HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 10 November 1988

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

MOTOR VEHICLE INSURANCE

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I move:

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

I must admit that the further I move into this question of compulsory third party property insurance for motor vehicles the more complex the subject becomes. I appreciate the opportunity I have had to discuss this issue with a large number of people, both in the insurance industry and at a more personal level. We would all appreciate that this is a very emotive issue, and we would be aware that over a period of time a number of articles have appeared in the media both for and against this proposition. I am aware of a number of recent—and not so recent—programs on talkback radio. It is only a matter of a few weeks ago that the ABC ran one of those programs when it was made very clear that this is a very emotive issue. Some of the positions put forward at that time indicated that people are very concerned and have become very emotive about it.

I have also been interested to look back over a period of time at debates that have taken place in this House and another place. Quite obviously this matter has taken up a lot of time and has been referred to by a large number of members in this place. There have also been the general debates that have taken place between the Insurance Council and individual drivers. The fact is that over a period of time many people been affected adversely in a number of situations when their vehicles have been involved in an accident with vehicles not carrying third party property insurance.

I have been made aware, particularly in more recent times, of a large number of these situations. My electoral office has been inundated by people who have brought forward examples of situations where they have been adversely affected following an accident with a vehicle that did not have third party property insurance. I have been made aware of that not only through my electoral office but through private contact with people. A couple of weeks ago I attended a private function at which this matter was discussed by quite a few people. I find it hard to believe that Government members are not receiving representations in their own electoral offices on this very same problem.

It is no good any honourable member's saying that it does not concern people in the electorate generally. How many times do we hear of situations where valuable vehicles are involved in accidents with vehicles which are quite often driven by young people who are driving their first car? In this debate I do not want just to target these young people, but the statistics with which I have been provided certainly indicate that that is one of the major areas of concern. I refer to the young person who is driving their first car, which is inexpensive. They cannot afford very much and they just want a vehicle which will get them from point A to point B. The matter of third party property insurance is about as far from their mind at the time of purchasing that vehicle as anything possibly could be. If people can afford only a couple of thousand dollars for a vehicle, it is not likely that they will want to pay anything more than they have to on insurance and other costs, so they are quite prepared to take a chance.

However, I suggest that a considerable number of people believe that owners of motor vehicles not covered by comprehensive insurance should have insurance protection against damage caused by their vehicles. It has been suggested very strongly to me that evidence of insurance should be required when registering a vehicle. I am sure that, if members carried out a survey, it would indicate that the majority of people believe that too many accidents are caused by drivers (often young) of vehicles (often old) with no accident cover, and the drivers do not have money or assets to meet any damage which may be caused by them.

During this week a constituent, who was very proud of the fact that they had never had an accident, complained that they had been driving a brand new car, which had been purchased only that day. They were stopped at the lights in Pulteney Street when their vehicle was involved in an accident with another vehicle, which in this case was a very cheap car driven by a young person. That vehicle had no third party property insurance and the young driver had no money. They are now trying to sort out the situation.

The Hon. H. Allison: It's impossible.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It is impossible, as my colleague the member for Mount Gambier points out. It is pointless taking legal action. They are facing a situation where the other party has no money and a very large number of people—

The Hon. H. Allison: There are hundreds a year.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: As my colleague the member for Mount Gambier says, many hundreds of people face this situation each year. I could provide many examples where these accidents have involved a driver who does the right thing and drives sensibly, and who is proud of an accident free record. I said earlier that I appreciate the opportunity which I have had to speak with a number of people. I also appreciate the cooperation of these people and the various organisations with which I have discussed this extremely complex subject, and I think that anybody who has looked into this matter would agree that it is an extremely complex subject.

At a very early stage I raised the matter with the RAA. I have had discussions with the Deputy Chief Executive of that organisation who provided me with copies of other documents and, also, a letter from the Chief Executive (Mr Waters) which states:

Dear Mr Wotton,

We refer to your recent inquiry regarding the concept of compulsory third party property damage insurance. The association has long advocated this form of insurance for those motorists who, for various reasons, do not comprehensively insure their vehicle, but does not support compulsion.

I must admit that most of the information I have been able to gather is in that vein. Most people see the need, but they do not support compulsion. The letter continues:

The reasons for this policy require lengthy explanation and we trust that the enclosed material will provide that.

In the first case, they included some comments on compulsory third party property damage motor insurance that were provided by NRMA Insurance Ltd. They also provided a draft report which emanated from a representative commitee that was appointed by the State Government in 1972 to make recommendations on this question.

As far as the Chief Executive of the RAA is concerned, the arguments and recommendations that were put forward in that report of 1972 stand today. I realise that I do not have much time to refer to these documents, and I also understand that they go against my motion, but it is important that I refer to just a couple of points. I refer to the

paper 'Some comments on compulsory third party property damage motor insurance' prepared by NRMA Insurance Limited. In its opening, it states:

NRMA Insurance Limited is often asked to comment on the possibility of the introduction of compulsory third party property damage (CTPPD) motor insurance. These requests come from political Parties, individual members of Parliament and a wide range of individuals. A system for CTPPD is seen as a remedy for the losses caused to innocent parties in motor crashes where the recovery of the cost of damage is not possible from the negligent party. The apparently simple requirement that all negligent damage should be indemnified by a universal and compulsory insurance system contains some very serious drawbacks.

It then goes on to say that these drawbacks far outweigh in absolute terms the advantages stemming from the solution of a relatively minor problem affecting a small minority of motorists. I disagree with that. Certainly, I do not see it as a small minority of motorists. As I said earlier, this situation embraces many people and that has certainly been borne out by the representation that I have received, and I cannot agree on that point.

Because I do not have time to refer to this matter in detail, other members might be interested in obtaining a copy of this document, which refers to the comparison of comprehensive insurance and compulsory third party property insurance on motor vehicles. It refers to the determination of negligence or fault, which is an important factor. It then refers to conclusions and states:

We believe that human nature being what it is, it will never be possible to eliminate unhappiness and argument from motor insurance. The situation for discontent certainly exists, but the fault lies more in human nature than with the insurance system.

And so it goes on. Also, I refer to the report prepared in 1972 when a committee was established; that committee based its deliberations on the understanding that the Government's objective at that time, which was considering the introduction of compulsory third party (property damage) insurance, was to remedy the situation in those cases where:

(1) An innocent party who suffers property damage (vehicular or otherwise) is unable to obtain compensation to the extent that he is not at fault because the offending party is not insured (third party) and is a 'man of straw'.

(2) Whilst a person, for his own protection, may be expected to insure his own property (first party) and cannot expect financial protection if he is not prudent enough to do so, nevertheless he may suffer financially from loss of 'no claim bonus' and the application of excesses placed on his policy, whether he is at fault or not.

That document refers to the attitude of the RAA and insurers. It makes lengthy conclusions which support the concept that such compulsory insurance should not be brought forward at this time. Again, I could take to task many of the points that are referred to in this document, and on a future occasion I look forward to being able to do so when I have more time.

Also, I have discussed this matter with the insurance industry and found that generally it is sympathetic to the genuine first party, the person who as a driver is doing the right thing, is recognised as having a good record as an excellent driver and who has proper insurance cover and so on.

The majority of people to whom I have spoken in the industry see a need to address many of the problems being experienced by those people who are causing this difficult situation. I must admit that I do not have a great deal of evidence of this at this stage, but the insurance industry has suggested to me that a number of companies are now moving to, first, protect the prudent, careful driver, the driver doing the right thing; secondly, to provide that the no claim bonus is not affected in the case of an accident where the driver is prudent; and, thirdly, to ensure that prudent drivers do not have to pay excess in these situations.

If that is the case—and as I said earlier, I do not see a lot of evidence to suggest that it is—that would go some way towards helping the current situation. It would appear from the documents I have cited that there is more evidence available at present which brings forward reasons why compulsory third party property damage insurance for motor vehicles should not be introduced rather than to support my motion. However, I come back to a situation where there is evidence. There is very real evidence in the community which backs up the situation whereby people, many of whom are totally innocent, are being put into extremely difficult situations. I move this motion, therefore, because I believe and put to the Government that there must be a way around this situation. I hope that this motion will provide the opportunity for the Government at least to bring us up to date in this House with its current thinking and actions.

From talking to people in the community and listening to the problems they are experiencing, I believe that there is evidence to suggest that this motion should stand, and I ask the House to support it.

Mr TYLER secured the adjournment of the debate.

FIBRO CEMENT ASBESTOS

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): I move:

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

This is a serious matter from a number of viewpoints. I will tackle the items in the order in which I read them to the House but, of course, the motion has been changed to fit in with Standing Orders. When I put forward this motion I put a number of items on the agenda, including the fear that such a move could create among the thousands of householders in South Australia who live in asbestos dwellings and my belief that the move towards regulation and licensing of fibro cement asbestos removal was counter to all the evidence available overseas and in this country.

Further matters were canvassed, including the fact that the chief protagonist in this little effort was Mr Jack Watkins, who is well known to this Parliament. Some concerns need to be aired about the way in which asbestos removal is taking place in this State—and I refer in particular to blue and brown asbestos—and, finally there was the item about the formal proceedings of the Occupational Health and Safety Commission.

I should put on record, first, that what I am debating today is not the hazardous nature of blue and brown asbestos. Let it be quite clear that the Opposition supports the proposition that, where these types of asbestos exist, they must be either permanently stabilised or removed. Members opposite would be well versed in the debate that has gone on about the carcinogenic nature of blue and brown asbestos. I have documents that further support the extreme danger relating to this. Thus, the Opposition generally supports the proposition that where these items are a health hazard they should be removed. But that is not what this motion is all about: it concerns an extension of the proposition that cement asbestos is indeed a dangerous substance.

Obviously the Minister is aware of what is going on, and, certainly, members of the industry are as well, and to suggest that fibro asbestos or cement asbestos is a dangerous sub-

stance is stretching the truth a little too far. I have documents at my disposal which show that cement asbestos is not a dangerous substance, *per se*. Indeed, WorkSafe, which is the national Occupational Health and Safety Commission, has suggested codes of conduct and guidelines for the handling of this substance, to prevent any health problems which relate mainly to the breaking up of the substance in a confined space.

To me, the bottom line of this, above all else, is that by taking this measure the Minister and his cohorts from the Health Commission are indeed indicating to all the people in the community who live in fibro asbestos dwellings—and I lived for 25 years in a dwelling which had a fibro asbestos roof—that there is some danger involved. The Minister well knows that that is not the case.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: The member for Victoria says that he still lives in an asbestos dwelling. The Minister is intent on causing the many thousands of people who live in such dwellings an enormous amount of fear and concern in that somehow some danger is involved—when all the worldwide evidence shows that that is incorrect.

A number of studies on asbestos have been undertaken, and some comparisons have been made between relative hazards in the Canadian situation. I am sure that the Minister will be well versed in this. The studies indicate that it is absolutely crazy to treat fibro asbestos as a dangerous substance. Difficulties can occur over a sustained period only if, on removal, the material is broken up in a confined space, in which case people would be subject to some health hazard. However, the same situation obtains with broken glass—one does not stick one's fingers in broken glass. One could detail a whole range of natural hazards that exist in this State and in the world that people should deal with carefully.

I do not intend to read out the full extracts of the advice tendered by the South Australian Health Commission on this subject, but it clearly shows that it is in favour of the codes of practice and the guidelines laid down by WorkSafe. So, why would the Minister want to depart from that proposition? It is inconsistent with the actions taken in a number of other countries around the world—and I have evidence from Canada. So, we have the problem that nobody understands why the Minister is so intent on breaking all the rules to bring this measure into operation as quickly as possible. Perhaps if we understand a little bit about what is going on in the asbestos removal industry today we may get the key to where the move is coming from and why it is coming.

Efforts are being made by one individual, Mr Watkins, to have the measure brought into place here in South Australia. Members in this place at the time may well recall his efforts from the gallery of this Parliament when he scattered his asbestos on the assembled parliamentarians. People might say that he was making a point, but in so doing he violated the Parliament. Most members would say that, if he has a concern (and he obviously does, as indeed we all do) about the effects of blue and brown asbestos, he was expressing that concern in an extravagant fashion but certainly in a fashion that brought the issue to the attention of the public. That is the most that we can say under the circumstances.

I am well aware of a number of problems that have occurred in this industry over a period of time. I have received phone calls about certain sites where asbestos is being removed by persons who are not members of a little cartel arrangement and where harassment has been taking place. A nice cartel arrangement exists in South Australia where money changes hands. There is also a suggestion that Government contracts are being pushed in a certain direction because of the arrangements that pertain in the industry. If the Minister wants a full expose of what I have been informed over two years about what is happening in the asbestos removal industry, I will give it to him in my reply or earlier.

I put the Minister on notice that the dirty, smelly little deals that are going on in that industry today cannot be condoned. They are a subject of extreme concern to the people involved in the industry and to employer groups in this town. Graft should not be condoned in any shape or form. I put the Minister on notice that there may well be a referral to the National Crime Authority if the industry is not cleaned up within the next six months. I believe that everyone should be given the opportunity to clean up the mess that exists in South Australia at the moment. Should that not happen, further action will be taken, I can assure the Minister of that. The Minister knows that I am a man of my word and, if I believe in something, I will never resile from pursuing it with a great deal of vigour.

The last matter relates to the Occupational Health and Safety Commission. The Minister would be well aware, as would other members of this House, that employer representatives are not happy about the way that the Occupational Health and Safety Commission is operating in South Australia. We know that at the September meeting the licensing of contractors was to be considered, but the matter was deferred to the October meeting.

We also know that the reference in the minutes of the October meeting suggests that the recommendations of the Asbestos Advisory Committee had been agreed to in September. We know that the Occupational Health and Safety Commission falsified the records, and somebody must take responsibility for that. We know that the matter was pushed through with undue haste. We know that it was not referred to a regulation committee, as is the practice in the commission.

All those rules were circumvented for a particular reason. I will not say a great deal more about the Occupational Health and Safety Commission, either, because I am debating this motion which is about asbestos, but I put it on notice to start performing in the way in which this Parliament gave it leave to perform not in the way in which certain members of the union movement are manipulating it.

A number of problems have to be sorted out in the health and safety area. Unilateral decisions cannot be made under the guise of tripartite consideration. It is important, particularly in the asbestos area, that we separate fact from fiction. It is important that people understand the cement asbestos problem. If the Minister wants some details or if he has not been informed about the hazards of cement asbestos I can give him a briefing. He has been around this place long enough to know that the sort of hazards in the marketplace today that would warrant the licensing of contractors simply do not exist.

If the Minister is party to this little scheme then he stands condemned before the Parliament; if he is not, then I will accept his undertaking that not only will he go through the proper channels but also that he will consider the international information on asbestos and the ramifications of any move to license contractors in this area before he takes it one step further. If the Minister will not remove it altogether he has to take the whole proposition back to the Occupational Health and Safety Commission so that it can go through the proper processes.

Interestingly enough, all this came to a head because of the problems we had at the old Emu Winery and Wirreanda

High. What happened is that certain private contractors worked on a rostered day off. So, the BLF became a little excited about it. Fancy private contractors working on a rostered day off in the building industry! Of course, it is their right to work any day of the week they like. The union then thought that it would use the good services of the Minister to slap an order on them for working in unsafe conditions, but when that was investigated it was removed.

Recently the Minister's office in the SGIC building was inundated with a large number of building workers who were protesting at the removal of the order. There are other pieces of information that I will share with the House if the occasion is appropriate, depending on the Minister's response. A lot more information can be exposed on what is happening in the asbestos removal industry today.

Mr Becker: The old standover tactics.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The old standover tactics, as my colleague the member for Hanson suggests.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: It seems a bit like you are using standover tactics.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The member for Mitchell might be accurate; I might well be using a standover tactic because that may well be the only way in which we get some sanity back into this town and into the operations of the Occupational Health and Safety Commission on this issue.

If that is the way it is going to be, then I can assure the member for Mitchell that I will pursue it with all the energy that I possess. It is a serious motion; it not only relates to the operations of a statutory authority, but more importantly also affects the lives of many thousands of people in this State and, if the Minister does not understand that simple proposition, he should not be a Minister in this House. I commend the motion to the House.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour): I oppose this motion—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Hanson interjects and says 'Yeah' or 'I bet'. I have been threatened by people before and I indicate that the threats from the member for Mitcham do not mean much because I have been threatened by experts and he is certainly not one of them. I direct this challenge to the member for Mitcham: it is an offence under the Crimes Act to receive secret commissions. There are some rather heavy penalties involved, yet the member for Mitcham constantly stands in this House and makes accusations about people in the building industry receiving kick-backs, bribes and all sorts of things. I do not know whether he has ever been to the Australian Federal Police or to the National Crime Authority with those complaints, but I would welcome his doing so, because this Government does not condone that sort of behaviour. If he has not already done so, he ought to report it.

However, like a lot of his colleagues in this Parliament, he stands in this place and has a lot to say about it but can never ever put up; they just go around denegrating people. But, if they claim that kick-backs are taking place, let them put the evidence up so that it can be gathered, presented to a court of law and the perpetrators prosecuted. If they cannot put up, they should shut up or go outside and say it so that charges can be laid in a civil court. They should not use this Parliament as a coward's castle for some of these accusations, because that is precisely what they are doing if they do not report the information.

I understand that the member for Mitcham has received a university education. The information he was obviously given to him by somebody who is aggrieved by the decisions of the Occupational Health and Safety Commission, but he would have noted that the proposal to amend the regulation is divided into two parts, as follows:

(a) the removal of installed thermal or acoustic insulation materials that consist of or contain asbestos; or

(b) the removal of installed asbestos-cement (fibro) products exceeding 200 square metres.

Subregulation (10) is to be varied to provide for clause *(a)* to refer to an asbestos licence fee of $2 900 and the fee for fibro cement to be $500. I alluded to the honourable member's education because he could have worked out that it was intended to have different standards applying to the removal of loose asbestos and fibro cement.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I would remind the member for Mitcham that when he was speaking and making all sorts of outrageous claims I was polite enough not to interrupt him. Now he is rudely interjecting; he is out of order. He has been here long enough to understand that and he should behave himself like an adult instead of carrying on like a little child.

An honourable member: Are you trying to intimidate him?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Not all all; I am just telling him the truth. I know as he does and a lot of people in the building industry do, the difference between loose asbestos and fibro cement. The allegation he has made that the amendment to the regulations to provide for controls or licensing of people who remove fibro cement is frightening to hundreds of thousands of people in South Australia who, like me, live and work in buildings containing Deep Six, Hardiflex or other asbestos products, is not correct. I refer to the Asbestos Guide to the Control of Asbestos Hazards in Buildings and Structures, the code of practice for the safe removal of asbestos, and the guidance note on the membrane filter method for estimating airborne asbestos dust of August 1988. The latter reference is hot off the press, and the honourable member may not be aware of it. On page 75, under 'Handling of asbestos-cement (fibro) products', it states at 9.1:

PRECAUTIONS TO BE OBSERVED WHEN WORKING WITH ASBESTOS-CEMENT PRODUCTS

In general, work procedures should be designed to minimise the generation of dust and, where possible, action should be taken to avoid the spread of any asbestos dust contamination. In particular, the following practices should be adopted:

Use non-powered hand tools such as hand-saws, as these generate a smaller quantity of predominantly coarser dust or waste chips.

Wetting down the material further reduces the release of dust when cutting. High pressure water jets shall not be used.

Power tools unless approved by the relevant statutory authority for asbestos work, and abrasive cutting or sanding discs, in particular, shall not be used on asbestos-cement products.

Work with asbestos-cement products in well-ventilated areas, and where possible, in the open air.

Good work hygiene principles should be observed. This may entail the use of plastic drop sheets to collect off-cuts and coarse dust or the use of approved vacuum cleaning equipment. Where it is necessary to sweep floors, the area involved should be wetted to suppress dust.

All off-cuts and collected dust should be disposed of as asbestos waste.

Approved respiratory protection should be used when appropriate, particularly in confined spaces.

Any reasonable, intelligent person possessing some logic and having some knowledge of the use of fibro cement would appreciate that all these points, which have resulted from three years of work in this area, indicate eminently sensible ways of using and working with fibro cement products. It is my understanding that, once the regulations are gazetted, when people come along to obtain their licence to remove the fibro cement, these will be the guidelines they will be instructed to use.

It is very important that, when people are working with materials that can cause injury to themselves and other people, safe working practices should be adopted. I do not think for a moment that members of this House or of the other place would agree to any unsafe work practice, although sometimes I just do not quite understand the logic of members opposite in this matter. One of the best ways of ensuring safe practices is licensing people to do this work.

If people do not behave and carry out the work in accordance with the code that I just read out (that was recommended by a tripartite body for use throughout the whole of Australia), the licence must be taken away from them. With regard to removal and the demolition of buildings, I know that people sometimes are less than careful regarding the way they go about their work. There can be a desire by some people to be fast track in their demolition work and to just barge in, bash things to bits and knock them around. Members will note that the code refers to off-cuts, bits and pieces to be collected up and disposed of as asbestos waste. I am quite confident that the inspectors of my department, when this measure is passed, will police it and ensure that the material is disposed of properly and not disposed of illegally as some allegations currently being investigated would suggest.

When it comes to removal, all the loose asbestos, or asbestos insulation as it is known, must be properly removed with the proper equipment. The demolition of buildings containing asbestos fibro cement products will then take place in accordance with the regulations. I do not think that any reasonable person could object to that. There have been some objections by some people about the methods used. Both Peak employer organisations in this State have spoken to officers of my department about the matter, although no-one spoke to Mr Baker or gave him access to the minutes. Someone must have made some allegations; someone must have telephoned Mr Baker and told him about them and then complained about procedures. The Occupational Safety and Health Commission is an independent tripartite body, and I make this point for the grinning member for Mitcham: if there are problems as to how the minutes of that organisation are set out, the people who are aggrieved can take up that matter at a commission meeting.

It is not for me to act on hearsay or on the word of a person who was not there and who, I am told, was not advised about these things by the Peake council. However, the honourable member stands in this place and makes accusations about impropriety—

Mr S.J. Baker: Are they true?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I was very courteous when the member for Mitcham was speaking, but he is behaving like a child again. He cannot contain himself. This is an independent commission and people who are aggrieved or who claim to be aggrieved can take that matter up at the next meeting, which is the proper place to do so. If they are not happy with it, perhaps they can do something about it.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Mitcham says, 'What a joke!' I have never come across anything to laugh about when he speaks because most of what he says is nonsense. My understanding of what went on at the October meeting was that these regulations were adopted, and they have been forwarded to me for gazettal on the basis of a report supplied at the commission's request from the Department of Labour. Through the Health Commission, the department received a copy of a letter from the Senior Specialist Medical Officer, Occupational Health and Radiation Control Branch. The relevant points are as follows:

> It is my contention that if this State adheres to the National Code of Practice, then asbestos cement sheeting does not constitute a health hazard neither to the removalist, handler nor to the general population.
>
> The way to deal with the problem is by way of education and implementation of the codes of practice, with severe penalties for non-compliance. It would seem to be a pity that the National Code of Practice, which after all, is the product of several years of deliberation by a tripartite committee, cannot be incorporated as a regulation in the State legislation.

I understand that some of the rumours around the traps from misguided people suggest that the Health Commission does not support strict regulations in this matter. In introducing these regulations, we will ensure that they are strict. The honourable member made assertions in respect of cartels. If anyone wants to remove asbestos, they can get the appropriate licence, provided they have the appropriate equipment.

Mr Becker: And pay the appropriate fees.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Yes. What can happen with the removal of sheet—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I remind the member for Mitcham that when he addressed this House I was very polite and did not interrupt. He is behaving like a child.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask all members to extend to each other the appropriate courtesies. The honourable Minister of Labour.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: You will open your big mouth, won't you!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: According to the notice of motion, which was deleted from the Notice Paper, the honourable member made a number of allegations about several matters. One of those was that the decision of the Occupational Health and Safety Commission was at variance with the advice of the South Australian Health Commission. I have just quoted the advice from the Health Commission and I do not see any variance. Perhaps the person who provided the honourable member with this information was selective in choosing that information.

Another point concerned the National Occupational Health and Safety Commission guidelines. WorkSafe has laid down some fairly clear guidelines, and it is the intention of the Department of Labour that the regulations will follow those guidelines for the removal of asbestos cement products. I do not see how that is at variance with the Health Commission's advice. The honourable member also referred to the research findings of the World Health Organisation. I do not know about that, either, because I have not been given any advice on that point. However, I would think that, if that advice was at variance, the WorkSafe documents would have said so and the South Australian Health Commission would have been clearer in its reference to this point on the basis that it should be under reasonably strict control. The honourable member made some comments about Jack Watkins. Whilst not everyone can agree with what Jack Watkins does, at least he has a concern—

Mr Oswald: Wind up your remarks; you've been going long enough.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: What a bloody cheek!

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to either resume his speech or seek leave to continue his remarks.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I intend to continue for a few minutes. The honourable member made some comments about Jack Watkins. I indicate to the members for

Mitcham and Morphett that they should look at the lungs of a person who has died from asbestosis or see these people prior to their death.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Mitcham parrots information from employers who, even up until last year, were saying that this stuff would not kill people, and they argued that in the courts. The courts are just turning it over. I want to make that point quite clear: the honourable member should see what is happening because I do not really think—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: No, I am not saying that at all.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has made his contribution to this debate. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: In respect to kick-backs, my advice to the honourable member is to see the National Crime Authority, the Federal police or the South Australian police with his information so that prosecutions can take place. If he does not have the courage to take that information down to Angas Street, he can leave it in my office and I will take it down there.

The formal meetings of the Occupational Health and Safety Commission are the appropriate forum for the placement of allegations about the falsification of documents. I will be writing to the commission about the allegations raised by the honourable member and I will ask for its views on the matter. I suggest to the member for Mitcham that, if he is very confident about these allegations, he should make a statement outside this place, in the public domain, in respect of the person he believes has falsified these minutes. It is a fairly serious allegation to make. All in all, the honourable member has presented a lot of misinformation this morning. It is based on poor information given to him. I urge the House to reject this bit of nonsense because what the honourable member has said today is blatantly untrue and misleading.

Mr BECKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIME STATISTICS

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

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

There are two irrefutable facts which apply to South Australia: first, since the Bannon Government came to office in 1982 there has been an alarming increase in crime; and, secondly, police are now being diverted from existing crime prevention and detection activities to other administrative and traffic policing roles, such as the increase in random breath testing, red light cameras and speed detection units.

Two irrefutable conclusions can be drawn from this: first, the revenue created by these expanded activities has assisted in balancing the State budget, but it has not in any way had an impact on the police in their primary role of preventing and solving crime. Secondly, unless the Government is prepared to throw off its 'soft-on-criminals' mantle and take positive action to arrest the growing crime rate in our community, we will see even more elderly people being bashed and robbed, a growing incidence of drug abuse, more homes wrecked and ransacked, more cars stolen and longer delays when people seek assistance from police patrol cars.

Let me provide a quick example on that last point. Last night the St Peters Church at Glenelg was broken into. By chance the rector noticed from his residence that the church door was open. He went over and realised that the offenders were still in the building, so he called the police. It took 35 minutes for a patrol car to arrive to assist the minister and apprehend the offenders. In the meantime, the minister had taken the bull by the horns—so to speak and, I thought rather bravely—because he went in and apprehended the two offenders aged 18 and 20. He proceeded to hold them for 35 minutes until the patrol car arrived.

It turned out that the offenders were not violent, but if they had been there was no way that the minister could have held them. When the rector asked the police officers why it took them 35 minutes to arrive, he was told that there were only two cars to cover the whole of the district from Seacliff to Glenelg. In actual fact, two patrol cars represent four police officers—four police officers patrolling that whole area—yet the Government says that it does not have a problem!

There is something very wrong with the administration of law and order in South Australia. Too few offenders are being caught and gaoled and other penalties hold no deterrence in our community. I defy anyone to stand up and say that nowadays gaol and some of the other penalties really act as a deterrent to would-be criminals. Certainly there is recidivism in our prisons involving sometimes up to 70 per cent of their clientele. Therefore, it would be said that gaol has no impact. But I submit that, if gaol was a deterrent, it could have the desired effect on would-be new offenders.

Not long ago a job scheme showed new offenders what would happen to them if they went into gaol, and that had the desired effect. Gaol can be a deterrent if it is used correctly. This is a very sad indictment of the Bannon Government which, in my view, is too complacent and casual about the increasing crime rate.

Members interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: Members can take part in the debate later. The statistics will bear out the points I am trying to make. The Attorney-General has been a voice in the wilderness in trying to do something about the leniency of sentences. Incidentally, it is a piece of Liberal Party legislation which gives him the right to appeal against lenient sentences. He has at least made an effort, but his is a small voice in the wilderness of the total policy of the Labor Party towards the rising crime rate in this State. The Government claims that it is doing enough. It also claims that we have more police officers in South Australia per head of population than any other State.

Mr Hamilton: We are not saying that at all.

Mr OSWALD: Other members of your Party are saying it because statistically we do have a high incidence of police officers per head of population in South Australia. However, it is patently obvious to anyone who examines the situation that too many police officers as a percentage of the force are tied up in policing other Government initiatives and are spending insufficient time on what they joined the Police Force for, which is an operational role, for which they are highly qualified and trained, to go out and detect crime.

To reinforce my argument, I will cite some statistical evidence relating to the crime increase since 1982. For every 100 000 South Australians, in the period between 1981-82 and 1986-87 the number of violent crimes increased from 92 to 181, or by a massive 97 per cent; property crimes, from 5 717 to 7 937, or 38 per cent; break-ins of dwellings, by 99 per cent; break and enters, from 1 595 to 2 591, or

62 per cent; robberies by 86.8 per cent in number and 79 per cent per 100 000 of population; and serious assaults, by 103 per cent.

The number of rapes and attempted rapes increased by 165 per cent; drug offences, 121 per cent; and arson and wilful damage (which includes vandalism), 55 per cent. Those increases have occurred during the period in which the Bannon Government has been in office. That is statistical evidence and I defy any honourable member who responds to this motion to disprove that. If they can, I would be very willing to read and listen to the debate.

Other statistical evidence impacts greatly on the services provided by the police and the prison service. As the member for Light points out, this statistical evidence, which members opposite claim they will refute, comes directly from the report of the South Australian Police Commissioner. I advise members to make sure that they have this report on their desk when they speak in the debate.

In relation to police services, the effective manning rates have fallen, particularly because of the move to a 38-hour week. Police morale is at an all time low because of threats to escalate country home rentals, a new career and pay structure which disadvantages senior constables, a spate of suspensions and resignations, Government indifference to the health and safety of officers who use the rescue helicopter, and the low penalties imposed by the courts. I could speak for another quarter of an hour about the impact on police officers of low penalties imposed by the courts. Suffice to say, they are sick and tired of trotting offenders into the courts when the courts send them back out into the community on bonds and more bonds. The police officers ask, 'What is the point of taking offenders to court when the low penalty is not a deterrent?'

I will now cite further statistics relating to the correctional services area. Between 1981-82 and 1986-87 the number of prisoners has been reduced by 27 per cent, notwithstanding a significant rise in criminal activity. There has been an increase in criminal activity, but a reduced number of prisoners in gaol and yet the gaols are overcrowded. It is an interesting axiom.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Becker): Order!

Mr OSWALD: The reconviction rate of offenders who have served more than 12 months in gaol but are reconvicted during the first five years of their release is 62 per cent. There is no disincentive to criminals not to reoffend. Average costs of maintaining prisoners have increased by 121 per cent, or from $19 000 to $44 000 per prisoner a year during that period. Drug and alcohol-related offences in prisons have increased by 760 per cent in that five year period and the total incidence has risen by 416 per cent.

Finally, the number of escapes has more than doubled—13 in 1982 and 28 in 1987. I remember the furore in this House which was engendered by the then Opposition about what it claimed was an alarming incidence of escapes when the Tonkin Government was in power. I now remind members that that figure has more than doubled under the Bannon Administration. It is a sorry indictment of where we are going under this Administration.

My speech today is all about Government priorities. Surely the Government's highest priority is to fight crime in the community and make South Australia a safe place in which to live. We see multi millions of dollars subsidising bus and train services, national parks, community organisation grants and so on and, however admirable they are in their individual right (everyone makes claims to these individual grants and Government subsidies), surely the time must come when we look at the priorities for the allocation of those moneys.

Some of these allocations surely must become secondary to this problem that we have in our community—to reduce the incidence of crime. I suggest to the Government that the millions of dollars that are given away should be turned back to the operational arm of the police so that our families can be protected and so that we can go about our daily work without violation—violation of our person and our property. Over the past six years of the Bannon Government the reality has been that crime has flourished. I know that there are many social factors with which Governments of all persuasions have to wrestle, but we must turn around the priorities of spending in this country so that, first, we are safe in our lifestyles and, secondly, we can progress into other areas of Government assistance.

We are about to enter a boom time in respect of burglaries in the holiday season. Last December 1 500 South Australian homes (primarily in the metropolitan area) were broken into. Over the combined December-January and Christmas-New Year period last year, 3 000 homes were violated. Based on statistics over the last several years, that figure is expected to increase this year. I find it hard to find any deterrent in the armoury of the Bannon Government and its Administration that will tackle this problem this year. The Bannon Government is void and bankrupt of ideas about what it will do about the rising incidence of crime.

In the *Advertiser* of 5 July this year the Government expressed concern about the large number of remanded prisoners who were placing a strain on the prison system. This was at a time when the eight gaols were full. I will not go through that list now because time is short, and I will leave out that part of my speech in deference to other members because of the shortage of time. Suffice to say, the eight gaols were full and the South Australian police were threatening significant industrial action if the prisoners were not removed from what was described as the squalor and medieval conditions of the City Watchhouse. All members would recall the campaign waged in August this year.

The Government's response through a spokesman of the Deputy Premier in the *Advertiser* of 23 July was to accuse the police of grandstanding. I well recall the police raising this matter in November 1986. On that occasion the Police Association threatened legal industrial action against gaol authorities in respect of prisoner overcrowding. At that time the association complained because the City Watchhouse was accommodating 35 prisoners. Now in 1988 we have the same argument, but the overcrowding in the watchhouse has increased; 49 prisoners are accommodated. What was the Government's solution to this problem? I keep saying that little was done, but let me analyse what I mean by 'little was done' to curtail those numbers.

I refer to the *Advertiser* of 18 August. First, the Government said it would release prisoners early from other institutions to create spaces; secondly, it would redistribute prisoners from the watchhouse within the organisations to reduce pressure at the watchhouse; and, thirdly, it would appoint a social worker to ease the tension amongst prisoners who, police claimed, were nearing violence. I ask the House, will that really make the ordinary, average member of the public feel secure when the only way the Government can solve this overcrowding in prisons is to say, 'We will let a few more of the offenders out and we will redistribute another group, and we will put in a social worker so that they do not go off their tree through the frustration of living in squalid conditions in the City Watchhouse'?

Let me wind up by saying that the public have completely lost confidence in the Bannon Government's policies to

contain crime. The law abiding citizens of this State are simply tired of being violated, both physically and by their property being molested. We are tired of housebreakings, of muggings in the streets, of the increasing incidence of rape and attempted rape on our women, of wilful vandalism, graffiti, and motor vehicles being wilfully destroyed, and we are tired of the increasing drug offences and robberies. We have no confidence in the way in which the parole legislation is coming to grips with the situation.

We have no confidence in the soft option Bannon Government attitude which pervades this State. In the circumstances, this Government should not be administering law and order in this State. It should resign. If it does nothing else, it could refer to the factors that I have produced in this presentation which unequivocally support the argument that crime is on the rise. Confidence in this Government has been lost, and I believe that the facts I have presented to the House cannot be disputed.

Mr HAMILTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SECONDARY SCHOOLS STAFFING

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Meier:

That this House expresses its concern at the implications for schools and students of the new 'average enrolment' staffing policy and calls on the Government to ensure that the quality of education in our schools is not reduced as a result of its new policy,

which Mr Robertson has moved to amend by leaving out all words after 'House' and inserting the following:

notes the Education Department's proposed staffing strategy for schools in 1989 and applauds its commitment that the quality of education will not be reduced by its implementation.

(Continued from 13 October. Page 1003.)

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): I wish to continue from where I left off last week, and turn to some of the reasons for the new staffing formula around which my amended motion revolves. Prior to the new formula, some schools had, in fact, been overstaffed for part of the year. Schools had been staffed on peak enrolment predictions which were made in October of the previous year. The result of that was that some junior primary schools were staffed at their maximum level from the start of the year, even though enrolments climb slowly throughout the year to reach a maximum somewhere during the third or fourth term.

In some secondary schools the reverse happened, where they started with maximum enrolments at the beginning of the year and through the year (and they were staffed at that level) and through the year enrolments dropped gradually until senior school students had finished exams in term four, at which time there was a fairly rapid plunge in numbers as students left school after their exams. Again, the result of that was that the school was staffed at the maximum and for a considerable period of the year an imbalance of staff and students existed.

The new strategy offers genuine efficiency measures without really affecting the quality of education. The staffing strategy represents no change for 42 per cent of high schools and area schools, and no change whatever for 34 per cent of schools with primary school enrolments. The proposal also has the advantage of allowing for individual negotiation to take place over students and schools with special needs. It gives special attention to small schools and country schools. It retains existing negotiable salaries to meet various specific school programs, and it retains the basis of allocating administrative time, non-contact time, school support grants, librarian salaries and ancillary staff salaries.

The Director-General has given several guarantees about maintaining the quality of education, and I will return to those a little later. The strategy behind the new policy will also allow the Government to make significant improvements in a number of key areas. Recently, the Government injected $3.5 million into a range of projects to boost educational opportunities for school children. Those projects include extra support for schools in the teaching of key subject areas such as maths, science, reading and writing. Extra support for primary schools in line with the recent findings of the primary education review has been allocated, and extra resources for students most in need, as part of the Government's social justice strategy, have also been allocated.

That additional help will go to Government assisted students and to primary schools with high numbers of socially disadvantaged students. All this has been achieved through savings which can be redirected through to classrooms without increasing the overall education budget. The important thing is that the budget remains basically the same, but there is a reallocation of resources. This is what is meant by the new staffing strategy 'providing opportunities to increase the quality of education'.

Increased efficiency means that savings can be directed to the classroom to enhance the immediate educational experiences of children. The staffing strategy also frees up resources for new priorities, such as professional development and retraining of teachers. It must be stressed that there has been, and will continue to be, considerable consultation with schools and teachers to ensure that staff is provided, to enable the quality of education to be maintained.

The Director-General had already established, several weeks ago, an advisory unit, made up of practising principals, to work with school principals to implement the new staffing arrangements. Those principals and schools, of course, could have consulted with that committee as and when they desired. In this instance, of course, the debate has been somewhat overtaken by events, because, as I understand it, most of those staffing problems have been resolved, one way or another. From my observation in my own area of town, it appears to me that indeed most schools are reasonably happy with the way in which it has been worked out. In other words, the initial panic turned out to be largely just that.

The Director-General has also given four guarantees, which are as follows. He has given a guarantee of continuous admission. He has guaranteed that all five-year-olds will be able to begin schooling on or shortly after their fifth birthday. He has also given a guarantee concerning vertical grouping, and, in that, the Director-General guarantees that schools with junior primary classes wishing to have groups of one, two and reception children together will still be able to do that. There will be no move to disband vertical grouping, where it is an integral part of a school's curriculum and programming structure.

Mr Duigan: It should be the critical element of everything.

Mr ROBERTSON: Indeed, it should. A third guarantee given by the Director-General relates to junior primary classes, and he has guaranteed that it will not be necessary for any student to change classes because of the new staffing strategy. Quite clearly, in the past changes have taken place as children leave and arrive at schools, as staff numbers are reallocated, and as rearrangements at the edges take place.

The Director-General has guaranteed that no additional changes will be occasioned by the new staffing formula.

The Director-General's fourth guarantee relates to secondary curriculum. In this he has guaranteed that secondary schools will be able to offer the same range of curriculum as they would have done had they been staffed on their February 1989 enrolments. In other words, because the numbers will fall off during the year, there will be no diminution in the range of staff available to offer the courses that would have been available under the old formula. The staffing strategy was part of a package which allowed teachers to have the additional $20.5 million pay rise—which I talked about last week. That, of course, is in accordance with legal requirements laid down by the Federal commission. At the same time, the package provides opportunities to continue to improve the quality of education at a time when the needs of education and the priorities in education are changing quite drastically.

It seems to me that the thrust of the package is that it is a reasonably brave attempt to arrest a continuing trend, whereby the ratio of staff to students has continued to increase. It seems to me that, ultimately, somebody had to make the decision, with a declining student base and a reasonably static number of staff, that we did not need to increase that ratio of staff to students to the point where it was one to one or one to two, or even one to 10, and that, indeed, there was a time when some of the additional needs and broader responsibilities of schools within the community ought to have been recognised. It seems to me that the Government deserves some plaudits for having had the courage to take that decision and deciding that now is the time to stop pursuing this obsession with lower student-staff ratios and to utilise some of the resources which are being freed up by that natural decline in student numbers.

The reallocation will provide for a number of crucial and important matters. It will provide the time and opportunity for teachers to upgrade their skill base. It will enable the department to mainstream children with physical and intellectual disabilities in a way that could not be done before in a meaningful fashion, because there will be more special education teachers and upskilling will be available for teachers. It will enable socially disadvantaged students to be more able to fit into their schools, to have more equal access to the opportunities of their rather more socially advantaged peers in that they will be guaranteed more access to excursions, school books, and the like. The new program will assist students of migrant families to fit in more easily because it emphasises and upgrades the level of ESL skills available for children so that chidren of migrant families will no longer be disadvantaged simply because they do not speak English as the first language.

The new staffing strategy also provides a second language for all South Australian children under the LOTE program—the language other than English program. It is widely recognised that Australia is one of the very few cultures in the world to remain primarily mono-lingual, and the language other than English program seeks to address that need.

Finally, the staffing restructure will provide a concentration on maths and science in preparation for creating the kind of technological society into which our children will be broadcast, whether or not they like it, after the year 2000 into the 21st century, and again the Government deserves plaudits for having the courage to recognise that need, for thinking ahead, planning ahead, and allocating appropriate resources to that end.

The Hon. H. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

GRAIN INDUSTRY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Blacker:

That this House strongly opposes the deregulation of the grain industry and calls on the Minister of Agriculture to lobby the Federal Minister of Primary Industry to retain grower controlled orderly market for the grain industries and further that this House is strongly of the view that before any change is made to the present marketing arrangements such change only be made after a full referendum of all registered growers of grains so affected,

which the Minister of Agriculture has moved to amend by leaving out all words after 'House' and inserting in lieu thereof the words:

urges the Minister of Agriculture to take all steps necessary to protect the international marketing arrangements for grain and to ensure the long term production base of grain growers in South Australia.

(Continued from 13 October. Page 1008.)

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): At the conclusion of private members' time two sitting weeks ago, both the shadow Minister of Agriculture (the member for Eyre) and the Minister spoke to the motion that I had before the House. I do not believe that either speaker took up the latter part of my motion, although I understand that the member for Eyre had some sympathy for the referendum idea, but the Minister did not comment on it at all. I will go through each of the speeches and comment on a few of the issues and concerns that I have.

The member for Eyre stated quite categorically that the State Liberal Party was totally committed to the grower-controlled orderly marketing of wheat and barley. I commended that attitude and acknowledged that view in first raising this matter. However, I am not so convinced that that has always been the case but, more particularly, I am quite confident of the fact that the State Liberals have not been effective in convincing their Federal colleagues on the same issue.

The day after the member for Eyre spoke in this House, one of his Federal colleagues was conducting a meeting in the South-East calling on growers to support deregulation. So, we certainly have a completely different attitude between the State and Federal Liberal Party in that respect. I commend the attitude taken by the State Liberals on this issue, but only wish that they could be more influential with their Federal colleagues on this point.

The member for Eyre also mentioned the State's rights under the Constitution and referred to complementary State legislation being required should the Federal Government proceed with deregulation. I believe that there is a query over whether the State has the right to be able to set its own course of action in relation to orderly marketing or whether the Federal legislation will override that.

Traditionally the view has been that it required State complementary legislation, and the States had the power to organise orderly marketing if they so required. I believe that there is now some legal opinion which suggests that if this comes to a crunch the Federal Government might be able to force the States to comply with deregulation. I hope that we do not come to that, and that each of the States will demonstrate to their Federal colleagues that they will not have a bar of the disassembly of orderly marketing. The member for Eyre also said:

The parliamentary Liberal Party supports the operation of the Australian Wheat Board and will not support any partial deregulation of the domestic market.

I endorse that comment. As I mentioned previously, I wish that it would be repeated on more occasions. The member for Eyre also said that I did not highlight the fact that BHP

was entering the grain marketing industry, and that is true, I did not mention it because at the time I was unaware that BHP was involved. The very next day I picked up the same article to which the member for Eyre referred, that is, the *Stock Journal* of 26 August, and I noted that BHP was calling for an officer to head its grain division. The comments I made about Elders-IXL equally apply to BHP or to any other multinational body that could become involved.

It is of concern that multinationals become involved in this, that they will be wheeling and dealing, and that that will result in the breakdown of orderly marketing. I take up the point that the member for Eyre referred to—'Joh for Canberra'. I was in sympathy with his comments, because I have been uneasy about this particular push. We can find several examples of the same things happening across the nation, and even here in South Australia the reluctance of the LCL—and more particularly the Liberal Party locally—to work with the Nationals.

During the recent Victorian election campaign Mr Kennett flatly refused to consider coalition publicly before the election, and that was identified as being a major contributing factor as to why the Liberals did not make it. In the Northern Territory we see a similar situation arising. There have been enough times when the Liberals and the Nationals have not worked together, and the result has been that the Labor Party has been able to govern when it should not have been able to.

The member for Eyre also mentioned that he was the only wheat grower in this House. I beg to challenge. I know that I cannot compete with him in terms of acres, but I am certainly a wheat grower. He also commented that there was only one wheat grower in the Upper House. Another interesting comment we could make is that all three grow wheat in the electorate of Flinders. That is one of my concerns—that in neither House is there a commitment to the real needs and worth of the grain growing areas, because only the one electorate is represented, and to that end we need a much stronger commitment from all sides of Parliament for the industry that provides probably the greatest single income to this State. To that end we must not let up, and we must implore all members to recognise that fact because it is a major contributing factor to our economic wellbeing.

After the member for Eyre's contribution the Minister took up the debate, and immediately moved that my motion be amended by striking out all words after 'the House' and inserting in lieu thereof 'urges the Minister of Agriculture to take all steps necessary to protect the international marketing arrangements for grain and to ensure the long-term production base of grain growers in South Australia'.

Mr Acting Speaker, that was specifically taking out the very teeth of my motion. Although the Minister still supports the Wheat Board as far as exporting grain is concerned, he has deleted any reference to domestic marketing. The member for Eyre or (the shadow Minister) has indicated his strong support for the orderly marketing of domestic grain; certainly my Federal colleagues and I have done so. However, in this case the Minister has withdrawn that part of the motion. One can only assume that, if the Minister goes to the lengths of taking out any reference to domestic marketing of grain, he must support the deregulation of the domestic market. That is the only conclusion that can be drawn because he has certainly taken the teeth completely out of this motion.

The Minister also tried to justify his actions by saying that he could step back and take a look at the wheat industry from a broader perspective because he did not have a sectarian interest in the community. I guess we can all take that view. I could claim that in talking about trade union matters or any other matter that comes before this House. However, for one who is relatively close—and I believe I can say I am very close—to my community and the wheatgrowers and graingrowers who have most to lose, I find it rather interesting that all the people who are making and firing the bullets in relation to deregulation are people not directly involved in the producing sector of the community. They are outsiders, and they are out there trying to position themselves in such a way that they can bleed and manipulate the grain growing industry to get their cotton-picking fingers into it. They want the cream off the top of the cake at the expense of the graingrowers.

If the graingrowers themselves were making this push and suggesting that we should deregulate, I believe this Parliament and the whole nation could look at this subject in a totally different way—but they are not. At least 99 per cent of graingrowers are in favour of retaining orderly marketing so why should we as a Parliament allow outsiders to come in to endeavour to manipulate the industry? We know what the Government would say if outsiders tried to manipulate other industries with which it has a close affiliation. We hear the Government time and time again criticise Opposition members when they talk about becoming involved in trade union matters. The Government says it is the trade unions, the members themselves, who should make that decision. What I am saying is that those growers are the ones who should be making the decision and putting up the proposals for the betterment of their industry, not the outsiders, not the wheelers and dealers, not the traders, not the exporters and not those who are going to make a 'quick buck' from across the border trade. This is the issue that needs to be stressed time and time again.

The Minister did say that he would support the continuing role of the Australian Wheat Board in the international sphere, and I do not think there is any argument with that. Everyone believes that the Wheat Board should be there as the exporter. However, with multinationals becoming involved, what happens if a multinational buys 100 000 tonnes of grain and then finds that it cannot dispose of it through the designated channels? It then goes to the Government and says, 'Before we can pay the growers for this grain we need to get rid of it, so you will have to give us a permit so that we can export it,' and so the system breaks down. That is obviously what would happen in circumstances like that.

It does not take very much imagination to see just how easily the system and the Government could be broken on this issue. The Government may have a strong will and an intention to retain control for the Wheat Board over exporting, but if a multinational came along and said, 'I have 100 000, or 200 000 or 250 000 tonnes of wheat, and cannot pay those growers until I receive payment for it, and the only way I can get rid of it is to export it, so you will have to give me a permit,' what will the Government do?

If it does not give that company the right to export, then it will leave countless thousands of growers unpaid for their grain. So it becomes a very crucial issue. I see this attempt initially to try to deregulate the domestic market as getting a foot in the door to try to undermine and deregulate the export market as well.

I have been accused of not being specific in my original remarks in identifying domestic and export markets, but they are one and the same. One is just a step towards the other. I believe that the graingrowing sector of the community would certainly know and understand just what this is all about. Very few people are left in this State who had a direct association with the old trader days. I have had the

opportunity to speak with a few of them. I sought them out to find out their attitude towards the deregulation of the industry. On every occasion, they have said, 'Fight it to the very end.' One comment made to me was, 'Sure, we will get a new breed of growers come through who do not know and have never experienced the trader situation, and they will probably think that maybe there is a chance of picking up a quick dollar on it, so they will relax their guard.' However, the comments to me have been, 'Whatever you do, fight it to the very end because it will mean the picking off of individual growers in the community.'

I implore this House to oppose the Minister's amendment, because it takes out of the debate the real intent of the motion, and that is a commitment from the South Australian Parliament that it will support the orderly marketing of grain and oppose the deregulation proposal put up by the Federal Minister. I am concerned that, if this issue gets through, it will get through with a Liberal-Labor amalgam at a Federal level. That worries me because I am not convinced that there is the commitment or intent by people in the two major Parties to see that the grain growers are protected.

The other interesting point is that the majority of people who are still supporting the proposal, almost without exception, are those not directly involved in the industry. I note that Mr Steele Hall has made reference to the fact that he is strongly opposed to the deregulation and supports orderly marketing. The reason is obvious: his farming interests are in a graingrowing area. That probably makes it all the more valid because he has a close association with the graingrowing area and is prepared to recognise that.

I call on the House to oppose the Minister's amendment because I believe it is certainly against the intent of the original motion. I had hoped that this House would send a clear message to the Federal Minister to make sure he knew where the people of South Australia stood. I want to make clear that, if the Minister succeeds with this amendment, it is not the will of the growers. That is patently clear. Every public meeting held around the community has made obvious, almost to the extreme, that the people concerned are opposed to the breakdown of the orderly marketing system that we have. I call on the House to oppose the Minister's amendment and support the original motion.

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (22)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, Duigan, and M.J. Evans, Ms Gayler, Messrs Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, and Keneally, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes (teller), Payne, Peterson, Robertson, and Slater.

Noes (13)—Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, S.J. Baker, Becker, and Blacker (teller), Ms Cashmore, Messrs Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Meier, and Oswald.

Majority of nine for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried; motion as amended carried.

POVERTY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Robertson:

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

(Continued from 3 November. Page 1281.)

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): It is interesting that in his motion, the member for Bright calls on the Federal Government to eliminate poverty, expecting the House to praise the motion, but fails to include the Bannon Government or acknowledge the steps it has taken to eliminate poverty in this State.

South Australia is the poverty capital of Australia. I would have thought that in any examination of a motion of this nature it would be a very good idea to look at what is happening in South Australia and to try to line up South Australia in the context of the Australian experience. If the Hawke Government is having any success in reducing poverty overall, it would follow that it is also having success in South Australia. We all know—all members opposite who are having a marvellous conversation among themselves—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber. The honourable member for Morphett.

Mr OSWALD: All members know that any move to reduce poverty in South Australia, whether it be by the Hawke National Government or the Bannon State Government, has been a total and utter disaster. The facts are completely irrefutable. We have a problem in this State with the growing ranks of the poor. In the six years that the Bannon Government has been in power, the average South Australian family's bills, just for the services provided by the Government, have absolutely blown out of all proportion.

If one looks at the basic services—car registration, insurance, transport, water and electricity—the costs have gone up by some $40 a week. That is fine if you are one of the lucky people in the community who have a job. However, if you are not one of the lucky Australians in employment, finding an extra $40 a week has been a disaster. In 1982, the same services provided for the average family of four cost only $24 a week. That figure has now blown out and the average family is paying an additional $40 a week.

The standard of living has declined under both the Bannon and Hawke Administrations. We can look at many other areas where costs have blown out. This Government, which wants to help the poor, has allowed water and sewerage rates to blow out. These rates now cost the average family $135 a quarter. In 1982—which, as I recall, was the last time that the Liberal Party was in Government—that figure was only $94. Drivers' licences, third party insurance and car registration fees now cost $23 a month; in 1982 that figure was $14 a month. Electricity now costs the typical family $161 a quarter; in 1982 it cost only $99 a quarter.

The Federal and State Governments would like us to think that they are making some effort to curtail costs. My concern is that we constantly hear the Government cry, 'Let's keep rises in line with inflation.' When will the Government come out in this community and say, 'Let's try to keep rises slightly below inflation'? We have a built-in growth in our economy, and everybody says it is okay to keep rises in line with inflation. When will we have an economy where the Government takes the lead and says, 'We will try to keep the rises below the level of inflation'? Then, and only then, will there be some relief for the disadvantaged and those below the poverty line in this State.

The member for Bright's motion merely puts up a smokescreen around the taxation policies and 'bracket creep' occurring in the Federal arena. It is designed to try to hide the fact that the taxation policies of the Hawke Administration and Keating Treasury have done two things: first, created a very rich group in the community who are in the top income echelon and known as 'Hawkie's mates'; and, secondly, created another group of people in the community who are the very poor.

Over the years middle ground Australia was created by that gap, which has now shrunk to the stage where, because of this bracket creep, there are very few in the middle ground and more and more in the very poor or very rich classifications.

Let us examine the group in the community that falls into this category below the poverty line. This category—and the member for Bright wants us to congratulate the Hawke Government for assisting it—comprises pensioners, supporting parents, superannuants and the unemployed. More recently, it has come to include married couples where one partner works and the other chooses to play the home-maker role, and they are to be applauded for attempting to stay home.

The last group I referred to—where there is a home-maker and only one breadwinner in the family—is finding it more and more difficult to survive. It is becoming patently obvious, even to blind Freddy, that since the Hawke Government came to power its only interest has been in assisting those people lucky enough to have a job. That seems to be the trend—this marriage between the ACTU and the Federal Government where they do their deals for the benefit of the workers, That is fine if you happen to be a worker and the wage spiral keeps going up but, if you are unfortunate enough to be a pensioner, a supporting parent, a superannuant or unemployed, then and only then do you see that the cost to the Government for you to survive in this country is less and less because prices continue to go up and inflation continues on but your benefits do not increase at the same rate.

What is happening under this Hawke Administration—which the honourable member wants us to praise for what it is doing for the unfortunate in our community—is that those people in jobs are keeping up with the inflation rate. The unit cost of labour, which we have debated at great length in this country, has continued to rise, while those not in the employment arena find that somehow they must try to keep up with it. When the Government hands out an increased benefit to the financially disadvantaged in our community, automatically costs go up and the wages bill rises, as does the cost of services. Those disadvantaged people find that their Government handout does not meet with reality.

This leads me back to my opening remark: when are Governments going to say, 'We will increase our costs slightly below the level of inflation'? As long as you increase your costs at the level of inflation those people in the non-employment area will never catch up. It is about time we had a compassionate Government in Canberra that took this into account.

It is specious nonsense for the member for Bright—who was asked to put this motion on behalf of the Federal Government—to expect anyone in this House to support it. The motion is a nonsense. There is absolutely no evidence in the public arena to say that the Hawke administration and the arrangements that the Prime Minister, Kelty and his Treasurer enter into are having any impact on the poor and underprivileged in our community. I urge all members to consider deeply the implications for the poor in our community and treat this resolution for the nonsense that it is by voting against it.

Mr DUIGAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

VEGETATION CLEARANCE

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. B.C. Eastick:

That the regulations under the Electricity Trust of South Australia Act 1946 relating to vegetation clearance, made on 27 October and laid on the table of this House on 1 November 1988, be disallowed.

(Continued from 3 November. Page 1233.)

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): As I said last week in seconding this motion, the handling of the tree trimming program by ETSA has been an absolute disaster from the new Minister's point of view. I indicated the enormous backlash from the public and councils. I pointed out that it was unfortunate that the former Minister who had handled the matter so sensitively was no longer there to give some continuity to the deliberations of the select committee.

The select committee was a harmonious group which seriously addressed the problem of this tree pruning program and the responsibilities that needed to be given to ETSA to come to grips with those problems where landholders—particularly in bushfire prone areas—were being particularly difficult.

Unfortunately, the new Minister jumped in, boots and all, and ETSA, which had a new General Manager and a new Chairman of the board, probably had not read the evidence of the select committee very thoroughly. Quite an outrageous pattern of behaviour was undertaken by ETSA soon after the new Minister came to office.

The legislation specifically stated that the Minister for Environment and Planning was to have the oversight of the regulations relating to the tree trimming program. I think that, under the heading 'Regulations', one of the last clauses in the Bill points out that the Minister for Environment and Planning is to have the oversight of these regulations. The whole problem has been an environmental one. When the legislation was first conceived by the Government, obviously, at that stage, it was sensitive to the fact that an environmental problem could arise through the ETSA tree pruning program, but we have not seen of or heard from the Minister for Environment and Planning. He has not had one word to say.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber. The honourable Deputy Leader.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The Minister for Environment and Planning has not been sighted, but the legislation clearly states that the Minister for Environment and Planning is in charge of those regulations. I suppose that that behaviour is not untypical of that Minister. In the past few days it has been pointed out that he is not at the forefront of these environmental issues. I draw the parallel with the current debate relating to environmental matters. Where is the Minister? He is hiding behind his public servants. Who conducts the debate in the public arena? It is not the Minister whose responsibility it is but, rather, he pushes his top public servants into the political arena.

It is amazing that we have not heard of or seen the Minister for Environment and Planning in relation to the ETSA regulations debate. After all, under that legislation, he is charged with that very responsibility. I am surprised that the media has not picked this up, because it has been mentioned on a number of occasions. I refer to the environmental savagery which has occurred as a result of this tree pruning program. It has been designed in an attempt to bludgeon district councils into accepting a program for which they will have to meet some of the costs. As I said, that was never envisaged by the select committee and, as a result, this problem has now arisen.

I am pleased that the new Minister has curbed his enthusiasm to implement legislation without reading the background to it. I trust that he has now had time to read not only the legislation but also the select committee evidence

and that he has come to grips with that evidence, particularly from the ETSA representatives, especially Mr Sykes, who was then the General Manager of ETSA. It is pleasing to note that the Minister has now said that he will have another look at these regulations, but it is a nonsense to gazette a set of regulations when the Minister now claims that they are unsatisfactory. That makes a farce of the process of gazetting regulations.

It is quite clear that every honourable member will not have any problem in supporting the move to disallow the regulations. I would be interested to hear any argument to the contrary. I could put a lot more before the House, but again time will beat me. It has been suggested that a similar program would be conducted in the city and in the country. There is a great deal of consternation in some major country towns. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Deputy Premier, on behalf of the Minister of State Development and Technology (Hon. L.M.F. Arnold)—

South Australian Centre for Manufacturing—Report, 1987-88.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: TUBERCULOSIS OUTBREAK

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: This morning the member for Victoria claimed on ABC radio news that there was an outbreak of 14 cases of tuberculosis in Bordertown and that the State Government had indicated it would not respond to the problem until December. Mr Baker's claims were inaccurate and alarmist. There has, in reality, been one case of active tuberculosis found at Bordertown, a 16-year-old student.

Public health authorities were notified of the case on 6 September. On the same day, the infected person was admitted to hospital for treatment. On the same day, the chest clinic sister contacted the school principal at Bordertown requesting him immediately to start compiling a list of all those who could have possibly been in contact with the infected student. On 6 October, and article was printed in the local paper to ensure that Bordertown residents were fully informed of the situation and to get a more comprehensive list of possible 'contacts'. When these usual and thorough preparations had been made, a public health team went down to Bordertown on 24 October to mantoux test and chest X-ray all those people identified on the 'contact' list—about 350 in all.

Contrary to the claims of the member for Victoria that there have been unnecessary delays, this timetable is not regarded by public health authorities as being at all abnormal. There is an enormous amount of organisation that always needs to be done before such a team can move in to do its work effectively. Of the hundreds of people who were tested at Bordertown, 30 were found to be 'silently' infected. It must be stressed that, although these people have tested positive, they are not unwell and they are not infectious to others.

Mr D.S. Baker: That's not right.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister has leave to make a ministerial statement.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: Within a fortnight a public health team will go to Bordertown to work in conjunction with the local general practitioner to establish an effective management program for all those who are infected. They will be treated with a drug, known as INH, which should eradicate the TB bacteria. Again, the member for Victoria has suggested that, because the chest clinic is not putting all their other commitments aside in order to commence immediate treatment in Bordertown, somehow people are being placed at risk. Let me repeat: these people are not infectious. They have tested positive, but they are not about to break out in active tuberculosis.

It has been found that the infectious student was infected with TB bacteria in Malaysia several years ago. His condition went undetected. Not having received any treatment, he developed active tuberculosis seven weeks ago. After receiving treatment at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the patient is now continuing treatment in Canberra where his parents live. Tuberculosis is a chest infection of public health importance. It is equally important that we keep the problem in rational perspective.

There are 70 to 130 new cases notified in South Australia each year. This is a remarkable improvement on the situation that prevailed at the turn of the century when infection rates were 200 times higher. In South Australia we provide mantoux testing to all year nine students throughout the metropolitan and country areas as a matter of routine.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Before calling for questions, I advise that questions for the Minister of Mines and Energy will be taken by the Deputy Premier.

PROPOSED ABORTION CLINIC

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Has the Minister of Health been advised of plans to establish a stand alone abortion clinic on land owned by the Adelaide Children's Hospital in Melbourne Street, North Adelaide and, if so, does the proposal have his support? I refer to a front page report in the issue of *City Messenger* published today that outlines plans for this clinic to be established in the Child and Family Centre at 271 Melbourne Street.

An honourable member: That's a contradiction in terms.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The report quotes a local doctor as saying the location is totally inappropriate, as it is near a large number of medical practices, all devoted in whole or in part to the care of mothers and children. The doctor has circulated a letter in the area that states:

> To place an abortion clinic amongst the practices . . . who are devoted to the welfare of children is nothing short of a macabre joke. Similarly, to have clients of such a centre faced with many pregnant women, babies, and children is surely psychologically damaging.

Earlier plans to establish an abortion clinic at Kermode Street near the Adelaide Children's Hospital fell through because of public opposition. Medical staff at Adelaide's major public hospitals also have demonstrated strong opposition to this type of establishment.

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: By way of background, there is certainly a clear commitment by the South Australian Health Commission to establish a pregnancy advisory centre in association with the proposed amalgamated Women's and Children's Hospital. No commitment—I repeat, no commitment—has been made at this stage, but certainly the Melbourne Street site is one of the sites that is being considered. The Health Commission is in the process of reviewing all the possible options for this service.

Mr S.J. Baker: It is just a matter of where, is it?

Mr Hamilton: Why don't you listen?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham and the honourable member for Albert Park are both out of order.

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: I will repeat; the South Australian Health Commission is in the process of reviewing all the possible options for this service. It is envisaged that such a service would cover a wide range of services including: pregnancy testing and diagnosis; pregnancy counselling; termination of pregnancy; post termination follow-up including contraceptive advice; post termination of pregnancy check-up; and post termination counselling.

The second trimester as above, including overnight care; development and dissemination of information on termination of pregnancy; contraception and sexuality to the community with particular and special emphasis on young women, rural women and migrant women; provision of information on education on sexuality, reproduction and reproductive health and related health and welfare issues; liaison with appropriate services and agencies to develop and provide a coordinated plan, equitable and accessible services; training of health and other relevant community services and health professions, relevant research and evaluation.

The termination of pregnancy appears to be one which excites members of the Opposition, particularly the member for Mitcham. Let me remind all members of the House that the termination of pregnancy is a legal medical procedure in this State. The Bill that provided for it was introduced by a former Liberal Attorney-General—a very good one, too. The South Australian Health Commission has an obligation to supply that service. It is a legally available service in South Australia. Where that service is provided has always created some difficulties. My guess is that it will always create some difficulties, because this issue quite properly raises a great deal of emotion in the community. I do not argue on one side of the debate or another. All I am saying is that it is a legally permissible medical procedure. The Health Commission will supply that procedure and in the most sensitive way possible to enable all women in South Australia to have access if they require it.

LABOUR MARKET SURVEY FIGURES

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): Has the Minister of Employment and Further Education seen the labour market survey figures released today by the Australian Bureau of Statistics? If so, will the Minister advise whether those figures indicate that the economic policies of the Government are having a positive impact on the level of employment in this State?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: I note that this question has been met with mirth by the member for Murray-Mallee and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I might say that the mirth involved here is more at the expense of the Leader of the Opposition for statements he made earlier. The figures that have come out today are impressive. They indicate real job growth in South Australia and a sustaining of the trend of job growth established over recent months. I believe that the policies established by this Government have contributed towards that trend.

Clearly, one has to acknowledge that it is not solely a function of Government policy; it is a function of many other factors as well. Nevertheless, Government policies established by this Government have aided, not hindered, job growth in this State. The figures released by the ABS today indicate that 4 800 full-time jobs were created in South Australia over a month ago, continuing a trend of strong employment growth in this State. That is a seasonally adjusted comparison, I might add. In South Australia in October this year 28 500 full-time additional jobs were created and, in comparison with the situation in October last year, that indicates a rate of growth in the full-time job market of 5.1 per cent, the national average being 4.9 per cent.

If we consider not the 12-month period but the national-State comparison of the six-month period April to October with the seasonally adjusted figures, we see that the growth rate in full-time employment in South Australia was double the national rate. The national rate was 1.4 per cent and the South Australian rate was 2.9 per cent. In seasonally adjusted terms, that means the unemployment rate for South Australia fell from 8.3 per cent in September to 8 per cent in October. In original terms, the rate dropped from 8.6 per cent to 7.8 per cent, and that shows a significant strengthening of the State's economy, particularly within the manufacturing sector. It reflects the significant support that has been given to that economy by optimism within the manufacturing sector. The actual outlook of industry is a key factor in employment growth, but that has also been aided by the policies established by this Government that are tangible in so many ways.

I come now to the mirth of the Deputy Leader and the member for Murray-Mallee, who believe that this whole issue is a joke. In the State budget papers, the figure of 3.5 per cent was predicted as the growth in employment in the year ahead. At that time the Opposition Leader said that that figure was unachievable; he said it was not realisitic. He denied that the number of jobs would grow by 3.5 per cent in the year ahead. Yet in the first quarter of this financial year, the number of jobs has already increased by 1.7 per cent, nearly half the target predicted in the State budget papers. That is why I have said that the joke is on the Opposition Leader who, in attempting to talk down the economy, has been unsuccessful.

CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I ask the Minister of Community Welfare: following a judgment by the Full Family Court which has found that, in the handling by the Department for Community Welfare of a case of alleged child sex abuse, her predecessor, Dr Cornwall, had tried to keep a very important piece of evidence from the court to cover up departmental incompetence, that Dr Cornwall had been 'party to proceedings which involved a grave allegation against the husband, which was found to be not merely unsubstantiated on the civil standard of proof but completely without foundation', and that departmental officers had not complied with the Community Welfare Act in dealing with the case, has the Minister ordered an investigation of this case in view of these court findings? Will any action be taken as a result for breaches of the Act and, if there has been no investigation, why not?

Given the nature of this judgment, which was handed down in the Family Court on 22 September. I am confident that the Minister will know the details of the case. I will give her names privately if she does not know them. The case involved an allegation by the Department for Community Welfare that a man had sexually abused his three year old daughter. It arose from contact with the department by a women's shelter acting on behalf of the mother of the girl alleged to have been abused. The mother and father had separated and there were difficulties over access to the children.

The women's shelter approached the department for advice on this matter but not to make any allegation of child sex abuse. The court found that at no time had the mother made an allegation of abuse, nor had she suggested to the women's shelter that such a complaint should be made to the department. However, without any evidence, the department proceeded to treat the case as one of child sex abuse. What then transpired was three years of litigation involving an attempted Government cover-up and finally the Full Court judgment which concluded as follows:

We consider that there are aspects of this case which give rise to considerable disquiet. The method of investigation of the allegations was unsatisfactory and incompetent and led to a substantial injustice being done to the husband and wife and to the children themselves.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The honourable member's question raises a whole range of issues and I do not intend to deal with each of them now. However, I will say a couple of things about the particular case that he raised. As I said last week in my ministerial statement, I do not intend to canvass in Parliament specific aspects of individual cases. It never ceases to amaze me that the only questions raised in this place and in the other place about child sexual abuse cases relate to the one case in which there is criticism of the conduct of officers of the Department for Community Welfare. It is interesting that members opposite have not once sought to put the whole question into some sort of context, despite the fact that statistics are available on the investigation of the complex issue of child sexual abuse.

I will inform the House again that, of the 385 cases brought before the Children's Court between 1 January 1986 and the end of September, only two cases were dismissed, involving four children out of a total of 508 children. I remind members of what I said in my ministerial statement: the department continually updates and refines the procedures and practices involving staff of the department with respect to the way in which child sexual abuse and other forms of child abuse are investigated and handled.

I have said to this House on a previous occasion that no system is perfect and that we have investigated ways in which my department can ensure the minimisation of any problems that may arise. I would have thought that the honourable member would try to provide one shred of balance to this incredibly sensitive issue, but of course not—we do not bother.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It is interesting that the Opposition chooses to highlight one case without having the courage to put on the record of this Parliament the enormous amount of work that has been done, not just by the Department for Community Welfare but by the Police Department and other Government departments and by non-Government welfare agencies which have decided, along with this Government that we will not stand idly by and let child sexual abusers be given some kind of a haven. Why is it that the Opposition only raises cases which seek to protect the accused? They never raise cases which seek to put the perpetrators of this violent crime where they belong. I feel very angry that this is the only time this issue is raised in the public forum, by the cowardice of Opposition members.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Of course I am going to investigate it.

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable Minister resume her seat. The member for Davenport.

Mr S.G. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the House to come to order so that I can receive in silence a point of order from the member for Davenport.

Mr S.G. EVANS: My point of order is that the Minister accused me of an act of cowardice in asking her to investigate an instance of incompetence recorded by the courts in a certain case. I ask her to withdraw the comment that it was an act of cowardice because this is the only place where we can get information on whether or not a matter has been investigated, and that is the proper role of the Parliament.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is of the view that the use of the word 'cowardice' is unparliamentary. I direct the Minister to withdraw that statement.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker, I will withdraw the statement. I would like to conclude by saying that, of course, like the other responsible Ministers on this side of the House, I have always asked for investigations of any criticisms of any actions of any staff in my department, and while I am the Minister of Community Welfare I will continue to do so and do so with pride.

WILPENA STATION DEVELOPMENT

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): Can the Minister of Environment and Planning provide the House with the projected visitor numbers for the Wilpena Station development? A number of figures are being bandied about regarding visitor numbers at Wilpena Station. I understand that yesterday, speaking on the Philip Satchell show, Mr Stewart Cockburn said that nearly 1 million visitors a year would pass through the resort. I ask this question in the light of some concern expressed by a constituent of mine that the area might be damaged by additional visitors and that the project might put additional pressure on Wilpena Pound.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: This claim has been drawn to my attention and I have to tell members that it is wrong by a factor of 300 per cent. What this gentleman seems to have done is multiply the estimated peak occupancy rate of 3 000 by 365, which assumes that each day will achieve the peak occupancy rate. It does not work like that. A full visitor feasibility study for the development was undertaken by chartered accountants, Pannell Kerr Forster.

Peak nightly occupancy is estimated at 2 645 visitors on long weekends and school holiday weekends—probably less than 10 days per year. Off peak visitor numbers will, of course, be considerably less. There is a projected average daily population graph which I cannot easily convert into words but which can be made available to members on request. For example, in February 1992 there is expected to be 630 people on the site per day. During April this will grow to nearly 900 and in the period August to October, 1 150. However, during June one would expect occupancy to fall below 500, which is a far cry from Mr Cockburn's 3 000 people per day, every day of the year. Pannell Kerr

Forster estimate that in 1990 the annual number of visitors will be 33 977, and it will grow somewhat from there.

At present, more than 27 000 people a year crowd into the existing accommodation facilities located right at the entrance of the Pound, and they have been pounding it to death. Another 13 000 people are estimated to bush camp in the remainder of the park so, if people want to denigrate the project, that is up to them, but let them get their facts right.

HON. J.R. CORNWALL

The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE (Coles): I direct my question to the Minister of Community Welfare. Will the Government pay compensation by way of an *ex gratia* payment to a father, his former wife and children as a result of the findings of the Full Family Court as revealed in the previous question and, in particular, findings by the court that the conduct of the former Minister, Dr Cornwall, 'in keeping secret a relevant and vital piece of information, caused the husband initial expense and prolonged the trial' and that 'a substantial injustice' had been done to the husband and wife and their children?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Obviously, the Opposition's questions have been prepared quite a bit in advance—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: —and it is intent on pursuing this whole issue. I am rather surprised that the member for Coles would seek this course of action.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister has the floor.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I was attempting to answer the question raised by the honourable member. Obviously, the member for Murray-Mallee is not interested in my answer.

Mr Lewis: You call that an answer?

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Murray-Mallee to order.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: At this stage I do not intend to pay compensation in respect of the case to which the honourable member has referred.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order, and I specifically call the member for Morphett to order. The honourable member for Newland.

GREENHOUSE EFFECT

Ms GAYLER (Newland): Can the Minister for Environment and Planning advise the House of the top dozen or so most useful things which ordinary families in the suburbs could do to help reduce the greenhouse effect? Following last week's Greenhouse Conference in Adelaide and around Australia, a number of Tea Tree Gully constituents have asked me what their families can do to play their part in this matter.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The greenhouse effect is a global phenomenon, and the impact that Australia has on that phenomenon is relatively small. However, there has been a great deal of interest in what individual people can do. I have to say at the outset that the greenhouse mechanism, which has been with us virtually since the birth of the solar system, has been disturbed by our activities and, whatever we might do now, there will be some further warming of the Earth's atmosphere and oceans. That process will continue for some time and we just have to put up with it. However, that is no reason for not doing what we can to reduce the further cumulative build-up of the greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.

That means addressing those activities which are responsible for the release of carbon dioxide, methane and chloroflurocarbons into the atmosphere. Chloroflurocarbons have a greenhouse effect out of proportion to the total amount of them being released into the atmosphere, so whatever is done to reduce the use of CFCs in the interests of the ozone layer will also have a considerable impact on the greenhouse effect. Nonetheless, the question of carbon dioxide and methane remains. Since for the most part the activities of men and women in the suburbs do not amount to the production of great amounts of methane, I will ignore that aspect and concentrate instead on carbon dioxide.

Obviously, this involves being energy efficient. Measures that could be taken include the insulation of the house in preference to the installation of air-conditioning; the use of outside lines for clothes drying rather than clothes dryers; the installation of a solar water heater and the use of solar energy for pool heating; the installation of a water saving shower rose to reduce energy and water use; and the use of microwave ovens in preference to electric or gas ranges. That sounds like a good idea. The only cooking I ever do is with a microwave oven these days: the other means are beyond me.

Other measures include the use of natural gas or oil in preference to wood or coal for home heating; ensuring that houses are designed and oriented correctly to minimise heating and cooling costs; and turning off lights. More broadly, the following measures would help: the greater use of public transport; the shared use of cars; and the use of bicycles and smaller and more fuel efficient vehicles. Further measures include the use of aerosols with hydrocarbons as the propellant instead of CFCs; the avoidance of buying goods manufactured from tropical hardwoods, because of the deforestation of places such as the Amazon Basin; the planting of trees; the protection of existing trees; and the avoidance of the use of polystyrene foam packing and cups, because CFCs are used in the manufacture of those items.

CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): Following her statement to the House last Wednesday, and further statements today, that the Department of Community Welfare is reviewing procedures for dealing with allegations of child sexual abuse, can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether the Government, as part of the review, is taking into account another recent court decision that raised questions about those procedures? The case referred to in a previous question is not the only one to have provoked recent comment from the bench.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes, she does say that there was only one case. On 19 August Judge Newman, Senior Judge of the Children's Court, concluded his findings in a case alleging sexual abuse of two girls aged six and three with the following comments about departmental policy and practice in relation to the investigation of notifications of child abuse:

> I think it makes good commonsense that in all cases of suspected child abuse the initial diagnosis should be made by specialist professionals in the field best equipped by training to properly make a sound conclusion and that validation should take place before any treatment program is planned, particularly

so in cases like these where the investigation has not been instigated by the child making an unsolicited complaint of abuse. For both these reasons, both applications are dismissed.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. Yes, I am familiar with the case to which he refers and I have read the transcript of the judgment in that case in some detail. The honourable member failed to point out to the House (and no-one would be surprised at that) that, in his complete remarks in which he dismissed the case, the judge went to great pains to point out that there was no shred of criticism that he made against any officer of the DCW. Now, is that not interesting? The honourable member did not bother to point that out. No, we are into the tactics of smear and innuendo! That is all right; that is fine!

The honourable member also asked what had we done to address this whole question of expert medical (if you like) diagnosis. However, I should have thought that the honourable member might have listened when I made an announcement in a ministerial statement last week. I remind him of what I said. From 1 November, a specialist paediatrician (Dr Terry Donald) is leading a specialist child abuse assessment team at the Adelaide Children's Hospital. I also announced (and obviously members opposite could not have been here that day) that the Flinders Medical Centre would also provide specialist services and sensitive guidelines for interviewing children. Some members of this House may not have had the opportunity to read Judge Newman's judgment in this case. I again remind Opposition members that this is only the second case in 385 cases that has been dismissed by the Children's Court.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Excuse me, I gave the same statement. Two cases involving four children have been dismissed and, if the honourable member can read, he will see that in *Hansard* tomorrow. In fact, I should have thought that the Opposition would compliment the work that is being done not just by the Department for Community Welfare but also the Health Commission in providing these diagnostic services. I openly stated—and the honourable member would have heard this if he had bothered to listen—that we needed to obtain some specialist pediatric services. We have done that, and they are already operating.

The honourable member has rehashed a question from the Upper House because I suspect that he is too lazy to write his own. A similar question was asked in the Upper House, I believe, a couple of weeks ago. It is an indictment on the Opposition, the quality of the questions it comes up with in Question Time. I have answered the question and I have made a ministerial statement. If the honourable member cannot be bothered to read what I have said, he must certainly be interested in the issue!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

SAMCOR

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Gilles): Will the Minister of Agriculture advise the House whether the South Australian Meat Corporation continues to make a profit? The 1986-87 annual report of the South Australian Meat Corporation indicates that the corporation made a profit for the first time for many years. Is this trend continuing?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am delighted to report to Parliament and the community that, for the second consecutive year, the returns for SAMCOR (South Australian Meat Corporation) have been excellent, with an increased profit for the trading year. SAMCOR has a troubled history, but in the past two years, following our review (which was very extensive), there has been a marked turnaround in its activities. It is worth exploring the returns for the financial year just completed because, if one looks at the overall revenue, the costs and the profit, one can see that the efforts of the board and of the staff have been well rewarded in those figures. Looking at the 1987-88 figures, there has been a 7 per cent increase in revenue, a 5 per cent increase in costs, a 50 per cent increase in profits, and an increase of 14 per cent in revenue per employee. The figures indicate a remarkable about-turn from what we saw four or five years ago with regard to the operating costs incurred by SAMCOR.

I think that full credit should be given to the staff and employees of SAMCOR, as well as to the board members under the chairmanship of Ken Taeuber who has made some very significant and important operational decisions. He is still a very valuable employee, as the honourable member for Gilles will appreciate. There are about 600 employees in the works itself, which is important in terms of the local environment. The operating costs of the organisation have been reduced, while revenue and the profit for this period have been increased, and that represents a major turnaround compared with the 1985-86 period when we had a significant loss in the SAMCOR works. It augurs well for the future of SAMCOR.

I understand that seasonal factors may lead to the 1988-89 figures not being quite as positive, but I am sure that under the careful management and guidance of the Chairman of SAMCOR, the support of the board and the strong support of the employees, SAMCOR will continue to operate in a profitable way. It is good news for those people interested in the operations of SAMCOR. I certainly pass on my thanks to all those who have been involved.

WILPENA STATION DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Has the Minister for Environment and Planning yet discovered, as he undertook to do in reply to a question last week, the source of funds which the Ophix Finance Corporation will use to finance the Wilpena development; will the Minister advise the House whether any SAFA funds have been offered to Ophix and, if so, to what extent and on what terms; and can the Minister advise the House whether any Japanese investment is being used to finance the project?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: My recollection is that I answered at least part of that question while on my feet and I indicated that no SAFA funds were involved in the project at all. While I was on my feet, I received a note which indicated that no SAFA funds were involved. As to the other information, I undertook to get what information was appropriate to provide, given the nature of confidentiality as is sometimes needed in these commercial operations. When that information is available to me, I will provide it to the House as appropriate.

CENTRE FOR MANUFACTURING

Mr DE LAINE (Price): Can the Minister of State Development and Technology outline the progress made by the Centre for Manufacturing after its first year of operation? When the establishment of the centre was announced by the Government, it was stated that its aim was to provide a range of assistance to manufacturers in this State to assist them in their efforts to become more competitive. It was also stated that there were plans for the centre to become

60 per cent self sufficient after its first five years of operation.

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question. It certainly has been a great pleasure to the manufacturing community in South Australia to note how successful the Centre for Manufacturing has been. It is without doubt that the South Australian Centre for Manufacturing, which the State Government has established, is the most successful centre of its type in Australia. That is determined by a couple of measuring sticks: first, the number of firms that are using it, the number of firms that go to it to actually ask advice and either receive advice or directions as to where they can best receive advice. In the first year the centre has handled more than 3 000 inquiries and provided assistance to some 165 firms in South Australia. Those firms, representing a very wide cross-section of industries, are listed in the annual report tabled in the House today.

It is noteworthy that the other index that can be used to measure the success of the Centre for Manufacturing is the extent to which it is recovering costs from fees charged to firms which seek its services and other non-government sources. The centre has a five-year plan to recover 60 per cent of its budget from other than Government sources by the end of the five years. The centre is already ahead of that plan and in its first year has recovered 21 per cent of costs from other than Government sources. That is a very impressive effort. Those two indices indicate that the South Australian Centre for Manufacturing has performed as well on the books as it has on the shop floor where it has proven to be a focus for vigorous export expansion within this State.

The centre, which employs 14 full time staff, also has colocated with it 11 related organisations including Standards Australia and the Australian Design Council. The centre was established by initiative of this Government and it is one of the things to which I referred in answer to the previous question on employment in indicating ways in which this Government has aided the growth of employment in this State rather than hindered it, as would have been the case had the Opposition had the opportunity to implement its policies.

REMEMBRANCE DAY

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): Will the Premier approach the Grand Prix Office to ensure that the first Formula One practice session is halted tomorrow for the Remembrance Day ceremony at 11 a.m. The first practice session is advertised in today's paper to run from 10 a.m. until 11.30 a.m. we have been told that that RSL has, as yet, had no official assurance from the Grand Prix Office that it will be halted during the Remembrance Day ceremony.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have made very strong representations, both formally in a letter to the controllers of the event and informally to a number of those involved in the decision making, to ensure that, at 11 a.m., there is silence on the track. I have not been officially advised as to the arrangements that have been made, but that has been the strongly expressed wish of the Government.

EDUCATION POLICY

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I ask the Minister of Education: in the light of the announcement of the proposed new education policy with its emphasis on the development of reading, writing and numeracy skills, will the Minister give an assurance that a comprehensive system of testing will be introduced to monitor the effectiveness and performance of the education system in these vital areas? Will the Minister undertake to make public statistical information on the results of such testing on a regular basis so that this House and the community may readily assess the results of the policy?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Earlier this week, when the Director-General of Education launched the Education Department's three-year plan, he announced that, next year, a State-wide system will be established to monitor the performance of students in schools and provide regular public reports on the State education system to ensure that the community knows what is being achieved in our schools. A good deal of work has been done in the department to provide information to the community and to ensure that there is accountability for the outcomes of our education programs. That is of particular interest to the community at this time and different education systems are approaching it in different ways.

There is clearly a great deal of concern by educationalists about standardised testing *per se*, that is, providing various year groups with some sort of literacy and numeracy tests, as has been the case in England for some time and as is being trialled in New South Wales, and as was proposed recently by the Victorian Liberal Party. That simplistic approach to standardised testing is rejected in South Australia as being superficial and because it is used primarily as a tool to restructure educational opportunities for young people, as it is in New South Wales and in England. In the United Kingdom options are being taken to privatise education on a wide basis and to dismantle the comprehensive nature of secondary schools.

However, we are embracing a system of qualitative testing by sampling across the student body. The base for that will be established next year and, as was announced some months ago by Education Department officers, a three-year program has been developed. It is believed that this form of testing and assessment will be very helpful to schools, students and teachers—indeed, across the education system. Further, as announced in the plan, every school will develop a school development plan or a strategy for the development of that school through the provision of its educational programs. Built into that plan is a system of review and accountability. An education review unit is being established in the Education Department, modelled on Her Majesty's Inspectorate structure in the United Kingdom, and that will provide objective assessment of educational outcomes for our schools in this State. All of that is embodied in the three-year plan that was announced earlier this week.

Members interjecting:

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

RURAL ASSISTANCE

Mr MEIER (Goyder): My question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Following the devastating dust storms which affected much of rural South Australia this week, particularly Yorke Peninsula and parts of Eyre Peninsula and the West Coast, what contingency plans does the Government have in the form of debt reconstruction and other departmental assistance to meet this new economic disaster which has compounded the crisis facing farmers and their families in South Australia? The estimate of dam-

age on Yorke Peninsula alone from this week's storms is $9 million. One farmer has reported a 100 per cent loss of barley. Another total loss is reported from the Department of Agriculture's own trial plots north of Maitland. Yields dropping from 15 bags to two bags per acre and even wheat losses of up to 50 per cent are typical of other reports which have come in.

One farmer who lost last year's crop through hail damage this week had most of this year's crop blown away. This situation suggests that debt reconstruction money will be required for some farmers on Yorke Peninsula, with some individual farmers having lost a minimum of $40 000 each. Farmers in the area are also calling on the Government to review its decision to reduce the number of staff at the Kadina District Office of the Department of Agriculture from nine to two in view of this new crisis.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am sure that all members would join with the member for Goyder in expressing concern about what happened on that very bad day, particularly the impact it had on the barley crops on Yorke Peninsula. I do not have a completely accurate figure; I think it is slightly less than was suggested by the honourable member, but it was pretty devastating and there could be a loss of return amounting to $4.9 million or $5 million. That is bad news, especially in terms of timing, because in many cases those crops were only days away from being harvested. It would have been heartbreaking for those farmers to experience a day like that, knowing the quality of their crops which were so close to being harvested and exported.

We have written into the package some flexibility. In line with the matters raised by the honourable member, there are a number of options available in terms of the assistance we can offer those people whose undertakings have been badly affected by that storm. As I see it, the situation in terms of options would be to have a proportion of funding available, given the needs of other regions in the State. In particular, I would look at the flexibility that we can provide as regards the quantum available for farmers in that region. I am talking now about not only the amount per farmer but also the total amount of funding that will be available for rural assistance in this State.

There is some flexibility, because we have allowed for a degree of uncertainty in terms of the final harvest in South Australia and the impact that that will have on funds, as well as funds needed to prepare for next year's crops. So, I assure the honourable member that that assessment will be made. The department is currently working on a comprehensive assessment of the situation. If need be, the department will provide additional resources in the way of officers to assist those regions devastated earlier this week by the fierce winds and heat.

The honourable member may be able to offer assistance by communicating information to his constituents. One of our problems is that people do not understand what we are offering. The honourable member would appreciate that we have been running a series of advertisements in the rural newspapers to convey to people the extent of the assistance available and the way in which it is available. I assure him that any assistance he can give will help us because we have a need to reach out to people who may think they cannot receive assistance. It certainly is available.

I think that the flexibility we have in this year's package will offer farming communities some relief from any stress suffered by them as a consequence of those bad days. I ask the honourable member to convey these views to his constituents. I am certain that the Department of Agriculture's officers will be happy to work with him and with other members from rural electorates to convey that information so that we can assist those people who are entitled to help and who need it to continue farming in their regions and, indeed, to recover sufficiently to reap the benefits next year.

AUSTRALIAN DEMOCRATS

Mrs APPLEBY (Hayward): Is the Chief Secretary prepared to withhold his signature from the document by which the Australian Democrat members of Parliament are paid? Further, would such withholding be for the period during which such members have effectively been on strike?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The subject is not open for debate; it is a question directed to the Deputy Premier.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It is my melancholy duty to inform the House that on Tuesday I signed the appropriate document, which means that all members in both Houses will receive their pay cheques for this month, so it is a little too late to adopt that course of action. I do not believe that the honourable member's question is by any means over the top, because it seems that the metaphor of industrial action is entirely appropriate in respect of what those two members in the other Chamber did, or refused to do, last evening. We certainly cannot call it work to rules, or anything like that; it is withholding that part of the labour which I suppose our constituents regard as the most important part of our activities. The community should look closely at what is happening in another place. After all, not a large number of people vote for the Democrats, but those who did vote for them at the last election were effectively disfranchised last evening in another place. If that behaviour continues this afternoon, they continue to be disfranchised in that other place.

I know the sort of mail which I would expect to receive from the electors of Baudin if I, because of a fit of pique over some legislation that had nothing to do with the legislation before the Chamber, were to withhold my vote. I can just imagine the letters and approaches I would receive—and deservedly so. I hope for the same treatment as is currently being meted out to those two members in the other place.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Flinders.

DROUGHT RELIEF

Mr BLACKER (FLinders): My question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the worst cereal growing season in the history of agriculture on many parts of Eyre Peninsula, will the Government now consider declaring Eastern, Central, Upper, Western and Far West Eyre Peninsula as drought affected areas and, if not, why not? Many parts of Eyre Peninsula have experienced the driest year on record and have received less than five inches of rainfall during the growing season of the grain. In other drought periods far less severe than those now being experienced, Governments of the day, whether LCL, Labor or Liberal, have assisted with stock and fodder, freight, agistment, water carting and other schemes to enable farmers and country towns to survive.

Many areas on Eyre Peninsula have been farmed for three or four generations of farmers and for at least 80 years. Local government authorities are also now being affected as a result of last Monday's dust storm. I am advised of at least 80 kilometres of road affected by sand drift. At least

two councils have been concentrating their efforts on clearing school buses routes so that the original routes can be reinstated. I am further advised that failure to declare the areas in question as drought affected means that the people in those areas cannot avail themselves of assistance under the State Disaster Fund involving the Federal-State Government financial agreement.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Flinders for his question. Having been asked the same question on many occasions at various venues throughout the State, I have given what I believe to be the most practical answer available regarding the reasons for not declaring these areas under the State Disaster Act.

The funding arrangements for natural disaster are worth reiterating for the benefit of members. There seems to be a view that I am not dealing with it as a drought situation. I certainly accept the environmental fact that parts of the environment of that region in particular are in a drought situation. One must consider the area in a regional sense because certain parts, prior to last Monday's terrible storm, were doing well. Indeed, the member for Eyre comes from an area that has had a reasonable season, and south of Karkoo it was a better than average season. That has changed dramatically following Monday's storm and heat.

The Government is sympathetic to the situation that the honourable member describes. We have to qualify for assistance and the funds are available on a fixed term and for a fixed period, which makes it rigid as to how people enjoying the benefits from that arrangement meet the repayments. Our costing is such that we can help people far more effectively by offering them rural assistance. The negotiated package that we have arranged with the Federal Government has allowed us to offer flexibility. I should be happy to arrange for a full departmental briefing for the honourable member as to how we are offering that arrangement and, if he has any suggestions as to how we can improve the communication or information flow on that package, I should be delighted to accept his advice.

We have considered a fixed interest payment arrangement, as required under the terms of the natural disaster or drought relief scheme, even though the State gets no assistance from the Commonwealth until we reach the magic figure of $8.4 million as part of a disaster. We are offering 10 per cent for up to 15 years with flexible terms, whereas for a natural disaster it is 8 per cent for a fixed term. There is no flexibility in the natural disaster or drought relief scheme. So, we believe that, in the normal course of events, indeed within the next year or two, we would see an average season or even a good season in that area. Indeed, I hope that next year is a good season.

We can provide much better benefits and keep the costs to the local community much lower than if we went into a natural disaster situation. Regarding the regional financial aspect (that is, local government), I will have to direct that situation to the Premier regarding the aspect. No doubt that matter will be raised in our discussions on Tuesday with representatives from Eyre Peninsula, and I am sure that the Premier will consider that aspect in the confines of his responsibilities as Treasurer. My jurisdiction concerns the farming community and the aspects that I must address involve only agriculture and agricultural activities and nothing in relation to small business related to agricultural activities. Small business is a matter for the Minister of State Development and Technology and the Premier.

In my undertaking and analysis, we have considered this matter carefully. Indeed, time and time again we have examined the figures and every time we examine the formula the best possible options with which we come up involves a package that offers itself under rural assistance because it can save considerable sums for anyone embarking on rural assistance, debt restructuring, or farm build-up under conditions *(a)* and *(b)* of the package offered.

I reiterate my offer to the member for Flinders and the other members who have constituents on Eyre Peninsula (the members for Eyre and Whyalla). If they want the department to brief them, I should be delighted to arrange it so as to communicate the benefits available through rural assistance as against drought relief. I accept that what is happening on Eyre Peninsula is a drought situation—I do not deny that. It is the formal declaration that worries us because it restricts our capacity to offer that flexible package to the people in the area.

I thank the honourable member for his question, and I hope that I have explained why the Government has adopted this position. It is not through any wish to ignore the drought. We accept the situation. We know that it is devastating and that the stress is real for the people in the rural community. We are doing everything to provide social service support. Indeed, my colleague the Minister of Community Welfare and I have been over there, and we met with the rural group that is considering that aspect. The Minister of Community Welfare has addressed that issue. We have had problems concerning social security offices and we are considering that aspect as well. We have tried to consider this as a comprehensive package. I shall be happy to invite the members for Flinders, Eyre and Whyalla to a briefing from departmental officers and the opportunity to offer suggestions.

ADELAIDE RAILWAY STATION

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): Is the Minister of Transport aware of the problems, or has he received notice of problems, concerning the rail tracks leading into the Adelaide Railway Station? Earlier this week in the Legislative Council the Hon. Legh Davis cast doubt on the track and said that he understood that modifications had to be made—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot refer to debates in another place. I call on the Minister.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am aware of the statements made in another place, but I have not received any report, nor have I been provided with any information that would suggest that the railway tracks at the Adelaide Railway Station are not as safe as they possibly could be. It surprises me that anyone would accept a rumour and then make a public statement to that effect. I believe that responsible members of Parliament check out this sort of matter and, if there remains a query, it is proper for any honourable member, particularly an Opposition honourable member, to ask questions in Parliament to which the Government should be able to respond.

However, to leave in the air the suggestion that rail tracks are unsafe at the Adelaide Railway Station and so hope in the process to cast fear into the minds of commuters that there may be a problem is a totally irresponsible action. As a result of those statements, I asked the State Transport Authority to investigate whether or not there was just a semblance of truth in what had been said by the Hon. Mr Davis. I have received a report from the STA and I should like to read it into the record. That report states:

> There are no established Australian standards for the installation and support of rail track on a concrete base.

So, the allegation that the track is not up to Australian standards is fallacious on that point alone. The report continues:

The structural support and securing arrangements which are in place in Adelaide station were specifically designed for their purpose by appropriately qualified structural engineers. The design and construction of these units conform to sound engineering practice and their performance under operating conditions has been totally satisfactory.

Therefore, I can assure all South Australians who use the STA (and increasing numbers of people are using the services offered by the STA in South Australia) that they can do so with the greatest confidence in the safety of the service that is being provided.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

DANGEROUS SUBSTANCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Dangerous Substances Act 1979. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Dangerous Substances Act provides for the keeping, handling, packaging, conveyance, use, disposal and quality of toxic, corrosive, flammable or otherwise harmful substances.

The Act places a duty of care on persons who keep, convey, etc., dangerous substances and authorises the making of regulations which, in the main, adopt various standards of Standards Australia to provide detailed requirements.

One of the Act's principal features is a licensing system that permits the Director of the Department of Labour to grant a person a licence to keep any dangerous substance that has been declared by regulation to be a dangerous substance for the purposes of the Act.

A licence is required where dangerous substances are to be kept in quantities exceeding prescribed amounts. This ensures that prescribed health and safety measures are in place relevant to the particular substance or substances kept. The Act's present licensing provisions are such that the Director is not permitted to grant a licence unless the premises in which it is to be kept complies with prescribed requirements.

This Bill seeks to alter the conditions under which licences are issued to overcome administrative difficulties that have arisen from subsequent amendments to regulations made under the Act. These difficulties arose following the introduction in 1987 of regulations requiring licences for the keeping of class 6 and class 8 dangerous substances, being of a toxic and corrosive nature respectively.

Persons required to be issued with a licence were those already operating businesses or establishments. There were two stages to the operation of the regulations, the first stage being the requirement to be licensed followed six months later by the second stage—compliance with the prescribed physical safety requirements. This lead-in time was to give licensees the opportunity to carry out any necessary improvement work.

In some instances compliance could not be achieved within the six month period. This had the effect of placing the Director in the situation of having issued a licence for premises some of which do not meet all prescribed requirements, contrary to the Act's licensing provisions.

The proposed amendments to the Act include an administrative discretion that will enable premises to be licensed even though they may not fully comply with prescribed safety requirements, providing there is no immediate danger to health or safety. In such cases improvement conditions will be attached to the licence which will ensure that the licensee receives positive directions as to the action or measures to be taken to meet the requirements of the Act and regulations and a date to be set by which the work must be completed.

To compound the problem outlined, the Act does not authorise inspectors to issue improvement notices requiring compliance work to be carried out within a certain period.

This Bill proposes that inspectors appointed under the Act be provided with powers to issue improvement notices and prohibition notices similar to the powers of inspectors under section 39 of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986. Improvement notices will serve to direct industry to attend to deficiencies which do not constitute an immediate danger to health or safety or the safety of any person's property. In the case of immediate danger situations a prohibition notice can be issued.

These amendments will not only allow for the proper and effective administration of the Act but also provide uniform procedures where appropriate between Acts with similar inspectorial functions. The opportunity has also been taken to upgrade the penalties provided by the Act, to express them in terms of divisions.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure.

Clause 3 makes a consequential amendment to section 3 of the principal Act.

Clause 4 strikes out subsections (3) and (4) of section 9 as the powers contained in these subsections are to be replaced by new powers under the provisions relating to improvement notices and prohibition notices.

Clause 5 amends section 12 of the principal Act to provide that a person keeping, handling, conveying, using or disposing of a dangerous substance must take steps to avoid endangering a person's health as well as a person's safety.

Clause 6 enacts a new section 14 in order to clarify the operation of this provision.

Clause 7 amends section 15 of the principal Act in two respects. Firstly, the provision that prevents the Director from granting a licence with respect to premises that do not comply with the regulations is to be replaced with a provision that will enable the Director to grant a licence in such a situation provided that the Director is satisfied that the keeping of prescribed dangerous substances on the premises does not constitute an immediate danger to health and safety. Secondly, the penalty for failing to comply with a condition of a licence is to be included in section 15 (instead of under section 14).

Clause 8 enacts a new section 18 in order to clarify the operation of this provision.

Clause 9 includes a penalty for failing to comply with a condition of a licence in section 19 of the principal Act (instead of in section 18).

Clause 10 provides for a new Part IIIA relating to improvement notices and prohibition notices. An improvement notice may be issued where an inspector believes that a person is acting in contravention of the Act. An inspector may include in the notice directions as to the measures to

be taken to remedy the contravention and specify a day by which the relevant matters must be attended to. A prohibition notice will be available in cases involving immediate danger to health or safety. An inspector may include directions as to the measures to be taken to avert, eliminate or minimise the danger. A person to whom a notice is issued may apply for a review of the notice.

New provisions will also empower an inspector to take action if a person fails to comply with a notice, or if there is immediate danger to health and safety and there is insufficient time to issue a notice.

Clause 11 makes an amendment to section 24 that is consistent with other amendments that are intended to protect a person's health as well as his or her safety.

Clause 12 and the schedule alter the penalties under the Act so that they become divisional penalties under the scheme recently introduced into the Acts Interpretation Act 1915.

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

RACING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 November. Page 1253.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): The Opposition will support this Bill. I note that some of the amendments that we initially suggested have now been proposed by the Minister. We obviously have had the same advice from the same group of people and it is very complimentary that the Minister recognises that our amendments should be accepted not only on our behalf but on behalf of the Jockey Club. I thank the Minister for recognising that.

The Bill as it stands would create a *de facto* racing commission. I am glad that the Government has recognised that and proposes to move the required amendments to ensure that the statutory authorities—the South Australian Jockey Club, the Trotting Control Board and the Greyhound Racing Control Board—have the opportunity to liaise only with the Minister and not, as provided in the original Bill, the obligation to liaise with all statutory authorities. In other words, they would comprise, in effect, a *de facto* racing commission. We have recognised that and, consistent with advice from the Jockey Club, we oppose that move very strongly. It is our opinion that the statutory controlling body of racing, the South Australian Jockey Club, can adequately determine its own forward financial planning and general promotion and marketing strategies without having to consult with other statutory authorities or Government bodies.

We believe that the Jockey Club does an excellent job as the controlling body of the galloping section of the racing industry, and we will argue very strongly that it should be seen to be independent of any of the other statutory authorities, although, for obvious reasons, it should consult with the Minister on any major and significant changes because, as we are all aware, the Government has a vital interest in the racing industry through the TAB and the Racecourse Development Board. We strongly support the need for the Jockey Club in particular, as it relates to the galloping side of the industry, consulting with the Minister.

The same applies to the Trotting Control Board and the Greyhound Racing Control Board. We believe that they stand in their own right and should be encouraged to set their own forward financial planning and promotion and marketing strategies. We believe they can do that quite adequately without having to consult with other statutory authorities in the industry.

That does not mean, of course, that there should not be a close liaison between the statutory authorities—the Betting Control Board, the Racecourse Development Board and the three major statutory authorities that run the industry. We believe that that should occur and we note that it does occur in almost every instance. So we are very happy to support the Government's proposed amendment that will allow the controlling bodies to consult only with the Minister.

The second amendment relates to the Racing Appeals Tribunal, and we congratulate the Government for recognising the need to set up one tribunal. The Minister and I had some involvement earlier in the year in discussions about the independence of tribunals, and there was much criticism of the way in which the tribunal carried out its job, I am in no way reflecting on the tribunal, but the issue brought into the public arena independence of that tribunal More correctly, the Nelson inquiry raised the matter of independence of both the galloping and the greyhound tribunals. It is a very positive move by the Government to set up this independent tribunal. It is a necessary body as far as the Opposition and I are concerned and it is a proposal which, hopefully, will herald a move in other areas. I would like to take this opportunity to suggest that the Government also consider setting up an independent body relating to stewards.

I believe there is ample evidence as to the way in which independence can be given to a group of stewards, and I cite the Casino as an example; the stewards who oversee and control gambling in the Casino are not only employed by an independent body but are also controlled by it. I believe it is important and I hope the Government will investigate the possibility of setting up a group of stewards independently controlled, through the Department of Corporate Affairs or some similar body. That would provide the racing industry with a significant and independent group of stewards. Again, I want to make clear that there is no reflection at all on the work of the stewards in the galloping, trotting or greyhound industries. I believe that such action would provide the industry with a group of independent stewards.

Another issue that I believe should also be thoroughly investigated is the establishment of a testing and research centre in Adelaide. During discussions in this Parliament at the time of the 'Batik Print' affair, it became obvious that the swabbing techniques and the testing for and research on the use of drugs in the racing industry were carried out interstate. I believe that this sort of testing and research should be carried out in Adelaide. There is no doubt that an excellent group of people are employed in the Government analysis centre and we should seriously consider setting up a racing industry research and testing centre in Adelaide. Given the significant sums of money now being contributed through the TAB and the Racecourse Development Board to the racing industry in this State, we should consider establishing a testing centre that can investigate the use of drugs in the racing industry. If the racing industry is to be seen as a vital part of South Australian development—and I know that that will be so in the future—this sort of action is required.

The South Australian public rightly demands that the racing industry is seen to be doing the right thing and, as a consequence, we should consider the establishment of this centre. Along with the setting up of an independent tribunal for appeals, which we support very strongly, we should be considering the establishment of an independently controlled group of stewards and a testing and research centre

for the detection of the use of illegal drugs in the racing industry. We will suggest a few amendments to that part of the Bill but, in principle, we support it.

The Bill replaces the word 'trotting' with the words 'harness racing'. Those words are now used to identify that part of the industry, and we have no objection to that change. In fact, we support it strongly. The fourth area relates to the removal of the word 'Control' from 'Greyhound Racing Control Board'. That seems to be a little pedantic, because the Racing Control Board in fact controls the greyhound industry but, if that is the way the Government wants to move, we do not have any objection to that change.

The next portion of the Bill changes the name of the 'Betting Control Board' to the 'Bookmakers Licensing Board'. Again, that seems to be a little pedantic but, if the Government wishes to go down that track, we do not object. Two other amendments are important in relation to bookmakers. First, a fine would be introduced as an extra disciplinary measure; the Bookmakers Licensing Board could impose a fine as an extra penalty. We have no concerns about that, because we believe that a significant range of penalties should be available to any licensing board. Since the fine is not applicable at the moment, we have no concerns about supporting that provision.

While talking about fines, it is important to note that this Bill doubles all fines for breaches of the Racing Act, and we strongly support that change. We believe that if something is to be done about illegal movements within the racing industry, the penalties must fit the 1980s. We support the Government's proposals strongly. The Bill provides that the Bookmakers Licensing Board, in granting or denying a new licence, must consider the interests of the racing industry. In Committee we will explore that further, but it seems to be a very broad definition. I hope that some specific guidelines have been set out. It is really saying that the Bookmakers Licensing Board will be able to do almost anything without recourse, because it could claim that it was in the interests of the racing industry. We will not oppose that provision but we will require the Minister to explain to the Parliament more clearly what is meant by that provision.

It appears that there are no appeal rights in relation to this clause. Are there appeal rights and, if so, by what method? We support the Bill generally, but we will suggest a few amendments. One of our proposed amendments is different from the Government's amendment and that is in relation to the eligibility of members of the tribunal. We believe that no member of a controlling authority or a licensed person should be on the appeal board. It should be fairly obvious that a person who sits in judgment and penalises an individual for a breach of the Racing Act should not also be a member of the appeals tribunal. That is not specifically spelt out, thus we will move an appropriate amendment. We also believe that a licensed person, whether a trainer, bookmaker or jockey, should not be able to sit on the appeals tribunal. That matter is also covered in our amendment. With those few words, in principle the Opposition supports the Bill.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I thank the Opposition for its support of this measure. In many ways this could be termed a bipartisan Bill. By and large, the amendments foreshadowed by the member for Bragg will be accepted. I do not have any problem with them; fundamentally they add to the Bill and further clarify certain aspects. I am sure we will be able to accommodate them. In doing so, and depending on what the other place decides (but I hope it sees the wisdom of this measure), the passage of the Bill will be expedited.

One could reflect on the history of this matter as a consequence of the Nelson inquiry. The Government considered a series of proposals as to how the industry could be better governed, better managed and further enhanced. There were also some interesting sideline aspects of the inquiry in which the Government determined it would not be involved. The member for Bragg touched on the one that created the most emotion and the most interest throughout the State, that is, the question, whether or not a racing commission should be established. The proposals have been well outlined in my second reading explanation. I believe that they will further encourage the good image of the industry in this State, enhance the quality of racing—and I mean that in the general sense and regarding all codes—and allow the industry to continue to grow as it has grown over the past decade or so. The Bill will also enable the industry to have a fairly clear idea of how it will operate.

As members will note, timed with the introduction of this Bill have been changes in the bodies themselves. The South Australian Jockey Club recently announced rearrangements of its committee and governing body and how they operate. They are important changes and the timing relates to these amendments to the Act. We can see a separation of the administration of the clubs from the overall administration of the industry. That is very important not only from the point of view of the clubs but also from the aspect of the overall dovetailing of various sections of the industry. For instance, with regard to galloping, the provincial and regional clubs are dovetailing into what the metropolitan clubs are doing under the banner of galloping in this State.

It is important to note that some changes have occurred within the administration and organisation of the industry, and they are included in the Government's amendments to the Racing Act. I am pleased to have the Opposition's support for this measure, and I know that the Government has the support of the industry with regard to the changes. I am sure that the disputes, trivial and time-consuming as they are (they provide great entertainment for the journalists who report on them), will be eliminated, and that will benefit the industry because it will remove some of the controversy. Anyone who goes down to the racetrack, to the local TAB agency or to the subagency at the local pub, hears the disputes and the speculation about various horses, and that goes on until the cows—or, more appropriately, the thoroughbreds—come in.

In the current situation, it is not possible to stop that rumour-mongering or innuendo. We have an independent appeals body (I note the member for Bragg's comment about stewards) and it is important that not only justice is done but that it is seen to be done, and these amendments will further enhance that. One must balance what one achieves with regard to fines. There is no point having fines if enforcement services are not available. If fair and natural justice is not available to those who are involved, the system collapses. One would find a fair and reasonable balance in what we are endeavouring to do, and that is probably highlighted by the way in which the industry has accepted it.

The amendments proposed by the shadow Minister and me—I speak for myself—to a large degree, come from discussions with the industry, which sought further clarification, and I am happy to accommodate that. I am pleased to accept the support of the Opposition. Issues relating to administration should be bipartisan, and it is important that they be considered in this calm sort of environment without any emotion. It is also important that the com-

munity sees that the Government and the Opposition—the major Parties—can deal with these things in a sensible, balanced and analytical way and that we can arrive at a decision on the basis of our regard for the security of the industry, that is, that the people who are charged with the responsibility to manage the industry—apart from myself—and who have the day to day responsibility for running it at a policy level and a management level do so correctly. I am happy to debate the shadow Minister's amendments in Committee and, when this Bill returns from the other place, I look forward to the amendments contained in it further enhancing the adminstration of the Racing Act.

Mr OSWALD: Madam Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Bill read a second time.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable it to be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House on the Bill that it consider each proposed new section contained in clause 18 as separate questions.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Duties and functions of SAJC as controlling authority.'

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

Page 2, lines 34 and 35—Leave out 'and all Government agencies and statutory authorities performing functions relating to horse racing'.

Mr INGERSON: The Opposition supports the amendment and notes that it has the support of the industry.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 5 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—'Functions and powers of Board.'

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

Page 3, lines 23 and 24—Leave out 'and all Government agencies and statutory authorities performing functions relating to harness racing'.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 10 to 14 passed.

Clause 15—'Functions and powers of Board.'

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

Page 4, lines 35 and 36—Leave out 'and all Government agencies and statutory authorities performing functions relating to greyhound racing'.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 16 and 17 passed.

Clause 18—'Insertion of New Part IIA.'

New section 41a—'Interpretation.'

Mr INGERSON: Can the Minister explain to the Committee who will perform the duties of Registrar and who will pay for it?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: A member of the department's racing division will fulfil the position of Registrar. The cost of running the tribunal in a general sense will be met by the industry.

Mr INGERSON: Whether it relates to galloping, trotting or greyhound racing, will the controlling authority be requested to meet the cost on behalf of the industry or will it be the industry itself?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The controlling authority.

New section inserted.

New sections 41b and 41c inserted.

New section 41d—'Appointment of members of Tribunal.'

Mr INGERSON: I move:

Page 5, after line 40—Insert subclause as follows:

(1a) A person is not eligible for appointment as a member of the Tribunal if the person is—

(a) a member of a controlling authority; or

(b) licensed under this Act or the rules of a controlling authority.

As I said during the second reading we are concerned that this panel of assessors nominated to appear on the tribunal shall be independent of the controlling authority and also shall not be licensed, although there is no intention to reflect on the positions of individuals. We believe that the definition of 'assessor' should take that into consideration because, in the first instance, they may have been involved in making the decision and, secondly, we believe that in order to ensure no possible corruption between licensed people and the appeal body that we ought to remove them totally from this position.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The Government has no problem accepting this amendment. The fundamental intention of the Bill—and it is certainly my intention as Minister with the carriage and application of it—is to ensure no possibility of conflict. What is incorporated in this further amendment will be the policy which will be adopted in the application of the Bill. So, I have no problem in further spelling out in the Bill the exact policy that the Government will adopt if the Bill is proclaimed.

Amendment carried.

Mr INGERSON: I move:

Page 6, after line 14—Insert paragraph as follows:

(ca) the person becomes a member of a controlling authority or the holder of a licence under this Act or the rules of a controlling authority;.

This paragraph is consequential on the first amendment in that it will not enable a person to be a member of the tribunal once that position is taken up by a member of the controlling authority or if the person becomes the holder of a licence.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I have no difficulty with this amendment. Obviously it is a consequential amendment and fits in with what was proposed by the previous amendment. The intention of the Government—and certainly what I would have envisaged being instituted as part of our policy in relation to the operation of this Act—would be to ensure that anyone who took up an appointment as member of the controlling authority or became the holder of a licence under the Act would have not been appointed and we would have requested that person to not create any situation of conflict with his other activities. Obviously, that situation would be taken into account in the appointment of an assessor.

Amendment carried; new section inserted.

New sections 41e to 41h inserted.

New section 41i—'Proceedings on appeal.'

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

Page 7, line 27—After 'order' insert 'and that it is appropriate to do so'.

Line 30—Leave out 'a bond of ' and insert 'as a bond'.

Lines 32 to 37—Leave out subclause (7) and insert:

(7) The amount lodged as a bond by an appellant is not to be refunded unless—

(a) the tribunal allows the appeal in whole or in part; or

(b) the appellant satisfies the tribunal that the appeal was genuinely instituted on reasonable grounds and not for the purpose of delaying the operation of the decision or order under appeal.

Line 38—After 'public' insert 'unless the tribunal, for good reason, determines otherwise'.

Mr INGERSON: We note that, whilst the Opposition's amendments circulated in my name relating to lines 32 to 37 are worded in a slightly different way, in essence they mean exactly the same, so we support these amendments.

Amendments carried; new section as amended inserted.

New sections 41j and 41k inserted.

New section 41*l*—'Principles upon which decisions made.'

Mr INGERSON: Proposed new subsection (2) provides:

The tribunal is not bound by the rules of evidence and may inform itself on any matter in such manner as it thinks fit.

What is the purpose of that proposed subsection?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It is intended that through this proposed subsection, the tribunal, when informing itself about matters which are before it, will have the greatest amount of flexibility as possible.

New section inserted.

New sections 41m and 41n inserted.

Mr INGERSON: Proposed new section 41h gives the Minister the power to make rules and it provides several ways in which the Minister can do that. However, the final proposed subsection provides:

The tribunal may, if satisfied that it is just and reasonable in the circumstances to do so, dispense with a requirement of the rules.

On the one hand, the Minister seems to be able to make the rules, but then the tribunal can ignore them. How will the Minister make these rules and where will they be set down? What is the purpose of proposed subsection (3) which provides that the tribunal can ignore those rules?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: In the interests of the efficient running of the administration, anyone in the industry should know the *modus operandi* by which the tribunal will run. I believe it is important that that be seen to be the general policy of the tribunal. However, I am sure that the member for Bragg will appreciate that, in certain circumstances, the tribunal may, if satisfied that it is just and reasonable, alter that requirement. There may be extenuating circumstances in relation to the late lodgment of an appeal and, in those circumstances, some flexibility must be built in to the mechanism that will allow the tribunal to consider certain situations which may arise from time to time.

Mr INGERSON: Where will these rules be set down? This proposed section states that the provisions of the Subordinate Legislation Act do not apply in relation to the rules. I assume that that means they will not be published in the *Gazette*. I assume also that the controlling authorities (the Jockey Club, the Trotting Control Board and the Greyhound Racing Board) will be informed of those rules, or will they be set out only for the tribunal?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The rules will be displayed in similar fashion to tote rules. Obviously we would make them available to any interested party, and it would be in the interests of industry to make them available. I can think of a number of places, as I am sure can the honourable member, where it would be most appropriate for the controlling authorities, on behalf of the tribunal, to display them. The tribunal would ensure that those rules are being administered.

Clause as amended passed.

Clauses 19 to 23 passed.

Clause 24—'Licences.'

Mr INGERSON: Subclause (1a) provides that the new Bookmakers Licensing Board will be able to grant or withdraw licences. The primary consideration in such a decision would be whether it is deemed to be in the interests of the racing industry. What guidelines will the Government provide to the Bookmakers Licensing Board, or does the Minister believe that that sort of broad definition will remain in order to give the Bookmakers Licensing Board *carte blanche* to decide what would be in the best interests of the racing industry? Does he intend to give them guidelines and, if so, how will those guidelines be published so that not only the Bookmakers Licensing Board but also the community at large knows about them?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It is important to note the existing situation and compare it with what is provided in this clause. At present, the Betting Control Board can in fact issue a licence for any reason here, and the Nelson inquiry suggested the type of amendment provided in this clause to give a basis whereby the Bookmakers Licensing Board, as it will be known, will have a foundation for issuing a licence. Under this provision, the primary consideration for the issue of a licence is to be the interests of the racing industry. It may appear that this loosens up the procedure, but it is tightening the operations of the new board.

Mr INGERSON: Although I accept the Minister's comments, it still seems that, if the statutory authority is merely told that its primary consideration is to be the welfare of the racing industry without setting guidelines, all sorts of appeal decisions will be made because of the lack of criteria. After all, will one criterion be that there are too many bookmakers? Will it be that some bookmakers are too old or some too young? Will it be that bookmakers are not holding enough money?

All those criteria could be deemed to pertain to the primary consideration of the interests of the racing industry. If an applicant is granted a licence or refused a licence, and the decision is appealed, where do we stand? Parliament should be a little more specific by giving guidelines to the board. Are there problems at present in this area of betting control? Is that why these changes are being made? Have there been instances where difficulties have arisen, or any reason, when the Betting Control Board has tried to grant a licence or to refuse a licence? Is this provision purely and simply the result of a present problem and, if it is, what is that problem?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: At present, there is an issue concerning the retirement age for bookmakers, and members of the Betting Control Board, as well as members on both sides of the Committee, have had an interest in that issue. Indeed, members of the bookmaking industry have a vital interest in whether a retiring age should be adopted. However, at present the Betting Control Board has no guidelines in arriving at a decision on that matter other than the keen interest of the bookmaker representatives in their occupation.

Probably successive Governments have considered the matter of the retirement age for bookmakers in terms of offering younger people the chance to come into the industry. Some bookmakers are in their 80s, while others are in their 60s or 70s. One could say that the process of licensing bookmakers is fluid. This provision offers guidance and direction to the Bookmakers Licensing Board and I hope that it will be seen as giving guidance to the industry as to where we should be going.

I do not want to pre-empt any of the present deliberations of the working party on this issue. The member for Bragg would realise the sensitivity surrounding this issue and he has probably been subjected to various representations and deputations from the racing industry. This provision tightens the procedure and gives guidance to the Bookmakers Licensing Board so that it will have a firmer understanding of what interests it should take into account when making a decision. At present, the situation is a free-for-all that is governed or checked by the interest shown by those who talk about the regulation or further control of the licensing of bookmakers. Other than attaching a schedule to the Bill or introducing regulations on the various aspects, the process has been fluid over the years. This matter has been dealt with by successive Ministers and Governments and this

provision is a small step forward in trying to give guidance to the Bookmakers Licensing Board in this regard.

Mr INGERSON: Unfortunately, the Minister and I must end up disagreeing. Would it not have been better for all concerned to spell out what we mean? This clause gives *carte blanche* because almost anything can be said to be in the interests of the racing industry. It is a pity that the Minister will not accept the need for guidelines. After all, the membership of the Bookmakers Licensing Board will change and, when it changes, there will be different attitudes towards, and emphases on, the interests of the industry.

It is unfortunate that as a Parliament we are telling the new board that its primary consideration shall be the interests of the racing industry, because such a statement is exceptionally broad. There are no guidelines and the first time the board does anything wrong we as a Parliament will be criticised for giving it this broad *carte blanche* direction. I suggest that it is unfortunate that we could not have been more specific. The Opposition does not oppose the clause, but it does not give the Betting Control Board, as it is known at present, the best opportunity. Parliament should give the board guidelines and set its direction in this area.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: If the honourable member were to take legal advice on this provision, he would find that it is more specific than he suggests. In fact, it is more specific than the present provision. The Bookmakers' Licensing Board will be required to have regard to the interests of the industry and, if there is a dispute about that, it will be decided quickly and clearly as to what is intended.

The honourable member says that we should stipulate how people should be licensed and for how long, but that issue requires a careful debate in the community. This provision gives the board a standard by which it can operate. The mechanisms are there requiring certain tests to be applied before a decision is made and I am sure that those tests will be clearly established. If there is a problem, as I have said before, my door is always wide open for anyone to talk to me about it. We have taken advice on this and the suggestion is that it will help to resolve the current situation where the administration of the Bookmakers Licensing Board (or the Betting Control Board as it is commonly known) operates on a *carte blanche* basis.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (25 to 31), schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOCAL PUBLIC ABATTOIRS ACT REPEAL BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 November. Page 1252.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): The Opposition supports this measure. It is another of the proposals that the Government has put to the House in recent times whereby it is repealing or cleansing the statute book of unnecessary legislation. The Opposition has no problem whatsoever with that process. The original legislation was introduced in 1911 to allow local communities to have an effective abattoirs (obviously in those days there was no refrigeration or similar facilities and it was necessary). As I understand from various inquiries I have made, the residents of Port Augusta, Port Pirie and other locations availed themselves of provisions under the Local Government Act because, in those days, local government was really the only authority that had the ability to make sure that reasonable standards were maintained.

My experience with local government in respect of slaughterhouses was most difficult, and I really hope that never again will I have the privilege of having to adjudicate upon which slaughterhouse is good and which one is bad. It was an early experience in public administration on my part and I learned in those days that you always go and have a look—you do not believe what you are told.

The Opposition supports this measure and, as I understand the arrangements, if it is necessary for local government to again involve itself in providing these services, the provisions and regulations of the Meat Hygiene Act will allow that. In view of the fact that the Meat Hygiene Act is now well in place, I hope the people who are administering it do so with a bit of understanding and consideration. Many people have made very large investments in building abattoirs in country areas and they are making every endeavour to provide reasonable standards. Unfortunately, there have been one or two examples where certain inspectors have been a little over zealous in their conduct. When the Health Department insists on one criterion and meat hygiene inspectors on another, it certainly does not add up to good administration. With those brief comments, the Opposition will be pleased to see this measure pass through the House and into the next Chamber and for it to be removed from the statute book.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Agriculture): I thank the Opposition for its indication of support. I will not delay the Bill any further. I think the member for Eyre has thoroughly canvassed the basis of the amending Bill that is before the House, and I thank him for his support.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): For some time now I have listened to debates and propaganda put out by the Liberal Party in terms of law and order in this State. I do not intend to canvass any other matters before Parliament. Nevertheless, members opposite will recall that at a recent function at the Wayville Showgrounds I told them that I would be addressing some of the propaganda and garbage that they put out, particularly in terms of the suggestion that this Government is going soft on crime. Anyone who has traced the history of what I have said since I entered Parliament in 1979 would know of my interest in this area. We have had to put up with nonsence and filth, particularly the rotten ads provided by Nigel Buick which were, in my view, subsequently paid off by the Liberal Party after 1979. I will not relent on this matter and the approach of those members of the Liberal Party who do not have a conscience.

I turn now to what this Government has done. In 1987-88, the Government committed $189.1 million to the Police Department, compared with $106.1 million in 1981-82 in the last Tonkin budget. This represents a massive increase of $83 million in six years. Funding for equipment has grown from $5 million in 1981-82 to $12.4 million in 1987-88.

Some of the Bannon Government's other policing achievements include: the introduction of community policing, including eight additional 24-hour police stations and an additional 26 police; upgrading police communications—the $20 million eight-year plan will provide police with latent communications equipment and better place them to assist the police; and the acquisition of automatic data

processing equipment and software to enable computerisation of case management. Computerisation, as we all know, is an invaluable tool for crime investigators. Other initiatives include: the construction of a new communications and emergency operations centre at a cost of $57 million; participation in the national automated fingerprint network at a cost of $1.2 million; and participation in the National Crime Authority.

Further, since the success of the trial Neighbourhood Watch scheme, in excess of 117 Neighbourhood Watch areas have been established in this State. I am proud to say that I was the first person in this place to ask that this matter be addressed by a Labor Government. The Opposition did not get involved in it. Neighbourhood Watch has been well supported by the community. In 1987-88, the Safety House Association received a grant of $40 000 plus a once-off payment of $15 000.

In terms of sentences—and I recall the garbage peddled by the member for Morphett, who well may sit there with a look of chagrin on his face—two major initiatives have been taken. The first extends the range of sentencing options available to the court. The second exercises the Crown's right of appeal against sentences which are considered lenient. Since November 1982, the Attorney-General (Hon. Chris Sumner) has authorised in excess of 100 appeals against sentences considered lenient or judged to be manifestly inadequate. Some examples are: rape, 24 years to 36 years; rape and murder, 12 years to 18 years; abduction, 18 months to six years; rape, three years to eight years; attempted rape, two years to 4½ years; heroin possession, one year to 4½ years; and armed robbery, three years to nine years.

The Attorney-General authorised in excess of 13 appeals with 11 being successful and two still pending. The penalty for the cultivation of Indian hemp has been increased from six months to four years. With regard to the Summary Offences Act, increases in penalties for over 50 offences have occurred, including indecent behaviour, soliciting for prostitution, fraud, unlawful possession of property believed to have been stolen, and wilful damage. The penalty for assaulting police has been increased from $200 or 12 months imprisonment to $8 000 or two years imprisonment. The penalty for hindering police has increased from $100 or six months imprisonment to $2 000 or six months imprisonment. The Criminal Law Consolidation Act clarifies the law and increases the penalties for production or trading in pornographic material involving children.

The Adelaide Remand Centre was opened in September 1986. Mobilong Prison was completed and opened in October 1987. The Adelaide Gaol closed in February 1988. All gaols provide education and other programs to enhance inmates' opportunities on their release. Considerable resources have been put into increasing the number of correctional officers from 600 in 1982 to 968 in 1986. Recruitment and training practices are under constant review.

The Summary Offences Act is under constant review. A comprehensive review of drug laws has led to wide ranging changes in control of the use of legal and illegal drugs under the Controlled Substances Act. Under that Act, which was passed recently, penalties for dealing in or manufacturing drugs of dependence or prohibited substances have been amended. With regard to cannabis or cannabis resin, the penalty is a fine of $500 000 and imprisonment for up to 25 years; for other drugs, it is a fine of up to $50 000 and imprisonment for up to 10 years. So much for going soft on crime!

The unsworn statement has been abolished in the courts. The maximum penalty for rape remains life imprisonment. That is an area that should be addressed properly when people talk about the large increase in the occurrence of rape. Our legislation should be compared with the statutes in other Legislatures throughout Australia. I understand that there are more degrees of rape in this State than elsewhere in the country. Legislation providing for young children to give evidence at commital hearings was introduced under the Justices Act Amendment Bill 1987.

The Attorney-General revealed plans to institute a series of Crown appeals against inadequate court sentences imposed for breaking restraining orders in domestic violence cases. Whilst the law allows for a penalty of up to six months imprisonment for breach of a restraining order, statistics for the first 18 months of the operation of this system show that only minimal penalties have been imposed. The Attorney-General has asked the Crown Prosecutor and the Commissioner of Police to be alert to the need to consider appeals in cases where they consider the penalty for breaching a section 99 order is inadequate.

Legislation providing for much tougher penalties and automatic loss of licence for causing death by dangerous driving was passed by State Parliament in 1986. The maximum penalty of seven years imprisonment was increased to 10 years with a minimum of five years and maximum of 15 years licence suspension for a first offence, and a minimum of 10 years suspension for subsequent offences. Penalties for causing bodily harm rose from a maximum two years gaol to four years gaol, with a minimum one year suspension for a first offence, and a maximum of six years and a minimum of three years suspension for a subsequent offence. The increased penalties and automatic licence disqualification have been designed both as a deterrent and to provide a more realistic punishment for offenders.

The Police Complaints Authority was established in 1985. In relation to pornography, a number of initiatives have been taken by this Government. In 1983 the Criminal Law Consolidation Act was amended to ban the taking, possession or distribution of photographs of children which are objectionable or which are taken in objectionable circumstances. Regarding violence, the Police Offences Act was amended in 1983 to tighten classifications. Guidelines covering violence, cruelty, drugs, terrorism and crime in videos and other related material were introduced. There is a whole list of penalties relating to dangerous substances. Unfortunately, time does not allow me to put those on record in this place. If that is going soft on crime, then I am a Chinaman, and I am no Chinaman, I assure you. That is nothing against the Chinese—a great people.

The reality is that those in 1979 who led that filthy and disgusting campaign are at it again. They are in the slime and the sewer, and that is where they belong, in my view, when they get down to these low and debased tactics. It is typical. I make no apology for any statement I make in this place about those sorts of tactic. They are debased and they are wrong.

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

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Recently the Attorney-General made a number of allegations about the Opposition.

Mr Robertson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, as you get a chance. They can be summarised with the statement—

Mr Robertson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: —as follows:

What I have to say I regard as extremely serious, about allegations of corruption and associations with the Mafia made by the Liberal Party about me.

This statement is absolutely false. What is more, the Attorney has condemned himself out of his own mouth. I refer to other statements he has made in relation to allegations linking him with the conspiracy to murder Donald McKay:

Would you be sensitive if, on arrival home from overseas on a Saturday in May 1987, you found your staff at the airport saying that the *Sunday Mail* was going to name you as the local politician being questioned by the NCA for involvement in a possible murder conspiracy?

Here he is accusing the *Sunday Mail* as a source of serious allegations. He further states:

The arrival of Chris Masters of *Page One* ensured that the rumour tempo increased, he was investigating my alleged Mafia links, he was asking why I had so many visits to Italy, he was alleging to police that I had stayed in Mr A's holiday villa in Sicily.

Again these admissions nail the Attorney. Here he is saying that Mr Masters was responsible for raising allegations about him. I draw no conclusion about that, although it should be noted that, at the same time as the Attorney has attacked Mr Masters, the Government has said that all matters raised on his television program are being investigated by the police.

It is also reported to me that the Attorney has stated that if the Opposition had not been spreading rumours about him, 'they had no compunction about letting the rumours run'. How does he suggest I do that? Get up and make a public statement revealing certain people have concerns about his associations, then say they are not true? What nonsense! He would have attempted to sue me in just the same way he threatened to sue a number of television journalists who put questions like this to him. Much more could be said about his Party in relation to rumours.

Last night I highlighted a number of occasions on which the Attorney has used parliamentary privilege to attack innocent people. His Party, including members in this House, has no compunction about starting, spreading and letting run rumours relating to members of the Opposition. But we do not cry or complain about it. The Attorney has viciously and maliciously misrepresented the Liberal Party and the Leader in the past week. Now, as I have demonstrated, he has condemned himself out of his own mouth, with the quotes I have just given. I draw no conclusion about whether he is right to claim that the *Sunday Mail* and Mr Masters began these rumours. But they were not started by the Opposition, and the Attorney has produced not one shred of evidence to show that they were.

Now, I turn to a couple of matters of importance to my electorate and the public generally. I have been approached by the Kersbrook Cooperative Society which has written to me in the following terms:

Dear Sir,

As you can gather from the attached information the firm Driveg Ltd is in financial difficultics.

Kersbrook Cooperative Society, along with a number of fruit and vegetable growers in your electorate who have supplied produce for processing, is a creditor of Driveg Ltd and a substantial amount of money has been due to this Society since April this year for cold storage of capsicums.

At a meeting of creditors held on 8 September 1988 we were given to understand that the infusion of fresh capital would make the concern viable and that the potential for future development and success was enormous.

We have since learned that a number of investors are currently evaluating Driveg Ltd. Among these are Dalgety's, Bush Boake Allen (Aust) Ltd, Vicon Tasmania (exporter) and an unknown apple dehydration concern also from Tasmania.

We know that the South Australian Government has an appreciable financial interest in Driveg Ltd.

This is the matter that I have been asked to take up on its behalf:

If indeed the Government is of the opinion that Driveg Ltd has worthwhile potential for this State we ask you to bring some pressure to bear for further financial assistance to be provided by the Government so that creditors will get paid.

I have raised that matter because quite a number of growers in my electorate are owed money—a lot of money—in terms of the operations of Driveg. I do not know how much Government money is involved in this project but I hope that the Government will investigate carefully the request of the society because, as I said, a large number of my constituents will be adversely affected if they are not paid as a result of default by this company.

Mr Speaker, I seem to be getting on much better tonight with my speech, and I have time to deal with a third matter. It concerns an article in the newsletter of the Institution of Engineers (Aus), which is called *Perspecs*. I will read a passage into the record because it might be helpful to members of the Opposition. Under the heading 'Inevitability of the Nuclear Option', the article states:

Australia has the expertise in enrichment technology and ample electrical energy generation potential to become a world leader in the enrichment of uranium. Moreover, Australian scientists and engineers could take the initiative in the permanent disposal of high-level nuclear wastes.

To turn this latent technology into a benefit for the community, Australia required leaders with the political will to consider a full exploitation of the nuclear fuel cycle and a community debate devoid of uninformed emotion.

These comments were made by a Vice-President of the Institution of Engineers, Martin Thomas, in response to the ALP's uranium discussions at Hobart in June. He said that Australia could not ignore the fact that an international nuclear power industry already existed and will continue to exist.

'The ALP, or at least Senator Button, seems to have realised that nuclear power is here to stay. Society's future energy needs must be based on either fossil fuels or nuclear energy, with the former increasingly giving rise to sulphur and carbond dioxide pollution, especially in the northern hemisphere.'

'People must face reality. In a few hundred years, world supplies of natural gas and oil will be exhausted. Solar and wind, while valuable in the appropriate environment, can only provide a small percentage of our needs. We owe it to future generations to plan now for their energy supplies.'

'There are obvious risks with the nuclear option. But with the proper safeguards in place, and a responsible and informed attitude, Australia could perform an international and national service and earn valuable foreign exchange, while having its impact on uranium affairs enhanced', Mr Thomas said.

That is an enormously valuable statement from a man who has the eminence of Mr Thomas. It is unfortunate that the Labor Party must be dragged screaming to the barrier to debate these matters of controversy. It is absolutely certain that, if the Liberal Party had not got Norm Foster to cross the floor, there would have been no Roxby Downs for the Premier to open on Saturday. Nothing is more certain. Mr Thomas indicates that we could enhance greatly and become a real voice on the world scene if we could only drag the Premier, screaming or not, to the barrier to look at the option of uranium enrichment.

As I have pointed out on numerous occasions, it is the safest part of the nuclear fuel cycle. It is quite false for the Premier to suggest that there is a technical problem. The Premier was quite embarrassed by some questions asked of him after the Hobart conference, and he stated that there were technical problems. That is not true. There are no technical problems with the Urenco Centec technology. It has been operating and supplying a large slice of the Western world's nuclear plant material for enriched uranium, and that has enhanced the value of the product enormously.

Everybody now agrees, including the Labor Party, that Roxby Downs will add enormously to the economy of the State. Without it we would be in an absolute pickle. Despite

the optimistic report in tonight's *News* about employment we still lag way behind all the other mainland States. Where would we be without Roxby Downs, which the Labor Party to a man in this place opposed and voted against—

Ms Gayler interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am using a turn of phrase. I do not think that the new vernacular from Canberra is really in vogue yet. Where would we be? Obviously we are going to have to drag the Premier screaming to the barrier again.

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): In deference to the previous speaker, I wish to speak about the problem of ageing, of the change in my view on this matter and the way in which I believe society treats the aged. I have been a believer in compulsory retirement at a fixed age, and in the past that has been 65 years for males and 60 years for females. Also, I have believed that we ought to encourage the trend towards early retirement in Australia.

The *Advertiser* of 30 July 1985 carried a report indicating that about 340 000 Australians are expected to opt for early retirement over the 20 years from 1985. The report indicated that in the decade prior to 1985 almost 70 per cent of Australian men in their early 60s had still been in full-time work, but that by the year 1985 only 35 per cent of Australian men of that age still had full-time jobs. The report went on to say that the Bureau of Statistics had reported that 60 per cent of all people had retired for positive reasons, and those reasons are indeed positive and I support them. It indicated that people at that age of retirement had amassed enough money to begin investing in boats, cars, seaside homes and the like and intened to live a long and happy retirement. I supported that policy at the time and I support it now.

Several years later on 25 March 1987, the *Advertiser* again ran a report which suggested that by this time only 30 per cent of male workers had remained in the work force beyond 65 years of age, a decrease of 5 per cent on the previous two years. At that time it indicated that nearly 70 per cent of males retired before the official retiring age and that 88 per cent of women had retired from full-time work before the age of 60 years. I think that these trends are admirable, and I certainly support them. Indeed, overseas Governments have encouraged their populations to retire early. A report in the *Advertiser* of 4 November 1985 suggested that the French Government had dropped the pension age to 60 years for both sexes and that the West German Government had dropped the pension age to 63 years, thereby enticing people to retire a little early. The West Germans went further and paid early pensions to people who became redundant after the age of 55 years (which might have some relevance to some of us in here).

I think the idea of voluntary retirement is excellent, and I support the people's right to do that. A recent edition of the National Social Science Survey Report published by the Research School of Social Sciences at the Australian National University had me thinking again about the question of compulsion—whether we should compel people to retire at age 65 or any other age. A number of people were asked in that survey whether employees should have a retirement age set by law. The survey, which was taken in 1986-87, indicated that 40 per cent of Australians favoured compulsory retirement and 43 per cent were opposed (a further 16 per cent were undecided). That indicates that support for compulsory retirement in Australia is among the lowest in the world, the only country surveyed which was lower being the United States.

Support for the idea of compulsory retirement in some of the OECD countries ranged almost as high as 80 per cent (in Italy). I am inclined to think that Australia and the US are right—more is to be gained by lifting that compulsion than by retaining it. The National Social Science Report went on to suggest that abolishing compulsory retirement would have a number of quantifiable economic advantages. A case in point was a worker earning $30 000 a year, earning a net $105 000 after tax in the five years between age 65 and 70. From that additional $105 000 after tax the Government would derive a benefit of $93 000—an additional $43 000 would have come in tax according to the tax rates pertaining at that time and the Government would have saved itself $50 000 on the full married rate of pension at that time.

I believe that something is to be gained by hanging on to people who wish to continue working—not compelling them to retire—and using their skills, abilities and talents beyond the so-called compulsory retirement age. Recently I attended a function at which the Reverend Alan Walker from Sydney was guest speaker. This was an interdenominational breakfast organised by Dr Graham Elford of the Uniting Church in Hallett Cove. Dr Walker, in his address, espoused a number of ideas which are quite dear to my heart and which, I must say, were quite surprising for a person of his age.

He strongly supported the claim of Aboriginal people to land rights. He deplored the continued presence of American bases on Australian soil and the economic domination of the Australian economy by American interests. He deplored the fact that Australia spends only .37 of 1 per cent of its GDP on foreign aid compared to a target percentage of 1 per cent set by the United Nations. He decried the fact that Australia seems to have jumped into every passing war in the past 100 years and called on Australians to exhibit a love of peace rather than a love of war.

He pointed out that between 1893 and 1968 Australian society had absorbed 6 500 Aboriginal children who were taken forcibly from their parents on Aboriginal encampments throughout Australia under the Act which obtained prior to the early 1960s. He pointed to the fact that social security and Medicare in Australia were as close as one would expect to come on this earth to a temporal expression of the Sermon on the Mount. With wisdom of that kind exhibited by a man like Alan Walker, I do not think we can justify putting people of that ability, intellect and age out to pasture. We must regard the aged in this country as a resource and not quarantine all the knowledge and experience of older people and condemn them to growing radishes and knitting doilies.

My own personal admiration for people such as Bertrand Russell and, indeed, Dr Alan Walker is quite astounding. I recall as an adolescent when I first had access to television at the age of 14 or 15 years, having just caught the last year or so of Bertrand Russell's life and becoming a staunch admirer of the great philosopher who was then aged 92, admiring the fact that he led the 'ban the bomb' marches in the United Kingdom during the early 1960s.

I do not think that, as a society, we can afford to dispense with the wisdom and talents of people such as Alan Walker and our own Bertrand Russells. However, to keep people like that active and involved, we must do a number of things. I believe that we should look at our planning and housing policies to cater for extended families. We should allow people to live with their children and their children's children a little longer. Further, we should look at altering industrial awards and removing the compulsion to retire at age 65 and thus allow people who wish to do so to continue

working a little longer, even if that is at a marginal cost to younger unemployed people.

We should look at superannuation schemes (preferably union based compulsory superannuation schemes) which would enable people to stay longer in the work force and thereby to earn a higher super payout when they retire. Locally, I believe that we should look at such things as STA travel concessions and extending them not only to holders of the yellow card or the genuine pensioners but also to people who hold the blue pharmaceutical card, which is issued to people on superannuation and part pensions. I believe that, if those and other measures were implemented, we could begin to treat our aged as a valuable resource to be fostered and treated with dignity and not shut them away.

Motion carried.

TRAVEL AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

At 4.46 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 15 November at 2 p.m.