendation that a specialist Anti-corruption Branch be established within the Police Force.

The specialist Anti-corruption Branch will target the prevention, detection, and investigation of corruption or misconduct within the Police Force. The Government further believes that the Anti-corruption Branch should have responsibility for investigating corruption of public officials generally and not merely that which may exist or arise in the Police Force.

An important feature of the directions issued by His Excellency is the provision for an independent auditor for the Anti-corruption Branch. This will ensure that the branch operations are subject to independent scrutiny, and help allay any community concerns that adequate action is not being taken when allegations of corruption against police or other public officials are made.

The Commissioner of Police has been consulted in the development of this initiative and it has his support. The directions to the Commissioner of Police essentially provide for:

- the establishment of an Anti-corruption Branch within the Police Force comprising an Investigation Unit, an Audit Unit, and any task force established by the Commissioner of Police to conduct specific investigations;
- the functions of the branch; including the investigation of the corruption of public officials, the investigation of police corruption and police misconduct, the auditing of police procedures and investigations, and assisting Government instrumentalities in developing practices and procedures designed to prevent or detect corruption;
- the requirement that the branch cooperate with other law enforcement agencies, the NCA, the Auditor-General, the Police Complaints Authority, the Ombudsman, and the Commissioner for Public Employment;
- the maintenance of branch records;
- the requirement that police cooperation and access to records be given to the external auditor appointed by the Governor for the purpose of conducting audits or undertaking inquiries requested by the Minister; and
- the Commissioner of Police to report to the Minister of Emergency Services on a six-monthly basis on the operations of the branch.

The establishment of the branch will, for the first time in South Australia, draw together the internal auditing and security functions of the force with the investigation of wider corruption. Importantly, the branch will operate under a well defined charter and be subject to specific external reporting and accountability requirements.

In the execution of its responsibilities, members of the Police Force are required to act in accordance with the law

and to exhibit a high degree of integrity. Compliance with the law and maintenance of standards of integrity are essential to public confidence in and the proper functioning of the Police Force.

The prevention, detection, and punishment of all forms of corruption are essential to the maintenance of good government, and the rule of law and public confidence in government, public officials, and legal processes. The formation of the Anti-corruption Branch is another important step in combating corruption at all levels.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MODBURY HOSPITAL

**The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS (Minister of Health):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS:** Last week the member for Morphett asked a question concerning an elderly patient who was transferred from Modbury Hospital to the Royal Adelaide Hospital and was subsequently diagnosed as having TB. The Opposition made a subsequent claim in the press that the patient's condition was not diagnosed at Modbury due to a shortage of funds. I wish to make clear to members that this was not the case.

Last Friday the clinician attending this patient—in fact he holds a senior appointment as a Visiting Medical Specialist at Modbury Hospital—stated on radio that this case was particularly difficult to diagnose for purely medical reasons; it had nothing to do with money.

The patient had very unusual symptoms. Extensive investigations for back pain, fever, and general debility were carried out by the doctor at Modbury Hospital and, when he could not diagnose what was causing the patient's symptoms, he referred him on 7 February 1989 to the Royal Adelaide Hospital Spinal Unit for a second opinion. A diagnosis of disseminated TB was established in consultation with thoracic medicine, and treatment started on 10 February.

This is a perfectly normal way to proceed, and it is to the medical specialist's credit that he took the time to publicly explain the situation. I deplore the Opposition's actions in engaging in a doctor and hospital bashing exercise in an effort to make cheap political capital.

As to the degree of infection spread, the Chest Clinic is already following up all known people who have been in contact with the patient. Appropriate therapy or follow-up will be offered where any abnormality is found. A list of staff and other patients in contact with the patient is being drawn up by the Modbury Hospital. These and their contacts will be checked as quickly as possible, and on two subsequent occasions over the next 12 months. The patient does not have a cough and is not producing infectious sputum, so his level of infection will be low.

However, as I said, the Chest Clinic is rigorously following up any known contacts, just as it does with the 100 or so cases of TB diagnosed in South Australia every year. While many South Australians are vaccinated against TB, the clinic takes all precautions with anyone who has been in contact with the disease by examining their health history, providing Mantoux tests, and, in the event of symptoms being present, providing a chest X-ray. It should be emphasised that these days TB is an eminently treatable disease which can be easily diagnosed and prevented from developing.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: GERONTIC NURSING COURSE

**The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS (Minister of Health):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS:** Over the weekend the Opposition claimed that training courses in aged care for nurses at the Hampstead Centre had been discontinued because of a lack of funds. Once again, we find that the Opposition cannot get its facts right. The truth is that as part of plans to revamp post-basic training for registered nurses, participation in the gerontic courses will be at least doubled.

The Royal Adelaide Hospital, which administers the Hampstead Centre, has reviewed its gerontic courses for both enrolled nurses and registered nurses. The assessment of the course for enrolled nurses was that it was inappropriately spread over a period of 12 months. It was considered that it would be better run over six months, and by adopting this format the hospital can more than double the number of enrolled nurses participating from around 14 to 30. This is not a cutback—it is an expansion.

In relation to the course for registered nurses, there has not been a suitably qualified nurse educator available to continue the course. In addition, there has not been a great demand for the course from registered nurses in Hampstead—most students have been from outside. As a result, the RAH is now looking at incorporating the course into the Statewide gerontic course being run by the Health Commission at the Continuing Education Centre (based at Glenside).

This will expose the students to wider clinical experience; there will be no restriction on the number of registered nurses participating in the course; and it will achieve these improvements with the same amount of funding. These measures are what I call good management. They are not, as the Opposition chose to misrepresent them, 'severe cutbacks' or a 'scandal'.

#### QUESTION TIME

##### ACTU WAGES POLICY

**Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Minister of Labour advise whether the South Australian Government supports the ACTU policy for a wage rise of \$30 a week next financial year and the claim by the Trades and Labor Council for more parental leave including five days paid leave a year for employees to care for dependants?

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** I thank the Leader for his question and advise the House that the Government has made no decision in respect of those two matters.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

##### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN INTERNATIONAL

**Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide):** Will the Minister of State Development and Technology advise the House on the status of the South Australian International proposal outlined by the Government in the 1985 election campaign? What has been put in place to assist our exporters and how successful has the State been in increasing exports? In yesterday's *News* the Leader of the Opposition is quoted as saying that the Government has broken its commitment to

provide a new drive for exports by not establishing South Australian International.

**The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD:** I thank the honourable member for his question. It is interesting to note that obviously the Leader and the Deputy Leader do not talk to each other. In fact, I am of the opinion that it was not the Leader's vote that allowed the Deputy Leader to retain his position as Deputy. If there was a close relationship between them, the Leader would know that I answered a question on this matter before the Estimates Committee in 1987; and he would know that that precise question was dealt with at page 479 of *Hansard* of that year. It identified exactly what has been put in place. The concept of South Australian International was to ensure the growth of exports from South Australia, and it had the judicious application of support by Government to enable that to happen.

Before the last election, included amongst the proposal, was the broad concept of South Australian International, and immediately after the last election we talked with bodies involved in export to discuss what the concept should involve in its exact details. Exporters in South Australia said that they did not want another trading house added to the range of trading companies already available in South Australia. That was their expert opinion—the opinion of people involved in export and in wanting to sell the goods of this State overseas. The Government, listening to that, quite accepted that there was not a role for a Government trading house. But, as a concept, SA International involved very much more than that.

SA International involved the selling of our expertise and the selling of South Australia overseas, and a great deal has happened in relation to that. Let us take a look at Sagric International. One would believe that the Leader of the Opposition has never heard of Sagric International: one would believe that the Leader does not know what that body has been doing very successfully for a number of years. In March of last year the South Australian Cabinet approved the amalgamation of Sagric International with the Adelaide Innovation Centre, to beef it up and to give it more capacity to sell our expertise internationally. That was publicly announced at the time, but it is quite clear that 'Groucho Marx' did not bother to read that.

The other point that needs to be noted is what else the State Government has done in this regard. First of all, we have had a number of very successful overseas trade missions—led by either the Premier or by me—which have been bringing back many sales to South Australian firms. A number of appointments have been made in the Department of State Development. Most recently, Roger James has come from the Austrade area, and previously Hugh McClelland also came from the Austrade area—and a number of other such appointments have been made. We have appointed a new representative in the Thai market, the second fastest growing economy in the ASEAN region, with our representation of Loxleys (Bangkok). We are doing other things in terms of promoting South Australia's educational and medical expertise. That, alongside of the support given by such bodies—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD:** Clearly, members opposite do not want to hear what is happening. I will tell the House in a minute why they do not want to hear; it is because there is a set of very pertinent figures that will come out in just a minute, and so they must bide their time for these figures. Other Government funded initiatives, such as the Centre for Manufacturing and the Technology Development Corporation, have been adding to the capacity of industry

and business in this State to win export sales—and that is precisely what has happened.

If one looks at the figures over the period of the former Tonkin Government, one notes that exports from this State declined; they declined dramatically, over a three-year period, by some 20 per cent. Under this Government, for 1983 to 1987-88, exports did not decline. Not only did they not decline but they grew by 76 per cent. That is in part a function of the pro-active stance that this Government has taken. The concept of SA International and of a Government assisting industry and business to get out there and sell internationally has well and truly been lived up to, is in place and is working for South Australia.

**Mr GUNN:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker. I draw your attention to the Standing Orders and to previous rulings you have given: the Minister has now taken five minutes to answer a Dorothy Dix question, he has gone far beyond what is necessary, to explain the matter clearly and he is now entering into an area concerning the previous Tonkin Government. Fortunately, he and his colleagues had no control over the operation of that Government. I ask you to rule the Minister out of order, Sir.

**The SPEAKER:** I ask the Minister to wind up his remarks as soon as possible.

**The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD:** Certainly, Mr Speaker. Let it be noted that the member for Eyre has at last got his name in *Hansard*!

#### Mr TERRY CAMERON

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham):** My question is to the Premier.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has the call.

**Mr. S.J. BAKER:** I ask this question in view of further information put to the Opposition in recent days about the activities of Mr Cameron. The Opposition has had contact with a former council inspector in the Willunga and Aldinga area who has confirmed that there were many complaints made about houses built by Mr Cameron. One house in Butterworth Road, Aldinga Beach, was in fact condemned because of problems with the damp course, timber fittings and plastic gutterings, and water seeping in because the floor level was too low. The former inspector has informed us that the Port Noarlunga council, as well as the Willunga council, would have records of complaints from tenants and buyers of homes from Mr Cameron, and that inspectors of the former Builders Licensing Tribunal also had made complaints about Mr Cameron's activities.

I also refer to the case of a person who purchased a block in Humphreys Road, Aldinga Beach, next to a block owned by Mr Cameron. At the time, a new fence divided the two blocks. The Opposition has seen documents showing that the fence valued today at a cost of just over \$600, was erected on 3 May 1978 between lots 785 and 786. Mr Cameron immediately sought from the new owner of the adjoining block, a pensioner couple, half payment for the fence, and this was promptly provided.

However, at some time in the first week of July, within two months of the fence being erected, it was dismantled. On inquiring with Mr Cameron, the owner of the adjoining block was informed that the fence had been moved to another block on which he was building a house. It seems that he shifted fences to put around his houses. He promised to replace the fence taken away. But, when he did so, it was made of old material and was structurally unsound. After

repeated, but unsuccessful, attempts to get Mr Cameron to put up another new fence, the matter was taken up with the police, the Ombudsman, the Legal Services Commission and the Willunga council.

On approach to the Willunga council, the owner of the adjoining block was told that Mr Cameron was destroying the area with his own building activities. This person who had a fence she half owned effectively stolen by Mr Cameron is now in her mid-seventies and does not wish her name to be brought into this matter. Soon after the events I have just related, she sold her block in frustration at being unable to obtain redress against Mr Cameron. During her unfortunate experience with him—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I caution the honourable member that, in the course of giving a chronology of what he perceives to be a sequence of events, he does not comment on the matter. The honourable member for Mitcham.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** During her unfortunate experience with him, a real estate agent gave her reason to believe that Mr Cameron made a regular practice of moving fences around properties on which he was building houses.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** There he goes again! He has been demoted but is so encouraged by being on the front bench that he still gets up and prattles on in the same sort of way. This matter has been dealt with on a—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Premier will resume his seat. The honourable member for Mitcham was able to put his question before the House in an atmosphere of reasonable courtesy. The Premier should be entitled to the same courtesy as part of his reply.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The honourable member—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable Deputy Leader that to interject in the manner in which he just did after the House has been specifically called to order is tantamount to defiance of the Chair.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** On a point of order, Sir, the Premier was being deliberately provocative—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair does not accept that as a point of order. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The member for Mitcham and other members of the Opposition well know what is being done in this instance. They well know that a proper investigation is being conducted, as a matter of urgency, which will elicit the facts. Notwithstanding that, they will get up day by day—and I prophesy, Mr Speaker, that there will be bits and pieces of this sort of thing, and we may even get some more questions now—in order to put allegations on the record as if they were fact, with no opportunity for anybody to put any other side of the case; to put those allegations on the record in this place and make sure they get a run in the media, pre-empting the investigation that is taking place in the proper way.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I note, although I did not hear the substance, the interjection from the member for Alexandra—which surprised me. But it also surprises me that the member for Mitcham in asking his question says unctuously that the Opposition has been informed by those in the Willunga council area (or words to that effect). In fact, as I understand it, it is more than 'informed by people in the Willunga council area'. There has been an attempt by the Opposition (and that is fine; if members opposite want to do their own investigations, good luck to them) to try to bring together and get hold of any pieces of information

that it can put forward in the House, unsubstantiated, with no right of reply at all.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** With no right of reply at all.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Mr Speaker, we will see when the report—

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I understand, for instance, that a particular dwelling that was referred to by the Opposition last week was not owned by Mr Cameron, as was alleged, and had not been owned by him for eight years.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** No one said it was owned—

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Yes, they did indeed. The question was, 'How is it that Mr Cameron said he did not have any current holdings of property when this property was there?' I suggest that the member for Alexandra listen to what is said. He did not ask the question—he should have asked this one.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** He should have asked this one, because it was the member for Alexandra who contacted the Assistant Director of the department's Consumer Affairs Division requesting a number of documents, which he said he wanted to have.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier will resume his seat. I warn the member for Alexandra that the Chair cannot tolerate continued interjections of that nature. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I am surprised that the member for Mitcham asked the question when the member for Alexandra has obviously been trying to do the research. He contacted the department and requested that he have these documents, because he wanted to check out some things. The very fact that he wanted documents in order to check out something indicates surely that he is not 100 per cent sure of even the information that he has. It is quite reasonable—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I suggest he should have waited. What I find a little more disturbing about this witch-hunt—this bit of muck raking—is that these sorts of efforts are being made often contrary to the statutes under which the Public Service, and in this particular case the Consumer Affairs Department, operates. The fact is (and the honourable member should know it, because he has been in this place long enough dealing with legislation—and so should his colleagues who have egged him on in the process) that under the Act governing these things it is not possible for such information to be provided. The Fair Trading Act prohibits the provision of documents to outsiders. So, in fact, he was asking—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** It is no red herring when this little witch-hunt is going on.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Typed in the Leader of the Opposition's office!

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Where was that typed? I would be interested—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Mr Speaker, I am being shown a document—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Where was that document typed? Did you get that from the Leader of the Opposition? Did you get that from the Leader?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition that, if he persists in his unruly behaviour, he will be named.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Mr Speaker—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Will the Premier please wind up his remarks?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Mr Speaker, I am trying to address the substance of this. I make the point that members opposite are determined to pursue this matter. I suggest to them that, if they are fair dinkum, they should wait until the appropriate report has been completed, until the proper investigation has taken place—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** —instead of placing before this House hearsay matters of events that presumably took place some 10 or 11 years ago on which a proper investigation is being carried out.

#### STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

**Ms GAYLER (Newland):** Can the Premier tell the House of any plans that the State Government has to reduce the number of statutory authorities and Government regulations in operation in South Australia? Earlier this month the Leader of the Opposition was quoted in the *Sunday Mail* as saying that nothing was being done to cut red tape in Government departments.

The article reproduces a list of organisations which the Leader said should be abolished. It has been put to me that some of the organisations listed had in fact already been abolished. As the author of South Australia's first deregulation report, I am keen that the Premier tell the House the real story.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I shall be glad to do so, as the story is a good one. I am amazed at the misrepresentation or apparent lack of knowledge of any kind shown by the Leader of the Opposition on this matter of deregulation. First, he lumps together a whole series of statutory and other authorities and confuses organisations created by statute or regulation with those that are simply the internal working arrangements of any department. Indeed, he lumps together the State Bank, the Office of Employment and Training and the Major Project Steering Committee, which is in fact coordinating work within Government and is not a regulatory body in that sense.

Aside from that, the Leader's second point is one of the most remarkable. He published in this article a list of organisations which he said should be abolished but, when I checked through the list, I found that one of those organisations, the Vermin Control Advisory Committee, was abolished as long ago as 1975—14 years ago. That was a neat little bit of research! The Leader overlooked the fact that the Hairdressers Registration Board, the Builders Appellate and Disciplinary Tribunal, the Builders Licensing Advisory Committee, the Builders Licensing Board, the Land Brokers Licensing Board, the Land Brokers Business Agents Board, the Land Brokers Valuers Licensing Board and the Second-hand Dealers Licensing Board had all been abolished and those matters were now dealt with by the Commercial Tribunal. There is the extraordinary thing: those are in his list

of things that apparently are to be abolished—very nice indeed!

Let us pick up the Leader's third point, which suggests that he has been in some sort of time warp for the past two years during which a number of major initiatives have been put in place in deregulation. Actually, it is probably not true to say that the Leader has been in a time warp: he has been totally preoccupied with seeing that deregulation is resisted because during that time he has, successfully in some cases but unsuccessfully in others, opposed the deregulation of the Potato Board, the Egg Board, petrol trading hours, retail trading hours, and I am not sure what else. Further, I understand from a motion foreshadowed by one of his colleagues today that Opposition members are also concerned about any deregulation of the Wheat Board. All those things must be treated on their merits, but that has been the preoccupation of the Opposition—to try to hang on to regulation whenever deregulation has been suggested.

In the meantime, in April 1987, two years ago (and the Leader includes this in his little article which unfortunately was reproduced as if it was up-to-date), legislation was passed in this place the result of which has been that 60 per cent of the regulations which were made prior to January 1960 and which expired in January this year have been allowed to lapse. Indeed, they are off the books. In September 1987, 18 months ago, my colleague the Attorney-General announced a number of major initiatives which provided that all legislation establishing statutory authorities would be reviewed within the next four years. That is in addition to the automatic sunset provisions that we have already put into statute form.

Regulation reviews are taking place which affect 34 statutory authorities. In that respect, I shall be keen for the Opposition to let us know which ones they think should be abolished. Indeed, I should like the Opposition to give us such a list as soon as possible: it will aid our consideration of this deregulation process. I know what will not be on the list—the Egg Board, the Potato Board, and a number of other organisations. I should be interested to see that. I would have thought that, rather than an article complaining that nothing had happened, we would have an article acknowledging that substantial progress had been made in the past two or three years and that the only real bar to such progress had been the attitude of the Opposition.

#### Mr TERRY CAMERON

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Premier instruct the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs to have his officers investigate the extent of the Premier's complicity in not pursuing an investigation into the activities of Mr T. Cameron and, to this end, specifically to seek access to the ALP State Executive's records of a meeting which, according to the Party's Vice-President at the time, Mr George Apap, rejected an inquiry into these allegations; and will the Premier reveal to the House whether he participated in any executive vote or any discussions within the Party in relation to allegations against Mr Cameron, and does he deny that he voted against any such investigation?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I am delighted to see the Deputy shoring up his position with another tough attack. This will encourage people such as the member for Bragg and others to realise that he is the man for the job despite—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I am delighted to hear it. I am also delighted that the Deputy Leader has discovered Mr

George Apap as some kind of oracle of what happens and somebody worthy of support—that is fine. I make no comment on that or Mr Apap's allegations; I simply say that as far as the procedures are concerned in this instance an investigation was undertaken, as I announced to the House last week, by the Commissioner for Public Employment. The investigating officer has interviewed all appropriate persons during the past week and the conclusion is that there has been evidence of maladministration or neglect of the particular matter and action will be taken concerning that under the provisions of section 68 of the Government Management and Employment Act.

So, that issue has been dealt with—and dealt with immediately—and appropriately—it was brought to our attention. In relation to this question and the earlier question by the member for Mitcham, I make the point, which has been made directly to the Leader of the Opposition by the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs who wrote last Friday to the Leader of the Opposition saying that if he has any information he would like it put before him and he is quite happy to send an investigating officer to interview such learned persons as the member for Mitcham who no doubt, provided the right brief has been typed out for him in the Leader's office, will be able to reply to those questions. In doing that, Mr Neave is giving effect to the undertaking I gave last week in the House which was that, rather than try to grandstand with questions in the House, if there is substantial information put it before the Commissioner and he will investigate it.

#### FARM SAFETY

**Mr ROBERTSON (Bright):** Given the number of accidents occurring on South Australian farms, will the Minister of Labour say what steps can be taken by his department to inform South Australian farmers on safety issues and to curtail the toll of injuries to farmers and their families? During 1988, I am aware of two articles in the *Farmer and Stockowner* which dealt with this issue: the first published on 24 August entitled 'Farm injury death rate—big worry to authorities' and the second on 19 October under the title 'Farming safety record hit'. Both those articles state that the South Australian rural industry accounts for some 17 per cent of work related deaths in this State despite the fact that agricultural workers represent only 5 per cent of the State's total workforce.

It has been put to me that this represents an unacceptably high proportion of work-related injuries, as well as a cost to the State's productivity which is unacceptable and a loss of foreign exchange for the country, not to mention the needless toll of death and injury and the unnecessary financial hardship to farmers and their families.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** The incidence of deaths on farms in South Australia last year is of great concern to the Government. Last year five people died as a result of work-related accidents, two being under the age of five years. In my opinion, those five deaths were caused by people having inadequate knowledge of handling what essentially is dangerous machinery and also by a refusal on the part of some people to install appropriate safety equipment and to adopt safe working practices.

So far this year one farm worker has died so, in just over 12 months, six people have died. Representing 5 per cent of the work force and 25 per cent of the work related accidents which occurred in 1988, that is an unacceptably high proportion. Earlier this year I discussed this matter with representatives of the United Farmers and Stockown-

ers, which agreed that it was an unacceptably high death rate, and we discussed the best way of curtailing that high rate.

People experienced in occupational safety and health will confirm that the death of workers represents the pinnacle of a triangle, with injuries declining in severity as the triangle widens towards its base, and that, if any of those components can be reduced, so can all the others.

The current death rate indicates a total lack of appreciation of how to work safely. Farm workers are involved in a complex situation, because in addition to operating dangerous machinery they also have access to dangerous chemicals which are sometimes not stored appropriately, and sometimes they do not understand what they are using and what it can do to them. This lack of understanding does not mean that they are ignorant; rather, they are not properly informed.

My discussions with the United Farmers and Stockowners were on the basis of providing regularly to the farming community information available to the Department of Labour and the Occupational Health and Safety Commission. Department of Labour officers and representatives of United Farmers and Stockowners will meet to work out a program for publicising such information in every issue of the United Farmers and Stockowners journal on a five year rolling basis. We hope that that in itself will assist in reducing the number of accidents, and I certainly hope that that proves to be the case. The Government has also instituted a code of safe working practices in the rural industry. The Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act provides a code which applies only to machinery. We have asked the commission to establish a committee, and it has done that, its terms of reference including the following:

1. To advise the commission on current and future priorities and strategies of hazard control which are relevant to the rural industry.
2. To identify issues of particular concern to the rural industry and provide a regular reference point on these and *ad hoc* issues which arise and to suggest means by which they could be resolved.
3. To consider existing data and make recommendations for the improvement of reporting, data collection and research for examining the cause and incidence of injury and disease in all relevant groups within the industry.
4. To comment and make recommendations to the Occupational Health and Safety Commission regarding regulations, codes of practice and guidelines which affect the rural industry.
5. To consider training needs within the rural industry and advise on appropriate training and methods to enhance access to courses.
6. To advise on ways of improving consultation within the rural industry and between the industry and the commission.
7. To consult through officers of the commission with relevant Government bodies at State and Federal levels.
8. To contribute to and liaise with other advisory committees and working parties established by the South Australian and national Occupational Health and Safety Commissions in relation to matters affecting the rural industry.

Discussions I have had with farm leaders other than those whom I met early in January indicate that they view with concern the frequency and severity of accidents in the rural industry. Such accidents have a dramatic effect on the family farm where the male is usually the only worker on the farm. If those workers are injured to such an extent that they can no longer work, it sometimes means that the viability of the family unit is destroyed and that they have to sell and leave the farm. We do not want to see that happen, and I am sure that the Opposition, although it has not asked any questions about safe working practices in the rural industry, will encourage its members in the rural community to be involved in this committee's work and to assist in reducing the level and severity of farm accidents.

**Mr TERRY CAMERON**

**Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition):** In view of the Premier's answer to the previous question, indicating that one or more public servants will be charged in relation to the failure to pursue an inquiry into allegations regarding Mr Cameron, will he immediately table the report prepared by the Commissioner for Public Employment in relation to this matter and say whether this decision means that the Government accepts no responsibility whatsoever for the failure to follow up Mr Smith's initial report into this matter?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** It is not appropriate for the report to be tabled as it will form the basis of the disciplinary proceedings provided under the Government Management and Employment Act.

**Mr Olsen:** The public servant is a scapegoat.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Nobody is a scapegoat. The procedures are established under the Act. If the Leader is suggesting that one simply condones any kind of maladministration, I am very surprised indeed. Our Government certainly does not. The proper procedures were not observed in this case and in consequence a disciplinary investigation has been recommended. That will take place. As to the responsibility of ministerial officers, I can only refer the Leader to my answer to a question last week in which I stated that there was no appropriate follow up by my office. So, I am bound to take some responsibility—and I said that last week. The issue about which we are talking, namely, the appropriate investigation of a matter, is very different from a follow-up inquiry to see what progress has been made on the matter which has not been reported.

**FAMILY ALLOWANCE SUPPLEMENT**

**Mr TYLER (Fisher):** Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask her Federal counterpart, the Minister for Social Security, to review the eligibility criteria for the family allowance supplement and, in particular, the aspect of the criteria which stipulates that eligibility is determined on the basis of the family income for the previous financial year and only takes into account current income if it has reduced by 25 per cent or more from the previous financial year?

I have been approached by several constituents who have recently applied for the family allowance supplement and find that, because of changed family circumstances, they are either not eligible for the supplement or that the amount they are eligible to receive is reduced. They acknowledge that the introduction of the family allowance supplement is a great benefit to families on low incomes and that, for most people, the fact that eligibility is determined on income for the previous financial year is more than fair.

However, in some circumstances that criterion causes problems. For instance, one constituent explained to me that during the last financial year both she and her husband were working. My constituent ceased her part-time job a couple months into this financial year just prior to the birth of her third child. This constituent finds that she is only eligible for a part payment of the family allowance supplement because, although she is currently earning no money, taken over the entire financial year their combined income has dropped by only 18 per cent rather than the 25 per cent stipulated in the Social Security Act.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I will be delighted to take up the matter with my Federal counterpart the Minister for Social Security (Hon. Brian Howe). I understand what the member for Fisher is saying with regard to the eligibility

criteria. I am sure that other members of the House are also aware of the situation, having had constituents raise this matter with them. Whilst I certainly support the Federal Government's initiative in introducing the family allowance supplement, it is indeed a great benefit to families on low income. I am sure that every member of this place would support the introduction of this very important initiative—in setting the criteria it is important to ensure that the very people the Federal Government wants to assist are not suddenly disadvantaged by their changed circumstances.

I am informed that entitlement to the family allowance supplement in a calendar year is based on the family taxable income for the previous full financial year. While I acknowledge that this provides a simple and readily accessible means of providing assistance to families, particularly where family income fluctuates due to such things as periodic overtime and seasonal employment, the requirement that family income decrease by at least 25 per cent from the previous financial year before an adjustment can be made may disadvantage a number of families on what I would call a marginal income. The member for Fisher has in fact pointed out one such example of a constituent in his area. In real terms, the drop in income required for reassessment in fact represents a drop of more than the 25 per cent when the consumer price index increases are taken into account in relation to this amount.

I believe that a review of the eligibility criteria for the family allowance supplement which examines the possibility of reducing the existing requirement to significantly less than the 25 per cent may ensure better targeting and equity in the administration of the payment. However, I will ask the Federal Minister to look at reducing the requirement that the preceding full financial year be taken into account: I will ask that instead the preceding three months be taken into account. I believe that would be a more appropriate and fairer method of assessing the entitlement. In response to the member for Fisher, I indicate that it is for those reasons that I will be very pleased to write to Brian Howe and ask him to consider implementing an immediate review.

**Mr TERRY CAMERON**

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** Will the Premier ensure that the inquiry into the activities of Mr T. Cameron establishes how many complaints against him were made to the Builders Licensing Board and why those complaints were not acted upon?

In his ministerial statement last Wednesday, the Premier said that the Government had been given no reason to believe that allegations against Mr Cameron required follow-up. However, there is evidence that complaints involving Mr Cameron were made to the Builders Licensing Board over an extended period.

In his interim report, Mr K. Smith refers to 'threats' made against inspectors of the board by 'persons associated with Mr Cameron'. The Opposition has a lawyer's letter showing that four years before this matter was first raised publicly the activities of Mr Cameron had been referred to the board. This letter was written on behalf of a couple who had bought a house at Magill built by Mr Cameron. It sought action to repair a range of defects. Importantly, the letter contains the following statement:

At the advice of your Mr Cameron, they approached the builder, Mr H. Egtberts, and despite numerous attempts to have the effects made good, and a complaint to the Builders Licensing Board, no remedial work has been completed.

I understand that other matters relating to Mr Cameron were also referred to the board and yet it appears that no

action was taken until this matter was raised in the House last week. I submit to the honourable the Premier the lawyer's letter so that he cannot dodge the answer.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Light knows that his last remark was out of order.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I have no intention of dodging the question—none whatsoever. I have no motive to do so. On the contrary, I suggest that the honourable member should take up the invitation that the Chief Executive Officer, Department of Public and Consumer Affairs, has made to the Leader of the Opposition, and provide that letter, whatever its relevance may be. The investigation is being undertaken by the Chief Executive Officer. He has complete authority to investigate how, where and when he likes. I am looking forward to seeing his report.

### HOUSE PRICES

**Mr RANN (Briggs):** My question is to the Minister of Housing and Construction.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr RANN:** The Leader has obviously seen his latest poll results.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr RANN:** Will the Minister of Housing and Construction inform the House whether the median house price in Adelaide is \$94 000, and what impact this would have on would-be first homebuyers in this State? In a front page article in the *Sunday Mail* of 19 February the present Leader of the Opposition linked monthly repayments of \$922 for first home buyers to the average house price of \$94 000. This figure is considerably higher than the \$63 000 house at Paralowie which the Minister was promoting in last week's *News*. My constituents will be most interested to know the reason for this discrepancy.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMING:** If the Leader of the Opposition, who put out that information to the South Australian public, is prepared to sit and listen, I will educate him as to the difference between what he calls the average price of houses and what the experts in the real estate industry (the Housing Industry Association, the Master Builders Association and Government statisticians) call the median price. What the Leader is quoting is the total value of all the sales divided by the number of those sales. So, if someone buys a house worth, say, \$500 000 in Walkerville, North Adelaide or Kadina, that would greatly inflate those figures.

Anyone in touch with the industry would know that the most reliable measure to use is the median price. For the Opposition's benefit, the median price is the half-way mark. To put it in terminology that the Leader of the Opposition would well understand, the median secondhand tractor price is the half-way mark. That means that, if the Leader of the Opposition sells 50 per cent of tractors at less than the figure quoted, then 50 per cent are at more than the figure quoted. That puts it in terminology that the Leader understands.

The median price for single unit houses in metropolitan Adelaide in the past three months to December 1988 was \$84 300—considerably less than the average house price of \$94 000 quoted by the Leader. The median house price for home units was \$67 800. Over this period the Housing Trust was selling dwellings to its tenants for considerably less than the median price. The average price of single units in the December quarter was \$54 052. The average sale price of double units to tenants was \$37 144.

Admittedly, trust dwellings are modest, but they provide South Australians who have not had a chance to get into home ownership with an opportunity to do so. However, to be generous to the Opposition, I will give the House some figures based on dwellings available to all South Australians to buy. On the median house figure of \$84 300 which I quoted previously South Australians could still take out a loan with the State Bank at 13.9 per cent for the first year. If the buyer borrowed 75 per cent of the purchase price, he would be making a monthly mortgage repayment of \$759—way under the scare tactics figure of \$922.31 put out by the Leader of the Opposition. He even included the cents.

If buyers chose instead to go for a unit at a median price of \$67 800, they would be paying \$594 per month—still considerably less than the Leader's figure. For the \$63 000 four bedroom house which I promoted last week at Paralowie (which is just outside the electorate of the member for Briggs)—and the Leader may not have seen that—people would be paying about \$578 a month, provided they had the 25 per cent deposit.

Members would be interested to know that 41 per cent of all residential sales in the three months to December 1988 were at prices under \$70 000. That price is similar to the price of the house at Paralowie. The Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party are deliberately trying to panic people into believing that there is a major housing crisis in South Australia. It is blatant opportunism of the worst kind, playing on people's fears. The Leader of the Opposition is an expert at that.

South Australia's first home buyers have access to the lowest house prices and interest rates on the mainland. Those are not my figures: those figures come from the Real Estate Institute of Australia. South Australians have access to the lowest house prices and interest rates on the mainland, yet the Leader of the Opposition goes out and tries scare tactics. One of the Leader's mistakes was that he kicked the member for Hanson in the guts and sacked him: the member for Hanson was the only person who, under my training, was developing a reasonable attitude to housing in this State. However, the Leader chose to ignore that. In November 1988 South Australians took over 7 800 house loans, a 25 per cent increase over the previous November figure, and building approval figures tell a similar story.

In the three months to December 1988, approvals for new dwellings showed a 50 per cent increase over the previous December figures, an increase from 1 600 to 2 400 approvals. Despite the Leader of the Opposition, South Australians are obviously recognising that home ownership is still a viable proposition in this State. I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to ask the member for Hanson to release his files so that the Leader can better understand housing matters.

### BELAIR RECREATION PARK

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** Can the Minister for Environment and Planning say what is the current price charged by the Department of Environment and Planning for the lease of the golf course and hotel complex within the Belair Recreation Park? Is the Government seeking an increase in this price in the current negotiations to transfer the lease to a Malaysian or some other foreign syndicate? What is the name of the syndicate and will the Minister give a guarantee that, if the lease is transferred, no restrictions will be imposed on public access to the park course and that there will be no increase in fees greater than the CPI?



**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I will obtain the information for the honourable member. I do not have all those details in my head. I can certainly give an assurance to the honourable member that the golf course is part of the park and, as such, there will be no attempt in any way to restrict public access to it. I will obtain the rest of the information and bring it down.

### SEA WATER POLLUTION

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** Can the Minister for Environment and Planning inform the House whether he has investigated land practices on land adjacent to the Torrens River and other suburban river outlets in order to prevent pollution of the sea at Henley Beach and other areas? I have received correspondence from Mr Peter Gilbert, Secretary, Marine Life Society of South Australia, who has suggested that the Government take action by tightening rural land practice adjacent to streams in order to prevent mud entering the sea and causing pollution. It has been suggested that, after a rain storm, mud enters the sea from the Patawalonga and Torrens outlets at Henley and Grange and that the main reason for this is the rural land practice which takes place adjacent to both these streams.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** A little bit of information is available. I understand that the gentleman who approached the honourable member also wrote a letter to the newspapers not so long ago. Very briefly, the argument goes like this: the Torrens River once discharged its water on to the Cowandilla plain; in the 1930s the breakout creek was built and, as a result, that water with its accumulated load of sediment and so on now goes out into the gulf. In addition, the argument would run, as a result of more intensive agricultural and other practices along the banks of the Torrens River (and I believe this gentleman was also in part targeting the River Torrens Linear Park scheme) there is a greater entry of silt into the river, and that in turn goes out into the gulf.

This matter is being investigated. I can tell the honourable member and the House that the readings taken so far not only at Seaview Road but also adjacent to the Patawalonga and adjacent to one or two of the storm water outfalls (because, of course, there are other outfalls down through Brighton and so on) do not suggest that there is something peculiar about the Torrens River, that there is a considerably higher average level of turbidity—water from the Torrens River—than from these other outfalls. This is by no means conclusive. Of course, there would be more sediment entering the gulf from the Torrens River than from these other outfalls simply because more water is discharged from the Torrens than from the Patawalonga or the other outfalls, which are mainly associated with the south-western suburban drainage scheme.

However, the amount of turbidity per cubic metre, or something like that, appears not to be significantly greater coming from the Torrens than it would be from other sources. Nevertheless, this matter is being further investigated and, if it proves that the turbidity from the Torrens has risen considerably in recent times, we are faced with a complex set of land use control problems, because not only are we talking about rural practices, but through much of its suburban course the Torrens flows through residential areas.

**The Hon. J.L. Cashmore:** And industrial.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Residential, including industrial. It has even been suggested that the outlet should be blocked up and that the water should again be discharged

into a terrestrial environment, but I do not see how that could occur, because virtually no land is available onto which it could occur even if this society was prepared to countenance the sort of costs that might be involved. So, the whole matter is still being investigated and we may have on our hands a reasonably complex problem that will require a set of responses and not just one quick fix. I shall try to keep the honourable member and the House informed.

### IRRIGATION LICENCE FEES

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** How does the Minister of Water Resources justify a 1 000 per cent rise in licence fees affecting irrigators whose pipelines occupy departmental land? I have been approached by a constituent at Loxton who has been informed that the cost of renewing this easement licence is to rise from \$10 a year to \$100. After protesting to the Minister about this 1 000 per cent rise, my constituent has been told in writing that the fee has been set at a level which allows the department to recover only administrative costs. This reply has left my constituent wondering why it costs the department this much in administration costs for an easement which is just over 3 metres wide and less than 100 metres long. Under the licence, the irrigator is responsible for the installation, operation and maintenance of the pipeline, with the result that the department's responsibilities are virtually nil and cannot possibly be costed at anything like \$100 a year.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I am not personally aware of the case to which the honourable member refers and I shall be delighted to get a report at the earliest opportunity and provide him with that information.

### OSBORNE BULK HANDLING BERTH

**Mr PETERSON (Semaphore):** Can the Minister of Marine advise the House of proposals for the future of the Osborne bulk handling plant and the employees at that site? Osborne is the major solid bulk general berth in Port Adelaide and for some years there has been doubt about the continuing operation of the plant there. It is common knowledge that discussions have been held with the Waterside Workers Federation regarding the employment of some employees at Osborne and also with users of the berth concerning alternative unloading sites. As I have received numerous queries from people wishing to know what is to happen, can the Minister clarify the situation?

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** I thank the honourable member for his question. The bulk handling plant at Osborne is nearing the end of its mechanical life and the cost of replacing it would not recover the cost of operating it and also the cost of servicing the debt raised.

There is also a tendency to have self-unloaders on ships, and it is proposed that, when the appropriate arrangements can be made, those workers who want to will transfer to the general pool of labour which the Association of Employers of Waterside Labour has at Port Adelaide. Those who do not want to will be redeployed within the Department of Marine and Harbours and other Government departments. Until such time as an appropriate arrangement can be worked out between the Association of Employers of Waterside Labour and the department, nothing can be done in that respect. The employees have been assured personally by me that they will have continuity of employment irrespective of what happens at the bulk handling plant. They recognise that the plant is ageing and becoming inefficient, and that call for its use is reducing.

**PASTORAL LAND MANAGEMENT AND  
CONSERVATION BILL**

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria):** In view of the Government's regulation review procedures which require the preparation of a Green Paper as part of the prior assessment process on proposed new Acts of Parliament, will the Minister table a copy of the Green Paper on the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Bill so that the cost benefit of the legislation can be established? Will she reveal who was consulted—

**Ms GAYLER:** A point of order, Mr Speaker. I believe that the Bill referred to is before the House on the Notice Paper and that the question is out of order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair is of the view that the question was not anticipating debate but was merely asking questions about ancillary matters—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! —associated with the Bill. The honourable member for Victoria.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. Will the Minister reveal who was consulted so that the cost benefit of the legislation can be established. Will she reveal who was consulted in the preparation of the Green Paper and, if a White Paper was also prepared, will that be tabled, too? This information is essential before legislation on this vital issue can be effectively debated.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I hope that I am not going to transgress in any way with respect to Standing Orders, but in answering the question I would like to say that a Bill is already before the House with respect to the care, practice, management—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** —and control of pastoral lands. The newly appointed shadow Minister of Lands has not contacted me to receive any briefing in respect to the portfolio of lands—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** —and I find it interesting that the Leader and the Deputy Leader find this amusing, when in fact the heir apparent to the leadership has contacted me with respect to briefings on the water resources portfolio. So, it is not unusual and it is not something which should be laughed at. I would have thought—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I will answer the question—  
**An honourable member:** When?

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** In my own time. I believe it is entirely appropriate that someone who purports to be the shadow Minister or the shadow spokesperson on an area as important as lands in this State should have made some contact with me to provide him with a briefing. But no, what we have seen instead is this same shadow Minister making quite untrue and outrageous statements in the media. I realise that this will cause some embarrassment to other members opposite, but a number of them have taken up my offer of a briefing with respect to the Pastoral Bill—which has already been introduced into Parliament and will be debated tomorrow—and have been provided with a very thorough briefing, which lasted quite some time. I must inform the House that the shadow Minister of Lands did not seek and has not had a briefing and obviously knows nothing about the matter. With respect to the consultation in relation to this legislation, I take members back to the early 1970s.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** That is exactly where they still are.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the Government front bench to order.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I thank my colleagues for their support, but I do have an understanding of the history of this matter.

**An honourable member:** When are you going to demonstrate it?

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** You stay around and watch tomorrow and you will see a demonstration of it. I do not wish to cast any aspersions on any previous Ministers—and that goes for both sides of the Parliament—but I believe that I have consulted more widely on this matter than probably anyone to date. I have visited the pastoral lands; I have met with pastoralists on their home territory; I have listened; I have made amendments to the draft Bill with respect to those particular matters; and I have also consulted widely with the UF&S, conservationists, and the Four-wheel Drive Association.

I believe that there has been more community consultation on this Bill than on many other pieces of legislation, and I find it amazing that this pretender to the shadow Ministry does not even have the decency to admit that he knows nothing—absolutely nothing—about the legislation. We are talking about a millionaire farmer from the South-East—a multi-millionaire who does not know anything about pastoral lands. I believe that the Leader of the Opposition has made a grave mistake. He has made a grave mistake by removing the member for Eyre who, to his credit, understands pastoral issues.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order.

*Mr Olsen interjecting:*

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION: Mr TERRY CAMERON**

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Alexandra.

**The Hon. T. CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** It is all right, Premier; it is not another question. This afternoon—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair was given earlier during Question Time an intimation that the member for Alexandra would, at a later stage, seek leave to make a personal explanation. I would anticipate that the member has had sufficient experience to be able to use the forms of the House in the proper manner.

**The Hon. T. CHAPMAN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I seek your leave and that of the House to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister of Transport is out of order. The member for Alexandra.

**The Hon. T. CHAPMAN:** During Question Time this afternoon the Premier alleged that my efforts to obtain certain information from the Department of Consumer Affairs were inappropriate. He alleged further that my efforts to gain that information were only to sustain claims that the Opposition had made in the meantime. In both cases he was wrong. My efforts to obtain information from the Department of Consumer Affairs were perfectly proper. The specific information I required was that which was provided last year to the Department of Consumer Affairs by the District Council of Willunga and which is public material.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. T. CHAPMAN:** Excuse me!

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Alexandra has leave to make a personal explanation uninterrupted.

**The Hon. T. CHAPMAN:** The reason for the request to the Department of Consumer Affairs for that material was that it had taken the Willunga council a considerable period of time and a lot of manpower to search that material, all of which related to the Cameron-built houses in its district. In order to avoid further search and repetition of that effort it was put to me by the mayor that the material requested last year had been provided, it could be provided again by the council, but to avoid that effort I might care to ask for the public material—I repeat—from the Consumer Affairs office. When that request was made, they ducked for cover. They raced to the Commissioner—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. T. CHAPMAN:** This is an explanation following the allegations made earlier by the Premier. I was disturbed about the manner in which he made those allegations. These are the facts. The officer whom I contacted consulted his commissioner who ultimately rang and said that he would not provide the material. I do not propose to canvass the reasons for his refusal, but they cover public material at that level and I will not have the Premier or anyone else make allegations about actions which I have taken quite responsibly, bearing in mind that the Terry Cameron houses which are referred to—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The limits placed on a personal explanation restrict the member to canvassing the claims that very directly relate to his allegedly having been misrepresented.

**The Hon. T. CHAPMAN:** All right, Mr Speaker, I will not pursue that matter any further. The foundation for this whole area of concern to which the Premier alluded when he alleged misbehaviour on my part really stems from the district which I formerly represented. I am not now the member for Aldinga Plains, but I am the member for the district which is largely occupied by the council in question. I was the member for that district throughout the period dating back to the mid 1970s when Terry Cameron moved into the area as a developer.

**The SPEAKER:** Call on the business of the day.

## SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time allotted for—

- (a) all stages of the following Bills:  
Stamp Duties Act Amendment,  
Superannuation Act Amendment,  
Pastoral Land Management and Conservation,  
Arthur Hardy Sanctuary (Alteration to Boundary)

and

- (b) consideration of the amendments of the Legislative Council in the State Transport Authority Act Amendment Bill—

be until 6 p.m. on Thursday.

Motion carried.

## STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 February, Page 1930.)

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** In its drive to encourage Housing Trust tenants to purchase the property in which they live, the trust has discovered two anomalies under the Stamp Duties Act in relation to waiving stamp duty for first home buyers. The Rental Purchase Scheme is jointly administered by the State Bank and the Housing Trust and is designed to assist low income tenants purchase a home. With a minimum deposit of \$500, the trust acquires a property for the purchaser, who then enters into an agreement for sale and purchase with the Housing Trust. Payments which are equivalent to home loan repayments are then made to the trust by the purchasers. The title of the property is transferred to the occupant after the last repayment is made. This reduces costs in time of default and avoids lengthy and embarrassing procedures in case of foreclosing mortgages.

Because the house is not transferred immediately upon the signing of the sale and purchase agreement to the rental purchase buyer, that person is unable to claim a rebate on stamp duty if it is their first home. Section 71c of the Act refers to this situation. The other Housing Trust scheme compromised by the Stamp Duties Act is the Shared Ownership Scheme, which was established in August 1986. The scheme assists trust tenants to purchase part or eventually all of their trust home in affordable stages, beginning with an initial 25 per cent share. First option to repurchase is currently held by the trust on properties which, due to their design or location, would be difficult to replace.

As Section 71c of the Stamp Duties Act allows only one exemption for first home buyers up to \$50 000, tenants participating in HOME trust shared ownership are eligible for concessions on stamp duty on only the first purchased share, as are other home buyers. Of course, this disadvantages those buyers.

As most purchases under HOME trust shared ownership are less than \$50 000, tenants purchasing subsequent shares are disadvantaged by comparison with normal first home buyers receiving full certificate of titles. Tenants participating in this scheme will receive less benefit from stamp duty exemptions than higher income purchasers in the open market. This, clearly, is not the intention of the Act and nor is it how I understand the scheme.

The amendments to the Stamp Duties Act will permit the Housing Trust tenant's occupation of the dwelling house which they are buying as a reason for claiming stamp duty concessions rather than the present requirement where they must intend to move into the house, as they are already in occupation. The existing provision has caused difficulties when Housing Trust tenants have sold their interest in the house and moved out. However, the amendment ensures that an interest under the agreement with the trust relating to the purchase of a particular house is not considered to be relevant in consideration of proposed section 71c of the Stamp Duties Act.

The third amendment will allow the concession on a series of conveyances under the one agreement for the purchase of a Housing Trust home. The final amendment provides that the legislation should come into effect on 1 February 1988 in order to rectify the status of applicants who have been rejected since that time.

I was somewhat disappointed that, during the Minister's second reading explanation, he did not canvass the reason why the retrospective date was included in the legislation. Normally, the Opposition opposes retrospectivity but, in this situation, it benefits first home buyers and we would be very loath to do anything which would upset that arrangement. I believe that such an anomaly should be rectified by Parliament.

About 10 applicants for HOME, shared home ownership and rental purchase Housing Trust houses have been discovered as being eligible for full remission of stamp duties up to a valuation of \$50 000 of their first home purchase. To assist these applicants, the trust has paid the stamp duty for six rental purchase scheme applicants, and four shared ownership cases are also affected.

We would like this benefit to be available to all first home buyers. We do not want to see these 10 families disadvantaged and nor do we want to see any other future purchasers of HOME ownership being disadvantaged under this scheme. There is no doubt that, if Housing Trust tenants and young families are in a position to purchase their own home, the whole community benefits. Any benefit which would assist in this area should be strongly supported by this Parliament. For that reason, the Opposition supports the legislation.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee. Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Concessional rates for first home buyers.'

**Mr M.J. EVANS:** I move:

Page 1, lines 14 to 33, and

Page 2, lines 1 to 13—Leave out clause 3 and insert new clause as follows:

**Insertion of s. 71cc**

3. The following section is inserted after section 71cb of the principal Act:

*Exemption from duty in respect of Housing Trust homes*

71cc (1) An instrument of which the sole effect is to transfer an interest in a Housing Trust home from the South Australian Housing Trust to its tenant in that home is exempt from stamp duty.

(2) The Commissioner may require a party to an instrument in respect of which an exemption is claimed under this section to provide such evidence as the Commissioner may require for the purpose of determining whether the instrument is exempt from duty under this section.

(3) In this section—

'Housing Trust home' means residential premises owned by the South Australian Housing Trust.

This amendment is somewhat more sweeping in its scope than that proposed by the Government. I support the provisions which removed the anomalies as identified and, in the event that my amendment is not supported by the Committee, I would support the alternative proposed by the Government, because I believe that it significantly improves the present position. However, I believe that now is an appropriate time for the Parliament and Government to propose a more sweeping provision in respect of stamp duty so as to provide a much greater level of encouragement for Housing Trust tenants to take the step of purchasing their own home from the Housing Trust.

It is quite clear, in the area that I represent and in the area adjoining Elizabeth represented by the Minister himself, that many of the tenants, particularly those in double unit houses who have been renting for many years, would very much like to purchase the house that they have made their home but which is still owned by the Housing Trust and for which they are likely to have to pay rent for the whole of the time that they live in the property. That rent will go up year after year. We have seen the trend of rental payments in recent years, and that trend is clearly upward. At the moment we have a guarantee that they will rise no more than the CPI, but that guarantee lasts no longer than the length of this Parliament which, even on the most optimistic construction, is no longer than March or April 1990. The case for tenants purchasing their house becomes clearer and clearer.

Despite the present difficulties with interest rates, that is ultimately in the long cycle of economics not a permanent phenomenon and quite clearly the advantage which accrues to tenants from their own purchase is substantial. Unfortunately, many of those same tenants are in the position of

being unable to raise substantial amounts of funds in the initial stage of purchase. The deposit is a significant handicap to them and stamp duties represent a substantial payment. Also, the Housing Trust administration fee is a significant cost, as is the cost of sewerage separation and the like in some of the double units. They are significant hurdles. Many tenants are on pensions, benefits or perhaps have a substantial family and are unable to meet many of the initial capital costs and therefore continue to rent, even though on a weekly or monthly basis they could meet the mortgage repayments necessary to purchase the property. However, they are unable to meet the one-off capital costs at the beginning of the process.

One of the ways in which we could substantially assist these people is by abolishing stamp duty on such transactions. The Government, of course, has not planned for a substantial inflow of stamp duty as it is not part of the normal course of events in this business. Housing Trust houses would normally continue to be rented and one would not have expected the Government to make substantial plans in its budget for massive payments of stamp duty. It would be a very appropriate measure for the Government to adopt at this time, thus creating renewed and strengthened interest in the sale of Housing Trust houses to an additional group of people above and beyond those who have already purchased. The purchases to date have been significant and very important. They will reflect a significant step forward in many local communities.

Additional groups of people out there are no longer able to take that initial step and clearly it would be a significant way for the Government to help them. For that reason I put forward this wide ranging amendment to the Government's Bill and commend it to the Committee.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I point out to the Committee that the question before the Chair is that clause 3 stand as printed. So that the member for Elizabeth can proceed with his amendment, that proposition needs to be defeated. If it is defeated, he can proceed with his amendment. However, if it is not, his amendment is knocked out.

**Mr BECKER:** Will the Minister advise the Committee how many defaults there have been to date under the Rental Purchase Scheme and the shared ownership scheme? In his second reading explanation the Minister states:

The title of the property remains in the name of the Housing Trust until the purchaser makes the final payment. This reduces costs in times of default and avoids lengthy processes in foreclosing a mortgage.

Will the Minister advise the Committee how many defaults there have been in respect of both schemes?

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I do not have information on how many people have defaulted under the Rental Purchase Scheme or under the shared ownership scheme. As I am sure the member for Hanson is aware, that is not the reason for these amendments; they seek to overcome an anomaly that exists and is relevant in the first instance for those using the rental purchase scheme because they will be able to pick up the benefit of stamp duty exemption. I will obtain that information for the honourable member as soon as practicable.

New clause negated; clause passed.

Clause 4 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 February. Page 1931.)

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham):** On behalf of the Opposition, I support the Bill. We debated the new Superannuation Act in 1988. It was a complex Bill and required much attention. Some of the amendments I put forward at that time were not successful and others highlighted at that stage still need to be examined in the fullness of time. However, this Bill addresses some anomalies that have occurred since the operation of the new Act. Most of the propositions contained herein are worthy of consideration.

The first major amendment under consideration is that dealing with the situation where a person under the Government Management and Employment Act resigns to take up a position in another authority. The problem exists if a break in service occurs without there being a natural transfer. The amendment tidies up that situation. Also, problems exist with school teachers on contract where there is a break in service due to the end of a school year. The Bill allows that situation to be handled. An anomaly has arisen with respect to the level of pension that can be received while the recipient has other forms of income. Previously the Act was silent on this matter, but it is now proposed that there cannot be double dipping in the system. If forms of remuneration reduce the pension, that situation is made clear under the Act.

As honourable members would remember, during consideration of the original Bill there was considerable debate about the claims on an estate by either a lawful or putative spouse in the case of the death of the contributor. The Act is now to be amended so that if one person has been paid out the other cannot receive the benefit. Interestingly, it was not picked up at the time that there was no means of getting money to pay out of the consolidated account the amounts necessary to cover the Government costs of the pension scheme. A provision in this Bill now allows for the appropriation of revenue to meet the employer costs of the benefit.

The legislation also specifies that a minimum number of contributory points must be earned before the scheme applies—that is, 360 points at the standard rate. For the benefit of members, I point out that the contribution points accumulate at the rate of one per month at the standard rate of 6 per cent. So, if we do a calculation, we are talking about a 30-year requirement. The legislation also prevents the payment of long service leave and recreation leave payments at the same time as a disability pension is in force. The rules also make it clearer that the temporary disability pension cannot be paid to a contributor after reaching the age of retirement.

I would have assumed that some of these matters now being brought before the House would have in fact been part and parcel of normal day-to-day procedures. I recognise that they are now being spelt out in the legislation, but I would have thought that they did not need to be in the Act—but perhaps it is better that they are, and the Opposition supports these propositions.

Another matter that is canvassed is that a person on higher duties can receive the benefit of the higher salary in terms of pension benefits but does not have to pay the appropriate contributions. The Opposition will make some further comment on that in Committee. Overall, the Opposition supports the proposition before the House. However, the Opposition has a number of questions about the actual amendments and about certain things which were not explained in the second reading explanation and which need clarification. With those few words, I indicate the Opposition's support for the Bill.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE (Coles):** My colleague the member for Mitcham has canvassed the principal provi-

sions of the Bill. I simply want to say that, following our support for the original Act, it is pleasing to learn from the Public Service Association that, although the Act has not been in operation for one year yet—with consequently no statement of accounts or report from the investment trust—generally the Public Service appears to be well satisfied with the Act and its operation. It is interesting that since the operation of the Act from 1 July last year there have been 1 302 new applications to join the scheme. This number compares most favourably with the 294 applications for the corresponding period in the previous year. It looks as though public servants are voting with their feet to indicate their support for the scheme.

It is clear that one of the compelling reasons for this support is the simplicity of the scheme, its effectiveness, and its competitiveness with any private scheme. I might be saying this prematurely, before the first report comes out, but I would say that, although the scheme may not be designed specifically to appeal to women and to those who are employed on a contract basis, and to those in lower paid jobs, in fact, the scheme does appeal to those groups, who are supporting it in significant numbers.

It certainly makes sense to clarify the aspect of the legislation in relation to those who are employed on contracts and who, without these amendments, would not be able to maintain their membership of the scheme, despite their continuing periodic employment with the Government. It is also sensible that the Act should be designed to encourage rehabilitation and re-establishment, by enabling people in receipt of an invalidity or a retrenchment pension to earn a limited amount of income to supplement that pension. In the long term, that is good housekeeping and is a provident provision on the part of the Government which generally uplifts the financial security and independence of individuals who have been employed in the Public Service and who might otherwise become more and more dependent on government for income support.

The Public Service Association regards the simplicity of the new scheme and its superiority by comparison with any scheme that public servants may be able to enjoy in the private sector as being the principal reasons for its popularity thus far. As the member for Mitcham said, this is essentially a Committee Bill, and a technical one at that, so the Opposition will confine its further remarks and questioning to the Committee stage.

**The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS (Minister Assisting the Treasurer):** The contributions from members opposite were quite interesting. I hope that that was not a foretaste of what is to come, where we appear to have two people vying to be Opposition spokesperson in this area. The member for Mitcham said that the Opposition will support the Bill, and then came the member for Coles saying that the Opposition supports the Bill. She was a little bit late to the desk, as I am quite sure that the member for Coles would have wanted to be the leading light. It is very flattering that such a small Bill as this has attracted such keen competition from the Opposition as regards its lead speaker. Nevertheless, I thank both Opposition spokespersons for their general support of the Bill. I want to pick up one thing that the member for Coles said, and I refer to her comment to the effect that, whilst the scheme was not designed particularly to attract women and lower paid workers, it is having that effect. I am quite sure that the member for Mitcham would tell the member for Coles that that is precisely what the scheme is about.

**The Hon. J.L. Cashmore:** I said that it wasn't designed exclusively for that.

**The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS:** That is not what the honourable member said—if she wishes to amend *Hansard*, please do so, but the record will show that the word ‘exclusive’ was an afterthought. Nevertheless, this is very welcome: indeed, the scheme was designed to attract lower paid workers; and it was designed to attract women. One could have thought that the previous scheme had been designed by highly paid men for highly paid men—and by and large they were the only people who were in the scheme. So, it was by definite Government policy that the scheme was made attractive to women and it is attractive to lower paid workers.

I believe that the State superannuation scheme will be seen as one of the major reforms of this Bannan Labor Government. There will be many others but, as I had something to do with this one, I believe that it will be a lasting reform. Again, I thank both Opposition spokespersons for their contributions.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—‘Interpretation.’

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** Will the Minister explain the practical application of this clause in the case, say, (as exemplified in the second reading explanation) of a contract teacher whose employment ceases at the end of an academic year and does not resume until the first, second, or third term of the following year? As I understand it, contract teachers are not paid their salaries in the same way as permanent full-time staff are. At what stage does the teacher know whether he or she will have contributions deducted, and at what stage is the Government contribution made in terms of the continuity of that employment?

**The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS:** The period provided for in the amendment is three months, and if the contract teacher gets a contract within three months, that is continuity. If not three months, then the person will be considered to have resigned.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** As this is critical to the future well-being of a number of people, and a number which is growing because of the increasing proportion of teachers on contract work rather than in permanent employment, will the Minister indicate the proportion of teachers on contract who are likely to be able to obtain some benefit from this clause, as distinct from those whose contracts might have regular gaps of three, six, or nine months?

**The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS:** I do not have those statistics with me. I will confer with the Public Actuary and possibly also the Minister of Education to see whether those statistics can be made available to the honourable lady.

**The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:** Is that three month period three working months or does it include the holiday period?

**The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS:** Calendar months.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I am concerned about subclause (b) which seems to be a change in the arrangements under the original Act that we agreed to last year. It now says that certain allowances—and it is almost a double negative—can be prescribed out of being exempt. That means that by prescribing them out they become part of salary. Why has there been a change in this provision, and are there certain areas which the Government wishes to have included under salary which have not been included there before?

**The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS:** There is a problem with the salary and allowances of one particular individual. As I understand it, allowances have always been allowed for superannuation purposes. Inadvertently, that individual’s allowance is no longer allowed for superannuation purposes. It was an oversight in the original Bill.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Will the Minister clarify exactly what we are talking about? As far as I am aware, such things as travel, accommodation, and other subsistence allowances were never part of the old superannuation scheme. As far as I know, there was agreement by all parties concerned that, unless there were some loadings in the salary component for particular working conditions, overtime components, or particular casual working relationships, all other matters would be beyond the scope of salary. If we now open up the ambit of this Act to include such things as a car that might be made available at the time, or some accommodation that was provided because someone had gone to the country, we will have grave difficulty in determining how far the Act extends.

**The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS:** I can assure the honourable member that, except for this one specific instance, which was an oversight, nothing else has changed. We have not opened up the area where allowances, etc., can be included for superannuation.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I thank the Minister for his assurance. Another item I wish to pursue relates to the definition of ‘salary’ and also impacts on the ability for contract people to have continuity of service for superannuation. Subclause (c) provides:

... (and such a regulation may exclude remuneration of a particular kind for the purpose of calculating contributions but provide for its inclusion as a component of salary for the purpose of calculating benefits);

As the Minister is well aware, this creates a difficulty in terms of people being required to contribute at the standard rate of 6 per cent of salary.

Is the Minister now saying that, if they are required to contribute at the standard rate of 6 per cent of salary and if they are on higher duties for two years, they shall have the benefit of those higher duties in the final pension or remuneration without paying the price that other people are required to pay? I consider that to be unusual, although I note that the second reading explanation suggests that the old Act contained such a provision.

The old Act had many problems but did not make provision for lump sum payment. I am not sure that it is relevant for the second reading explanation to say that this measure was part of the old Act. I am also concerned that, if people are part of a superannuation scheme to which a large amount of money comes from the public purse, the benefit accrues in this form on the basis of moneys paid in and on the basis of contribution at the standard rate rather than as a result of some adjustments that are made at the end of the day to top up someone’s pension because of a higher duties salary. Under these circumstances, if higher duties pertain, I would consider it appropriate for the contributor to pay in the balance owing plus interest to ensure that he or she receives a higher pay out.

**The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS:** By and large, contributions are not deducted at a higher rate for a person on higher duties. On most occasions, people acting on higher duties return to ordinary duties, and we would need to pay back odd dollars, which would cost more administratively than the cost of the benefit. However, if the higher duties period is of 12 months or more, we believe that it is worthwhile for the Superannuation Fund to receive higher contributions so, accordingly, a higher benefit is paid. However, for a short period it is not worth the administrative disruption.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 and 5 passed.

Clause 6—‘Disability pension.’

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** With respect to the clause just debated, I make the observation that the regulations will specify the shortness of the period, which was not explained in the

context of the second reading explanation. Clause 6 contains a measure whereby recreation leave or long service leave cannot be paid while a person is on a disability pension. I cannot conceive of any circumstance in which that would occur, because a person on a disability pension loses all rights to those benefits. I accept the amendment, but I ask the Minister to explain why it is necessary.

**The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS:** I understand that the problem occurred within the Education Department, where people would go on long service leave and subsequently apply retrospectively for a disability pension, and receive it.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 to 10 passed.

Clause 11—'Division of benefit where deceased contributor is survived by lawful and putative spouses.'

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** This provision stops double dipping, but it causes me some concern in that the onus is on the spouse to make a claim against the board before the pay out is made. I understand that the board does not want to pay out the same amount twice to two conceivable beneficiaries. This measure was debated long and hard, and it was left to the board to make a decision on the basis of the cohabitation procedures laid down. Can the Minister explain how this will work if the board does not have a claim before it from one party who may have a more legitimate claim than another, and makes a pay out? Does this absolve the Crown from making a mistake? If a mistake is made, this provision states that the Crown is not liable to pay out the sum twice. Can the Minister explain the administrative procedures that will be followed to ensure that the people who are entitled to receive the benefit actually do so?

**The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS:** This is clarification: the board has some concern that if it pays out to a spouse and it could find that 20 years ago the deceased had a putative spouse who is suddenly knocking on the board's door and saying, 'I was a putative spouse and I want my share', I am advised that this provision will ensure that the board does not have to pay twice.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The Opposition will have to study this matter and consider amendments in another place. The Minister has said that the board is not responsible for its own actions if it has paid out on a claim that has not been thoroughly checked or for which insufficient effort has been made, so that this provision absolves the board from responsibility.

The board is almost a trustee in this situation. When we place our affairs in the hands of a trustee company, there is a responsibility on that company to ensure that the wishes of the estate are met. That is not quite as clear in the situation with which we are dealing here, but nevertheless the same proposition should hold, that is, that on the death of a contributor people with some reasonable claim on that fund should have the right to claim and all possible measures should be entertained to ensure that the recipients receive the benefit to which they are entitled. This provision clouds the issue a little more because it provides that, once the board has made the decision and paid out the money, that is the end of it and no-one can come back to claim. It is important that people who have that right are allowed to exercise that right. The board should not have a cop-out provision such as that contained here. On advice, this matter will be examined and perhaps pursued in another place.

**The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS:** I will be delighted to have the matter examined in another place. (I am sure that it will be examined whether I am delighted or not.) The fact remains that the board can only check so much. If a spouse appears and makes a claim on the deceased's superannuation, generally that spouse is in need of money. How can the board

check what happened 20 years ago? Perhaps a person is in another country. Who knows? How does the board do that? To what length does it go, especially while the spouse is waiting for money? That is the dilemma. Whilst the board makes every reasonable check, there is no way to follow this through other than by having an army of police to try and track down all previous friends, relatives, connections, living arrangements, and so on. It is simply impractical.

There is only a limited amount that one can do and there is an obligation for the board to take all reasonable measures to ensure that the person who is making the claim is the only person who is entitled to make a claim, but there is a limit to what the board can do. If the process is lengthened so that every possible connection that the person has had in life with a partner is covered, the board would never pay out anything, or the person entitled to the superannuation is waiting for it while sometimes in financially distressed circumstances. Whilst I am sure the other place will take great delight in picking over this matter, I hope that members there will read *Hansard* to see the problem with which this clause is designed to deal.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I thank the Minister for his response, and recognise the innate difficulties to which the Minister refers. It may well be that, if someone is contributing to the scheme, on the nominating form or on an updated basis the person provides certain details so that, when the person passes away, it would be relatively simple for the board, on the advice of the information on the form, to establish whether there is more than one person with a claim on the funds. With those few words I thank the Minister for his response.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (12 to 16) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

[Sitting suspended from 4.12 p.m. to 4.17 p.m.]

#### STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

- No. 1. Page 1, line 20 (clause 3)—Leave out '8' and insert '6'.
- No. 2. Page 1, lines 23 to 27 (clause 4)—Leave out paragraph (a).
- No. 3. Page 2, line 1 (clause 4)—Leave out paragraph (a) and insert paragraph as follows:  
'(a) an interest in a strata unit or a strata corporation.'
- No. 4. Page 2, lines 4 and 5 (clause 4)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert 'but no other shares or interests in the capital of a body corporate'.
- No. 5. Page 2, lines 6 to 8 (clause 4)—Leave out subsection (6) and insert subsection as follows:  
'(6) The Authority cannot acquire any security issued by a body corporate except with the prior approval of the Governor.'
- No. 6. Page 2, line 30 (clause 8)—Leave out 'sections 25, 26, 27, 28 and 29 of the principal Act are' and insert 'section 27 of the principal Act is'.
- No. 7. Page 2, line 33 (clause 8)—Leave out '25' and insert '27'.
- No. 8. Page 3, line 7 (clause 8)—Leave out '26' and insert '27a'.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 1 to 5 be agreed to.

Amendment No. 1 deals with penalties. The Legislative Council considered that the penalty in the original Bill was not high enough, and recommended that there should be a division 6 fine. The Government will accept that amendment. Amendments Nos 2 to 5 deal with the powers of the authority to be involved in various commercial activities.

The original provisions of the Bill were recommended by the Crown Law office in order to clarify the powers it considered already existed in the Act. However, the Legislative Council in its wisdom having decided that those provisions should not be supported by Parliament, the Government has accepted that view. Nevertheless, the powers already contained in the Act will remain there, although they will not be clarified as suggested by the Crown Law office. For these reasons, the Government accepts the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 1 to 5.

**Mr INGERSON:** The Opposition congratulates the Government on its acceptance of these amendments because they were originally moved in this place by the Opposition. Therefore, Opposition members consider that these amendments will improve the legislation. One of the clauses in which the Opposition has a specific interest restricts the investment of the corporation in strata units and strata corporations. This is an excellent amendment, and we congratulate the Government on accepting it. The other clause in which the Opposition has a specific interest ensures that the Governor shall be involved in acquiring any security issued by the body corporate. As I said, we congratulate the Government for recognising how good the Opposition's amendments are.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 6 to 8 be agreed to.

I will move consequential amendments if this motion is carried. When various amendments were carried in another place, confusion arose in that two provisions in the Bill now relate to the same matter. When Opposition members in the Upper House moved these amendments, they would have anticipated that all their amendments would be agreed to. That was not the case and, unless further amendments are made, both sections 29 and 27 will deal with summary offences and expiation. Section 27 also includes the provision for the STA to waive expiations should it decide to do so. Thus section 27 which incorporates the Government's wishes and which has been passed by both Houses supercedes section 29. Therefore, section 29 should have been deleted in another place. I will move amendments in that regard.

Motion carried.

Clause 8—'Payment of fares and charges.'

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I move:

Page 3—Line 22—Leave out '27' and insert '27b'.

After line 31 insert new clause as follows:

8a. Section 29 of the principal Act is repealed.

I will not repeat the explanation for my moving these amendments. As there is already a section 27, the new section must be 27b.

Amendments carried.

## ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide):** This afternoon I would like to pay tribute to the Lord Mayor of Adelaide, Mr Steve Condous, for the initiative he took at lunchtime in launching a campaign called 'I say no to drugs' which is designed to raise money for accommodation and other programs for homeless young people in South Australia, particularly in the inner suburban area of Adelaide.

I pay tribute to the Lord Mayor not just because of his personal commitment to the plight and circumstances of

young homeless people on the streets of Adelaide but also because he is doing two important things. First, by becoming publicly and actively involved in the 'I say no to drugs' campaign, he is sending out an important message to young people and, secondly, he is involving a number of major community organisations and individuals. That is important, because the position of Lord Mayor is highly respected in the community and this message to young people is a statement that established people within the community accept that it is appropriate and proper to say no to drugs of any sort. The fact that the Lord Mayor has been joined in his campaign by the State Government—certainly by me and by many other people—is a positive social message from those holding public office for the time being.

The 'I say no to drugs' campaign will run for at least two weeks, concluding on 5 March with a major public concert outside the Adelaide Town Hall—a drug and alcohol free concert. The alcohol free concerts run by the Lord Mayor for the past two years have been an outstanding success. As I said earlier, they have sent a strong message to young people but they have also sent a strong message about the positive benefits of family groups engaging in a number of entertainments in the public arena.

The other characteristic of the Lord Mayor's initiative is interesting; by trying to incorporate in this campaign a large number of people from the corporate sector, the Lord Mayor has extended the notion of social responsibility. He has extended to a wider audience the acceptance of some sort of responsibility for social dislocation. The fact that a wider audience is becoming involved is good for two reasons: it is good in the immediate sense in that more people are prepared to make a financial contribution towards overcoming some of the consequences of the social alienation and dislocation of young people as a result of their early life experiences; it is also important in the sense that, rather than a number of social ills being seen as the Government's responsibility, because of the efforts of the Lord Mayor they are being seen as a community responsibility.

A number of social problems, or social ills if you like, fall into this category. The two that come into focus in this campaign are drug abuse and homelessness, but I am sure that we could think of many others where the community must accept a collective responsibility for the consequences of social dislocation, making a collective effort to overcome the difficulties faced by the individuals involved.

It is important that the community make a collective contribution, not just for the sake of homeless individuals or those who are drug dependent but also for the community itself. Unless the community acts as a collective whole in defence of its collective interest, it is very difficult for a Government to accept the responsibility of providing all the money for the various counselling and support facilities. I believe that the Lord Mayor has done a wonderful service to the community by trying to involve more people. There has been an extraordinarily generous contribution by many business houses in South Australia to the campaign to assist young homeless people on the streets of Adelaide.

The *News* today indicated that \$300 000 had been raised. This afternoon, at the launch at the Town Hall, the Lord Mayor listed the firms which have made substantial contributions to the campaign. I seek the leave of the House to have inserted in *Hansard* the names of those 48 major sponsors of this campaign so that we have on public record in this place the major effort that they have made to combat the problems of drugs and homelessness.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Can the honourable member assure me that the material is purely statistical?

**Mr DUIGAN:** It is a list of names.



**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Chair is in a dilemma, because it can only accept a list of statistics. I am afraid that at this stage I cannot accept that the material be inserted.

**Mr DUIGAN:** I accept your ruling, Sir. Unfortunately, time prevents me from reading the 48 names into *Hansard*, but they include some of South Australia's major banks and private companies. There have also been significant contributions from others in the private sector.

Last week the Minister of Community Welfare, in answer to my question about homelessness and the provision of emergency accommodation, listed a number of the efforts of the South Australian Government by way of financial contributions and the provision of staff to this area of activity. It is substantial. In excess of \$500 000 has been provided in the past financial year for the provision of emergency accommodation for up to 100 young people within the City of Adelaide. There are support services—counselling, health guidance, health advice, welfare advice and personal guidance programs—to provide or re-establish a concept of self-esteem and a degree of confidence within these young people which they will need if they are to become part of the community. There are also employment and training-related programs through which it is hoped that the opportunities that in the past have been denied to these young people will be able to be taken so that they can again become part of the community.

I was impressed by the Lord Mayor's speech. He wants to provide these young people with the opportunity of making a real and meaningful contribution to society. They have had bad life experiences. They do not necessarily like the kind of lives that they are leading. They are leading a survival-type life. It is the responsibility of all people in our community, and particularly in public life, to ensure that the services are available to enable these young people to become part of society.

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I am pleased to have the opportunity to take part in this grievance debate, because there are two matters that I should like to draw to the attention of the House and of Ministers in particular. The first relates to difficulties which the Jamestown High School is experiencing with the stadium which was constructed only a short time ago. The school community and the district were pleased when approval was given. A considerable amount of local input was involved to ensure that the building was constructed, and it has had a tremendous amount of community use.

However, the standards set by the Department of Housing and Construction appear to leave a lot to be desired. Those responsible for the management of it have expressed concern about the safety of those who use the building. It is quite deplorable that this situation should occur after less than a couple of years of operation. Following my visit yesterday, I received a letter from the school. The letter, which is on the letterhead of the Jamestown High School Council and bears today's date, reads:

Attention: Graham Gunn

Further to your visit to Jamestown High School stadium I would like to bring to your attention—

that the school parents and friends committee are currently in the process of recommending the stadium be closed to use by students as it is hazardous;  
the local basketball club of 200 players are threatening to boycott its use even though they are involved in their finals series.

The following are the structural problems that we believe are putting the students and community at risk:

1. There are constantly bricks falling from the top layer of the wall and it has been found that large sections of the walls move quite freely in areas where the cross-ties are supposed to hold the wall firm. Movement of up to 5-10 centimetres is not

uncommon in some sections. We would suggest that the walls are capped and fastened.

2. There is a lack of support at all the doorways. Should be reinforced with a column structure. (Suggested by local builder/concerned parent.)

3. Lack of expansion joints on the outside wall of the office storeroom. Not adequate for the length of the wall.

4. The extremely dangerous condition of the floor in this building continues to be a major problem, and has been since the stadium was first opened. The work was deemed unsatisfactory early in 1988. There would be well over 200 tiles that are no longer stuck to the floor and others are constantly coming out. Apart from this many are now twisted and sticking up. This is causing a very dangerous situation which could result in injury to our students or members of the community that use the facility. We believe the floor needs to be replaced and the tiles should not be glued to the concrete but instead laid on marine ply board. We have tried having the tiles reglued to no avail.

In view of the fact that well over \$200 000 of public money has been invested, this is a serious matter. This sort of building has been constructed in many parts of the State and provides valuable public facilities, for which there is a demand. However, it is absolutely essential that the Minister of Housing and Construction, whose department is responsible for drawing up the specifications and requirements for a building of this nature, as well as being involved in the supervision, immediately send his officers to Jamestown to make an on-the-spot inspection and that he take immediate action to rectify the problems, particularly those relating to safety hazards as outlined by the school parents and friends committee.

It should not take a visit by the local member of Parliament before some action is taken. In the past the community has tried unsuccessfully to have the situation rectified. Yesterday they invited me to inspect the building, which I was only too pleased to do, and I requested that they put their complaints in writing so that they could be brought to the attention of Parliament and the Government.

I believe that, by the end of the week, the Minister should have officers visit the site in order to rectify these problems. The question of who is to pay for those repairs is then a matter for the Department of Housing and Construction. The school and the parents should not have to pay for design faults in the building. There are grave deficiencies in the design and specifications, because the walls should not move when someone pushes them with their hand; nor should bricks fall from a height of six or seven feet. It is ludicrous.

If this occurred with a private builder, there would be grounds for action to be taken. The Department of Housing and Construction was involved in this stadium's supervision and, therefore, it is the responsibility of the Minister to ensure that appropriate action is taken. I hope that this is the only stadium in my electorate that is having these problems. The Government, through the Education Department, is still funding the building of these stadiums across this State, and action should be taken to ensure that the specifications are examined by competent people so that further stadiums will not have these design problems.

The parents and others involved have acted quite properly and responsibly. They have sought advice about these matters and are concerned about the safety of the people using this stadium—and that is a quite proper concern. I hope that I do not have to bring this matter to the Minister's attention again.

Another matter that is causing me concern is the number of contract teachers who have been placed in my electorate. Any local community likes teachers to stay a reasonable amount of time and likes to be assured that when teachers settle in and get to know the community they will not suddenly have their contract terminated and be sent else-

where. During the latter part of last year, when placements were made in my electorate, concern was expressed about the number of contract teachers who were being shifted when they were very suitable for their schools. I believe that certain permanent employees of the Education Department appointed to those positions refused to go.

I suppose that that is their right, but if one were a police officer or bank employee one does not have a great deal of choice. I believe that, in most cases, had these people accepted those teaching positions they would have enjoyed the local communities. I am amazed at the reasons why some people are hesitant to go to country teaching localities, particularly in the larger country towns. I can understand this if they have children who will be starting secondary or tertiary education, and I believe that suitable arrangements can be made to solve such problems.

However, if teachers believe that they will not like a country teaching position, it is not satisfactory that they can take four years leave without pay or a position in the private education system and then return to the public education system. Communities should not be put to this inconvenience or disruption. I believe that, if teachers are prepared to teach in country schools for a couple of years and are accepted in the community, they ought to be given the option of taking the position permanently if they meet the necessary requirements. I believe that too many people are on the contract teaching list and that this is causing problems.

Another matter, which is causing many problems, is the reassessment of all the school bus routes in my electorate. Also, some schools in my electorate have not yet had a principal appointed for this school year. In fact, they have acting principals, and that is destabilising. I was of the view that many people wished to take up senior positions in the Education Department. This situation is unfair on teachers, schools and communities. The people acting in those positions would, in many cases, make first-class principals, but unless there are exceptional circumstances I believe that, prior to the start of the school year, the principal should be appointed so that the school year can begin on a sound footing. This is very important for the students and the community. As all members would agree, the education of young people is very important; they are the best asset we have.

**Mr PETERSON (Semaphore):** The role of members of Parliament is to raise the concerns of the community that are brought to our attention, and I now pass on to this House some of the matters that have been raised with me. There is great concern in the community about escalating costs in relation to people's way of life, and the subsequent lack of ability to keep up with the cost of living, despite their very best efforts.

It is interesting to note that recently a Federal Minister, Senator Button, was talking about increased savings. Many people cannot even survive on what they are getting, let alone save—but I will come to that later. A few years ago I raised the subject of a concession system on interest rates for pensioners. At the time the honourable member said that that was illegal. A similar scheme is now being mooted as a way of making people save money. I mentioned that here five or six years ago, but nobody listened. It is now the 'in' thing, which is good to see. Only yesterday I spoke to members of a pensioner group in my area, and they were extremely vocal on the problems they are encountering, especially with the broken promises of politicians of all Parties. Grey power is certainly alive and well in the community. As was demonstrated in the recent Western Aus-

tralian elections, it will be a force to be reckoned with. Its members are very concerned about several changes to their rights over the past few years. Over the past 18 months they have seen about six changes to their income and investment abilities and, as a result, they are quite upset.

One of their major concerns, with which I agree very much, is the delay in receiving medical treatment for serious problems, such as hip replacement. They should have the right to experience the best quality life available in the few years left to them. It is inestimably better if they can receive treatment as soon as a problem arises.

I refer to a letter I received from a slightly above average family, according to their income. It outlines their difficulties. The letter is addressed to Mr Bannon, Mr Sawford and me. (I will ensure that the other two members receive a copy.) It states:

The Australian Labor Party is doing a very good job of losing the votes of many Labor supporters. Many people who live in the Port Adelaide and other areas are losing trust in the Labor Government as promise after promise is being broken. The promise of tax cuts for the people who work hard and don't bludge on the Government, which costs the worker continually more and more, that is, higher taxes and higher Medicare levy, are not forthcoming.

I hope that they will be in the next budget. The letter continues:

As my husband is a shift worker he is heavily taxed and pays a very high Medicare levy. He also has to pay for private health care cover so, should any of our family of four be ill and need hospitalisation as I have just done, we can be covered. Also, Medicare does not cover dental or orthodontic treatment, which my daughter needs (around \$1 600), nor spectacles, which our son and I need. These are not a luxury but a necessity.

With regard to the Medicare levy, unless a doctor's services are conducted in a recognised hospital, the gap between the doctor's fees and the Medicare benefit cannot be covered. I would like to know why.

That is something that I would also like to know. It seems that the logical thing is to allow for gap insurance. The debate has gone on for many years, but it seems to be a way out of the problem. Why cannot we come to some arrangement? The letter further states:

Before Medicare we were fully covered by private health cover for everything. We have never been lower than the second top table, currently top with Mutual Community, yet now we can't cover the gap.

The writer goes on to give three examples of accounts they now face, as follows:

Example one: ultrasound X-ray \$122; Medicare benefit \$71.40—gap balance to be paid by us \$50.60.

Example two: chest X-ray \$51; thoracic spine X-ray \$59—Medicare benefit \$73.15 with a gap balance of \$36.85.

Example three: specialist consultation \$63—Medicare benefit \$44.20 with gap balance of \$18.80.

The letter goes on to ask:

How would you suggest I find the money to pay these extra bills, including electricity, gas, E&WS, Telecom and a monthly house repayment of over \$800?

Today the Minister of Housing and Construction stated that the average home loan repayment is \$759 per month—I wrote it down at the time. Obviously, this loan is not extraordinary: it is just a few dollars over the average. It is an ordinary loan in the sense of today's values. The letter continues:

Last year my husband earned \$32 951—

and he earns good money, on average Australian values today—

and paid tax of \$9 181.40, and \$411.88 for the Medicare levy, plus Mutual Community cover.

So, there is a large total outlay. The next point in the letter is significant: it relates to something that the Government should look at and think about. This point is made to me all the time. The letter states:

The Labor Government is supposed to work for the worker, yet all the big businessmen get cuts and pay a lower rate of tax, and politicians and judges get massive wage increases. Yet, the poor workers get to work hard, get no wage increases and no tax cuts, which have been continually promised, and have prices continually rise.

In her letter this lady goes on to say:

Might I suggest that you and the Labor Government do something to help the workers who voted you into power, before the same voters vote you out.

I think that there is a risk of that. I think there will be a swing in the vote next time due to these very real concerns that people have. The next point in the letter relates to a State matter, as follows:

Another thing which really drags on the workers' pockets is education costs at State schools. We have just recently had to pay school fees for our two children: high school fees of \$132, plus a book deposit of \$20, totalling \$152; and primary school fees of \$96. Plus, any excursions or any extra pens, pencils and books needed during the year.

School fees are continually going up every year and the sizes of classes are getting bigger and bigger, yet the Education Department does not supply extra teachers to cover this, but instead tries to cut back teachers and makes classes even bigger. Any child with learning difficulties has no chance of improving if they cannot have access to better teaching facilities.

Our school has a learning assistance program (LAP), where parents volunteer to help these children. I am lucky, both of my children have no learning difficulties, but I work with two children on the program, and if the Education Department would cut class sizes then teachers would be able to help these children. In closing—

*Mr Tyler interjecting:*

**Mr PETERSON:** Well, I don't care whether they are here or not. My role here is to tell Parliament what the concerns of the people in my electorate are—and that is what I will do. Even if all members go out, I will do that. I might mention here that I have spoken to an empty House in my early days, and so it is nothing new for me. However, it will now be recorded in *Hansard* that many members are not in the Chamber. So, I do not care who is here. I have a duty to my electorate, and I will do it. The letter continues:

In closing, as far as I am concerned, unless the Labor Government makes a lot of drastic changes to benefit the worker—not

just the low and high income earners, but workers right across the board—e.g., tax cuts, wage increases with no price increases, education standards and costs, and something to enable all people to be able to cover the 'Medicare gap', not just when in hospital . . .

She goes on to say that she has always voted Labor but may perhaps not do so in future. That is for her to say. One has only to refer to the media to see how people are being affected. I can refer to two articles in tonight's *News*, for example. A survey was referred to in the *News*—admittedly it was a Liberal Party survey, but it can be taken as read—as follows:

It found hip pocket issues—interest rates and the cost of living—were the most worrying to voters.

The *News* editorial made the following statement:

They are being priced out of the housing market; they are being priced out of the supermarket.

This is true. The average person, the average worker, the average ALP member, or the average worker even on the Liberal side of things, working for, say, an average tradesman's wage, with a little bit of overtime, with two kids and a wife to support, and buying a house and a car, has no hope—no hope in the world. These are the families that need help. These families out there are the core of our community, the core of all of our electorates, wherever they might be, whether those electorates are Mount Gambier, Hanson, Adelaide, or wherever. The core of the electorates comprises working people, people working for wages, trying to get ahead, trying to buy a house, which is the Australian dream. They are trying to pay for their kids' education, clothe themselves, and eat, as well as prepare a little bit for their future. However, even if they save a few dollars, under the tax system that we have, they lose it.

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

Motion carried.

At 4.55 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 22 February at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 21 February 1989

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

INSECTICIDES

5. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. Does the South Australian Housing Trust fumigate all properties prior to purchase or refurbishment by the trust and, if so, which insecticides are used and how frequently are properties treated with insecticide?

2. Is Dieldrin used in Housing Trust properties currently, has it been in the past, and will it be used in the future?

3. Have other insecticides been considered for use by the trust?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. The trust only treats occupied or vacant rental houses for termites when there is evidence of actual infestation. The trust does not carry out periodic treatment of rental properties.

The trust only employs pest exterminators licensed by the South Australian Health Commission to treat pest infestations in occupied or vacant rental houses.

These contractors are strictly controlled by the South Australian Health Commission and must comply with the Australian Standard 2178-1986 'Protection of buildings from subterranean termites—detection and treatment of infestation in existing buildings'.

Where a pest infestation occurs in a tenanted house the pyrethroid type chemical 'Cislin 10' is used. This chemical is declared to be non-irritant to humans and is odourless and non-flammable. Pyrethroid is a derivative of pyrethrum.

Purchased houses are treated for termites if one of the following conditions exist:

- where there are concrete floors to be poured within the house (such as would be the case if constructing/reconstructing the wet areas);
- where constructing additions to an existing residence; and
- where there is evidence of some past or present infestation.

New construction is treated in accordance with the Trust Standard Specification 3000 which provides for the treatment of areas under all new buildings to be in accordance with AS 2057-1986 as required by regulations under the Building Act (Section 48.1). The successful tenderer is free to use any appropriately licensed sub-contractor who in turn is permitted to use any one of the several chemicals permitted under AS 2057-1986.

2. The pesticides Aldrin, Chlordane, Dieldrin and Heptachlor are now subject to Regulation 18 under the Controlled Substances Act 1984 which limits the sale of these chemicals to licensed pest controllers for use as termiticides.

Provided these chemicals are used by licensed pest control operators in accordance with the relevant Australian Standard, health and building legislation, and there is strict adherence to the code of practice for the safe use of termiticides, their usage in trust properties is permissible.

Treatment is only undertaken for reasons described in 1 above and any further pest eradication work would only occur if there were signs of infestation.

3. Any permissible and effective chemical is used for pest eradication in trust properties provided that the work is undertaken in strict accordance with established procedures.

HOUSING EXPENDITURE

12. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. On which and how many Aborigines is the proposed \$6 391 000 for rental assistance to be spent in the year ending 30 June 1989?

2. On which and how many pensioners is the proposed \$2 819 000 for rental assistance to be spent in the year ending 30 June 1989?

3. On which and how many people is the proposed \$2 302 000 mortgage and rent relief to be spent in the year ending 30 June 1989?

4. On which and how many people is the proposed \$1 700 000 for the Crisis Accommodation Program to be spent in the year ending 30 June 1989?

5. On which and how many people is the proposed \$1 391 000 for the Local Government and Community Housing Program to be spent in the year ending 30 June 1989?

6. On which and how many people is the proposed \$52 053 000 received under the Commonwealth State Housing Agreement to be spent in the year ending 30 June 1989?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. It is proposed to spend the allocation as follows:

	\$
Aboriginal Housing Board .....	400 000
Fringe Dweller Program .....	1 600 000
Capital Upgrading .....	500 000
Land Purchases .....	150 000
Building Trades Program .....	600 000
House Purchases .....	3 141 000
	6 391 000

The house purchases are intended to house 42 households in Adelaide, Ceduna, Murray Bridge, Port Augusta, Berrri, Renmark and Meningie. The rest of the program will assist numerous Aboriginal households, including the provision of employment training.

2. The sum of \$2 819 000 will be used by the South Australian Housing Trust for the provision of cottage flats for approximately 52 households.

3. The sum of \$2 302 000 untied Commonwealth grant for mortgage and rent relief will be matched by a similar amount of State Government expenditure. Rent relief will assist (on the basis of last year's performance) approximately 8 250 new applicants, with some 6 250 in receipt of relief at any one time. Mortgage relief is divided between the Home Guarantee Interest Rate Protection Plan and direct relief. The equivalent figures are 235 applicants and 190 households in payment at any one time.

4. Recommendations for use of the allocations under the Crisis Accommodation Program are made by an Advisory Committee involving a range of expertise. This Advisory Committee has not yet completed its deliberations in respect of the 1988-89 program.

5. Recommendations for the use of the allocation under the Local Government and Community Housing Program are made by an Advisory Committee involving a range of expertise. This Advisory Committee has not yet completed its deliberations in respect of the 1988-89 program.

6. The sum of \$52 053 000 received in untied grants under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement for 1988-89 represents only a proportion of total expenditure on housing for the year.

The major categories to be assisted, in addition to those set out above, include approximately 1 000 households in housing cooperatives and housing association tenancies; 38 000 Housing Trust tenants in receipt of rent rebates; and numerous thousands of households assisted through the funding of organisations concurred with advice on housing and shelter provisions.

The untied grants allocation is split up as follows:

<i>1. Administered by South Australian Housing Trust</i>	
<i>Recurrent</i>	\$ millions
Emergency Housing Office .....	4.408
Rent Relief .....	3.135
Trace-a-Place .....	0.084
Mortgage/Rent Relief Admin. ....	0.636
Housing Co-operatives .....	9.630
Community Rental—Co-op Unit ....	0.140
Rent Rebate Assistance .....	29.900
<i>Capital</i>	
Debt Servicing .....	3.620
<i>2. Other</i>	
<i>Recurrent—Community Sector</i>	
Grants and other programs .....	0.500
Total .....	52.053

### HOUSING TRUST

31. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: Why does the South Australian Housing Trust use the Housing Improvement Act to enter and inspect privately owned and occupied homes with a view to setting rents?

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** The Housing Improvement Act has two major objectives, *viz*:

to encourage the improvement of substandard dwellings whether owner-occupied or rented and to protect the interests of potential purchasers of substandard dwellings; and

to protect the interests of private sector tenants by controlling the rents of dwellings which have been declared substandard under the Act.

Clearly, the trust is not inspecting privately owned and occupied homes with a view to setting rents.

### COMMONWEALTH-STATE HOUSING AGREEMENT

107. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: What were the findings of the triennial evaluation of the 1984 Commonwealth/State Housing Agreement, what changes arose from the evaluation and what are pending?

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** The triennial evaluation of the 1984 Commonwealth/State Housing Agreement resulted in a number of amendments to the agreement. A supplemental agreement was agreed on 25 August 1988, the provisions of which are deemed to have commenced to operate as at 1 July 1987. The main changes arising from the evaluation are as follows:

1. Increases in the base level of Commonwealth financial assistance. For the years 1987-88 to 1989-90 the level of assistance is determined at \$700 million, of which \$11 million is earmarked for the Local Government and Community Housing Program, and \$14 million for the Crisis Accommodation Program. This compares with \$510 million for 1985-86 and 1986-87, of which \$10 million was earmarked for the Local Government and Community Housing Program.

2. States are now required to use at least half of the funds from Commonwealth financial assistance, Loan Council nominations for housing purposes and State matching funds for the purpose of rental housing.

3. Amendments to the accounting practices for the house purchase assistance account.

4. The use of funds in the house purchase assistance account for rental housing assistance or specific housing assistance; and for assisting house purchase by means other than supporting mortgage lending to individuals, including joint ventures and secondary mortgage market trusts.

5. Annual review of income (in lieu of each 3 years) for the purpose of determining assistance under house purchase assistance schemes, where such assistance is income related. In South Australia, this change does not apply to the current concessional loans scheme, which is based on an escalating interest model.

6. Discretionary powers to the States to waive the recovery of assistance made available under the house purchase assistance scheme. This includes waiving such recovery in the event that the loan is discharged if recovery would cause hardship.

7. A new provision whereby single people are judged for eligibility for house purchase assistance on the same basis as other types of households. Similar provisions for rental housing assistance, also encompassing young people, have also been formulated.

8. Use of funds under the Commonwealth/State Agreement for the provision of general rental housing assistance, including investment in rental housing funds and rental housing trusts.

9. Introduction of a cost floor in respect of sales of rental housing, whereby sales within 5 years of the date of purchase or construction must be at a price at least equal to the replacement cost at the time of sale. Previously only market value considerations applied in these circumstances.

10. Permission for co-operatives and other organisations to acquire rental housing from State Housing authorities at less than market value. There is a similar provision that if these bodies sell such properties within 5 years of their construction or acquisition by the State, they must repay to the State the replacement cost at the time of sale.

11. Revised requirements for the supply of information to the Commonwealth, including details of cases where the recovery of house purchase assistance is waived; information on criteria for eligibility of assistance, including priority and emergency assistance; and information on the relative proportions of Commonwealth and State funds allocated to house purchase and rental housing assistance respectively.

12. An amendment to reflect that the Commonwealth is now represented in the agreement by the Department of Community Services and Health, replacing the Department of Housing and Construction.

### DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND CONSTRUCTION

112. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: How many internal Department of Housing and Construction committees are there, who are the members and how many reports were presented to the Minister or Director of the department in the year ended 30 June 1988 and what action has been taken on each report?

**The Hon. T. H. HEMMINGS:** The main internal committees that were in place in 1987-88 to assist the internal day to day management of the department are set out below.

Most of these committees do not produce reports. However, as a result of decisions reached during meetings reports may be produced and these are processed through normal line management procedures. This includes reporting to the Chief Executive Officer and myself, as appropriate.

1. Sacon Industrial Consultative Committee  
Members:  
Dean Lambert  
Peter Hankinson  
John Smith  
Phil Stearns  
No formal reports.
2. Strategic Planning Task Force  
Members:  
Bob Nichols (Chairman)  
Dean Lambert  
Helen Hardwick  
Mary Marsland  
Trevor Zimmermann  
Roger McMillan  
Jim Wilson  
Bill Dunbar  
Graham Whiteway  
One report presented  
Action taken—strategic plan implemented and reviewed.
3. Sacon Steering Committee—4 per cent Second Tier Efficiency Committee  
Members:  
Bob Nichols (Chairman)  
W. Abroe (Treasury)  
J. Bates (PSA)  
P. Dewhurst  
L. Miller  
R. Slade  
B. Emmins  
J. Wilson  
G. Whiteway  
O. Vick  
No formal reports. Efficiency measures being progressively implemented.
4. Information Systems Steering Committee  
Members:  
G. Little (Chairman)  
R. Nichols  
D. Lambert  
P. Hankinson  
R. Power  
I. Ide  
D. Hiles  
T. Lloyd  
K. Twomey  
R. Alwis  
G. Price  
C. Koay  
S. Curtis  
No formal reports.
5. Project Allocation Committee  
Members:  
D. Lambert (Chairman)  
R. Slade (Executive Officer)  
S. Druitt  
H. Koh  
G. Manning  
J. Wilson  
W. Dunbar  
R. Frinsdorf  
R. Amos  
T. Lloyd  
L. Ginsberg  
R. Jarrett  
K. Brooks  
B. Bradbrook  
No formal reports.
6. Contracts Consultative Committee  
Members:  
D. Lambert (Chairman)  
R. Slade (Executive Officer)  
M. Marsland  
I. Ide  
B. Deayton  
G. Manning  
H. Koh  
R. Amos  
R. Farrant

- T. Lloyd  
W. Deakin (Observer)  
P. Martinello (Observer)  
No formal reports.
7. Equal Opportunity Advisory Panel  
Members:  
R. Nichols (Chairman)  
L. Kropinyeri  
J. Anderson  
J. Raymond  
M. Danielli  
L. Miller  
O. Vick  
No formal reports.

In addition to these committees, regular management co-ordination meetings are held, as would be expected in any large organisation.

### HOUSING TRUST

142. **Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: In respect of the South Australian Housing Trust for 1988-89, what is the—

- (a) estimated income from rents payable by tenants;
- (b) the total amount of anticipated rebates;
- (c) estimated gross value of sales of residential properties to tenants;
- (d) estimated gross value of sales of vacant land;
- (e) expected cost of excess water payable in respect of residential property;
- (f) anticipated cost of ordinary and vacancy maintenance, respectively, and the estimated total cost of all categories of maintenance;
- (g) estimated level of bad debts;
- (h) estimated amount of interest payable for SAFA; and
- (i) expected final net surplus or deficit for the year?

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** The information provided is current as at 30 November 1988:

	\$ million
(a) estimated gross income from rents . . . . .	249.841
(b) Less estimated rental rebates . . . . .	87.498
Less estimated loss on vacancy rent . . . . .	3.431
estimated rent payable . . . . .	158.912
(c) estimated gross residential sales . . . . . (Note 1)	48.067
(d) estimated gross vacant land sales . . . . . (Note 2)	15.000
(e) estimated excess water cost—residential property . . . . .	5.907
(f) estimated ordinary maintenance . . . . .	4.301
estimated vacancy maintenance . . . . .	9.550
estimated total maintenance . . . . .	46.737
(g) estimated bad debts . . . . .	0.630
(h) estimated SAFA interest payable . . . . .	44.601
(i) estimated surplus . . . . . (Note 3)	12.158

Note 1 } Both estimates were revised in early  
 Note 2 } November 1988  
 Note 3 This estimate may vary depending on the continued success of the residential and land sales program.

### WAR DISABILITY ALLOWANCE

144. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. How many South Australian Housing Trust tenants are war veterans receiving the war disability allowance?

2. How much extra rent will the trust receive in a full year by including the allowance as income in rent assessments?

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** The replies are as follows:

1. There are currently some 1 600 trust tenants paying reduced rents with incomes derived from a Veterans' Affairs service pension. No statistics are available on the number of these tenants who are also receiving a disability pension.

2. The trust has always included Veterans' Affairs disability pensions as income for the purpose of determining rental rebates. The Department of Veterans' Affairs disability pensions are paid regularly to meet general cost of living expenses; they do not appear to be paid in relation to a specific expense incurred by the recipient as ongoing treatment expenses are covered under a repatriation scheme. Accurate figures are not available but, based on information from New South Wales, it is estimated that up to \$1 million annual revenue is gained by the assessment of disability pensions as income for rent setting purposes. If Veterans' Affairs disability pensions were excluded in rental calculations, anomalies would be created to the disadvantage of other tenants. There are a very small number of tenants who receive an overseas disability allowance and who must cover the costs associated with their disability themselves, as they are not eligible for repatriation assistance. In these circumstances this source of income is excluded from rental calculations.

#### SABEMO

163. **Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

What are the details of Government projects for which SABEMO has been appointed construction or project manager?

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** SABEMO currently has one construction management contract with the South Australia Department of Housing and Construction (Sacon) namely Kingston College of TAFE—Redevelopment. The company is not involved with any project management for Sacon.

#### FIRE REGULATIONS

168. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. Has the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service received correspondence from a Mr R.D. Hockley and, if so, when and was a reply sent and what was the reason for any delay in replying?

2. Has the MFS inspected the premises of W.P. Crowhurst Pty Ltd of 37 Belford Avenue, Devon Park and, if so, did the premises conform with fire safety standards and, if not, what were the problems identified, what action has been taken to rectify them and do the premises now meet all requirements and, if not, why not?

3. Have the fire safety regulations been examined to determine whether they are completely adequate for this business operation and, if so, what were the findings and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The replies are as follows:

1. The South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service received correspondence from a Mr R.D. Hockley dated 16 July 1988, and 22 October 1988. A response was sent on 16 December 1988. The delay in replying to Mr Hockley was due to the large number of questions asked by him

which necessitated research and consultation with other parties.

2. The premises of W.P. Crowhurst have been inspected on several occasions by the Metropolitan Fire Service to advise on fire safety matters. These inspections have been at the request of Crowhurst or their agents and in more recent years to form an opinion on water supplies for Part 27 of the Building Regulations. As the majority of the premises was constructed prior to 1974, the older sections are not technically subject to the requirements of the Building Act. The mezzanine which was constructed in 1987-88 is subject to, and complies with, legislated requirements. Hose reels have been installed throughout, and although the water pressure in the area generally is relatively low, the system installed, including facilities for SAMFS pumps, is considered satisfactory.

The premises have been compartmented into three sections by fire walls and a flammable liquid storage area has been provided to Department of Labour requirements. Inspecting officers from the Fire Prevention Division are of the opinion that based on their observations during inspections and considering compartmentation, installed firefighting facilities, method operation and housekeeping, a reasonable standard of fire safety is being achieved.

3. Based on the SAMFS interpretation of legislation, the premises comply with the required standards of fire safety.

#### PLANNING

169. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. Do the manufacturing and retailing activities of W.P. Crowhurst Pty Ltd of 37 Belford Avenue, Devon Park, conform with the zoning and planning regulations for the area and, if not, why not?

2. Were alterations made to the premises before council approval was obtained?

3. Are sufficient car parking spaces provided and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The replies are as follows:

1. W.P. Crowhurst Pty Ltd has conducted its business from the Devon Park site for approximately twenty years and, therefore, prior to any planning controls. When the planning regulations under the now repealed Planning and Development Act came effective, the legislation did not require existing uses to conform to newly introduced standards. The same situation occurred when the present Development Plan came into being under the Planning Act in 1982. The effect of this was that pre-existing uses were permitted to continue unaffected by planning controls unless there was a request to further develop their use, in which case the development was subject to the control in force at the time. The Crowhurst development was in existence prior to the introduction of planning controls.

2. The company has usually made alterations with council's approval but the city of Enfield's City Planner has advised that alterations were commenced without council's consent in one case involving internal office alterations. However, pursuant to Regulation 14 (2) of the Development Control Regulations, 1982, an application was lodged on request and subsequently approved.

3. Planning controls do not require the company to provide 'sufficient' car parking.

#### FOUNDATION SOUTH AUSTRALIA

176. **Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport:

1. Was the sport of soccer in receipt of any form of sponsorship from the tobacco industry prior to the enactment of the new legislative controls and, if so, what was the extent and nature of this sponsorship?

2. Has the sport of soccer made any request to Foundation South Australia for a grant from the fund established under the Tobacco Products Control Act and, if so, what amount has been sought?

3. Is there any provision in the foundation budget for a grant or other assistance to the sport of soccer and, if so, what amount is it intended to allocate and what form will the assistance take and, if not, is it intended to make any such allocation in the future?

4. To which bodies or organisations will any proposed grant or other assistance be allocated and is there any agreement or requirement that individual clubs will receive any part of any such grant or assistance?

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** The replies are as follows:

1. Questions about sponsorship arrangements existing prior to the legislation should be directed to the South Australian Soccer Federation.

2 and 3. Foundation South Australia has advised that applications to the foundation for support and sponsorship are made in complete confidence and any negotiations that occur subsequently in regard to such applications are also confidential. Public announcements are made by the foundation when all involved parties have agreed to specific sponsorship arrangements.

In regard to soccer in general, Foundation South Australia is participating in the national consortium led by the Victorian Health Promotion Foundation that has recently taken over the sponsorship of the Australian Socceroos and the National Soccer League from Rothmans.

#### YORKE MOTORS

178. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs: Did the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs investigate a complaint alleging that Yorke Motors sold, as brand new, a motor vehicle which had the odometer turned back and in fact was a demonstration car, and, if so—(a) was the company required to pay damages; and (b) what

action has the department taken against the proprietors of the company involved and, if none, why not?

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** The Department of Public and Consumer Affairs did investigate a complaint alleging that in June 1986 Yorke Motors (City) Pty Ltd sold, as brand new, a demonstration vehicle in which the odometer had been replaced prior to sale.

The department is unaware of any civil proceedings instituted for damages. After discussions with the department, Yorke Motors (City) Pty Ltd agreed to rescind the contract. The department has not taken any action against the company as legal advice indicated that, on the evidence available, a prosecution would not succeed.

#### LOXLEY (BANGKOK) LIMITED

193. **Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition)**, on notice, asked the Minister of State Development and Technology:

1. When was Loxley (Bangkok) Limited appointed as the Government's representative in Thailand?

2. How much was Loxley paid for its services in 1987-88?

3. During 1987-88, how many specific trade and investment opportunities did Loxley identify and, in each case, what was the nature of the activity involved?

**The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD:** The replies are as follows:

1. Loxley (Bangkok) Limited was appointed as the Government representative in Thailand on 1 July 1988.

2. Nil.

3. Nil.

#### CHARITY DELIGHTS

228. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs: Has the Minister received and investigated complaints concerning children selling bags of sweets claiming they are 'Charity Delights' and, if so, do the children who sell these sweets receive 20 cents per \$2 bag and do the supervisors of the sales area receive 50 cents per bag, and which charities benefit from these sales and to what extent?

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** There is no record of any complaints being received and investigated by the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs concerning children selling bags of sweets claiming they are 'Charity Delights'.