## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 28 March 1985

**The SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

### PETITION: HOTEL TRADING

A petition signed by nine residents of South Australia praying that the House reconsider legislation allowing hotels to trade on Sundays was presented by Mr Rodda.

Petition received.

### PETITION: POWER LINES

A petition signed by 1 275 residents of Mitcham Hills and neighbouring regions praying that the House urge the Government to ensure that power lines be placed underground along the Old Belair Road from Blythewood Road to Sheoak Road before it is resurfaced was presented by the Hon. D.C. Brown.

Petition received.

### MEDIA BAN

**The SPEAKER:** I wish to read a statement to the House. Following the incident in the Strangers Gallery yesterday, I want to advise the House of several matters. First, in view of the assault made on the police officer concerned I have authorised the police to lay a charge of assaulting a police officer.

In relation to the incident itself—the throwing of material on to the floor of the Chamber—I have decided to ban the offender from the precincts of the Assembly until further notice.

One disturbing aspect of the unfortunate affair was the action of TV crews and the publicity TV stations gave to it. I am sure members will agree that publicising incidents such as this can only encourage other persons to emulate them.

At the time of the incident I did say in the House that there was to be no reporting of the incident. It was not my intention to ban reporting of the incident but to prevent use of film or sound or photographs to unduly highlight it. Accordingly, I made that distinction and advised media representatives that there was to be no broadcast of film or sound and no photographs of the actual incident and ensuing events in line with the longstanding agreements. Under those agreements reporting the proceedings of Parliament, amongst other things, entailed focusing only on the member speaking. It most certainly did not include filming or photographing other events without specific approval.

An illustration of the sort of broadcasting I was seeking to prevent was the suggestion broadcast by one station that I had recommended no charge be laid despite being aware that a police officer had been kicked in the stomach—an allegation I utterly refute.

In view of the fact that three of the stations breached both the original agreement and my direction, I have written to the respective managements advising that the privilege of recording proceedings in the House of Assembly Chamber has been withdrawn. I advise members that this position will be maintained until the stations are prepared to apologise and agree to abide by the long standing arrangements—this time in writing.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: Mr L. JOHNS

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Acting Minister of Emergency Services):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** Yesterday, in this House, the member for Alexandra asked me a question pertaining to the position of Mr L.C. Johns in the Country Fire Services. As members would be aware, my colleague the Deputy Premier announced last week that he had approved the recommendation of the Country Fire Services Board that Mr A.D. McArthur be appointed Director of the Country Fire Services.

Since October 1984 and until last week, Mr Johns had held the position of Acting Director. Last Friday the Board directed Mr Johns to commence recreation leave, and his position is now a matter for the Country Fire Services Board to determine and recommend to me, as Acting Minister of Emergency Services. Until the Board makes its recommendation I do not believe that it is appropriate for me to make any further public comment. My colleague has, I believe, asked the Chairman of the Board to give this matter early consideration.

### COFFIN BAY WATER SUPPLY SCHEME

**The SPEAKER** laid on the table the following report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Coffin Bay Water Supply Scheme.

Ordered that report be printed.

## QUESTION TIME

### MEDIA BAN

**Mr OLSEN:** My question is directed to you, Mr Speaker. What specific instructions have you given the Sergeant-at-Arms to fulfil the conditions that are contained in the statement that you have made this afternoon? I understand, Sir, that you have issued to the Sergeant-at-Arms an instruction that has several conditions. Will you affirm that those conditions will apply in future? The conditions are as follows:

(1) No representatives of channels 7, 9, or 10 are to enter any of the galleries of the House of Assembly until further notice.

(2) Any representatives of the channels seeking to enter the House of Assembly precincts are to be challenged and asked their reason for requesting admittance. If they have been requested by any member to attend a press conference or interview, they may proceed under escort to that location. At the end of such interview they are to be escorted from the building. If they do not have an arrangement to meet with any member, they are not to be granted admittance to the precincts.

(3) In the event that any representatives of these channels attempts to film any other event beside the interview/press conference mentioned above they are to be immediately escorted from the building.

You are to arrange whatever additional resources you need (including attendants and police officers) to ensure these directions are carried out.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes.

**Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition):** I seek forthwith to move dissent from the statement and ruling you have given today.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member must bring up his reasons for dissent in writing.

**Mr OLSEN:** I will do so.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable Leader of the Opposition states:

I move dissent from your ruling because it infringes the basic freedom of the press and of members of Parliament.

**Mr OLSEN:** I move accordingly. Yesterday, Mr Speaker, you gave a ruling on this matter, and it caused much confusion in this House. The ruling that you gave immediately following yesterday's incident in the public gallery amounted to a complete ban on any media or press reporting of that incident. In effect, the media were to act as if nothing had happened, and your statement clearly stated that the ban would apply not only to the television operator but also to the gallery immediately behind the Speaker.

Clearly, you, Sir, put down a hasty decision in this Parliament yesterday to ban the reporting of that incident in an attempt, I now believe, to censure the media. After consultation with the Premier, and prior to your meeting with media representatives at 3.15 to try to clarify the confusion that had prevailed in the Parliament yesterday, you, as I understand it, modified that ruling to allow the incident to be reported so long as no film, photographs, or—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I take the deepest exception to the reflection on the Chair that I consulted with the Premier and then—

**An honourable member:** We saw it; everyone saw it.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I take the deepest exception to the statement made that I consulted with the Premier and, as a result of that, modified what I proposed to do. I ask the honourable member to withdraw that.

**Mr OLSEN:** Mr Speaker, I have merely reported the sequence of events that took place in this House yesterday. The sequence of events was quite clear.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! What I object to is the inference that I modified my stance in deference to something that the Premier had said. I want that withdrawn.

**Mr OLSEN:** I did not say that. I said that, following your decision and ruling in this House, you sought (and everyone in this Chamber saw it) consultation with the Premier. Subsequently, at 3.15 you had a meeting with the media representatives. I merely identified to Parliament the sequence of events.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr OLSEN:** Yesterday afternoon, I advised you, Sir, of my view that the media would see any limitation imposed by you on the coverage of the incident as being an infringement of the rights of the media. I communicated that view to you yesterday afternoon. The commercial television channels have clearly taken the view that the guidelines under which they operated in this House allowed them to cover the incident in the way in which they did last night. Mr Speaker, in 1983, at the time when you first allowed television and radio coverage of Parliamentary proceedings (and I indicate that the Opposition fully supported your move in relation to this), discussions were held about the guidelines to apply, and we were involved in the consultation process as to the guidelines to be set for the operation and the presence of television cameras in this Chamber.

Those guidelines related to coverage of activity on the floor of the House. However, it was not our understanding that the guidelines prevented filming of incidents that might occur in what is a public gallery in this Parliament. The Opposition believes that your rulings yesterday were made in haste, and that significant confusion has reigned since then, as it seems that several positions have been adopted since that ruling was given.

I understand, Sir, that you communicated to the television stations yesterday that, because they had broken an agreement, cameramen from those stations would not be allowed into this Chamber. That was the modified ruling made late yesterday afternoon. Subsequent to that, we were given this new set of rules that you have acknowledged now apply. I point out to the House that it is not only cameramen who are now no longer allowed in the precincts of this Chamber and Parliament but also any representatives of the channels. Today we witnessed the instance at the front door of the Parliament where not only cameramen, in accordance with your first letter, have been denied access, but also no journalists from channels 7, 9 or 10 are allowed—

*The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** The Minister for Tourism knows full well that there are several people in a camera crew. One is a journalist who reports and one is a cameraman. The first letter from the Speaker referred to the cameraman and made no reference whatsoever to a journalist who was reporting. However, today we have a new set of rules—the third set of rules that has applied in less than 24 hours on this incident.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** They change by the hour.

**Mr OLSEN:** Clearly, they do. I point out the gravity of these rules. We have the denial of the public to access to the proceedings of this Parliament on your ruling yesterday, Mr Speaker (and that is what it amounts to). They broke that ban in the interest of reporting to the public as they saw fit. I concur with that and acknowledged that in correspondence to you, Mr Speaker, yesterday afternoon.

We have gone several steps further today. Now, if I want to hold a press conference or an interview, whoever comes to this House for that interview will be escorted in and escorted out of the interview. That does not apply to the Premier in his media conference room on the eleventh floor of the State Administration Building. People who have security passes as a result of their occupation do not, in the Premier's media conference room, have to be checked in and out as though they are a security risk to the Premier's office, but here the Opposition, in this House, in any of the interview rooms here, will have media representatives escorted in and out of the Parliament. That is an objectionable state of affairs and clearly and blatantly works against the Liberal Party.

**The Hon. G.F. Keneally:** So will we.

**Mr OLSEN:** The Minister of Tourism knows full well that in Government offices he has other opportunities to hold press conferences. I do not have such opportunity. The only place that I can do it is on the steps of Parliament House, with an umbrella if it is raining. That is the difference between the facilities available to Government Ministers and those available to the Opposition. The Minister is not comparing like with like, and full well he knows it. In addition, I can well understand the censorship that the Government benches want to apply to us. With the market research delivered to the Premier last Friday afternoon I can well understand why he wants to gag the Opposition.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader's remarks are out of order.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** In your memo, Sir, to the Sergeant-at-Arms for the fulfilling of these new conditions (without, I might add, consultation with the Opposition in terms of the detail of the memo that you have now distributed), I draw attention to the fact that, whatever additional resources are needed to escort people (who have a security pass, I might add) in and out of this building, we can hire any number of additional attendants or police officers to ensure that those directions are carried out and carried out forthwith. Yet, as has been pointed out, we had a position earlier today and still applying, as far as I can see, where no police officer is in the public gallery to protect the security of members of the public and members of Parliament in this Chamber, but

people with security passes cannot get in or out. That is a set of conditions denying us access to the media.

As to the condition that they cannot be let in unless they have an appointment, as the Premier would well know since he has occupied the offices down here, not all media representatives have an appointment; they come in and out of my office from time to time to discuss matters of a general nature but, if they have not got an appointment, they will not be allowed into my offices on the second floor. That is a ridiculous state of affairs to apply, and I would hope that the Premier would well appreciate the censorship that has been applied to the Liberal Party and the Opposition in this instance with these conditions that have been introduced. If he is fair minded at all, and wants to give the Liberal Party and the Opposition a fair go, with access to the media and the use of facilities in press conferences to put our viewpoint, then he will have no option but to support the motion before the House. Failure to do so will mean that the Premier wants to gag and disadvantage the Opposition. I hope that the Independent members will understand that.

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

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer):** I refer first to the Leader's last point. I have some considerable sympathy for the point made: that is, that the Opposition should not be constrained in its dealings with the media. However, I would have thought that, if that is going to be a problem—and it would depend a lot on the way in which the Speaker's ruling is interpreted by the Speaker in terms of at what time—

**Mr Olsen:** Come on!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Let us stop the grandstanding and try to solve the problem. As I was saying, it would depend a lot on whether we are talking about access while Parliament is sitting—in other words, the incident arose in relation to the media's filming of events in the Chamber—or whether it applies overall, for how long, and so on. They are matters that quite legitimately could be taken up by the Leader with the Speaker. I would expect the Leader to do that, and I know that the Speaker would be quite happy to discuss it.

**Mr Lewis:** We just have.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Yes, you have, by trying to inflame the situation and capitalise on it. I think that is a pity. Before the Leader of the Opposition falls off his bench with appeals, I stress this again: I am saying that, quite properly, it is a matter that I am sure could be taken up with the Speaker in relation to this question of access and that the Speaker will deal with it. Let me put the matter into perspective. Until 1983, when the present Speaker occupied the Chair, there were no rights to televise events in this Chamber, except occasionally on a very special basis. The present Speaker (Mr Speaker McRae), at his own initiative, introduced televised media access, first on a trial basis and now on a general basis. The Government was pleased with that and the Opposition, as the Leader has already said, was consulted about that move.

It is well known that on both sides of the Chamber there were members who were not very happy about the move. Some members of the Leader of the Opposition's Party were very doubtful about whether it was a good thing; equally, I guess there were some Government members who felt the same. Nonetheless, the Speaker's view prevailed. In all the controversy over the past 24 hours, I think it is most regrettable that that has been simply dismissed: that is, that until 1983, despite television having been in this State since 1959, it had no such general access to Parliament. The present Speaker facilitated that and special provision was made for recording for radio, press and so on. That has been a welcome move, and it is still almost unique in the world: as I understand it, there are very few Legislatures which allow it—the Israeli Parliament is one, and there are three or four others.

**An honourable member:** What's that got to do with it?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** It has a lot to do with it. The point that follows from that is the accusation that Speaker McRae is attempting to censor the coverage of the proceedings of Parliament. The first answer to that is, surely, to look at Speaker McRae's record—and I am not sure whether I am correct in referring to you by name, Mr Speaker—and realise that he is operating on the principle that Parliament should be accessible. The Speaker has had the gratitude of the media for that. The cameras were there because of the action he has taken. He does not start from the basis that we should be keeping these things out of Parliament, and credit should be given for that.

Discussions should ensue on the part of the Leader of the Opposition, who has particular problems. Incidentally, he says that he took up the matter with the Speaker yesterday. That was done by means of a letter which the Leader released to the media, a widely publicised communication through the channels of the media, and that is not the way I suggest the matter should be dealt with. Secondly, the matter should be taken up by the media itself, directly with the Speaker. I am sure that some resolution of the matter will occur if that is done. After all, the Speaker in this instance—and I think honourable members should recognise this (and I think that is why it is quite scurrilous for the Opposition to move this motion)—is protecting the rights of all of us as members of the House.

I assure honourable members that I did not in any way instruct the Speaker or advise him on the course of action he should take. Equally, when Mr Speaker made a statement before Parliament I received it by delivery from the Clerk at the same time as the Leader of the Opposition did. Mr Speaker did not consult with me on that. I have no objection to that because the Speaker, on behalf of all of us, cutting across Party boundaries, must protect the rights and privileges of the House as he sees fit.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The Leader of the Opposition keeps chortling, 'What about our rights and privileges?' I am suggesting that that is quite a legitimate matter to take up in the proper way and not to try to do what is being done. Perhaps it curries favour with the media (it makes the Leader of the Opposition very embarrassed indeed over his appointment of a press officer or media liaison officer) to try somehow to get back into favour. I could buy favour in the same way.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I am suggesting that we should take a rational approach to this. I happen to believe that it is in the interests of the public that the media be given as much access as possible to report the proceedings of Parliament. I know that Mr Speaker does also, because he is the first Speaker ever in this House to have done so. That is where we start. To move this motion simply ignores those facts and the reality.

Suddenly, the Leader of the Opposition now emerges as the champion of electronic coverage of the House, yet when he had a period in Government his Party did not do anything about it. Let us recognise those two points: the principle on which the Speaker has worked, and the fact that the Speaker in taking the action he has has not done so at the direction, instruction or whatever of the Government, the Opposition or any other members. He has done it in relation to his duty as Speaker.

If the Speaker's ruling or particular understanding of the ground rules is in dispute it will be resolved. No doubt there will be a response to Mr Speaker's communication to

the media. I would hope that they have a meeting at the highest level with him and that the matter can be sorted out. If I was a member of the media I would have confidence in being able to do so, because I would be dealing with the Speaker who actually allowed me access for the first time ever in Parliamentary history. That is really where the matter begins and ends.

In all this discussion we have also ignored one other aspect that the Speaker has mentioned: the question of access in the gallery and its openness. The Strangers Gallery is not and never has been a place where there is total and uninhibited access. It is not a public place in that sense. It is a place in which certain rules have always been laid down to be observed. Persons in the gallery must observe certain standards of behaviour. They cannot interject or join in the proceedings. We members are not allowed to refer or speak directly to people in the gallery. That is part of the Strangers Gallery concept of access to Parliament. One cannot throw hundreds of years of rules out of the window. Also, there is the question of whether or not—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** No, I am not. It is also the question of whether the nature of reporting of an incident like that might encourage other such incidents. As members (members of the Opposition, as much as ourselves), we should thank the Speaker for doing that. The Leader of the Opposition mutters in his usual underhand way, 'If we had some security it would not happen.' This Government has spent a very large sum of money in recent years on the greatest upgrading of security in this place that has happened in the period from 1886 when Parliament House was opened.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** On the one hand, we have members saying that it should be free, open and total access as much as possible and, on the other, we should have rigid security measures—perhaps frisking and bullet-proof glass, who knows? Let us work it out sensibly. All members have an interest in this. It is not a Party matter. Let us ensure that Mr Speaker, in protecting our rights, also reflects our wishes. I suggest that this is a despicable motion.

**The SPEAKER:** Going back to the beginning, I had discussions channel by channel, radio station by radio station, with all those involved, commercial and national, and these were big boys, well capable of looking after themselves. Those discussions were on the basis that two options were open, the first of which was to reach a gentlemen's agreement (and I rather laugh at that in view of what has happened); and the other was to reach an unwieldy written document which in my view would be so complex and so difficult to enforce that it would simply be unworkable.

I stressed at the time that, in allowing Parliament to be reported, I was ready to assist the media in every way. I pointed out that this was a great change in Australia and indeed most of the Western world. I am sure that all the time the keynote was this flexibility, provided that the media respected the flexibility that I granted. It was on that basis that the media, and in particular the visual media, were allowed entry—a privilege which they did not have before on a day by day basis—into the gallery.

The Leader referred to a change in attitude by me yesterday, and the Deputy Leader referred to some change upon the hour. I can only say, 'What nonsense.' I was confronted yesterday with a difficult situation and I made a statement which, in fact, went too far. I called a press conference at 3.15, and at that press conference the television stations and all the radio stations, together with the print media, were represented. In the presence of the senior Clerk, I very carefully went over the original agreements and stressed that, if they were to take this matter to air, not only was it a breach of the direction that I had made but also it was a breach of the agreement. One representative from channel 7 said, 'In that case, I will defy you.' That was the sort of attitude that was adopted in my room. At no stage, however, did I lose my temper. I remained moderate and calm throughout the whole thing.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I remained moderate and—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, please! I ask that I be heard out in the same way as those complaining against me were heard out.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Remember, we are dealing with grown men: we are not dealing with schoolchildren. They were clearly able to understand what I was saying. They clearly knew that they were in breach of the original agreement, and they clearly knew that they were setting out and embarking on a course of defiance. If that was the case, so be it, but then they must pay the consequences. I have been brought up in a school (maybe that school is going out of favour) where, if an agreement is made, it is honoured. That is the school in which I was brought up, and if you—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Coles will come to order, and so will the member for Davenport. If one breaks an agreement, one takes the consequences of one's own action. There is nothing wrong in that. I checked that I had been defied by the very people who had given me their solemn word two years ago. They broke their agreement not just with me but with the whole House and, having checked that they had defied everything (by checking each of the television channels last evening), I found that all except channel 2 had broken the agreement.

I then took the obvious step of advising the Managing Director of each of the commercial channels in writing this morning that they would not be permitted to film Parliament or to film events in the corridors and that other restrictions would be placed on them. I pointed out to them that this matter could be resolved forthwith. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition gave me a telephone call this morning, I think at about 11 o'clock, and said that he was willing to assist in discussions with the media. I said, 'So am I. All that I want is a written apology and a written agreement.' That is simple enough. They are men enough on the boards of those companies—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** They are men enough to know that they have broken their word and that they should be men enough to give me a written apology and to enter into a written agreement. My word, this time we will make very sure that the written agreement covers all the points at issue.

Concerning the direction to the Sergeant-at-Arms, what else was I to do in the circumstances when it came to my attention that it was deliberately engineered by the commercial television channels that they would be present at the doors of Parliament House this afternoon specifically to confront with the attendants of this House: not with members, not with me, but with the attendants of Parliament House? What do members expect me to do: to come to the defence of the attendants, or just leave them out on a limb? Perhaps each member could ponder that question. My answer has been to come to their defence with a clear and simple statement of their responsibilities.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Come to order! You have had your opportunity. So, having consulted with the senior Clerk and the Sergeant-at-Arms, I gave the written direction to Mr Bridges and asked that it be enforced. The Leader can still have his interviews in his room on the second floor, even though these people have not yet seen the error of

their ways and apologised. Provided that they abide by this document, they can go ahead. There need be no problem whatever. All that the boards of the companies need to do is instruct their Managing Directors to apologise to me in writing and set up a written agreement. Then, the whole problem is solved easily and simply.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (16)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Goldsworthy, Ingerson, Lewis, Meier, Olsen (teller), Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (18)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M.J. Brown, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Payne, Slater, and Trainer.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Blacker, S.G. Evans, Gunn, Mathwin, Oswald, and Rodda. Noes—Messrs Crafter, Mayes, Peterson, Plunkett, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

## STRANGERS GALLERY

**Mr TRAINER:** I direct my question to you, Sir, in your role as Speaker. Would you, Sir, when you are considering the security arrangements for the Assembly, also consider the pros and cons of the installation of some form of protective screen at the front of the Strangers Gallery made of non-reflective glass?

The security arrangements in other Parliaments in Australia and overseas severely restrict public access. I have seen the procedures that are inflicted on electors who wish to observe the proceedings in the House of Commons at Westminster or in the United States Congress in Washington. The security arrangements involve extensive searching of persons and property, the use of metal detectors, and so on.

It has been a long term tradition of this House and one which I am sure most of us would wish to see continued that we give free access to the electors whom we all represent. That free access could still be maintained if a protective screen of glass could be installed across the front of the Strangers Gallery. If made of non-reflective glass, such a screen would provide protection for members from deranged persons yet not detract from the magnificent 1890s ambience of the Chamber, nor deprive the public of the ready access to which they are entitled.

**The SPEAKER:** First, I agree with many of the honourable member's sentiments, and I thank him for his question. It has been claimed that Parliament House is a public place and that therefore access should be unfettered. In one sense it is a public place, but substantially, and certainly legally and historically, it is not: there are restrictions on the right of any citizen to come in here.

I agree, and my own personal view always has been that there should be the greatest access to Parliament House consistent with reasonable security. One of the problems about security is that the least said about it the better. One of the difficulties we have at the moment is that a report exists dealing with the question of security. It is a high level report, which was prepared, as I understand it, through liaison between the Public Buildings Department and the Police Force some two or three years ago now during the Speakership of the member for Light.

I suggest that any member can come and discuss with me the way in which security can be improved. I am most happy to listen to that. Further, because recent events have highlighted the issue, I would like to see the major Parties, in consultation with the Country Party and the two Independent Labor members in the House, attempt to reach some agreement based on this report to which I have referred. One of the difficulties that has faced both Speaker Eastick and myself has been a general lack of co-operation between the Parties which honourable members represent. Furthermore, I point out that there are some five very large divisions making up separate departments of this building, and we very badly need, in my respectful opinion, the Administration of Parliament Act to come into effect. Secondly, as part of that, we very badly need the major Parties to get together in a co-operative joint venture and let us see what can be done. In the meantime, any honourable member who wishes to see me will find that I am still as approachable as ever. The honourable Deputy Leader.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Mr Speaker, when did you change the original rules for television filming of the proceedings of Parliament? In your lengthy defence to the House this afternoon you repeated several times that the television reporters were in breach of the original ground rules laid down for filming proceedings of this House. I do not know how far back 'original' goes, but during the initial periods of filming the proceedings of Parliament some questions were asked by the Opposition as to what the ground rules would be, and the Leader of the Opposition was summoned to your office to discuss them. In the event, he could not go, and I went.

You, Sir, and I had a discussion on what the ground rules would be. You showed me a letter that you intended to send to the television stations regarding the ground rules, which we discussed. Two points were contained in those ground rules: first, that there must be fairness in reporting (that is, both sides of the House would get equal time and exposure); and, secondly, that there would be no deliberate attempt by the television channels to embarrass members of Parliament.

At no stage, Sir, was there in that letter or in our discussions any reference to what would happen in the public gallery or in the filming of other events around this place. Quite obviously, the original ground rules must have been changed if in your assertion the managers of the television channels have been in clear breach of the original agreement. They were certainly not in breach of any agreement to which the Opposition was a party. If you changed those ground rules, Sir, I would further like to know why the Opposition was not consulted.

**The SPEAKER:** I recall the honourable member coming to my office, and I also remember that the ground rules were laid down in about mid-1983. I do not recall sending a letter, although I do recall the two points made by the honourable member. In fact, I think that the honourable member asked a question in this House because he believed that a television camera had been focused on him when another member was speaking.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** With respect, Sir, your memory fails you again.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member may believe that, but I think I can remember it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The situation is that the basis of the ground rules—

*The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Alexandra has been here long enough not to have to be treated like a child. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked me a question and he might pay me the courtesy of listening to the answer.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! As I explained, the original ground rules were laid down orally: they were made on a station

by station and television channel by channel basis. There were no changes, and there have not been any changes.

## BUS SERVICE

**Ms LENEHAN:** Will the Minister of Transport investigate the following concerns which have been raised with me by residents of Hackham West with a view to, first, the introduction of an articulated bus to replace the standard size bus on the 7.52 a.m. service from Beach/Majorca Roads on route 743; secondly, the provision of an extra bus service on routes 743 and 744 on Thursday evening after the 7.23 p.m. service from the Noarlunga Centre; and, thirdly, an extension of services into Saturday afternoon and Sunday and public holidays?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The behaviour in this House has become worse and worse as the weeks have gone on. It is the behaviour of children, not adults. I ask that some adult-like responsibility be shown.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** I thank the member for Mawson for her question. I appreciate that the honourable member, as long as she has been the member for that district, has always endeavoured to improve the bus services in her area, which is a rapidly developing one. She has asked me to investigate those services that her constituents are concerned about. I will certainly be happy to do that.

**Mr S.G. Evans:** What about mine?

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** Yes, the member for Fisher has the same problem; his is not the only area—there are quite a few others. It would be wonderful if the State Transport Authority had the resources to meet all the demands that I am receiving. I understand that an articulated bus was introduced on the 743 service on 27 February, but I will check that out. I will certainly investigate the possibility of the other requests that have been made and forward a report to the honourable member.

## MEDIA BAN

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Mr Speaker, how many police and extra staff will be needed to escort members of the media into and out of Parliament House and to accompany them while they are in the building?

**The SPEAKER:** None, provided that there is co-operation. Of course, if there was a confrontation and a struggle, I would be required to call for reinforcements, obviously—under normal circumstances, none.

## CHILD CARE FACILITIES

**Mr FERGUSON:** Will the Minister for Environment and Planning, representing the Minister of Community Welfare, inform the House whether any progress has been made on the Henley and Grange council's submission to his Department for a child care centre in Henley Beach? Very strong representations have been made to the Minister's Department for a child care centre in Henley Beach. I have been contacted by the Western Community Hospital seeking support for the child care centre which will assist the shortage of nursing staff in the Henley Beach district. In correspondence to me, the Director of Nursing, Ms C.N. Daulby, has stated:

The Western Community Hospital wholly agrees with the concept of a child care centre for the City of Henley and Grange and supports the submission prepared by the Henley and Grange council. As a hospital whose main workforce is composed of women, we are aware that the current lack of facilities for child care prevents many of the nursing profession from returning to the workforce. It is anticipated that, with nursing education moving from hospital based to college based, a shortage of nursing staff will occur. Therefore, it will be imperative to attract the younger married registered nurse back to the workforce, so adequate child care facilities are of the utmost importance.

From the aspect of 'preventative medicine' we as a health care institution can also see the importance of a child care centre in this district. The fact that a parent knows her child is competently cared for in an acceptable environment must alleviate a considerable amount of anxiety and stress. It is a well known fact that stress is a major contributing factor to many illnesses. Perhaps the number of persons collecting supporting parents benefits could decrease when a person is able to return to the workforce also giving them a feeling of self-esteem. We lend our total support to the Henley and Grange council in their submission.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I will draw the honourable member's concerns to my colleague, the Minister for Community Welfare, and ensure that he brings down a full report on the matter for him.

## MEDIA BAN

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Mr Speaker, can you say whether the message just delivered to the press by Mr Geoffrey Anderson, a senior member of the Premier's staff, advising the media that they may enter Parliament House at 3.15 p.m. is with your approval or at the instruction of the Premier?

**The SPEAKER:** I know nothing of the matter. The member for Albert Park.

*Members interjecting:*

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

## BUDGET ACCOUNTS

**Mr HAMILTON:** Will the Minister of Mines and Energy give favourable consideration to the implementation of budget ETSA accounts similar to those that now exist with the South Australian Gas Company? In conjunction with this, will the Minister consider ETSA, Sagasco and Telecom account budget payment centres being set up at various locations throughout South Australia? I have been approached by a number of my constituents requesting that they be able to pay money into such budget accounts so that when their ETSA accounts do arrive they will have sufficient money put aside to pay for them.

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** I thank the honourable member for that question, because it gives me an opportunity to tell the House that some months ago (certainly last year) I had some discussions on this matter with Drew Polglase, General Manager of the South Australian Gas Company, Leon Sykes, General Manager, and Bill Hayes, Chairman, of the Electricity Trust. It was my view that since accounts for electricity are for a three month period they can be for a sizable amount, and it might be of benefit to those members of the community on limited and fixed incomes if some scheme could be introduced to allow for regular payments to be made.

I was also aware that at about that time a scheme along those lines was being introduced in Victoria. As a result partly of those discussions but also, I want to make clear, on the initiative of the Gas Company, a scheme was introduced which enables people to pay the Gas Company on a regular basis an amount which is then used to defray their two monthly accounts. As I understand it, a person can elect to pay in this manner and a discussion is held during which the Gas Company estimates the likely yearly consumption of gas and what it would cost. The customer works out the most convenient time interval for payment, be it weekly, fortnightly or monthly, and a sum which will

then be paid on that basis is established. The person can then be issued with a book of vouchers and regular payments can then be made. The amount paid in is adjusted on a yearly basis against the actual accounts received.

It is my understanding that payments can be made at those places where Gas Company accounts can be paid. I will check that for the honourable member and see if I can get any further information. My understanding is that the member's question also referred to ETSA and Telecom accounts. As a result of my discussions with the Chairman and the General Manager of ETSA a number of schemes have been looked at.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** I can take up much more time if needed. As long as the honourable member maintains the standard of interest he is portraying, I will need that time to get through to him. ETSA is examining a number of schemes for periodic payment of accounts. One of the suggested schemes is very up to date and innovative. It is the first time I have heard of such a scheme. It involves an electronic evolution of the coin-in-the-slot arrangement that used to be available for the supply and payment of gas. I understand that in some parts of the world such a scheme was also used for the supply of electricity. This new scheme overcomes some of the difficulties associated with the old coin-in-the-slot containers, such as misappropriation either through robbery on the premises or the householder tampering with the device. This new scheme takes into account most of those difficulties in that it uses a coded card. The card is inserted into the mechanism and that allows a specified amount of electricity to be used and the card is consumed. That takes care of the situation of anyone attempting to reuse the cards or in some way getting more electricity than a person might be entitled to through the use of a card. In relation to Telecom accounts—

**The Hon. D.C. Brown:** Are you trying to deliberately talk out Question Time?

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** No, not at all. I would have thought the travesty—

**The Hon. D.C. Brown:** Look at Klunder laughing behind you. Klunder's there telling you how much longer you've got.

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** I am sorry that the member for Torrens and others are not interested in this matter, because it concerns many people in the community. I will bring down any further information I have and let the honourable member have it.

**The SPEAKER:** I will add quickly to my answer to the question the member for Light: no matter what instructions anyone else has given, the instruction that I have issued will be carried out and obeyed. The honourable member for Davenport.

## MEDIA BAN

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** My question is to you, Mr Speaker. Does the stop work meeting of members of the AJA at the front of Parliament House at present mean that a black ban has been imposed on the reporting of the proceedings of this Parliament due to the Speaker's inconsistent rulings which effectively amount to a censorship upon the press?

**The SPEAKER:** I have not got a crystal ball in which to gaze.

*The Hon. D.C. Brown interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member want an answer? I cannot divine by some extraordinary measure what on earth is happening at that meeting. All I can tell the House is that the President or the Secretary (I am not sure which) of the AJA has asked for a meeting with me at 3.15, and hopefully that will be the start of fruitful negotiations.

---

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

## PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: SPEAKER'S REMARKS

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** In answer to a question from the member for Ascot Park this afternoon you rightly indicated that there had been problems to both the previous Speaker and yourself in relation to matters of security. I rise only to say that I would have phrased it slightly differently and said that there were some honourable members of both Parties who were frustrating the implementation of security measures.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** This afternoon, after it was alleged that you had erred in your determinations yesterday and more particularly during the period of your defence, a number of interjections flew across the Chamber and various remarks were made by you. At one point you said that I, the member for Alexandra, was acting like a child. I draw the matter to your attention. I will take on the chin any allegations that are directed to me when they have some foundation but I believe you recognise that you did err in that instance. I ask that you direct that that remark be withdrawn.

**The SPEAKER:** I indicate that the honourable member did approach me and gave me his word that what I thought had prevailed had not and, those being the circumstances, yes, I do withdraw the word.

## POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

## CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning):** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It provides for the suspension from operation of the sections of the Classification of Publications Act Amendment Act which make it an offence for a person to sell, display or deliver for sale a film (or video tape) that has not been classified. The Bill allows for these sections to be brought into operation by way of subsequent proclamation. It was the Government's intention to proclaim the recent amendments to the Classification of Publications Act, which will

result in the withdrawal from sale of X type video tapes and initiate compulsory classification of all video tapes for sale or hire, as soon as possible. Indeed, it had been hoped to proclaim the legislation to operate on and from 1 April. (Obviously, the Government is anxious not to postpone that date because to do so would result in the continued availability of X rated tapes, which is not the desire of this Parliament.)

Although it is pleased with the legislation in its present form, the industry in general is concerned that many of the G, PG, M and R types of video cassettes that they currently have on their shelves have not been formally classified by the Commonwealth Film Censorship Board in Sydney. This would mean that once the legislation is proclaimed to come into effect they would have to withdraw many video tapes from circulation until a formal classification is issued by the Film Censorship Board. The industry estimates that about 2 500 titles would be directly affected. The Commonwealth Film Censor has verified this figure and has advised that, of the 2 500, possibly as many as 2 000 titles could presently be available through normal retail outlets; this represents a considerably high proportion of all video tapes available for retail sale. The Commonwealth Film Censor has also advised that, at the present rate of classification, the backlog of 2 500 could be cleared over a period of five months.

It seems reasonable, therefore, to allow the industry a little further time before introducing a compulsory classification system. This would then alleviate the need for them to remove from their shelves these particular tapes. (I am informed that some of the film/tapes which fall into this unclassified category are *Blue Fin, Chariots of Fire, Empire Strikes Back, Annie, Champions, High Road to China,* etc.) The Government's intention is to bring these particular suspended provisions into operation in four months time.

The Classification of Publications Act Amendment Act which recently passed through Parliament will be brought into operation as soon as this particular amendment has been passed and assented to. As a precautionary measure for the period until the suspended provisions are brought into operation, the Bill provides that it will be an offence to sell, display or deliver on sale a film that has been determined by the Classification of Publications Board or by the Film Censorship Board to be beyond an R classification. The suspended provisions will, of course, when they come into operation, cover that ground and more by prohibiting the sale of any film that is not classified as a G, PG, M or R film.

The opportunity is being taken to include in this further amending Bill amendments to sections 18a and 19. Section 18a presently makes the person having the control or management of premises in which an offence involving a restricted publication is committed also guilty of an offence. Section 19 presently provides for the seizure and forfeiture of restricted publications involved in certain offences against the Act. The amendments proposed will extend the application of these sections so that they will apply to any offences against the Act involving publications whether classified or not.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows: Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on the day on which the Classification of Publications Act Amendment Act, 1985, comes in operation. Clause 3 amends section 18 of the principal Act which sets out offences against the Act. The Classification of Publications Act Amendment Act, 1985, which is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation, provided for a new subsection (3) making it an offence for a person to sell, display or deliver on sale an unclassified film. The clause makes amendments providing that this new offence is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation in order to enable its operation to be postponed to some day after the commencement of the Classification of Publications Act Amendment Act, 1985. The clause also inserts a new offence that in effect prohibits the sale of any film determined under the principal Act or a corresponding law to be not suitable for classification as a G, PG, M or R film. This new offence and the supporting evidentiary provision will, under the clause, expire when the new subsection (3) comes into operation.

Clause 4 amends section 18a of the principal Act which provides that where an offence against the Act is committed in relation to a restricted publication the person having the control or management of premises in which the offence was committed is also guilty of an offence unless he establishes the defence under subsection (2). The clause amends this section so that it will apply in relation to any publication whether or not classified as a restricted publication. Clause 5 amends section 19 of the principal Act which authorises a member of the Police Force to enter premises upon which an offence relating to the exhibition, sale or distribution of a restricted publication is reasonably believed to have been committed and to seize any copies of restricted publications upon those premises. The section provides for forfeiture of restricted publications involved in an offence against the Act. The clause amends this section so that it will apply in relation to any offence against the Act involving a publication whether or not classified as a restricted publication. I commend the measure to the House.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** The Opposition has facilitated the passage of this legislation in both Houses and it supports the Bill on the basis that it believes the Minister is willing to give a commitment that the rest of the legislation will be proclaimed and that a meeting of Executive Council will be held either today or tomorrow to ensure that the X rated films that were the subject of much debate when the original legislation went through will be banned by 31 March. I understand that during debate in another place it was suggested that the meeting of Executive Council might be deferred and that the legislation, therefore, might not be brought into effect until 3 or 4 April. Perhaps the Minister will confirm that Executive Council will meet in time to ensure that X rated video material will be banned by 31 March and not subsequently.

It is reasonable that this Bill extends the transitional period for some films that are not yet classified. These films number about 2 500, and include *Blue Fin* and *The Empire Strikes Back.* Most of these films are innocuous and the legislation will enable the Commonwealth Film Censor to catch up on his four-month or five-month backlog of classification without having to have these films pulled out of circulation over the next few months. The exclusion of subsections (3) and (3a) of section 18 of the legislation will permit the rest of the legislation to be put into effect, which will mean that X rated movies and videos will be banned and that those innocuous films can continue to be sold or hired.

Indeed, the legislation would be unworkable and the law would be seen to be an ass in some respects if its effect was the banning of a whole range of films which are acceptable for sale or hire in the market place. It would also mean that the police themselves, if they allowed those innocuous films to remain on shelves for sale or hire, would literally be turning a blind eye to the sale or hire of those films rather than prosecuting for breaches of the new legislation. Clause 5 further strengthens section 19 of the principal Act which authorises a member of the Police Force to enter premises upon which an offence relating to the exhibition, sale or distribution of a restricted publication is reasonably

believed to have been committed and to seize any copies of restricted publications upon those premises. The Opposition supports the Bill.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning):** First, I thank the member for Mount Gambier and other Opposition members for facilitating the passage of this Bill. Secondly, I give the commitment, as requested by the honourable member, that the Government intends that Executive Council shall meet in the morning. The only possible problem with that timing would have been if the message from this House did not reach the other House in time for the President to visit His Excellency later this afternoon in order to obtain assent to the Bill. However, in view of the co-operation that has occurred in this Chamber, I would not anticipate a problem. I also have had an undertaking from the Attorney-General that the Legislative Council will sit until the message comes back from this place. In any event, the Legislative Council this session has been sitting for much longer hours than was its wont, so I would not imagine there would be a problem in that respect. I commend the measure to the House.

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

## LAND AND BUSINESS AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second reading.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning):** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

This short Bill is a measure linked with the new Liquor Licensing Act. It amends the Land and Business Agents Act to require that those carrying on the business of hotel broking obtain an endorsement on an agent's licence under that Act. At present, hotel brokers are subject to an unnecessary 'double licensing' requirement. Hotel brokers must first obtain an agent's licence under the Land and Business Agents Act as a precondition to obtain a hotel broker's licence under the Licensing Act.

It has been decided to rationalise the provisions relating to hotel brokers by transferring the occupational licensing requirement to an occupational licensing Act—the Land and Business Agents Act. At the same time, a narrower and more appropriate definition of 'hotel broker' has been adopted.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 inserts in the definition section, section 6, a definition of 'hotel broker'. The term is defined as meaning a person who acts as an agent in relation to the sale, purchase or exchange or any other dealing with or disposition of premises in respect of which a hotel licence is in force under the Liquor Licensing Act, 1985.

Clause 4 inserts a new section 13a providing that it is to be an offence for a licensed agent to act, or hold himself out, as a hotel broker unless his licence bears an endorsement, made in accordance with the regulations, authorising him to act as a hotel broker. Clause 5 amends section 107, the regulation making section, by inserting a power to make regulations providing for any matter or thing relating to hotel broker endorsements, including the proceedings and grounds for the making or removal of such endorsements.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## LIQUOR LICENSING BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's message intimating that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendments Nos 4 to 16 but had disagreed to amendments Nos 1 to 3.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I move:

That the House of Assembly do not insist on its amendments Nos 1 to 3.

The amendments to the Bill made by the House of Assembly and disagreed to by the Legislative Council are as follows:

No. 1. Clause 27, page 14, after line 5—Insert paragraph as follows:

*(ab)* if the licensee elects to open the licensed premises to the public for the sale of liquor on a Sunday, the licensee must keep the licensed premises open to the public for that purpose for a continuous period of at least four hours.

No. 2. Clause 37, page 19, line 26—Leave out paragraph *(b)*.

No. 3. Clause 37, page 19, line 29—Leave out '(1) *(a)*' and insert '(1)'.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I am pleased to support the motion, and I take this opportunity to perhaps enlighten the Committee as to the precise meaning of what the Minister has just referred to. As to amendment No. 1, to which the Legislative Council has disagreed, the Government has now agreed to back down on its previous insistence that hotels which open on a Sunday must remain open for a continuous period of at least four hours. The Opposition is pleased that the Government has seen reason on this issue, and that hoteliers will now have flexibility in regard to being able to open on Sunday for as long or as short a time as they please. We know that this will be particularly appreciated by country hotels, especially those in remote areas, and we believe that it is now more likely that better service will be provided for the public than otherwise would have been the case.

Amendments Nos 2 and 3 to clause 37 relate to retail trading of liquor stores on Sunday. Amendment No. 3 is consequential on amendment No. 2. The Government's not insisting on these amendments is a backdown from its previous refusal to countenance the proposition of retail liquor stores trading on a Sunday. On the two counts to which I have referred, the Opposition is pleased to support the motion. On that relatively happy note, the Liquor Licensing Bill (after it is proclaimed) will become law.

Motion carried.

## ART GALLERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 21 March. Page 3452.)

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray):** On behalf of the Opposition, I am pleased to support the Bill, to which I will speak only briefly. The Liberal Party spokesman on matters relating to the arts, the Hon. Murray Hill in the other place, will speak on this matter in more detail. The Opposition is pleased to support this small Bill, which proposes to change the term of office for Board members from a fixed four year term to a term not exceeding three years. The Premier and Minister for the Arts indicated in the second reading explanation of the Bill that:

> The resultant increased turnover of Board members should increase active commitment from members and wider community participation from the public.

That is important. I hasten to add that I have had very little, if anything, to do with the administration of the South Australian Art Gallery. I hope that one day that will change,

because I, together with many other people in this State, am very proud of the Gallery.

I enjoy going there as often as I can with members of my family. It needs a considerable amount of attention and dedication on the part of the Board and those responsible for the administration of that facility. I recognise the need for a wider participation on the part of the public so that indeed more people can have a depth of knowledge and understanding of some of the problems that are confronted by the Board, which, I am sure, enjoys being part of determining the direction that the Gallery should take in the future.

In supporting the Bill, I am pleased to see that Mrs Heather Bonnin has recently been made Chairman of the Board. I know that Mrs Bonnin can bring a considerable amount of expertise and that she will certainly be dedicated in the work that she will do as Chairman. I wish her well as Chairman of the Board in the responsibility that she has. The Opposition supports the Bill.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer):** I thank the honourable member for his support of the Bill. His remarks indicated that he understands the purpose behind it. With the enactment of this change there will be the flexibility that is suggested. As we say in the second reading, the drafting style also brings up to date the terms under which members of the Board are appointed. The Art Gallery has undergone considerable changes recently with the new Director and Chairman of the Board. I fully agree with the honourable member that it is a major arts institution in this State performing a vital service to the community of South Australia. Certainly, I see it going from strength to strength. This minor amendment will, nonetheless, enhance the ability of the Board to remain flexible and provide for that participation which is so important.

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

## SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MUSEUM ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 21 March. Page 3453.)

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray):** Again, the Opposition is pleased to support this Bill. The object of the legislation is to increase from six to eight persons the Board membership of the South Australian Museum and to provide variable terms of office. Currently, a four year fixed term needs to be served. It is to be changed as a result of this legislation to a term not exceeding three years. The South Australian Museum is emerging as one of the very great cultural and scientific institutions in Australia. We in Government, with the Hon. Murray Hill from another place as the then Minister of Arts, were largely responsible for the redevelopment of the Museum which was initiated between 1979 and 1982.

The Museum's anthropological collection is world famous. The South Pacific collection is, I understand, the best in the southern hemisphere, and the Aboriginal collection is the best in the world. One has merely to recognise the number of people who visit the Museum from other States and other countries to know how well thought of it is. On the part of the people who live in this State it is important to recognise that not only for the reasons I have suggested but also because it is a very great tourist attraction. The opening of stage 1 of the project, the natural science building, will occur in May. I hope that it will not finish there and that we will be able to see the continuation with stage 2 in the near future.

I agree with what the Premier has had to say in his explanation of the Bill. The Board does need wider expertise. That is good in any circumstances such as this. Some experts could be deterred from serving on the Board, as is the case at present, if the fixed term arrangement continued. Also, I can understand that the Board would have difficulty in obtaining quorums under the present arrangement. I recognise the magnificent work that has been carried out by the Chairman, Mr Tyler, who is quite obviously a very great driving force in the rejuvenation of the Board and staff. I know that he strongly supports this Bill. Again, he is totally dedicated to working towards improving the South Australian Museum, and for those reasons the Opposition is pleased to support the Bill.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer):** I thank the honourable member for his remarks and support of the Bill. It is certainly true that the Museum is at an extremely exciting stage of its development. It will shortly have physical facilities that will be amongst the best in Australia and for the first time it will be able to do justice to the remarkable collections that it houses. The opportunities provided by the Museum redevelopment project justify some increase in the size of the Board, as the institution over which it will preside would have a much wider responsibility than it has had in the past. I certainly commend the Bill to the House.

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

## ADELAIDE FESTIVAL CENTRE TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 21 March. Page 3453.)

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.
*A quorum having been formed:*

**The Hon. D.C WOTTON (Murray):** This Bill is similar to the Bill that we just dealt with in that it proposes to increase the number of members on the Trust Board of the Adelaide Festival Centre from six to eight, with a new requirement that one of the eight members should be nominated by the Adelaide Festival of Arts Incorporated. Opportunity is also provided in the legislation for the Governor to appoint deputies to trustees. The Opposition was pleased to support the previous two Bills, but we we have some concern about this measure. When it is appropriate I will be moving an amendment to provide for only one other Board member, taking the number from six to seven.

We believe that that should be the case until such time as the next vacancy occurs on the Board, when the number of Board members shall revert to six (and I will explain that in a moment). My colleague in another place, the shadow Minister for the Arts, will speak on this matter in more detail when he has the opportunity to do so. I am aware that the Adelaide Festival of Arts Board has been keen for some years to have representation on the Festival Centre Trust Board. I understand the current position is that the proposal is not now opposed by the professional administrators: in fact, I understand that they support the measure.

In regard to the question of a larger Board for the Centre Trust, the Opposition recognises that, under current planning and in the current situation, the Labor Government is keen

to expand the Board and the executive at the Centre. Because we have expressed concern in the past (and will continue to do so) about the ever increasing number of people serving on these boards, the Opposition believes it would be prudent for the Board's size to remain as it is but for allowance to be made for the appointment of a representative of the Adelaide Festival of Arts Board, for the reasons that I have suggested.

Although I know that those concerned have been keen for that to happen for some time, I also know that the Premier will not support that. Obviously he has made a commitment, as Minister for the Arts, to push for the Board membership to be increased. We do not go along with that. When coming to Government we will want to know exactly what the situation is, and we will make appointments at that time if it is felt that that is necessary. At the present time that necessity is not there, as we see it. However, we support the nominee of the Adelaide Festival of Arts. We believe that the present number should be increased from six to seven and that when there is a vacancy on the Board it should revert to the original number of six. We support the second reading of the Bill to enable an amendment to be moved in Committee in relation to the matter that I have just mentioned.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer):** As to the matter concerning the nominee from the Board of the Festival of Arts, this is something that I undertook to provide some considerable time ago in discussions with the then President, Mr Alan McGregor. I think it is a good move and, in fact, in the past few months the current President of the Festival of Arts Incorporated, His Honour Justice Prior, has attended trustee meetings as an official observer. He has taken part in those meetings as a precursor to the Festival of Arts formally nominating him as a member of the Trust. I think that is a good idea and, in fact, it has been in question for a long time now.

When I was Minister for the Arts in 1978-79 there were two trustees, I think, who were also members of the Festival Board of Governors. There was always the problem as to whether they could act as official representatives or whether they really had two separate hats and had to perform in different ways. Where a body nominates a person to be a trustee, one assumes that the trustee, while obviously having to consider the Trust and its responsibilities, must also be able to put forward the perspective or point of view held by the Adelaide Festival of Arts. I hope that that formal representation at the Trust and Board level will be reflected more closely. I am sure this is happening with the Trust's role at officer level in servicing various aspects of the Adelaide Festival of Arts. There has been considerable talk about those relationships being developed, I think particularly with Anthony Steel, as Director of the Adelaide Festival (and as a former Managing Director of the Adelaide Festival Centre), and with Murray Edmonds as the new General Manager of the Trust. That point is not in dispute.

The honourable member has foreshadowed disagreement over the increase in the size of the Trust. It is a little inconsistent to object, since we have just increased the size of the Museum Board to eight for the same reasons. I do not think that eight members is cumbersome. In fact, in view of the complexity of the Trust's activities, I think that is appropriate. As to the ability of sucessive Governments to appoint members, I agree that it is important to preserve that. For those reasons it is my Government's policy to introduce the concept of staggered appointments so that there is a turnover of members. Effectively, it means that successive Governments are in a position to make changes, and it is not simply left to the luck of the draw. At the moment a Government cannot make an appointment to reflect its policies or attitudes, unless it is in office when one of these positions comes up.

As I have said, our policy is to ensure that there are staggered appointments where possible; therefore, year by year, there is the ability to either continue with particular members in office or, alternatively, a new Administration or a new Minister in an existing Administration can have some specific input. That is provided for. In fact, it is more possible under the Trust membership that I am suggesting than it is under the existing Trust membership. I think that helps to meet the points made by the honourable member, and I am surprised that he does not support the measure. I simply reiterate that I commend the Bill to the House. I think it will make the Trust more flexible, and it will certainly aid its ability to carry out its responsibilities in relation to the Festival Centre and more closely co-ordinate with the Adelaide Festival of Arts Incorporated.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Composition of the Trust.'

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I believe that all my amendments can be moved as one. Therefore, I move:

Page 1—

Line 19—Leave out 'eight' and insert 'six'.

Line 20—Leave out 'six' and insert 'four'.

After line 26—Insert new subsection as follows:

(1*a*) Notwithstanding subsection (1), the Trust shall, on and after the commencement of the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust Act Amendment Act, 1985, but only until a vacancy occurs in the office of a person appointed on the nomination of the Minister, consist of seven trustees, of whom—

*(a)* five shall be persons nominated by the Minister;

*(b)* one shall be a person nominated by the Council from amongst the members of the Council or the officers of the Council; and

*(c)* one shall be a person nominated by the Adelaide Festival of Arts Incorporated.

The Bill provides that the Trust shall consist of eight trustees, whereas we suggest there should be six trustees. The Bill further provides that six members shall be persons nominated by the Minister, and we suggest that four persons should be so nominated. I have explained the reasons why the Opposition is keen to move this amendment, so I do not intend to go into detail. I hope that the Committee will support my amendment.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

## FOOD BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 21 March. Page 3462.)

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles):** I am very pleased indeed to speak to and support this Bill. When researching the measure I reflected, without wishing to attach any undue importance to my own personal experience, that I may well be one of the best qualified people in the House to speak on it. I rate my first qualification, which is shared by some other members, as that of a housewife who has for the past 26 years been daily involved in the purchase and preparation of food for a family. However, my other qualifications go even further than that, as the daughter of a baker and the granddaughter of a grocer and as one who worked in school holidays on the factory floor in my father's business. Despite all that family involvement, I have no pecuniary interests to declare. Also, at one stage my husband was General Manager of one of South Australia's oldest and largest food processors. So, one way or another, I have

been involved in the food business generally, both as a consumer and through family interests at various times, although not personally but through those interests as a producer.

So, I have a unique interest in the area. In addition to that, of course, for three years I administered the health portfolio and in that capacity I administered the Food and Drugs Act, which this Bill along with the Controlled Substances Act repeals. It also repeals the Bread Act, 1954, and the Bakehouses Registration Act, 1945, both of which had their origins in the far distant past. Further it amends the Health Act, 1935.

The food industry involves a great many people, and it is very significant economically for both South Australia and Australia. It is difficult to obtain accurate data on the food processing industry and its technological base, but it is known that in the late 1970s approximately 22 000 people were employed in this industry in South Australia. That was approximately 10 per cent of the Australian total.

It is now believed that those numbers would be smaller. For example, in the last five years there has been a 6 per cent drop in the number of people employed in metropolitan bakeries. That circumstance would be reflected in other segments in the food industry. It is due partly to increasing technology in that area but also partly to changing food tastes and altered consumer demand. The fact that the food industry is a significant economic contributor to our State is demonstrated by some export figures in which the Premier, who happens to be the Minister on the front bench (although not the Minister handling the Bill), would be interested.

Australian Bureau of Statistics figures for principal processed food exports for 1983-84—the total for South Australia—indicate that export revenue was earned in the following areas: meat and meat preparation, $79.03 million; cheese, $7.07 million; crustaceans and molluscs $72.48 million; and although I do not have comparative figures for previous years I imagine that that the fishing industry export has shown a quite dramatic growth. It is creeping up very fast on the meat and meat preparation export figures as far as value is concerned, and in the next decade it could well overtake those figures.

One of the biggest importers from us is Japan, as well as the United States. In 1983-84, $24.28 million was earned from the exports relating to malt brewing. It is good to know that companies like Coopers Brewery have cracked the United States market with their distinctive beers. Dried peas and beans earned $2.33 million. Most of those products, interestingly enough, are exported to the Middle East, which is a major market for dried peas and beans.

It is interesting to realise what effect cultural influences have on food and the effect of those cultural influences on demand. Large and valuable orders are placed each year with a South Australian food company by Moslem communities in the Middle East for custard powder, which is much sought after during the month of Ramadan because it is ideal food with which to break a fast. Very few South Australians would realise that we export custard powder to the Middle East so that Ramadan can be observed comfortably and happily, but that is the case. Glace fruit earned $1.49 million; canned fruit, $1.3 million; non-alcoholic beverages, $.04 million; and wine and brandy, $10.45 million—a total of nearly $200 million derived from processed food. We are not talking about primary production but simply about processed food. That in itself demonstrates the great economic value to South Australia of the food industry.

Another interesting aspect of the industry in South Australia at least is the fact that the major companies involved in it have been involved for decades, some for a century, and have become household names. I made inquiries about the nature and number of companies involved in this industry and obtained a list of some of the principal companies, which are as follows: APD Snack Foods; Amscol Icecream (and other dairy foods); Anchor Foods; Arnott Motteram; Balfours; Berri Fruit Juices; CSR; Coca-Cola Bottlers; Cooper's Brewers; D. & J. Fowler; Ditters; Glover Gibbs; Hoadleys; Alfred Lawrence (suppliers to the food industry); South Australian Brewing Company; SAFCOL (one of the biggest, if not the biggest, fishing co-operative in Australia); Tip Top Bakeries; Vidale (which is a division of Unilever), and Woodroofe. The majority of those companies are household names in South Australia and, speaking for myself, and looking at the products of those companies, I would say that their concern for quality has always been paramount and that there is great brand loyalty in this State to those household brands.

During the past few years there has been an increased interest in matters of pollution, ecology, quality of life, consumer rights (including the right to knowledge), civil rights, and modern social epidemics. The merchandising of food has become less personal with the advent of packaged foods dispensed through self-service supermarkets. These stores do not have readily available informed sales staff to advise purchasers about the quality, composition or origin of the foods offered for selection. The growth, for example, of fresh meat, fruit and vegetable sales outlets which were traditionally the preserve of the suburban butcher and greengrocer now occupy supermarket space right alongside sales space for processed food. This has deprived many consumers of the opportunity for discussion, advice and personal service from their food retailers.

This thirst for knowledge about food is causing growing public concern and in particular it is leading to a demand for the availability of information which is readily understood. Added to this is the developing public interest and concern to increase health status by positive actions which are likely to promote and maintain health, and the corollary is great concern over the possible adverse effects of food and food additives. It is well known that individual foods have always been regarded as having a particular health property by tradition and it is interesting to see that some of those traditions, or old wives' tales, are now being confirmed by scientific analysis and evidence. The old wives' tales have always held that you eat meat for muscle-building, drink milk for bone-building, eat sugar or honey for energy and fish to develop the brain. Many of the so-called old wives' tales in folklore have some foundation in fact, but they can be exaggerated, and that fact is exploited by some people known in the industry as quacks. That can cause concern—a lot of it may be harmless and a lot of it certainly has a potential to be harmful.

The position is changing: many basic foods as well as food additives seem to be coming under suspicion as being a cause or at least a major contributor to ill health. Animal fats and dairy produce are considered to contribute to vascular disease; meat has been accused of causing bowel cancer, and just recently I think I read that the handling of uncooked meat can be the cause of some disease which causes foetal damage; salt is thought to be the cause of high blood pressure, and even refined foods are under suspicion; soft water has been thought to be a contributor to arterial disease; and these are just a few of the concerns that have been brought before the public in the past decade or so.

In addition to that there are concerns about food additives such as preservatives and colourings, notably the effects preservatives and colourings can have in developing hypertension, both in children and in adults. Food changes due to preparation cause loss of minerals and vitamins and there is a fear of contamination by pesticides or bacteria. All these things make it readily understandable that the public has a high level of confusion. It is often said now that

nothing seems to be safe to eat or drink. I would qualify that by saying that moderation in all things is a very good rule.

It is perhaps interesting and appropriate that in one week in this House we are passing legislation affecting both the liquor industry and the food industry and, of course, this Food Bill will have a direct effect on the liquor industry, both brewing and wine-making, and those products will come under the ambit of both pieces of legislation. The dilemma of the public is being accentuated by an increasing awareness of the responsibility of the individual to take positive action to develop and preserve good health, and a realisation that both the quantity and quality of food eaten are significant to healthy living. Apart from other modifications to the lifestyle such as exercise, non-smoking, adequate rest and relaxation, diet is one of the major factors about which members of the public can do something, if only adequate guidance is available.

There we have the challenge to the food industry, the health profession and the Government. It is an onerous responsibility and one that rests on them, also on the general public in terms of their responsibility to find out and then to make informed choices. The normal and proper avenues by which Governments become involved in this challenge are by legislation and health promotion. I am a great believer in the latter. Based on a belief that all food available for human consumption shall not be injurious to health, shall be free of foreign matter, sound and wholesome, free from adulteration and should not be misrepresented or mispurported, Governments enact legislation which covers the composition and ingredients of processed food, additives, contaminants (including microbiological contaminants), labelling (including the percentage of ingredients), representation of the product and any claims made for that product, packaging and handling, preparation, distribution and service.

I suppose in a nutshell that is what this Bill is all about. Industry must meet these laws in a proper spirit if it is to win and maintain the level of confidence of both the Government and the consumers necessary for business to be prosperous. Technology gives industry a wide scope to process foods in different manners, to change composition, to add or subtract vitamins and minerals, to change colour and texture and to preserve food items for long periods.

I remember complaining that glace cherries are not what they used to be and was told that the so-called cherry that appears in most packets these days is not actually a cherry at all but another substance made up to look like a cherry. I was told that if you did to a cherry what was necessary to get it to the glace stage (and I quote), 'You would beat the hell out of it and it wouldn't be worth eating.' Things are not always what they seem when they come out of a food packet, but they should certainly be what they are labelled as being. That is another purpose of this legislation.

Manipulation of the kind that I have described requires a profound knowledge of food and food chemistry, and much of such processing is carried out not only to meet consumer demand but to try to create new demands for new products. This market situation carries some degree of risk that is not always immediately measurable, and only in recent years has medical science identified the extensive range of complete chemicals that are capable of producing adverse health effects, especially those chemicals with mutagenic or carcinogenic properties. An enormous lot is left to discover, notably, in one area of special interest to South Australia, the processing of water to make it safe for human consumption. The rate of action may be very slow and subtle and the concentration needed to produce the desired effect is bound to vary from chemical to chemical.

I know, for example, that the Health Commission is monitoring carefully the levels of tri-halo-methanes in the water in the northern towns and it may be some years before it can be proved beyond doubt that the existence of such substances is either possibly injurious or not injurious to health. In this State we have a tremendous interest in the outcome of that monitoring, and its importance should never be forgotten. Inevitably, laws lag behind scientific developments, consumer demands and manufacturers' responses: therefore, it must be getting on for 10 years since the development of uniform food legislation throughout Australia has reached the point where in this House today we are taking the step of confirming a Bill that has already gone through another place and of becoming one of several States that have enacted uniform food legislation.

It is important, in considering the need for food legislation, to also consider the need to ensure that commercial interests are not burdened with excessive restrictive legislation. In consulting on this legislation this week with senior members of the food industry, I asked what were the principal issues confronting the food industry in South Australia in 1985, and I was told the answer in two words—cost containment. The cost of raw materials, transport, wages, rents, distribution and all the concomitant on-costs are, in the opinion of the food industry, its greatest challenge. I questioned representatives about quality and quality control, and the positive response was that it would be dangerous to contemplate reducing costs by diminishing quality control because, if one reduced quality, the product would be destroyed in the market place. Quality must be paramount in the food industry because lack of quality is so quickly discovered that the range of choice means that a product may die on the shelf if it does not meet the consumer's expectations. So, food production, processing and manufacturing and its legislative and administrative support have had a dynamic growth today which has not been equalled in the past.

Some of the factors that I have outlined were important in the development of the first food legislation early this century, but some of those factors were not considered. The question of distribution scarcely arose because the food was grown, produced, sold, and consumed in the same locality, so co-ordination of quality control and hygiene were not factors that had to be taken into account by the law. This Bill completely revolutionises the old concepts and results in a much more comprehensive piece of legislation.

Regarding the need for co-ordination, even though we are debating in a State Parliament legislation that will affect the State, albeit legislation that is to be reflected in other States, it is important to recognise that we are still part of a much bigger scene. When I referred to the value of exports, I indicated that. In the food industry there are the State level, the national level and the international level. Australia is a signatory to the Codex Alimentarius, which is prepared by the joint World Health Organisation and Food and Agricultural Organisation. As a member, it has agreed to adopt the standards produced by the Codex. This is, no doubt, assisting in achieving uniformity of standards for composition and labelling which will facilitate international trade. However, it brings problems with it, in that many of the standards are difficult to adopt into Australian practice, since they are developed by agreements between over 110 countries. These matters are considered at Commonwealth level and much uniformity is achieved in the recommendations that come from the National Health and Medical Research Council through its Food Standards Committee and its Food Legislation Committee. These committees comprise representatives from the Commonwealth, the States, industry and technology.

This Bill is essentially a Committee Bill, and it has already been thoroughly examined in another place. It provides for a uniform approach to the composition of food, the labelling of food, hygiene (including vending machines), and offences.

The administrative mechanism for this Act and the penalties differ from legislation in other States. Historically, in South Australia and throughout the Australian Commonwealth local government has played a primary role in administering food legislation. That primary role is to be somewhat diminished as a result of the requirement for the Health Commission to play a central co-ordinating role recognising the modern realities of the food chain and the distribution of food on a broad scale, and recognising also the need sometimes to be able to rapidly recall products that have had a broad distribution. That is one of the major advantages of this Bill.

From the point of the view of the prevention of mass illness, this Bill provides for an adequate call-back system which will be required for all processed foods to be able to be identified in such manner that a batch which has been found to be suspect to some reasonable contamination may be recalled from retail outlets and the public adequately warned. This is demonstrably important. It is intriguing to read in the definition clause of the Bill that 'food' means any substance (whether in solid or liquid form) for human consumption or represented to be for human consumption, and includes a gaseous food additive and a substance that is intended to be introduced into the mouth but not ingested. If one looks at the model food standards regulations and the list of foods identified there, it seems almost a semantic miracle that such a relatively small set of phrases can identify such a vast range, as follows: cereal and cereal products; meat and meat products; fish and fish products; eggs and egg products; vegetables, edible fats and oils and related products; milk and other dairy products; gelatine and jelly products; spices, condiments, sauces, vinegar and pickles; sugar and like products; honey and confectionery; icecream and related products; nuts and nut products; fruit and fruit products; cordials, syrups, fruit drinks, soft drinks and essences; alcoholic beverages; tea, coffee, chicory, cocoa and related products; and special purpose foods.

Given that list, I wonder how many of us could come up with a definition which simply states that, 'Food is any substance, whether in solid or liquid form, for human consumption', although I suppose that there is really no other way of putting it. The food processors who deal with that vast list can be categorised to include millers, bakers, brewers, bottlers, manufacturing grocers, and the manufacturers of confectionery, snack and dairy foods. That list virtually covers the activities of the companies that I described earlier as being the backbone of the food industry in South Australia.

I was Minister of Health at the time when the Ministers' Council agreed to the uniform food legislation, and during my term considerable discussion and negotiation took place, principally with local government, as it was essential that local government be satisfied with any proposed legislation. I certainly commend all those involved since I left that office in coming to what appears to be a relatively amicable agreement. Local government is to be responsible for food controls at retail level and for hygiene, while the Health Commission will be responsible for analysis. The legislation sets up a Food Quality Committee, on which will fall the responsibility for the development of regulations.

Because of amendments made in another place, concerns that the food industry had in relation to the original Bill have, in the main, been met. However, the very great concern of the food processors in relation to the protection of valuable industrial information, namely, formulae and the methods for food production, is still at a level which must be further met, and I propose to try to do that during the Committee stage. The fact that food inspectors have enormous powers to enter a property and seize documents is causing the industry great concern. The Opposition believes that the industry needs some further protection than that which is contained in this Bill.

Many members would have received a letter from Coca-Cola Bottlers outlining that company's concern. I think it is fair to say that that company is speaking for the entire industry in saying that there were five proposals in the original Bill that would have made life unduly difficult for manufacturers. Virtually all of those proposals have now been satisfactorily dealt with. There is no point in my going over these matters in this debate, because they were dealt with in another place. However, the inspection clause is still causing some concern. As the letter from Coca-Cola Bottlers states:

> As soft drink manufacturers—

and the author might well have said 'every other person involved in the industry'—

> we jealously guard product formulations, marketing plans, components of production litreage, and similar data. Where commercial secrecy is desirable, we would require that the nature of documents which could be inspected be prescribed.

That has been done, but I believe that the matter needs further attention. The letter further states:

> We would expect these to relate to ingredients standards, hygiene procedures, quality assurance testing and similar product related items.

That seems to be a fair enough requirement by companies, because their whole future and the place that they have in the market are really at stake when it comes to the consumption of their products. The formula for Coca-Cola has certainly been jealously and very effectively guarded, and it has never been discovered by anyone. The product has been emulated but never precisely copied by any other manufacturer. During the Committee stage this matter will be addressed by way of amendment.

I conclude by stressing the extreme importance of the legislation. I doubt whether it will receive any of the spirited debate that was related to the Liquor Licensing Bill, simply because South Australians (and we in this House among them) tend to take very much for granted the great public health measures that are inherent in legislation of this kind. We have been fortunate enough to grow up in an era where high standards have been maintained. Had we lived in the preceding century, life would have been very different indeed, and illness and death would have been very much related to the lack of hygiene, in terms not only of infectious diseases but also of contaminated food and its adverse effects on individuals.

So, I can only express gratitude that we are so fortunate in this country, and in particular in this State, in the standards not only observed by the manufacturers and retailers of processed food but also in relation to standards of enforcement and administration of legislation that have existed at both State and local government levels.

The newly established Food Quality Committee will make regulations laying down standards with which food must comply and standards to avoid misrepresentation of the quality of food, as well as standards in relation to labelling, premises and hygiene requirements. All those things will secure for us and our children for some decades to come (if the past is any guide, because food Bills seem to have a very long life in this State) conditions under which we can feel very secure indeed. I commend the Bill to the House and I commend the Minister, his staff and everyone involved with developing this legislation which, in the main, appears to be acceptable to all concerned.

**Mr BAKER (Mitcham):** I refer to two matters, the first of which relates to a case that was brought to my attention about nine months ago, involving a bakery in the Adelaide metropolitan area. The bakery had been fined on two occa-

sions for operating at unhealthy premises. The magistrate concerned was acting on an action brought against the company by the Metropolitan County Board. The bakery had not paid fines imposed; the Board could not distrain the equipment as payment of the fine, because it was regarded as being tools of trade. The bakery continued in its unhealthy state. It was not closed down. I do not see how this new set of guidelines will solve that sort of problem.

The person who raised it with me suggested that, if a manufacturer continued to operate in an unclean and unhealthy situation, there should be adequate means whereby this could be policed. It was of some frustration to the Metropolitan County Board that it could take no effective action to close down the bakery because the law did not prescribe it. I see again in the new Bill that there is no means whereby this mechanism can be used to prevent unhealthy food hitting the South Australian market.

The second point I wish to address is that of the quality of food and what should be included in a label. I was visited this week by a woman from the Womens Electoral Lobby who said that it would have been nice to be consulted on the Food Bill. I told her not to worry about consultation because it will all be in the regulations. I showed the lady concerned a copy of the Bill and said that, if she wanted to have an impact on the legislation, she should see the Minister about the labelling provisions which will be encompassed in the regulations. This Bill really is a regulation Bill. It sets up boards and contains some means of redress. It gives powers to officers but really it does not show the direction of Government in this regard. In most cases that is appropriate.

The concern expressed to me in regard to labelling was that people have a right to know the substances that are contained in food. Medical science has advanced a long way down the track on this subject in the past five years. There is now a greater awareness of the problems of excess salt, colouring and preservatives in food. Whilst this subject was brought to my attention this week, it has certainly been in the media for a number of years as new discoveries have been made. I am sure that the regulations are on the way at this very moment, as the Bill will have to be proclaimed in the near future.

When the Minister is looking at the regulations, particularly as they relate to labelling, he may consult with some of the groups concerned, and I hope he gets some idea of the magnitude of their concerns with current practices. To my knowledge, South Australia has been well served in this area and as a State can be relatively proud of its record over a period of time. From my observations, our food is far better labelled than that in almost any State in Australia. A cost is involved with labelling, but we have led Australia in this regard. I take the point raised by one of my constituents, namely, that we can continue to improve in this area and get manufacturers to specify those items which are necessary and about which people wish to know so that when people consume food of a packaged form they will know of any substances that may be harmful to their health.

I can find no great fault with the Bill. My colleague the member for Coles has raised some matters that were brought to our attention by Coca-Cola and she will be pursuing those at the Committee stage. It is difficult to find fault with a Bill that is not really a Bill but rather a means of setting up a system of regulations, which will be the most important part of the Bill and not the Bill itself.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Tourism):** I have listened very closely to the contributions of the members for Coles and Mitcham, and I thank them for their contributions. The need for the introduction of this amending Bill has been well known and well stated for a long time. It is a major change in an area that has desperately needed reform for some time. The Bill has been one of the most widely circulated pieces of legislation in this House to my memory. All the organisations and bodies throughout South Australia, including the Local Government Association, for which I have a particular concern, have been involved in lengthy and detailed discussions. As all honourable members would be aware, this is a very complex Bill and, as the member for Mitcham has said, it is such that it is only an enabling piece of legislation; the rules (if one could describe them as such) will be included in the regulations.

The common argument of members from both sides of the House—depending on whether they are in Opposition or in Government—is that government by regulation is not necessarily a good thing. Legislation periodically comes before the Chamber wherein government by regulation is the most desired course. This is one such piece of legislation. It is only proper to acknowledge that the member for Coles was one of the Ministers in South Australia who wrestled with the need for reform during her time as Minister of Health. Her contribution ought to be acknowledged. I am certainly also prepared to acknowledge her long involvement in the food industry in South Australia.

Not many industries impact so dramatically upon each and every one of us as does the food industry. We as citizens depend very significantly, in relation to the foods and beverages that we consume daily, on either the goodwill of the industry that produces them or Government regulations which ensure that the consumer is protected in every way. That is in no way a reflection on the producer, but we all know that quite often it is only at the expense of the consumer that we are aware that something might not be as it ought to be. That is not a satisfactory way for the industry to develop and market its products.

This piece of legislation, which has taken so long to come to fruition, gives South Australia the rules that it has sought for so long. In the knowledge that the legislation has been widely canvassed, discussed and approved, and, although there are some areas on which members opposite and on this side of the House need to ask questions, I urge the House to support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

**Mr M.J. EVANS:** Like the member for Coles, I draw attention to the definition of 'food', as follows:

> . . . any substance (whether in solid or liquid form) for human consumption or represented to be for human consumption and includes—
>
> *(a)* a gaseous food additive;
>
> *(b)* a substance that is intended to be introduced into the mouth but not ingested:

I am informed, as per a briefing kindly made available by the Minister of Health (and I thank him for that courtesy and the diligence of his officers), that paragraph *(b)* is intended to cover chewing gum and the like. I believe that an argument could be made to the effect that it could also cover cigarettes and tobacco products in general. I do not think that that would be necessarily stretching the definition too far.

**Mr Baker:** Don't confuse the issue.

**Mr M.J. EVANS:** I have no intention of confusing the issue. While nicotine may be a drug, tobacco products in general are not drugs. I understand that the Controlled Substances Act permits the control of substances such as nicotine in its pure form. However, the Food and Dructs Act excludes nicotine when it is included in tobacco products. I do not mean to suggest that we should in anyway prohibit cigarette or tobacco products or that we should deal with

them any more strenuously than is the case at the moment. However, I draw attention to the fact that I consider that the same strenuous standards which we apply to food covered by this legislation (including chewing gum and alcohol, in the form of beer, and so on) should also relate to cigarette products.

There are broad labelling requirements under the cigarette labelling legislation (which requires cigarette packets to carry a warning that smoking is hazardous to health). I think consideration should be given to including cigarettes and tobacco in the definition so that high standards of preparation, transportation, packaging, and labelling (in respect of the percentage of nicotine and tar, and so on) could be dealt with under this legislation. We have reached a point where we are dealing with alcohol and the like as a food in this context, and we are dealing with chewing gum as a food in this context, so I believe that consideration should be given to including tobacco products so that rigorous standards can be maintained and enforced in relation to the preparation, packaging, and labelling just as we are proposing with respect to other foods.

We very quickly jump to control the percentage of food preservatives and food additives which are, for example, carcinogenic, and we do that quite rightly. While not strictly regulating them to make it impossible for them to be sold, I think we should have similar controls and a similar philosophical perspective in relation to cigarettes—no more and no less. While I understand that it is not intended that they be included in this definition, I think the time will come when society will demand that the same high standards of labelling, presentation, and control that we apply to food additives and preservatives should apply to those dangerous additives that appear in tobacco products. I make that point in connection with the definition of 'food' while not opposing the clause.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I think the Committee would be aware that I could give a long and detailed response, but the constraints of time prevent me from doing that. It is a relevant point that the honourable member has drawn to the Committee's attention, and that is the purpose of Parliament. I point out that nicotine is a poison under the Food and Drugs Act and would be picked up under the Controlled Substances Act, so there was no need to include it in this legislation. I know that the member for Elizabeth is aware of that.

His comments to this clause will be referred to the Minister of Health for his consideration. There seems to be no need to include tobacco products in this legislation. If thinking changes in the future, I am certain that the honourable member's comments will be considered.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—'Authorised officers.'

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The clause provides that the Health Commission and local councils may appoint authorised officers. While the Minister's second reading explanation outlines the changed arrangements, the Bill itself does not make it clear how councils will work together in future to co-ordinate and maximise the use of their resources in the same way they have done in the past. I believe that this clause is an appropriate place to pay a tribute to the Metropolitan County Board, the East Torrens County Board, and other County Boards that have been created to allow councils to work together effectively using staff resources to cover an area. I would like the Minister to explain how that will be done in future and what will happen to the staff of existing County Boards. In both cases that I am personally aware of—the Metropolitan County Board and the East Torrens County Board—there has been an enormous amount of dedication and great *esprit de corps* among the staff and indeed among the councils themselves. It would be a shame to see that lost without anything being devised or created to take its place.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** In response to one of the last points made by the honourable member, staff currently employed under the Metropolitan County Board will be employed by the Health Commission. Their employment will continue, but they will be employed by a different body. I think the East Torrens County Board will only have powers of immunisation, so its powers will not be affected by the legislation and it will not be concerned. Under the Local Government Act, local government will have the authority through its powers as an independent organisation or as a group (where councils can join together as an authority) to have its officers involved under this legislation. There has been consultation and consideration of the Health Commission's intention in relation to local government, and I can assure the honourable member that the Local Government Association is satisfied with the agreements that have been reached and that the rights and needs of local government are well protected.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I am not suggesting that local government is not satisfied. I am sure that if it were not we would have read about it or heard about it by now. I am seeking an explanation of what local government will be doing by way of co-operative arrangement. I know that it has that power under the Local Government Act, but what will be done by way of co-operative arrangement to maintain that cost efficient use of council resources in the administration of food legislation?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** In the metropolitan area, where the Metropolitan County Board previously was the controlling authority, local government has established a working party to determine the co-operative work that the honourable member mentioned. Of course, it is different in the country, where councils operate under their own authorities. Local government and the Health Commission are working together to determine how best they can co-operate in these new procedures with the cost effectiveness that the honourable member requested.

At this stage I am not in possession of the detailed information that the honourable member seeks, but I undertake to obtain it for her. Unfortunately, I do not have it here now, because local government has not determined what procedures it will adopt and has not finalised the procedures with the Health Commission. So, the most economically effective and co-operative action will be involved in the procedure required under this Bill.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Accepting that no-one can satisfactorily answer my question at this stage, can the Minister explain the arrangements with the Health Commission? For example, from my knowledge which is somewhat out of date there would scarcely be the accommodation within the present Commission premises for the staff of the County Board, yet I recall visiting a very efficient little office on Greenhill Road where the County Board was housed. Will everyone be under the same roof or will there be suburban and regional offices administered by the Commission for the administration of this Act?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** The honourable member has raised a very relevant matter. It is not intended that the legislation will come into effect until the end of this year. By that time it is intended that the new offices will be all housed under the one roof.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** A roof that does not exist at the moment?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I understand that this will not affect the honourable member's voting: she is seeking information. The most appropriate action for me to take is to get definitive answers to the questions, because I do not

have that information, nor are the officers able to tell us what is in the Minister's mind in terms of his programme for office accommodation. However, I undertake to get the relevant information in reply to this and the previous question of the honourable member which I acknowledge has not been answered to her or the Committee's satisfaction.

Clause passed.

Clauses 9 to 16 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

## 'KOOROOROO'

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the resolution contained in message No. 77 from the House of Assembly recommending, pursuant to sections 13 and 14 of the Botanic Gardens Act, 1978, the disposal of the house known as 'Koorooroo' in the Mount Lofty Botanic Garden, part section 840, volume 2017, folio 108.

## ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr GROOM (Hartley):** I want to follow on the issue of the Liberal Party's State taxes and charges levied by it whilst in Government between 1979 and 1982. It is important that I talk about the Liberal Party's list of imposts, as it alleged that the current Government had imposed—its list of 160 alleged State taxes and charges and other imposts plus six extra charges levied by this Government. It has aired that list up and down the length and breadth of South Australia. However, it is important that the Liberal Party's list of State taxes and charges be exposed for the shonky list that it is. It is nothing more than a blatant attempt to deceive and mislead the public. As members now know, as a consequence of some investigations I felt compelled to undertake, it has been revealed that there are two Opposition lists of alleged State taxes and charges.

*The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** My list of the Liberals' taxes and other imposts levied between 1979 and 1982 was compiled using the same criteria that members opposite used.

*The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** I know that this is a very painful area for members opposite and that they do not like having their list exposed for the shonky list that it is. We now know that there are two lists that are shonky.

*The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** I will come to it. The first list was put out by the Leader of the Opposition when he released it to the media on 9 November 1983. His list includes fee increases paid by the Government as opposed to increases paid to the Government. I readily admit that I used that criteria when I compiled my list of the Liberal Party's charges. I previously mentioned these figures. The Leader of the Opposition mentioned Hairdressers' Registration Board fees. The Chairman's fees increased from $1 090 to $1 200 per annum—up 11 per cent. The members' fees increased from $900 to $1 020 per annum—up 13 per cent.

Clearly, that is a fee increase paid by the Government as opposed to an increase paid to the Government, yet that criterion appeared on the Leader of the Opposition's list. Another of his fees related to trotting stewards' fee increases up between 15 and 30 per cent. Again, they were board fees. I will not go through all of those matters, because many are minor. For instance, I do not think that cremation fees will affect many members for some considerable time in the future.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** There have to be certain preconditions before cremation fees are paid. There will not be too many members of the public directly affected by cremation fees next week, the week after, or in the next few years, yet this item appeared on that list to pad it out. Many of these are minor matters. The member for Mallee got up in this House and said, in effect, that the list of the Leader of the Opposition was no good; the real list was the one he put in *Hansard* last October. So, I went through his list, which possibly might be the *de facto* list of the Opposition now. It may have supplanted the list put out by the Leader and therefore have *de facto* status. When I went through that list, which the honourable member kindly made available to me—and of course he was quite right: it was in *Hansard*—there were 38 instances of doubling up. The doubling up has quite clearly been included to try to pad out the list, to make it look as long as possible. The honourable member protested to me that he did not include fee increases paid by the Government as opposed to fee increases paid to the Government, but on page 4—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** I will get to that. On page 4 of the honourable member's list he listed '26.5.83, Racing Act, increased fee and he has—

*Mr Ingerson interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** I know that is painful to the member for Bragg. This definitely touches a very sore point: the shonky list honourable members opposite put out. They will not be able to parade up and down this State with their shonky list, because the public will be told that it is a shonky list. There are listed 38 instances of doubling up, and the member for Mallee protested in this House that he did not put in increases paid to the Government as opposed to increases paid by the Government. However, in relation to the Trotting Control Board steward fees were increased between 13 per cent and 30 per cent from 1 August 1983: the Chairman's fees went to $85 and a member's fee went to $65. Using the very same criteria, it is true he deleted the Hairdressing Act because he thought that was wrong in the Leader of the Opposition's list, but he still left in the Racing Act board fees, and that is an increase paid by the Government.

I have simply used these criteria when I have compiled my list. There are 38 instances of doubling up. Under National Parks and Wildlife, on 30 August 1984, they padded that out three times. The worst of all was the Fisheries Act, on 25 October 1984. Everyone knows that the State is divided into fishing zones: Western and Central, etc. I have been kinder to members opposite and I have included only one item, when I have adopted the similar criteria, but in the Fisheries Act there was an increase on 25 October 1984, but they listed it as 12 separate increases because there are 12 different zones in the State. They included in their list item 150, western zone; 151, central zone; 152, southern zone; 153, Investigator Strait; 154, Spencer Gulf; 155, St Vincent Gulf. That clearly is a very shonky way of going about compiling a list.

**Mr Ingerson:** That is your opinion.

**Mr GROOM:** It is not only my opinion: it is also the opinion of all my colleagues, I believe, on this side of the House who have studied the list. It is the view of an increasing number of people who are now starting to look at the Opposition's list in a detailed way, starting to go through it. There are 38 instances of doubling up. Take the Real Property Act—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** I heard the member for Goyder saying something to the effect that, 'We did not promise not to

increase taxes, as honourable members opposite did.' They told the people in 1982 they had a balanced Budget. They said that it was a balanced Budget and assessments were based on that. The fact of the matter was that it was the greatest piece of deception anyone could imagine because it was not a balanced Budget: it was a Budget with a $63 million deficit attached to it. How dare members opposite use a hypocritical attitude and have a go at the Premier? We have been forced into increasing taxes, charges and other imposts because of the mess left by members opposite. They told the public in 1982 that they had a balanced Budget and they brought it down as a balanced Budget, knowing full well that that was a deception and this Government has had to pick up the tab, and try to get the State out of its financial mess. The benefits are coming.

The fact of the matter is that the increases that have occurred under our Government out of necessity must now be seen as moderate in the light of the Liberal Party's 194 taxes, charges and other imposts that they levied between 1979 and 1982. Many people have forgotten, but I am going to remind them of this, certainly my constituents. Electricity rose by 12.5 per cent on 1 July 1980, by 19.8 per cent on 1 July 1981 and by 16 per cent on 1 May 1982; and they had the cheek to put down the increase that took effect on 1 December 1982 as our first tax increase when it was one that they negotiated and had announced in October 1982.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** The Willunga District Council controls an area of South Australia immediately south of Adelaide which contains within its boundaries some of the richest primary producing areas of the country: that is, on the Willunga Plains, in particular. In and about those plains the townships of southern McLaren Vale, Willunga, Sellicks Beach, Aldinga, Port Willunga and north to the Noarlunga River are fast developing areas of our community. That council has been seeking recently to establish a bike track and walking trail from Willunga to McLaren Vale, with parks at either end, as part of the 1986 Jubilee project.

Efforts by the council and the local committee to get this project under way have been sabotaged recently by the State Government. A report on the front page of the 13 March 1985 issue of the *Southern Times* Messenger Press signalled the situation as it currently stands. The trail referred to is planned to run along land which was formerly the Willunga to McLaren Vale rail line and which belongs to the State Transport Authority.

I want to place on record my support for that locally initiated venture and call on the Minister of Transport and his Cabinet colleagues to reconsider their attitude towards this work. In doing so I would cite certain details identifying the history of approach and response by the council and to the council from the Ministers mentioned. Originally, the council wrote to Mr Kym Bonython, Chairman of the Jubilee 150 Board, asking for his committee's support to get the land at no cost—a reasonable and logical request in the circumstances, bearing in mind that the State bore no cost in relation to its acquisition.

That letter went to Mr Bonython from the council on 28 June 1984, and to date the council has not received a reply. On 7 September 1984 the council wrote to Minister Abbott; to the Minister of Tourism, and the Minister for Environment and Planning. On 17 October 1984 it received a reply from the Minister of Transport, the pertinent paragraph of which states:

> In the event that this Government decides that this land is surplus to its requirements, I am not prepared to direct that the Authority transfer the land to council for a consideration less than the current market value . . . present lease expires March 1985 and therefore suggest council consider its long-term requirement for the land.

The council also had pointed out to the Minister that the expiry date was March 1985. On 4 December 1984, council received a reply from the Minister of Tourism, who repeated the advice delivered by the Minister of Transport and went on to say that he regretted he could not be of assistance to the council in this matter. On 14 December 1984, council wrote to Premier Bannon on three items, one being the railway land. On 5 March 1985, a further letter was delivered to the Premier highlighting the report to which I referred as being recorded in the Messenger Press.

If the Willunga council is required to buy the land from the State Transport Authority, it will cost about $100 000 on today's market values, and $100 000 happens to be the level of grant available to the council from the Commonwealth Government. So, all the money that the council has qualified for in respect of this Jubilee project would be absorbed in filling the coffers of the State Government for the purchase of land that the State Government inherited without cost, and the project is therefore in jeopardy because there is no way in the world that the council, between now and the 1986 celebrations, could raise the required money all over again to establish its project. The council has received favourable responses from the State Bicycle Committee, from the Federal Labor member for the district (Mr Gordon Bilney), from the community generally, and from me as local member.

When local councils and committees show the degree of initiative that this community has shown, it behoves the State Government at least to come in behind them and help them morally and in this case with land that neither the State Government nor the Commonwealth Government requires, land which the State Government has in its name at present at no cost to the South Australian public. Clearly, the council has a good case. I call on the Ministers concerned to reconsider their attitude, even at this late hour, to council's request so that that community may participate in the 1986 celebrations and spend the money that they have raised locally and by way of Commonwealth grant in a fruitful direction and not simply for the purposes of filling the State coffers.

In the remaining time at my disposal, I wish to raise a matter concerning my public announcement yesterday of the Liberal Party's position in respect of combating millipedes in South Australia. The call, in part, was for the State Government to proceed to get that project under way and at least to establish a Commonwealth-State task force, as a matter of urgency, to investigate the level of funding required to positively tackle the millipede problem in South Australia; to recommend the method of raising the necessary revenue; to identify a realistic period over which a biological agent can be captured in Portugal, specificity tested and synchronised; to adopt a unified national effort to eliminate this problem. Recent opening rains, followed by unseasonably warm weather this year, have created a climate in South Australia enabling the best millipede hatchings for many years. For those people regularly experiencing this problem each autumn, through winter, and well into spring, it is very disturbing indeed. To have these smelly little grubs in the home, in the food pantry, in the wardrobe, in the baby's cot and up the baby's nose is causing incredible family stress.

The problem is growing every year and will only worsen unless concerted and positive action is taken. In 1980, the former Liberal Government allocated $90 000 for a three-year research programme with the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation. This was matched by a further $90 000 from the Commonwealth Government. Total funding ran out in 1983. The current Government, which was well in office at that time, declined to proceed with the research programme. Last year, the present Gov-

ernment made token funding available, but this has not advanced action to deal with the problem. As well as establishing an agreed basis for funding of the necessary research, the task force proposed by me should have a number of other important responsibilities. It should identify a realistic period over which a biological agent (a Portuguese parasite fly or predator) can be captured in Portugal, specificity tested to ensure that it will not invade other than the desired target, and synchronised so that its breeding cycle is reoriented to enable adjustment from its Northern Hemisphere reproduction habits to Southern Hemisphere seasonal conditions.

I urge the Government to accept the view expressed by the Minister of Agriculture in the press yesterday, where he publicly stated that there was plenty of money available, indeed all that was necessary for this project. He also said that this was only a scientific problem. The scientists of this country are ready and willing to proceed with this programme when the Government makes the money available.

**Ms LENEHAN (Mawson):** In participating in this adjournment debate, I wish to discuss the recent National Women and Housing Conference, which was the first conference of its kind to be held in Australia and which was held in Adelaide from 1 to 3 March this year. As a participant at the conference who attended every session, I take this opportunity to acknowledge publicly the work of all those involved in the planning, the organisation and, indeed, in the success of this most significant national conference. I refer particularly to the Minister of Housing and Construction (Hon. Terry Hemmings), who must be congratulated on his support and initiative in gaining the involvement of other State Housing Ministers and providing the impetus and enthusiastic support for the holding of the conference in South Australia—not to mention the financial support and commitment which his Department gave the conference.

The conference provided a forum for women to voice their housing needs and preferences and to identify strategies to encourage greater participation by women in the planning, provision and management of housing. The conference challenged inequities and discrimination in housing policy and practice, and it devised a range of strategies to redress the serious defects. It is imperative to identify the current position of women before developing strategies for change.

Women are more likely to experience housing stress because of their low economic status. Their exclusion from well paid jobs means that many are also excluded from access to private housing, whether owned, mortgaged or rented. Australian housing policies have been historically oriented towards the traditional nuclear family, even though only a minority of households fit this model. Households which do not fit the stereotype are shut out, and many of these households are headed by women. This includes single women, young and old, never married, divorced and widowed, single parent families, women in shared households, extended families, and other non-traditional household groups. The housing system does not accommodate this range of needs, nor does it provide for the specific needs of Aboriginal women, disabled women, young women, older women, migrant women, and women who have been the victims of domestic violence. Many women fall out of the housing system altogether and make up a large but concealed proportion of the homeless in Australia.

At the conference, statistics presented identified significant differences in the levels of Government assistance to households in the different housing tenures, as follows:

| | Per household per annum $ | |
|---|---|---|
| Home owners/ purchasers | 1 600 | (first home owners scheme, concessional lending, controlled interest rates, non-taxation of capital gains, imputed rent, tax rebates) |
| Public tenants | 900 | (rent rebates and low ceiling rents) |
| Private tenants | 600 | (supplementary assistance and rent relief) |

To ensure that low income earners, especially women, have equal access to all sectors of the housing market, it is vital to increase income security for women and to examine both the legal and income support measures—

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Ms LENEHAN:** I am fairly concerned that the honourable member has little regard for the issue of women's housing. However, I take this issue extremely seriously, as do the women of this State.

*Mr Whitten interjecting:*

**Ms LENEHAN:** Yes, I note that only three Liberal members are in the House. That is a significant indication of the Opposition's interest in housing matters as they relate to women. It is vital to increase income security for women and to examine both the legal and income support measures required to assist private renters. The conference recommended that policies must be designed around three central areas: namely, access, control, and design and planning.

In the time that I have remaining to me in this debate I shall briefly outline some of the recommendations proposed by the conference. In the area of access, it was generally agreed that all women have the right to affordable, appropriate and secure housing, regardless of their social status, paid workforce status, ethnic background, or choice of lifestyle. It was resolved that the following goals should be set in relation to public housing: to achieve the 1982 Federal ALP policy target of doubling the proportion of public rental housing stock over a decade; to make public housing a viable housing form instead of a residual one in the longer term; to achieve a more diverse housing stock, which is sensitive to the specific needs and preferences of different household types; and, finally, to encourage new forms of public ownership through co-operatives and other types of community managed housing.

In relation to the private rental market, it was resolved that tenants should be protected against discrimination, and that the provision of assistance should reflect the problems created by the inability of low income households to afford private sector rentals and the levels of assistance already provided to home owners and public tenants. It was further resolved that assistance to obtain home ownership should be targeted at those households in need and only for as long as they are in need; that taxation subsidies and other Government assistance should be redirected to low income households through the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement; and that new forms of home ownership, such as non-profit co-operatives and shared housing, should be encouraged.

It is necessary to increase and improve the provision of crisis housing and associated support systems. In the area of control, it was stated that women must have control over resource allocation and policy in relation to housing, as well as control over our housing environment. To achieve those controls, Federal and State authorities should involve community and lobby groups at the early stage of policy development; they should resource community groups and tenant

groups so that they can make an effective contribution to the policy process; and, finally, until full involvement is achieved, incorporate in policies and decisions on resources the outcome of the various consultations that have taken place.

In relation to household design and planning, this must reflect the needs of women in relation to all household types. During the first National Women and Housing Conference, I was delighted to have the opportunity to move an amendment to the Australian Labor Party's housing policy platform. The incorporation is as follows:

6.3 Recognising the changing lifestyle patterns of women Labor will provide and facilitate:

*(a)* a wider range of housing types and design to suit their needs;

*(b)* more affordable housing in view of their relatively lower income and employment levels;

*(c)* adequate and early provision of local community services, particularly for outer suburban residents who are further from the wider range of city services and facilities.

I am proud to be part of an organisation like the Australian Labor Party, which recognises the needs of women and housing.

Motion carried.

At 5.25 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 2 April at 2 p.m.