HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 1 December 1988

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

INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL TRAINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD (Minister of Employment and Further Education): I have to report that the managers for the two Houses conferred together but that no agreement was reached.

SECONDARY SCHOOLS STAFFING

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Meier:

That this House express it 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 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 10 November. Page 1443.)

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I support the motion of the member for Goyder and oppose the amendment that was moved by the member for Bright. I will refer to the member for Bright's concluding remarks shortly, but I suggest that he seemed to be relatively complacent about the problems that have arisen over the past few years within the Education Department. While he and his Minister have offered reassurances about the future of education in South Australia, I can assure him that, right across the State on a weekly basis, problems are still arising and they seem to be addressed by the Minister and the department on more of an *ad hoc* basis than with any long-term planning in mind.

I also suggest that, complacent though the member for Bright seemed to be last week, there was certainly enough heat in the educational kitchen for the Minister to want to take the pot off the boil. The four or five reassurances and guarantees from the Minister and his Director-General, whilst removing some of that heat, certainly have not completely satisfied the teaching staff, the parents, the Institute of Teachers or the general public of South Australia with regard to the Education Department's long term intentions. On standing back from the whole problem, it would appear that the Education Department (the Government, in particular) is addressing this problem within education mainly from a financial viewpoint and much less with education itself in mind.

The member for Bright, in his concluding remarks, said that the Education Department was to be commended for the steps that it was taking in launching the Education Department into the technological era and preparing it for the year 2000 and beyond. In his opening remarks several weeks ago (this debate has been going on for quite a few weeks) the member for Bright referred to the fact that the Government had a new three year 'back to basics' plan. The best that I can say for the Government and the member for Bright is that they seem to have a Rip Van Winkle mentality: they have been asleep for the past 20 years.

The Liberal Party policy in 1979 was applauded on the basis that it was 'back to basics'. It sought to restore the emphasis on reading, writing and arithmetic in primary schools so that by the time youngsters reached secondary school they would not be underprivileged in being unable to communicate and comprehend those secondary school text books that are generally written by teritary educated people in much more sophisticated language than is the case in primary school. We emphasised that the important aspect of contemporary education was to ensure that youngsters in primary school were fit and able to cope with secondary education.

I am not claiming that in 1979, when I put together that Liberal Party education policy, I was initiating something. In 1975 the Federal Senate report on the education of slow learners (a report commissioned for the Whitlam Government but which was handed down to Malcolm Fraser) stated in one small but extremely important paragraph that, until the problems in primary education were properly resolved, the problems in secondary education stood no chance of being redressed. So, for the Government in 1988 to come up with a 'back to basics' policy is really an admission that during the past 20-odd years during which the Labor Party has been in power in South Australia it has failed abjectly.

I remind members, in case they come up with the premise, that the Liberal Party was in power from 1979 to 1980 and that during that period we commissioned the Keeves report which came down with precisely the recommendations we made in our 1979 policy, one being that money should be diverted from secondary education in light of the declining student numbers. Of course, those declining student numbers emerged as a threat to South Australia's education system back in the mid-1970s, before we came into government. I remind members that the Minister would give a guarantee to teachers who were going through the South Australian College of Advanced Education that they would be employable but, because of that 5 000 per annum decline in student numbers, with the emphasis on declining enrolments in secondary schools, in 1977 or 1978 the then Minister of Education (Hon. D.J. Hopgood) decided that he could no longer give a guarantee of employment, so he withdrew the bonding system.

The writing was already on the wall. Keeves made several recommendations, one being that money should be diverted from secondary education and put into primary education, and at the same time he made recommendations with regard to technical and further education. Of course, those issues were already the subject of numerous reports at State and Federal level that had been commissioned by both Labor and Liberal Governments, so the job of the Keeves committee of inquiry was to utilise the information gleaned from those different reports and put it together in the form of a recommendation for South Australia's blueprint to the year 2000.

In 1982-83, when the Liberal Party lost government, the Keeves report, which had been ridiculed by the then shadow Minister of Education (Hon. L.M.F. Arnold), subsequent to his becoming Minister of Education, was shelved. Those important recommendations that the rest of Australia took to heart were shelved in South Australia, and the slow pace with which the Keeves report has been identified by this Government as an important document is reflected in the snail like pace with which the reorganisation of the Education Department has taken place. The Labor Government was putting submissions to Cabinet in 1983 with regard to the reorganisation. It was not until 1986 or 1987 that that reorganisation was brought to a conclusion, although there

are still problems associated with it. There are still administrative problems.

One problem is that the South-East region is centred in Murray Bridge, so that people from as far north as Clare and as far south as the South-East in Mount Gambier and Port MacDonnell have to communicate with Murray Bridge, of all places, and there is not even an airport. People have to take an aircraft to Adelaide, then a car to Murray Bridge, whereas previously they were able to communicate directly with local services which were much more comprehensively staffed. I am not decrying the fact that Murray Bridge has benefited; I am pointing out that that was not an educational gain.

It is regrettable that one of my South-East teachers was killed in a road accident near Keith en route from Murray Bridge to Mount Gambier, possibly as a result of fatigue from having not only to perform his duties but also to drive many miles to Murray Bridge in order to report. It is much too big an area for one region to cover, but that was the Government's decision. Now we have the member for Bright criticising the submission of the member for Goyder and claiming that the department is doing a wonderful job, and that it is far-sighted, when I claim that these recent moves by the department are really an admission of abject failure in the field of primary education, in particular. I am quite sure that, despite what the member for Bright might have said, every member of this House will receive weekly letters from pre-schools, kindergartens, primary schools and secondary schools saying, 'Look: the new staffing formula is not working. We are having to curtail in one way or another either our syllabus or curricula. We are not able to give the range of subjects which we have previously offered. Can you help us?'

I do not think that any honourable member would deny that. As I said, the Minister is having to redress these problems on an *ad hoc* basis instead of according to a long-term, fixed, positive plan based on financial expediency. That is not good enough. The various Labor Ministers of Education have made firm and unequivocal commitments to the public, the Institute of Teachers and staff of schools in regard to what they would do and how they would improve education. Instead, they have been dragging the chain. In 1982, 33 per cent of South Australia's budget was committed to education—one-third of the budget. I suggest that, in 1988-89, that figure is nearer 22 per cent or 23 per cent. I will be generous by saying 23 per cent, but it still represents a very substantial decrease in the State Government's commitment to education.

I know that figures can be manipulated, but the statistics are there on the board. The proportion of State revenue contributed to education is down substantially. Even allowing for the reduction of student numbers from 245 000 in 1978 to about 185 000 this year, it still means that there has been a massive drop, which the Government said it would compensate for by diverting the conserved funds to improvements in other areas of education.

What has the Government done? It has reduced the number of advisory officers in the South Australian education system. It has completely cut out the School Libraries Advisory Branch. It is still difficult to get librarians into South Australian secondary schools. There is still an urgent need for school counsellors. There is still a shortage of advisory officers in the Museum, the Art Gallery and other areas of endeavour. The Government has reduced the amount of money put into the swimming education program. And so I could go on. This is the Government which, in 1982, criticised the then Minister of Education and me and said, 'We will do much better. We will expand the facilities.' Words, words, words! The promise has not been met.

In passing, I thank the Minister for having attended to the problem at the Mount Gambier High School which I addressed to him some two or three weeks ago. The school pointed out that the loss of a .9 teacher position would restrict its offerings when the Minister had promised that that would not happen, so that .9 teacher position was saved. That is something that I can credit the Minister for.

However, I do not like the *ad hoc* basis, because people from the Mount Gambier East Kindergarten approached me and said that staff reductions, in this underprivileged area of Mount Gambier, a predominantly Housing Trust area where students do not have the opportunity to acquire books and learn before they get to primary school, resulted in students being underprivileged. It is precisely in areas such as this—the Angle Parks, the Mount Gambier Easts and the Port Adelaides of South Australia—where the promises that were made by this Government in 1982-83 should have been maintained. But the Minister is looking at them on a day-to-day basis instead of saying, 'We recognise your needs now. Here is the assistance.'

I am having to ask the Minister, cap in hand, to help my underprivileged constituents. I will continue to do it, but I will not listen to the sycophantic words of Government backbenchers when they praise what the Minister is doing. Furthermore, I point out that, with regard to the issues raised by the member for Bright about going into the year 2000 and into the technological era, in 1970 we were hearing exactly the same words from Labor Governments—the technological era is upon us, industry is automating, there are fewer jobs for people and therefore we have to train our young people and retrain our school staffs and put these programs into the schools so that the children are ready for these new technological jobs that are coming onto the market.

What has been done? Exactly the same words are being mouthed by the present Government—the honourable member is now saying that we will be into the technological era by the year 2000. As I said, Rip Van Winkle lives again—20 years behind the times. The technological era is well and truly upon us. The 3 000 unemployed in Mount Gambier in 1982 represented 2 000 more than the numbers unemployed in Mount Gambier in 1979-80. That was the impact of the Labor Government's taking over. Even now, the unemployment level still stands at 2 000 after six years, during which time the Government has promised and promised to retrain young people for jobs in the technological era that has already decimated the work force within South Australia and elsewhere in the Western world.

The crisis is here; it is with us now; and for the Government to have a 'back to basics' policy in 1988, which will extend for another three years before they arrive at a conclusion, really begs the question, 'Where on earth has the Minister been for the past decade?' The crisis is literally with us here and now, and the new Director-General may have influenced the Minister in bringing forward this revolutionary policy. However, I remind the House once again that 'back to basics' was the Liberal Party policy in 1979, and it was applauded by the then Institute of Teachers and by scribes of some considerable repute in South Australia such as Max Harris who had already been pushing the issue of 'back to basics', the semi-literacy of students, in his own weekly columns. But, was he alone? No.

His efforts were decried by the then Labor Minister of Education in 1978 as being, I suppose, something akin to demented warblings. But he was backed by industry and commerce which alleged that people were going out unable

to do simple mathematics. The hand in the pocket computer had taken over and, if the pocket computer battery failed, the brain was not in gear; it was not programmed. Also, universities, for the past two decades, have said that students have been arriving on their doorsteps desperately in need of remedial maths and remedial English before they could cope with year 1 tertiary studies.

These signs have been there for the past 20 years. The Liberal Party in 1979-82 addressed them, through the Keeves report, as a blueprint for the next 20 years, just as the Karmel report in 1970 had been a blueprint for that decade. So, I find it extremely difficult to support the expanded debate of the member for Bright, which really went further than the motion of the member for Goyder. But I could not come here today simply to support the member for Goyder with regard to changes to the staffing formula in South Australian schools without answering the meanderings of the member for Bright, who just does not seem to realise that technology is well and truly here with us.

People in my electorate whom I was asking the Minister of Education to exempt from third year high school in 1973 and 1974 could not get that sort of manual job nowadays. They have to go on to leaving and matriculation in order to stack boxes in Coles and Woolworths. That is the competition, and the technological era arrived with a vengeance back in the 1970s. Those manually unskilled jobs are no longer available.

So, the evidence from people across Australia, from universities and from industry and commerce has pointed out for the past two decades that we are in trouble. The Education Department, as always, has become the whipping boy but, having been the whipping boy, has it really responded under this Government in spite of all the tell tale signs that were available to it in 1982? I would suggest that it has not, and the three year policy (three years to find out whether we need to get back to basics, mind you) is only now being launched.

SSABSA, the South Australian examination board, is backing the Government by saying, 'Look we should reduce the number of matriculation subjects, so that we can concentrate more on the important ones.' In 1981-82 Marion High School was offering over 50 matriculation subjects, and the signs were certainly there because I went down to Marion High School to find out just why they had so many subjects on offer.

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

Mr TYLER secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 November. Page 1616.)

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): In rising to speak to this Bill, I extend my apologies to the member for Elizabeth for the delay in obtaining some of the data which I now have. I am pleased to be able to announce to him that the debate can proceed. In addressing the subject of the prescribed amounts of cannabis and cannabis resin set under the present Act, for the purposes of section 32 (5) *(a)* (i), those amounts were recommended, as they needed to be within the provisions of the Act, by the Controlled Substances Advisory Council. Therefore, they have the status of whatever imprimatur that advisory council can add to them.

When the prohibited substances regulations were recommended to the Minister in 1985, the issue of cannabis and cannabis plants was given a great deal of consideration. Eventually, the advisory committee considered that 1 000 growing plants and 100 kilos of cannabis, attracting a penalty of $4 000 and 10 years imprisonment, were the appropriate amounts to distinguish from the higher penalty of $250 000 and/or 25 years imprisonment. After due consideration, the advisory council on that occasion came down with that as the the cut-off—1 000 growing plants and 100 kilos of cannabis. Since that date, both penalties have been revised. The maximum penalty for commercial dealings in the so-called lower amount of cannabis is now $5 000 and/or 10 years' imprisonment, whilst the penalty for the higher amount is $500 000 and/or 25 years' imprisonment. It is significant that that has been revised upwards, which effectively is what the member is trying to do on this occasion.

The potential value of any growing crop of cannabis is quite erratic, as anybody in the industry would know. For example, it is quite possible that 50 large plants will yield considerably more cannabis than 1 000 seedlings. In setting the amount at 1 000 growing plants, which is the phrase used by the regulations, the advisory council was obliged to estimate from the expertise which was available to it at that time and from the experience of previous court decisions. In particular, it was felt that, if the amount was significantly less than 1 000 plants (if that amount were chosen for the purpose of that section), an unacceptably small differential would exist between the so-called lower amount and the amount designated by the courts to be the amount deemed reasonable for personal cultivation and use.

Subsequent to the decision to accept 1 000 plants as the cut-off, the advisory council, in conjunction with the Police Drug Squad in early 1987, conducted an analysis of detected offenders, the amounts involved and whether or not those persons were thought by the police to have had other criminal connections. This was an exercise to determine the extent to which so-called professional criminals were involved in the cultivation of marijuana and the amounts that they in fact cultivated. The result of this joint investigation indicated that 1 000 plants was indeed an appropriate cut-off point so far as the investigating team from the Drug Squad was concerned, and persons arrested for cultivating less than that amount generally had had no previous criminal associations and no criminal record that was known to the police. By comparison, persons cultivating more than 1 000 plants were in many cases believed to have had other criminal connections.

In short, the investigations seemed to show that on that criterion—that criminal association—the fixed amount of 1 000 plants was an appropriate demarcation line between the lower and higher penalties. It must be acknowledged that this was subjective and that because of the long lead times involved in gathering the statistics and the long lead time over which those statistics accumulated, the data was somewhat dated at the time. However it was the best data available, and for that reason it was used. The Government is clearly committed to increasing penalties in the area of commercial dealing in prohibited drugs, and it has demonstrated that commitment in its legislation. The penalties for persons convicted of dealing in smaller amounts of cannabis or cannabis resin are quite substantial. Indeed, $50 000 and/or 10 years imprisonment is quite a considerable penalty for the lower amount. There is no evidence to date to indicate that professional or large-scale criminals are attracting lower maximum penalties than the penalty warranted.

It must be recognised that any amount of growing cannabis plants or of cut cannabis is extremely equivocal. Many seedlings may yield far less cannabis than a few robust plants, and the weight of cannabis can vary hugely, depending on whether the cannabis is freshly cut, wet, or dried out and dessicated.

The Government has received no recommendations from any expert bodies to suggest that the amounts ought to be changed, and it is worth emphasising that fact. No statistical or other expert evidence suggests that the penalties ought to be changed. At this stage there is no demonstrated need to change the prescribed amounts, and there is no support from this side of the House for such a move.

I regard the introduction of this Bill as an attempt by the member for Elizabeth to indulge in a little grandstanding. I do not know whether or not he believes in what he is doing, but there seems to be at least a suggestion that there are a few votes in this move and that it has been played for what it is worth for its electoral effect. I think that it plays on a justifiable public concern about drugs. People are understandably concerned that there may be a link between soft and hard drugs and that, if their children use cannabis for their own personal use, they may move on to using hard drugs.

That thesis has been debated for many years and I do not think that it is incumbent on the honourable member or me to make a judgment on that. I believe that there is a concern about this matter and that people have evinced that concern over the years. Further, I believe that the honourable member is trying to exploit that concern. I understand the concern, but I believe that the honourable member, for his own electoral gain, is playing on people's insecurity and the concern that they have for their children. That is why I and members on this side of the House reject this legislation.

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I find it amazing that the member for Bright would allege that I have introduced this legislation solely for the purpose of political gain, that I have indulged in the exploitation of people's fears about the issue, that I have played for votes, and that I am indulging in nothing but grandstanding. I think that that kind of analysis would be resorted to when there is an inadequate rational argument to oppose the proposition which I have presented, and that is indeed what we have seen today.

Unfortunately, the House has been asked to wait many weeks to continue with this debate. I thank the honourable member for his apology, which was reasonably presented and I accept it in that spirit. I know of the circumstances which have intervened in the meantime and I understand that but, on the other hand, to then present as the reasoned response of the Government to this measure the fact that it has been introduced only for electoral purposes is quite offensive and verging on the imputation of improper motives on my part for introducing this measure.

I say to the member for Bright that, if the measure had been introduced solely for that purpose, I would have handled it quite differently. I would not have acquiesced week after week in the constant adjournment of this matter while the Government sought to consider its position. I would have taken the issue to the media and I would have complained about it in this House. In fact, I have done none of those things. Week after week I have agreed to await the Government's reasoned response with no protest in the public arena. That is not the stand of a person acting solely out of electoral motives.

I have not taken this issue directly to the media. On one occasion a talk-back program telephoned me one evening and I spoke on that program at its request. I have not issued hundreds of press releases in the mould of Government press secretaries. I do not have a Government press secretary working for me, and I have not sought to exploit the issue in any way.

The member for Bright has not adduced any evidence in this place about the alleged exploitation of people's fears. Where are the public comments on my part that play on people's fears about this issue? I challenge the member for Bright to present those to the House. Where are the cuttings, the press clippings and references to television and radio programs? They do not exist. I find it quite reprehensible if that is the only argument which the Government can bring against this measure.

I introduced a Bill very similar to this in the last session of Parliament. Again, there was no grandstanding, no mass media coverage or press releases. Where is the exploitation that the honourable member alleges so forthrightly exists? As to the more substantive remarks that were made, of course, the Minister of the day, in response to a question on notice from me about this issue, agreed that the amounts were quite arbitrary—and I accept that they had to be. When this measure was first brought forward a line had to be drawn. The Minister of the day said to me quite clearly in that response to my question on notice that the amount was arbitrary. I accept that. It is a perfectly reasonable thing. One had to draw a line somewhere and that is where the Government chose to draw it. That is a quite reasonable expectation. But one would expect that that would be reviewed over time. I believe that the member for Bright has agreed that it is appropriate that we should reconsider these matters over time.

I remind the honourable member that I am not adjusting the penalties, in relation to which I agree that the Government itself has changed over time, but I am simply proposing that the House should consider altering the threshold at which those penalties should cut in. That is a quite different proposition to suggesting that I am seeking to alter what are already high penalties. Indeed, I am not: I am simply seeking to bring down the threshold to a level that I consider to be more reasonable in the circumstances in which we find ourselves today.

I agree with the member for Bright that the value that I placed on marijuana plants is certainly open to consideration. That value does vary from time to time, naturally. Any commodity which is subject to such a variable marketplace demand and variable circumstances must change over time. However, the amount was derived from a response to a question on notice asked of the Minister of Health of the day, and I accepted his advise on the matter.

It is quite erroneous to now bring forward this question of the differentiation of cultivation of marijuana for personal use. Of course, that was a relevant consideration when the Dangerous Substances Act was first proclaimed, but because of action taken by the Government it is no longer a relevant consideration. The matter of personal use and personal cultivation of marijuana has been taken into account in a quite separate way. The Government introduced the necessary legislation, it was passed by this House and it became law. I will not debate the merits of that, as that debate is over. The fact is that there is no longer any risk of an individual being wrongly charged in respect of cultivation for personal use, because the law makes quite separate and distinct provision for those people who wish to grow a few plants for their own use. So, we have now moved right out of that area, and I do not believe that that

question is relevant any longer. Nor do I believe that it is relevant to say that anyone who grows, say, 500, 600, 700 or 800 plants is doing that for personal use.

Mr Peterson interjecting:

Mr M.J. EVANS: Indeed, as the member for Semaphore reminds me, one would have to have a very significant drug use addiction to require 800 or 900 plants for personal use. I suggest to the House that it is quite clear that anyone who indulges in the cultivation of many hundreds of plants must have a commercial motivation in mind. I do not think it is possible to draw any other conclusion than that. I would say to the member for Bright that, in fact, the price of marijuana has reached a level now—it is of the order of $1 000 or so per growing plant—whereby, quite clearly, the cultivation of hundreds of plants can involve massive criminal profits, which go towards the financing of other criminal activities.

I therefore believe it is not that the penalties need to be changed but that the threshold at which the penalties cut in needs to be changed, so that the risk of growing hundreds and hundreds of plants, as distinct from thousands, becomes too great and people are dissuaded from taking the risk of growing 600, 700 or 800 plants. That is the effect that I am seeking to achieve through this measure. I hope that it will be supported by the House. It is to discourage this trade, which the Minister of Agriculture described recently as killing our children—and quite correctly so. I have not sought to exploit that kind of fear. I have not made those kinds of statements, although quite clearly they are applicable to this debate. Indeed, Ministers of this Government have introduced them of their own accord in a related debate which we recently had in this State.

I commend the second reading to the House. I believe that this is a reasoned, careful response to the present situation in which we find ourselves with respect to the cultivation of illegal substances.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (18)—Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, S.J. Baker, Becker, and Blacker, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick, M.J. Evans (teller), S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Peterson, and Wotton.

Noes (23)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Blevins, De Laine, Duigan, and Ferguson, Ms Gayler, Messrs Gregory, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Payne, Plunkett, Rann, Robertson (teller), Slater, and Tyler.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Second reading thus negatived.

MERCHANT SHIPPING FLEET

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Peterson:

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

(Continued from 17 November. Page 1617.)

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): It is with a great deal of pleasure that I respond to this motion. I always read the speeches of the member for Semaphore, I am of the view that the public in the Semaphore area do not know the value of the member who represents them until the *Hansard* reports of his speeches are read. When one reads the reports and, as in this case, sees the research that the honourable member has put into his motion, I believe his constituents must be proud of their local member. I hope that the material he has put together here is well circulated among people in the Port Adelaide area who have an interest in the merchant marine. Clearly, the member for Semaphore has the interests of the merchant navy at heart in bringing such a motion before the House, and he is to be commended for it.

I read his speech twice and I thought that a couple of points were very good. First, the member for Semaphore acknowledges that we are an island nation and that we need to be a maritime power: few members in this Chamber would disagree with that. Not only do we need a maritime power that can move our freight but we need a naval power to boost our combat fleet, although that matter also could be the subject of another motion another day. I was also interested to note the honourable member's emphasis on how reliant we are on other countries, and he stated that $2.2 billion had been paid out in 1987 in freight costs to overseas shipping lines. Any Australian would be concerned to learn of such figures. He also referred to the Australian Maritime Ministry Mission, which was set up to study developments of manpower and training of sea-going personnel with the aim of rationalising and establishing a more economical shipping industry. That committee has met, and the member for Semaphore referred to several matters examined by it which I will now paraphrase.

First, the Australian shipping industry has been involved in a process of continuing change and the use of innovative technology. Also, over the years Australian shipping interests have shown a willingness to adopt and invest in new technology, with many of the most recent developments incorporated in the industry's modern vessels. Finally, if Australia wishes to maintain an efficient shipping industry and expand further into international trade, it will need to adopt the policies of developing nations that have successfully used the benefits of high technology, creating high employment and ensuring better educated and trained crews.

To the credit of our merchant fleet, we are doing that, albeit slowly, but we are moving into technology, and I refer to BHP's new fleet. Technology is moving into the new era with our shipping. The days are past where we had enormous problems with crews and their attitudes. Crews are now becoming more realistic, and that is pleasing. The use of new technology on ships is absolutely vital. In this area we were being beaten hands down overseas and any move back to an Australian merchant fleet, competing on the high seas with overseas ships, is to be applauded. I repeat that the honourable member's constituents are fortunate to have a member with the perception and foresight to move such a motion in this House.

Members interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: Although members opposite say that I have said it before, such a motion, which normally we see moved only in Federal Parliament, is important for the consideration of a State Parliament, affording its members a rare opportunity to speak on a subject of national importance to this country, namely, the need to increase the size and efficiency of our merchant fleet. The whole of our export industry, whether in South Australia or the Commonwealth, revolves around the type of motion moved by the member for Semaphore. I hope that all members will allow this motion to go to a vote this morning.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I support the concept of what the member for Semaphore is trying to achieve, but at the same time we must not walk away from the reality of who is going to meet the cost. No matter which aspect of trade or commerce is involved, one must be competitive. The honourable member would accept that because, if someone can provide freight at a lower rate, unfortunately, one must accept that. The wheat industry,

the wool industry, the dried fruit industry and the wine industry work on terribly fine margins. I have been involved in primary production all of my life and, in many instances, we are just not able to export because of the on costs.

Mr Peterson: Of the ship itself or the on costs involved in getting it to and from the ship?

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: All of it. There are problems with handling on the wharfs in Australia.

Mr Peterson: It has nothing to do with the motion.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: No, I agree, but I am saying that it is part and parcel of the total package. Producers of wheat, wool or horticultural products are faced with this dilemma time and time again. The likes of the Federal Treasurer say that we must export. I agree: no man is an island. We must trade with the rest of the world but it must be done profitably, not at a loss. Unfortunately, in the industries with which I have been involved, very often the markets that have been developed are lost because the margins are so fine and, with shipping costs and wharfage costs, the failure to deliver product has meant that we are unreliable suppliers. That has nothing to do with the actual ship itself but it is a matter of getting the product onto the ship in Australian ports.

It is all part and parcel of the problem faced by primary producers and by secondary industry manufacturers: to get our products on to the world market and to be competitive. That is where we have had enormous problems in the past. I support the comments made by the member for Morphett and in so doing I support what the member for Semaphore is trying to achieve. We cannot walk away from the fact that we must be competitive. That must be the bottom line. I would be delighted if Australia had a large, strong and viable merchant fleet, which would be helpful in times of difficulty that may arise in the future. There is no substitute for independence and not being reliant on other people. However, to be independent, one must survive in the world marketplace. If that is not possible, it all falls down in a disintegrating heap. I support the thrust of what the member for Semaphore is trying to achieve and I only hope that the industry can get its act together and become competitive.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): Such are the vagaries of this place: yesterday I was naive; today I am brilliant. You do not know where you stand here.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: You've learnt a lot overnight.

Mr PETERSON: Overnight I have achieved a lot of knowledge. I thank members for their contribution and it was interesting to hear their points of view. The member for Murray-Mallee concentrated on coastal shipping and the cost of coastal facilities when moving goods intrastate and interstate. He missed the point that most facilities—for example Klein Point, Ballast Head and Ardrossan—are company-owned and operated ports. It is an in-company cost, which is limited. My motion is directed towards the maritime fleet as such, not necessarily coastal shipping, although the percentage of coastal shipping is much lower than that of overseas shipping.

The member for Morphett was specific in his comments on the motion, and I thank him for that. The member for Chaffey spoke of competition and land costs, and that is part of an ongoing investigation into port operations. It is true that some practices will have to be changed, and nobody doubts that. To take an example, in Queensland where the Liberal and National Parties were in coalition for some years, the highest land costs were those to transport coal from the coal face to the ships. In fact it was more expensive to get it from the coal face to the ship than to transport it all the way to Japan. Land costs are high and must be fixed.

Members referred to the merchant fleet. We know that we must have some sort of maritime shipping service to this country. The land costs will be there—but they can be modified—whether we use our own ships or somebody else's ships. It is naive to think that, if somebody comes in as a free trader or an overseas trader, the initial reduction they receive will remain. Conferences come out of this system whereby all free traders come together to form a cartel and cut up the country. It surprised me years ago when I went to other ports in this country and saw ships, flags and funnels that I had never seen before. The shipping companies had divided up Australia and said, 'You take the cargo out of this port and we will take the cargo out of another port.' So we should not be generous to overseas shipowners—they have screwed plenty out of this country over the years, as will others when they come in.

The cost of shipping has been referred to. The BHP *News Review* of September/October this year contains an article headed 'Plea for competitive shipping'. Of course, BHP runs its own fleet. The article refers to shore-based—not seagoing-costs, as follows:

> First, 'an acceptance by State Governments that basic infrastructure in ports should be provided as a community service and should not be singled out as revenue raising enterprises'.

That refers to shore-based costs. It further states:

> Secondly, port management 'should be structured more along the lines of a users' cooperative with all directors having a stake in efficient operations'.

Again, there is nothing about seagoing-costs—only shore-costs. The third point is that services should be provided on the basis determined by users. BHP is one of the largest shipping operators in Australia, but the article says nothing about the ships it operates—it speaks only about shore-based costs. My motion deals only with the shipping fleet.

The *Financial Review* of Tuesday 15 November has a feature on shipping reforms. Some of the points in that article encapsulate the spirit of my motion. It states the following point, with which I agree:

> There can be little doubt that the maritime industry has seen considerable change—change that is breaking down traditional relationships between officers and ordinary seamen (known as ratings) on board ships.

In moving my motion I spoke about the college, which was mentioned also by the member for Morphett. The article continues:

> The changes are also leading to multi-skilling and retraining of officers and ratings, so that several tasks can be performed by one seaman.

So they are consolidating costs. The article continues:

> Both unions and shipowners acknowledge that the writing is on the wall for Australian coastal shipping—

we now come to coastal issues—

> and that change, or rather further change, is imperative if the industry is to survive into the 1990s.

So they are aware of the problems and they are doing something about them. It is interesting to note that coastal shipping costs—and this was raised by the member for Murray-Mallee—have declined from 52c to 37c per tonne per kilometre. So there has been a substantial reduction in seagoing-costs. One of the points I made when I introduced my motion is contained in the article, and I refer to making the bunkering of ships less excise, because that would reduce shipping costs.

It would reduce the cost of the ship. Again, that is a cost incurred by Government, not by the crew or the people operating it, but by the Government. I am asking for the tax incentives that I also asked for in my original speech. A point made many times about seamen in that they have

a day off for a day worked. That is true, but that occurs within many industries in Australia. Moomba must be moving very close to that practice. The average worker in Australia has 111 days off a year, including public holidays and weekends. Do not forget that when people are at sea they do not have weekends off but work seven days a week. The comparison there is also close.

They are the points I wanted to make. As I said earlier, it is naive to think that, if we get rid of our own ships and others come in, there will be an ongoing reduction. There will be an initial reduction, then the rates will go up. That is the custom in Australia. There have always been people who have breached conference lines, come in here, undercut and been absorbed into the conferences, and suddenly their rates are exactly the same. The people involved in the maritime industry realise that. It is agreed that there are problems in the industry and that changes are required. Undoubtedly, the changes are under way. The employers and unions, as has been mentioned in this House know that is so. The future of exports in this country lies in controlling part of that export process. We cannot handle it all, but we should control what part we can. The only way to have that control is to have ships of our own.

I ask members of this House to read the motion carefully. It says nothing about the shore-based situation; it states:

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

Members should consider that. Australia is an island: we need our own ships. I ask for the support of the House.

Motion carried.

MOTOR VEHICLE INSURANCE

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

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

(Continued from 17 November. Page 1618.)

Mr TYLER (Fisher): When I addressed this matter previously I outlined my attitude in this matter and foreshadowed that I would move an amendment to the motion of the member for Heysen. I move:

That all words after 'House' be deleted and substituted with the following words:

supports the principle of compulsory third party property insurance on motor vehicles and calls on the South Australian Government to investigate as a matter of urgency this scheme's feasibility.

It is appropriate to amend the original motion, even though the amendment will not alter the thrust of what the member for Heysen seeks, to tidy it up and state that this House supports the principle of third party property insurance. However, the amendment also gives recognition to the fact that, even though it is superficially attractive to initiate compulsory third party property insurance on motor vehicles, there are practical problems, which I outlined to the House previously. It also takes into account that the Government must consult and investigate the matter properly, because a number of very significant groups in the insurance area oppose the introduction of compulsory third party property insurance.

I pointed out that the body representing insurance companies in this State (the Insurance Council of South Australia), the body representing motorists (the RAA), and the compulsory third party insurer (SGIC) all oppose the introduction of compulsory third party property insurance. They have all indicated their support in principle for people seeking to take out third party property insurance, but they believe that it should be done on a voluntary basis. There are distinct advantages in making property insurance compulsory and obviously there are good examples. The member for Heysen in his contribution cited situations in which his constituents were financially disadvantaged as a result of their car colliding with that of an uninsured person.

The amended motion would be appropriate because it would ask the Government to investigate the matter and consult with all the bodies that must be brought on side if the system is to work effectively. I congratulate the member for Heysen for bringing this matter before the Parliament; he deserves congratulations. It is an important matter and I am sure that members appreciate the fact that it has been aired in this forum. I commend the amendment to the House.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I thank the member for Fisher for his comments. When I introduced this motion I made clear that there were some practical problems. I will not go over the ground that I addressed previously, but on that occasion I highlighted a number of difficulties that were being experienced by my constituents and others. Having talked to a number of the organisations to which the member for Fisher referred, I recognised that there are real difficulties with the introduction of such a scheme. I think that the amended motion would be satisfactory and, therefore, I support the amendment. There is no need to take this matter further. I hope that the Government will seriously consider this matter on behalf of all those who have been disadvantaged and who, while nothing is done, will continue to be disadvantaged.

Amendment 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 17 November. Page 1623.)

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I am pleased to have an opportunity to speak to this motion. It is a pity that the efforts of the Federal Government have not achieved real gains in eliminating poverty. Unfortunately, the evidence shows that that is the case at this stage. However, that is not surprising, because the way in which the Hawke Government has gone about seeking to eliminate poverty has been typical of the way in which Labor has attacked so many things and sought change in the past. First, I will direct my attention to the reason why the member for Bright moved this motion. Obviously, it is an attempt by the Labor Party in South Australia to sweet-talk Mr Hawke because, come the next State election, this Government will distance itself as far as possible from the Federal Government. It will not want to know its Federal colleagues. We have seen that in the past and we will see it again in the future. This matter arose when the Federal Government went to the people in 1987. Part of its policy was the so-called 'family welfare package' which was pitched at low-income families, and during that period Mr Hawke made the categorical statement:

By 1990, no Australian child will be living in poverty.

We certainly heard a lot about that statement at the time. I must say that it always amuses me how the Labor Party use the word 'family' and then does everything in its power to try to help disintegrate the family. It started back in the

Whitlam days with the Family Law Court, and we have seen what damage has occurred since the changes were made there. Of course, the Labor Party's definition and interpretation of 'family' leaves most people who understand the traditional family flabbergasted, because it includes a wide range of families. But, this debate is not on this topic specifically: it is on poverty in particular.

Mr Hawke had made the promise that, by 1990, no Australian child would be living in poverty. We should have realised at the time that he did not really mean what he said. It has been traditional of Labor leaders to say things and then not hold to such promises. Most of us here would remember in 1982 the then Leader of the Opposition (Mr Bannon) stating specifically that there would be no new taxes or increased taxes. Of course, he had to go back on that promise when he came to office, so it is not new. But I think it is interesting to see how Hawke has changed his mind. This change of mind was best summarised in an article entitled 'Hawke hit by loss of memory' written by national political writer Matthew Abraham earlier this year.

We have seen other members of the Labor Party hit by various afflictions and, although we will not go into that, I can say that Hawke's loss of memory has been recognised for quite some time. The article states:

> The Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, appears to be suffering from a severe bout of medium-term memory loss. Over the past two weeks Mr Hawke has had great trouble remembering words he uttered before hundreds of carefully chosen witnesses on the stage of the Sydney Opera House on 23 June last year.

That was in 1987. The article continues:

> Then, playing one of his major election cards, Mr Hawke said: 'By 1990, no Australian child will be living in poverty.' At a child poverty conference in Melbourne last week, Mr Hawke was asked whether he was going to stick to his pledge that no Australian child will be in poverty by 1990. His response? 'Well, let's get the pledge right. The pledge was that there would be no need for a child to live in poverty in 1990.'

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: New words.

Mr MEIER: As the Deputy Leader says, new words indeed. The article further continues:

> Back in Melbourne this week, in an interview with Muriel Cooper on Radio 3AW, Mr Hawke was asked how he would live up to his pledge that no child would live in poverty by 1990.
>
> PM: 'Let me make two or three points about that. What I said, and there is some attempt to put a different gloss on it, is that there will be no need for any Australian child to live in poverty.'
>
> Cooper: 'Now, if I remember rightly, you said no Australian child will live in poverty.'
>
> PM: 'We'll, you don't remember correctly. What I said, and what my position is, is that there will be no need for any Australian child to live in poverty by 1990.'

I think that we could only refer to the Prime Minister here as a liar.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I believe that the honourable member who has just used that term would know that that is not a very parliamentary term and, as it refers to a member of the Party to which I belong, I ask that it be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order. The word referred to by the honourable member for Mitchell is unparliamentary when used in reference to a member of this House or of another place. It may be undesirable and unseemly for language of that nature to be introduced, but I cannot rule it unparliamentary in reference to someone who is not a member of this Parliament.

Mr MEIER: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr MEIER: That is very good. Actually, there was a good cartoon in yesterday's paper—

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sure that the honourable member for Goyder can make his contribution without prompting from the honourable Deputy Leader.

Mr MEIER: I think any Australian would recognise that, if the Prime Minister initially said, 'By 1990 no Australian child would be living in poverty' and later he said, 'No, I did not say that. I said "By 1990 there would be no need for any Australian child to live in poverty," ' he would be telling a deliberate untruth. I hope that that term does not upset anyone here. Certainly the adjective that I used earlier summarises the position better. It is tragic that the Leader of this country has to stoop to such a level in 1988. No wonder the people of Australia do not have confidence in politicians generally. I think we recognise that they do not have confidence in Labor politicians and particularly in the Labor Government. I am very sorry that the Prime Minister has to stoop to such tactics. He should have been aware, when he first made the statement, that it was an impossible commitment to fulfil. He has acknowledged that since in various articles.

What is the situation? We have from time to time had various people produce the number of people living in poverty. I came across an article which stated that poverty in South Australia was affecting about 30 000 South Australian children. That article came from the Children's Services Office, and one would assume that it had a fair idea of what was going on. I have also been informed that Victorian figures indicate that more than 30 000 young people without incomes were slipping into a subculture of crime. That information came out of a child poverty conference. It seems to be very clear from today's paper that the Labor Party cannot divorce itself from the increasing crime rate in this State. One does not have to be a Rhodes Scholar to recognise that fact. Even the member for Mawson earlier this year said that more than 43 per cent of single parent families were living in poverty. She has often had things to say about community welfare, and the like, and she recognises that things are not in a good state.

I note the comments of political reporter Randall Ashbourne late last year when he acknowledged at the outset, 'At the time of the next election, the ALP will have governed South Australia for all but three of the past 20 years,' so we know where nearly 100 per cent of the blame lies in South Australia. He further stated:

> And according to an analysis of 1986 census data, we are the State with the highest level of poverty—with 53.4 per cent of households receiving an annual income below the poverty line.

Further on in the article he states, 'Over the past five years'—and they were all Labor Government years—'real incomes for most workers have fallen by about 6 per cent.' He then details the various incomes in the five year period. He goes on, 'Over the same period, the Bannon Government's tax receipts rose by 72.7 per cent against an Australian average of 60 per cent.' People recognise that Labor Governments are high taxing Governments. The figures that I have just indicated, namely, an increase in tax by 72 per cent as against a fall in real income by 6 per cent, clearly shows that Labor is determined to tax the people poor. Mr Ashbourne further states:

> However, in some areas the increase has been even more dramatic. Petrol tax receipts are up 173 per cent.

Remember the time when the Hawke Government first came to office and said that it would reduce the price of petrol? And what has happened? It has gone up 173 per cent! The article continues:

> Liquor tax collections are up 93 per cent; tobacco tax is up 170 per cent; registration and drivers' licence fees are up nearly 70 per cent.

So the article goes on. They are not my words: they are the words of political reporter Randall Ashbourne, a reporter who I do not think usually gives the Opposition Parties a very good run. In fact, I think he tends to favour the Labor

Party time and time again. However, he recognises true and pure facts in this instance. I acknowledge Mr Ashbourne's work. We are experiencing a very disturbing trend in relation to poverty. Is Hawke's family allowance supplement doing anything to alleviate poverty? That is the big question.

Mr Lewis: No, it doesn't get to the port.

Mr MEIER: As the member for Murray-Mallee says—and he has stolen the word from my mouth—'No'. The answer is 'No'. This month an article appearing in the *Advertiser* was headed 'Attack on child poverty hits low-income families'. I think that this article is very relevant and highlights the shambles of the Hawke Government. The article states:

> The Federal Government's much acclaimed attack on child poverty through the Family Allowance Supplement for low-income families, discourages some families from improving their income, according to a report of the Federal Government's chief economic advisory body.
>
> 'The introduction of the Family Allowance Supplement has reduced average—but increased marginal—effective tax rates for low-income families', the Economic Planning Advisory Council said yesterday.
>
> Many welfare recipients are in a 'poverty trap' in that they receive little or no net gain if they work additional hours.

The article further states:

> A low-income worker with dependent spouse and two children living in public housing faces an effective marginal tax rate of nearly 120 per cent as his or her wage reaches $560 a week.
>
> Not until the wage reaches nearly $600 does the family experience a normal rate of just over 40 per cent.
>
> It is this tax mountain which can discourage people receiving Government income support from working to free themselves from this dependence.

That article indicates that the situation in relation to poverty is not good, that things are not improving and that the Government is not making any headway in this area. However, that is not surprising because, as I indicated in the earlier part of my contribution, that is part of Labor's record in tackling problems.

Let us a look at some aspects of the Labor Government's record. It said, 'We will introduce free education'. That promise won many votes and it was elected as a result of it. There was relatively free primary school, secondary school and tertiary education. However, what has happened since that time? Only in the past 12 months we have seen how the tertiary education area has been turned around and, after many years, the Labor Government has said, 'No, we cannot make it free anymore. We are going to have to tax the students.' The Labor Government has been elected to office and, after being in Government for some time, it has now decided to reverse the decision.

What about free education in primary and secondary schools? Anyone who is a parent would now have to laugh about that statement. Primary and secondary education is far from free. Parents only have to look at the bills they receive from Government schools to realise that education in this State is no longer free. It costs a considerable amount of money. There are some provisions for low income families, but it is costing everyone a considerable amount of money. Labor promised free education but, in time, it has allowed costs to be introduced.

What about health? The Labor Party promised free health services. I have never had to pay as much for health services as I am paying now and have been paying under the Hawke Government since it first introduced this so-called free health service. It is tragic! If I want the choice of doctor or hospital, I have to keep my private health insurance. Because I live in a country area, it does not give me much option. I know of so many pensioners who cannot afford private health insurance but, nevertheless, somehow have to continue it and not let it lapse. They have said to me that it is causing them real hardship, but that there is no way they can afford to let their private health insurance lapse.

So, it can hardly be said that the Labor Government has brought in free health care. The health care system is deteriorating, and we have heard of the many examples of waiting lists increasing out of all proportion, and how the number of beds has been reduced in so many hospitals. Only last week in this House I raised in a question to the Minister of Health the matter of the Adelaide Children's Hospital and children being turned away after having had a bed booked weeks before for an operation—a real tragedy. What about the free dental care for students? That scheme came in quite some time ago. Has Labor maintained that? I cannot speak for the city area but I can for the country area. I know that my colleague the member for Murray-Mallee told me recently how so many of these dental services for students are being closed in his area, and I fear for my area. The Labor Government brings these sorts of things to a peak and then, when it feels that the time is right, it begins phasing them out.

In relation to Department for Community Welfare services, just over 12 months ago we had closures on Yorke Peninsula, and that has occurred in other areas. Country areas should not have to suffer in this way. Where are the poor? I was interested to see that a recent survey revealed that 75 per cent of Australian families in poverty live in rural areas. So, services should be increased in these areas.

Briefly, I want to say that the Government is going about these matters in the wrong manner. It is all wrong. It should be looking to help people with their housing costs. We have seen interest rates increase out of all proportion since Labor has been in power. When I took out my housing loan at about 9 per cent or 9.5 per cent, in the Fraser Government's time, that was considered a bit too high, but last year the interest rate was up to about 15 per cent. It has now dropped a bit, thankfully, but it is still at about 14 per cent. People are saying, 'Oh well, I suppose we have to accept that.' We should not have to accept it.

Small business is being hit in so many areas, and not able to employ people and therefore more people are put on the poverty line. Look what the fringe benefits tax did to that the manufacturing industry. It nearly killed it. Thankfully, some new models are helping to revive it. However, Labor can be blamed for the decline in the manufacturing industry and for putting people out of work, putting people on the poverty line—one could go on and on. The Hawke Government's method of trying to combat poverty is simply to spend more taxpayers' money. It is like putting an ambulance at the bottom of the cliff for the people who fall off. Why do we not tackle the problem where it really exists? However, Labor continues to do what it is renowned for, namely, throwing good money after bad.

The Hon. R.J. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

DROUGHT RELIEF

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gunn:

That this House—

(a) calls on the Minister of Agriculture to immediately put into effect short-term financial assistance to the drought affected areas on upper Eyre Peninsula, including carting water to the Government tanks west of Ceduna;

(b) calls on the Government to provide special funds to immediately commence construction of a pipeline west of Ceduna to Penong to provide a reliable supply of water to residents at Koonibba and Denial Bay; and

(c) calls on the Department of Social Security to take a more sympathetic attitude towards people on upper Eyre Peninsula feeling severe financial difficulties caused by drought conditions which have prevailed in the area.

(Continued from 3 November. Page 1234.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): In continuing my remarks on this important motion, I want to briefly re-emphasise the difficulties that many people who are associated with or who rely on agriculture on Upper Eyre Peninsula are experiencing. About 1 800 farming units are supported by a large range of small businesses right across Eyre Peninsula, and I refer to machinery agents, shopkeepers, and so on, which are essential to the well-being of the total area. Unless a sensible and workable solution is found to the difficulties facing many of these producers, the unfortunate and quite unnecessary drain of people leaving the area will continue.

In my view, not only would this be unfortunate but also it would have a long-term effect on the education facilities and other Government services that are so important and necessary.

Eyre Peninsula has a history of producing large quantities of grain and produce which has benefited all South Australians, but I believe that it is an area that has not received the range and amount of Government support and assistance to which it is entitled. It has the ability to regenerate, rebound, and produce very quickly.

The overwhelming number of people now operating those rural properties are the best people to be on those farms, because they have the experience. In most cases, they come from a long line of farmers, and they understand the area. The need to assist these people is urgent, because planning must be made in the very near future for the next season's crop so that it can be planted. I believe that it is essential that all those people who desire the opportunity to sow a crop in the forthcoming year should be provided with adequate assistance to enable them to achieve that objective.

There has been a considerable amount of discussion in Government circles, and conferences have taken place in an endeavour to find a workable solution to this difficult and complex problem. I suggest to the Government, first, that the $150 000 increase in funds to the Rural Industries Assistance Branch at 8 per cent over three years should be increased to $200 000 at 8 per cent over a minimum of five years. Secondly, funds should be made available so that small businesses on Eyre Peninsula, which rely on agriculture and the community, can also be assisted. This was done by the previous Government, and I believe it is necessary because it would be disastrous if we continued to lose those businesses, not only to the people directly involved but because the loss of employment and future loss of employment is exceptionally important. Further, there is a need to continue to generate employment for those people who are not directly involved in agriculture.

There is a need to provide assistance to allow stock to be moved out of the area to agistment, and the people will know that they will be able to bring the stock back next year when the season breaks. If they are not given some assistance, they will have difficulty in replacing their essential breeding stock, which they have to maintain in order to trade out of their difficulties.

I also believe—and I am cautious about what I have to say because I am most concerned about this problem—that the financial institutions have a role to play. In many cases they advance large amounts of money to people. I believe they should analyse carefully and individually each case on its merits, because if they do not they run the risk of causing even more problems and making the total situation worse than it is. I believe they have to be prepared to alter some of their past arrangements to make sure that these people are given every opportunity realistically to trade out of their difficulties, and again play an important role in generating export income for the benefit of all South Australians.

I could comment on several other matters. The member for Flinders and I have been involved in ongoing discussions to ensure that these people are given every consideration—and I intend to remain so involved. I have been particularly cautious in my comments, because the last thing I want to see, as one of the local members representing this area, is any course of action which may jeopardise the long-term benefits or future of those people involved in agriculture.

I clearly understand that many people are suffering great personal anxiety, hardship, and considerable stress because of the severe and difficult financial situation in which they find themselves. I know that this is having a severe toll upon them, their families, relatives, and those people who know them. Because of the difficulties these people are facing, I believe it is essential that adequate counselling and assistance or financial reimbursement is made available very quickly. I believe that the Commonwealth Government has to change the present criteria for awarding social security unemployment benefits to those people.

Commonsense dictates that that sort of assistance should be available to people who are in the most severe financial difficulties and under stress. The rulings and guidelines that currently apply makes it unnecessarily difficult for such people, and that should not be the case. I understand clearly why the Commonwealth Government tightened up the provisions because unfortunately people were rorting on the system. However, I strongly hold the view that I would far sooner give one or two people who may not deserve it unemployment benefits than deny one or two people who have an absolute and essential need for then. I brought this matter to the attention of Parliament because I believe it is essential that it be debated, since it is of interest to all South Australians. I know that many people are working hard to try to give assistance wherever possible in this matter, but I urge everyone involved to try to provide assistance to those people as soon as possible and in a manner to assist them to trade out of their difficulties. Once this short-term problem is resolved, consideration has to be given quickly to solving the long-term difficulties of the area, particularly those problems west of Ceduna.

On that basis, I call on the State Government to give the water program a high priority through the E & WS Department. I understand that, if the project was moved to the top of the list, there is the likelihood that Commonwealth funds will be made available. Therefore, I say to the Minister of Water Resources, the Government and the E & WS Department that we must not have a repeat of the exercise in the early 1970s when the State Government put in a submission to the Commonwealth for assistance for the Kimba to Polda pipeline that was not satisfactory. The second submission, which was satisfactory, attracted grants.

I urge the State Government to lift this urgent project to the top priority in South Australia so that Commonwealth funds can be attracted to it. I was delighted that my Leader committed a future Liberal Government—as he has done previously—to completing the proposal within its first term of office. I urge the House to support the motion, as it is imperative for the welfare of the rural economy in South Australia that the actions that I have put forward be put into effect as soon as possible.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I wish to add my total support to the motion moved by the member for Eyre. I represent

part of the area to which the honourable member has referred, and I am acutely aware of the circumstances of many people and the hardships that many are enduring. Therefore, I concur totally with the comments that the member for Eyre has made about the discussions that both he and I have had with Government Ministers and officers. I can only say that I have been pleased that we have been getting a good hearing. I recognise that officers do have a firm grasp of the problem. Whether they can resolve the problem remains to be seen, but I hope that that sincerity will be carried through.

The first part of the motion relates to financial assistance for water carting. I am pleased to say that the Government has already given that commitment. Water is being carted to those areas. Although it does not solve the problem, it does get the people out of the immediate crisis they were in about whether they could retain breeding flock on the limited amount of feed that might still be available, or whether they could set up feed lots for the nucleus of the breeding flock that they are trying to retain.

I, too, pledge my full support and commitment to that project. Coming from an agricultural area, I recognise that water is a fundamental right of every South Australian citizen. Certainly, people without reticulated water sometimes smart at the idea of everyone else requiring filtered water and all the various extras that seem to come with it when they themselves cannot get access to the basic commodity, let alone the quality of that commodity.

The second part of the motion speaks of the need for the immediate construction of a pipeline west of Ceduna. Again, that is not in my district, but I add my full support to it because such a pipeline would create a more permanent solution than the temporary solution provided by the Government for this year. The third part of the motion calls on the Department of Social Security to take a more sympathetic attitude towards people on Upper Eyre Peninsula facing severe financial difficulties caused by drought conditions which have prevailed in the area. I totally support that request. The Government should take up this matter with the Federal Minister to ensure that a reasonable proposal is put to the Ministers and that a positive approach is made to tackle this problem.

I quote two examples that have come to my attention. A farmer whose property was the subject of a forced sale by creditors received no bid or offer for it, so he could not get out. The mortgagees saw no point in kicking him out and he was effectively just living in the house. He was pushed to such an absolute extreme that he had to borrow a tankful of petrol to get to Port Lincoln. When we got there I eventually got him on to unemployment benefits only because he had signed a declaration that he had no further interest in the property, thereby forfeiting any hope of regaining control of it.

Although that farmer could receive unemployment benefits, in another case that was perhaps even more tragic, although nothing could be more tragic than a person losing his property completely, another farmer owning an unencumbered property which almost five years ago was worth $400 000 tried to assist his family (and he had a number of sons) by selling the property and buying a larger one with a market value then of $800 000. This meant that he had borrowed 50 per cent, which was well and truly within the guidelines of any financial institution at that time. In order to do that, he set up a family company in which one person owned a $1 share. The farmer put $400,000 into that and now he has lost the lot. Indeed, he is at the point where his liability is over $800 000 whereas his assets are an unknown quantity, although believed to be about $400 000.

So, instead of being in a situation of plus $400 000, he is in a situation of almost minus $400 000, and now the Social Security Department is saying, 'No, you can't get unemployment benefits because the family company that you established owes you the $400 000 that you put in in the first instance,' although the department knows full well that he cannot ever recover the money. That person is well and truly beyond receiving that money, yet the Social Security Department will not recognise his need because of a technicality.

These anomalies are within the law theoretically correct, but a different approach is required in recognition of that sort of problem. If the second farmer had deliberately set up his family company to avoid any specific part of Government regulations, maybe he should carry that risk. However, in this instance he was merely trying to provide for his family and he has suffered the consequences because of his action. Although a wealthy man four or five years ago, he is now one of those in absolute despair because of his circumstances.

The member for Eyre referred to the effect of the drought on country towns. I believe that the Government must look at this issue in a broader sense and not just look at individuals. It must examine the way in which the situation is affecting country towns, the socio-economic climate, growth patterns and the age categories of the people involved.

We are now finding that young married people who have the ability to find employment away from these areas are moving away. Some of them have already gone to Roxby Downs. With the older farmers staying on the land, there is no new breed or influx of younger generation farmers, therefore that farming traditions, expertise and experience are not being continued. Many of the lessons in farming can be learnt only through practical experience, and I fear that we will break the continuity in that farming expertise, with serious implications in the long term.

Furthermore, difficulties being experienced are affecting town shopkeepers and machinery agents, whose businesses in many cases have folded and already gone. The remaining few are having an extremely difficult time. I believe, and I repeat the statement I made to the House only a few weeks ago, that the Government should immediately establish a small towns inquiry. The Victorian Government took action: it undertook a very thorough study on a representative town in a country area, investigating the impact on the town itself, including business houses and machinery agents. It also looked at the effect on sporting activities and the growth pattern or, if you like, the continuity of farming expertise in the area. The inquiry looked at the ability of the town and the district to survive in economic terms.

In other words, the inquiry looked at the whole impact of this situation and the damage that has occurred during drought periods, as well as the difficult economic climate resulting from increases in interest rates and from a combination of those factors. The Victorian Government inquiry highlighted areas of responsibility in respect of the community, local government and the State and Federal Governments. It is my view that a package of this kind is required to assess the overall implications of this situation.

I get the feeling that there has been an attitude in the past—and I trust that my reading of the situation is that the Government is changing its attitude—that, because it involves an isolated pocket and it is 'over there', it is out of sight and out of mind. I hope that that attitude is changing for the better. I hope that a longer-term view will be taken to ensure the continuity not only of individual farmers' operations but also of the ability of communities to provide the optimum economic wealth for this State.

Some have said, 'Those people are farming in areas that are too dry. Therefore, they should get out.' Many of those areas have been established farming areas for 80 years and have operated successfully during that time. Because they are going through a difficult climatic time—and the drought period is only a short span of the history of those areas—we should take a broader look at the situation and have Government policies averaging out on at least a five year basis and, in the case of the more marginal areas, a ten year basis. I am sure then that not only would these people survive but they would be able to prosper to the benefit of this State and the nation. I support the motion.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Agriculture): I seek to amend this motion, as follows:

Delete all words after 'House' and insert the following in lieu thereof:

(a) Congratulates the Government on the expanded rural assistance loan scheme and the decision to cart water to Government tanks west of Ceduna, both announced last week by the Premier.

(b) Urges the Government to consider carefully all possible alternatives for the provision of permanent water supplies west of Ceduna.

(c) Supports the efforts of the Rural Affairs Unit of the Department of Agriculture to liaise with the Eyre Peninsula offices of the Departments of Social Security and Community Welfare, in order to maximise the benefits of these services to people experiencing financial difficulty on the peninsula.

In moving this amendment, I have no intention of scoring points or upstaging the member for Eyre. As the member for Flinders indicated, paragraph *(a)* of the motion moved by the member for Eyre has already been addressed, particularly with respect to additional short-term financial assistance. In addition, a long-term approach to the issues on Eyre Peninsula has been adopted. The decision has also been made to cart water to Government tanks so, in effect, that part of the motion is redundant and needs amendment to be dealt with appropriately by the House.

My colleague the Minister of Water Resources must deal with paragraph *(b)* of the original motion. As Minister of Agriculture I have more of a watching brief but, as members are aware, the Water Resources Council has a particular role in advising the Minister and the Government on this aspect. My amendment deals with that and urges the Government to consider carefully all possible alternatives for the provision of permanent water supplies west of Ceduna. My understanding is that the Minister and the Engineering and Water Supply Department are considering all possible alternatives. If the motion is carried in the form proposed by the member for Eyre, that would pre-empt the deliberations of the Minister and the department. Therefore, it is appropriate to amend paragraphs *(a)* and *(b)*.

With respect to paragraph *(c)*, as much as I could engage in debate about what we are doing (I do not want to be seen to be scoring points on this issue), much of what the two local members have indicated to the House is true in terms of the impact on the Eyre Peninsula community, and it is appropriate for me to acknowledge and accept their comments. No-one can understand the extent of the tragedy of those individual families and no-one would want to wish those difficulties on anyone.

The member for Flinders said that the Government has not shown a caring perspective, and the press has wanted to present it that way. Bearing in mind the emotion of the area and the environment, the press has been somewhat unkind in the way in which it has presented what the Government is endeavouring to achieve. Be that as it may, one must get on with the issue, which is what the Government is attempting to do.

I do not want to refer to the financial institutions or mention in any depth what is happening there. I have communicated to the members for Eyre and Flinders that we are working on that with the financial institutions and addressing the key issues about which they are concerned. Hopefully we can have some arrangements in place to avoid some of the events that have occurred in other States in the past.

I know that concerns exist about social security. We have concerns about social security services to the far west section of Eyre Peninsula. If I were the local member I would be saying the same thing about upgrading the services being provided to West Coast residents, as it is important that social security gets the message. I am sure that it is getting the message from the members for Eyre and Flinders, as well as from my officers about the services needed there. We three members are at the quarry face on this issue on a day-to-day basis, and as members of Parliament have been carrying the issue around with us daily, although I realise that other members also have an interest. The issues that are important certainly come back to the two local members and to me daily. I can provide further information on what we are doing as a Government to highlight the need for additional attention in the West Coast region.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I do not need your help. This is a serious issue, if you care not to interrupt. I am sure that your colleagues are more interested than you are. On Monday, 3 October a meeting arranged by the Department of Agriculture and the Department for Community Welfare was held in Port Lincoln to discuss personal and financial counselling services for farming families on Eyre Peninsula.

Those attending included: Mr Graham Broughton, Rural Affairs Unit, Department of Agriculture; Mr Lange Powell, Director, Northern Country Region, DCW Chairman; Mr Gerry Taylor, Acting Manager, Port Lincoln DCW; Ms Carrie Gaskin, Manager, Ceduna DCW; Mr George Djadic, Manager, Port Lincoln DSS; Ms Kathy Fourie, Port Lincoln Health Centre; Mr Bill Herbert, Chairman, Cleve District Council; Mr George Gill, Chairman, Le Hunte and Environs Rural Counselling and Advisory Service; Ms Geraldine Boylen, Port Lincoln DCW; Ms Liz Stanley, Whyalla Community Health; Rev. John Richardson, Secretary, Far West Rural Support Group; and Ms Christine Richardson, member, Far West Rural Support Group.

As a result of the meeting DCW have undertaken to increase the hours of operating for their part-time financial adviser in Ceduna, Ms Jenny Everett. DCW has also undertaken to review, with the Health Commission, itinerant services provided by both agencies in the Le Hunte area. DSS Port Lincoln will review availability of DSS staff in the Le Hunte and Ceduna areas. The meeting urged strongly DSS Port Lincoln to pursue installing a 008 toll free line for their Port Lincoln office, and to advertise more widely their current reverse-charge telephone call policy. The meeting felt strongly that DSS guidelines for the Family Allowance Supplement, Austudy, and unemployment benefits as affected by changes to the assets test need urgent attention.

Members will know that that is what we have been talking about. I know that my colleague the Minister for Community Welfare will be discussing this matter not only with me but also with other Ministers. To add to the current timetable, so that honourable members know what steps are being taken, a further meeting will be convened by the Reverand John Richardson, the Uniting Church Pastor—

Mr Lewis: When are you going to do something?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Why don't you shut up and disappear?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Tyler): Order! The member for Murray-Mallee will come to order.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

PETITION: NORTHFIELD HIGH SCHOOL

A petition signed by 675 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to expand agricultural studies at Northfield High School campus and allocate adjacent land for the purpose was presented by Mr Gunn.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: POLICEMAN'S POINT CARAVAN PARK

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: On 16 August this year I asked the Auditor-General to examine the Policeman's Point Caravan Park CEP project, which was sponsored by the Federated Storemen and Packers Union. In my request to the Auditor-General, I asked for an examination of files to determine whether all actions undertaken had been appropriate according to existing CEP guidelines and requirements. I have now received the report from the Auditor-General's office, and table that report. In the report, the Director of Audits concludes that:

> He is satisfied that the project was approved in accordance with CEP guidelines that existed at the time.
>
> The level of CEP grant expenditure ($202 000) was supported by schedules of project expenditure.
>
> The sponsors met their required contribution ($108 000).

The report indicates that the Storemen and Packers Union contributed more than the necessary $108 000 as its sponsor's contribution to the CEP project (a figure which includes purchase of the property for $80 000. The Auditor indicates that the union reported expenditure above this figure but that:

> Evidence was not on file to support the total reported expenditure of $136 000; however, the value of supporting vouchers exceeded the amount of required contribution. Those supporting vouchers related to the acquisition of the property (see next item); architect, engineering, and planning services associated with the project design and project costings; and materials associated with project facilities.

The caravan park has been sold by the union for $152 000—at most a $22 000 capital gain against non-specified but apparently significant operating losses. In comments to this House on 18 August this year the member for Coles suggested that the union doubled its investment in the park. This is not the case. In his cover note to me, the Auditor-General states:

> On the face of it, the caravan park seems to have been overcapitalised. If (as claimed) the Federated Storemen and Packers Union contributed more than required (and incurred) under its sponsorship, then it is unlikely that any significant capital gain was realised from the venture.

Furthermore, also in August, the member for Coles alleged some form of political patronage was involved in the Storemen and Packers Union obtaining a CEP grant, a claim which I believe was offensive to the very able people involved in assessment of applications. The CEP Consultative Committee at the time was made up of a group of people representing a wide range of interests. The list of members is included in the report which I have tabled. The Auditor-General's Report states:

> At a meeting on 7 May 1984 the Community Employment Program Consultative Committee recommended project approval . . . It is apparent that the Federated Storemen and Packers Union qualified as a 'community organisation'. Over the years a number of trade union organisations have received project grants under the Community Employment Program.

In her August comments to the House, the member for Coles also claimed that only three local people obtained work on the project. The Auditor-General's Report makes it clear that all employees on the project schedule who were employed with CEP funds, were referred by the CES at Mount Gambier as being eligible for employment on the project.

Referral from the local CES office has been standard practice in all CEP projects, and the report makes it clear that this occurred on this occasion. From the report it is clear that CEP requirements and guidelines were adhered to, and that the Federated Storemen and Packers Union did not achieve any significant financial gain from the endeavour. This report should end, once and for all, the dishonest and misleading campaign which members opposite have waged on this issue.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: REVIEW OF PRIVATE COLLEGE LICENSING ARRANGEMENTS

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD (Minister of Employment and Further Education): I seek leave to make a further statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: I wish to take this opportunity to inform members of my intention to review the basis on which private colleges will be licensed in the future. Since 1942 private institutions offering technical and further education courses in South Australia have been required to be licensed and there are three reasons for conducting this review at the present time.

First, the operation of the licensing arrangements under the Technical and Further Education Act since 1975 has revealed some minor anomalies which it is my purpose to correct. Secondly, the Commonwealth has relaxed the constraints on the marketing of Australian educational services overseas and I think that members will agree that our educational institutions, including those operations in the private sector, should be able to participate fully in the opportunities now open to them.

The Australian Education Council has agreed that mechanisms need to be put in place to ensure that the quality of the educational services offered to overseas students are of the highest standard in order to protect the interests of students and also to preserve the reputation for quality that the Australian education system has overseas. This review will identify what those quality assurance mechanisms should be in relation to the private tertiary education sector.

Thirdly, the State currently has two pieces of legislation that affect the private college sector, namely, the private college licensing provisions of the Technical and Further Education Act and the accreditation provisions of the Tertiary Education Act. The review will explore the scope for rationalising these provisions.

I will be distributing for public comment a discussion paper prepared by the Office of Tertiary Education which identifies a number of possible changes. Specifically, the paper suggests that the private college licensing provisions

of the TAFE Act be repealed and that future licensing requirements be incorporated into the accreditation provisions of the Tertiary Education Act which is concerned with the coordination and quality of tertiary education in South Australia, including the private sector. This will provide a consistent approach between public and private sectors and satisfy the majority of the Commonwealth requirements relating to full fee paying overseas students.

The paper also raises the question of how the costs of ensuring quality of education service should be apportioned between public and private sectors. It seeks to place those matters on a rational footing. The discussion paper outlines a possible direction for the future of private college licensing that would confer some advantages on the private college sector while at the same time affording some assurance of the quality of services provided by that sector. It is my intention to canvass a range of opinions on the matter before enacting changes to the current arrangements and so I release this paper for public discussion. Members and interested members of the public are invited to respond to the proposals by the middle of February 1989.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Libraries Board of South Australia—Report, 1987-88. Ordered to be printed (Paper No. 54).

Tourism South Australia—Report, 1987-88. Ordered to be printed (Paper No. 155).

By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Commissioner for Equal Opportunity—Report, 1987-88. Ordered to be printed (Paper No. 109).

Teachers Registration Board—Report, 1987. Ordered to be printed (Paper No. 89).

Friendly Societies Independent Order of Odd Fellows Grand Lodge of South Australia—Amendments to Constitution.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: GOVERNMENT PRINTING DIVISION

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: In the House on 17 November 1988, the member for Coles asked whether the Auditor-General is investigating two recent transactions involving the Government Printing Division and, if so, why? The member for Coles also asked whether I, as Minister, was aware of concerns within the printing division about these transactions.

In her explanation the member for Coles suggested that the taxpayers may have been short-changed in these transactions by as much as $600 000. As we have come to expect, the Opposition's information is completely wrong. In actual fact, as a result of the purchase of a five colour press and the sale of a four colour press the taxpayers have made considerable savings. Funds had been approved in the 1988-89 budget for the Government Printing Division to purchase a five colour press.

An opportunity arose to purchase from Consolidated Graphics Corporation (CGC) a five colour Heidelberg offset press with in-line coating, UV drying, and computer controlled inking and damping systems for $1.565 million. This press was 18 months old and has a 12 months warranty. When removal costs and the cost of a plate scanner are included, the total cost to the Government Printing Division was $1.705 million.

However, before Cabinet approval was granted on 14 June 1988 this proposed purchase was reviewed by Treasury as is normal for all Cabinet submissions. CGC purchased from the Government Printing Division for $500 000 a four colour Heidelberg offset press with standard manual controls, and no computerised facilities or infra-red drying systems. This press was purchased by the Government Printing Division in 1979, which makes the press nine years old. The machine was to have been fully depreciated after 10 years—hardly an almost new machine as claimed by the member for Coles.

A new five colour Heidleberg Offset Press configured similarly to the machine purchased by the division would have cost approximately $2.265 million. The Government Printer is not aware of any concerns about these transactions; in fact, the Government Printing Division is extremely happy with the five colour press and is currently producing excellent quality products from this machine. The Department of the Auditor-General has confirmed that a normal interim audit of the Government Printing Division is being conducted, as is the case each year. In line with normal practice if any matters emerge which need to be drawn to the attention of the Chief Executive Officer or the Minister, that will be done when the audit is completed. No special investigation is being conducted. In summary:

- The division did not pay $2.1 million for a second-hand press. It paid $1.705 million when the removal costs and the plate scanner costs are included.
- The division did not sell an 'almost new' press for about $600 000. It sold a nine year press for $500 000.
- The taxpayers were not short changed by $600 000. Tax payers were saved money by a prudent decision to buy a perfectly effective second-hand press with warranty thus avoiding the new press purchase price of $2.265 million.
- There is no special investigation into these transactions being under taken by the Auditor-General.

It is regrettable that, once again, the Opposition has allowed itself the doubtful luxury of making inaccurate allegations in Parliament when a simple phone call could have established the truth. Perhaps factual information does not fit easily with its current political strategies.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: YATALA LABOUR PRISON ALLEGATIONS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: Mr Speaker, on 6 October 1988, Mr Bill Trevorrow of the Correctional Officers Association of South Australia made a series of sensational claims regarding the Yatala Labour Prison. These claims were that a convicted sex murderer and his associates at Yatala choose 'whichever young boy takes their fancy' and that these prisoners 'dictate which prisoner they will have in their cell'. Mr Trevorrow then went on to claim that these prisoners virtually ran the prison, passed inmates from cell to cell for sex and that homosexual rapes were daily occurrences. He also alleged that these practices were being conducted with the full knowledge of correctional officers at Yatala.

No dates, particulars, corroborating witnesses or names (other than Bevan Von Einem's) were offered in support. The Department of Correctional Services Senior Investiga-

tions Officer, Mr Lee Bowes, approached Mr Trevorrow on 6 October, the same day the claims were made, in order to conduct a preliminary investigation of the allegations. Mr Trevorrow refused to speak to him. Similarly, the Police Department attempted to interview Mr Trevorrow on the same day. He refused to cooperate in this instance as well. The Government then wrote to Mr Trevorrow on 7 October 1988 with an offer to pay the legal costs incurred by COASA seeing a lawyer in order to determine the most appropriate way of putting information to the relevant law enforcement agencies. Mr Trevorrow has never replied to that letter.

Recently, Mr Trevorrow changed his mind and agreed to be interviewed by the police. Subsequent to that interview, the Police Commissioner, Mr Hunt, on 17 November, wrote to the Executive Director of the Department of Correctional Services regarding the allegations made by Mr Trevorrow. That letter states:

Dear Mr Dawes

Re: Allegations by Mr Bill Trevorrow

I refer to your letter of 6 October 1988 and advise that an investigation into the allegations made by Mr Bill Trevorrow has found no evidence to support his allegations. Mr Trevorrow has been interviewed and he states that he made allegations based upon the advice of prison officers at Yatala Labour Prison. He has refused to identify the prison officers concerned. Prisoner, Bevan Spencer Von Einem, has refused to be interviewed by police.

Mr Kennedy, Manager of Yatala Labour Prison, states that Von Einem does not share a cell with any other prisoner. A policy directive, dated 3 May 1985, was produced which clearly indicates that the policy of management of the Yatala Labour Prison is that within Division 'B', where Von Einem is confined, no prisoner is to be placed into a cell if another prisoner occupies that cell.

In the absence of evidence to support the allegations by Mr Trevorrow and, indeed, strong evidence from Mr Kennedy supported by a documented policy statement *re* the occupation of cells, the finding of our investigation is that the allegations made by Mr Bill Trevorrow are refuted.

Yours sincerely

(signed), D.A. Hunt Commissioner of Police

PRINTING COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr RANN (Briggs) brought up the second and final report of the Printing Committee for 1988, and moved:

That the report be received and adopted, in the yuletide spirit.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park) brought up the fifty-eighth report of the Public Accounts Committee, relating to the 1983-86 reorganisation of the Education Department.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEM

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier say whether the Government Management Board is now investigating the cost of installing the Justice Information System and, if so, will he explain precisely when and why the board took this action? Is it related to concerns that the final cost of this system may go even higher than the upward limit of $50 million put on it by the Auditor-General in his latest report to Parliament? When the Government announced in 1984 that it would implement a justice information system it said that the cost we be $14 million. However, even allowing for inflation, there has been a massive escalation in the cost since then.

In March this year, a consultant to the project reported that the system was 'suffering from organisational fatigue, anxiety and frustration'—despite the fact that it is still a long way from full implementation. In his report to Parliament in September, the Auditor-General said that the cost would reach between $40 million and $50 million. I now understand that further cost projections suggest that the final cost could be much higher than that again and that that is the reason why the Government Management Board has initiated an investigation of its own into the project.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In fact, the Auditor-General's comments, as quoted by the Leader of the Opposition, and the Government's own internal examination of the progress of the Justice Information System meant that an in-depth study was in train in relation to the service, its costs, its future course of direction and its management—a very intensive exercise. It crosses departments, of course, because the system, in fact, is aimed at serving various departments. However, the figures quoted are not correct. Just what the actual costs are is under assessment. Also, anticipated savings arising as a result of the installation of the system must also be assessed. The economic justification for the introduction of a comprehensive justice information system was based, in part, on the savings that would be so generated.

It appears that in fact savings to the extent anticipated have not been generated in large part because of the uptake of the system. There is no question that such a system will provide for far more efficient administration—there is no question of that. Whether it creates that sort of saving is the issue that has to be looked at. A detailed response on what the Government is doing has been provided to the Auditor-General and the in-depth study of the costs of the system is under way.

Obviously, it is a stage system so that, if costs cannot be justified in certain elements of the system, those elements will not be proceeded with. That is the sort of judgment that has to be made. Over a whole of life assessment it is certainly an expensive project, but it is unavoidable expenditure for Government if we are not only to be able to administer justice efficiently but to provide a series of other ancillary services that this system contemplates.

BUSINESS MIGRATION

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of State Development and Technology tell the House how business migrants who have come to South Australia have performed in establishing businesses in this State? On Saturday a report in the *Weekend Australian* claimed that fewer than 10 per cent of the wealthy migrants who have settled in Australia with their families under the BMP scheme have actually initiated the investment plans proposed in their migration applications.

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: I noted the press report in Saturday's paper and the claims that fewer than 10 per cent of the 4 000 business migrants who have settled in this country have actually initiated the investment plans they drew up to justify their coming here. I quote from the article, as follows:

This figure is only an estimate—one source claims it is probably less than 5 per cent—because the Department of Immigration has refused to conduct rigorous checks of settlers since the scheme began in 1982.

Following that article the Department of State Development and Technology undertook an investigation of the situation in South Australia and in the process recalled the survey

which was undertaken earlier this year and which we made available to the Federal Government. Before referring to the facts of that survey work, I indicate that we as a State Government have proposed that business migration should be subject to assessment not only in the pre-migration phase, in other words, when applications are being vetted, but also in the post-migration phase; once applicants have been given approval to come to this country, there should be an evaluation or monitoring of what is happening to successful business migrant applicants. We made that point of view known to the Federal Government earlier this year when it was doing the review.

The other point that I need to make is that the article actually makes a claim that may be misinterpreted by some leaders. It claims that fewer than 10 per cent of business migrants are believed to have actually initiated the investment plans that they drew up to justify their coming here. True, a number of business migrants who invest in businesses within Australia are investing in businesses that were not identified in the plans originally submitted. In other words, upon assessment of local business circumstances in coming to this country, they alter their investment plans, but they ultimately still invest. I do not believe that we would be very critical of that decision to change their mind. They are making a business decision to change their mind.

Coming back to the general emphasis or proposition that few business migrants are using their business migration status to actually invest in business, I point out that the survey undertaken earlier this year by the Department of State Development and Technology of a random sample of 50 business migrants who have settled in South Australia found that 30 of those have already established businesses. In other words, 60 per cent had done that.

I point out that most business migrants undergo a settling in period when they come to this country before they establish their business. They survey local conditions. They assess the best opportunities and they may change their plans. We find from the survey that most businesses were established within a period 12 to 28 months after the arrival of those people in this country. While that figure of 60 per cent is significantly better than the 10 per cent hinted at in the Saturday article, it will not be as high as the ultimate figure, because included in the 40 per cent are a significant number who have been here only in very recent times and who are still in that assessment mode.

I can also indicate that the range of business undertaken by these business migrants has been wide indeed: clothing, computer products, air-conditioning, sausage casings, souvenirs, food products, cane furniture, garment labels, paper foil laminate, plastic toys, jewellery, wooden furniture, architectural models, mattresses and baby feeding products, to indicate those in the manufacturing range. Following my participation in two business migration seminars in Hong Kong last week, I can report that there is still concern about the attitude in Australia to business migration. I was able to say that in South Australia that situation is better than that in other States and I was able to confirm that there seems to be, at least in South Australia, a bipartisan stand on business migration. Whereas that may not be the case in terms of Federal Opposition politics or of other States in this country, in this State we all seem to recognise the virtues of business migration.

I also pointed out that in any country in the world there are some who oppose migration, in this country no less than in any other, but that most South Australians welcome new settlers and that all that potential business migrants need do is contact those business migrants who have already settled here and I am confident that they will find that those business migrants had been welcomed to South Australia.

BUILDERS LABOURERS FEDERATION

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister of Labour. Did the office of the Minister of Labour receive, on Tuesday, a report from an industrial journalist who said that he had been intimidated and had his life threatened two weeks ago by officials of the Builders Labourers Federation while they were attending an Industrial Commission hearing in Adelaide and, if his office did receive such a report, what action does the Minister intend to take on this information?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I am not aware of any person reporting that information to my office. I will contact my officers to ascertain whether such a report has been made and, if it has, it will be investigated.

NOARLUNGA CENTRE RAIL SERVICE

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): Can the Minister of Transport explain several delays that I am told occurred in rail services on the Noarlunga line this morning?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question and I acknowledge his keen interest in the transport needs of his electorate, especially as they refer to the Noarlunga rail system. On Tuesday, in response to a question from my colleague the member for Mitchell, I reported that there had been major changes in the State Transport Authority's signalling system and that those changes would considerably benefit not only the rail system and commuters especially but also the taxpayers of South Australia. I also said that I thought that the worst was over and indeed I hoped that the worst was over and that only unexpected faults in the software packages might cause future difficulties. Unfortunately, however, we have experienced some of those unexpected difficulties. I can never be accused of being a Luddite.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Eagle Eddie Edwards of the Liberal Party in this place, who masquerades under the name of the member for Bragg, is interjecting once again. All members will remember Eagle Eddie Edwards as the Olympic athlete who made a career out of not being very good—in fact, out of being pretty bloody awful.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Let me return to the STA. As I have said, no-one can accuse me of being a Luddite. Indeed, I am as anxious as anyone for the introduction of new technology, but it seems that, unfortunately, Opposition members hanker for the old systems and the maintenance of inefficiency and potentially unsafe situations to the disadvantage of STA commuters.

I am not into that. What I am into as Minister of Transport is the introduction of systems that are to the advantage of commuters. There is a great deal of hilarity opposite about the new signalling system, but when it works, which it will very efficiently once all the software difficulties have been resolved, members opposite will want to brag that it was their Government which signed the contract and introduced the system in 1982. It is like the O-Bahn: once the system is operating properly, out they come from their hiding places and say, 'Great system! We introduced it.' That is what they will be saying about the signalling equip-

ment. As I have said, it is more than disconcerting to me that when we introduce new technology and new software packages there is a bedding down time. Unfortunately—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Members opposite are saying that we should have tested it. If any of them had any idea at all about technology, they would know that the only way to test signalling equipment is to use it. You have to run the service to see where the difficulties are, and you address those difficulties as they become apparent. It is absolutely no consolation at all to the commuters of South Australia to know that everywhere else that new signalling equipment has been introduced these sorts of difficulties occur. People who travel on the STA buy their tickets and, in my view, are entitled to expect the service for which they pay. I am also one of these people who believe that trains ought to run on time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Some of this behaviour is very uncouth. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Members opposite apparently think that this will be their last opportunity for a short time for them to be in Opposition. Let me tell them that they will remain in Opposition for a long time. They are just a bit nervous at the moment. I have instructed the STA to make absolutely sure that it brings all the resources available to it, along with the consulting engineers and Westinghouse from the UK, to make sure that any faults that exist within these software packages are quickly overcome. Last night there was no difficulty at all—the trains ran to schedule, as they did the evening before. The next morning, the problems recur.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: That can be explained. Members opposite do not care one hoot about the inconvenience that has been caused to STA commuters. I am concerned about that, as are the backbenchers on my side of the House. It is probably because no member opposite has a rail system running through their electorate.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The taxpayers of South Australia are expected by the member for Heysen to subsidise passengers to Bridgewater by more than $10 or $12 per single trip, and I do not think that is appropriate for the taxpayers to bear. A problem within the software packages was resolved last night by the writing of a new program. Unfortunately, the problem that occurred last night masked other difficulties in the system that have become apparent this morning. The software is once again being rewritten, and, as I said before, as much as I am able to assure the commuters of South Australia that the system will be running this evening and as from tomorrow, I give that assurance.

However, history over the past 12 months has shown me and the commuters of South Australia that there are some problems attached to improving the system. I ask them once again not to lose confidence in and patience with the STA. They do have a very good system: they will continue to have a very good system—one that many outside experts would regard as the best in Australia—and we will continue with that system. Any short-term problems resulting from the introduction of the new signalling system will be overcome as quickly as possible, so that customers can be assured they will receive the service for which they pay.

BUILDERS LABOURERS FEDERATION

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): My question is directed to the Minister of Labour. Will the Government now intervene before the State Industrial Commission to seek orders to prevent members of the BLF using threats and intimidation in the current industrial dispute in the building industry in Adelaide? In view of the evidence I now put before the House, will the Minister reconsider his refusal to initiate deregistration proceedings against this union?

On Tuesday the Minister accused me of never having made any attempt to validate allegations made against the BLF. This was not true. This afternoon I have further evidence in the form of a statutory declaration signed by the Director of a respected organisation representing contractors involved in the present dispute.

The statutory declaration refers to 'threats and intimidation from members of the Australian Building and Construction Workers Federation, commonly referred to as the BLF'. It states that these threats and intimidation 'have been in the form of physical contact through jostling, knocking work helmets off heads and general intimidation by way of verbal threats'. I interpose here that I also have information that these threats have extended to the families of contractors. The declaration further states:

> It is an untenable position that registered companies cannot instruct their employees to enter onto any site affected by this dispute and carry out their lawful business without threat of intimidation to companies and employees of loss of future work on major contracts or any contract within the industry that these employers operate. It is totally unacceptable that organisers of the BLF can intimidate and make threats of loss of work to employees of these contractors and thereby deprive them of their livelihood.

I will give the Minister a copy of this declaration so that he can pursue the matter. It is dated today and signed by Mr Brian Evans, National Director of the Building Industry Specialist Contractors Organisation of Australia.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister.

Mr S.J. Baker: What are you going to do about that?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I will again outline the Government's present attitude. We are aware, as everyone is, that there is some dispute in the building industry as to how work is performed on several building sites, and activities at those sites vary from day to day. This morning I was advised that some building contractors, who I think are affected by this dispute, were seeking a meeting, and I will be meeting with them first thing on Monday morning. Until now I have not been asked to do anything by any employers in the building industry.

The only person I am aware of who has been seeking deregistration at this stage is the member for Mitcham, and an editorial has appeared in the *Advertiser*. There have been no other calls for deregistration, and on that basis I will not institute any proceedings. That will only be done if there is a considerable degree of uniform thinking in the building industry itself. I point out that deregistration proceedings—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Mr Speaker, if the member for Mitcham is patient, I will explain it to him. He should learn to wait. His parents should have taught him to be polite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Deregistration proceedings undertaken without the general support of participants in the industry fail. I draw the member for Mitcham's attention to what occurred some years ago when building employers took deregistration proceedings against the BLF.

Several years later, when the BLF sought re-registration in the Commonwealth commission, the employers did not oppose it. That was because—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham was allowed to ask his question uninterrupted. The same circumstances should apply to the Minister. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: That failed because there was general agreement amongst the unions that deregistration proceedings should not occur and they did nothing about it. The situation in New South Wales and Victoria of more recent note is that the unions themselves welcomed what happened and participated in the recruitment of members that had become ununionised, if you like, or members of a deregistered union. To all intents and purposes, the BLF ceased to exist in New South Wales and Victoria because of that. My advice and understanding of the situation in South Australia is that agreement has been reached between the BLF and the BWIU, which is the principal competitor for membership of the classes covered by the BLF, not to poach from each other. That removes one area of disputation. If we were to move to deregister, it would fail because the BLF would still be around.

With respect to the statutory declaration that will be provided to me later, I will have it transported immediately to the Commissioner of Police and ask him to investigate the allegations it contains. In my opinion, threats of physical violence are better dealt with by the police. I am of the view that, when people are threatened, they ought to have the full protection of the Police Force and the laws of this State, and I will ensure that that happens.

CHILD PROTECTION STRATEGIES

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Community Welfare tell the House whether she believes there really is widespread alarm in the community over the Government's—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair would appreciate a total reduction in the number of interjections so that I can hear the question. The honourable member for Mitchell.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Thankyou, Mr Speaker. In view of that rather rude interruption, I will repeat the question. Will the Minister of Community Welfare tell the House whether she believes there really is widespread alarm in the community over the Government's child protection strategies? If one were to accept an article in the *News* today, the reason for the question would be quite understandable. The article states:

> Alarm over the Bannon Government's child protection strategies was widespread, the Opposition Community Welfare spokesman, Ms Laidlaw, claimed today.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am gravely concerned at the Opposition's repeated attempts to whip up emotive and unsubstantiated and, indeed, untrue stories on this issue. Child protection is about the care and well-being of our children. Nobody, I believe, in the community wants to see children at risk or in danger of abuse or neglect. The Government's strategy aims to ensure not only the protection of our children but also support for families to care for their own children. I believe that this criticism will undermine the public's confidence in the department and affect the morale of the workers and, as a result, our children will be put further at risk. This is because the mischievous—indeed dangerous—comments of the Opposition and some sections of the media could make the public fearful of approaching the department with concerns that they may have about their own children's safety or about children in the community who they know or believe are in danger.

On a number of occasions I have outlined to this Parliament the Government's child protection strategies. However, in view of the claims made in today's *News*, I will again outline some of the initiatives that are in place and some that are currently being implemented. The article in today's *News* contains several misinformed views (expounded by the Opposition), some of which are downright ridiculous.

With respect to the whole question of notification of child abuse, I shall place on the public record, for the information of members, the fact that notifications are made by the public of South Australia to the Department for Community Welfare. It is quite ridiculous to infer that Department for Community Welfare workers are out there in the streets of our cities and towns looking for children to somehow snatch from families. The notifications come from doctors, teachers, the police, relatives and neighbours.

Another important aspect relating to this assertion that there is widespread concern in the community relates to the fact that in South Australia we have both mandatory reporting and subsequent mandatory investigation into all notifications of child abuse in this State. There are only two States in Australia where it is not mandatory to report child abuse. Members will probably not be surprised to learn that Victoria is one of those States, and the other is Western Australia. I understand that there is constant public criticism of the Governments of those States over the deficiencies in their reporting systems. I also understand that both of those States are moving to implement a system of mandatory reporting of child abuse.

The Department for Community Welfare has developed a comprehensive training package for people who, under the law, are obliged to notify the department of child abuse. As I have said, this involves people such as teachers, doctors and the police. I understand that there is nothing like this package elslewhere in Australia. Following the release of the Bidmeade Report and the Child Sexual Abuse Task Force Report, the Department for Community Welfare and other Government and non-Government agencies have been implementing the recommendations that have come from those reports. Much of the work is being coordinated by the Health and Welfare Child Protection Unit and the Child Protection Council of South Australia, which is chaired by none other than Dame Roma Mitchell.

As I have said on, I think, three occasions in this Parliament—and I will say it yet again—a specialist unit has been established at the Adelaide Children's Hospital, and as from 1 November that unit has been headed by Dr Terry Donald, who is a paediatrician and specialist in this area.

The article in today's *News* refers to the fact that the proportion of substantiated cases as against the number of notifications has declined dramatically over the past five years. We all know that there has been an increase in notifications of child abuse in South Australia since this Government came to power. Whilst I would like to claim that that is solely to the credit of this Government, I have to be honest and say that this increase in notifications is occurring Australia-wide—it is not applicable only to South Australia. This increase in notifications is due to increasing community concern.

The article also indicates that, where once notifications of suspected child abuse were confirmed, only a quarter can now be proved. This totally and absolutely takes no account of the work that the department is doing. What this reflects is that, as to the notifications in this State last year relating

to 4 500 children, because of the improved inter-agency services to families, 94 per cent did not even enter the court system. This means that the department, working with such agencies as the Child Adolescent and Mental Health Service, the community welfare centres, non-Government welfare agencies, and community based self-help groups, is ensuring that the problems are resolved within a family. Counselling for individual members of the family, financial counselling and support for families has meant that problems are resolved within the families. Does the Opposition expect that, when a notification is made, a departmental officer should rush out to a family and remove a child, without doing everything else that is possible to ensure that that child is protected?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: We believe, and I believe, that the family is important. However, I must point out that there are some horrendous cases. Every day workers in community welfare centres, hospitals and police stations deal with children who have been deliberately blinded, poisoned or burned, thrown against walls, brain damaged or raped. This article suggests that the department has somehow been derelict in its duty of very carefully laying down procedures for notification, investigation and the provision of support services. I reject totally this claim by the Opposition.

I believe that my answer, while it has been a little lengthy, is important and has addressed every aspect of the question raised by the member for Mitchell. In conclusion, I want to say that I have been contacted both personally and in writing by members of the community who have expressed concern to me and who have asked the question: why is the Opposition so hell bent on supporting and defending abusers of our children? Why is the Opposition not supporting the Government and its agencies through the Department for Community Welfare in attacking the abusers of our children? It will continue to support—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister has had ample time to expand on her answer. The member for Bragg.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Minister of Housing and Construction to order. The Minister of Community Welfare.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The member for Mount Gambier has said that I told an unprincipled lie, and I would ask that that statement be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mount Gambier appears to have used unparliamentary language and I direct him to withdraw the particular word that is always considered unparliamentary. The honourable member for Mount Gambier.

The Hon. H. ALISON: I withdraw the statement, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! Thankyou. The honourable member for Bragg.

ISLAND SEAWAY

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Mr Speaker, I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Community Welfare.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Mr Speaker, I have been called by the member for Mitcham in this Parliament an unprincipled slut and I would like that statement to be withdrawn.

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Eyre. The Chair did not hear the phrase allegedly uttered by the honourable member for Mitcham. However, if those words were uttered there would not be a person in the community who would not agree that they are completely unparliamentary. If that is the case, I direct the member for Mitcham to withdraw.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Mr Speaker, I guarantee to the House that I did not use those words.

An honourable member: You liar!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Light.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. In the past I believe that you have directed that the term 'liar' in relation to any member is unparliamentary—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: —and I ask you to request the Minister of Housing and Construction to withdraw that statement in relation to the member for Mitcham.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no question that the use of that word is unparliamentary and, if that was used by the Minister, I direct him to withdraw.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Mr Speaker, at least I have integrity—I withdraw.

The SPEAKER: The member for Bragg.

Mr INGERSON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Transport.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the member for Bragg resume his seat.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on both sides should take stock of the situation and bear in mind the sort of image that they are creating for the Parliament. I ask them to restrain their behaviour for a few more hours at least. The member for Bragg.

Mr INGERSON: My question is directed to the Minister of Transport.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bragg will resume his seat. I direct the honourable Minister of Housing and Construction, the honourable Minister of Education, and the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition to help the Chair maintain a reasonable degree of decorum in the House. The honourable member for Bragg.

Mr INGERSON: Can the Minister of Transport say whether safety equipment on the *Island Seaway* has recently been replaced and, if it has, at what cost? Has the Minister now received the report on the seaworthiness of the vessel that was first promised in June? If he has, when will that report be made public and, if he has not, why not? Finally, why have there been further delays and when does the Minister now expect to receive the report?

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: You said you would support it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair may have to take most regrettable steps if I do not have the cooperation of members.

An honourable member: Particularly of Ministers.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bragg.

Mr INGERSON: Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. I have been informed that life boat equipment on the *Island Seaway* has been completely replaced within the last month despite a statement by the Minister quoted in the *Sunday Mail* on 19 June that 'life rafts fitted to the *Island Seaway* comply with the highest maritime standards set by authorities'. In that article, the Minister also said that he had hoped the engineer's report on the vessel would have been completed by that time. Subsequently, in a letter to the editor published in the *Advertiser* on 28 July, the Minister said:

> The report has been promised at the end of August.

Further in this House on 4 October the Minister said:

> I am trying to get Howard Smiths to complete the report as quickly as possible.

He also promised that 'as soon as the report is available and Cabinet has seen it, it will be made public, and the sooner the better'. However, five months after the report was first promised, the public is yet to see it. I wonder whether the Minister could also say when the Premier will go to the Island to discuss the future of the *Island Seaway*, as he promised to do five months ago.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question even though he had great difficulty in receiving the decorum of the House in asking it. I thank him because, as the House would be aware, this is the second time this session that the honourable member has asked me a question on transport, both times about the *Island Seaway*. So, apparently the honourable member shares with me my confidence in the State Transport Authority and in respect of all my other responsibilities, about which he was so eager to question me in the past to such an extent that they are now matters of the past, and I certainly thank him for that. I am not the Premier's appointment secretary and, if the honourable member wants to know when and where the Premier is going, he should ask the Premier and, if it is appropriate for the Premier to do so, I am certain that the Premier will respond.

The matter of replacing the life rafts with life boats has been public knowledge for I do not know how many months. Certainly, the honourable member's colleague the member for Alexandra has known about it for 10 months. Indeed, it seems that the member for Bragg is just catching up and I suggest that there should be some sort of discussions between the two members opposite. The original life rafts designed for the vessel were designed in response to the highest technical and safety levels that have been set. However, the Government did have regard for the people who worked on the *Island Seaway* and who would have to use the life rafts or life boats if there were occasion to do so, with the idea of providing more appropriate safety equipment for them. At the moment I am not aware of the cost but I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

The report on the *Island Seaway* has not been completed by engineers, as I have explained on any number of occasions. These reports have been undertaken by people who are not ships engineers; they were undertaken by marine institutions, by Lloyds of London and by ships architects. Members opposite need to understand that a marine engineer is a metal tradesman with additional qualifications. Marine engineers are not ships architects or ship designers, and they are not the people we would have undertaking reports for us. I can advise members—particularly the member for Alexandra—that all the reports we have asked be completed have been completed.

My colleague the Minister of Marine and I are now studying these reports prior to making a submission to Cabinet. As soon as we are in a position to make that submission (because Cabinet members should be the first people to have an opportunity to consider the reports so that the decisions can be made), we will be making the appropriate public announcement.

CORRUPTION ALLEGATIONS

Mr TYLER (Fisher): Is the Deputy Premier aware of the criticisms made by the Leader of the Opposition, Senator Robert Hill and the Hon. Trevor Griffin that the Government misled the public, played down the extent of corruption in South Australia and has been reluctant to involve the NCA in South Australia? In a front page article in yesterday's *Advertiser* the Leader of the Opposition claimed that the Government had misled the public and played down the extent of corruption and corrupt practices in South Australia.

Furthermore, in the same article the Opposition legal affairs spokesman claimed that the extent of the alleged criminal activity raised questions about the reluctance of the Government to seek further NCA investigations. In today's *Advertiser*, Liberal Senator Robert Hill, the Federal shadow justice spokesman, is reported to have made similar claims.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: In one sense I was very surprised that Senator Hill made those sorts of statements, after the way in which Trevor Griffin really left him up the creek without a paddle yesterday—

The SPEAKER: Order! 'The Hon. Trevor Griffin' is the phrase that should be used by the honourable Minister.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes, I am sorry—the Hon. Trevor Griffin, member of another place, left him up the creek without a paddle yesterday in repudiating the NCA approach. In relation to the Leader of the Opposition's claims, one wonders where he has been for quite some time.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It was express repudiation, no doubt about that. I remind the House that it was this Government which, in May 1986, invited the NCA to undertake investigations in this State as a result of a national reference into organised crime, drug distribution and associated criminal activities. It was that investigation which resulted in the apprehension and conviction of Barry Moyse and his criminal associates. It was that investigation which resulted in the interim report of the NCA, received in July of this year. It identified a number of matters that required further investigation.

The Government has not hidden any of that. The Government has always acknowledged that there are a number of unresolved matters arising from the NCA investigations which require further attention. My statement to the House on 16 August openly canvassed those issues. During that statement I tabled extracts of the NCA report for the information of the House. I also advised the House that, based on advice from the NCA, I was not in a position to canvass any of the allegations, for obvious reasons. That puts paid to the Leader's unfounded and quite mischievous claims that I have somehow misled the Parliament.

Senator Hill's claims are similarly incorrect. In May he made quite outrageous claims concerning crime and cor-

ruption in this State, claiming that there was widespread and institutionalised corruption in the South Australian Police Force. When challenged by the Attorney-General and by the Commissioner of Police to substantiate his allegations, the Senator simply could not deliver. At the same time, the Government did not deny that there were cases of corruption or misconduct in the force although the Government did not accept the Senator's unsubstantiated allegation of widespread and institutionalised corruption.

Briefings by the NCA have not indicated that the problem was as widespread as the Senator had claimed. In the meantime, the Government has established appropriate mechanisms to deal with corruption, including the establishment of the NCA office in South Australia.

As to the Hon. Mr Griffin's comments, they were quite astonishing, I believe, for their lack of honesty. As with the Leader, he is prepared to desperately squeeze this issue for all its political worth, with no regard to the cost to individuals or public confidence in the administration of justice in South Australia. He asserts that the scope of the future NCA activities raises questions about the reluctance of the Government to seek further NCA investigations. Let me correct that obvious contradiction: the terms of reference have been deliberately drafted to provide sufficient scope for the NCA to investigate a broad range of matters and allegations which remain unresolved.

Mr Griffin should applaud the Government's commitment to dealing with these important matters. It is quite absurd for his Party to claim that the broad reference is indicative of a much wider corruption problem than previously acknowledged. Had the reference been set in narrower terms, no doubt the Liberals would now be attacking the Government for restricting the NCA in the scope of its investigation. It is another of these bob each way matters.

The Government, in considering the NCA recommendations, took the decision to invite it to establish an office here. We took the initiative: it is the Government that has put up the money to fund the NCA office in Adelaide. In contrast, I believe, the Leader has demonstrated a shallowness and lack of resolve to deal with these important matters. When has he supported his Federal colleagues in calls for an NCA office in Adelaide? I do not recall it at all. As with Wilpena, the issue where he has now been effectively gagged by the member for Coles, and with many other issues, he seems to want to have a dollar each way.

Can I conclude by saying that several weeks ago the Attorney-General and his challenge to the Liberals to put up or shut up clearly showed the people how shallow the Leader's posturing really is. It is a matter of slinging some mud, hoping that it sticks, and to heck with the consequences.

IMPORTED BIRDS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Will the South Australian Government oppose plans to allow live birds to be imported through the Torrens Island quarantine station and, if not, will he explain what contingency plan would be implemented by his department in the event of an outbreak of exotic bird disease in view of concerns that such a plan could require the slaughter of domestic birds, commercial birds and native species across 90 per cent of the Adelaide metropolitan area? Originally, only hatching eggs were to be imported through Torrens Island. However, the Federal Government now has plans to extend this to live birds.

The United Bird Societies of South Australia has made representations to the Government expressing serious concern about the possibility that this could introduce an exotic avian disease to Adelaide. Precedents for the treatment of such an outbreak suggest that domestic, commercial and native birds within a 20 kilometre radius of Torrens Island, which covers 90 per cent of the metropolitan area, might have to be slaughtered. In a letter to the societies dated 29 September this year, the Minister for Environment and Planning revealed that the South Australian Government had 'several areas of concern' over the plans to import birds from other countries through Torrens Island, and he indicated that the Minister of Agriculture would be pursuing the matter.

Of particular concern to the societies is uncertainty about precisely what contingency plan the Department of Agriculture would implement in the event of an outbreak of disease originating from the quarantine station, the extent to which such a plan would require the slaughter of large numbers of birds in the metropolitan area at significant economic cost for commercial producers, and personal loss for owners of domestic birds, and what compensation would be payable in the event of such losses.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It is interesting to hear the honourable member's question, given that his colleagues in another place last night voted to disallow the exotic fish regulation which was designed for exactly that purpose. If one were to replace the word 'birds' with 'fish' in the honourable member's question, one would have to say that there was some inconsistency in the Opposition's approach. Members opposite are not quite sure which way to flutter their feathers. In all seriousness, this is a very complex issue and, as the honourable member has said, there has been considerable discussion between Federal and State agencies with regard to the possibility of the importation of live birds into this country.

I understand that it is primarily a matter of quarantine control which, of course, is managed by the Federal Quarantine Office, and that that matter is being examined. This State, under its own legislation, has joint powers as well as rights regarding quarantine provisions. Obviously, we are carefully investigating the situation concerning importation. I understand that our Chief Veterinary Officer and other officers of the department have been involved in extensive discussions with the Federal Government and the Quarantine Office about the protection provisions involved.

My understanding at this stage is that the safeguards aspect is being carefully examined. I understand also that provisions are in place that will prevent from happening what the member for Light suggested will happen. Discussions along the lines of providing those important safety measures, protections and buffers against any outbreak of disease in native or domestic birds are taking place with the Federal authorities. I will obtain a report so that this matter can be updated when the House returns. In the meantime I can advise the honourable member, by letter, on the state of negotiations. I am satisfied with the progress of negotiations in relation to safeguards, and I will ensure that those safeguards are properly instituted before any further moves are made in this matter.

HOME AND COMMUNITY CARE PROGRAM

Ms GAYLER (Newland): Can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether the Home and Community Care program for elderly and disabled people has failed, as suggested by the Liberal position paper on the ageing? Does the Minister support the Opposition's proposal to move to a system of 'self-help' rather than 'doing things for an older

person'? Elderly and disabled people in Tea Tree Gully have told me how much they appreciate the HACC program.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for her question. Indeed, the Home and Community Care program has not failed, as has been inferred by the Opposition in its position paper on the ageing. In fact, the funds provided for HACC have almost doubled since 1984-85 from $13.1 million to $25 million in 1987-88. In practical terms this means an increase from 57 services in 1984-85 to some 308 services this year.

I believe it is important to note that the administration of HACC in South Australia is universally acclaimed by other States. In fact, the Federal Government has referred to South Australia as being the jewel in the crown, in relation to our program. Any new program has teething problems, and measures have already been taken to overcome some of them. Despite these problems, funds have been provided for a very wide range of services and, as the honourable member would know, these include something like $326 000 to Access Cabs, recurrent funding to seven local councils for community care workers, and some $274 000 in capital funds to upgrade the Meals on Wheels kitchen. A further $193 000 has been provided for a new incontinence promotion service—something that is very important to older people.

About two weeks ago I had the opportunity to meet with the South Australian Advisory Committee of HACC. These people come from right around South Australia—from far country areas as well as from various regions in the city—and I have to say that they are an extremely dedicated and hard-working group. They have contributed, along with the paid staff and the Chair in South Australia (Mrs Judith Roberts) to the success of HACC. It is certainly not a failure, and I believe it very much works on the principles of older people themselves contributing to their help. HACC provides the services that they very much need.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

LIVING ARTS CENTRE

The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE (Coles): Can the Premier say what is the current status of the Living Arts Centre development, and will he explain what role, if any, Mr Robert Carthew and Mr Jim Stitt have in the project? The Premier promised in his 1985 election policy speech that the Living Arts Centre will proceed and he made a number of subsequent statements indicating that final decisions on the future of this project were imminent.

Most recently, the Government has been negotiating with the Multiplex company of Perth. This is revealed in a letter dated 17 September this year which the Premier wrote to Mr Robert Carthew, who has been in dispute with the Government over rights to architectural plans for the project. The Premier's letter was in reply to a letter Mr Carthew had written to the Premier dated 25 July.

In the letter, Mr Carthew indicated that he had had discussions with both the Attorney-General and the Hon. Terry Roberts of another place about a detailed design submission that he had made to the Government. Mr Carthew explained to the Premier that while his work had taken him at least 400 hours to complete and had taken the form not only of a detailed feasibility study but also detailed architectural plans, a strip-down model, and a detailed report, he had received no payment. Further on in his letter Mr Carthew stated:

> I was told to ring Jim Stitt by Terry Roberts MLC and was told that he was an approved finance broker who could arrange investors. At this stage I was not told that he [Mr Stitt] was working for Multiplex, and was only informed of this several weeks later. I trusted him because I saw him at the end of a Labor Party monthly meeting at Trades Hall going off in a social group with Terry Roberts, and because of this felt it was okay to deal with him.

Mr Carthew now claims that the Government, without his agreement or any payment to him, has used his work to entice Multiplex into the project, and that Mr Stitt has reneged on assurances that Mr Carthew would have a continuing role in the project. I understand that Mr Stitt is the principal of a Perth based company called International Business Development Proprietary Limited which has a paid up capital of $3.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think that the honourable member would have helped us all if she had also read out my letter to Mr Carthew which put the position. Presumably, he supplied that to her as well as supplying her with the other documents and his complaint. Unfortunately, I do not have that letter before me otherwise I would read it into the record. Therefore, I can only operate from my memory of the matter. First, the member asked me the current status of the Living Arts Centre. That project, at present, is under active investigation. We are awaiting a proposal, subject to certain conditions, from Multiplex.

Multiplex is the most recent in a series of developers which has indicated an interest in and, in the case of a couple of them, most particularly the Fricker company, have taken the project right through to a feasibility stage. So far no company has been successful in coming up with the appropriate package of arts venue components and a financial bottom line that will satisfy the requirements of the Government. At this stage (again from memory) we are still awaiting from Multiplex some final proposition, but it has indicated an active interest in the project. I hope that it can come up with something positive. Frickers was unable to do so although it advanced the project quite considerably, and eventually withdrew because it was not able to meet the Government's requirements.

Meanwhile, there has been considerable expenditure on the Living Arts Centre site. The venues have been upgraded and very successfully used, not only at festival time but in the intervening period. A number of groups and organisations have enjoyed very cheap accommodation there over some years. First, therefore, the site has been used, and used very productively I think, although obviously not in the long-term way that we propose. Secondly, the value of the site has certainly increased greatly. So far we have not been able to get private entrepreneurial or development interest to draw the strands together in a satisfactory way.

I understand that Mr Stitt is a consultant to Multiplex. I am not sure whether he introduced them to the Living Arts Centre project or of the extent to which he has been involved in liaison, but that has been purely his role. As to some quarrel Mr Carthew may have with him, I think I adequately dealt with that from the Government's point of view in my reply to Mr Carthew.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: CHILD PROTECTION ALLEGATIONS

Mr S.J. BAKER(Mitcham): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I refer to accusations made against me for telling untruths. In response to the accusation made by the Minister of Community Welfare that Opposition members are supporters of child abusers, in the heat of the

moment and believing this was a vile and quite defamatory comment against me and each of my colleagues I responded by saying, 'A sleazy little slug.' I did not use the word 'unprincipled' or 'slut'. I would never use the word 'slut'.

Members interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: 'Slug'—'a sleazy little slug'.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has leave for a personal explanation.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The word was 'slug'. It was appropriate for the moment because I think it had the right connotations for the things that were said at the time. I now would like to withdraw those words 'a sleazy little slug', and I would ask the Minister of Community Welfare—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: Whilst I am on my feet, I ask the Minister of Community Welfare to withdraw the words, 'The Opposition are supporters of child abusers.'

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Water Resources): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: In the member for Mitcham's personal explanation he suggested that I had said that Opposition members were supporters, defenders—and I forget the other word—of child sexual abusers. What I actually said was that I have been approached, both in writing and personally, by members of the community who have said to me, 'Why is it that the Opposition appears to be supporting, defending and promoting child abusers?' I think it has a very different connotation, because that has actually been said to me by members of the community than the implication that was made by the member for Mitcham, and the *Hansard* transcript will show exactly what I said. It is my understanding that the word 'slug' was not used by the member for Mitcham—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is now going beyond the bounds of her personal explanation.

Mr GUNN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. During Question Time, I was warned for allegedly interjecting. I believe I was unfairly warned because, at the time I was interjecting, several members of the Ministry, including the Minister of Agriculture, continually—

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot accept that as a point of order at this stage.

Mr GUNN: Come on!

The SPEAKER: The Chair cannot give a ruling on a point of order about half an hour after the alleged incident transpired.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 14 February 1989 at 2 p.m.

I would like to speak to the motion in order to spread Christmas bonhomie, good humour and general goodwill in the spirit of the festive season. This session has been distinctly lacking in that respect, culminating in unfortunate incidents today. I hope that when we return in the New Year some better modicum of decency and restraint can return to the parliamentary proceedings.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not intend to respond to interjections. Those members who believe that what I am saying fits them, let them so consider. I would prefer to draw attention away from those on the floor in this Chamber and some of their behaviour and, on behalf of the Government and Government members, thank all of those in the Parliament who have served us so well in what have often been quite tense and difficult proceedings. The Clerks at the table and their secretarial staff and those servicing the various committees are to be thanked; those in the Library, with their continuing support in providing assistance in research and information to this Parliament; the attendants for their work in the Chambers and outside; and those involved in the security of this place and the police who attend on duty here—it is perhaps not one of the most exciting assignments for them but nonetheless very necessary to have their presence in this place in case of problems.

I thank *Hansard* and those who perhaps use the efforts of *Hansard* to reinterpret proceedings here in the press galleries; Parliamentary Counsel; and the caretakers on their 24 hour operation, keeping access to this place open for all members at any time as required. Finally—and I hope I have not left out anybody—I thank the catering staff. In company with one or two of my colleagues last night, I experienced the extremely high level of functional hospitality that is capable of being presented in this House, with fine quality food and one or two beverages as well for which we were very grateful—and for which we paid, of course. Although, the bill is yet to be delivered, we will have paid in a number of ways. Therefore, I would like to underscore in naming those who have assisted us in this way and thank them most sincerely for providing us with yet another year's solid, dependable, willing and cheerful support.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I would like to support most of what the Premier has had to say, particularly the latter part of his remarks. I have observed in my time in this place, which is just about as long as anyone here (there are a couple of members who have been here longer), that some members of Parliament on both sides can dish out the treatment and also take it. However, there are others who can dish it out but cannot take it. As the years go by, I hope that more of those who choose to dish it out may also be able to take it. I have also observed that it is all a battle for the minds and wills of the media. The slant that the media may wish to put on events may not suit either side of Parliament. I could refer to recent events which I would describe as nothing short of disgraceful, but—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, and we all have something in mind, although I am quite sure that what I have in mind is not what members of the Government have in mind. If people are going to dish it out, they have to be prepared to take it. I want to get to the main purport of this message, and that is to wish everyone in this place a happy and healthy Christmas. I hope that some of them have a good dose of salts after their Christmas dinner, purge the liver, and come back here (as the Premier may have suggested) in a better frame of mind. In some ways, it has been a turbulent year on the floor of this Chamber; I have figured in one or two of those events and make no apology for it. I would like to wish everyone here, on behalf of the Opposition, a happy and healthy Christmas and, if they are so minded, a holy one (I do not know how one hopes that the atheists have a holy Christmas, but they have to work that one out).

However, I want to reinforce what the Premier said in relation to the people who make this place tick. My list, which mirrors his, includes the Clerks and the staff, the

Attendants, the Library staff, the people in *Hansard*, who put up with a fair bit one way and another, the catering staff, the caretakers, the telephonists, the typists, and the police—everyone associated with this place. They all do their job conscientiously, and without that the place would just not run. As some people observe, we have difficulty in making this place run, anyway, Mr Speaker, but, nonetheless, it does run, and these people behind the scenes make life more comfortable for us. With those few observations, I support, as I say, the bulk of what the Premier has said, and I reinforce the comments that I made when I started—that if you want to dish it out you have got to be able to take it.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I support the remarks made by the Premier and the Deputy Leader. I would like to add my thanks to the Clerks, the Attendants, the Library staff, *Hansard*, and everyone else who contributes to the running of this place. I want to thank you, Mr Speaker, and all members for their cooperation. I trust that each and every member has a merry Christmas and the health and happiness that goes with it, and if we have that we will have the prosperity that really matters.

The SPEAKER: I am sure that all the staff in the building appreciate the good wishes and gestures of appreciation that have been extended to them by members. Members may not be aware that, as well as the 47 members of this Chamber and the 22 of the other place, a total of over 150 people work full time here looking after the needs of the Parliament, and also another 50 part-time people work here. I think it is good for us on occasion to put on record our collective appreciation for their efforts. When we came in here at the beginning of Question Time—and I understand that it was the Deputy Premier who was responsible, with the assistance of the Government Whip—we found that small red festive candles had been placed at every member's place, as a sign of festive goodwill.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Transport has suggested that some of them may be emitting a ticking sound—but that is not correct. This is the season of goodwill to all men and women, and I am sure that that goodwill is extended now, if not a short while ago, between all of us—even between the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and myself. In that context, it is probably most appropriate that we are adjourning until that day of universal affection, 14 February, Valentine's Day.

I suggest that with this festive season and 14 February in mind we put behind us the ill will that occurred during Question Time. I apologise if I have been curt with any members today or on any previous occasion—with the rider that I apologise only if I have been unnecessarily curt. I remind members that the Chair not only has to deal with disputes but also must endeavour to prevent quarrels progressing further or, better still, try to prevent them erupting in the first place. I wish all members a happy and a holy Christmas.

Motion carried.

BOATING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 7—After line 40 insert new clause as follows:

Insertion of heading

9a. The following heading is inserted in the principal Act after the heading to Part IV:

DIVISION I—BOATING OFFENCES

No. 2. Page 9, lines 34 to 38 (clause 12)—Leave out subsection 7.

No. 3. Page 10—After line 19 insert new clauses 16a and 16b as follow:

Insertion of Division

16a. The following Division is inserted after section 30 of the principal Act:

DIVISION II—PROVISIONS RELATING TO BREATH ANALYSIS, ETC.

Interpretation

30a. In this Act—

'alcotest' means a test by means of an apparatus of a kind approved by the Minister of Transport for the purposes of the Road Traffic Act 1961, by which the presence of alcohol in the blood of a person who exhales into the apparatus is indicated:

'analyst' means a person who is an analyst for the purposes of the Road Traffic Act 1961:

'breath analysing instrument' means an apparatus of a kind approved by the Governor as a breath analysing instrument for the purposes of the Road Traffic Act 1961:

'breath analysis' means an analysis of breath by a breath analysing instrument.

Presumption of blood alcohol level

30b. If it is established that there was present in the blood of a person charged with an offence against section 26 (3) *(b)* the prescribed concentration of alcohol at any time within two hours after that offence is alleged to have been committed, it will be presumed, unless the court before which the person is charged draws, from the evidence before it, a reasonable inference to the contrary, that the prescribed concentration of alcohol was present in the blood of the person at the time the offence is alleged to have been committed.

Contracts of insurance

30c. (1) A person who is convicted of an offence against section 26 (3) *(b)* is not, by reason only of the conviction and any consequent penalty, to be taken, for the purposes of any law, or of any contract, agreement, policy of insurance of other document, to have been under the influence of, or in any way affected by, intoxicating liquor, or incapable of operating, or of exercising effective control of, a boat, at the time of the commission of that offence.

(2) The provisions of subsection (1) have effect notwithstanding any law, or any covenant, term, condition or provision of, or contained in, any contract, agreement, policy of insurance or other document, and a covenant, term, condition or provision purporting to exclude, limit, modify or restrict the operation of that subsection is void.

(3) Any covenant, term, condition or provision contained in a contract, policy of insurance or other document purporting to exclude or limit the liability of an insurer in the event of the operator of a boat being convicted of an offence against section 26 (3) *(b)* is void.

Compliance with directions of police

30d. (1) A person required under this Act to submit to an alcotest or breath analysis must not refuse or fail to comply with all reasonable directions of a member of the Police Force in relation to the requirement and, in particular, must not refuse or fail to exhale into the apparatus by which the alcotest or breath analysis is conducted, in accordance with the directions of a member of the Police Force.

Penalty: Division 8 fine but not less than the maximum of a division 9 fine.

(2) It is a defence to a prosecution under subsection (1)—

(a) that the requirement or direction to which the prosecution relates was not lawfully made;

or

(b) that there was, in the circumstances of the case, good cause for the refusal or failure of the defendant to comply with the requirement or direction.

(3) No person is entitled to refuse or fail to comply with a requirement or direction under this section on the ground that, by complying with that requirement or direction, he or she would, or might, furnish evidence that could be used against himself or herself.

Right of person to request blood test

30e. (1) A person required in accordance with this Act to submit to a breath analysis may request of a member of the Police Force that a sample of his or her blood be taken by a medical practitioner.

(2) Where a request is made by a person under subsection (1), a member of the Police Force must do all things reasonably

necessary to facilitate the taking of a sample of the person's blood—

(a) by a medical practitioner nominated by the person;

or

(b) if—

(i) it becomes apparent to the member of the Police Force that there is no reasonable likelihood that a medical practitioner nominated by the person will be available to take the sample within one hour of the time of the request at some place not more than 10 kilometres distant from the place of request;

or

(ii) the person does not nominate a particular medical practitioner,

by any medical practitioner who is available to take the sample.

(3) The taking of a sample of blood pursuant to this section—

(a) must be carried out by the medical practitioner in the presence of a member of the Police Force;

and

(b) must be at the expense of the person from whom the sample is taken.

(4) A sample of blood taken by a medical practitioner in accordance with a request under subsection (1) must be divided by that practitioner into two approximately equal parts and placed in sealed containers of which—

(a) one must be handed to the member of the Police Force present at the taking of the sample;

and

(b) one must be retained by the medical practitioner and dealt with in accordance with the directions of the person from whom it was taken.

(5) Nothing in this section absolves a person from the obligation imposed by section 30d (1).

Evidence, etc.

30f. (1) Without affecting the admissibility of evidence that might be given otherwise than in pursuance of this section, evidence may be given, in any proceedings for an offence against section 26 (3), of the concentration of alcohol indicated as being present in the blood of the defendant by a breath analysing instrument operated by a person authorised to operate the instrument by the Commissioner of Police and, where the requirements and procedures in relation to breath analysing instruments and breath analysis under this Act, including subsections (3) and (4), and under any other Act or regulations have been complied with, it will be presumed, in the absence of proof to the contrary, that the concentration of alcohol so indicated was present in the blood of the defendant at the time of the analysis and throughout the period of two hours immediately preceding the analysis.

(2) In any proceedings for an offence against section 26 (3), no evidence can be adduced in rebuttal of the presumption created by subsection (1) except evidence of the concentration of alcohol in the blood of the defendant as indicated by analysis of a sample of blood taken and dealt with in accordance with section 30e or 30g.

(3) As soon as practicable after a person has submitted to an analysis of breath by means of a breath analysing instrument, the person operating the instrument must deliver to the person whose breath has been analysed a statement in writing specifying—

(a) the concentration of alcohol indicated by the analysis to be present in the blood expressed in grams in 100 millilitres of blood;

and

(b) the date and time of the analysis.

(4) Where a person has submitted to an analysis of breath by means of a breath analysing instrument and the concentration of alcohol indicated as being present in the blood of that person by the breath analysing instrument is the prescribed concentration of alcohol, the person operating the instrument must forthwith—

(a) inform that person of the right pursuant to section 30e to have a sample of blood taken by a medical practitioner;

and

(b) warn that person that, if he or she does not exercise that right, it may be conclusively presumed for the purposes of proceedings for an offence against section 26 (3) that the concentration of alcohol in the blood during the period of two hours preceding the analysis was the concentration as indicated by the breath analysing instrument.

(5) In proceedings for an offence against section 26 (3), a certificate—

(a) purporting to be signed by the Commissioner of Police and to certify that a person named in the certificate is authorised by the Commissioner of Police to operate breath analysing instruments;

or

(b) purporting to be signed by a person authorised under subsection (1) and to certify that—

(i) the apparatus used by the authorised person was a breath analysing instrument within the meaning of this Act;

(ii) the breach analysing instrument was in proper order and was properly operated;

and

(iii) in relation to the breach analysing instrument, the provisions of this Act and of any other Act or regulations with respect to breath analysing instruments were complied with,

is, in the absence of proof to the contrary, proof of the matters so certified.

(6) A certificate purporting to be signed by a member of the Police Force and to certify that an apparatus referred to in the certificate is or was of a kind approved under the Road Traffic Act 1961, for the purpose of performing alcotests is, in the absence of proof to the contrary, proof of the matter so certified.

(7) A certificate purporting to be signed by a member of the Police Force and to certify that a person named in the certificate submitted to an alcotest on a specified day and at a specified time and that the alcotest indicated that the prescribed concentration of alcohol may then have been present in the blood of that person is, in the absence of proof to the contrary, proof of the matters so certified.

(8) Subject to subsection (10), in proceedings for an offence against section 26 (3), a certificate purporting to be signed by an analyst, certifying as to the concentration of alcohol, or any drug, found in a specimen of blood identified in the certificate expressed in grams in 100 millilitres of blood is, in the absence of proof to the contrary, proof of the matters so certified.

(9) Subject to subsection (10), in proceedings for an offence against section 26 (3), a certificate purporting to be signed by a person authorised under subsection (1) and to certify that—

(a) a sample of the breath of a person named in the certificate was furnished for analysis in a breath analysing instrument;

(b) a concentration of alcohol expressed in grams in 100 millilitres was indicated by that breath analysing instrument as being present in the blood of that person on the day and at the time stated in the certificate;

(c) a statement in writing required by subsection (3) was delivered in accordance with that subsection;

and

(d) the person named in the certificate was informed and warned of the matters referred to in subsection (4) in accordance with that subsection,

is, in the absence of proof to the contrary, proof of the matters so certified.

(10) A certificate referred to in subsection (8) or (9) cannot be received as evidence in proceedings for an offence against section 26 (3)—

(a) unless a copy of the certificate proposed to be put in evidence at the trial of a person for the offence has, not less than seven days before the commencement of the trial, been served on that person;

(b) if the person on whom a copy of the certificate has been served under paragraph *(a)* has, not less than two days before the commencement of the trial, served written notice on the complainant requiring the attendance at the trial of the person by whom the certificate was signed;

or

(c) if the court, in its discretion, requires the person by whom the certificate was signed to attend at the trial.

Insertion of heading

16b. The following heading is inserted immediately before section 31 of the principal Act:

DIVISION III—MISCELLANEOUS

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

These amendments relate to offences in relation to exceeding alcohol limits. The amendments originally moved by the member for Chaffey referred to a number of sections in the Road Traffic Act. These provisions are now spelt out and will become part of the Boating Act. The provisions will be part of the Act and thus people who buy the Act will be able to refer to those provisions and will not have to buy another Act of the Parliament to find out details of

these provisions and what penalties apply if they are breached. I urge the Committee to support the amendments.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: As the Minister has said, these amendments include the details of section 47 of the Road Traffic Act. These provisions will now be incorporated into the Boating Act. When the Boating Act Amendment Bill was before the House of Assembly previously the Minister indicated that he agreed with the principle of the amendments that I put forward at that time but that he thought the full details of the requirements of the Road Traffic Act relating to .08 blood alcohol content should be included in the legislation. Consequently, the Opposition totally supports the amendments, as they relate to the Opposition's original amendments to the legislation.

Mr LEWIS: Having been the first member of this place to have advocated the inclusion of these provisions in the Boating Act, so far as I am aware, I am naturally happy to support not only the amendments originally put by the member for Chaffey but, more particularly, the more fulsome provisions to be placed in the Boating Act as they otherwise appear in the Road Traffic Act. The Minister's comments were not quite correct in one respect, in his suggesting that by including all the relevant provisions of the Road Traffic Act in this legislation, as per the amendments suggested by the other place, we will no longer need to refer to the Road Traffic Act. Even though this is a minor detail, we find that on three occasions the legislation refers to the Road Traffic Act as being the source of authority or definition in relation to the words 'alcotest', 'analyst' and 'breath analysing instrument'.

I am sure that members of the general public, like myself, the Minister, the member for Chaffey, and other honourable members, will, nonetheless, know that generally those definitions relate to the relevant pieces of apparatus used to test blood alcohol levels and the consequences of that use. I do not make any big deal of this; it is a fine point that I believe should be on the record because, believe it or not, I believe in being precise, where possible. Should a person commit an offence, and want to refer precisely to legislation, that person will now know that it will be necessary to look at both the Boating Act and the Road Traffic Act.

There is also another reference to the Road Traffic Act in new section 30d (6), in relation to complying with directions of a member of the Police Force. However, like all members of the Opposition, I support the amendments. These provisions are long overdue, and I hope that this will enable us to get rid of the people who over-indulge in alcohol, deliberately or not, and thereby endanger not only themselves but the lives and safety of others, as well as the safety of property belonging to others. To so endanger other people is irresponsible. It deserves the kind of condemnation which it will now receive through the law. The simplicity with which offences of this kind can be identified and detected is now assured by the inclusion of this provision.

Mr OSWALD: I refer to new section 30b. In principle, I support this piece of legislation enthusiastically, but I seek an assurance from the Minister. I do not expect my question to be answered today, but I would like the Minister to go back to his department and research the point that I am about to raise so that, if we need to tidy up this measure, he can bring back the Bill later. I refer to the two-hour provision. Under the Road Traffic Act when someone is apprehended for drink driving and has blown in the bag it is easy for them to say that they want a blood test. The police can get to a hospital fairly quickly, and certainly within two hours.

I do not want to see a situation where people on the Murray River, when apprehended by the police doing spot checks, are able to escape the law, through a loophole, when they are obviously over the limit. A person might blow into the bag and then ask for a blood test. By the time the police get them to an approved place for testing, more than two hours could have passed; or if the prescribed time has passed, the result of the blood test could be within the legal limit whereas, if they had arrived at a hospital quickly enough, the level would have been higher.

I want to make sure that the two-hour provision cannot be abused because of the distance from the river or any other recreational area where a person might be apprehended by the police. Because of this possible loophole, they can seek a blood test and by the time the offender gets to a hospital, especially in the Coorong or somewhere on the Murray, the blood alcohol level would have dropped below the level at which a conviction is obtained. Although I do not expect an answer to this query today, I would be happy for the Minister to obtain a legal opinion to determine whether this loophole exists. If it does, we can soon fix it.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: As to the last matter raised by the member for Morphett, when this amendment was agreed to by the Government a series of clauses similar to provisions in the Road Traffic Act were listed in the Bill that went to the Legislative Council. In discussions with the member for Chaffey at the time I indicated my objection to transposing clause numbers. I prefer them to be written out, as is the case here. The problem that the member for Morphett has raised is similar to the problem that police officers have on some country roads.

My knowledge of the Coorong and the Murray suggests that one could drive to a medical practitioner within two hours. The problem outlined by the member for Morphett is exactly the same as that experienced by police officers in remote areas like the Eyre Highway, the road to Alice Springs and perhaps the road to Melbourne. I will have my staff check to see whether that is a problem. Where this offence is likely to be detected, I do not think that there would be any great difficulty in getting to a medical practitioner to have blood drawn and put in appropriate capsules for transportation to a laboratory for analysis.

Motion carried.

ROSEWORTHY AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (COMPANIES, SECURITIES INDUSTRY AND FUTURES INDUSTRY—PENALTY NOTICES) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 November. Page 1584.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): The Opposition supports the proposition. The Bill allows the Corporate Affairs Com-

mission to issue notices in respect of a breach of the Companies Code, acquisition of shares, securities and futures. Each of those areas has a specific Act governing their performance. The general proposition which is now to be uniform throughout Australia is that under this cooperative effort—Commonwealth and State—the State will issue notices for what one would describe as reasonably minor offences. We do not know which offences are actually covered, but we presume that they do not involve an element of criminality.

Those offences will be made available by regulation. It will then be the responsibility of the Corporate Affairs Commission to exercise these expiation notices in the same way as we exercise our expiation notices in South Australia. Members will be aware that the penalty imposed under expiation notices in this State is often half, or in any event less, than the normal maximum fine. For those people who are guilty this method offers a quick and easy way to remove the burden. However, the system is a little more difficult for those who believe they are not guilty.

That matter has been mentioned in this House previously and it is not my intention to proceed with debate along those lines. I would simply say that it allows the State instrumentality to do the work of the Commonwealth. It allows the system to work more effectively because a full prosecution is not required when the amount of money involved is not of great moment, particularly in the field that we are talking about: $2 500, which is not of great consequence. What has been determined by the Commonwealth is that under State law each of these matters will be dealt with quickly, using expiation notices generally for offences of relatively minor nature. The proposition is supported by the Opposition.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Acting Attorney-General): I thank the Opposition for its indication of support for this measure, which allows for much more efficient use of resources within the State Corporate Affairs Commission and within the context of the cooperative arrangements that have been developed in this country with respect to the regulation of companies, securities and capital markets.

The extension of the offences for which penalty notices may be issued will make it possible to further ensure that the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs has the maximum number of options available to him in dealing with summary infringements of the companies and securities legislation. Up to the present, very little use has been made of the penalty notice system as the offences presently prescribed are of a relatively minor character. The extended penalty notice system will enable the Corporate Affairs Commission to deal with these offences quickly and efficiently and also enable some investigating and legal resources to be directed towards more serious offences. I am sure that all members will applaud that redirection of resources.

As the use of a more extensive penalty notice system will no longer involve the present amounts of court time and costs of dealing with such offences, it is expected that the adoption of the extended penalty notice system will alleviate certain pressures on the magistrates court system. As in the case of legislation that was before us yesterday, this Bill will have the effect of reducing the length of court lists in this State.

So, for these reasons this measure has many advantages and will better serve the South Australian community and especially help business in this State, hopefully giving greater confidence to investors in the South Australian private sector. I therefore commend the measure to all honourable members.

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

HIDE, SKIN AND WOOL DEALERS ACT REPEAL BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 November. Page 1584.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): The original legislation was introduced in 1915 with the aim of reducing the illegal disposal of hides, skins and wool, and it has therefore operated for many years. I have no real objection to its repeal, as such action is part of the Government's plan to shed unnecessary Acts from the statute book, and I have no problem with that course of action. However, after inquiring about this Bill, I have a few points that I should like the Minister to consider before this matter is dealt with in another place. These points, which have been raised by an organisation that has a significant interest in the South Australian wool industry, mainly concern the wool tax, which is collected by the Commonwealth Government. The letter from that organisation states:

> We refer to your letter of 16 November 1988 with enclosures and herewith submit our view on the effect of the Bill. In 1976, the Hide Skin and Wool Dealers Act was amended due to changes within the meat processing industry and livestock slaughtered within the metropolitan area as defined by the South Australian Meat Corporation Act. The amendment removed the onerous task of recording the individual brand and earmarks of each skin or hide. Upon consideration of the Act to present trends, we believe recording of Sheep Skins—Regulation 4 (1) *(c)* (i) and Hides—Regulation 4 (1) *(c)* (ii) now serves a useless purpose.
>
> In relation to Wool regulation 4 (1) *(c)* (iii), this portion of legislation retains a useful purpose when a preferable wool lien under the provisions of the Stock Mortgages and Wool Liens Act is contravened, or when notice of possible conversion should be given to a licensed wool dealer, thereby preventing a mortgagor from committing an offence which could be civil or criminal depending on the relevant circumstances. We suggest the Hide Skin and Wool Dealers Act be amended to the 'Wool Dealers Act' for control and issue of wool dealing licence, recording of transaction as in regulation 4 (1) *(c)* (iii), and as prevention to theft or misappropriation of encumbered wool whereby the rural industry retains an asset which is acceptable to financial institutions in approving financial loans to rural members of the community.

I understand that there is a requirement that ensures that persons dealing in wool pay a tax to the Commonwealth Wool Commission. As the current tax is about $80 a bale and as over 600 000 bales of wool is disposed of in South Australia each year, up to $60 million is involved. I ask the Minister to consider the comments put to me by the organisation in its letter to ensure that we are not opening any loopholes that would prevent the Australian Wool Commission from collecting the wool tax, which is used for promotion and other activities beneficial to the industry. I support the measure.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Agriculture): I thank the honourable member for bringing those matters to my attention and I shall be pleased to take them up. Certainly, my advice both from the department and from the industry, especially from those people engaged in the commercial aspects of the industry, is that the provisions of the Bill, including the repeal of the original legislation from the statute book will have no detrimental impact.

If the honourable member will give me a copy of the letter that he read, I will certainly take up these matters and have them investigated immediately, because I would not want in any way to do anything that would affect the funds used for development and market research in the industry.

Such a result would be of concern to all those engaged in the industry and to anyone concerned with the wellbeing of the economy as a whole.

I thank the honourable member for bringing this matter to my attention and I hope that it has been addressed in all the discussions that have taken place with the Chamber of Commerce, the independent wool dealers, the private treaty wool merchants, the sheepskin export packers, and the United Farmers and Stockowners, all of whom were consulted during the process of drafting this Bill. I thank the Opposition for its support of the Bill.

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

[*Sitting suspended from 4.1 to 5.43 p.m.*]

STATUTES AMENDMENT (WORKERS REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 16 (clause 2)—Leave out 'Subject to subsection (2), this' and insert 'This'.

No. 2. Page 1, lines 18 and 19 (clause 2)—Leave out subclause (2).

No. 3. Page 1, lines 27 and 28 (clause 4)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert:

4. Section 60 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by striking out subsections (3) and (4) and substituting the following subsections:.

No. 4. Page 2, lines 2 and 3 (clause 4)—Leave out paragraph *(b)* and insert new paragraph as follows:

(b) the Corporation is satisfied—

(i) that the employer or the employers constituting the group have reached a standard that, in the opinion of the Corporation, must be achieved before conferral of exempt status can be considered;

and

(ii) that in all the circumstances it is appropriate to do so,.

No. 5. Page 2, line 7 (clause 4)—Leave out 'should have regard to' and insert 'will have regard to such matters that the Corporation considers relevant, together with each of'.

No. 6. Page 2, lines 22 and 23 (clause 4)—Leave out paragraph *(h)*.

No. 7. Page 2, lines 24 and 25 (clause 4)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 8. Page 2 (clause 4)—After line 25 insert the following:

and

(b) by inserting after subsection (5) the following subsection:

(5a) Where application is made to the Corporation for the renewal of the registration of an employer or group of employers under this section, the Corporation cannot, in determining whether to grant the renewal, consider the effect that registration of the employer or group as an exempt employer or group of exempt employers has on the Compensation Fund.

No. 9. Page 5, lines 12 to 15 (clause 9)—Leave out the clause.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I shall make one or two brief comments. We in the Opposition are not satisfied with the outcome in the other place, although it is a better result than was the original proposition. We are delighted that the retrospectivity clause has been taken out under proper pressure applied by the Opposition and the press, with the support of the Democrats. That is one of the positive features of the amendments before us.

I am not satisfied with the second item because, whilst it does make quite clear that the effect on the fund cannot be taken into consideration, the corporation has a very wide-ranging ambit to have regard to such matters as it considers relevant. That may indeed take it into unchartered waters, and may be the basis for preventing a worthwhile employer from leaving the scheme.

We have reached a compromise on this issue. It is not one that I am satisfied with, but it puts the issue on a more even footing. The principle had been put in the Bill that we cannot consider the effect on the fund. The principle has been put in the Bill that we shall have regard to the employer's record in safety and rehabilitation, and that remains on the record. The Opposition believes that as much as can be done has been done in the circumstances and we are pleased that the Government has accepted the amendments—and indeed has backed down from the stance that it intended to take when the original measure was presented to the Parliament.

Motion carried.

HIDE, SKIN AND WOOL DEALERS ACT REPEAL BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the sitting of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m.

Motion carried.

DANGEROUS SUBSTANCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 4, lines 9 to 25 (clause 10)—Leave out proposed section 23c and insert new section as follows:

23c. (1) A person to whom an improvement notice or prohibition notice is issued may apply to the President of the Industrial Court to have the notice reviewed by a review committee constituted under the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986.

(2) An application for review must be made within 14 days of the receipt of the notice.

(3) Pending the determination of an application for review under this section, the operation of the notice to which the application relates—

(a) in the case of an improvement notice—is suspended;

(b) in the case of a prohibition notice—continues.

(4) A review committee may, if it thinks fit, make an interim order suspending the operation of a prohibition notice until the matter is resolved.

(5) An order under subsection (4) must be made subject to such conditions as may be necessary to protect the health or safety of any person, or the safety of any property.

(6) Where a prohibition notice has been issued, proceedings under this section must be carried out as a matter of urgency.

(7) The provisions of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986, relating to the procedures and powers of a review committee under that Act extend, with necessary modifications, to proceedings on a review under this section.

No. 2. Page 4, line 26 (clause 10)—Leave out the heading and substitute new heading as follows:

Powers of committee on review

No. 3. Page 4, line 27 (clause 10)—Leave out 'review authority' and insert 'review committee'.

No. 4. Page 4, line 29 (clause 10)—Leave out 'review authority' and insert 'review committee'.

No. 5. Page 4, line 32 (clause 10)—Leave out 'review authority' and insert 'review committee'.

No. 6. Page 4, line 34 (clause 10)—Leave out 'authority' and insert 'committee'.

No. 7. Page 4, line 35 (clause 10)—Leave out 'review authority' and insert 'review committee'.

No. 8. Page 4, line 37 (clause 10)—Leave out 'review authority' twice occurring and substitute, in each case, 'review committee'.

No. 9. Page 4, line 40 (clause 10)—Leave out 'review authority' and insert 'review committee'.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I am absolutely delighted that our amendments have succeeded—it must be Christmas time! These provisions relate to an infinitely sensible arrangement of having matters in dispute involving the issue of improvement and prohibition notices dealt with by an independent authority. The Minister resisted this vigorously during the passage of the legislation in this place, and we are now delighted that the Minister has seen the wisdom of these amendments.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (COMPANIES, SECURITIES INDUSTRY AND FUTURES INDUSTRY—PENALTY NOTICES) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

At 6.8 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 14 February 1989 at 2 p.m.