HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 23 September 1986

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

MILLION MINUTES OF PEACE

The House observed one minute's silence in acknowledgment of the International Year of Peace.

PETITIONS: ELECTRONIC GAMING DEVICES

Petitions signed by 156 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to permit the use of electronic gaming devices were presented by Mr P.B. Arnold and Ms Gayler.

Petitions received.

PETITION: TUMBY BAY KINDERGARTEN

A petition signed by 519 residents of Eyre Peninsula praying that the House urge the Government to upgrade staff allocations at Tumby Bay kindergarten was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

PETITION: COUNTRY DOCTORS

A petition signed by 130 residents of Eyre Peninsula praying that the House urge the Government to introduce measures to encourage more general practitioners to country areas, particularly the Eyre Peninsula region, was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

PETITION: SUNNYSIDE CONSERVATION PARK

A petition signed by 136 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Minister for Environment and Planning to reject any applications to develop recreational facilities and activities in the vicinity of the Sunnyside Conservation Park was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

PETITION: GLENELG MAGISTRATES COURT

A petition signed by 1 059 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to reinstate the magistrates court at Glenelg was presented by Mr Oswald.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 19, 20, 22, 124, 133, 145, 147, 152, and 170; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

TRANSPHERE (SOUTH PACIFIC) PTY LTD

In reply to **Mr GROOM** (6 August).

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The dispute between Transphere (South Pacific) Pty Ltd and the honourable member's constituent is not a consumer matter but a dispute between two businesses. Nevertheless, officers of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs have made some inquiries in relation to the matter and have obtained copies of the documents involved. It appears that the documents used by Transphere (South Pacific) Pty Ltd may breach section 4 of the Unauthorised Documents Act 1916. Consequently, copies of the documents, together with other information that has been provided to the department, have been forwarded to the Commissioner of Police for examination.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

In reply to the **Hon. B.C. EASTICK** (13 August).

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: An extra $9 million of expenditure authority is required in the Supply period to enable the Government's debt servicing arrangements with SAFA with respect to welfare housing loans to be brought into line with the arrangements which apply for other loans. Payments to SAFA in respect of welfare housing loans will be made quarterly instead of annually in June. This change represents a further step in the process of simplifying debt servicing arrangements in the public sector. The requirement for a further $6 million reflects the fact that, in 1986-87, the Government must pay interest on its 1985-86 borrowings. During the 1985-86 Supply period those borrowings had not been made and so the Government's obligations to make interest payments were correspondingly lower. No part of the $6 million is due to unplanned borrowings.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Department of the Premier and Cabinet—Report, 1985-86.

By the Minister of State Development and Technology (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Small Business Corporation of South Australia—Report, 1985-86.

Rules of Court—Supreme Court—Supreme Court Act 1935—

Judgment Debtor Interest.

General Rules, 1987.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Highways Department—Report, 1985-86.

Local Government Finance Authority Act 1983—Regulation—Prescribed Body (Amendment).

Corporation of Brighton—By-law No. 1—Bathing and Controlling the Foreshore.

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Betting Control Board—Report, 1985-86.

QUESTION TIME

DEFERRED ANNUITIES

Mr OLSEN: Can the Premier say on what date SAFA issued its deferred annuity to raise $100 million?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As I understand it, the transaction was entered into on 22 August 1986.

ADELAIDE ARCHITECTURE

Ms GAYLER: Is there anything that the Minister for Environment and Planning can do to expose the deplorable standard of some Adelaide architecture as evidenced at the new Penfolds Magill residential subdivision, and to protect the freedom of speech of the few Adelaide architects prepared to speak out against the domestic and commercial architectural atrocities being imposed on our city? I was advised on the weekend to see the so-called top of the market houses being built on prime dress circle land at Skye. It has been put to me by people who also saw the housing recently built there that the architects concerned ought to be 'bricked in' during the construction process. The housing has been described to me as showing no sensitivity to the Australian climate, including mock Australiana, a bungalow with the most crass, obtrusive Roman columns and other blots on the landscape bearing no sensible relationship with the lie of the land in spite of earlier proposals for residential design guidelines for the site. Meanwhile, architect Hamish Ramsay has been—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms GAYLER: —challenged by the Architects Board on the ground of professional misconduct for writing a letter to the Editor of the *Advertiser*, pointing out that:

> Architects can do only what their clients will pay for, and that city plans are in place as much to control their clients' greed as the architects' megalomania—

which is a quote from the September *Adelaide Review* article headed, 'Our Own Little Soviet'. Mr Ramsay's letter followed letters to the Editor by Professor Jon Cooper and architect John Chappel, each arguing for greater freedom for architects to do what takes their fancy to Adelaide's environment.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I must say that I find the honourable member's revelations about Mr Ramsay really quite astounding. I would have thought that the exercise entered into by his profession on this occasion is very ill conceived indeed. I would hope that wiser counsel will eventually prevail, because it is very—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: —important that there should be the maximum freedom of discussion in relation to the appropriate types of built form which should grace our city, lest instead we get built form which in fact does not grace the city but rather is somewhat of an outrage. I think what the honourable member has shared with the House is an indication that it is important that there be proper planning controls and that architects, no more than any other people, should be allowed purely to do their own thing when it comes to development. As I understand it, there is a system of encumbrances which operate in relation to this subdivision. It is a system of encumbrances the control of which is in the hands of Burnside council rather than with the developer. It has always been one of the problems in the past that sometimes a developer has gone out of business and 10 years down the track there is no longer the capacity to be able to administer the encumbrances properly.

Nonetheless, it is always the case that a system of encumbrances cannot adequately address some of these problems, so those commentators (and some of them are well placed in the community) who argue for an open slather for architects, particularly within the City of Adelaide, should be instructed by the perhaps unfortunate example that is facing us from the eastern suburbs at present.

DEFERRED ANNUITIES

Mr OLSEN: I direct a question to the Premier. In seeking his approval to issue a deferred annuity for $100 million, did SAFA raise with the Premier the tax implications of this scheme? In this House last Thursday, the Premier said that SAFA 'acts entirely within the spirit and letter of the relevant taxation laws'. However, the Federal Treasurer, through his action last Friday night in closing off this loophole, has taken the opposite point of view. His ruling is that this scheme, by which South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales intended to raise more than $400 million and, in so doing, minimise the tax obligations of those investors providing the funds, amounted to a form of tax evasion.

The Premier's involvement in such a scheme can be contrasted with the many statements he made in 1982 about tax evasion. For example, in a press statement on 30 August 1982, as Opposition Leader, he said:

> As much as $6 billion has been lost nationally to revenue by tax avoidance and evasion. Can the Premier say categorically that South Australia is in no way involved?

While under the former Liberal Government, South Australia was in no way involved. We have been involved in tax evasion under this Government and the Premier owes the House and the public an explanation for his hypocrisy.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: First, I stand by the statement I made that was quoted by the Leader of the Opposition. I do not agree with the Federal Treasurer that the transaction was in any way out of order.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is interesting that members opposite, who have been braying about the iniquities of the Federal Government, have now suddenly discovered that they are very closely aligned in policy and attitude with Mr Keating. Well, I act for South Australia and in South Australia's interest, and I will—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —not, simply because someone in Canberra has a particular view of a particular transaction, suddenly discover that we are in error or in some sort of moral danger. It is interesting to note that the Opposition has suddenly discovered this. Secondly, I made clear, as I have done throughout, that the transaction that was entered into not only in this case in relation to SAFA but also by other financial institutions (including, I understand, a Federal Government financial institution) was seen as a perfectly legitimate method of financing. SAFA is a tax exempt body. In fact, the deferred annuity system involves the payment of taxation: it involves the deferral of the obligation, but it does not affect—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —SAFA in any way. At any time, the Federal Government or the Federal Treasurer—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —is able to say that certain kinds of transactions are transactions that he does not wish to see carried out. In fact, the law encouraged such transactions prior to the Federal Treasurer's announcement. If we read the words he used, we see that he did not say out

of hand that it was something that should be abolished or that it was a loophole. What he said in his statement—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —was that this matter had been drawn to his attention, I am pleased to say, not only by the Leader of the Opposition and his friends, who are great supporters of SAFA in South Australia, but also by the Victorian Parliament. Incidentally, it was members opposite who talked about collusion in this matter (and there was only one level of collusion, I suggest). The Federal Treasurer pointed out that he would need to examine the matter and, if his examination suggested that he did not wish to see this practice continued, it would cease as from 8 p.m. on Friday. That is fine. We will adhere to that. The Commonwealth Government has a right to make such pronouncements, whether we agree or disagree with them.

In conclusion, my views have not changed from those I had in 1982. I do not condone or support tax fraud and tax evasion. However, what I do say in relation to the South Australian Government Financing Authority is that, if legitimate instruments are available to improve its effectiveness, then we will take advantage of it. I would be derelict in my duty to South Australia if I said otherwise.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is fairly tolerant towards some minor infringements. However, there are three matters on which the Chair will be fairly unbending: first, members shall be clearly heard when they have the call to speak and shall not be shouted down; secondly, the business of the House shall be expeditiously conducted in a reasonably orderly and dignified fashion; and, thirdly, the authority of the Chair shall be upheld at all times. I warn members that if they transgress in any of those three areas they do so at their peril.

TORRENS LAKE POLLUTION

Mr DUIGAN: Has the Minister of Water Resources seen the reports concerning the natural and man-made pollution that has occurred in the Torrens Lake over the past few days? Can any action be taken by the Minister or his department to control the entry of this unsightly mess into our city? Recently I have received a number of queries about actions that could be taken, either by the Government or the Adelaide City Council, to prevent the Torrens Lake becoming impassable and unnavigable, and to increase the deterrents to the haphazard and indiscriminate disposal of cardboard and plastic drink containers.

It has been put to me that one measure to control the unsightly mess and assist council staff to clean up after heavy rains might be for vertical grids to be erected at suitable points along the river prior to its entry into the city, and also, to place grids at the entry point of subsidiary creeks that are serving as stormwater disposal systems. The suggestion is further made that an examination be undertaken of the grid arrangements at stormwater ducts to ensure that water does not pass into the river via that route, laden with cans and bottles.

The other suggestions are related to fines for the disposal of non-returnable containers, usually plastic and cardboard, and whether there is sufficient incentive at present to dispose of them properly. Is there any avenue for these matters to be explored by the E&WS Department with various councils along the river so that the sight we were subjected to last weekend can be avoided in the future and the danger of contamination and disease averted?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have inspected this situation at first hand. On several occasions in the past three weeks when jogging around the Torrens I have noticed the buildup in the amount of material on the water, and I have also noticed today that there has been a considerable cleanup. There is still an area to be looked at down by the weir and I imagine that that has been left for the time being because water is still being let out from the weir. There are also one or two quieter areas, backwaters of the river, where a good deal of material is left.

I think that probably the Adelaide City Council adopted the correct policy in not being premature about a cleanup because, obviously, for as long as there was a heavy run-off into the river then no sooner would it have been cleaned up than it would have been dirty again. We cannot rule out the possibility also of further heavy rains early, say, in October which may necessitate a further cleanup. I will certainly take up the suggestions put by the honourable member in relation to some form of removal of the grosser forms of pollution at points of entry to the river.

I have to agree completely with what Mr Colquhoun said in this morning's *Advertiser* about it being very much a whole of community problem. While some parts of the community look at the Torrens Lake and wring their hands in despair, another part of the community, I guess for the most part not the same people, contributes massively to that problem. Our litter performance in this State, if I can use that term, is good in Australia-wide terms. Of course, it has been assisted considerably by the beverage container legislation we have had in this State now for over 10 years.

Because of changes in technology the beverage container legislation no longer addresses some of the major containers that are used. That is why the Government announced at the last election that at some time during its four-year term it would conduct a fundamental re-examination of the beverage container legislation—not with a view to in any way walking away from the basic thrust of that legislation but to see how it could be restructured to take into account the newer forms of containers such as wax cardboard containers, and so on, which are now very much part of the scheme. In due course I hope to be able to put further information before the House in relation to that matter.

DEFERRED ANNUITIES

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Premier answer this question? Does he stand by the statement he made in the House last Thursday that Loan Council was informed of SAFA's intention to issue a deferred annuity to raise $100 million, in view of the statement by a senior South Australian Treasury source, reported in last Saturday's *Advertiser*, that Mr Keating had not been aware of the scheme? In answering the question, will the Premier undertake to table the advice that was provided to his Federal colleague?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Loan Council was advised.

TOXOPLASMOSIS

Mr ROBERTSON: Can the Minister for Environment and Planning outline to the House any steps being taken by his department to control the spread of *toxoplasmosis* in South Australia and to protect native animal populations from the disease which is carried in the main by feral cats? On the ABC radio documentary *Quantum* recently, it was stated that marsupial populations in the Eastern States of

Australia have been severely affected by the disease *toxoplasmosis*, which affects a number of mammal species.

According to the *Quantum* report, the major vector in transmitting the disease is the feral cat. I therefore ask the Minister what dangers are posed to native animal populations in South Australia and what measures he regards as appropriate to deal with the population of feral cats?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: We need to learn a good deal about *toxoplasmosis*. There is no doubt that the feral cat is a problem in the wild in this State. There is little doubt that, along with the fox, it has probably been the major introduced predator leading to a decline in the numbers of smaller marsupials.

An honourable member: What about the rabbit?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The rabbit is a grazing species which, of course, has also had a devastating impact. In terms of predation, one thinks of the carnivores. It is interesting to note that, in trying to breed up a battong population in this State, it has been necessary for us to go to offshore islands where there are no feral cats and where, free from those predators, it is possible to breed up the species. There have been some experiments in this State. The Warrawong Sanctuary, of course, is a very good example of initiative on the part of the private individual to exclude these feral predators from the natural environment. That has been very successful and there are in that sanctuary some smaller marsupials in considerable numbers that would not be found outside the sanctuary.

In the north of the State in the Flinders Ranges some work has been done by the National Parks and Wildlife Service within my own department. Reports are available from both the Australian National Parks Service and the Victorian people about *toxoplasmosis*. The Keith Turnbull Institute has done some work in this area, but I think that a good deal of work needs to be known. At this stage all we can do is encourage additional research into the problem and, to the limited extent available to us, introduce control programs here for the cat. The feral cat, of all species, must be one of those that is best suited to survival. One imagines that, if this planet was ever so unfortunate that the bomb did go off, a few grasshoppers and cats may be the only survivors.

DEFERRED ANNUITIES

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier table the correspondence or the advice supporting his claim that Loan Council was advised of the scheme alluded to in the earlier question and advice obtained by SAFA indicating that the scheme was not tantamount to dodging tax?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is not usual for the Government to table legal advice that it receives, and I certainly do not intend to do that. Secondly, as to the communication with the Loan Council, these are communications in confidence to the Loan Council. However, I will take advice on whether or not it is appropriate.

BRITANNIA CORNER ROUNDABOUT

Mr FERGUSON: Is the Minister of Transport able to inform the House about an allegation made by the member for Bragg, who said that a 'gross engineering mistake' had been made by those responsible for the design of the roundabout at the Britannia Hotel corner near Rose Park? My question is prompted by a prominent report in the latest *Sunday Mail* in which the member for Bragg was quoted as saying that the roadworks at the Britannia corner constituted a 'gross engineering mistake'. The honourable member was maintaining that the present Government must do 'something' but he did not specify what. He also did not specify where any 'mistake' had been made, or by whom.

The newspaper report to which I have been referring, followed by another report, was said to detail 'black spots' for road accidents in the metropolitan area. This earlier report cited figures said to have been obtained from a body called the Road Safety Council, although I understand that there is no longer such an organisation in South Australia.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his topical question. The shadow Minister would be surprised, and probably delighted, to know that I did read the report in the *Sunday Mail* and listened to him on the Philip Satchell show yesterday morning. It is a pity that he speaks in such emotional terms when he is talking about intersections in Adelaide. It is also a pity that he seeks to make political mileage out of some of our road traffic problems. I am sure that the honourable member was not reflecting upon the Highways Department, so I then assumed that he was reflecting upon the Government.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: If that is the case, as the member for Hanson has just reassured me, the member for Bragg should understand that the intersection was planned and built by the Tonkin Government. The Minister at the time was Michael Wilson. The Opposition has already confirmed that it is the politics of the situation in which they wanted to be involved. The intersection with the eggabout, as described yesterday morning, was designed and built by the previous Government.

The member for Bragg says that he travels through that intersection every day. He has obviously just noticed that there is a problem there. He certainly was not aware of it when he had such close contact with his colleague the previous Minister of Transport, the Hon. Michael Wilson. No-one is saying that that intersection is desirable, but it is the best engineering solution that the Highways Department has been able to devise. There can be other solutions. If the honourable member wants to suggest that we should have grade separation, with the millions of dollars involved in that, that will be an option for a Government in the far distant future, because it is not an option at which this Government would be looking.

The suggestion that this is one of the worst black spots in Adelaide does not have regard for the facts. Certainly, in terms of minor accidents, it has the highest listing. This year, however, the accidents were significantly fewer than last year, although generally they were minor accidents. In terms of accidents involving bodily injury, that intersection is not the most dangerous in the city.

Mr Ingerson: Not yet.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: 'Not yet', says the honourable member. I listened to the radio program on which he appeared yesterday morning, and it seemed to suggest to me that, for these people who use the intersection as regularly as the honourable member does (I do not know how many dents he has in his car), the roundabout is the best solution for the traffic flow if it is used carefully. It was also interesting to hear that most people who say they use the roundabout daily have not noticed any accidents. True, that does not mean that there are not any; there are a number of minor accidents but only minor ones. In the short term, there is no other solution to that roundabout or intersection that will not involve governments in huge amounts of money, but the Highways Department nevertheless monitors traffic flow—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member makes no more sense here today than he did yesterday morning or at the weekend, in the *Mail*—but he keeps on trying. The suggestion made by most people who use the intersection, and this is certainly the advice given to me by the Highways Department, is that there needs to be an improvement in the signage, but there are difficulties in that. Current signage is at grade or ground level, but that does not seem to be as effective as it otherwise might be. Then we would have to look at overhead signing. Several options have already been tried at ground level but, in terms of overhead signs, the department would have to take into consideration the special design and massive supporting structures that would be required. A number of people who would use that road and who might have an interest in that part of Adelaide might regard overhead signs as being visibly objectionable or constituting visual pollution.

Such signs would be expensive and, in any event, that area is now in use for the Grand Prix, and any urgent consideration would have to wait until after the Grand Prix. Nevertheless, that intersection is one that the department and the Government are well aware of. The intersection works effectively in the role required of it. Whilst the member for Bragg says the intersection shows gross mismanagement or is a gross engineering mistake, I do not reflect upon his colleague in that way. I believe it was the best option that was available, and it is the best engineering option. If the member for Bragg has some advice or some reasonable solution—except emotional criticism and political point scoring—we would consider it, and I would forward the proposal to the department for its evaluation.

NUCLEAR WASTE

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say what has changed since 1980 to satisfy him about the Swedish system for the dispoal of nuclear waste? In welcoming the sale of Roxby Downs uranium to Sweden, the Premier has emphasised that Sweden has proven a system for the safe disposal of Nuclear Waste. In fact, to my knowledge this system has been proven for at least eight years. While I was in Sweden in 1980 inspecting the same system, the Premier, then Opposition Leader and violently opposed to Roxby Downs and uranium mining generally, had this to say (and I quote from a press statement of his on 10 November 1980):

> I think that Dr Richard Jones, Head of Environmental Studies at the University of Tasmania, has adequately dealt with Mr Goldsworthy about Sweden. Dr Jones has recently returned from Sweden and he contests Mr Goldsworthy's view that the waste disposal problem has been solved.

The scene in Sweden has not changed. I have visited Sweden and spent much time studying the work it has done on the disposal of nuclear waste. As the only thing that has changed since then has been the Labor Party's attitude on Roxby Downs—as far as the Premier is concerned, anyway, although there have been some other changes in attitude federally that the Premier purports not to share—I invite the Premier to confirm that he was wrong in the statement he made in 1980 and that this is further evidence of his and his Party's hypocrisy on the whole issue.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not confirm that at all. We are some years down the track, and technology is improving all the time. I point out also that, as I understand the position in Sweden, they have decided to phase out their nuclear energy program over a period of years. Whether in fact that takes place and how quickly it takes place, we do not know. At the time I spoke, though, as I recall it—and this would be subject to checking—it was the very time at which these had been debated in Sweden and a referendum had been held taking that very decision. I would have thought, therefore, that it was quite a reasonable proposition for me to make. I also drew attention to the research study which the Deputy Leader says is nonsense, because his investigation—and I am not quite sure what his technical qualifications are in this matter—had concluded that that particular study was wrong. The relativity of safety and hazards systems has obviously improved in the period since. That is not to say that they have successfully overcome the problems: they have not, and further research and work needs to be done.

EMPLOYMENT ADVERTISING PRACTICES

Mrs APPLEBY: Is the Minister of Employment and Further Education aware of the advertising practices of some employers which cause stress and concern to those seeking employment? Yesterday a constituent came to see me, and he was very distressed by certain occurrences when he sought employment. Saturday's *Advertiser* carried an advertisement listing responsibilities and skills required. The advertisement also stated that applicants were to telephone between 9 a.m. and 3.30 p.m. on Monday and speak to a person indicated by name. My constituent telephoned at 9 o'clock, to be told to hold the line. He was then cut off. He telephoned again and was told to leave his name and telephone number and he would be contacted as soon as the line was free. At approximately 10.15 a.m. he telephoned again, as he had not been contacted, and was told that the position had been filled. I telephoned the firm in the afternoon to ascertain if the position had in fact been filled at the time stated, and was told that it had not been. The outcome was that the firm had been inundated with calls and had instructed the switchboard to inform callers that this was the case.

My constituent questions the practice of advertising that people may telephone between 9 a.m. and 3.30 p.m. when in fact this was not the case and, further, to tell an untruth to persons (who had the skills and ability to fulfil the stated requirement) when inquiring and actively seeking employment. Having been confronted with many complaints of this nature, I ask, on behalf of those persons who genuinely seek employment through the 'situations vacant' columns, what can be done to rectify this insensitive practice.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: There are two issues raised in the honourable member's question: first, the fact that the advertisement listed a time from 9 a.m. to 3.30 p.m.; and, secondly, that a constituent ringing between those times was told something that was not in fact true. I guess it is difficult to comment on the first matter, in regard to advertising between 9 a.m. and 3.30 p.m., because the employer may not know when exactly the position will be filled and may want to leave open the opportunity for people to ring right throughout the day, so that somebody who sees the advertisement in the newspaper—say, in the early afternoon—does not automatically think, 'That must be filled because they have stipulated a time; therefore, I won't even bother trying.' I can understand the company saying 'from 9 a.m. to 3.30 p.m.' but I acknowledge that a real problem is created when people are told things that are not necessarily correct. I have also had constituents complain to me about the way that they have been dealt with by some companies in relation to advertisements that they have placed.

I repeat the phrase 'some companies', because in fact the overwhelming majority of companies behave in a most

responsible manner in their employment practices and in terms of advertising positions vacant: they would not condone the activities referred to by the honourable member.

However, this is a problem, because it happens on isolated occasions—and the fact that it happens at all contributes to some people, who are unemployed and desperate for work, finally reaching the conclusion 'what is the use?'. These people do whatever they can to find a job, and jobs are not easy to find in particular areas. They then come across a situation where they are put off from applying for a job on the basis of misinformation. That is what has happened to the honourable member's constituent—misinformation put him off. He asked about a job and was told that a job was not available when in fact there was one available.

As a result of the honourable member's question I propose to do two things. First, privately I will ask the honourable member for the name of the company, so that we can communicate with it to suggest that it advertently or inadvertently (and it might well have been inadvertent—someone down the line might not have appreciated the full situation or might not have known the facts and thought that the job had gone) caused distress to the honourable member's constituent: we will ask the company perhaps to be more cautious in the way it handles these matters on future occasions. More significantly, I will take up with various employer groups what mechanism we could utilise to advise companies that place advertisements in newspapers about some of the problems that may result. I repeat the point that the overwhelming majority of companies handle this matter most appropriately and responsibly, but some companies perhaps do not fully understand the impact of some of the things they do.

I would like to put it at that level, allowing the most generous interpretation, that the company does not understand the great frustration and despair felt by many unemployed. Such an experience for some unemployed people could be much more devastating than the person at the other end of the phone can possibly understand. I will take up this matter with the company to see what we can do in that area. I thank the honourable member for bringing this matter to the attention of members in this place.

TOURISM RESEARCH

Mr S.J. BAKER: Will the Premier explain why—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will not refer to the Minister. Will the Premier explain why a $250 000 research project to identify South Australia's new tourism markets has been awarded to a Sydney based company, rather than to an Adelaide based company, and was the contract awarded within the guidelines laid down by the Premier in a directive to all Ministers in 1984?

The Department of Tourism called for expressions of interest for this contract earlier this year. The biggest South Australian based market research company which has contracts with a number of this State's largest and most respected companies, including the Adelaide Casino, Coca Cola, Mitsubishi and the South Australian Brewing Company, lodged an expression of interest and held informal discussions with the department, but was not placed on the short list or given the opportunity to present a detailed submission in order to receive consideration for the contract.

The company was later informed that the contract had been awarded to a Sydney based company, and further communications with the Minister and the Department of Tourism have yielded no explanation to date. Procedures to be adopted by all Ministers in commissioning market research surveys were set down by the Premier two years ago, and included the following directive:

Proposals are to be obtained from at least three appropriately qualified and experienced individuals or firms.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not aware of the matters to which the honourable member refers, so I will obtain a report.

OPERATION NOAH

Mr RANN: Will the Minister of Emergency Services inform the House whether the anti-drug phone-in, Operation NOAH, will be held this year, and will he report on the results of the national NOAH held late last year?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Whenever I hear that name I am reminded of the passage that was obviously omitted from the Book of Genesis that they could not play cards on the Ark because Noah was sitting on the deck! It is true that the South Australian Police Force, in conjunction with other State and Territory police forces, will be planning an Operation NOAH for Wednesday 19 November this year. The detail of the times when the lines actually will be open will be released shortly.

I know there has been some criticism of Operation NOAH in the past, and I think that that probably relates to some misunderstanding of the way in which NOAH is to operate. We are not here into victim blaming or victim punishing. We are trying as strongly as we possibly can to get at those who are involved in the trafficking of illegal drugs, in particular, heroin, cocaine and amphetamines.

It is our desire that we should build on what has occurred in the past. Members will also be aware that the thrust of the national program in relation to drugs seeks to focus not simply on those drugs which are illegal but also those legally sanctioned drugs which, if one looks at the overall statistics, have a considerable, in fact, a devastating impact on the costs that have to be borne by the community in terms of health and medical programs—I refer to tobacco and alcohol and, I guess, to a lesser extent, to caffeine.

This is very much a broad sociological problem; it relates to those social forces that induce us to become a drug oriented society. A good deal of the information that has come forward in relation to Operation NOAH and the Commonwealth-State drug programs gives us a clearer picture of perhaps some of the tentative ways in which we might be able to address some of those broader programs.

I would like to thank the honourable member for indicating to me earlier today that he would be seeking this information, because in the short time available I have been able to obtain some information for him and the House in relation to the 1985 Operation NOAH program. In South Australia at that time there were 1 160 phone calls and 853 follow-up investigations arising from these calls. The remainder were treated as intelligence reports. There were 114 persons arrested or reported on a total of 169 drug offences. Drugs with an estimated street value of approximately $876 000 were seized, including quantities of cocaine, heroin and amphetamines.

Nationally 12 070 calls were received resulting in 886 arrests or reports and the seizure of drugs with an estimated street value of $7 million. In relation to the widely reported concerns about the substance 'crack', I can indicate that to this date there have been no reports of crack in this State to the police or health authorities. Of course, that does not mean that there may not be some in the State and involved in the drug abuse scene.

RADIO STATION 5AA

Mr INGERSON: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport confirm that radio station 5AA incurred a trading loss of $1.35 million last financial year? Will its performance require an injection of public money to bail the station out of its serious financial trouble?

Despite optimistic statements by the Government and the board at the time of the TAB's takeover of 5AA, its performance has not matched expectations. On 21 February 1984 the former Minister of Recreation and Sport described the takeover as an 'exciting move' and the General Manager of the TAB, Mr B. Smith, said in the *News* a week later (on 29 February):

We still want to make a decent profit out of the station.

However, since the takeover, 5AA has slipped from second to last in the commercial station ratings, and last year's trading result shows it is losing almost $4 000 a day. In asking the Minister what is the Government's attitude to 5AA's financial performance, I point out that any injection of public funds to bail it out could have implications for the retention of its licence, which depends on the station remaining an independent operation.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: As I have pointed out to the House on numerous occasions, as did the former Minister, the link between the Government and radio station 5AA is one that is purely through the TAB, and the Minister has no direct responsibility or accountability in relation to radio station 5AA. As a consequence, it is a matter for the TAB to manage and, as the former Minister behind me has indicated, it is a commercial operation which is accountable and responsible to the TAB. As members know, the former Minister and the Attorney-General made submissions to the Australian Broadcasting Control Tribunal and, as a consequence, we know that that linkage is a responsibility for the TAB.

Mr Ingerson: Are you responsible?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Yes, I am responsible for the TAB.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Obviously members opposite are not familiar with the legal nuances that relate to the relationship between the TAB, 5AA and the Minister as such. It has been explained to members opposite on numerous occasions but, obviously, they cannot, or do not want to, understand that relationship. In relation to 5AA, the TAB report was tabled last week on my behalf by the Minister of Labour. The report referred to the performance of 5AA in the notes attached to the accounts. I have spoken to the Chairman of the TAB regarding that situation and he has assured me that the TAB is fully aware of what is happening in relation to the operation of 5AA. The Chairman has assured me that management and accounting mechanisms have been put in place to ensure that the situation with 5AA is certainly managed and controlled and that the benefits that 5AA brings to the racing industry in this State continue.

I think it is important to note the situation in relation to racing. As members would be aware, the report tabled indicates that last year there was a growth of just under 10 per cent in the overall turnover. In comparison, in terms of cost operation—that is, the revenue cost relationship—the turnover to the TAB and the profit return on that represents a figure of about 18.47 per cent growth. That indicates that for the past year the TAB performance and operation as a management organisation has been excellent.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Outstanding.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Yes, outstanding. Of course, it involves two important factors: first, there has been a tight economic situation which has affected most gambling sports throughout the State. We have seen that occur as a consequence of economic effects that are being reflected in the general economy as well as in this industry in particular. Secondly, there is no doubt that the opening of the Casino has had an effect. I am not sure how large that effect has been. To some extent I think the effect of the Casino has been over magnified and exaggerated, but I am sure that it has had some effect on the gambling dollar. In view of that, and in view of the overall performance of the TAB, one can only highlight how well the TAB has done.

In talking to the Chairman and making my own assessment (and I am sure that members would make their own assessment in relation to 5AA), it is very important to note that part of the overall support the TAB has received has come about as a consequence of the operation of the racing information that has been provided to the South Australian community by 5AA. The comments made to me by very keen punters—not the two bob punters like myself—acknowledge that the coverage supplied by 5AA (and the shadow Minister has agreed with this) has been excellent. From my limited knowledge of radio programming and formats, I can see that there has been a major change away from the original format presented to the community by 5AA and that now 5AA presents a great deal of racing. I think that aspect is important to note and must be taken into account when looking at the overall function of the radio station.

My assessment is that a cost factor has been involved in relation to establishing that information service for the community. Hopefully, that cost factor will see a major redress in the next financial year. In summary, certainly, I am concerned in relation to the overall performance, and I know that the Chairman of the TAB is also concerned. However, comments from the TAB to me have been qualified and I qualify my comments to the House when I say that the overall impact and support given to racing in this State by 5AA has been very important. It must be balanced against whatever costs have been incurred in the TAB's initiating this service to the community.

ROYAL SHOW BAGS

Mr TYLER: Will the Minister of State Development and Technology, representing the Minister responsible for children's services, approach organisers of the Royal Adelaide Show and draw their attention to the fact that no fewer than 10 show bags at this year's show contained material symbolising violence? I have been approached by a number of parents in my electorate who have been alarmed that show bags designed for sale to children and containing material that symbolises aggression and violence were available at this year's Royal Adelaide Show. I am told that swords, daggers and guns were commonplace whilst one show bag even contained a replica M16 rifle. My constituents consider that it is an unfortunate paradox that on the one hand Governments, churches and community leaders are doing much to promote peace in our International Year of Peace and, on the other hand, people are selling commando and Rambo kits to young children.

Mr Meier interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In answer to the first part of the question, I certainly will refer it to the Minister of Education for him to take up with the organisers of the Royal Show. In indicating my preparedness to take up the

matter, as a parent I found a similar situation when my wife and I took our five children to the show. After spending 2½ hours going to the other exhibits at the show and, having listened to repeated requests by one or other of the five children as to when they were going to get their show bags, we encountered another problem. A series of difficulties occurred.

The difficulty with my daughters was not so apparent, because there were not that many show bags which they had chosen and to which my wife and I took objection. There were one or two with things in them about which we were not happy. We bought one, not realising at the time that a problem existed, but later discovering that a watch contained therein easily fell apart revealing batteries that could have posed a poison problem. That matter has been publicly identified previously, and I hope that it is drawn to the attention of show organisers to ensure that products do not easily fall apart. Mercury batteries are not a safe product. That was not a problem for the girls, because with other bags that they chose we were able to exercise the right of choice of parents.

With the bags that my sons were eager to choose, the situation was not such a happy one. We found that we as parents did not have a right of choice offered to us. The member for Goyder indicates that many of those items are available in the stores. However, other items are available in stores, and the right of parents to choose other toys is still available. However, we did not find that to be so with the show bags. We had an ironic choice available to us and found ourselves in a position of encouraging our sons towards bags containing lots of sweets and lollies, whereas we usually spend a lot of our time trying to discourage the consumption of these products. No member would challenge the right of a parent to exercise that right of choice.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: That was the only choice that we had. Amongst other products, there were many representations of weapons in most of the bags that my sons had initially exhibited some interest in choosing. We had to go to the least common denominator, rejecting swords, guns, shields and various representations of instruments of war. The best that we could go for was something similar to bondage, where there was a set of handcuffs in one of the bags. I then spent the next five hours, after my son had broken the keys to the handcuffs, trying to release him.

I believe that many parents do wish to exercise for their children the right of choice over products with which their children have contact. Whilst I do not wish to take away the right of parents to choose materials available on sale, many of us would rather not have our children in constant contact with representations of instruments of violence, unlike the member for Mitcham, who said that he had six guns when he was a child. Those of us who did not have that situation were not offered that right of choice.

Also, as a parent, I would appreciate my colleague's bringing this matter to the notice of the Royal Show organisers in the hope that they can put that request to the people making these bags. This is an important matter and it is not something that is quite so superficial as members opposite would have us believe. There is something there that parents would like addressed, I believe.

ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATIONS

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Transport include grape harvesters in recent amendments to regulations under the Road Traffic Act? A mechanical grape harvesting contractor in the Riverland has been served a summons by the Highways Department on the grounds that the low loader and grape harvester have a combined overall height of 4.44 metres. However, recent amendments provide for a height of 4.6 metres for specified loads. In a letter I have received, the contractor states:

We have for seven years operated a contract grape harvesting business in the Riverland—without incident. During this time, we have frequently passed over the Springcart Gully weigh station whilst carrying our grape harvesters. We have had a good relationship with the operators, and have tried very hard to operate within the law. At no stage has anyone ever suggested that our machines or low loader were too high. We have never hit any overhead wires, and, as far as I know, have not come near them.

On the day previous to the offence, officers of the Highways Department routinely weighed the truck and then wanted to see the wide load permit. After ascertaining that a permit was not required, the truck was allowed to proceed. However, the next day the truck was pulled in again and measured for height. As the summons says, it was 0.14 m too high—

that is about 5½ inches—

The officer suggested that we let the tyres down. It is possible to get a permit for over height for one week trips, but it requires a lead car, and this is totally impractical. The season lasts nearly three months. Why, after all this time, when we have spent a good deal of money to ensure that all is legal, does someone come up with another obstacle? To comply with the law, we would need to change trailers. A new trailer would be $25 000 plus. Machine grape harvesting has become an economic necessity in grape growing areas, and I seek your assistance in ensuring that common sense prevails.

Will the Minister look at this matter in the hope that common sense will prevail?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. An enormous amount of work is being done within the Permit Section of the Highways Department and by the Commercial Transport Advisory Committee concerning dimensions and load tonnages, etc., for motor vehicles. I am aware of the matter that the honourable member raises because he indicated privately to me that he would be doing so.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: That was about citrus bin trailers.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: That was another issue. The honourable member has raised the question of a citrus bin trailers with me privately, and this is another problem that they have in the Riverland. I will refer the question to the Commissioner of Highways for an urgent report to the honourable member.

BUILDERS LICENSING ACT

Mr M.J. EVANS: Will the Minister of State Development and Technology, representing the Attorney-General, seek an assurance from his collegue the Attorney-General that the Builders Licensing Act 1986, will be brought into operation as a matter of urgency? When this measure was approved by the Parliament earlier this year, the Attorney-General indicated that it was his firm intention to have the legislation operational by 1 September 1986. That deadline has come and gone, and the Act remains unproclaimed.

Members of the industry, who are concerned to ensure that the consumer is able to obtain the significant additional protection which the new Act gives them, have expressed very real fears to me that the Act will not now come into effect until February 1987, at the earliest. It has been put to me by those close to the industry that one of the major contributing factors in this delay is the failure of the H.I.A. to establish a sound indemnity insurance scheme and, if this is the case, there is ample cause for the Government to promote the establishment of an alternative indemnity

fund outside the reach of the H.I.A., in order to ensure the immediate implementation of the Act.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question. Certainly, I will have the matter referred to the Attorney-General for an urgent response. The matters raised are of concern to any member who has in his or her constituency people who are building houses, and that certainly would apply to every member in this place. As soon as I have a response, I will inform the House.

STATE SUPPLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time allotted for—

(a) completion of the motion 'That the House note grievances' on the Appropriation Bill;

(b) consideration of the Legislative Council amendment in the Constitution Act Amendment Bill (No. 3); and

(c) All stages of the following Bills:

Firearms Act Amendment Bill
Coroners Act Amendment Bill
Animal and Plant Control (Agricultural Protection and other Purposes) Bill
Statutes Amendment (Parole) Bill
Coober Pedy (Local Government Extension) Act Amendment Bill
Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 3)

be until 6 p.m. on Thursday.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Water Resources) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Irrigation Act 1950. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill provides for an amendment to the Irrigation Act 1930, in order to provide a rate for the supply of water to blocks for domestic purposes.

With the advent of pipemain supplies in irrigation areas, the practice of filling underground tanks with water for domestic purposes during periods of irrigation was made obsolete. Domestic supplies in rehabilitated areas should now only be obtained through 25mm metered services.

A domestic service is fixed free of cost, but a minimum annual rate and additional water rates, where applicable, are charged. The current practice is to secure these charges by means of a signed agreement with each consumer. This is administratively unwieldy and has also led to a small minority refusing to sign the agreement thereby legally exempting themselves from these charges.

By continuing to use irrigation water for domestic purposes these consumers have placed themselves in a financially favourable position with respect to other domestic consumers. This amendment seeks to rectify that by imposing a domestic rate on all blocks to which a domestic supply is available.

The Bill also provides a power to make regulations to charge an interest rate on unpaid fees and charges. It is proposed to make a regulation imposing interest on unpaid spray irrigation charges.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 inserts a definition of 'the consumption year'. The amendments made by this Bill provide for water to be charged for by volume with a minimum or base rate that must be paid whether water is consumed or not. Payment of the base rate entitles the ratepayer to a quantity of water costing the amount of the base rate. If additional water is used an additional charge is made at the declared rate. The definition inserted by this clause defines the period over which consumption of water is measured.

Clause 4 replaces the first four subsections of section 74 with new rating provisions. Two base rates can be declared in relation to blocks: one in relation to water for irrigation and one in relation to a domestic supply. A base rate may also be declared in respect of town allotments. New subsection (3) ensures that the base rate at least must be paid and any additional water used must be paid for as well.

Clause 5 makes a consequential amendment to subsection (1) of section 75 which simplifies the wording of this subsection.

Clause 6 makes a consequential amendment to section 76 (1).

Clause 7 repeals section 77 of the principal Act. The substance of this subsection will be provided by new subsections (3) and (4a) of section 74.

Clause 8 amends section 78 of the principal Act. New subsection (1) empowers the Minister to supply water to non ratable land.

Clause 9 amends section 114 to allow the imposition, by regulation, of interest on unpaid fees and charges.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill proposes an amendment to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act relating to causing death by dangerous driving and causing bodily harm by dangerous driving.

There has been considerable disquiet recently concerning death and injury on the State's roads. Despite intensive police campaigns, random breath testing and publicity relating to road safety, the road toll for the first seven months of 1986 was higher than for the same period in 1985.

It would appear that community attitudes are now tending to be less accepting of drink drivers. Yet there are still far too many cases of drink driving resulting in death or injury. In fact, over 40 per cent of road deaths are alcohol related. Of course, drink driving is not the only factor

contributing to death and injury on the roads. Other factors such as excessive speed, failure to observe safety requirements and driver inattentiveness can all contribute to this major social problem.

All drivers have a responsibility to themselves and to other road users to know and observe road rules, to comply with safety requirements, to drive in a reasonable manner, and to avoid driving when they are tired or have some other impairment to their driving ability.

At present the maximum penalty under section 14 (1) for causing death by dangerous driving of a motor vehicle is imprisonment for seven years. While the maximum penalty for causing bodily harm by dangerous driving or riding of a vehicle or animal under section 38 (1) is two years, the court has power to order a licence disqualification in addition to imprisonment where the offence involves the use of a motor vehicle.

The Government has been concerned for some time at the leniency shown by the courts in sentencing under section 14 (1) and section 38 (1) of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. The Crown Prosecutor monitored the sentences for these offences during the period January 1983 to May 1985. In the majority of cases involving bodily injury by dangerous driving a suspended sentence was imposed. While sentences for causing death by dangerous driving ranged from fines and suspended sentences to terms of imprisonment for periods up to 24 months.

In an attempt to increase the sentences for these offences appeals have been instituted where it has been considered that the sentence is manifestly inadequate. However, the Supreme Court seems reluctant to impose sentences close to the maximum, even for the most serious offences.

The Government now considers that the only alternative is for Parliament to increase the maximum penalties and in doing so give a signal to the courts that the present level of sentences is inadequate.

In policy statements released prior to the last election, it was announced that the Government would legislate to increase penalties for persons who cause death by dangerous driving. This Bill is in line with that policy commitment.

The Bill repeals the current sections dealing with causing death and causing bodily harm by dangerous driving or riding and enacts a new provision to deal with these offences.

The increased penalties proposed in the Bill apply only to offences of cause death or cause bodily harm involving the dangerous driving of a motor vehicle. The increases are substantial, with the introduction of higher penalties for both first and subsequent offences. The penalties for causing grievous bodily harm have been increased to the same level as for those relating to cause death.

The penalty applicable to the offence of causing bodily harm by dangerous driving or riding of an animal or a vehicle, other than a motor vehicle, is imprisonment for a maximum period of two years, i.e., the same penalty as applies to the current section 38 (1) offence. A distinction has been drawn between offences involving the driving of a motor vehicle and those that do not because:

> the major problem on the roads is dangerous or drunken driving involving the use of motor vehicles;
>
> it would be inappropriate for the higher penalties, including mandatory licence disqualification, to apply to cyclists and horse riders etc.

In a recent appeal in the Court of Criminal Appeal, the Chief Justice warned against a knee jerk reaction to the road toll. However, the Government is of the view that the community as a whole is dissatisfied with the level of sentences, especially in 'cause death' cases. Rather than a knee jerk reaction, the Government sees the amendments as a measure calculated to act as a deterrent and to provide a more realistic punishment of offenders.

The Bill also provides for the introduction of automatic periods of licence disqualification for those offences involving dangerous driving of a motor vehicle. In the case of subsequent offences for cause death or cause grievous bodily harm there is a minimum 10 year licence disqualification.

This may seem harsh to some people, but when viewed in the context that a person has caused serious injury or death to victims on more than one occasion, the Government does not consider that it is. Further it must be borne in mind that driving is not a right but a privilege. People who abuse the privilege must learn that such behaviour is unacceptable to the community.

At the same time as amendments are made to penalties, the Government has proposed a wider review of the offences of causing death and causing bodily harm by dangerous driving or riding.

The Bill provides for a change in the relationship between manslaughter and the offence of causing death by dangerous driving. Under the present provisions a person can be charged with either manslaughter or causing death by dangerous driving but he cannot be charged with both. If the charge for manslaughter is defeated, there can be no alternative verdict of causing death by dangerous driving. There are, however, alternative verdicts to manslaughter and cause death, namely dangerous driving or driving without due care.

This Bill provides for the offence of causing death by dangerous driving to be an alternative verdict to a charge of murder or manslaughter. The proposed amendment will permit the Crown to charge murder or manslaughter in a case where a person has been killed as a result of a motor vehicle accident but allow the jury to assess the circumstances of the case and, if they consider it appropriate, return an alternative verdict of causing death by dangerous driving. The alternative verdicts of dangerous driving or driving without due care will no longer apply where a person is charged with manslaughter.

Another area which has been clarified relates to accidents where more than one person has been killed or injured as a result of an act of dangerous driving. The courts have expressed doubt whether the same act of driving can result in a separate offence with respect to each person killed or injured by it. However it has been accepted that, where one offence has been charged, death or injury to another person may be taken into account as a matter of aggravation.

The Government considers that it is inappropriate that the Crown can only lay a charge in relation to one person's death or injury. Therefore the Bill provides for the Crown to lay multiple charges where more than one person has been killed or injured as a result of the same act of dangerous driving.

The other area which has been examined and clarified is the mental element required for the offences of causing death or causing bodily harm by dangerous driving. In criminal cases, the Crown must prove that the physical act involved in a crime was voluntary in the sense that it was done pursuant to an exercise of the will of the accused. If self induced intoxication raises a reasonable doubt in that respect, the accused is entitled to acquittal.

There is already room for argument that voluntariness would not be an issue in relation to the offences of causing death or causing bodily harm by dangerous driving or that it may not be relevant where a person consumes alcohol or drugs knowing that in due course he may drive a motor vehicle in an intoxicated condition. However, the matter is

not settled and this argument would run contrary to the approach adopted by the High Court in its benchmark decision in O'Connor's case.

It is essential that liability for conviction for these offences should not be escaped because of an inability to establish the requisite mental element by reason of self induced intoxication. This Bill provides accordingly.

This Bill, if adopted, will strengthen the law relating to causing death by dangerous driving and causing bodily harm by dangerous driving.

I commend this Bill to members and I seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 repeals sections 14 and 14a of the principal Act.

Clause 4 inserts new sections 19a and 19b. The new sections embrace the subject matter of existing sections 14, 14a, 38 and 38a. Subsection (6) *(b)* of section 19 is inserted to ensure that courts will not use the Offenders Probation Act 1913, to mitigate the licence disqualification imposed by the new provisions. Subsection (7) makes it clear that a person can be separately charged in respect of each person killed and injured as a result of the one accident.

Clause 5 repeals sections 38 and 38a of the principal Act.

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

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill proposes an amendment to the Road Traffic Act in relation to the penalties for failing to stop and report after an accident.

Section 43 (3) of the Road Traffic Act creates the offences of failing to stop after an accident, failing to render assistance to an injured person, failing to provide personal details and failing to report an accident to the police. The current penalty for failing to stop after an accident where someone has been injured or killed is a maximum $500 fine or imprisonment for a maximum of six months. The maximum penalty for other breaches of section 43 (3) is a $300 fine.

One of the major reasons for the inclusion of section 43 (3) is to penalise the hit-run driver. By attempting to leave the scene of an accident before their identity can be established, hit-run drivers seek to avoid the legal consequences of their actions.

The obligation placed on drivers to provide assistance where someone has been injured in an accident seeks to ensure that an injured person receives medical attention as soon as possible so that injuries and resultant complications are minimised.

The Government considers that the current penalties for section 43 (3) offences are too low, especially when compared to the general penalty for offences under the Road Traffic Act which is a maximum $1 000 fine.

The current maximum penalty for failing to stop after an accident where someone has been injured or killed is within a similar range to the penalty applicable to first offences for driving under the influence. However, the introduction of minimum penalties, the automatic loss of licence and the publicity associated with drink driving penalties may influence an intoxicated driver to make a decision to leave the scene of an accident until he has sobered up. The temptation to leave the accident scene may be even greater where the driver already has drink driving convictions, or where it is obvious that a person has been injured in the accident.

An increased penalty may not act as a deterrent in all cases as a driver may still panic and attempt to avoid his responsibilities without considering the criminal penalty. Nevertheless, the Government considers that there is a need to combat the incidence of hit-run accidents by increasing the maximum penalty for the offence of failing to stop. This Bill provides for the penalty for the offence of failing to stop after an accident where a person has been injured or killed to be increased to a maximum $5 000 fine and/or imprisonment for a maximum of one year. In addition, unless the offence is trifling, there is an automatic loss of licence for a minimum period of one year. The Bill sets the same penalty for the offence of failing to render assistance to an injured person.

The maximum penalty for breaches of the other provisions in section 43 (3) has been increased to a $2 000 fine. In addition, the court can continue to impose a period of licence disqualification in accordance with section 168 of the Road Traffic Act. I commend this Bill to members.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 43 of the principal Act. Paragraph *(b)* of new subsection (3b) ensures that a court cannot mitigate the minimum period of disqualification under the Offenders Probation Act 1913.

Clause 4 makes a consquential amendment to section 169 of the Principal Act.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This short Bill seeks to correct a problem which has occurred with different sections of the Residential Tenancies Act Amendment Act 1981 coming into operation at different times.

The Residential Tenancies Act 1978 commenced operation on 1 December, 1978. Following a review in 1980, amendments were introduced to Parliament. On 16 April 1981, section 6 of the Residential Tenancies Act Amendment Act 1981 (section 7a of the Act) commenced operation. It provided for the application of the Act to certain periodic tenancies entered into before 1 December 1978 and continuing after the commencement of section 7a.

By proclamation of His Excellency the Governor on 24 October 1985, section 4 of the Residential Tenancies Act Amendment Act 1981 (section 6 of the Act) commenced operation on 1 March 1986. Pursuant to that section, the Crown is bound by the Act.

Because section 7a commenced operation before the Crown was bound by the Act, any periodic tenancy agreement

entered into by the Crown between 1 December 1978 (when the Act commenced operation) and 1 March 1986 (when section 6 commenced operation) is not a residential tenancy agreement and therefore not bound by the Act.

Since 1 March 1986, various Government Departments and Crown Authorities have been complying with the Act. However, the problem created by sections 7a and 6 commencing at different times means that any periodic tenancy entered into between the relevant dates and continuing is not within the ambit of the Act. It also means that the Residential Tenancies Tribunal, in this situation, has no jurisdiction to deal with disputes between the parties.

The Residential Tenancies Tribunal considered this issue on 2 May 1986 in the matter of the *Highways Department v Yeend* and decided it had no jurisdiction to deal with an application made by the Department.

It was clearly the intention of Parliament that the Crown be bound by the Act. If Parliament imposes requirements on private sector landlords, the Crown should also be bound by those same requirements. This Bill seeks to implement beyond doubt Parliaments intention in this regard when it passed the Residential Tenancies Act Amendment Act 1981.

It seeks to amend section 7a of the Residential Tenancies Act 1978 so that any periodic tenancy agreement entered into by the Crown after 1 December 1978 and which continues after 1 March 1986 shall be a residential tenancy agreement to which the Act applies. It is proposed that the application of the Act to such agreements should commence on and from the first day after the commencement of the amending section on which rent is payable under the agreement.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 amends section 7a of the principal Act. That section ensures that the principal Act applies to a residential tenancy agreement entered into before the commencement of the Act where the tenancy under the agreement is a periodic tenancy, that is, a tenancy for an indefinite period.

Section 6 of the principal Act provides that the principal Act binds the Crown, but was, however, brought into force after the commencement of the principal Act. As a result, the present provisions of section 7a do not serve to apply the principal Act to a residential tenancy agreement that provides for a periodic tenancy where the agreement was entered into by the Crown with some other person before the commencement of section 6.

The clause amends this section by inserting a further provision, the effect of which is to ensure that the principal Act also applies to a residential tenancy agreement to which the Crown is a party where the agreement provides for a periodic tenancy and was entered into before the commencement of section 6 of the principal Act.

Under the new provision, the Act will apply to any such agreement on and from the first day after the commencement of the new provision on which rent is payable under the agreement.

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

FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Family Relationships Act Amendment Act 1984, clarified the status of children born through AID and IVF procedures where one or more donated gametes were used in the procedure.

The rationale behind the legislation was that it was necessary to establish, in relation to AID and IVF children, the persons in whom parental legal rights and responsibilities for the care and upbringing of such children are vested.

This needed to be clarified because the children in these cases have biological parent(s) as well as social parents.

It was considered that the social parents should have, in law, parental rights and responsibilities while the legal relationship with the biological parent should be severed.

The South Australian legislation was based on a model Bill agreed by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General. Legislation in similar terms has now been passed by N.S.W., Vic., W.A., N.T. and A.C.T.

At the time the amendment was before this Parliament objections were raised because provision was made for the status of those children born to couples living as 'husband and wife on a genuine domestic basis' as well as for the status of children born to married couples.

The objections to the provisions were twofold:

first, that providing for the status of those children born to de facto couples was tantamount to providing that de facto couples should have access to IVF and AID programs conducted in public hospitals;

and, second, that the phrase 'living as husband and wife on a genuine domestic basis' was vague and imprecise.

For the benefit of members who were not in the Parliament in 1984 I will outline the Government's view on these two matters. As regards the first objection, the Government is of the view that legislation regarding the status of IVF and AID children is entirely separate from the issue of determining which couples should have access to IVF and AID programs. It is considered that every child should have a legally sanctioned relationship with those persons who bear the social responsibilities of parenting. It is also considered that where donated gametes are concerned, the donor of those gametes should have no parental rights or responsibilities in respect of a child born as a result of the use of those gametes.

As regards the second objection, it is drawn to members, attention that the same phrase (albeit with the word 'bona fide' substituted for the word 'genuine') is used in the legislation of each State and Territory which has passed legislation on the status of AID and IVF children. There has apparently been no difficulty with the use of the phrase in these Acts.

Further, a similar phrase is used in the Commonwealth Social Services Act. S. 59 (1) of that Act refers to a woman 'living with a man as his wife on a bona fide domestic basis although not legally married to him'. This phrase has been examined by the Administrative Appeals Tribunal on a number of occasions and the case of *Waterford v. Director General of Social Services* [1980] Fed. LR. 98 is instructive as to the proper interpretation to be placed on those words:

> In the first place, the words 'bona fide' cannot literally mean what they mean in translation, that is to say 'in good faith'. They would be meaningless if they did. We consider they mean 'real' and 'real or genuine' in the sense that the 'domestic basis' referred to must be real and not accidental or contrived . . . But, the proper approach, we consider, is to regard the phrase as a whole and not to break it up into individual words. So doing, it must be seen as a legislative expression of a view that *a woman whose relationship with a man has all the indicia of marriage save only that it lacks a legal bond* shall not obtain the advantage of a widow's

pension . . . A widow in fact or by application of the extended definitions no longer has a man to support her. But if she replaces the lost relationship which had formerly afforded her that support with another relationship that is the *equivalent of marriage* then her status as a widow within the definition is lost notwithstanding that the new relationship is not supported by a legal bond . . . (emphasis added)

The Government is satisfied that the use of the phrase 'living with a man as his wife on a genuine domestic basis' is an adequate and proper term for use in the Family Relationships Act.

A sunset clause was incorporated into the Family Relationships Act Amendment Act 1984, with the effect that the new provisions will not apply to a fertilization procedure carried out on or after 31 December 1986.

In keeping with the Government's view that issues of access to fertilization procedures are entirely separate from issues regarding the status of the children born following those procedures, this Bill when introduced in another place removed the sunset clause from Part IIA of the Family Relationships Act dealing with the status of children conceived following medical procedures. However, an amendment successfully moved in the other place has altered the effect of the Bill so that the sunset clause is retained but extended in its operation until 31 December 1988. This is all that the Bill now achieves.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 10b of the Act by extending the relevant date in subsection (2) to 31 December 1988.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

TRUSTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This short Bill is being introduced in conjunction with the amendments to the Administration and Probate Act following the review of Public Trustee's investment powers.

Under section 5 (1) *(g)* of the Trustee Act 1936, the common funds of private trustee companies are authorised trustee investments. This Bill seeks to amend the Trustee Act to add the common funds of Public Trustee to the list. This would remove any doubts about Public Trustee's power to invest moneys from estates in the common funds. However, it is not proposed to open Public Trustee's common funds to investments from the public. The amendments have been discussed with private trustee companies, who have raised no objections.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. Clause 3 provides for the inclusion of the common funds of the Public Trustee as authorised trustee investments.

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

ADMINISTRATION AND PROBATE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill is being introduced following a review of the investment powers of Public Trustee. The review proposed a rationalisation of those investment powers to bring Public Trustee's investment powers into line with those of private trustee companies. It recommended this legislation to allow a better tailoring of investments by Public Trustee to suit the needs of the estates on behalf of which those investments are made. This should result in significant administrative savings in the management of those investments. These proposals have been discussed with the private trustee companies operating in South Australia and have their support.

Public Trustee common fund, established under section 102 of the Administration and Probate Act as operated at the moment, maintains its value in money terms. However, in inflationary periods the purchasing power of the money reduces. If the common fund did include investments which are more likely to retain their value with inflation then the purchasing power of the fund might be better maintained.

The competing investment needs of the estates administered by the Public Trustee cannot be met by having only one common fund as exists at present. A single fund cannot meet the diverse needs of estates whose moneys are invested for a comparatively short period and the needs of those estates whose real value must be protected from inflation (preferably by investment in shares).

This Bill amends section 102 of the Administration and Probate Act to allow the creation of common funds additional to the present one common fund established by that section.

One common fund could be used to invest moneys in short term securities on behalf of short term estates. A second common fund may be used for medium to long term investment in fixed interest securities. Finally, a third common fund may be used for investment in shares.

Short term investments are more suited to some estates, medium term investments to others and long term investments to others. In fact, some estates would benefit from moneys being invested in investments with a combination of these maturities. For short term estates, investments could be made, via a common fund, in short term investments with maturities of less than one year. They would attract the prevailing rate of interest and, because of their short term nature, would need no protection from the effects of inflation.

For medium to long term estates, investments could be made, via a common fund, with similar maturities. A medium term investment would be from one to five years and a long term investment would be anything over five years. Because of the adverse long term effects of inflation on the real value of fixed interest securities, a substantial part of these long term investments could be stocks and shares which are authorised investments under section 5 of the Trustee Act. The common fund investments could be tailored to the terms of the estates on behalf of which those investments are made.

Investment for any one estate may all be in one common fund (this may be the case of a short term deceased estate) or may be invested in more than one fund. For example, a long term protected estate may have moneys invested over several common funds to provide for that person's short

term financial needs but at the same time protect the balance of that person's moneys from the effects of inflation by investing in a stocks and shares common fund.

Accounting systems would be needed to process dividends and to account for changes in the value of the additional common funds, but this would be facilitated by the proposed computerisation of Public Trustee Office's operations.

It is pointed out that all private trustee companies in South Australia have the power, through their separate Acts of Parliament, to establish and operate one or more common funds. This submission proposes to bring Public Trustee's investment powers into line with those of trustee companies.

Section 18 of the Aged and Infirm Persons Property Act provides that a manager (appointed under that Act) shall be deemed to be a trustee for all the purposes of the Trustee Act. There is no such clear direction provided for the administration of the estates of the mentally ill and mentally handicapped, under the Mental Health Act. It is proposed that an additional power be added to the administrator's powers under section 118m(2) of the Administration and Probate Act, to enable an administrator to invest money in patients' estates in any investments authorised by the Trustee Act 1936. These powers, together with the power to create additional common funds, would enable Public Trustee to invest protected estate moneys across a number of funds to the advantage of the patient rather than leaving them in the existing common fund.

In summary, this Bill amends section 102 of the Administration and Probate Act 1919 to allow the creation of common funds additional to the present one. This will permit better tailoring of investments to suit the varying needs of estates managed by the Public Trustee. It will allow significant administrative savings by having all investments go through common funds rather than have the present large number of individual holdings and will protect the real value of moneys invested by the Public Trustee on behalf of medium to long term estates.

An amendment is also being proposed to the Trustee Act 1936 to provide that the common funds of Public Trustee are authorised trustee investments, as is the case with the common funds of private trustee companies.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. Clause 3 inserts a new definition for 'common fund' and strikes out the definition of the Common Fund Interest Account (which is rendered superfluous by this Bill). Clause 4 proposes the insertion of new sections 102 and 102a. Proposed new section 102 specifies the manner in which money held on trust may be invested, provides for the creation of one or more common funds and prescribes various rules that are to apply with respect to those funds. Income arising from the investment of a common fund shall be credited as income on amounts invested, in maintaining the Common Fund Reserve Account and, in appropriate circumstances, towards the Public Trustee's costs. The existing common fund is to continue in existence for so long as it is appropriate to retain moneys in that particular fund. Proposed new section 102a alters the restrictions on the ability of the Public Trustee to borrow money on overdraft. It is proposed that the Public Trustee be able to borrow with the approval of the Minister instead of a judge and that the Public Trustee be able to borrow from any bank and not just the State Bank, as is the present case.

Clause 5 contains amendments to section 112 which are consequential on the enactment of new section 102 and the abolition of the Common Fund Interest Account. Clauses 6 and 7 contain consequential amendments to sections 118a and 118g respectively. Clause 8 gives express authorization to an administrator appointed under the Mental Health Act 1976 to invest a patient's estate in authorized trustee investments.

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

COOBER PEDY (LOCAL GOVERNMENT EXTENSION) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Select Committee on the Coober Pedy (Local Government Extension) Act Amendment Bill and the future operation of local government for the Coober Pedy community has now reported to Parliament. In order to carry out the recommendation of the report, that Coober Pedy adopt local government, it is necessary to make certain amendments to the Coober Pedy (Local Government Extension) Act 1981.

The select committee indicated that it would be desirable that the transition to local government be as smooth as possible for Coober Pedy. Elections for the Coober Pedy Progress and Miners' Association are due to be held in October, 1986. As there will be general council elections in May 1987, it is considered unnecessary and undesirable to involve the local community in two elections in such a short period of time. Therefore, it is proposed that the Association elections due in October be suspended.

The new council will commence operations on 1 January 1987 and the current membership of the Coober Pedy Progress and Miners' Association will continue until the May council elections in 1987. The amendments to the Extension Act will allow for the suspension of the October election and as well as this will allow for the very important transition of powers to the new council from the Association. Thus it will protect the rights of employees and ensure that the assets and liabilities of the Association become those of the new council.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. It is proposed that the amendments to the constitution of the Coober Pedy Progress and Miners' Association Incorporation come into operation on the Governor's assent to the Bill and that the remainder of the Bill come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 3 amends the long title of the Act.

Clause 4 makes necessary consequential amendments to the definitions used in the principal Act.

Clause 5 provides for the repeal of sections 4 to 12 (inclusive) of the principal Act and substitutes new provisions dealing with the dissolution of the Association and incidental transitional matters. The new provisions will ensure that the local government council that is to be formed at Coober Pedy will be vested with the property, rights and liabilities of the Association and that the staff of the Association will have continuity of service. It is also proposed that charges levied by the Association will be recoverable as rates levied by the new council and that by-laws in force

immediately before the dissolution of the Association will become by-laws made by the council. Under new section 5 the members of the Association appointed as the first members of the council will be deemed to have held office as members of a council for periods equal to their terms as members of the Association. New section 6 provides for the Act to expire on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 6 effects various amendments to the constitution of the Association. The amendments are designed to ensure that elections for membership of the Association are not held in October 1986 and that the existing members continue to hold office until the dissolution of the Association.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Select Committee on the Coober Pedy (Local Government Extension) Act Amendment Bill and the future operation of local government for the Coober Pedy community has now reported to Parliament. In order to carry out the recommendations of the report it is necessary to make certain amendments to the Local Government Act 1934.

Because of the isolation of the town of Coober Pedy, its unique character and the general feeling in the town, at this time, against a widespread use of control and regulation, it is considered that the application of the Local Government Act should allow for the waiving of certain powers under the Building Act, Health Act, Food Act and Motor Vehicles Act. In practice this would mean that the current arrangement would apply with respect to the Health and Food Acts whereby the South Australian Health Commission provides the necessary services.

The provision concerning the waiving of powers pursuant to the Motor Vehicles Act will allow Coober Pedy to continue as an 'outer area' and thus the local population will not incur the added cost of motor vehicle registration fees. (This would normally occur when Coober Pedy became a local government area.) The process which allows for the Building Act not to apply to private dwellings will be handled by proclamation.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the Act is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 inserts a new section 883 relating to the proposed District Council of Coober Pedy. Subsection (2) provides that land within the area of the council that is subject to a mining lease or comprised in a registered precious stones claim is not ratable property under the Act; a similar exemption applies in relation to the levying of charges under the Coober Pedy (Local Government Extension) Act 1981. Subsection (3) provides that the council is not to be responsible for the performance of any function under the Food Act 1985, or the Health Act 1935 (the South Australian Health Commission is to be able to perform those functions) and that the area of the council is to continue as an outer area for the purposes of section 37 of the Motor Vehicles Act 1959.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on motion:

That the House note grievances.

(Continued from 18 September. Page 1019.)

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I wish to raise a matter which I think is of critical importance to every member of this House. I urge them all to read the judgments of the then Acting Chief Justice (Justice Zelling), Justice Jacobs and Justice Prior, in relation to parliamentary privilege and ministerial responsibility. There seems to be some debate in the community as to these long-standing tenets and as to what is meant by them. These judgments arose following the case in a lower court of *Chatterton v Chapman*, when judgment was given in favour of Chatterton, and Chapman was heard on appeal in the Full Supreme Court.

These three eminent judges gave what I consider are most definitive rulings on these two questions of vital importance to parliamentary democracy, not only in this State but around the whole Commonwealth. I will be very surprised if the judgments of those three judges do not have far more significance in the Commonwealth than they may appear to have at the moment. I was particularly interested in this case, because the question of parliamentary privilege had been canvassed in other jurisdictions, particularly in relation to privilege before Senate committees, and the like, and there was a question mark hanging over this doctrine, especially as a result of the comments of a judge in the lower court. I might observe that the judge in the lower court got a bath. When the Acting Chief Justice says of the lower court judge that, in effect, he was partisan, that he entered the arena—

The Hon. T.M. McRae: They don't get a bath; they are directed in their thinking.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I was using colloquial terms. I like to keep out of the courts, because when one is in court one is usually in trouble; but, for the first time ever, I went down to the Supreme Court and sat there on the final day, as evidence was given, to see what was occurring in this case. I believed that the whole question of parliamentary privilege was under challenge, and it was a very illuminating experience. I was most impressed by the three justices and, on that occasion in particular, with Acting Chief Justice Zelling, this being one of the last judgments that he gave before he retired. I can tell members that I was impressed—and it takes a bit to impress me, during the processes of the courts here or anywhere else.

The Hon. T.M. McRae: But were you impressed with the counsel as well?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: One of them got a bath also. The fact is that these three judges gave judgments which uphold, without any question of doubt, absolute parliamentary privilege within this place. Suggestions were being made in the inferior courts that, because we let television cameras in, by some means or another we had given away our privilege. That is why I went down to hear what the Supreme Court had to say—because parliamentary privilege was being questioned.

In the time available to me, I want to quote from these judgments. In the judgment by Acting Chief Justice Zelling, at the bottom of page 25, he states:

> In any event as far as free speech is concerned there is absolute privilege in relation to free speech irrespective of section 38 of the Constitution Act. This arises from inherent necessity, see the judgment of the Privy Council in *Chenard and Company v. Arissol (1949) A.C. 127 at 134.*

There are a large number of quotations in these judgments which indicate clearly that parliamentary privilege exists within this place. Then there was a discussion of qualified privilege or the extension of privilege outside Parliament, when a member is dealing with material handled in Parliament. That is a bit less definite in these judgments, but nonetheless there was discussion of what happened in Parliament, and a judgment from Canada was quoted where the then Prime Minister sent a telegram and put out a press statement. It was given in a judgment there that this was an extension of what was done in Parliament and was therefore privileged.

Our three eminent judges did not quite go that far but they acknowledged that what was said inside Parliament could not be used to strengthen a case against an accused for something he said outside Parliament. What we say in here is absolutely privileged, and I was jolly glad to hear that reaffirmed when I thought that it was under attack.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: I'll bet!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I would think that that applied to any right-thinking member of this House, and members opposite ought to be at least as thankful for that as members of the Liberal Party, because they get up and attack companies with impunity. I am not getting down to that petty level, however: I am just saying that it is critical for the proper functioning of a democratic Parliament that what happens within this place is privileged, and that was upheld in no uncertain terms. On page 28 the Acting Chief Justice states:

> It was wrong of the respondent to place the responsibility on his officers when the responsibility ultimately was his.

This bears on the question of ministerial responsibility. I was appalled to hear the Hon. Frank Blevins in this place seek to shrug off his responsibility because his officers had done something that had led to difficulty. That is a complete denial of ministerial responsibility, and that matter is dealt with at some length in the three judgments. Mr Justice Zelling said:

> It was wrong of the respondent to place the responsibility on his officers when the responsibility ultimately was his. If the words were defamatory by reason of being stronger than they should have been, then I think the occasion was a privileged occasion in that as a member of Parliament the appellant Chapman did have a right to ventilate this question; he could only do so by ventilating it to the electorate at large through a medium such as television. Further they are comment and I think a defence of fair comment is not defeated by the use of very strong language if the maker of the statement believes the comment to be true.

Thus Mr Justice Zelling was upholding that no Minister should expose public servants to criticism, and there are numerous quotes to sustain that view. If they make a mistake in his department, they are ultimately responsible. Not only did the lower court judge get a bath but also Chatterton got a bath—he got a real shower over this question of ministerial responsibility. The nub of the case was that Chatterton was suggesting that he had nothing to do with the grant of drought aid to a company in which his family was involved.

I will run out of time, so on another occasion I will expand on this issue further, because I believe that these judgments go to the very nub of parliamentary democracy. On both counts that doctrine was fundamentally reaffirmed, with slight shades of variation, by these three judges in South Australia. I can tell members that I was jolly glad that I went to the Supreme Court for the first time, because I was most impressed.

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

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Members no doubt will be extremely familiar with the topic that I wish to raise—the continuing saga of the Finger Point sewage treatment plant. This matter has been before a succession of Governments for a decade and a half, but it was not until 1981-82 that the first financial allocations of $500 000 towards the forward planning for that scheme were made through State budgets. Again in 1982-83, $250 000 was allocated by the Tonkin Government towards completion of the planning, land acquisition and commencement of the scheme. However, at that point the system broke down. The incoming Labor Government decided that that $250 000 should be withdrawn and spent elsewhere. We now face the unusual situation where both Liberal and Labor Parties claim to be firmly committed to the scheme; the Liberal Party, in fact, allocated $750 000 towards commencement of construction; and, more importantly, in the period before the last State election both Parties firmly committed themselves towards commencement of the Finger Point sewage treatment plant.

The Premier will recall that, just prior to the election, he completed a series of television ads, one of which included the scene of bulldozers in frantic activity, digging holes at Finger Point. I understand that the bulldozers were taken from Adelaide to Mount Gambier, that the low loaders then returned to Adelaide but, rather than carry on with the task, a few days after the election advertisement having been shot, those bulldozers were removed from the scene: the low loaders were brought back from Adelaide to transport them to the metropolis.

Mr Becker: How much did that cost?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: We do not know how much that cost. That is probably one issue we can raise with great interest during the Estimates Committees. The significance, of course, is that the Premier, whom I and other people in the South-East regarded as an honourable man making an honourable commitment, has now apparently allowed himself to be sidetracked. This seems to have happened only in the past three or four weeks, and I say that because I have a letter from the Premier of South Australia dated 30 May and addressed to me personally at my electorate office. The letter states:

> I have received your letters dated 8 and 11 April 1986 regarding the recent burst in the Mount Gambier sewer outfall main and land acquisition for the Finger Point sewage treatment works.
>
> I have publicly stated my commitment to the construction of the Finger Point sewage treatment works and this commitment stands. Design and estimate preparation is continuing uninterrupted so that a submission to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works can be expected during July 1986. Given the time required for committee and Cabinet deliberations, the tender call for construction is likely to occur in the latter half of 1986.
>
> The Engineering and Water Supply Department is continuing negotiations with the Port MacDonnell District Council in an attempt to reach agreement on the price of the land required, despite council's reticence to accept the department's offer as determined by an independent valuer. No delay to the Finger Point project has occurred because of the protracted negotiation period, nor do I expect any delay, even if negotiations are further extended.

The Premier then goes on to consider a number of other issues, such as continuing leaks between Mount Gambier and Finger Point in the sewage outfall pipeline (and if time allows I will refer to that subject matter later). But more

importantly, in a letter received on 31 July 1986, again in response to my correspondence to the Premier, he says:

Dear Harold,

I refer to your letter of 17 June 1986 concerning the Finger Point sewage treatment works project.

In that letter of June 1986 I had raised the problem of the dispute between the Department of Lands and the E&WS Department and the Port MacDonnell District Council; the district council was asking about $14 000 for land on which the sewage treatment plant is to be sited but the Government was offering only about $7 000, really a pittance when one considers that the scheme will cost about $5 million. So a very small amount is under dispute. The Premier further said:

I have previously stated my commitment to the construction of this project, as you would be aware from my letter to you of 30 May 1986, and this commitment stands. Work on this project is to continue as scheduled and in this regard design work and the preparation of estimates are proceeding, as are negotiations for the purchase of land required for the works.

Although delayed somewhat, a submission to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on the project is in the final stages of preparation with a view to submitting it in August this year. This delay has not altered the programmed completion date of the plant. I trust that this clarifies the situation for you with regard to this project.

The advice given by the E&WS Department, which supported the Premier's advice to me, to the Port MacDonnell council was that the scheme be commenced in January 1987, to be completed in May 1988. I ask the Premier what has happened? As I said, I regard him as an honourable man, firmly committed to the scheme. Yet between 31 July and the introduction of the State budget no provision was made. In spite of the Premier's multiple commitments, his pre-election advertisements, his two letters to me and correspondence between the E&WS Department and the Port MacDonnell council, no funds have been committed to the project under this State budget.

Has the Premier been bypassed by his Government department? Has his commitment to the South-East been ignored and, if so, what is the Premier going to do about it? The commitment to Finger Point is extremely important. The health of the people at Port MacDonnell must unquestionably be at risk. Residents of the South-East realise that, inside the James Corcoran breakwater at Port MacDonnell, the water in summertime becomes green with algae, rather heavy and somewhat stagnant. A breach has been made in the breakwater to allow some circulation of fresh seawater, but one of the problems is that the circulation of water from Finger Point around into Port MacDonnell, and then for it to come into the breakwater and hang there, contributes to some health hazard.

Apart from that, the Government has also recognised the threats to the South-East fishing industries, in particular, the crayfishing and abalone industries, by banning the taking for human consumption of all fish within a 1 000 metre radius of the Finger Point outfall. That 1 000 metre radius is quite a substantial area because a large number of crayfish and abalone are to be found there. More significant, however, is the report of the Department of Fisheries that crayfish are not static; they do not recognise the 1 000 metre limit and migrate very rapidly and over a long distance, as much as 50 km, from the Finger Point outlet all through the South-East. That means that fish can be taken which have been born and bred within the 1 000 metre limit; and this the Government has banned. Of course, there is no knowledge at all of where the fish initially came from when they are bagged and taken ashore. So much for Government restrictions.

Apart from that, the Finger Point beach itself is one where I, over the past 30 years and particularly in the years before the outfall was installed, used to spend time on surfing and for general recreation—a very pleasant part of the South-East of South Australia. The Premier said that the Public Works Committee has yet to visit Mount Gambier, and that is true. Apart from that, once that committee has approved the scheme there is no provision at all in the present State estimates for the Engineering and Water Supply Department for sewage treatment plants.

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

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): During this debate I wish to refer to a speech made by the Independent member for Davenport in relation to the 14th annual report of the South Australian Ombudsman. I was rather saddened by the comments made by the honourable member in relation to this piece of printing design because, in some ways, it represents an attitude that is all too prevalent in our society concerning the provision of proper design, not only in printing, books and booklets, but in other areas of endeavour.

One of the things that often shows the difference between nations is that those people who have been successful in design have stood head and shoulders above other civilisations. One instance would be where the Roman Empire was able to improve on Greek architecture with the invention of the archway. This simple forward movement in design gave greater flexibility to Roman Empire buildings and greatly improved the flexibility of Greek architecture, which the Roman Empire nearly always copied.

The reason for properly displaying printed material is to ensure that that material is read. The suggestion that reports should merely run on page by page without proper and judicious use of white space, margins, paper and type faces, is quite ludicrous. Many reports that are merely typewritten page after page without proper consideration of design are consigned immediately to the wastepaper basket, and the importance of their message is lost. It is obvious that the Ombudsman wishes to make sure that his message is read, and the distribution of his report to the various libraries will ensure that not only is the message read and understood, but that the message will last. The Ombudsman is not merely reporting to Parliament, although that is an important function of his work; he has something to say to the general public, and the general public, in order to note what he is saying, should be able to have properly designed and typographically correct reports.

Unfortunately, one of the offshoots of new technology has been the ability of people to produce work easily. In doing so we have lost much of the expertise that has been available to us over many years in relation to proper design of printing material. The production of proper design in fact saves money and does not waste money. With a properly designed book it is not always necessary to reproduce as many copies as in the case of poorly designed work, which is often lost and disposed of very quickly by people not realising the significance of the message it contains.

Every printing apprentice in every part of the world would know the importance of correct and proper design. One of the matters criticised by the honourable member was the size of the margins that the report contained. The size of the margins in any publication is extremely important to the readability of that book, and I find it quite ridiculous that the judicious use of white space contained in this publication has been criticised as it has.

Whilst on this subject I must refer to the particular criticism made by the honourable member in relation to the use of blank pages at the end of this booklet. The use of blank pages in a situation like this actually saves money,

rather than the reverse. Anybody with any connection with the printing industry would know that impositions play a vital and an important part of putting a publication together. Printing machinery has been so designed that it takes a particular size of publication in order to print and one of the principles involved with printing a booklet such as this is that it must be in even pages. Therefore, quite often, if a page is taken in the front for a title page, then correspondingly, depending on the amount of copy available, it becomes necessary to leave a blank page at the end. Specific printing machines are set up for specific page sizes, and to criticise the leaving of a blank page at the end of a booklet shows a total lack of knowledge of the printing process.

One of the other criticisms made of the publication was that illustrations were used within it. The use of illustrations and cartoons is a device that goes back for centuries. There is an old old saying that every picture is worth a thousand words. This is something that I agree with, and whenever cartoons, illustrations, halftone blocks, etc., are used in the printing of publications, I applaud their use.

As I have mentioned before, this is not a new device. I have had the pleasure, when going overseas, of seeing original manuscripts, both in the British Museum and in the museum section of St Peters Basilica. The most interesting manuscripts, from my point of view, are in the museum of St Peters Basilica, where the old handwritten manuscripts are available on display, and they are absolutely priceless. The point I am making is that these manuscripts took up hours and hours of work and precious paper, which was very difficult to come by in those days and was handmade, and contain large and beautifully done illustrations, usually associated with the first letter on every page taking up sometimes three-quarters of a page backed with gold leaf and absolutely brilliant works of art.

Even in those days, when the resources were difficult to come by, people took the time to make sure that their work was read by including very large and beautifully designed illustrations. I hope that members of this House who criticise a very well put together and designed booklet will in the future take into consideration the damage that they are doing not only to the printing industry but also to the cause of good design throughout this State. The South Australian Government, and indeed the Australian Government, spend millions of dollars providing facilities to teach all sorts of design within the printing industry, in industrial design and in other areas.

The criticism of these efforts is something akin to the remark of Oliver Cromwell 'Into the churches' which resulted in beautiful pieces of artwork being smashed to pieces; and there is probably an analogy with the Red Guard in China, which did similar sorts of things. In future, I hope that those who simply wish to fill in 10 minutes of debate take a great deal of thought before making such a disparaging speech about the work of designers and the efforts of printers in the Government Printing Office.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I have been advised that the State Labor Government intends to amend the Local Government Act in a manner that will cause financial stress for many small private schools scattered throughout the metropolitan area. I have been contacted by some of these schools, which have pointed out to me that the rates they pay will vary considerably. The proposal is that their current rates, which stand at 25 per cent of the rateable value of the full school rates, will be raised to 100 per cent. This is causing much concern for the boards and councils of these small schools.

Many of these schools, which are run by churches and are scattered throughout metropolitan Adelaide, are trying to provide a high quality education at an affordable fee. I point out to the House that many of these small schools are by no means wealthy by any stretch of the imagination. In many instances they have a high percentage of single parents and also a percentage of parents who are struggling to give their children a religious education. I applaud the parents who are struggling to do this and think that they should be encouraged in every way possible. That also applies to the Government's attitude to these schools.

The Government can help by holding the ratings at 25 per cent. It seems that Labor Governments generally are obsessed with the idea that all private schools are wealthy; they seem to be obsessed with the fact that these private schools have major assets in the way of buildings and property; and they seem to be obsessed with the idea that the parents of children attending these schools are wealthy. Those thoughts are totally false because that is not the case and, in particular, it is not the case with some of the small religious schools in the western suburbs. In particular, I refer to a small religious school at Glenelg which has sent me a copy of a letter that it sent to the Hon. Barbara Wiese as Minister of Local Government.

I will read the letter to the House because I believe that it explains very clearly the position that the school board will find itself in if the proposed legislation is passed by Parliament. Addressed to the Hon. Barbara Wiese, Parliament House, Adelaide, the letter states:

Dear Minister,

I am writing on behalf of the Board of St Mary's Memorial School in Glenelg with reference to the proposed amendment to the Local Government Act, and in particular to the revision of provisions relating to rates payable by schools to Local Government.

The board is concerned that the proposed revision to the Act will result in a change in rates payable by our school from the present 25 per cent of rateable value to the full 100 per cent value, even though State Government schools will continue to be exempt from the payment of rates.

The board has in the past been concerned at the difference in treatment of Government and private schools in this regard, as both require the same provision of services from local government and make the same contribution to the local community. However, to have this difference now extended by the application of full rating to private schools is a situation which requires strong opposition and we urgently request your immediate action to ensure that all educational facilities are treated equally.

Contrary to the view expressed in the summary papers describing the proposed changes to the Act, namely, that the present 'concessions' are hard to justify for private schools since these have 'independent means of generating income', any increase in rates payable will be required to be passed on totally to parents via fees. Such a fixed cost in the case of Government schools would be independently met by the Government increasing payments to schools, and the ability of Government schools to meet this type of increase would be much greater than the case of our school. St Mary's Memorial School is a relatively poor local school with a high proportion of low income, single parent families. Fee increases to meet the proposed rate increase will cause a major problem to the great majority of our parents, and we must request that you recognise this problem before any draft amendments are tabled in Parliament.

The alternative suggestion that each school separately negotiate its rate payment with its own local government council is considered unacceptable, as this represents an unsound and variable basis for planning and development of the school system.

The board requests that you give consideration to its proposal that a common policy be developed for all schools on this matter. We would request your detailed consideration to the suggestion that all schools be specifically nominated in the Local Government Act to pay rates at the fixed rate of 25 per cent, or that all be exempt from rates. Alternatively, an even lower rate say, 10 per cent of assessed value applied to both Government and private schools should secure a similar level of payment to present receipts. We look forward to your positive response to these proposals.

The letter is signed by the Secretary of St Mary's Memorial School Board. I support the school board in its request. In fact, I think it is a completely reasonable request. The author

of the letter may be unaware that, if all schools were charged the full 100 per cent rate, there would be a contra entry in the books. However, I do not think that is really what we are on about.

We must ensure that the small religious schools around Adelaide retain their 25 per cent rating on property. That is a fair and reasonable request. The parents of the children attending these small schools and the Catholic and Anglican churches which are standing behind them cannot afford to absorb an increase in rates. If the rates are increased, the schools will have to pass the increase on to the parents. As I said in my opening remarks, the majority of parents at these schools, particularly those at St Mary's Memorial School at Glenelg, cannot afford to pay the increase. It would be unreasonable to expect them to pay the increase and it would be unfair to the small Roman Catholic, Anglican and other denominational schools that would have to bear the impost of such legislation. I urge the Government not to introduce the legislation at all in the first place but, if it must bring it in, it should maintain the *status quo.*

Ms GAYLER (Newland): I will use this debate as an opportunity to expose the folly of Liberal and extreme right policies relating to labour market deregulation. More particularly, I will bring to the attention of Parliament the threat that Liberal industrial relations policies pose to women and young people in the work force. The Opposition, both federally and in this State, along with its so-called new right prime movers, advocate allowing firms employing less than 50 workers to strike their own voluntary agreements—so-called 'opting-out provisions'. We have witnessed in recent months corporate chiefs—those in our community with enormous power, financial backing and influence—flexing their big business muscle in attempts to undermine Australia's centralised wage fixing system and dispute settling conciliation and arbitration arrangements. The John Stones, Charles Copemans and Andrew Hays have launched a concerted attack on ordinary working people in an attempt to decimate a system that has given Australia responsible wage determination and remarkable declines in industrial disputation along with fair protection for individual workers.

The media, understandably, focuses on the big battles, the big companies and the big business spokesmen. However, it is also worth looking at the effect of these policies on particular segments of the work force rather than simplistically viewing Australia's work force as a single homogeneous entity.

In the case of women in the work force, let me start with some pertinent facts. We know that over half the married women in the work force in South Australia are in part-time jobs. We also know that 62 per cent of working women in paid employment are in three narrow categories of work, namely, clerical, service and sales jobs. Weekly total earnings for all employed women are only 62 per cent of male earnings. We know that women have, for various reasons, different patterns of withdrawing from and entering the work force and that only 46 per cent of women are union members compared with 61 per cent of men. In the area of apprenticeships, women are still almost exclusively confined to hairdressing apprenticeships, of which they make up some 62 per cent.

In summary, women in the work force are generally paid lower wages, have fewer job opportunities, poorer conditions and, in many respects, are already the group at greatest risk. They are for those reasons more vulnerable to proposals which undermine the centralised wage fixing system and conciliation and arbitration processes. Because women are concentrated in retailing and sales, clerical and hairdressing firms, for example, it also appears that women fall disproportionately into the category of being employed in smaller firms, those employing fewer than 50 employees, which the Liberals seek to attack first.

The Opposition wants to leave workers in this category to fend for themselves. It is unashamedly wanting a return to the law of the jungle, to further reduce the power of those in the work force with least industrial muscle, with lower wages and least organised workers. Women especially, but also young people generally, would be further disadvantaged by these backward moves. What would individual bargaining look like in the work place? It is a fantasy to suggest that the employer in the local deli, the corner hairdresser, the neighbourhood chemist shop or the local real estate office will suddenly become democratic and generous in working out with his or her staff the pay, hours and working conditions of employees.

Without the backing of a fair and just system of wage rates, working conditions, hours of work and sick leave those most vulnerable—women and young people—would have a very simple choice: like it or lump it. It would be a case of, 'You want to keep your job—here are your new terms and conditions.' Theirs is a typical divide and rule tactic of the extremists: take away from the weakest and least protected in a community what little collective bargaining power they have—they can fend for themselves in the Liberal's industrial jungle.

Women in casual jobs, women in lower skilled positions, migrant women, and women outworkers in areas like the clothing industry will all be the targets of the Liberal's so-called downward flexibility in the work force. Let those women be under no misapprehension—'downward flexibility' means wage cuts under the Howard/Olsen labour arrangements. They will have their sick leave, holiday pay and other conditions threatened and, under so-called 'voluntary agreements' they will have precisely nowhere to go under the Liberal scheme of things.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): A few weeks ago the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity in South Australia wrote to a couple of car rental businesses on Kangaroo Island in my constituency and drew to their attention the fact that an allegation had been made that representatives of those companies had discriminated against certain tourists, in particular, Japanese or Asian tourists. Ms Josephine Tiddy, in her correspondence dated 15 August 1986, drew to the attention of the proprietors of those respective businesses the details of the allegations and cited that, upon establishing the allegations, it would appear to be in contravention of section 13 of the Racial Discrimination Act 1975 and sections 51 and 61 of the Equal Opportunity Act 1984.

That was a perfectly proper approach to the subject, given the background, the claims that had been laid at the various levels prior to being lodged with the Office of the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity; the appropriate steps were taken to investigate the matter in accordance with the responsibilities of that Commissioner, with the object of having the issue resolved.

I have had drawn to my attention, following the receipt of that correspondence at Kangaroo Island, the contents of the responses. I want to place on the record of this House the nature of one of the responses, which sets out in very clear terms the situation as it applies on Kangaroo Island and in relation to its roads. It also sets out clearly an admission that discrimination between races and discrimination of a number of other kinds does occur in that community where it applies to the selection of those to

whom cars will be hired out. A response to the earlier mentioned correspondence from the Island dated 21 August 1986 states as follows:

You refer to claims of racial discrimination on Kangaroo Island in the rental car industry in as much as it applies to rental cars.

For obvious reasons I will not identify the company; nor in this instance is there any need to identify the signatory. However, the message is both clear and important. It further states:

I wonder why you refer only to Asians or Japanese tourists. We discriminate against all races, including Australians and European. Of course the discrimination is against the individual rather than the race. Such discrimination is quite commonplace here in South Australia, and I am a little perplexed at your attitude. The South Australian Police Force discriminates against the various laws it will enforce and those it won't. The judicial system discriminates against those who will have their names suppressed from publication and those who won't. The Metropolitan Baking Act, or whatever it is called, discriminates against those who can bake fresh bread on weekends and those who cannot. This State of South Australia is full of discrimination. We—

that is, the hiring operators on Kangaroo Island—

discriminate against motor car drivers in a manner similar to insurance companies who automatically discriminated against all under 25-year-olds. Yet are all under 25-year-olds drivers automatically a bad risk? Who knows, we don't think so, because we frequently rent vehicles to them.

Well, we do not rent to any driver, no matter what race, religion, age, academic qualification or financial status, if we consider that they are inexperienced to drive on Kangaroo Island's unsealed roads.

I am told that Kangaroo Island has the highest accident rate per capita in Australia. I am doing you and the rest of Australian citizens a favour if I keep inexperienced drivers out of our public hospitals as a result of an accident, not to mention the favour to the driver.

I am certainly doing our business a favour by minimising the number of accidents which we have, so I will continue to discriminate in the manner which we have done in the past. We will get out of rental cars, if we cannot be selective to whom we rent. Then even experienced drivers will have no access to [the company's] rental cars, so between you and—

mentioning another senior officer of an associated department (Tourism)—

you will have struck a savage blow to the Kangaroo Island tourist industry, which is quite a irony coming from [that level within Tourism].

I have deliberately left out the names of the other officers involved in this exercise. I make it clear that I do not reflect on the steps taken by the officers in this instance, as the correspondence reveals, but I do believe that it is important to put down formally a couple of messages. One is an admission that our unsealed roads on Kangaroo Island are of a rubble type and, to the inexperienced driver, they are dangerous, to say the least.

There are formal notices in the cabins of M.V. *Troubridge* and in the lounge area of that public transport facility warning people of the unsealed roads on the island. I cannot stress enough the importance of caution and care being applied by anyone—whether they be South Australian, or people from interstate or overseas—touring the island. I can fully understand the caution, if not the quite harsh diligent selection process, that vehicle hiring operators on Kangaroo Island have traditionally adopted. They have every reason to continue that practice.

In this instance, I am assured that there will be no legal or official action taken and that from Ms Tiddy's office in particular an officer will shortly go to the island to discuss this matter in a consultative and advisory way with those vehicle hiring operators to ensure that people are not personally offended in the future if they choose to visit that delightful community, hire a car and drive on the loose surface roads to which I have referred.

The other point I want to raise relates to the plight of motor car hiring company representatives. In seeking to be satisfied that prospective hirers are experienced drivers, obviously the companies call for drivers licences. In many cases international tourists do not have an international licence and, even if they do, it is not printed in English but in the language of another nationality. In some instances, tourists bring their own drivers licences from other countries, and invariably those licences are also in a foreign language. This applies also to Japanese drivers licences, in which there is no reference (in English) to the relevant details at all.

Therefore, on arrival in Australia—whether it be Kangaroo Island or any other area—there exists immediately a difficulty in interpreting the content of the licence, especially if the visitor, whether Asian or any other nationality, has difficulty with our language. If nothing else, I hope that the Minister representing the Minister of Tourism in another place takes steps to try to clarify the situation concerning international tourists in particular, and those of other nationalities who do not have a good grasp of the English language so that they have some driving licence card or identification in English when they come to visit Australia and South Australia in particular.

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

Mr De LAINE (Price): The fourth Bannon State budget is a very responsible, disciplined and well balanced budget, given the realities of these difficult economic times. Some problems are of a nature over which neither the State Government nor the Federal Government has much control, and this situation applies no matter which political Party is in power.

In the past, Australia was in a unique position in that, because of its absolute geographic isolation, it was insulated to a great extent from the rest of the world and its problems, particularly economic problems. Now, because of vast improvements in travel, communications and modern technology, the isolation and insulation have disappeared, and we find ourselves as a nation in the middle of the real world with all its problems.

Employers are constantly saying that our problems are the fault of the Government, if it happens to be a Labor Government, workers, unions, the value of the dollar etc. Everyone and everything is to blame but the employers, and the Opposition supports them in their view. It is true that the causes of our problems, especially in manufacturing industry, are very complex, but employers and management must shoulder most of the blame.

Most of the problems in industry today are brought about by bad management, yet workers get the blame. Lots of factories have not been upgraded for 30 years and their machines and equipment are outdated. Their methods and processes are obsolete and management suddenly finds that the world has left them behind and they cannot compete. They suddenly wake up to what is happening, and panic. They go out and buy lots of up to date high tech machines and equipment and sack a large percentage of their workers.

After the dust has settled they find they have bought the wrong equipment. Instead of getting computers and other high tech equipment tailored for the functions that they wish to perform, in many cases they have bought new toys that are not suitable for their particular needs. So, we have expensive new equipment gathering dust, either because it is not suitable or because as yet no-one at that particular establishment can operate the equipment.

I am not opposed to new technology, but the equipment bought should be researched thoroughly to suit the partic-

ular functions required. This technology is necessary in some manufacturing areas to improve efficiency, but it should be planned and phased in over a period in order to have the least impact upon employment. The same management people who have caused the unemployment are criticising these unemployed people and accusing them of being dole bludgers. Most problems—but not all—in manufacturing industry are caused by management. Most problems involving unions are caused by bad management. In many factories management has little understanding of even basic industrial relations concepts and principles. Safety problems are mostly bad management; outdated or inefficient methods come from bad management; management problems reflect bad management; and low productivity is usually the result of bad management.

Indeed, lack of incentive is bad management, often caused by loss or lack of a career structure within the organisation. I have seen this at first hand in some large organisations where complete departments have been ruined as a result of jobs for the boys, where people have been elevated to certain management or supervisory positions purely because they have belonged to the same lodge or club or because they played football or golf with certain people, and so on.

I have seen it happen so often. It may involve a person who is perhaps a leading hand and is looking forward to the day when he perhaps becomes foreman of a department. However, because of these jobs for the boys, someone's friend, uncle or cousin is brought in with no expertise and put in the job, whereas the person who should have been given the job and is there to carry the department has lost his career structure, and his incentive takes a nosedive. Another area of bad management includes working conditions which affect the morale of workers. Low morale means low productivity or inferior quality, or both. Some work is soul destroying, repetitive or boring, and this contributes to low morale. An example would be in a traditional motor vehicle assembly plant in the body shop, on the line. Because of the amount of steel involved in these areas, they are very cold places in the winter time and very hot in the summer.

Another problem I have seen stems from the fact that, because there is so much steel and overhead equipment, lighting is very bad and artificial lights must be used. Many times on a very hot day in summer, when it is perhaps 38 degrees, or even as high as 42 degrees, the lights have to be turned off because of the heat. I have actually seen production workers working almost in semi-darkness in an effort to keep a little cooler. Added to that is the noise, sparks, fumes, oil and everything else. Then there is the matter of the very small wages that these workers receive. Despite what employers say about workers getting too much money, these are very poorly paid people.

The following figures might surprise some members. For an ordinary passenger motor vehicle costing of the order of $15 000, the actual labour costs represent 5 per cent. In other words, for a $15 000 car, the labour cost is $750. The rest of the cost is in materials, and so on. There are some small components that would have a labour cost associated with them, and it would be an interesting exercise one day for me to find the actual final figure. However, in the large parts of the vehicle plus the assembly, the labour cost is 5 per cent. So much for the greedy workers and high wages! Over the last three years in this country there has been a fall of 5 per cent in real wages at a time of strong growth when wages could have been expected to rise strongly on the basis of past experience.

Mr Tyler: And record profits.

Mr De LAINE: Yes, I am coming to that. There has been a fall of 7 per cent in real unit labour costs—something that no other country in the Western world has achieved—and, as my colleague says, a return to more normal levels of profitability. It is absolute nonsense for employers to argue that Australian workers enjoy conditions far above those enjoyed in other countries. Such arguments ignore the facts. Comparisons with other countries put the issue in its proper perspective. Comparatively, the holiday conditions enjoyed by Australian workers are no more generous than those in many western industrialised countries where workers enjoy similar length holidays and the payment of a bonus for annual leave is relatively common place.

The holiday loading has been under attack of late. The difference with Australia is that Australia gets less than most other countries. We receive 17½ per cent holiday loading, whereas some other Western countries receive much more: Belgium, 90 per cent; Denmark, 30 per cent; France, 30 per cent; Greece, 50 per cent; Netherlands, 30 per cent; Norway, 32 per cent; Portugal, 100 per cent; Sweden, 25 per cent; and Finland, 50 per cent. These all compare more than favourably with Australia's 17½ per cent. In countries such as Finland, Switzerland and West Germany, and even the United States, agreements provide for various forms of additional leave money. In Japan, a loading is not paid as such, but instead workers receive up to two months pay each year in the form of an annual bonus. These examples put the arguments in their proper context.

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

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I rise to lodge a formal complaint on behalf of my grapegrowing electors and indeed those employed in the grapegrowing industry elsewhere in South Australia. There has been the creation of an expectation that with the vine pull some people can hope to extract themselves from an industry that is in great difficulty. That hope has not been met by the current State Government. Let me very quickly refer to the initial arrangements. The scheme was announced by the Federal Government, which indicated that money would be available on a shared basis with the States for the pull of table grapes. Because the number of table grapes in South Australia is so small, by negotiation between the Government of the day and the Federal Government it was agreed that, instead of table grapes in South Australia, it would be possible to undertake the pull of wine grapes.

That decision was to be commended: it was a sensible approach that was lauded by people in the industry, and an announcement was made in due course. Regrettably, because of the delay by a number of people in the industry in lodging their applications, those who lodged their applications first received assistance straight away, whether or not they warranted assistance. Many people who were speculation buyers of property, many who had businesses or professions in country areas associated with a rural way of living, decided to quit their grapes and not have any more problems. They lodged their application and were assisted. However, many of the people who were most in need of assistance, those who rely entirely upon grapes and a little income from cows, sheep, bees and poultry, were a little more lax in lodging those applications.

I suggest that it was correct within the system that, on receipt of the notice of lodgement, a lodgement was given a number, and consecutive numbers were given to all that followed. Consideration was given then to deciding on the lodgements in that order. By the time application No. 135 was reached, the money had run out. A number of announcements in the newspapers in April and early May of this year clearly indicated that there were no further

funds and, therefore, the vine pull scheme was in some difficulty.

Indeed, the Minister of Agriculture advised a group of people at Tanunda on 18 June this year that at that stage there were 730 applicants and only 135 of them had been processed. All applications were in by the due date, which was June 1986. The Minister, at that meeting at Tanunda, indicated his intention to place a means test on every person whose application number was in excess of No. 135. That matter appears in the *Advertiser* of 19 June under the heading, 'Means test of grape vine pull under fire'.

Such was the outcry and the grave concern expressed by the United Farmers and Stockowners (which was representing the grapegrowers) that a retraction was made on 2 July 1986. Less than two weeks later, the Minister indicated (and this is reported in the *Advertiser* of 2 July 1986) that 370 of the 730 applicants would be helped without being means tested, at a cost of $4.5 million of the total $5.2 million available for vine pulling. So there was a change of heart. But what about applicants Nos. 371, 372, 400 and 420, who had fulfilled their obligation and were standing in line? They were suddenly told, 'You will be means tested, although those who have gone before will not be means tested.'

I suggest quite positively on behalf of the people I represent and those in other wine grape growing areas of South Australia that, except where circumstances make it quite unnecessary for people to receive assistance, everyone who had lodged their application by the due date should be considered equally with those whose application had been processed in the early days. I suggest that for several reasons. First, there was a clear expectation that the only hope for the future of a number of those people was what was being offered. There was also a move by senior officers of the Department of Agriculture and the viticultural station at Nuriootpa, on the advice that was in their hands at that time, to advise these applicants, 'Go out and commence the process by taking out your strainer posts. Wind up your wire and take out your struts and, by the time the application is considered and you are told to go ahead, it will be open go. Do not bother to prune your vines because, if they are to be pulled out, they will not need pruning, and that is an added cost which at this stage you cannot meet and for which there will be no return.'

There are scores of people in that position in the Barossa Valley and elsewhere: they have undertaken positive work at a cost of personal endeavour as well as costs for fuel and other commodities that are necessary to pull out those posts and wind up that wire. These people are now told that, because they do not receive 50 per cent of their total income from the vines, based on present values (and deflated values, which had been decided by the self-same Minister of Agriculture), they are no longer eligible. I refer to people who have been mowing the lawns at the local high school or doing ancillary work at schools and whose wife is working one or two nights as a nurse for the benefit of the community, utilising the profession that she had applied prior to marriage, to help the family and to keep the family from having to make application to the Department for Community Welfare or the Department of Social Security.

These are people who are prepared to continue in an agricultural pursuit without vines but who now are unable to obtain the assistance that was promised them, according to the expectation they were given and the promises made, quite faithfully, by members of the department. These people had been assured that they would receive a response by 31 August, but to this date, 23 September, they still have not received a response from the department. I refer to people whose vines are breaking out in bud, people who could just not physically prune the vines that require pruning at present because of the time factor, and people who, if they pruned the vines, would not have wires to tie down the canes because those wires have been pulled out on advice.

They are the people on whose behalf I protest. I say quite clearly to all members in this House, and specifically to the Minister of Agriculture, that it is high time the position in relation to the vine pull was reassessed. I am not suggesting that every applicant should receive consideration: I believe that those Johnnys-come-lately who tried to lodge their application after the due date (and there are many of those) should perhaps get short shrift or be considered in a different way to those who lodged their application by the given due date. Unless some positive step of this nature, with a certain amount of compassion, is taken by the Government, we will see a lot more bankruptcies and there will be a lot more unfortunate personal consequences within families.

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I would like to take time to draw attention to a number of matters of concern in relation to the administration of the health budget. In particular, I direct attention to the administration of the Commonwealth health budget which, of course, has implications not only for the State and its funding but also for the citizens of South Australia. It is unfortunate that in recent years we have seen a real and substantial divergence between the public and the private health systems in this country. While I have particular respect for the Federal Minister for Health (who is also my Federal member of Parliament in the District of Bonython, and who has done a great deal to try to reform and improve the administration of health in this country), unfortunately, by a process of Party policy and fixed ideology, he has been caught between competing forces from the left and right of him which have locked his policy administration into a very limited and fixed train of thought.

Consequently, that has produced a health system that is perhaps the worst of all possible worlds: it is neither a public nor a private system; it is funded neither publicly nor totally privately; it is simply an amalgamation of both those systems whereby those who have the funds and the income to purchase private health insurance or who choose to scrimp and save to get the money together to pay that substantial bill of private insurance are able to enjoy significant benefits over those who are not able to obtain the funds or those who have been led by the Government to believe it is not necessary to take out that insurance. That is simply not the case any longer.

We in Australia have seen the emergence of substantial waiting lists in public hospitals not only for non-urgent surgery but also for measures that the patients themselves consider to be quite important and quite urgent. In my own area, although substantial gains have been made in relation to the Lyell McEwin Hospital, I understand that, particularly in the area of ear, nose and throat surgery, there are waiting lists of about 18 months to two years. That is not the fault of the staff at the Lyell McEwin Hospital: it is rather a reflection of the way in which the current system that we have evolved is acting to channel people into private health insurance. Those same patients, if they are privately insured, instead of having to wait some 18 months for treatment, are able to obtain treatment almost the next week if they have full insurance.

I do not regard that as satisfactory, and I am very surprised and indeed concerned that the Federal Government has allowed such a system to evolve, given its strong commitment to providing health care for the poor and the

disadvantaged in Australia. But these days, of course, given the cost of private health insurance, one does not have to be particularly disadvantaged or poor to find that the cost is a substantial impost. To acquire full private health insurance, one is looking at about $60 a month, and that is indeed a substantial slice from the average wage-earner's pay packet. While the Medicare system has enabled people to receive treatment by their local doctor of choice and 85 per cent reimbursement of that fee and has therefore provided quite adequate access to general practitioners in Australia, it is not the case when one requires hospital treatment that that same service is available. I believe that one of the things we need to look at very seriously, apart from the timing mechanism in the House—

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the clock. While I am very appreciative of the contribution that the member for Elizabeth is making, I am sure that it is more than one minute since he commenced his contribution.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I am sure that is right.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I thank the member for Heysen for drawing it to my attention. We will guesstimate and put the clock on seven minutes.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I am sure that that will be much more satisfactory, both to me and other members. The cost of hospital care is accelerating rapidly, to the point where only those on full private health insurance are able to afford the full range of services that the private sector is able to provide. I for one quite firmly believe that medical insurance is a thing that the public sector can provide very well. There is no reason why the public sector cannot provide efficient and effective medical insurance. In this context I am not speaking of a British style national health system, because that is quite another concept altogether and has not proven to be as successful as those who initiated it might have hoped.

However, that is not to say that the public sector, in this case Medicare and Medibank, is not able to provide, through the medium of the Health Insurance Commission, an effective private health insurance scheme funded through a levy system. The present restrictions on the levy simply restraining it to 1.25 per cent of taxable income, thereby ensuring that people are able to obtain only one standard of service from that scheme, is most unfortunate indeed. It forces people into what has become a duplicative private health insurance scheme whereby very many private health insurance schemes throughout this country provide the same service, at substantial cost to their clients, as that provided by Medibank Private. The duplication of service between Medicare and Medibank Private must be costing the country a great deal of money.

The Commonwealth health budget for 1986-87 is some $7 300 million, and within that there is a substantial cost of general administration of some $71 million. Of course, that is providing the wherewithal for a public health insurance system which could easily adopt all the requirements of those who wish to have a greater standard than that necessarily provided by Medicare. It is essential that the Federal Government should look seriously at the ambit of its services and attempt to redress the ever-diverging gap between public and private health care in this country.

For the Labor Government to be able to hold its head high in the community in respect of health care it needs to ensure that those who are not able to afford the full tote odds private system are able to obtain adequate health cover, and I do not believe that that is the case at present. The ever-increasing waiting lists in the public hospitals and yet the ready availability of that same treatment in private hospitals, I think is a cause for serious concern, and it is about time the Federal Government, in consultation with the States, addressed that problem.

However, one aspect that they have addressed in cost-cutting terms is pharmaceutical benefits. It concerns me that not only have we seen a massive increase to $10 in the amount of patient contribution, but also that a range of what are called in the Federal budget low cost over-the-counter items are to be deleted from the schedule of pharmaceutical benefits from 1 November 1986. Many of these drugs are of particular need to individuals in the community who have relied on them for some time, and although a safety net provision is to be introduced whereby after 25 prescriptions have been issued in one year the patient will be entitled to free pharmaceuticals for the remainder of the year, the fact is that people still have to spend the initial $250 to purchase the 25 prescriptions at $10.

That is a substantial impost on pensioners and low income earners, and where a person is suffering from a chronic illness they will have substantial costs to meet before they reach that safety net provision. Although I appreciate that the safety net is there, I think that comes a little bit too late to assist many of those on low incomes. In fact, it should be used to identify those who need chronic health care and pharmaceutical benefits and provide accordingly. Although the drugs may be described by the Federal Minister for Health 'as low cost over-the-counter' items, many pensioners and low income earners with perhaps heart or other chronic conditions that require repeated access to drugs would challenge that statement.

In the few moments that remain to me I would like to take up the matter of a State fee, in this case the motor vehicle establishment fee. The Minister recently imposed a $10 charge on those who allow their registration to lapse for more than 30 days. While I agree that a significant administrative and clerical component is required of the department to reinstate such a lapsed registration, I believe that the introduction of the fee without warning has caused some hardship and discontent amongst the motor vehicle licensing public. The fact is that in this State over many years it has become a practice that people may allow registrations to lapse while they travel overseas or the like, while they are perhaps ill and unable to drive, or perhaps during the winter months when they only use their boat or caravan during summer.

This practice has been established over many years and the Government's previous regulations and the Acts of this Parliament permitted that practice—even encouraged it. Suddenly, without warning, a $10 fee is imposed, and those people who had reasonably taken the Government's measures before to permit them to allow their registration to lapse are, in effect, caught by that measure. I believe that the Government should have provided much greater warning of that introduciton, and I question what will happen late in 1987 when the department's multimillion dollar computer system comes on line. Then it is not the case that there will be substantial clerical work involved. In fact, if the computer system is properly designed it will be a relatively simple task to reinstate the registration. I hope that we can look forward to reading in the *Government Gazette* this time next year that that fee has been abolished in view of the savings that computerisation will make to the system. In view of the concession extended to me earlier, I will now retire.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I want to take this opportunity to refer to a major concern which relates not only to my electorate but is on a much wider scale through-

out the State, regarding the distribution of subsidies for the Country Fire Service for 1986-87, and also the ongoing uncertainty concerning the future methods of the distribution of such subsidies. There is also an apparent lack of consultation relating to changes that we are told are to be implemented to the Country Fires Act. A considerable number of CFS brigades are located in my electorate, and I represent probably some of the most fire prone areas in the State. Of considerable concern to me are some of the complaints and uncertainties expressed by senior officers within the brigades for which I have responsibility. In particular, volunteer officers are expressing more frustrations and concerns now than I have ever known since I have been a member of this House. One brigade for which I am responsible is the Mount Barker brigade, and the Mount Barker District Council is responsible for some nine different brigades in the area.

Mount Barker is only one of the councils of which I am aware to take up the matter with the Minister of Emergency Services. The Mount Barker council has forwarded me a copy of a letter that it has written, as follows:

Following consideration of documents received from the Director, Country Fire Services, in relation to distribution of subsidies for the 1986-87 financial year council has resolved as follows:

That the Minister of Emergency Services be requested not to implement the proposed change in the method of distribution of subsidy payments for the 1986-87 financial year, to allow further investigation on the effect of the changes to Region 1. Such investigation to include the actual cost of maintaining brigades in high fire risk areas and the basis of subsidy payments for equipment purchases.

For your information this council is responsible for nine CFS brigades, and maintenance expenditure for 1985-86 was $50 720 (estimated as $69 687 for 1986-87). The anticipated subsidy payable for 1986-87 is $3 850 whereas in 1985-86 the telephone and landline concession entitlement (based on the Commonwealth grant for this purpose) was $4 932. This payment was included in the overall maintenance grant.

For equipment, a total of $54 855 has been approved for 1986-87, and at the rate of subsidy payable (20 per cent), $10 971 will be received by way of subsidy.

That council has been very responsible in its approach following the change of policy by the CFS Board. It has been one council that has been able to help out, for example, the Mount Barker brigade very well indeed in regard to a new vehicle.

There are other councils that, for financial reasons, are not able to assist in the same way. I have been made aware of other brigades that have sought to purchase new vehicles but have been unable to do so until this year because they wanted a vehicle recommended by the board but, as I have said, that was not possible until this year. With the change of policy they have now lost the opportunity to obtain a subsidy through the board.

I have also received correspondence from the Mount Lofty Ranges Fire Fighting Association, which has particular concerns, as follows:

Consultation

There was no consultation with CFS brigades prior to the announcement of the changes.

Statistics

In many cases the statistical information on which the funding decisions were based is incorrect.

Standards of Fire Cover

Little, if any, regard seems to have been taken of local fire danger potential.

Prior Commitments

Some brigades had written commitments to subsidy funding by the CFS Board and one had proceeded with a purchase, only now to find that no subsidy will be forthcoming.

Planning

All Brigades are involved in planning in areas of equipment, improvement and replacement, facility improvement and training. The decision has caused much of this planning to be halted.

The letter refers particularly to morale and, above all, it states:

The most important factor that you should be aware of—

and the letter is addressed to the Premier—

is the deterioration of the morale of volunteers.

It is only in the past week that I have received a copy of a letter that was sent to the Director of the South Australian Country Fire Services by a constituent of mine who has had considerable experience within the CFS over some 16 years. The letter states:

Arising from my experience of some 16 years close association with the CFS, I make the point I consider most pertinent. The volunteer input should be acknowledged, encouraged and not tampered with. If the thousands of volunteers who put in countless hours service to their communities through CFS billed the Government for their time, the State would be broke. Volunteers from all areas are more than happy to extend their service to give extra time in formalised training as well as the necessary time in the field. CFS headquarters would do well to foster the training of volunteers rather than attempting to set up a bureaucracy of administration costing huge amounts of State and local money. It is easy to justify greater expenditure on bureaucratic administration, and the larger the organisation becomes the easier it is to justify further expansion. The organisation finally becomes a self perpetuating monster consuming greater amounts of money each year.

I look back to the CFS when we at Thebarton Police Barracks, with Mr Fred Kerr as our Director and about four seconded police officers, a storeman, two female office staff, a police cadet and myself as secretary, adequately encouraged, maintained and directed the efforts of about 10 000 volunteers in the field.

I do not wish to pretend that those arrangements were the ultimate, nor do I wish the CFS of the 1980s to return to them. However, I have no desire to see the CFS continue on its present course of division and discouragement of local effort with an ever growing professional bureaucracy at its head. To be specific, I would make the following points which I consider pertinent.

1. The 'wealthier' council areas are largely metropolitan fringe and contain the highest risk factors in terms of population and real property in the State.

2. These 'wealthier' councils are probably no more wealthy per head of population than the more sparsely populated fringe areas, bearing in mind the extensive works and maintenance expenditures which accompany a larger denser population.

3. The 'poorer' fringe area councils contain a large number of self-sufficient farm type firefighting appliances. The local farmers do not look to CFS for complete fire protection as do urban householders. There have been instances of expensive fire vehicles in these areas being under-utilised.

4. The Adelaide Hills area, as testified by 'Black Sunday' and two recent 'Ash Wednesdays', contain both the highest bushfire risk factors as outlined above, plus some of the most difficult terrain in the State. Coupled with a denser population, busy freeways containing large and heavy transport vehicles, often with dangerous loads and a wider range of urban and rural fire risk, these areas should be cared for financially, not penalised, because individual council income is high compared with outer rural areas.

5. Local people in all areas work hard to acquire a decent level of fire protection for their communities. This is certainly not a selfish attitude but a practical one. If it is to be considered 'selfish' for our brigade seeking to voluntarily protect our district and neighbouring districts to the best of our ability, as all CFS volunteers do, I fear for the future of voluntary community service in any form.

That is only one letter among many that I have received from constituents. I believe that the letter expresses the concern, uncertainty and frustration that the volunteer movement is feeling at this time.

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

Mr TYLER (Fisher): I will contribute to the budget process and bring to Parliament's attention some of the important matters affecting my electorate. First, I refer to a few things that have arisen in the debate so far—all from the Opposition. The Opposition kept referring to this budget as a borrowing budget. I am glad to see that the Opposition has finally got it right. I note that on budget night the

Leader of the Opposition referred to it as a taxing budget. Members opposite have certainly gone through the budget papers and finally recognised that this is a borrowing budget and not a taxing budget. It is a borrowing budget for very good reasons—reasons that the Premier spelt out in his budget address. If it was not for this borrowing activity, certainly there would not be any stimulus in the building, housing and construction areas, as there would not be any schools, houses, roads, bridges, and so on, being constructed.

The Opposition kept referring to the legacies that we would leave for future generations from this borrowing program. However, it never looks at the other side of the ledger—the legacy that we will leave in the form of infrastructure in relation to the schools, the roads and the bridges. The Opposition should be consistent and look at this from a positive view and not always from a negative view. It is also disappointing and a bit surprising to see the Opposition continually attacking SAFA. SAFA has certainly been one of the success stories of the Bannon Government. In fact, almost every respected political journalist in this State has dubbed it the 'Bannon Bank'. Single-handedly, SAFA has shielded this State from the effects of declining revenue. The Premier should be applauded for this by all members of Parliament, and indeed he is being applauded by all South Australians. Members opposite should go into the pubs and clubs, into the schools and out into their electorates, because they would then see that the Premier is very highly regarded.

Quite frankly, I find very disappointing the Opposition's approach to Parliament and to constructive political discussion in this State. I am one of the people who believe in the parliamentary process, and think that the Opposition does have a constructive role to play. It is a pity that it does not see itself playing a constructive role. I am sure the Opposition believes that its role is purely a negative one. I was interested today, in reading my copy of the Adelaide *News*, to see on page 29 an advertisement which I now draw to the attention of the House. Headed, 'Our problem is Us', it states:

> When I think about our attitude on the economic situation in our State, I reckon the biggest problem is all we ever hear is bad news. And with this constant stream of bad news coming at us from all sides it's easy to start getting more and more negative. But when you start going into some of the details it really isn't that bad.
>
> For instance, our inflation rate is below the national average and our employment growth is above the average. In fact, on close inspection we are not doing all that badly at all. All we have to do is keep trying a little harder all the time. And when you start seeing the good news that's around us you will find it won't be long before the State we're living in gets even better.

That was inserted by Brian Phillis, the Managing Director of the Brian Phillis Group. The Opposition should have a good hard look at what respected people in the business community are saying about our State. They are certainly looking not at the negative side but rather at the positive side. We live in a great State, and this Government is trying to make it even better.

I would now like to refer to some of the problems in my electorate. As I have told the Parlaiment on many occasions before, I have an extremely young electorate. I have an electorate that has experienced rapid growth in recent years. Of course, all this means that there is a great demand on community and human services; for example, child-care is a vital area in my electorate. I am pleased to see in the budget that there is a commitment to build a child-care centre at Aberfoyle Park. Although I am delighted that this child-care centre will be built in the next 12 months, I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister responsible for children's services the critical shortage in my electorate of facilities for children. Kindergartens, child-care centres and playgroups are all bulging at the seams. In fact, there are several playgroups that operate from people's homes.

However, I do acknowledge that we have very real financial problems and constraints on us at the moment and that times will get leaner before they get better. But, education is another critical area. Although I believe that the students living in my electorate have some of the best school facilities and the highest standard of teachers available in this State, there is still much more that we could do. For example, the Reynella East School, which has approximately 2 000 students, is bursting at the seams. I hope that the Minister of Education bears this in mind and talks to his department about getting the Woodcroft group of schools up and running as soon as we possibly can.

The Morphett Vale East area and the Reynella East area are currently developing rapidly. This is of great concern to the school council of Reynella East, of which I am a member. And, while I am on the subject of the Reynella East campus, I would also remind the Minister of Transport again that the Reynella East area and the Happy Valley West area have inadequate public transport. This is a point that I hope the Minister will bear in mind. I also hope to have the opportunity to take up this matter with the Minister during the Estimates Committee.

Also on the matter of transport, I would like to talk about the problems associated with transport in the Sheidow Park and Trott Park area. There could be no worse problem in our community than isolation. And that is exactly what the residents of Sheidow Park and Trott Park have at the moment. They have a very poor STA bus service in that area. The Minister of Transport will know, and my friends in the STA and the Department of Transport will remember, that over the past couple of years I have made repeated calls for services in that area to be upgraded. I have told the residents of Sheidow Park and Trott Park that I have pledged myself to ensure that they get an adequate bus service and that this current service is at least upgraded. This area is about to experience a big housing boom. A couple of weeks ago, I took the opportunity to meet with one of the local councillors from the Marion City Council who covers the Ward 4 area, and we looked at some of the proposals and some of the programs that are available for the Sheidow Park/Trott Park area. Part of that was looking at a huge Hickinbotham and A.V. Jennings development which is to be constructed shortly. In fact, construction of some houses has started south of Landers Road at Trott Park. The sorts of pressures that this development will have on the local community and the existing infrastructure in that area should not be underestimated. For instance, the local primary school, which is already experiencing a huge enrolment increase, will not be able to cope with the expected increase in population. The same applies to the local kindergarten, and I urge the Minister of Educaiton to look at this situation as soon as possible. I am sure that his department and the officers of the southern region are well and truly acquainted with the situation that will exist in the next few years.

The same applies to the transport system, which, as I have mentioned already, is inadequate, and the Government will be under even more pressure in the next couple of years. But, it is not all negative in the Sheidow Park and Trott Park area. For instance, the CAFHS centre, which has been built in the primary school grounds, is a much welcomed initiative of the State Government, and certainly the Minister of Health should be congratulated. I remember last year talking to a group of mothers on site with the Health Minister concerning the problems that they were experienc-

ing in obtaining their new building. I am pleased to see that the building is now in existence.

Also, I would like to congratulate Marion council on a marvellous initiative in constructing the Trott Park Neighbourhood House. I had an opportunity to look at the building and talk to some of the coordinators there last week. The facility is well and truly being utilised by the local community. Currently the staff are employed on a CEP grant but, when the grant runs out towards the end of the year, I have no doubt that pressure will be put on the State and Federal Governments to find some resources for the Trott Park area. I certainly will be in there fighting for them.

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

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): I have read through the *Hansard* report of the Government members' budget speeches, and it is obvious that most lack any basic knowledge of the budget papers or their meaning. That, unfortunately for this State, includes the Treasurer himself! However, one Government member did show some knowledge of the difference between capital expenditure and recurrent expenditure. I hope it is not because of this glimmer of understanding of financial matters that the Premier has consigned him to the cobweb bench. That member is the member for Hartley.

The member for Hartley, in his budget speech on 16 September, levelled severe criticism at Opposition speakers for their failure to deal with the budget in their speeches. Then, he proceeded to deal with budgets presented four to seven years ago, continuing with quite inaccurate statements related to Liberal Party election policies and the use of the private sector. Neither of these two subjects, which took up most of the honourable member's budget speech, has anything to do with the 1986-87 budget. The honourable member appears to have overlooked that, in criticising the budgets of 1979 to 1982 and the use of capital funds to balance a recurrent budget shortfall, the same criticism should now be directed at the 1986-87 budget. His lavish praise smacks of political bias.

I would ask the member for Hartley to look carefully at the increased borrowings from statutory authorities in the proposals for the 1986-87 budget (an increase of $181 million to $314 million), together with a close examination of how those borrowed funds are going to be used. When he has completed that small and simple exercise, I invite him to examine the probability of the recurrent budget items for 1986-87 not producing the amounts predicted.

In my budget speech I dealt with two areas of concern: land tax and payroll tax. If one examines those facts closely it will be seen that this budget is just as open to critical comment as those criticisms levelled by the member for Hartley at the previous Government's budget result. But the use of capital funds in this budget is undertaken with a great amount of subtlety which I am sure is not understood by those vocal members from the Government benches opposite.

Despite the honourable member's lack of critical comment on the huge increase of borrowings (and I stress that) and their use in the 1986-87 budget, his most blatant misinformation is his criticism of the Liberal Party's election philosophy on privatisation. I now refer to the honourable member's budget speech, in which he stated:

> Let us look at the contribution of statutory authorities to State budget revenue. Let us look at some authorities and some of the Government bodies that members opposite were going to privatise. The Electricity Trust contributed some $28.2 million.

In the first place, the Electricity Trust contributed nothing: electricity consumers were touched to the tune of $28.2 million as another tax on the power they used. Even if ETSA was privatised the Government could still apply such a tax on power consumption. Further, the Liberal Party's policy did not advocate the privatisation of ETSA: it advocated that all commercial operations undertaken by Government or Government agencies should be placed under the microscope and, if it could be clearly demonstrated that the consuming and taxpaying public could be served more efficiently and cheaply by the private sector, changes should be made. If, then, the Government insists on taxing electricity use it can do so but not boast about statutory authority contributions to State revenues. The key to the Liberal Party's election policy was to encourage cheaper and more efficient services, both for the consumer and for the taxpayer. The honourable member then continued his misinformation by referring to the Woods and Forests donation of $2.9 million as a payment in lieu of income. The member for Hartley stated:

> Honourable members opposite wanted to privatise the Woods and Forests Department.

Mr Groom: You're after it.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I am quoting from the honourable member's speech. The direction the Liberal Party was taking in relation to the Woods and Forests Department was similar to the direction we were taking with ETSA: that the commercial operations of the department should be closely examined and, if it could be clearly demonstrated to be in the interests of the taxpaying and consuming public, then something should be done about it.

I want to have a quick look at the commercial operations of the department to enlighten the member for Hartley. The department's commercial operations are worth about $20 million, which amounts to about 5 per cent of its total capital valuation. If its commercial operations were privatised, the return to the State's Treasury in the reduction of public debt would be the same as the $2.9 million allowed for in the present budget. The major assets would continue to be held, as would the major forest operations.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is too much conversation across the Chamber.

Mr D.S. BAKER: It can be seen from this brief examination that the argument put forward by the honourable member is patently wrong. Economic reality will eventually decide the issue for the pragmatic Labor members opposite, but never for the dedicated socialists. The Prime Minister has recently found that out. However, the Government has changed its view on some of the issues it vehemently attacked during the election campaign and, as time passes, it will change its view even further. I can well remember the uneducated attack on the Liberal Party's policy on the sale of Housing Trust homes to existing tenants. Suddenly, the Minister has changed direction and has seen a faint glimmer of sense in this area of privatisation.

Finally, the member for Hartley, for the few minutes in his speech that did not relate to previous budgets, talked about the South Australian Financing Authority. The responsibility of SAFA was previously undertaken by Treasury. These responsibilities are now taken one step away from the Treasury Department, and I believe that that is a small step towards privatisation. Of course, I am not arguing for privatisation of our State Treasury but, if the efficiency in administration of certain Treasury responsibilities has been so remarkably improved through the establishment of SAFA, how can the member for Hartley so strongly oppose the necessary examination of commercial operations under-

taken by Governments to see whether, in the interests of consumers and taxpayers, we can utilise the drive, imagination and efficiency of the private sector to carry out some of those functions?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Gilles): I wish to refer to the Betting Control Board Report and the Auditor-General's Report relating to the activities of that board. The Betting Control Board Report was tabled today by the Minister in this House. In the report I note that the number of licensed bookmakers has declined from 104 in 1985 to 99 in 1986, and the number of bookmakers' clerks or agents has declined from 1 178 in 1985 to 1 146 in 1986. I would like to refer particularly to the duty of the board to register licensed premises operative in Port Pirie. To my surprise, over the weekend I noted in the press a statement by the new Chairman of the South Australian Jockey Club (Mr Malcolm Fricker), who, under the heading 'Betting shops outdated—Fricker', was reported as saying that betting shops were outdated. He indicated that the South Australian Jockey Club aimed to persuade the State Government that they were obsolete or outdated. He is quoted as saying that bookmakers' turnover and the tax paid on that turnover was in the vicinity of $200 000 in 1985-86, as indicated in the board's report. He said that, if the same sum as had been invested with Port Pirie bookmakers had been invested with the TAB, the returns available to the Government and the racing industry would be far more substantial.

I have news for Mr Fricker, because I believe he has drawn a wrong assumption in saying that, if betting shops were not there, that money would have been invested with the TAB. I believe that nothing could be further from the truth because, if Port Pirie's betting shops did not operate, I believe the money would not necessarily all be invested with the TAB. I believe it would be more likely to be invested with SP bookmakers so that the Government and the racing industry would receive no revenue at all from that source.

Those of us who were in the House in 1982 can well remember the amendment to the Racing Act which was moved by the then Liberal Government Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. Michael Wilson). Section 105 of the Act was amended to allow the premises to continue indefinitely. I refer to the history of licensed betting premises in Port Pirie, on which I will give some background information.

In 1934, the then State Government passed legislation to legalise off course betting in shop premises in South Australia, not only in country areas but also in the metropolitan area. It would appear that the main reasons were that with the depression the racing industry at that time was on the verge of collapse and the incidence of illegal betting was prevalent. Racing clubs gained no revenue from this activity. With the advent of licensed betting premises and the revenue gained from turnover tax on bookmakers' holdings, the distribution of moneys to the racing clubs assisted with the continuation of the sport. This situation continued until racing in South Australia was suspended during the Second World War. After the cessation of the war, racing was resumed. However, the betting shops were not automatically reopened throughout South Australia. A tribunal was formed comprising members of the Betting Control Board for a hearing to be conducted for the resumption of licensed premises. Only three licences were granted—for Peterborough, Port Pirie and Quorn.

For some obscure reason, a further investigation was conducted and Quorn and Peterborough's licensed premises were discontinued. This left Port Pirie as the only town in South Australia with licensed betting premises, and this situation still applies today.

The operations of the betting shops continued from 1946, when they again came into operation. Assurances were given by Governments over a long period of time that they would continue. However, in 1976 with the advent of the Racing Act, following the Hancock inquiry into racing, moves were made to phase out the bookmakers at Port Pirie. A meeting was convened between the bookmakers, the member for Port Pirie (Mr Ted Connelly) and the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Mr Casey). This meeting was held at Port Pirie in early 1976. Mr Casey sought to close the premises by 1980. However, a compromise was reached and the date for their closure was decided on and accepted reluctantly by the bookmakers as 31 January 1983. That was written into the Racing Act as section 105.

I believe that most of us can remember the situation that prevailed in 1982, and this was supported in 1980 by a committee of inquiry into racing which was established by the Tonkin Government and which also recommended that premises be closed from that date, 31 January 1983. However, following a debate in this House on the matter, as Opposition shadow Minister of Recreation and Sport I gave notice that I would introduce a private member's Bill to allow the continuation of licensed premises after that date. The Tonkin Government had a sudden change of heart, and as a consequence the then Minister (Hon. Michael Wilson) introduced a Bill to amend section 105 of the Racing Act to allow the premises to continue indefinitely. I might point out that I, as shadow Minister, and the Labor Party supported that legislation.

As the South Australian Jockey Club would know those licensed premises have now operated for some 52 years. Indeed, at the time of the last debate in this House we were impressed with the weight of local opinion overwhelmingly supporting the retention of betting shops in Port Pirie. Indeed, at that time it was very difficult to find anybody in that town who was opposed to it. I point out that I strongly support the retention of the betting shops in Port Pirie. They have now been in operation for over 50 years and have become part of life and part of the social environment of Port Pirie. They are almost an institution in that town and offer a service to local people. If that service was not available, a large amount of money would be spent in SP betting. The Government and the racing industry therefore would receive no revenue from that source. Over the years, no discernable social problems have been associated with the betting premises in Port Pirie, and the police have advised that very little, if any, illegal betting occurs in the town. I believe that the Chairman of the South Australian Jockey Club has unfortunately backed the wrong horse.

As I said, I strongly believe that the shops should be retained and that Mr Fricker and the Jockey Club would be better served if they, in conjunction with the State Government, gave more attention to the problems that are associated with SP betting throughout South Australia rather than advocating the closure of licensed premises in Port Pirie. Those clubs have served a very useful purpose over 50-odd years; they are part of the life of the people of Port Pirie; and I believe that those people are entitled to that service. It may appear on the surface to be an anomaly, but history shows very clearly that the people of Port Pirie support the betting shops. If the money was not devoted to betting in the licensed premises, it would certainly not be invested with the TAB, which has, I understand, two agencies in the town. So the people have a choice as to what service they are able to obtain.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I wish to use the time allotted to me this afternoon to further the cause of Eyre Peninsula people in relation to this vexed problem of daylight saving and two time zones. I guess one could be a cynic and say that, following my speech in this House last Tuesday and a question on Wednesday, one would expect the Government to get its troops organised and come up with some background material. Last Wednesday I asked the Deputy Premier whether he would table documents in relation to supporting evidence for the introduction of Eastern Standard Time for South Australia.

As one might have expected, the very next day I received a letter from the Managing Director of the State Bank, and my cynical, political mind thought, 'Ah ha, the Government has put the hand on the State Bank and said, "You come up with a letter to support us in this action".' I have made considerable inquiries since that time, and I am convinced that there was no parallel between the time at which I asked the question and the letter that I received from the State Bank. If there is any reflection in the comments that I am about to make, I certainly do not wish them to be interpreted in that way. However, I believe that the letter should be read into *Hansard* because I think it highlights some of the anomalies and misconceptions, as I believe them to be, confronting this State at the present moment. The letter states:

Dear Mr Blacker.

I note that the State Government intends to legislate to put South Australia on the same time zone as used by the Eastern States. State Bank of South Australia supports any move to bring Central South Australia into the same time zone as the Eastern States.

The implication of that letter is that the State Bank supports not only the division of South Australia into two time zones but also that one should adopt Eastern Standard Time. The letter continues:

We believe that local business and in some cases people's clients are disadvantaged by the current half an hour difference in time between the key centres of Sydney and Melbourne and Adelaide.

I cannot accept that as any sort of fair and reasonable argument. I could just as easily have been quoting from *Hansard* of 1898, when the original Standard Time Act was introduced into State Parliament. If we changed the dates and left the argument exactly the same, one would not know the difference, except that perhaps at that time the speakers were more eloquent in their handling of the English language. My point, and the inference in that letter, is that communications technology has advanced nowhere since 1898. One would have thought that this letter was written at that time if one compared it to the *Hansard* speeches. There is no reference to the 35-hour week, to flexitime, to facsimile machines, to telex machines, to instantaneous money transfer machines, and so on. All those facilities are available today, yet for some reason we believe that South Australia should be different from anywhere else in the world because we cannot handle time zones, as every other area in the world can do. The letter continues:

That belief [the Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide trio] is to a degree supported by the results of a poll recently commissioned by the State's Chamber of Commerce. I understand that two-thirds of the small number of respondents in the poll (on this very issue) were in favour of some change in the time zones to bring South Australia into line with the eastern seaboard.

No reference or consideration or thought is being given to this State within our own boundaries. It seems to want to shovel business out of the State rather than work within the State. What about the theme 'Our State's great'? The letter continues:

There is also support for change amongst members of the Institute of Directors in this State.

I do not know about that. They have certainly not contacted me, and I am not aware that they have contacted any other member of this Parliament. The letter continues:

So we believe there is wide support from South Australian business for the moves proposed by the State Government.

I challenge that remark. There is not wide support from South Australian business. There might be support from some of the big businesses whose principal offices are outside this State, but there is not widespread support from those who engage the thousands of people in the work force. The letter continues:

The bank's money market people have some difficulty with the current time difference. They experience a period of 'dead time' during the middle of the day when eastern States offices are not manned by senior people. Delays in negotiating deals can mean a cost to the bank's clients because of the volatile nature of the money market.

Again, possibly fewer than six employees could be implicated in that regard, yet the letter tends to suggest that the whole of the South Australian work force should be inconvenienced because of those six employees. The letter states:

We can identify three problems:

- communications
- efficiency
- potential for loss by clients.

State Bank's stockbroking arm, SVB Day Porter Pty Ltd, echoes those sentiments.

Again, only a handful of people are involved. Why cannot those people start work earlier? They probably do in this instance, yet the letter seeks to impose this penalty on the rest of the community. It goes on:

The company has to begin operations earlier than its counterparts and contacts in eastern States giving principals less time to prepare for the day's dealings. (Preparation includes updating on overnight movements in stocks and backgrounding from the morning's financial press.)

All members would be aware that anyone involved in the international money market, and so on, would know that they have to run their business 24 hours a day if they are to be in it and, if the bank is operating only within the business hours of this State, obviously it is not in the money market seriously.

Mr Peterson: What do people in Perth do?

Mr BLACKER: This letter tends to suggest that we pick up from the Eastern States but lose in comparison to the west. Let us face it—we do a lot of business with the west, and why should the west be further isolated? The letter continues:

There is also the aspect of international bodies wanting to deal with Adelaide based organisations. Overseas business people would find it easier if they did not have to isolate South Australia from the eastern States' time zone.

Rubbish! The letter continues:

Two less significant, but nonetheless important aspects we believe should be considered are travelling times interstate and the psychological effect of being half an hour behind. The present time differential means Adelaide people travelling interstate for business have a demanding schedule to be in Sydney or Melbourne at the opening of the business day. Psychologically South Australians have had to put up with snide remarks about being half an hour behind the East for years.

What a load of rubbish. The letter states:

The criticism is negative—

like the letter—

not constructive and can therefore have an adverse effect on people here. I would urge South Australians to get behind the move to bring business here into line with the eastern States.

It is signed 'Yours sincerely, Tim Marcus Clark, Managing Director, State Bank'.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: He did not get behind the South Australian granite issue.

Mr BLACKER: A good point. The honourable member has raised the granite issue, which I shall take up another time. I have spoken previously in the Parliament about that. This letter makes no mention about time zones or about the fact that, over this period, 12 of the branches on the Eyre Peninsula will be affected to a larger degree than is suggested in the letter. They do not care about that. They are happy to split the State for short-term convenience. If the State provided that there would never be any daylight savings, perhaps Eyre Peninsula could wear Eastern Standard Time, but we know that that is farcical. We know that the State has no intention of doing that.

What is more, I am critical about the way in which the Government has brought in regulations on daylight saving. It made a press announcement and, before that was done, Victoria and New South Wales brought forward their daylight saving two weeks because South Australia had done so. That was in the bulletin. Unfortunately, it was untrue and it is only now that the South Australian Government has made the move to start daylight saving earlier. That is a cynical political move, manipulated by the Government, and it should be condemned for doing so. We have seen the snide and calculated manipulation of the system. As the regulation has come in at this late stage, once 14 sitting days are up, the extra week of daylight saving will be gone. It will be past that time. That makes Parliament a mockery.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to take part in this debate. The first matter that I want to raise is the attitude and the attempts of the Health Commission to deny people living in the country areas their just right—reasonable service and the maintenance of the existing hospitals, most of which were originally constructed by the local communities. Last night, my colleague the Hon. Martin Cameron and I attended at Jamestown a meeting attended by 400 people, called to protest about the attitude and the plans of the Health Commission to do away with obstetrics services in a number of hospitals in the Mid-North of South Australia. No doubt the manner in which the Health Commission has gone about advising local communities and the manner in which it has twisted the information provided is quite deplorable. The time has come for the cleaners to be put through the Health Commission. There is no need to reduce country services at these hospitals, but there is an urgent need to get rid of a large number of that over-bloated bureaucracy that makes up the Health Commission. We should start with the Chairman. If ever there was a poor appointment, that was it. I realise that it would be an expensive exercise, but the taxpayer and the consumers who use the facilities are entitled to reasonable access to reasonable medical facilities. The information that has been given and the sneaky way in which the Health Commission has gone about endeavouring to put its plans into practice should be condemned.

I call on the Minister to give an unqualified assurance to those in the country areas that obstetric and other services will not be reduced, and people will not be forced to go to the regional centres such as Port Pirie, Port Augusta, Whyalla or Clare. For years these services have operated effectively. We have the lowest death rate per 10 000 people in country hospitals in the world, and on the latest figures available it was two deaths per 10 000 people. That is second to none. However, this bureaucracy known as the Health Commission, the devious scoundrels that manipulate the situations, are trying to take away from these local areas the services that have supported the people so well.

The meeting I attended last night overwhelmingly supported the existing services. These people are not only annoyed but outraged to think they have been given virtually no input into these working parties, which are under great time constraints. Having originally tried to bring this system in earlier this year and having been beaten on that occasion, they are now trying to come in through the backdoor. An article headed 'Jamestown meeting to fight hospital threat' in the *Review-Times* on Thursday 18 September 1986 states:

> 'We're sick and tired of having our services taken away; it's time we started to yell.' That is the opinion of the President of the Jamestown branch of the Country Women's Association, Mrs M. Cooper.
>
> The branch is convening a public meeting, to be held on Monday night, to discuss the latest threat to country hospitals. Earlier this year a number of Health Commission working parties were established to examine country hospitals. Preliminary findings were that obstetric and surgical services should be centralised and smaller hospitals become geriatric and minor emergency centres.
>
> 'It is not just obstetrics or surgery which is at threat, but the whole future of country hospitals,' Mrs Cooper said. 'Once obstetrics go, which is a major medical income earner, so will the doctors, leaving us with a reduced service, or no hospital at all.'
>
> 'Women have a right to have babies in their own area, with the support of friends and family. They also have the right to quality pre-natal care, which will not be available to outlying towns.'
>
> She said the public was largely unaware of the implications of the working party recommendations, or the urgency of the matter. 'The latest possibility is that the only regional hospital will be based at Clare, which is even further for people to travel.
>
> The public meeting will inform the community and encourage them to lobby the Health Commission or members of Parliament . . . She said that the CWA branch had been asked to convene a public meeting following the State Council meeting . . . The meeting will be addressed by . . . Dr J. Shepherd . . . Dr J. Biggins . . . and Jamestown Hospital Director of Nursing.
>
> Dr Biggins said yesterday that there were 'some real worries' and it was important to inform country people as to the future of their hospitals. He said that, while the Health Commission had been 'fair' in providing a balanced information service to the Working Party, he feared the 'hidden agenda' which could mean the closure of many State hospitals. Dr Biggins urged the public to attend the meeting and send their submissions to the Chairman of the Consultative Committee on Obstetrics and Neo-natal Services, before 10 October.

An article in the latest edition of the *West Coast Sentinel* headed 'Country maternity safe, says AMA' states:

> When it comes to having a baby, South Australia's country hospitals are as safe as Adelaide's big maternity wards.
>
> That's the welcome reassurance for country mothers-to-be from the South Australian branch of the AMA in a letter to all country hospital boards detailing the results of an independent analysis of disputed perinatal statistics.
>
> 'These statistics show that the rate of avoidable perinatal deaths is no different than in metropolitan teaching hospitals,' says the State President of the AMA, Dr Lehonde Hoare.

I sincerely hope that the Minister of Health will take on notice what the local people are saying and that these services will not be done away with and will remain. The doctors in these areas I am concerned with are qualified, and it is foolish to want to centralise all these services. Over the past few years millions of dollars have been spent on country hospitals. Over $1 million recently was spent on the Orroroo Hospital, and they want to turn it into a geriatric home. This sort of nonsense should come to an end.

I am most perturbed and look forward to fighting this issue until we are given an assurance that country people's rights will be protected and that commonsense will prevail. When one has well-meaning and probably highly qualified people, it is unfortunate that they lose touch with reality and have no practical commonsense. Their academic qualifications blind their judgment.

A number of my constituents are concerned about a report detailing how the new funding arrangements for the CFS are to be implemented. The District Council of Murat Bay, based at Ceduna, has been most upset about the manner in which it has been treated. I sincerely hope that the Minister of Emergency Services (Hon D.J. Hopgood) will have discussions with the Country Fire Services Director and others to ensure that here is better understanding of problems in country areas. In the past, many councils have

made large contributions, but it now appears that they are to be penalised for their good work. That is unfair. Those who have not made the effort that they might have made appear to be being rewarded for not looking after their district in the past.

This is a matter which ought to be addressed as we are about to have a fire season and potential for real problems. I do not want to have to stand up in the House later in the year and be critical, as I have been today, of the Country Fire Services Board or the Health Commission, but I have a responsibility to the people who sent me here to ensure that they are well looked after. I have a duty to ensure that country people in this State are protected. People in isolated communities have enough to put up with, without losing services.

The Government has already said that it wants to divide the State into two time zones: God only knows why! If ever there was a hare-brained scheme, that is it. I suggest that daylight saving should cease when the school year commences at the beginning of February, so that everybody can be treated fairly.

The Deputy Premier's exercise is only testing the water. He is only running the flag up the pole to see the result. He knows full well that the public of South Australia do not want the State to be split into two time zones. I suggest that he go to Port Lincoln when the matter is discussed in a few weeks.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Gayler): The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I want to continue where I left off on 17 September. I was providing the House with the information found in my youth survey of school leavers in my electorate. I reached section V in the questionnaire which stated:

SECTION V: ABOUT THE THINGS YOU DO FOR LEISURE TIME ACTIVITIES RECREATION, HOBBIES, ETC.

1. What are the two or three most important activities for you in this category?
2. Do you belong to any clubs or organisations in your community? YES/NO
3. If 'Yes', please list the most important and the (approx.) subscriptions you pay each year to belong (if any); e.g. tennis ($10), Church Youth Club (nothing), St John ($30), etc.
4. Do you attend Church:

(Approx.)
- ☐ Not at all (or almost never)
- ☐ 3-4 times a year
- ☐ A fair bit (12-20 times a year)
- ☐ Fairly regularly (20-40 times per year—2 times a month or more)
- ☐ Never miss if I can help it.

5. Do you go out socially:

(Approx.)
- ☐ More than five times a week
- ☐ More than once, but less than 5 times a week
- ☐ Once a week
- ☐ Less than once a week on average.

6. Do you read books for relaxation:

(Approx.)
- ☐ One or more a week
- ☐ One or two a month
- ☐ Hardly ever
- ☐ Never

7. Do you read magazines and newspapers? YES/NO
8. If 'YES' please state 2 or 3 of your most common or favourites.
9. If 'YES', what do you read in them, i.e., what information are you after? e.g. News, comics, sport results, houses for sale or rent, etc.
10. Do you listen to radio? YES/NO
11. If 'YES', how long each week, i.e. for how many hours? Name two favourite radio stations of your choice.
12. Do you watch TV? If 'YES', how long each week? hrs
13. What are your favourite channels/shows?

SECTION VI: ABOUT OUR LAW AND ORDER

1. In general, how do you feel about penalties for breaking the law? Are they: much too harsh, harsh, about right, too soft, or totally inadequate?
2. In particular, what do you think are the three or four worst kind of crimes/offences; and do you think the penalties are high enough, e.g., rape, murder, drink driving, hit/run drivers, stealing poultry or burglary—

four options were then given—

3. On the other hand, are there any crimes/offences which you think are over rated by the media? If so, please say so.
4. Do we have enough policemen in our communities? Yes/No
5. Are they spending their time correctly to keep law and order and protect us from wrong doers? Yes/No
6. If 'No', what should they do more of or less of?
7. What crimes do you think are getting worse or will get worse (if any), e.g., white collar, assault, drugs, speeding, burglary, etc.

Section VII dealt with helping each other.

I invited those people responding to the survey to indicate whether they were willing to participate in further surveys and whether they would like a policy statement from the Liberal Party about youth. I then invited further comments or advice on the remaining half page. I thanked those responding for their participation and help. As I said earlier, of the 2 120 surveys sent out to school leavers 442 people replied. That is a response rate of 20.85 per cent, which is amazing. It is much higher than one would expect to achieve in any direct mail market survey or public opinion poll. In fact, it is greater by a factor in the order of 10 times what one normally expects.

There were some interesting results, which I am happy to provide. In response to the first question about the size of families, it is interesting to note that, of the people who responded, more had sisters than brothers. The average size of families—that is, the number of children—was 3.75. That is a bit different to the norm for the urban family size of children in the same age group. In relation to the number of step-brothers and step-sisters, it turned out that there were more step-sisters than step-brothers. Although it is not statistically relevant, there were 42 as opposed to 39. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a purely statistical table. I assure you, Madam Acting Speaker, that it is purely statistical.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Can you assure the House that the material is purely statistical?

Mr LEWIS: I have done so, Madam Acting Speaker.

Leave granted.

FAMILY DETAILS

How many brothers and sisters do you have?

	Brothers	Sisters
none	110	131
one	159	154
two	119	99
three	41	33
four	7	14
more than 4	6	11

Average number of children in each family 3.75.
How many step-brothers and step-sisters do you have?
Number of step-families: 25
Total No. of sisters: 42
Total No. of brothers: 39

Mr LEWIS: In relation to the question I asked of single people to ascertain how many planned to marry, 377 of the 408 single people in the survey chose to respond. As members will recall, I invited anyone not wishing to respond to any question not to do so. The response was that 345 (or 91.5 per cent) said that they planned to marry; only 32 said they did not plan to marry. Funnily enough, of the people who planned to marry, the average age of the 345 people

who responded was 23 years (regardless of sex). I refer to a table which gives the age listings from 19 years to 31 years and beyond and the numbers of people in each category or age group where they are grouped in a cluster; the percentage of the responses that emerged is included. I seek leave to have that table inserted in *Hansard*.

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

Mr LEWIS: Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

SINGLE PEOPLE

This question for single people only.
At what age do you plan to marry?
Number of single people—408 (92.31 per cent)
Number of responses—377 (92.40 per cent)
345 (91.51 per cent)
32 (8.49 per cent)

This question for single people only.
What age do you plan to marry?
Number of single people—408 (92.31 per cent)
Number of people expect to marry—345 (91.51 per cent) of singles
Number of responses—338 (97.97 per cent) of 345
Age people think they will marry: Average is 23

Age	No.	Per cent of Responses
19	2	0.59
20	5	1.48
21	25	6.21
22	46	13.61
23	67	19.82
24	52	15.38
25	52	15.38
26	41	12.13
27	20	5.91
28	12	3.55
29	7	2.07
30	3	0.89
31 and beyond	6	1.78

Mr LEWIS: It is interesting to know when looking at question 9, in the first section, that a greater number of respondents felt a much stronger tie to their mother than to their father. I say this by virtue of the fact that 202 people felt that their mother was very supportive of them as they approached school leaving age whereas only 167 people thought that their father was very supportive. I now go to the question 'keen to see the last of you', where four people felt that that was the way their mother thought of them and seven thought that that was the way their father thought of them. On the surface, the last two figures do not appear to be statistically relevant, but they are indeed so in relation to the overall matrix into which they fit.

I now refer to the next question about the respondents' attitudes to their parents. I would have expected that the respondents were people who felt a responsible attitude to life and to themselves, and so on, and not people who felt angry about the way in which their parents had treated them. Funnily enough, some respondents literally loathed and detested their parents. Of this small number, four had that attitude to both parents. However, again, there was an outstanding weight of opinion indicating that there was a stronger tie between the adolescent approaching school leaving age and the mother; that is, they admired and respected their mother. There were 292 as against only 276 who had the same strength of feeling about their father. The number who just tolerated their parents was 83 and 84 respectively. I would like leave to have both these tables inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them, as they are purely statistical.

Leave granted.

PARENTS' ATTITUDE

How did you feel about your parents attitude to you as you approached school leaving age?

	Mother	Father
Very supportive	202	167
Helpful	111	108
Indifferent	81	97
Uncaring	5	15
Put you down	3	3
Keen to see the last of you	4	7
Unanswered	36	45

10. What was your attitude to your parents when you left school?

	Mother	Father
Admire and respect	292	276
Just tolerate	83	84
Avoid if possible	7	17
Reject them	1	3
Loathe and Detest	4	4
Unanswered	55	58

There is a great deal of statistical information that time does not allow me to incorporate. However, there are two other matters in relation to the results of the survey to which I will draw the House's attention. The first relates to the question 'What is causing high unemployment in Australia'. In the responses, I rated a first preference with five points and a fifth preference with one point and, accordingly, multiplied out by the factors involved in each category. The categories were: first, 'unemployed people don't try hard enough to find work'; the second was 'Intolerant bosses inconsiderate'; the third, 'Insufficient training'; and the fourth was 'Other'.

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

Mr BECKER (Hanson): The problems that have already been outlined in the budget will not help the economy in this State as it was designed to do by the Federal Government. There is no way in which the Federal budget will help our economy to recover.

The Hon. J.W. Slater Interjecting:

Mr BECKER: The honourable member interjects and says that that is not so. It is about time that we took stock of ourselves and worked out what it costs to employ a person today. I will quote from the *Australian Business Review* magazine of 30 July 1986. The member for Hartley will appreciate having this information, because he can then circulate it in his electorate saying that 'Becker told me that these are the facts about employing a person in the community today.'

The article states that the cost of wages is an issue today within our society, and demarcation problems probably cost the country still more, as do oncosts. It is the oncost component that is being attacked in certain sections of our society as one way of reducing costs and helping to produce greater productivity. A friend building a factory was quoted the following indirect labour costs which are additional to wages: annual leave, 9.5 per cent; the 17.5 per cent annual leave loading costs 1.6 per cent; statutory holidays, 4.5 per cent; sick pay, 4.5 per cent; long service leave, 2.3 per cent; and payroll tax, 6 per cent.

The Premier said that he would get rid of payroll tax. If he did that he would save employers 6 per cent. By doing that it would help increase employment in South Australia. Workers compensation comprised 29.6 per cent, superan-

nuation 5 per cent, administration and medical 4 per cent, giving a total of 63.4 per cent. In other words, when someone is employed irrespective of their wage, 63.4 per cent of their wage has to be added on to cover all these costs. It is no wonder we are experiencing difficulty in competing with overseas markets. No wonder our cost of exports is so high. No wonder the Federal Government had to devalue the dollar and keep our dollar down so that we can try to export and compete on the world market. It is certainly not helping this country when we are loaded with such high costs.

The area being attacked—and one with which I had a bit to do some years ago—is the annual leave loading of 17.5 per cent which costs employers only 1.6 per cent. It is hardly an amount worth worrying about. We should be looking at the areas of workers compensation at 29.6 per cent and payroll tax (a State tax) at 6 per cent. That is the challenge that I see facing the State and Commonwealth Governments. The man responsible for a lot of these additional on costs was the President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, the present Prime Minister. Surely he realises what he has done to this country of which we are so proud. If we get rid of Hawke we might not have these problems. If we put John Howard in, he would make the decisions and encourage incentive to ensure this country gets back on its feet.

During the past few weeks we have seen a few controversies in the State, including none other than the reported possibility that the former Premier, Mr Don Dunstan, may return. Little did I realise the furore that this issue would cause. The people of South Australia have given a clear message to the Bannon Government. The Premier himself said that Don Dunstan had much to offer and that he would like to see him back in South Australia. Anyway, Don Dunstan will not be filling the vacancy on the board of the State Bank. I therefore issue this Government with a challenge. It should replace the late Don Simmons, a former member of the State Bank board, with another Government appointment, a person who was a former member of this Parliament. At last the Government can practise what it preaches in equal opportunity and appoint Mrs Molly Byrne as a director of the State Bank. It can put a woman on the board of the State Bank. I cannot recall there ever having been a woman on that board. I have said on many occasions that I believe that there should be a woman on the Electricity Trust board.

The challenge I give the Premier of South Australia is that he replace the late Don Simmons with Mrs Molly Byrne—a woman. The Government would then practise its policy of equal opportunity and equal representation and would also be putting a consumer on the board. Mrs Byrne has many years experience as a politician, is a hard worker within the community, and a woman of compassion and feeling. She could bring some expertise to the State Bank board. Some of these august bodies are purely commercial, making only commercial decisions. Everyone has lost track of the State Bank. The Savings Bank of South Australia was the one that offered .25 per cent more interest for savings deposits and was able to lend money to persons wishing to purchase houses at slightly lower than the normal commercial rates. The Savings Bank of South Australia served the State extremely well, as has the State Bank and as should the new State Bank as far as housing loans are concerned. I am a little worried about the corporate lending it is giving at the moment and about the standard and level of such lending, but that is another issue.

If we are going to follow tradition and have a former Liberal Party member of Parliament and a former Labor Party member of Parliament on the State Bank board, I think the only person to choose in the latter case is Molly Byrne. That is the challenge that I give the Government. If the Government does not appoint a woman, I will want to know why, as I am quite sure will the women of this State.

The former Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. J.W. Slater) proved that he was a compassionate person and did much to help the various sporting groups in the community. He would have been as proud as I was when I saw the television coverage of the speed roller skating. I was amazed at the standard and level of the competition achieved in this country. The former Minister gave them, I think, $15 000—

The Hon. J.W. Slater: More than that—$50 000.

Mr BECKER: Yes, they were given $50 000 to build a track. The large number of competitors from overseas provided a considerable contribution to our tourist industry. Unfortunately, the Australian team got a pretty raw deal, and full marks to the coach for insisting a few times that they were being cheated. I hope that that sport will continue to grow.

This weekend the State Netball Carnival and the National Intellectually Disabled Netball title will be held. Last year the inaugural championships were held in Brisbane, and they were won by the South Australian girls—they did not lose a match. However, I was disappointed to find that, when the intellectually disabled girls netball championship team returned to South Australia, there was no shield, plaque or cup. It was sponsored by Dunlop, and I have not yet had a chance to speak to Dunlop about that matter. Last night, I had the opportunity at the Renown Park Sports Club to present to the intellectually disabled girls a plaque in commemoration of that outstanding victory. My wife and I donated a plaque in honour of their achievement.

The Adelaide City Council wants to charge that organisation $540 to erect this weekend two marquees and four tents and to place two Coca-Cola vans and two flagpoles at the South Australian Netball Association's headquarters at Edwards Park. It wants to charge $540 to provide some shelter for 200 intellectually disabled girls who will be there, as well as supporters, friends and referees.

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

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Further to the member for Hanson's comments, I think that that is another example of the Adelaide City Council making a decision going against the interests of sporting bodies. I, too, find it quite incredible that the Adelaide City Council should ask the intellectually disabled netballers to pay over $500. I support very strongly the member for Hanson's comments on this matter. In the past few months I have had some interesting dealings with the Adelaide City Council in relation to the netball facilities at Edwards Park. The decision by the Adelaide City Council in relation to the administration of the sport from Edwards Park is very disturbing.

I now take up some comments that were made by the Minister today in relation to the Britannia corner. It seems that if one makes a little criticism and points to a certain problem area, one gets a bit of a headline and congratulations from the Government. The Minister was very happy to comment on my lack of engineering expertise, although I point out that, as a pharmacist, I have never purported to specialise in engineering. I think it is a pity that the Minister went on about the matter for so long without recognising that it is a road safety problem. I commented in the media on Friday that I thought it was a disgrace that the Government has chosen to reduce the road safety budget and the promotion of road safety at State level by some 20

per cent. I notice that the Deputy Speaker understands the comments that I have made about my engineering expertise, and I thank him for recognising that.

[*Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.*]

Mr INGERSON: The Britannia corner is, as the Minister said, a very difficult intersection, being accessed by five roads. The major problem involves the continuation of Fullarton Road and the fact that drivers coming from the south into the intersection must make a right-hand turn and then an immediate left-hand turn to go into Fullarton Road. Drivers coming from the north, along Dequetteville Terrace, do not see that the second turn that must be made by traffic negotiating the intersection from the south. That aspect could be looked at by the Highways Department and remedied fairly soon. As the Minister pointed out, there is a signposting problem, and another minor problem that could be fixed easily concerns the line of sight and the possible removal of shrubs and trees.

The main matter I wish to discuss tonight is the direction of a document that will be released tomorrow. Through this report 'Child's play: sport and equality', it is the first time that I have been directly involved with the Commissioner of Equal Opportunity. So, it is the first time that I could say that I believe the Commissioner is totally out of step with the community and what it would wish to see in the area of community sport guidelines for children. The recommended guidelines suggest that in the past girls have been discriminated against, and there is no question about that. The report recommends that the matter should be corrected by positive action in favour of girls at the expense of boys' sport, both now and in the future. I find such positive discrimination in favour of either sex, especially in primary school sport, abhorrent when there is an acceptance in the community that we need to recognise that there should be equal opportunity.

My second observation relates to my objection to the thrust throughout the report that goes against traditional sport and the involvement of boys in football and girls in netball. The report argues that in many cases we ought to be encouraging girls to play football and boys to play netball. In particular, it argues strongly that, if there is any attitude that the boys ought to be involved in the A netball team, we should introduce a special clause to prevent that from happening but, if girls were to play football, it should be encouraged and allowed to happen. I do not believe that any positive discrimination either way should be countenanced at primary school level.

Another area of concern is the reference to the need to minimise competition and winning. I believe that that philosophy is totally wrong, yet it is a philosophy going through our schools at present. That philosophy should be overturned as soon as possible. A further area of concern is that these guidelines to be released tomorrow are expected to be implemented by schools in March 1987, but I believe that that is quite impossible.

Another point I would like to make relates to the interpretation of the under-12 rule. The Commissioner has gone ahead and said that the under-12 rule, which applies in the Federal Sex Discrimination Act, is relevant and should be brought into the appropriate provision in South Australia as it relates to the strength, stamina and physique of competitors. In the State Act there was a deliberate decision not to include the age of 12, for an obvious reason: it is impossible to define strength, stamina and physique at that age, and this Parliament made a decision not to specify that matter.

I believe that the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity, Ms Tiddy, has exceeded the thrust of both those Acts and is promoting social change in primary school sport which is out of step with the community. The wide community has not asked for this, nor has it been consulted, and this applies particularly to the parents, parents' associations, primary school principals and primary schools. I find any push in this area to be quite obnoxious.

My attitude is very clear: there should be equal opportunity in sport for all children, both boys and girls, at primary school; and there should be increased involvement and encouragement for boys and girls to increase their skills in both the sporting and physical education areas. It is also important that they learn these skills in sports which they will continue at a later age. It is absolute nonsense to say that we should encourage a cross-involvement in sport when those skills will not be carried on at the secondary school level.

It is vital, as far as I am concerned, that 'encouragement' and 'desire' are key words, very important words, in relation to any change, and there should be no compulsion. The gradual progression, with an emphasis on participation, enjoyment, social development, basic skills and learning, adapted modified rules and competition, and with winning being a very important concept of the whole competition, is something I believe should be attempted. There should be no attempt to break up traditional sports. However, I recognise and support the need for skill development through modified rules, particularly at junior and primary school level (grades 3 to 5), but we should continue to offer the traditional senior rules at upper primary school level (grades 6 and 7) because from there children will progress into the secondary area.

There is no question that girls have been disadvantaged; or that we should increase coaching, encourage more participation and, where facilities are inadequate, make changes. But I do not believe, as this document states, that we should introduce positive discrimination, for example, the establishment of girls football teams or boys netball teams. We should not insist that, if boys win their position in the netball team on merit, they cannot play, but girls can play—a very positive discrimination, I believe in the wrong direction, and something on which we should comment very strongly.

We will support special measures only if selection to competitive teams is made on the overriding principle of merit and personal choice. It is in the children's best interests that there is no tokenism in choosing a position in teams but that merit is what it is all about, that is, that they have earned their position. The organised competition should allow for teams based on merit alone—mixed sex teams, girls only teams and boys only teams. It is vital that 'encouragement' and 'desire' and not 'compulsion' be the key words in relation to mixed sex teams. I support the winning concept very strongly, because it is through competition and encouraged participation that children will learn both winning and losing.

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Last week the *Yorke Peninsula Country Times* had the headline 'Telecom working party recommendation: Close Kadina.' That came as a shock to many people in the Kadina area and also the Yorke Peninsula area as a whole because, although the matter had been talked about unofficially for some weeks prior to the announcement, no-one, I believe, really felt that the Telecom operation at Kadina would close. The announcement

was made by the South Australian Telecom Manager, Mr Huston, and I quote from the lead paragraph of the *Yorke Peninsula Country Times:*

> Mr Huston, the South Australian Telecom Manager, told over 100 Kadina staff last Thursday that the working party, inquiring into Telecom operations in the country, had recommended that the Kadina district be closed in a phased fashion.

It further states:

> Mr Huston said that he had come to Kadina in response to the many telexes which had landed on his desk from Kadina staff expressing concern about the rumoured closure.
>
> He said that the reason for the reassessment of operations was that Telecom in South Australia was incurring a loss, and if it is to be a viable operation, a relook at the district boundaries was an obvious move.

Telecom at Kadina is the administrative centre for a huge area. In fact, that area has the most telephone services of any district in South Australia and the Northern Territory outside the Adelaide metropolitan area. Despite this, Telecom is proposing to close down the second biggest district in the State. Where will it go? It would appear more than likely that much of the operation will go to Whyalla, so there will be three main districts in the country regions—Whyalla, Murray Bridge and Mount Gambier.

What was the situation like in earlier days? Formerly, the Kadina district was the key centre and Whyalla was an outpost of that district. I believe that it is a step backwards, a very negative way to look at the future of Telecom, to consider closing an area that is relatively close to most facilities and most communication networks in the State.

Another facility that has been moved to Whyalla is the regional office for the Western Education Office. That occurred several years ago and at that time it was stated: 'It will not create any inconvenience. It will be a relatively central area.' But what has happened? On quite a few occasions I have called into schools in my area of Goyder and I have been told that the principal or perhaps the principal and another staff member have had to go to Whyalla. That is a massive distance to travel and it takes time for these staff to get into their vehicles and travel to Whyalla for various administrative reasons. The travelling expenses cost the State a lot of money and, in my opinion, that practice is helping to wear out the personnel because of the massive distances that have to be covered.

In fact, the irony of the situation is that, despite the decentralisation to Whyalla, a sub office has been established at Kadina. Admittedly, there has been at least one person at Kadina for many years, but now a substantial office has been established: in fact, it was formally opened just before the last State election in 1985. However, Telecom wants to fall into the same error of going out into the country for no good reason.

What did Mr Huston, the South Australian Telecom Manager, have to say in addition to the earlier comments that I referred to? He emphasised that the proposals are only recommendations and there will be time for Kadina staff, local government and other interested bodies to comment on the proposal. He also went on to say that the working party had visited all areas and talked to management and staff, although the staff disputed that they had been involved in discussions—someone's homework has not been done perfectly in that connection. Mr Huston also indicated that the final decision will be made by the Telecom State Steering Committee by December of this year.

It is now late September, so a decision almost certainly will be made in November or December which will affect more than 100 employees, as well as many businesses in the Kadina area. It will have an unsettling effect on the whole area at a time when rural communities do not want that sort of unsettling effect. I believe that it is imperative that Telecom Australia, and particularly the South Australian section of Telecom, wakes up and sees that the suggestion is the wrong one.

It was interesting to note that one of the Telecom union representatives who was present when Mr Huston made his announcement, stated that the Northern Territory and Darwin Telecom operations, which are run from South Australia, are the reasons why South Australia makes a loss. It is very unfair if Telecom is attempting to put the blame at the feet of the Kadina operations, because that has nothing to do with it—the cause is outside this State. If Telecom thinks that moving those operations to Whyalla will improve efficiency, I believe that it needs to redo its sums and to re-evaluate the situation, because it would be obvious to anyone who has a basic understanding of South Australia that the massive distances that will be incorporated in a move to Whyalla will remove any potential savings.

It is clear that Kadina should become the central headquarters area and that the Whyalla operation, if needed, can serve as an outpost. We would then have headquarters at Kadina, Murray Bridge and Mount Gambier. The Murray Bridge operation, in terms of its location in relation to Adelaide, seems to work efficiently. I think we recognise that Mount Gambier is another reasonably heavily populated area which serves the southern part of the State well. But it would be a step backwards to locate the headquarters at Whyalla, which has a declining real population (with associated services) relative to the rest of the State. As the *Yorke Peninsula Country Times* said in the first paragraph of its editorial on the front page:

> The Lions code of ethics contains the lovely words 'To build up—not destroy'.

I feel, as that editor does, that Telecom is proceeding in the wrong way. It is no good, having built up Kadina, wanting to destroy it. Wake up Telecom, before it is too late!

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Today the Premier opened a very important tourism conference, the theme of which is 'Making the dream come true'. This conference was opened just a short while before the Minister of Tourism in another place demonstrated yet again her capacity to make the tourism dream turn into something approaching a nightmare.

The saga of this poor performance by the Minister and a demonstration of her almost complete incompetence began on Saturday when the Minister, in response to well justified statements by the Chairman of the South Australian Association of Regional Tourist Organisations (Mr Martin Stanley), made the extraordinary claim that it would be economically stupid to overspend on marketing until the results of market research were known. I advise the House that there is very little risk of the Government's overspending on marketing, because it has slashed the budget for the Department of Tourism from $2.5 million last year (which was less than the tourism budget in any other State) to $2.2 million this year, which is a severe actual cut and a very severe cut in real terms when inflation is taken into account.

The Minister attempted to use expenditure on market research as a justification for the slashing of the marketing budget. In making the announcement about research the Minister said that the tourism budget had not suffered any more than other Government departments budgets had suffered and that this market research would provide a great boon to the industry. In today's *News*, the Minister made the formal announcement of a study that will cost $250 000. The article states:

The Minister said that the money had been allocated for an extensive study into new Australian international visitor markets and added that the research was unprecedented in its scope.

In response to questions from my colleagues in the other place, the Minister assured members that the Premier's guidelines laid down for the commissioning of market research had been adhered to. It was fairly plain to those who heard her answer that she was unaware of what the guidelines are, but she still assured members in the other place that the guidelines had been adhered to. When subsequently questioned as to which company had been the successful tenderer for the market research study, the Minister stood up and after making this announcement with great fanfare in two newspapers, said, 'I do not know.'

I claim that the Minister's ignorance and incompetence on this issue have severely damaged the Government and dealt a severe blow to the tourism industry, which is entitled at the least to expect its Minister to know what is going on. The least that the Minister should know is who is the successful tenderer when giving approval for expenditure of no less than a quarter of a million dollars of taxpayers' money. It is incomprehensible to the tourism industry that the Minister should make significant announcements about large market research contracts and then admit that she does not know which company will be undertaking the work.

Certainly, I would say that the departmental officers who are organising the conference would have been severely embarrassed to be summoned by the Minister, once she had made that major gaff in another place, to provide her with the basic information that she should have had in the first place. It is extraordinary and a matter for serious questioning of the Government that this major contract, which is the biggest the Department of Tourism has ever let for market research, has gone not to a South Australian company but to an interstate company. There is at least one company in South Australia which has major corporate clients, including such highly respected groups as the Adelaide Casino, Coca-Cola, Mitsubishi, and the South Australian Brewing Company, which probably singly and certainly between them would spend far more than the Department of Tourism is proposing to spend on market research. That company was overlooked. It wanted to tender. It expressed an interest, but it was not allowed to present a detailed submission to the Department of Tourism so that it could be considered for the contract. The least that the Premier should do is to investigate the incompetent manner in which the Minister has handled this market research issue. We certainly should instruct her to make sure that she knows what she is talking about before she reads blindly from a press statement, simply mouths parrot fashion what is put in front of her and shows no depth of knowledge whatever about the work that is going on behind the scenes.

Last week in the House, I raised the question of the possibility of political interference in the appointment of a senior position in the Department of Tourism. I asked if the member for Mawson had brought any influence to bear, and whether the Minister could assure the House that the Government Management and Employment Act would be upheld in respect of this appointment. The question was based on solid information that I have received from a number of sources—none originating in the Public Service, but all originating from the tourism regions and private operators. I checked my sources carefully and asked the question in such a way that there was no possibility of identifying the applicant who I believed, on the basis of the information that I had received, was receiving open support from the member for Mawson. Later in the day the member for Mawson, in an extremely strident speech, gave a categorical denial that she had attempted to bring any influence to bear.

She suggested that the question was not proper. Mr Speaker, I maintain that the question was very proper indeed because of the range and extent of the complaints that I had received about the member for Mawson's involvement. Having made a categorical denial, the member for Mawson subsequently qualified that by saying that she denied she had openly, at any public venue or at any public place—in other words, she did not deny that she privately raised the question. She denied that she had, in a public place, raised the question.

Following those categorical denials which, upon my reading them, sound to me like the words of a woman who doth protest too much, the member claimed that I had effectively destroyed that applicant's chances of being appointed to the position. She also said that I had attacked a member of the Public Service. Mr Speaker, there was no attack whatsoever on any member of the Public Service and nothing in my question could have been construed as an attack. On the contrary, my question was designed to ensure that every applicant for the position received fair and reasonable consideration. I am assured by the Minister on the front bench that that is what will occur.

I have had an extraordinary document put into my possession, in the form of a letter from a Minister. I do not propose to name the Minister, because if I were to do that I could go some way towards identifying the public servant. I was so careful not to do so that I did not even indicate whether the public servant was a man or a woman. It is well known that a number of public servants have applied for this position. The member for Mawson was not so scrupulous in her statement to the House.

As I do not propose to identify the Minister, and as the Minister has exercised extremely poor judgment in attempting to influence a member of this House outside the House on a matter that is before the House, I leave it to the Minister's colleagues and the Minister to sort out amongst themselves whether or not he will identify himself. In his reply to me the Minister says that if the public servant was a person to whom he believed I might have been referring, and added, 'Even though it is essentially none of your business'—I take extreme exception to that. A public appointment is the concern and business of every member of this House. The matter was raised in a very proper fashion and those who are involved in it have a great deal to be ashamed of in relation to the manner in which they have handled it.

Everyone who applied for that position is entitled to assume that there has been no influence brought to bear whatsoever on the interviewing panel. The range and extent of complaints that have been brought to me have caused me, after very much careful research, very careful consideration, and extremely careful wording, to put my question before the House.

Mr DUIGAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:

Page 1, lines 31 to 34 (clause 3)—Leave out all words in these lines.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be disagreed to.

In putting this disagreement I am acting on behalf of my colleague the Minister of Education, who normally repre-

sents the Attorney-General in another place. That might be borne in mind as I go through some of the arguments. I should like to contrast the proposed new section 67, whether amended or not, with what applies at Commonwealth level. I understand that, in the Commonwealth, there is no express statutory power to appoint acting Ministers in any event; it is a much more woolly proposition than is being proposed here. Secondly, there is no constitutional warrant for the appointment of acting Ministers. Thirdly, the appointment is done on a purely administrative basis—by means of a letter from the Prime Minister to the intended appointee. I point out that our proposed legislation if, as I hope, it is accepted unamended, would require that the matter still be printed in the *Government Gazette*.

There is no Executive Council or Governor-General involvement in the Commonwealth situation, but that is not what is proposed here. There is sometimes no precise specification of the period of appointment: in other words, the formula 'until the Minister resumes duties' is often used. We are proposing nothing of that order here. The proposition is that a definite period be identified. In the Commonwealth situation there is no gazettal of the appointment. In short, what applies in the Commonwealth is a purely administrative act which, to all intents and purposes, is invisible to the public. Much the same applies in the parent of Parliaments in the United Kingdom and its treatment of acting Ministers.

Because the arrangement seems to have worked reasonably in respect of the Federal Parliament and the United Kingdom Parliament, we believe that our proposition, which is much tighter than that which is presently in force at Federal level and in the United Kingdom, is reasonable.

I should like to repeat what my colleague the Minister of Education said about this legislation when it was previously before the House and I draw attention to the argument put in another place. Until the Bill is, I hope, passed unamended, we have a convoluted process for bringing in acting Ministers. Ministers are often called interstate at short notice and there may be matters of import which need to be addressed while they are away, yet we have a long process through which to go before we can appoint an acting Minister.

I remind members of the length of time involved. A proposition has to be put before Cabinet, and it must fit in with the Cabinet time lines. The Cabinet has then to come up with a name for nomination which is presented to the Executive Council. That happens on a Monday. The matter is then held over until the Executive Council meeting on the following Thursday, when the Council accepts or rejects the nomination in the presence of the Governor, who signs the appropriate documentation if the nomination is accepted. There are some special occasions when that process can be telescoped, but the process that I have described invariably applies to the appointment of acting Ministers, in other words, a considerable period of time is involved.

In the nearly four years that I have been a Minister, on a number of occasions I have been called interstate at short notice to attend to Government business and I have had to forgo the opportunity of there being an acting Minister in my absence because my stay out of the State would have ended before the ordinary process could attend to the appointment of an acting Minister. I do not believe that the original proposition made in 1873 intended that to happen; nor do I believe that such a convoluted system was intended. The Government does not believe that. That is why we propose to insist on the original proposition and that the amendments be disagreed to.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I am fascinated by the Minister's contribution. I take the point that the Minister of State Development and Technology is acting for another Minister, which is another example of the problem with acting Ministers. I have just read the report of the debate in another place and, although I am not permitted to refer to that debate, I am quite surprised at some of the very salient points that seem to have emerged since the matter was debated there: it is almost as if the Government said, 'This looks like a good idea; now we will try to see if we can justify it.'

I do not know from where the Minister obtained his information. Unless my files are incomplete, no justification was shown for this measure in another place. I presume that the Attorney had some grasp of what he was trying to achieve. I am not convinced that South Australia's standards should be immeasurably diluted by any Acts of the Commonwealth. We have a system which I think has worked rather well. I suppose we must excuse the Minister of State Development and Technology because he was not involved in the earlier debate. However, surely he must recognise that the amendment provides a faster track acting Minister type of arrangement; I am sure that he would admit that. We have come along a path to a point where it is no longer appropriate to get out the seal and go through other processes—processes that have been used for 113 years, so I am told.

We strongly adhere to the principle about which we have spoken during this debate, namely, that, if there are acting Ministers, the public and the Opposition are entitled to know who they are. We also want some level of accountability so that we do not have a missing fourteenth or fifteenth Minister doing a roving patrol for all the Ministers who are on recreation leave, sick leave, interstate leave, or whatever. We want accountability. We have always had it in this State, and we intend to preserve it by making the process easier. Although we are not detracting from that responsibility, we will not make it so easy that the Labor Party in this State can ride roughshod over ministerial responsibility and accountability.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendment reduces the effectiveness of the proposed legislation.

CORONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 August. Page 638.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): The Opposition has pleasure in supporting this Bill. I have two queries that I will tidy up during the Committee stage. In principle, the Opposition believes it is appropriate for the State Coroner to have the right to conduct coronial inquiries in relation to accidents involving death or loss of persons at sea if that occurs within the reasonable bounds of this State. At the moment, if a person is lost at sea outside the three mile limit, the State Coroner cannot act. I think I have said enough: the debate has been well canvassed elsewhere. The Opposition supports the proposition.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology): I thank the member for Mitcham for his indication of general support for this legislation. I point out again that I am acting on behalf of the Minister of Education, who represents the Attorney-General in another place. However, I will obtain answers to any questions that

are asked in Committee or, indeed, I may be able to obtain some answers during the Committee debate. If not, the answers will have to come later. I thank the honourable member for his indication of support.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Jurisdiction.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I have read the changes which allow the State border to be over 1 000 kms out to sea, if the map that I am looking at is correct. What right *per se* has the Coroner to intervene if there is a death or misadventure at sea in those waters? If there is a loss of life on a boat which docks in Melbourne or another State because a port there is closer, what is the Coroner's responsibility? Can the Coroner instigate an investigation on his own behalf when a case is being handled in another jurisdiction for those same reasons?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: With respect to the first question, that matter is already covered within existing powers that are provided under State and Commonwealth legislation. Regarding the second question, the pertinent matter is where the death occurs: if it occurs in State territory, then it is within the State's province and therefore the Coroner's duties remain the same, regardless of the port where the ship finally berths.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

FIREARMS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 September. Page 1008.)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): The Opposition supports the Bill. The Minister made the point in his second reading explanation that its principal objective is the modification of the total prohibition of the possession of dangerous firearms for the purpose of allowing theatrical or film making groups to undertake authentic productions of films or stage presentations.

In that matter the Opposition believes that anything that can be done to attract these people to use the facilities of South Australia is a distinct advantage and that the responsibility of these organisations and the controls that will be imposed upon them by this measure will make quite certain that the trust is not against the best interests of the community. The Minister uses the term 'whilst ensuring proper control', and I suggest that that is most important in relation to the manner in which we fully concur with the action to be taken.

I make the point, however, that in researching this measure, although it tends to concentrate in that one area alone, it has caused some consternation to people within the firearm fraternity because they point out that there has been no consultation with them regarding the matter in hand. Whilst it is true that the principal proposition is as I have outlined, namely to allow for a special licence for a special purpose, the fact that clauses 11 and 12 of the Act have been reconstructed, albeit using many of the same words, causes some concern in relation to what else is being hidden, the purpose of this and whether there are ulterior motives.

I can appreciate the concerns of those other people, even though the motives of those undertaking the exercise are completely credible and unquestionable. However, the fact that the Bill was introduced into this House without those bodies receiving any official notification of what was taking place has not done anything to cement the sort of rapport that ought to exist between the Minister and those groups. I speak specifically of the umbrella group, although I recognise that it is not the only group that is directly associated with the firearm industry. I refer in this respect to the Combined Shooters and Firearms Council, which looks after the interests of the great majority of people involved in recreational firearm activities.

That apart, the group has given, after explanation and discussion of the measure, its approval of what is to take place. Like the Opposition, it is completely in accord with the need to make this provision for groups to come and use our facilities. It will be looking (and this is not a threat or an idle warning, but a statement of fact) very closely at the regulations that will flow from these changes. The Minister will acknowledge that it is quite often not so much what is in the Act as what is contained within the regulations that causes the day-by-day concerns that such organisations or individuals may have.

I will raise several questions when we deal with the clauses. However, at this moment I simply indicate that the Opposition gives its concurrence to the passage of the Bill through the second and third reading stages. However, the answers given to questions asked on the clauses may lead to some further consideration of matters in another place after further research is done.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I thank the member for Light and the House for the consideration of this matter. I should amplify a little what the honourable member has had to say about consultation. My office has been contacted on a couple of occasions in the past few days by Mr Keith Tidswell. I do not mind naming Mr Tidswell, because he is a person with whom I have excellent relations and for whom I have the utmost respect. On one occasion a couple of years ago his organisation presented me with the sporting shooters environmental award of the year.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It is perhaps a little ironic, as the closest I ever got to discharging a firearm was a pea rifle at the Glenelg sideshows about 20 years ago. That followed the interestingly titled kangaroo summit that was held, I think, during the first 12 months of the first Bannon Government. On that occasion Mr Tidswell's organisation made a significant contribution to what emerged as being a fairly broad consensus at that time. I think they were also pleased that someone had taken the initiative to provide such an exchange of views. As I have said, although I was slightly embarrassed, I was pleased to be granted a certificate. I have had discussions with Mr Tidswell on several occasions since then. He has broken bread with me in the Strangers' Dining Room in this place and, as I say, I believe that my relations with him and his organisation are excellent.

I must say that the number and complexity of the organisations involved in firearms generally in this State are such as to bewilder Galileo, Newton and Einstein put together. I am unable to give members an explanation of the way in which those organisations operate, because of the complexity and the number of the organisations. On one occasion I asked a member of my staff to put together for me a flow chart of the way in which the various organisations relate to each other, and that gentleman was able to do so, but it was a very complex diagram indeed. I do not reflect at all on the people who are involved in those organisations, but I do say that it is something of a pity that the number of

organisations and the relationships between them have become so complex. The situation is saved from utter chaos, I believe, because of people like Keith Tidswell who are extremely well informed and people of goodwill, who understand the sensitivity of matters relating to firearms and who are always at pains to ensure that the organisations that they represent are responsible in the way that they approach legislation and control the activities of their members.

In this State, where we have problems with firearms it is invariably with those people who are outside the membership of the recognised organisations. In addition, the recognised organisations have been very strong in educational programs. They have urged educational programs on the Government and have given assurances to the Government that, where the Government is prepared to initiate such programs, they will make it a requirement of membership that their people should be involved in such programs. So, I do not believe that there is any ill feeling, or lack of contact between those organisations, and I would be the last to want to put at risk what I believe is an excellent relationship in a sensitive area.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: What is the message?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Having cleared the way, I can now say that it did not seem to me that it was necessary to have a specific consultation with Mr Tidswell's organisation in this matter any more than it was necessary to have a consultation with pastry cooks, butchers, bakers or candlestick makers. My intention was clear, and it was clear to me that the drafting of the legislation was such that it in fact did not affect Mr Tidswell's members or members of any of the other organised groups in any material particular. When Mr Tidswell rang, he indicated that his members were a little surprised at what one might call the thoroughgoing reworking of the clauses that had been undertaken. I am in the hands of the experts in this matter. I believe that on balance what is before us is the correct procedure. My concern is with the principle that we are trying to enact here rather than the specifics of verbiage, no matter how important that might be.

In those circumstances, my staff indicated to Mr Tidswell exactly what the situation was. Apparently Mr Tidswell was still a little nervous about it and requested a deputation to discuss the matter further. It was one of the very rare occasions when I have refused a deputation. I did so, because I was aware that it was necessary that the legislation go through this week if it were to have any impact on what is being requested of the Government in this matter. I believed that Mr Tidswell and his members would accept an assurance in writing from me that what we were legislating for here did not affect them in any material particular.

So, the assurance has been given and I am perfectly happy to make that assurance in writing available to the member for Light or any other members of the House if they wish to peruse it. I am sure Mr Tidswell would not mind because it is not in the nature of a personal communication between the two of us: it was written to him on behalf of his organisation. The assurance is there, and it is repeated on this occasion. I thank the member for Light for giving me the opportunity of further amplifying what I have said in that legislation and to assure the House that in voting for this Bill they will be voting for something that is only as outlined in the speech that I gave to the House when I introduced the Bill. I commend the legislation to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Repeal of sections 11 and 12 and substitution of new sections.'

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: This clause repeals existing sections 11 and 12 and replaces them with new sections. Much material contained in the original sections is replaced, but there are some extended provisions. I refer to new section 11 (4), which provides:

> The classes of firearms licences that may be granted shall be fixed by the regulations.

That new subsection replaces the original subsection passed in 1977, which provides:

> A licence of a particular class shall, in accordance with the regulations, authorise the holder of the licence to have in his possession—
> *(a)* firearms of a specified class; or
> *(b)* a specified firearm.

The definition in the new subclause is not as definitive as the original definition, albeit that there is now to be a new class of firearm for the purpose of the thrust of this legislation. It is the conjunction of the word 'regulations' with that non-specific regulation being given in the new subsection (4) that has caused some concern within the shooting fraternity. It is the fear of the unknown, and I believe the Minister understands that. Certainly I appreciated his comments about Mr Tidswell, whom I met, to the best of my knowledge, for the first time earlier this evening. If Mr Tidswell has had a letter directed to his attention, I do not believe it has reached him.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I signed it yesterday.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: In my discussions with him, whilst he was much to the fore in pointing out that there had been good rapport, and he hoped that good rapport would be maintained, he believed there was a need for even closer cooperation between an umbrella group such as his and some of the practitioners involved in administering the legislation. In no way was he referring in a derogatory sense to the present personnel, but was referring more to the problems of the past.

It is, nonetheless, an area of some concern to him on behalf of his members, because the members will kick him if he cannot provide them with the answer, as I am sure the Minister will appreciate. Could the Minister clarify this matter for the Committee and say precisely how far he would expect these regulations to go and whether, on the advice given to him, there is, under new section 11 (4), the likelihood of an extension of the former provision and the intended new provision?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am advised that, really, new section 11 (4) has to be read in conjunction with new subsection (3) which goes before it and, in a sense, new subsection (5) which comes after it. In fact, new subsections (3) and (4) change nothing from what was in the originally drafted legislation. It is certainly not the intention of the Government that anything should change other than in relation to the specific matter we are trying to address here. I can give that assurance to the honourable member—that, in fact, although the verbiage has changed slightly and it is set out in a way which I think is slightly more logical than in the previous legislation, nonetheless the combined effect of it is that by regulation the Government will not be able to do more than it claims it wants to do in this legislation. In case the record did not pick up my disorderly interjection earlier, I can make the point that, as I recall, I signed that letter to Mr Tidswell yesterday some time. If it went by normal mail, I can understand why he would not have received it by this afternoon.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I thank the Minister for that information, and I point out to the Committee, as no doubt every member knows, that new subsection (4) cannot be taken in isolation from all the other provisions. That is one of the areas of contention to people looking at amendments

at any stage: that they tend to home in on the particular words in front of them rather than seeking to relate them necessarily to other aspects of the Bill or, more particularly, the Act.

New section 12 (4) to (6) seems to indicate convoluted terminology, and that is not said in any derogatory sense. I suggest purely and simply that it is awkward to read, particularly if one has been taught not to have the same word occurring twice in close proximity in the one sentence. We say here, for example, in new subsection (4):

> The Registrar may grant an application for a firearms licence in accordance with the application but shall not refuse . . .

On the surface it would appear that if it were to state 'The Registrar may grant a firearms licence in accordance with the application', that would be quite sufficient, although if one reads it slowly I admit that 'application' first occurring does have another connotation. However, at a time when the Government and others are suggesting that all legislation should be in the simplest possible form, albeit not leaving the way open for argument before the courts or for misunderstanding, I pick up that point and trade it with the Minister.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have to concede that the member for Light is on very strong ground indeed because you, Mr Chairman, have raised this matter in the House from time to time.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable Minister will realise that the Chairman is not allowed to say, 'Hear, hear!'

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am sure you will maintain the impartiality of the Chair at all times, Sir, but I am in a little fear and trembling since the honourable member is playing on the home ground and I am the visiting team on this occasion. The member for Light is certainly correct in principle and probably also in particular in relation to this matter. I do not know if he wants to proceed with it at this stage. I could give an undertaking that, when this matter is presented in another place, the Government could streamline the verbiage by way of an amendment on that occasion. We could consider an amendment on the hop to streamline the verbiage, but perhaps the better way to go is for the Government to take advice, and my colleague in another place could streamline the verbiage, provided that we do not get ourselves into legal quicksand, by way of a Government amendment in that place.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I accept that assurance. I do not believe that it would be wise to make a move until such time as it has been checked and double checked in all of the forums where such matters necessarily need to be considered. I have seen the occasion when, on the spur of the moment, a decision has been taken and subsequently it has had to be reviewed because the wording used is affected by some other form of words occurring further down in the text. I am very pleased to have had the tutoring, which members of the House have had recently from the member for Henley Beach, and which picks up the importance of thinking this way in the future.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—'Offence'.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: New section 29 is not a lot different from the previous one in thrust and purpose. However, it has caused some consternation outside these walls that it might have the effect of interfering with the possession of silencers which have been in the possession of dealers or traders for many years in the past. It is a point made out of caution rather than from a genuine knowledge or an indication of anybody having taken direct legal advice on this matter. Can the Minister indicate to the Committee whether in the knowledge of his officers there is in the possession of dealers a number of silencers which they may have had for many years but which they have not been trading because it has been illegal to trade, and whether the new section will have any serious repercussions on those people who have legitimately held those silencers from the time it was legal to have them in their possession? These silencers represent stock and, by virtue of gaining some antiquity, may have some genuine and real value in the longer term.

It is a semi hypothetical question and I do not suggest otherwise, but I believe that this matter requires a degree of assurance and, if the information relative to the existence of such silencers is not available from the department, I would like to have that information in due course.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: At this stage I cannot give the Committee the specific information sought by the honourable member. If in fact the information is available, I will endeavour to obtain it, but I make two points: first, this amendment removes from section 29 the reference to a dangerous firearm and merely retains in the legislation the words 'a silencer'. The interpretation is that in fact a silencer *per se* is not a dangerous weapon: it becomes a dangerous weapon only when it is attached to the firearm. We are not changing that in any particular way. Where a dealer is in possession of silencers which are not attached to firearms, that person never has been nor will be in breach under this legislation: it is only when the device is actually attached to the firearm that it comes under the control.

I am not very familiar with the way in which these things are marketed, but I assume that, if a person has a registered firearm, they go into a shop to get a silencer for that firearm and they do not necessarily, for the most part, buy the firearm with the silencer attached. The controls relate to the point at which the silencer is attached to the firearm. I assume that the fears which have been expressed to the honourable member (and which he quite rightly brings before the Committee) are groundless, because what we are really doing here does not change the legislation in relation to silencers but only in relation to dangerous firearms.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I refer back to the interpretive sections of the original Act and, in particular, section 5, where the definition of 'a silencer' is as follows:

> A device attached to a firearm and designed to muffle the report of the firearm upon discharge of a bullet or other missile.

Apart from what the Minister said (and I do not argue about the correctness of the context in which it was stated), the simple fact is that new section 29 provides:

> A person who has possession of a silencer is guilty of an offence.

As I pointed out, a silencer means a device attached to a firearm, so that we are not referring to a silencer being an article that is known as a silencer unless it is attached to a firearm, when it becomes a silencer. Again, I imagine that there could be quite a lot of play in a court as to when is a silencer not a silencer, particularly because the device that we are talking about could be a rubber dummy or a baby teat.

An honourable member: A rubber pad.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Yes, a rubber pad, or anything of that nature. I do not want to go into the facetious side of it. I have raised the matter because the Bill is not specific enough by way of definition. In a practical sense, a silencer is an attachment that can be made to a gun. That makes it a silencer attached to a gun rather than a silencer because it is physically attached to a gun. We should take more advice on this matter in the long term. It has been receiving rather more positive attention across the border than we

are giving it by continuing to enact the interpretation clause and re-enacting this provision under new section 29.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I thank the honourable member for that suggestion, which can certainly be taken up. We are talking about silencers only because of the historical accident that they are teamed with dangerous firearms under section 29 of the parent Act. If section 29 had referred to dangerous firearms and section 30 had referred to silencers, it would not have been necessary to make reference to silencers in clause 8. It was not the Government's intention, in bringing forth this modest measure, to have a thoroughgoing review of the legislation in this area. I will consider the honourable member's suggestion in the light of a further review of the legislation of a more thoroughgoing nature that we might want to undertake. The intent of clause 8 is to leave the provisions of the parent Act concerning silencers unchanged.

Mr BLACKER: I share the concern of the member for Light, because the Minister's explanation in relation to 'a silencer' as it applied to the Act and about when it is or is not a dangerous weapon is not totally consistent with the views expressed when the original legislation went through the House. At that time it was considered to be an offence to have a silencer in one's possession. Whether there is a difference between an individual gun licensee or a dealer may be subject to debate, but, if the Minister could take further advice and perhaps obtain clarification, we would all benefit.

Clause passed.

Clause 9 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ANIMAL AND PLANT CONTROL (AGRICULTURAL PROTECTION AND OTHER PURPOSES) BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 28 August. Page 829.)

Clause 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

Mr GUNN: Will the Minister inform the Committee, to relieve the concern of some people, whether under the new arrangements certain types of animals will not be permitted to graze in certain parts of the State? I understand that there have been suggestions that, in the Flinders Ranges, for instance, except in special circumstances goats might not be permitted to graze. I have received correspondence from people in the industry expressing concern. I also understand that many people in the South-East are concerned about the number of semi-domesticated deer that run wild. Every now and again landowners replenish the numbers by various means, because they are nice to see on a property and provide sport. The people involved in the provisions of the previous Bill might also be involved in the harvesting of these animals. What is envisaged in relation to this clause? Does the Minister have any other information? This clause defines animals as being live vertebrate animals, and most of the animals to which I have referred could probably be classed as vertebrate pests.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am at somewhat of a disadvantage, as I do not have my notes with me. The intention is as the honourable member has outlined: it would be for the declaration of animals such as feral goats. We would deal with feral deer if that situation was seen as a threat by the authority. I hope that answers the question.

Mr GUNN: Before these animals, particularly deer, are declared under the new Act, I request that full and proper discussion take place with interested bodies to see whether some of the fears and problems may be overcome. In my experience it is far better to have discussions and resolve these matters in a sensible manner. It makes it easier for everyone concerned. If the Minister gives that assurance I will be happy to let it go at that.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: There have been quite extensive consultations, in the process of the drafting of this Bill, by departmental officers. I understand the import and seriousness of the question but I can assure the honourable member that there would be consultation with the association representatives and respective people in the affected area.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—'Crown bound.'

Mr GUNN: I have been in this place for quite a while and I have listened to many debates from people on different sides of the Chamber. It is marvellous how they change hats when they change positions! However, I am pleased to see that the Crown is bound. Will the National Parks and Wildlife Service be brought under the umbrella of this provision? If that is to be so, it will be involved in extensive work in complying with the provisions binding the Crown if it is to meet the conditions that landholders would be expected to meet. Will the Minister advise whether the National Parks and Wildlife Service will be made to meet these conditions?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It is not envisaged that the department would be bound. That is not the practice. If the department is judged not responsible or not to be a good manager, the matter would be one for me to take up, as the Minister responsible for the Act, with the Minister responsible for national parks. It is not envisaged, as I understand it, that we should bind that Minister.

Mr GUNN: I do not want to labour the point. I was pleasantly surprised to find that provision in the Bill, but it appears unique if we bind the Crown but then not oblige it to meet the provisions of the legislation. That is an interesting set of circumstances. If we expect private landholders to comply with the Act, the Government should set a good example by doing the same. I am not in an aggressive or obstructive mood—

An honourable member: You are being friendly.

Mr GUNN: I am grateful. Life is too short to be difficult. These are provisions I have tried to have inserted in legislation over many years. In areas where boards operate there are several national parks, and this provision will be trotted out. There is nothing surer.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I understand the honourable member's concern. The committee which was given the task of drafting and preparing the Bill and conducting consultations included a representative of the Department of Environment and Planning. It seems that I have circumvented the bureaucratic process by asking the relevant Minister directly a few minutes ago. The committee's intention was to seek a commitment from the department in regard to the application of the legislation. The representative has given an undertaking that that should be the case, and what the Minister has said reinforces that. As for being legally bound, I understand from the Minister's answer that that is not the department's intention.

Mr BLACKER: I find it extraordinary that we have clause 4 which binds the Crown, and that the Minister says that that is not so. If that is the correct interpretation, where do we stand? I was pleased to see the provisions of clause 4, because there are many national and other parks. Pest plants are important there and many landholders believe that the national parks foster or harbour pest plants. Nothing has been done about that in the past. I should have thought

that binding the Crown would oblige the Government to provide appropriate control of pests and plants on Government owned land and parks as well.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I appreciate the honourable member's comment, but I understand from the original draft Bill that that clause stood as well. I understand the commitment. What I have said in relation to the Minister's commitment about the application of the legislation stands. As the Minister responsible, I would do everything to ensure that the Crown respected and honoured the commitment embodied in the legislation.

From the discussions that have been held, I understand that there has not been a commitment back from the Department for Environment and Planning, which the member for Eyre mentioned as the department with which he was concerned (and it is the National Parks and Wildlife Service in particular). I will pursue that matter in relation to the application. I understand the thrust of the question and the meaning and purpose behind it in relation to the management of the whole State and not having areas excluded from the application of the legislation.

Mr BLACKER: I accept the Minister's sincerity and his belief, from his view, that it does bind the Crown in his portfolio. I find some anomaly in the Minister's having to sue one of his colleagues in order to prove that the Crown is bound. The Crown might be bound from the Minister's point of view in the application of the legislation, but the landholder is his ministerial colleague who is also a member of the Crown. Therefore, to my mind, that Minister should be equally responsible and should have an equal obligation.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Again, I respect the member's genuine concern. I am sure that Ministers have had different views about applications and honouring legislation for which they are responsible in situations where they believe another Minister is not responsible, and the Deputy Premier and I are no exception. We have already had differences in my brief career about how things should apply. I can see the inconsistency in not applying the legislation in its total sense. That would go against my grain and would go against the whole spirit of the legislation. It would create confusion and distress for the community of South Australia if the legislation was not applied in its full sense.

From a brief discussion with the Deputy Premier regarding his position as the Minister responsible for national parks, it is clear that he sees that it is his responsibility to ensure that his departmental responsibilities tie in with the meaning and application of the legislation. I assure the member that I will do everything in my power to ensure that other departments and the Ministers responsible for those departments meet the spirit of the legislation.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I completely accept what the Minister is saying, that his intentions in this matter are quite clear. However, what is also clear is the wording of the Bill before us. The Bill makes it quite definite that the owner of land in the definition clause includes several types of land tenure. Subparagraph *(d)* then provides that the Crown is the owner of other land. That definition is deemed to include an occupier of land, who is the person in possession or control of the land. Clause 4 binds the Crown, so where is there an exemption for the Minister for Environment and Planning in relation to his national parks responsibility, because clause 47 provides:

> An owner of land within a control area for a class of animals to which this subsection applies must destroy all animals of that class on that land.

That is a clear direction. It is quite clear from the definitions of 'occupier' and 'owner' that the Minister for Environment and Planning would be the owner or the occupier (or both) of a national park and associated land. Clause 4 binds the Crown, so will the Minister draw the Committee's attention to the exemption provision which allows his colleague to not strictly enforce the legislation in relation to his land?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am inclined to agree with the member for Elizabeth in relation to his interpretation. During the committee discussions when the Bill was drafted my officers intended that the Crown should be bound. The Bill seems to be very definite in its intention. I hope that the wording used by the member for Elizabeth in relation to the Crown avoiding its responsibilities (and I think that was the member's inference)—

Mr M.J. Evans: Where is the exemption?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Elizabeth's final comment related to the Crown's not applying the legislation to the letter. The Minister has assured me that he will and, from my interpretation, I do not think that he has much choice.

I am not sure how he feels about that, but I am not particularly uncomfortable about the ability to apply the legislation in its true sense. There may need to be discussions with him and his officers relating to his interpretation of his position.

Presumably he has applied some other interpretation. He has an officer on that committee representing his interests and that officer has indicated that the Crown is responsible for the national parks and is concerned that the Act does apply to them.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 passed.

Clause 7—'Members of the commission.'

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

Page 4,—
Line 30—Leave out 'the Executive Committee of'.
Line 36—Leave out 'the Executive Committee of'.
Line 40—Leave out 'the Executive Committee of'.

I think that it would be better to take these amendments to three lines in the Bill *en bloc* because they seek to achieve the same objective. I am seeking to delete the words 'the Executive Committee of' where it relates to nomination of members of the commission by the Local Government Association. As members are aware, the LGA is a broad umbrella body which includes many sub-parts and constituent members. I think that it would be wrong for the Parliament to seek to bind the corporate nature of the LGA in the way in which its nominations are to be formulated and prepared. While it is true to say that the Executive Committee is the paramount day-to-day group of the LGA, there are many other possible ways that a person can be nominated by the LGA and they may be changed over a period of time, so I think that it would be more appropriate to nominate the organisation as a whole rather than any particular body in it.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am prepared to accept the amendment. I believe that the honourable member's comments about going inside the organisation are quite right. It is easy to accept that the normal principle would be that the LGA would be the body as a whole, whether its Executive Committee, the general council or a plebiscite of all its members undertook to select particular nominees.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 8 to 10 passed.

Clause 11—'Delegation by commission.'

Mr M.J. EVANS: The commission has a number of powers and functions under the Act which might reasonably on some occasions be accepted by another person in the field. I think that that is the intention of this clause, but the only groups covered are a member of the commission, an employee of the Public Service or a committee of the commission. That excludes a control board or a local

government body actually out in the field. I wonder why the Minister did not include those two agencies, which seem to be intimately involved in the administration of the Act.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I accept the point being made. Local government has a close and direct involvement with this legislation. I think that Division II answers the question in relation to specific powers being given to local boards. I think that that is where the powers that the member seeks in relation to those designated under paragraphs *(a)*, *(b)* or *(c)* of clause 11 (1) in fact institute the authority required with the local board.

Clause passed.

Clauses 12 to 23 passed.

Clause 24—'Functions of boards.'

Mr M.J. EVANS: The Minister will note that, where we are dealing with an urban council which is constituted to have the powers and duties of a control board, it is bound by the Act in the normal terms of each of the clauses as we come to them, except in this case of division II, where an urban council acting as a control board is not subject to division II. The definition of 'control board' is as follows:

> 'control board' means an animal and plant control board established under Division II of Part II and includes (except in relation to that Division) a council vested with the powers, duties . . .:

Therefore, an urban council acting in this capacity does not have this division applying to it. That is fair in relation to most of the other provisions dealing with the mechanics and administrative details. However, in this case we are dealing with the functions of the control board, and it sets out in some depth what we expect of those control boards.

I would have thought that it was the same thing that we expected of an urban council acting as a control board. However, an urban council is not subject to this division, so it seems that the Bill does not provide any scheme or motivating items to which an urban council can have regard. It is not subject to the functions provisions. Could the Minister explain his drafting or thinking in this area?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: We might need further explanation in relation to the drafting. I understand that the honourable member's interpretation of 'control board' would exclude a metropolitan council from the provision and from acting as a control board. Our interpretation is not that.

Mr M.J. Evans: They would seem to have no functions.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I see the thrust of the honourable member's question. On the advice of the Parliamentary Draftsman, I draw to the honourable member's attention clause 15 *(b)*, under division II, which provides:

> . . . where the Governor is satisfied that the area of a council is predominantly urban in character, declare that the council shall have all the powers duties and functions of a control board in relation to its area.

I think that that enforces the urban council having those powers. Does that answer the honourable member's question? It is the advice that we have received from the draftsman. It satisfies me.

Mr M.J. EVANS: The Minister is saying that that part of division II does apply to a metropolitan council, despite the fact that the definition says 'except in relation to that division'. It seems that the provisions under division II almost go around in circles. However, I can certainly accept what the Minister is getting at. The definition excludes such a council from all of division II, but the Minister is saying that the first clause of division II applies to that council. If that is correct, I would certainly accept that.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The penny has now dropped, in my case, anyway. The Parliamentary Draftsman has made the point that clause 15 refers not to control boards but to the area of the council, in relation to which the Governor may allow certain action to be taken. I think that that explains it. It is exclusive, if you like, of the definition of 'control board'. If that intention is not conveyed, I am sure we have failed in drafting the provision.

Mr M.J. EVANS: Right, that is fair enough. Quite clearly, clause 24 will define the functions of an 'urban control board'.

Clause passed.

Clause 25 passed.

Clause 26—'Local authorised officers.'

Mr M.J. EVANS: Clause 26 (2) *(b)* provides that:

> The Commission may, by notice in writing addressed to a control board: specify in the notice the qualifications or experience that a person must possess in order to be appointed to be a local authorised officer.

Does the fact that this is to be done on a board by board basis mean that the qualifications and experience will vary board by board, or will an overall standard be set? I want to clarify that, because this talks about notice being given to each board rather than about an overall standard.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The board would apply the provisions on the basis of a certificate, which is attainable from TAFE, or notice that an applicant intends to undertake that certificate course to obtain that qualification. Also, guidelines are set down for the qualifications of a person to be appointed under the provisions of the Act.

Mr GUNN: It will be under the provisions of this clause that the Commission may direct local boards as to the type of person to be appointed. As I understand the situation, currently most boards have multiple purpose officers, who may act as building inspectors, weed inspectors or vermin inspectors, and perhaps health inspectors. This is a sensible way to handle the situation, and it would appear to me that that should continue. I want an assurance from the Minister that no direction will be given that will alter the current arrangements; otherwise boards could find themselves involved in fairly expensive operations in which I do not believe they would wish to be involved and, certainly their ratepayers would not want to foot the bills for that.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I think there are two levels to the answer to the question put by the honourable member. Regional boards would have the requirement of employing a full-time officer vested with powers under the Act and would need to be fully commited in relation to the application of that requirement. We are probably looking at the smaller local government areas and the honourable member is right in what he says about the multiplicity of functions such officers have. They have many hats, and that will continue. I am not sure what the honourable member wants me to reassure him about, but I am sure that the board would enforce the application of standard requirements in regard to qualifications, continuity and equity in the application of the Act. All members of Parliament would be judging that with great care, and certainly country members would be watching it closely.

Clause passed.

Clause 27—'Powers of authorised officers.'

Mr GUNN: I move:

> Page 12, lines 36 to 45—Leave out paragraphs *(a)* and *(b)* and insert:
>
> *(a)* enter and inspect any land, premises, place or vehicle where reasonably necessary for the administration or enforcement of this Act.

My amendment seeks to modify the extensive powers that officers will have under this legislation. In my judgment Parliament from time to time has acted without giving proper thought or consideration to the lengths to which it is willing to go to authorise officers with little experience and clothe them with extensive powers.

The power to enter a residence without a warrant causes me much concern. An example was given in this place today

of Highways Department officers obviously abusing their extensive powers. If one gives people extensive power and if in the past they have not been used to giving directions or have not had authority, it is inclined to go to the head and they become overenthusiastic and zealous in the manner in which they carry out their duties. Therefore, through experience, I have learnt that it is unwise to let such provisions go unchallenged.

It is not good enough to say that the director of a department says it is necessary because such provisions, once written into the law, stand and people get appointed and start looking up their little books and seeing that they have certain authority. Then we find some character racing around annoying people. At that stage it is too late to do anything. People can get issued with tickets and all sorts of things. My amendment is reasonable and gives officers adequate powers.

To give junior officers the power to enter a person's home is unnecessary and wrong. People are entitled to privacy. If law enforcement officers need authority to enter a house, except in rare circumstances, they should have to go to the trouble of justifying the intrusion. I propose my amendment in good faith and I hope the Minister will be reasonable and accept it. Officers have adequate power under other provisions.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I draw the honourable member's attention to clause 27 (2), which provides:

> An authorized officer shall not exerecise the power conferred by subsection (1) *(a)* or *(b)* in relation to premises that constitute a dwelling house except upon the authority of a warrant issued by a justice.

That subclause covers the major thrust of what the honourable member intends to protect in regard to people's civil rights, and I certainly support him in that respect. People are entitled to that bare minimum of rights. Having made that comment, I point out that it is important to note about the general provision that there is strong support from the people who have to deal with those who engage in illicit trade in exotic species.

I am sure that no-one in the South Australian community working under the provisions of this Act would dare tread one inch out of line, knowing that the member for Eyre would be watching. As well, I am certain that most members of Parliament would be very concerned about any person who went outside the normal bounds of reasonableness in enforcing the provisions of the legislation in an endeavour to apprehend or prevent some action which may have a detrimental effect on the whole community, whether it be in relation to exotic species or some other trade which may have that impact.

It is really important to note that this provision is critical in order to give officers the opportunity and the power to prevent and apprehend those who may be committing an illegal act under the terms of the legislation. I therefore say that subclause (2) covers the very basic civil liberties issue about which the honourable member is concerned in relation to subclause 1 *(a)* and *(b)*— that is, a premises that would constitute a dwelling house—but in relation to a vehicle or land I believe that the officers need that power in order to enforce the legislation. The Government—whatever shade of Government—also needs, this provision in order to ensure the protection of the whole community of South Australia, so I strongly support this Bill in its form and certainly do not accept the honourable member's amendment as it stands.

Mr GUNN: I do not want to unduly delay the proceedings, but I am somewhat disappointed that the Minister would not accept what I believe to be a reasonable amendment. I could have drawn it in a different manner. I assure the Minister that I believe under many Acts of Parliament people are overstepping their authority, and I have raised such matters in this place but I cannot cast my gaze over the whole of the State; unfortunately, I am not privy to all the activities of the large number of Government officials who operate around the State.

One of the problems is that once we write measures such as this on to the statute books people do get victimised, and Ministers in many cases appear loath to act. Ministers will call for a report on such matters, but the people who are causing the problem will write the answer. It is not a very satisfactory arrangement.

Those people who will administer this legislation will know that the Committee has taken particular interest in this clause and from time to time will want to know what is taking place. I suppose that, during the budget Estimates Committee hearings next year, we will have a chance to cross-examine the Minister and his officers over how many people have been prosecuted and how often these powers have been exercised.

As someone who has grown up in the farming community, I would be the last person who would want to take action which would in any way endanger the most important industry we have in this State—the agricultural industry. I am also aware of how annoyed people in rural pursuits become when they have to confront over-officious, zealous officials, and the best way to act is to have cooperation and commonsense, so I hope that these provisions are implemented based on commonsense.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I must stand and defend, to some extent, the officers who may feel that I am not defending their rights if I do not make some comment on this matter.

Mr Gunn interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The honourable member indicates that he has been mild, and I accept that. In most cases, and certainly this is the advice given to me, we are talking about local people who are living in the community in which they are given the delegated authority to act, under the powers vested by this Act, on behalf of the local board. It is not as though they will be descending from Adelaide in hoards. Where there is a serious situation, there will probably be an enforcement from the central board. Otherwise, it will be a local person who lives within the community and has a responsibility and a concern, as the member for Eyre indicated he has (and I am sure all members of the House have) in relation to the tremendous and horrendous dangers that will be faced if some exotic pest or animal is brought into the area and threatens the whole well-being of the agricultural community.

We have to be realistic in relation to those officers who will be enforcing the provisions of the Bill. It seems to me that, as in most cases they are local, they would have a sensitivity to this matter, and they have to live in the community in the years to come, in any event. It is not as though they will be heavy handed in the way they will approach land owners. As I have said already, this is an important facet of the Bill which is essential for the measure to operate. The comments made by the member for Eyre have been noted, and certainly I have taken them on board. I am sure that the officers concerned who are here tonight have also taken them on board. Whether it be the member for Eyre, the member for Flinders, the member for Victoria or anyone else who may have the greatest exposure to the application of this Bill, I am sure that they will be ever vigilant in ensuring that their local officers are sensitive to the needs of the local community.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: No, I cannot; in most cases they will be.

The CHAIRMAN: I call the member for Elizabeth to put his amendment. It has to be done this way in order to safeguard the honourable member's amendment.

Mr M.J. EVANS: Thank you for your advice, Mr Chairman. I move:

Page 12, line 38—Leave out ', or any records or papers, that is or are'.

I believe that that will have the effect of achieving the wishes of the Minister in relation to the powers of authorised officers to break into premises, and enter premises without having to break in, in order to seize and obtain actual animals and plants that are held in contravention of the Act. I believe that that is a perfectly reasonable and proper exercise of an authorised officer's power. I have no difficulty with that whatsoever. Obviously, in order to safeguard agriculture in this State, those kinds of serious and extreme powers may well be necessary, but I do not believe that those powers are necessary in relation to seeking out records and papers which relate to this kind of offence. There are adequate powers in the clause further on, and I draw the Committee's attention to paragraphs *(h)*, (i) and *(j)*, which provide adequate powers for an authorised officer to require the production of records or documents, to inspect and take copies of any of those documents, and in paragraph *(j)* to seize any other thing that in the opinion of the authorised officer affords evidence of the offence.

Therefore, while I believe that other provisions give adequate power for that, I do not believe that power is necessary in respect of paragraphs *(a)* and *(b)* where there is actually a power to break into virtually anything without limitation and stop any vehicle, not only to seize an animal or plant—which I think is perfectly reasonable and legitimate—but also to obtain records and papers, where I do not believe that that kind of extreme power is warranted. Clearly the records and papers *per se* do not threaten agriculture in this State, but rather the contraband animals and plants do. By all means, let Parliament preserve that power, but let us not extend it beyond its reasonable application.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I appreciate the concern expressed by the member for Elizabeth. Under normal circumstances, I think that I would probably agree with his amendment but, if one were privy to our previous discussion in relation to the provision of a warrant, one would realise that the honourable member raised the question whether or not an officer would need a warrant in order to enter premises and undertake the actions that are spelt out in subclause (1) *(a)* and *(b)*. A warrant is needed in order to take the action as spelt out in subclause (2).

The member for Elizabeth referred also to clause 27 (1) *(g)*, which states:

require a person who has custody of records or documents of, or relating to, any matter dealt with by this Act to produce those records or documents;

The onus is on the person to produce those documents. I am advised that the deletion of the words 'or any records or papers, that is or are' would diminish quite dramatically the opportunity to successfully prosecute the person or persons concerned. We believe that the inclusion of those words is essential to enable us to undertake successful prosecutions in this very serious area which concerns not only the rural community but also other people who are interested in their own propagation, livestock or plants, or in the continuation of their farming. In order to be able to discover and prosecute the persons involved, we believe that a warrant is essential.

I accept and understand the point raised by the member for Elizabeth. I believe that this provision should be enforced by an officer only under exceptional circumstances but, in order to pursue successful prosecutions, these words are needed. However, they would have to be subject to very careful scrutiny and use by the officer concerned.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I remind the Minister that the limitation on the need for a warrant relates only to where the premises are a domestic dwelling house. So, any area, any other part of the farm, any business, any shop, any office complex or anywhere else, apart from a personal dwelling house, will be entirely open to search and seizure without notice. This will apply even to the extent of breaking open a person's private files or a person's safe in an office, building or bank, stopping a person's moving vehicle and breaking it open, or breaking open any locked case or object in the vehicle. That action would be carried out to obtain the plants and animals (which I accept as being perfectly reasonable to safeguard animals, and I do not question that).

However, to extend the powers to that extent just to obtain the records and papers which might lead to an assistance of prosecution is to extend by leaps and bounds—in fact, it is a quantum leap—the law of the State in relation to obtaining evidence. I imagine that many other agencies, including the police, would like the power for much lesser offences in relation not to the agricultural impact but to the nature of the offence, because this covers any determination in relation to this measure. I imagine that the police officers and taxation officers would like the power to break into and enter any locked vehicle, business premises or filing cabinet in order to obtain evidence (and not to obtain illegal plants or animals that threaten the State) which might enhance a prosecution, and this power is being given to an authorised officer who deals not normally with evidence but with contraband plants and animals.

I strongly suggest that the Minister is advancing, to quite an unreasonable extent, the law relating to search and seizure, without notice and without the agreement of the person concerned far beyond that relating to any other provisions with which I am familiar, to obtain not only the animals and plants but also the records and papers.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I accept the honourable member's point about the ability of officers, under this measure, to enter premises other than dwelling houses to obtain these papers. The process that we envisage under this Bill, of including the control of exotic pests and animals, would be the thrust behind providing powers to officers. This matter is being exposed to the United Farmers and Stockowners, which is the organisation whose members are the most likely to be affected by the application of the Bill. They have no objection to the clause. The LGA has also had exposure to this clause and it has no objection to its application.

I understand what the honourable member is saying. In different circumstances, I would join him and echo his comments about police powers, certainly in regard to matters relating to my electorate. He would say the same about other matters outside the Bill. If people in my electorate or in the district of Elizabeth undertake acts that are illegal or threatening to the wellbeing of the community, I support the view taken.

This matter might come up in the other place and I will certainly take on board what the honourable member has said. I give an undertaking to come back on this matter in due course. I shall take up the matter with the officers concerned. I accept that this is a serious step to take. Serious and illegal deeds under this Act require serious action. However, one has to balance that against the impact of civil rights. I shall come back on this given what might happen in the other place.

The CHAIRMAN: To safeguard the amendment of the member for Elizabeth, I shall put the question in relation to the amendment of the member for Eyre, that all words on page 12, lines 35 to 38, up to an including the word 'plant' be left out—that is up to the point at which the member for Elizabeth's amendment seeks to have effect. If that question is passed, the balance of the amendment moved by the member for Eyre will be put and the amendment moved by the member for Elizabeth is lost. If the first question is negatived, the member for Eyre's amendment will not be proceeded with and the amendment of the member for Elizabeth can be put. Therefore, I shall put the first part of the amendment moved by the member for Eyre.

Amendment to lines 35 to 38 negatived.

The CHAIRMAN: I now put the amendment moved by the member for Elizabeth.

Amendment negatived.

Mr GUNN: I move:

Page 13, lines 33 and 34—Leave out 'premises that constitute a dwelling house except upon the authority of a warrant issued by a justice' and insert 'any land, premises or place unless the officer has given the occupier of the land, premises or place not less than two days prior written notice of the officer's intention to enter and inspect the land, premises, or place'.

This amendment is similar to the previous one. I have been through the arguments and they follow on. I hope that the Minister, in relation to the administration of this Act, will bear this very much in mind.

Both the member for Elizabeth and I made it very clear that under this legislation we are clothing officers with extreme powers, which should not be given lightly and which should be exercised carefully. When Parliament passes an Act it is administered, and we do not have an opportunity to review it. It is placed on the Statute, and for many years these provisions can be misused. Bad habits then grow over a period of time, and I have given examples of this. I hope that great care and caution will be used, because the privacy, rights and freedom of individuals should not be taken away lightly.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: This amendment will completely undermine the application of the Bill and the ability of officers to successfully apprehend and prosecute. As I said to the member for Elizabeth (and the member for Eyre has picked this up, and I reassure him), notwithstanding what might come from another place, I will certainly have discussions with the officers in the next day or so to determine a more acceptable position for both honourable members, taking into account the intention of this amendment which, with the earlier amendment that the member for Eyre moved, takes on board the concerns expressed by the member for Elizabeth.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 28 to 35 passed.

Clause 36—'Contributions by councils to board funds.'

Mr GUNN: I move:

Page 18—

Lines 24 and 25—

Leave out 'and shall cause that determination to be published in the *Gazette*.

After line 25—

Insert new subclauses as follows:

(6a) A constituent council may, within 14 days after receiving a notice under subsection (6), apply to the Minister for a review of the determination.

(6b) The Minister may, on an application under subsection (6a), confirm, vary or set aside the determination.

(6c) A determination of the commission under this section shall be published in the *Gazette* in the form in which it is made unless it is varied by the Minister, in which case it shall be published in its form as so varied.

This may be my most reasonable amendment. It gives local councils the power to appeal against decisions of the commission. In this British system of Parliamentary democracy where we believe in checks and balances, it has been instilled into me that one always has the right of appeal against determinations of quasi-judicial boards or other such boards. My amendment allows a limited appeal to the Minister, but at least it gives that right to people who are aggrieved.

A board often has the tendency to become self-centred and believe it can do no wrong. It can become very arrogant and often impersonal in dealing with people. I believe that its decisions, particularly when acting as a tax collecting agent for the central Government, should be subject to appeal. This amendment will provide that, within 14 days after a determination, the right to appeal to the Minister, who can vary or leave it, publishing his decision in the *Gazette*.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It is important to note that under clause 36 (3) there is provision for a process for consultation between constituent councils and the commission before a decision is made to determine the contribution to be paid by constituent councils. It is also important to note that the maximum contributions referred to are governed by clause 36 (4), which provides:

Subject to subsection (5), the contribution to be paid by a constituent council under this section shall be—

(a) in respect of such portion of the council area as is comprised of rural land, such percentage, not exceeding 4 per cent, of the general rate revenue to be derived by the council during the current financial year in respect of that rural land, as the commission determines;

There is a built-in governor based on rural land. Clause 36 (4) *(b)* provides:

in respect of such portion of the council area as is comprised of urban land, such percentage, not exceeding 1 per cent, of the general rate revenue to be derived by the council during the current financial year in respect of that urban land, as the Commission determines.

There are two aspects: the consultation process in clause 36 (3), and a process of setting a maximum by which the commission can ask the constituent council to contribute to the funds nescessary to enforce the legislation. I believe that adequate processes are built into that mechanism and that they will protect the rights of the constituent councils. We have built in what may be an expensive and extensive administrative appeal mechanism which could prove more costly and not achieve the desired results, but I believe that the constituent councils will be well protected.

Mr GUNN: We know what consultation can mean. The board has the power ultimately to impose, so the officer can say, 'We have come to tell you that you will pay 3.8 per cent of your rate revenue.' That is what consultation can mean. We have experienced it before.

We are to have unelected officials imposing on elected officials a course of action which is quite unnecessary, with no right of appeal. I do not want to waste the time of the Committee or to do some lobbying up the corridor. This is a reasonable amendment. The Minister obviously has an accountant who can say whether it is reasonable. If he built in a few of these protections he would find that many problems could be avoided. This is not an earth-shattering amendment: it merely affords elected people some right to go to the elected Minister. Unelected people are to be able to impose their will on freely and democratically elected people.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: It's not on.

Mr GUNN: It is not on. It is not a fair go. I have been reasonable, but I shall be determined on this matter and lobby my colleagues in another place. The Minister may

want to dig his heels in. Two can do that. In the spirit of common sense this mild amendment ought to be accepted.

I find it hard to see how people exercising the proposed powers are unprepared to have their decision subjected to consideration by a Minister. The Minister has to face the people and local councils which inflict rates must face the people, but we are to have an outside group of people who will sit in judgment, inflict taxes, and be able to thumb their nose. We know how self-centred some such groups can become. I do not believe that that is good enough.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Perhaps I might put the discussion on the Bill into context. I assure the honourable member that there were extensive discussions with all representative bodies. The body primarily concerned with clause 36, especially subclauses (3) and (4) is the Local Government Association, and there is no opposition—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I will not comment on that. I will let Mr Hullich or—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: That is a bit broader than the scope of this Bill—whether or not we have State Governments. In relation to the Local Government Association's position, I understand what the member for Eyre wants to do and I appreciate his argument. It appears to me that there is a mechanism in place which allows for consultation and discussion between the local board secretary and the secretary of the commission. There is a mechanism which sets a maximum, and that is enshrined in the legislation. The Bill says, 'not exceeding'. That is the limit.

Mr Gunn interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Yes, I know.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister will address the Chair and will not worry about interjections.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I believe the mechanism is there to basically cover what the member for Eyre is driving at. I certainly believe that, if there was a strong objection from the LGA, which has obviously consulted with its member councils—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Are you sure about that?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: That is not for me to determine. Knowing the extensive consultation that the LGA goes through (and a key officer of the association was in the gallery this evening), I am sure that there would be clear consultation in relation to this and that there would be a very strong objection if the LGA was concerned. One thing about local government is that, in relation to money matters and, if it is concerned about the State Government applying some impost that local government cannot or will not accept, it will speak up very loudly and very clearly to this Parliament and to members. I feel quite comfortable about supporting this matter as it stands and leaving this clause in the legislation.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): Tonight I will address the topic of industrial disputation. Members opposite have made various comments, on a regular basis, about how responsible the union movement is in Australia.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: The honourable member mentions Queensland, but I will mention some of the OECD countries so that we can put Australia's contribution and, more importantly, South Australia's contribution in a proper context in the total spectrum. While I was overseas I visited a number of countries and spoke to their Government officials about their strategies for employment and industrial relations. I think the most positive feature of my trip was the extent of commitment made by not only the Governments of those countries but also the trade unions and the employer groups in coming together for the common good. Perhaps some members opposite have also spoken to officials in this regard and have probably received the same information. The important thing that really impressed me was that, even in countries where the unemployment rate has slipped down the scale to what was the case 10 years ago, enormous efforts are being made by those countries, and particularly by the players in the system—the employers and the trade unions. However, that effort is not being reflected here in Australia.

We are not seeing that level of consultation, agreement or even common direction in the way in which we approach our industrial relations system in this country. The Australian Bureau of Statistics bulletin of 18 September publishes a graph showing that the period of greatest industrial disputation in Australia's history took place during the Whitlam years—believe it or not! It is my view that we are heading in the same direction again unless somebody starts to take a more rational approach in the circumstances that we are facing today.

It is interesting to compare our performance with that of some of our trading partners and some of the nations in what we class as the developed world. I seek leave to have a table which was prepared by the Parliamentary Library inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The SPEAKER: I take it that the material is purely statistical.

Leave granted.

Note that the data below refer to days lost per 1 000 total labour force, which includes military employees. This is due to the fact that data on the number of civilian employees is not available for eight of the 14 OECD countries. Results are calculated from data published in the ILO Yearbook 1984 and various editions of the OECD publication Labour Force Statistics.

Table 1:

Working days lost per 1 000 members of the total labour force

	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983
Canada	694	774	741	482	363
USA	194	195	153	81	154
Japan	17	18	10	9	9
Australia	617	494	614	310	233
Austria	0.2	5	1	0.1	0.2
Finland	105	684	262	81	280
France	159	73	64	99	64
Germany	18	5	2	1	2
Italy	1 224	722	456	801	598
Norway	4	53	14	141	3
Spain	1 412	463	385	205	322
Sweden	7	1 037	48	0.4	8
Switzerland	1	2	0.005	0.2	2
UK	1 115	454	160	199	141

The effect of using total labour force rather than civilian labour force is minimal—for Australia in 1983 the difference was two working days lost.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will outline first the countries doing far better than us and then will outline the ones that are not doing as well. In 1979 there were 194 working days per thousand members of the labour force lost in the USA and in 1983 it was 154; in Japan, 17 in 1979 and nine in 1983;

in Australia, 617 in 1979 and 233 in 1983; in Austria, 0.2 in 1979 and still 0.2 in 1983; in France, 159 in 1979, and it slumped to 64 in 1983; in Germany, 18 in 1979, and it slumped to two in 1983; the figure for Italy was higher than our figure; in Norway, four in 1979, and it slumped to three in 1983; in Spain, the figure was higher than that for Australia; in Sweden, seven in 1979 and eight in 1983; in Switzerland, one in 1979, and it increased by 100 per cent to two in 1983; and, in the United Kingdom, 1 115 in 1979, and it decreased to 141 in 1983.

Members interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: The interesting remark was made by the member for Briggs is that that is the Thatcher Government.

Mr Rann: That is not a deregulated system; you don't understand—you were busy looking at the sights.

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

Mr S.J. BAKER: The member for Briggs said that that was the Thatcher Government and then changed tack and said that that is not a deregulated system. I wish he would decide what he wants to argue because, quite clearly, figures show that England has made enormous improvements in this area and, very importantly, English officials had pride in showing me while I was there that Australia has almost double the level of industrial disputation in England.

Mr Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: I am hearing these extraordinary statements from the other side of the House. I do not wish to react to interjections which have no substance, so I will not bother pursuing them. The point of the exercise is to illustrate to honourable members, at least in statistical terms, that Australia is doing very poorly. On the Richter scale of industrial disputation, in 1983—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call on Government backbenchers to restrain their excitement.

Mr S.J. BAKER: We had Canada sitting at 50 per cent higher than us and Finland slightly above us, along with Italy and Spain. The important thing to remember is performance. We can argue about systems, but does that not indicate to members opposite that it is about time the industrial relations system in Australia changed considerably.

Mr Rann interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: The member for Briggs spoke of the Austrian system. Would he like to mention the German or Swiss systems? I will take up the proposition that we are talking about a system that has evolved over the space of 100 years at least.

Mr Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections about the law of the jungle are inappropriate and so it is for members to carry on as though we were applying the law of the jungle here.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Members have mentioned that the system in those countries is different. That is the point I am trying to make. The system is different from the one we are trying to operate here in Australia. If members opposite feel that they can live with a system that is continually an adversary system, a system that disrupts and brings Australia's competitiveness to its knees and continues to lower Australia's esteem in world terms, surely it is about time that the Government changed, because the system in Australia is no good. The system has to change. If deregulation happens to be the vehicle and if that is the only way we can get any sanity into industrial relations in this country, then so be it. Unless some members opposite make the attempt and make the people within the trade union movement understand that what they have done over the years and what they are doing today is destroying this country, then Australia has little chance of ever reaching its full potential.

If members opposite are happy with a level of industrial disputation as high as it is today compared with such places as Austria, which loses one-fifth of a day per 1 000 employees, whilst we are operating on a system that talks about 200 plus per 1 000 employees, then I suggest that they should go back to the classroom and look at their basic education. Unless we can compete, unless we can get the union movement to get some element of sanity into the way it operates in this country, we will never reach our potential.

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

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): I had the privilege earlier this evening of launching for the Citizens Advice Bureau a new information kit entitled 'Accommodation and Services for the Aged'. The kit incorporates a list of accommodation options available for ageing people as well as some information about the range of services available for retired people throughout metropolitan Adelaide. It includes explanations of the different accommodation arrangements and it attempts to give some people an idea of the financial traps involved in changing from one form of accommodation to another. The kit will be used by people in information agencies and community welfare information agencies throughout metropolitan Adelaide and indeed throughout South Australia.

It is very timely that this production has been launched in the week prior to Seniors Week, which begins in South Australia next Wednesday. The kit is a response to the obvious need that citizens advice bureaux and community information agencies have identified throughout the community to ensure that they can adequately respond to the numerous requests being put to them by ageing people who are looking to alter their accommodation arrangements and who are seeking information about the other services organised by Government departments for elderly people.

It is important to focus attention on the aged in the community not simply because it is seniors week next week or simply because the Citizens' Advice Bureau has determined that it is necessary to provide an information kit for them but because as a State we will have many more aged people to deal with over the next 20 to 25 years. Often the statistics that precede discussions on planning dilemmas and problems facing Governments relate to population increases in relation to various age categories.

It is noted in many reports that over the next 25 years South Australia's population will increase by 27 per cent, while the percentage of people over age 65 will increase by more than double that amount—by 67 per cent. The percentage of the population aged over 75 will increase by more than 118 per cent, and the percentage of the population over 85 will increase by 225 per cent.

That leads some people in the community to the very pessimistic view of seeing the whole community being engulfed by what is sometimes described as a geriatric tidal wave. However, I do not think that that is the position. A characteristic of planning for the aged is that, because there will be more of them, it is relatively easy; that is, we know how many aged people there are now in the community, and we are able to predict how many there will be in the next 10, 20, 30 or 40 years. The biggest challenge facing Government agencies is in preparing for that change and being able to plan adequately for it.

It is important to note, as Dr Adam Graycar (the Commissioner for the Ageing) often does, that, in fact, there is a substantial difference between people over the age of 65 and those over the age of 75. Of those in the former category, it is often noted that the majority own their own house, are not sick or disabled and are not desperately poor, but are physically healthy and mentally alert, and that probably the biggest problem that they face is one of adjusting to retirement and, in many cases, to the problems associated with reduced income. I think it was Hugh Stretton whom I heard recently making the pertinent remark that one of the biggest problems that faced people was in trying to accommodate 70 or more years of life with 40 or so years of earnings.

So, they are the difficulties that face people who are over 65 years of age. Really, there is no overwhelming argument for intervention in the lives of those people, as they are more than adequately able to cope. However, the figures that I gave earlier indicate that that will not be the case when considering those in the next age categories, and I am referring to people over 75 and 85 years of age. Those people will become increasingly dependent on the community.

The other aspect of this matter in relation to what will occur in the years ahead of us relates to the fact not simply that there will be more aged people but that people will live for much longer. In future, we will face the circumstances of having to provide accommodation options for people at the upper end of the age spectrum that we have not had to consider before.

Obviously, there will be a transition from the period of people being 65 years of age through the next 20 years or so of their life. Recently, a number of Government studies have addressed this problem. One report to which I wish I refer provides some guidance to community and non-profit organisations and others involved with the housing welfare of ageing people. It deals with the way in which the new forms of housing are being provided across the metropolitan area.

The Aged Subcommittee of the Advisory Committee on Planning has put out an interesting report recently, and it is now available for public comment. It says that in recent years there has been substantial growth in the construction of housing specifically designed for the aged. The report notes that the trend is likely to continue with the number of aged persons in the community increasing. The report notes that most forms of housing for the aged are not traditionally single-storey, detached family dwellings on separate allotments of land, but that planning authorities have tended to deal with those applications as flats under the planning regulations even though, to the people living in them, they are not flats and the design standards and location requirements for aged persons dwellings differ considerably from those applying generally to flats.

The report of this subcommittee of the Advisory Committee of Planning goes on to make seven major recommendations which, in effect, involve a proposal for a supplementary development plan which could be applicable to all councils throughout metropolitan Adelaide and which would specifically address itself to the issue of aged housing. The report sets out a number of appealing objectives or sentiments in the area of aged housing. Those sentiments could lead to a series of regulations on which new planning applications could be based. I believe that the report and the recommendations deserve the serious consideration of all people who are involved in aged care, especially accommodation.

Be that as it may, the kit that I launched for the Citizens Advice Bureau is a contribution to the current circumstances facing people who are looking to change their accommodation and will certainly be of great value to those who are providing information to the elderly. I would like to commend the bureau for the efforts that it has made in having this kit prepared.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I wish to take up from where I left earlier this afternoon concerning the vine pull scheme and the grave problems that exist in the Barossa Valley and other areas associated with the wine industry. I appreciate that the Minister of Agriculture is present this evening, and I ask him to note my earlier contribution and the comments that I am making now. There has been a genuine expectation by a large number of people in the industry that they would be accommodated by the vine pull scheme. That expectation has not only been raised by the Minister of Agriculture and his officers in a legimate way but it has also been aided and abetted positively by the Minister's Federal colleague, the Minister for Primary Industry, who has made announcements indicating that additional funds had been made available and that they were being channelled to the State, which would be in contact with applicants in the very near future.

I indicated to the House earlier this afternoon that a number of those people who fulfilled the requirement of lodging their applications on time and who were told positively that they would have advice by 31 August have not yet received that information. Indeed, I am advised by one applicant, whose name and number I am willing to give the Minister, that he has never had a formal piece of information handed to him concerning his application.

He knows what his number is, only by virtue of having rung the department on several occasions. I can give that number to the Minister. It is something greater than the 370 which at the moment is that mythical cut-off point. I say 'mythical cut-off point', although I acknowledge a statement attributed to the Minister in early July that everyone over 370 would be means tested. However, this person had made the application before those rules had changed and in the knowledge that a number of his neighbours and others within his district—who were in a less precarious position than himself and many others—received the funds without question.

The fact that the system was allowed to roll on (with applications being accepted whether or not the person needed the funds) is causing the greatest degree of distress amongst the vine growers. I finished my speech this afternoon by talking of a number of bankruptcies and family breakdowns: I do not resile from what I said. There is a tremendous amount of pressure on a number of families, some of whom have been small grapegrowers who have augmented a part-time income from off the farm. That has been a tradition of the small farms of the Barossa Valley for many years. In the past 15 or 20 years, many of the grapegrowers have not been self-sufficient fund-wise from their grapes, yet their grapes have made up a significant part of their total income.

Not only the husband—the breadwinner—but also the wife and family assist both in the pruning and, more particularly, in the picking. Therefore, the income is earnt by a number of people and provides sustenance for those people, augmented by the husband who may go out to work for part of the time in the wineries, and may do some of the contract picking, or perhaps he may be a shearer who gets, for example, $8 000 or $9 000 per annum from shearing to maintain the family way of life. The production of anything from three to 15 acres of vines adds to the family income.

They are the people who were given a very clear message that they would be the type of person to be assisted. As I

mentioned this afternoon, they have been advised by senior officers of the Department of Agriculture and the Viticultural Station at Nuriootpa to go ahead and pull out the strainer posts at the end of each line of vines, get rid of the droppers, wind up the wire and be ready to make a move. They understood they would be told by 31 August. Come 31 August they had no information. Today, 23 September, they still have no information but they have vines which have not been pruned because the officers told them not to prune them if they were going to be pulled out.

They are now in the position where, if funds were to be made available next year, they would be a questionable group for consideration because by that time, if they have not pruned the vines this year, the vineyard would be looked upon as a derelict vineyard falling outside the criteria which have been rightly placed from the initial stages on applicants for vine pull. Let me give one or two examples from letters I have received from people who are in this very awkward position. One letter states:

> If I wish to increase production in my vineyard I must irrigate it to do so. However, I have a dual problem. The underground water in my area is almost invariably too saline for vines and, secondly, mains water is not available except at tremendous cost to get it into our vineyards, so this unfortunately is not an option we have. Since our contract has lapsed with [a winery]—

and hundreds and hundreds of individual growers have lapsed contracts with a whole variety of wineries—

> we have been unable to sell the nine tonnes previously sold to that winery.

The letter further states:

> Because our income from vines has been decreasing (and seems likely to go down further in the future)—

and I refer members to the wine price which was struck for the 1986 harvest—

> I have had to try to get work elsewhere to make up for the lost vineyard returns. Our vineyard income has also gone down for another reason. Over the past few years wineries have advised us to pull out specific varieties of grapes because they claim they don't want certain varieties. We have done this.

That is, they have undertaken that work of their own accord without assistance, and they are still in difficulty. Let me quote from another letter. It states:

> I am requesting special consideration for acceptance as a successful applicant in the vine pull scheme. The department requested income tax returns for 1983, 1984, 1985 years and since this period our financial situation has deterioriated drastically.

It has deteriorated drastically because of the marked reduction in the base value of the grapes for the 1986 year. It further states:

> I wish to present an income tax statement to the month of March, which shows our income was so low we were eligible for and received the family income supplement payment from Social Security.

He goes on to say that he was a 100 per cent contract grower for a winery but has now been told that they will no longer be requiring any grapes from his vineyard. The letter continues:

> Since our property is on the floor of the [Barossa] Valley and not recognised as a premium growing area, it will be extremely difficult or impossible to place the fruit with another winery. It would be more practical to receive the vine pull scheme and at least leave this industry with some dignity. Because of our financial position it would be impossible to remove the vines at our own expense but would also help to diversify into some other form of agriculture.

A further letter is from a person who works part time at the Adelaide Brighton Cement Company, which is one of the alternative forms of employment available through the Barossa Valley. He has been told that, because he only obtains 42⅓ per cent of his income from grapes and the balance from the Adelaide Brighton Cement Company on a part-time basis, he is ineligible for the vine pull scheme. That 42⅓ per cent of a very low and almost poverty income is a very considerable proportion of his total annual income. He is unable from his own resources to undertake a vine pull, even though he has been advised by departmental officers to pull only 3.5 acres of vines.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 24 September at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 23 September 1986

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT

19. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What major items of construction equipment with a replacement value of $50 000 and over are presently owned or leased by departments and/or statutory authorities under the Minister's control?

2. What are the recorded utilisation details of this equipment for the past 12 months?

3. What is the replacement value of each piece of equipment?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The reply is as follows:

Highways Department Items	Units owned	Replacement cost per unit $'000	1985 average utilisation per unit
Tractors, Crawler Class 4	9	79	308H
Tractors, Crawler Class 5	9	117	853H
Tractors, Crawler Class 6	18	154	691H
Tractors, Crawler Class 7	1	338	718H
Tractor with Mounted Back-hoe	13	50	588H
Loaders 4WD 1.43-1.73 cu. metre	22	63	495H
Loaders 4WD to 0.96 cu. metre	21	70	896H
Loaders 4WD 3.5 cu. metre	5	150	815H
Loaders Crawler to 1.5 cu. metre	5	119	412H
Light Graders	22	68	701H
Light Graders	32	68	744H
Medium Light Graders	3	90	379H
Heavy Graders	46	166	1077H
Scrapers, Elevating 26 cu. metre	1	532	398H
Rollers, Powered Smooth Drum 10-13 tonne	3	99	562H
Rollers, Powered Smooth Drum 13-15 tonne	18	99	323H
Rollers, Powered Rubber Tyred 11 tonne	10	62	283H
Rollers, Powered Rubber Tyred 35 tonne	12	155	408H
Rollers, Powered Vibrating to 2 tonne	6	78	414H
Rollers, Tandem Vibrating 6-8 tonne	1	50	326H
Rollers, Powered Vibrating 8-10 tonne	13	90	456H
Bitumen Transporter	4	70	78H
Babal Tamper Finishers	1	71	421H
Bitumen Tamper Finishers	6	200	497H
Road Profiler	1	178	604H
Tractor, Mounted Post Hole Borer	4	52	358H
Line Marking Machines	3	185	5 955K
Boring Rigs	5	50	253H
Bitumen Sprayer to 2 275 litres	4	90	60 021L/S
Bitumen Sprayer over 2 275 litres	5	170	509 667L/S

H = Hours
L/S = Litres/Sprayed
K = Kilometres

The average utilisation shown in the table is the average number of units (hours, kilometres, litres) recorded when a machine is actually working, It does not include the time recorded against essential or unavoidable non-working activities such as daily servicing, fueling, weekly maintenance, wet weather stoppage, transportation between worksites, rostered days off, nor breakdown repairs.

Depending on the type and age of the machines and the nature of the work being undertaken, such activities could consume up to 25 to 30 per cent of the available time.

The low utilisation shown against the bitumen transporters (which is the tank only and not the prime-mover) is not reflective of the true usage of that equipment. Because of age (two are 20, one 38 and one 39 years old) their prime use is now for the static storage of bitumen products on construction sites for which they are perfectly satisfactory. Utilisation is only recorded in hours when the heating burners are in use. Two of the units are currently located in Northern Region and two in the South-East. Their estimated residual value is $2 000 for the two younger units and $1 500 for the other two units.

The Highways Department continually monitors machinery utilisation and uses it as one factor along with local hire availability, nature of the work and economic considerations in determining ownership and hire strategies.

State Transport Authority Items	Units owned	Replacement cost per unit $'000	1985 Average utilisation per unit
Front End Loader	1	57	Used Daily
Furukawa FU20 Tractor	1	64	Used Daily
Furukawa FL120A	1	64	Used Daily
Artic Motor Grader	1	120	Used Daily
Case Front End Loader	2	64	Used Daily
Front End Loader	1	75	60% Daily Use
Mobile Crane	1	80	Intermittent
Road/Rail Tower Wagon	1	100	Used Daily
Elevator Platform Vehicle	1	60	60% Daily Use

In addition the State Transport Authority has a number of special purpose machines used for maintenance of its rail and tram tracks. Some of these machines could be used in new rail track construction.

20. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction—

1. What major items of construction equipment with a replacement value of $50 000 and over are presently owned or leased by departments and or statutory authorities under the Minister's control?

2. What are the recorded utilisation details of this equipment for the past 12 months?

3. What is the replacement value of each piece of equipment?

The Hon. T. H. HEMMINGS: The following advice is provided in response to parts 1, 2 and 3. The information in regard to utilisation relates to the 1985 calendar year.

(A) S.A. Department of Housing and Construction

Plant Type	Hours Operated	Replacement Value
		$
Panel Saw	1250	55 000

(B) S.A. Housing Trust

Plant Type	Hours Operated	Replacement Value
		$
Bulldozer D5—Caterpillar	686	124 000
Bulldozer D3—Caterpillar	470	66 000
Bulldozer D3—Caterpillar	650	66 000
Bulldozer D3—Caterpillar	975	66 000
Crane—BHP	325	65 500
Excavator 200—Komatsu	816	76 500
Grader 12E—Caterpillar	947	169 000
Grader 12E—Caterpillar	1 052	169 000
Grader 120G—Caterpillar	1 076	169 000
Grader—Komatsu*	985	169 000

Plant Type	Hours Operated	Replacement Value
		$
Grader 120G—Caterpillar	(Commissioned Jan. '86)	169 000
Loader 955L—Caterpillar	878	145 000
Loader 930—Caterpillar	1 361	107 000
Loader 930—Caterpillar	1 303	107 000
Loader 920—Caterpillar	1 706	95 000
Loader 920—Caterpillar	637	95 000
Loader 930—Caterpillar	1 130	107 000
Roller—McDonald	476	64 770
Roller—McDonald	413	64 770
Loader 930—Caterpillar	912	107 000

*Note: This plant replaces similar plant used during 1985 and hours operated include new and previous plant usage for the year.

22. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. What major items of construction equipment with a replacement value of $50 000 and over are presently owned or leased by departments and/or statutory authorities under the Minister's control?

2. What are the recorded utilisation details of this equipment for the past 12 months?

3. What is the replacement value of each piece of equipment?

The Hon. M. K. MAYES: The Departments of Agriculture, Fisheries and Recreation and Sport do not own or lease major items of construction equipment with a replacement value of $50 000 or over.

124. **Mr LEWIS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Correctional Services:

1. How many reports of breaking and entering, illegal use of motor vehicles and petty larceny and the like have there been in South Australia and Murray Bridge each year since 1970 and each month since January 1986?

2. What has been the strength (in full-time equivalents) of police posted to the Murray Bridge Station each year since 1970?

3. How many police personnel have there been in the Police Force (full-time equivalents) each year since 1970?

4. How many applications have there been for Aboriginal legal aid for people commited for trial for the offences of breaking and entering, larceny, illegal use, assaults, breaking with threats and menaces in the Murray Bridge district each year since 1975 and each month since January 1986?

5. When was the current building occupied as the police station complex in Murray Bridge first erected and what was the population of the Murray Bridge district at that time?

6. What substantial modification (and increase) in space has been made to that building since that time?

7. How many cells and what kind, that is, adult or juvenile, have there been available for detention of arrested people since the time the current police complex was constructed?

8. Why are there only four shifts rostered and worked at Murray Bridge by the police and why are other similar police establishments rostered and worked with five shifts?

The Hon. Frank BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1.

1970-78—1985-86

Year	Area	Breaking Offences	Larceny/ Illegal Use of Motor Vehicles	Larceny
1970-71	State	9 515	2 357	23 166
	Murray Bridge	N/A	N/A	N/A
1971-72	State	12 344	2 990	27 051
	Murray Bridge	N/A	N/A	N/A
1972-73	State	12 507	3 380	27 953
	Murray Bridge	N/A	N/A	N/A
1973-74	State	13 348	4 169	27 811
	Murray Bridge	N/A	N/A	N/A
1974-75	State	14 688	4 679	29 882
	Murray Bridge	N/A	N/A	N/A
1975-76	State	14 039	4 846	28 579
	Murray Bridge	N/A	N/A	N/A
1976-77	State	14 567	4 496	31 340
	Murray Bridge	N/A	N/A	N/A
1977-78	State	15 258	5 510	34 407
	Murray Bridge	N/A	N/A	N/A
1978-79	State	17 960	6 492	37 566
	Murray Bridge	N/A	N/A	N/A
1979-80	State	23 867	5 850	32 260
	Murray Bridge	53	10	126
1980-81	State	21 879	5 802	27 067
	Murray Bridge	149	28	237
1981-82	State	21 122	5 584	25 283
	Murray Bridge	203	31	284
1982-83	State	21 924	5 635	26 580
	Murray Bridge	270	31	319
1983-84	State	26 144	6 413	27 742
	Murray Bridge	353	51	318
1984-85	State	27 734	7 548	27 620
	Murray Bridge	292	42	296
1985-86	State	30 934	10 780	33 338
	Murray Bridge	174	58	322

January 1986-June 1986

Year	Area	Breaking Offences	Larceny/ Illegal Use of Motor Vehicles	Larceny
1 Jan. 1986 to 31 Mar. 1986	State	7 136	2 574	8 792
	Murray Bridge	47	11	102
1 Apr. 1986 to 30 June 1986	State	7 938	2 744	8 400
	Murray Bridge	44	16	59

Figures readily available for the Police District of Murray Bridge are produced on a quarterly basis. Monthly figures are not readily available. The cost of extracting this information is not considered warranted.

2.

Murray Bridge Police Strength Since 1970

Year	Strength	Year	Strength
1970	N/A	1979	26
1971	N/A	1980	30
1972	N/A	1981	30
1973	16	1982	30
1974	17	1983	30
1975	20	1984	30
1976	24	1985	30
1977	25	1986	30
1978	25		30

3.

Departmental Strength Since 1970

Year	Strength	Year	Strength
1970	1 831	1979	3 135
1971	1 853	1980	3 173
1972	1 880	1981	3 220
1973	1 952	1982	3 269
1974	2 052	1983	3 297
1975	2 145	1984	3 286
1976	2 558	1985	3 263
1977	2 702	1986	3 192
1978	2 879		

Strength as at 30 June each year

4. Not available.

5. The existing complex was erected in 1963 and consisted of two buildings, the main Police Station and Divisional Headquarters, with the single men's quarters in an adjacent two-storied building.

Census statistics for 1961 give the population of Murray Bridge at 5 404.

6. Modifications to the complex since 1963 have provided for:

Additional parking at the rear.

In 1978 the ground floor of the single men's quarters was converted for CIB.

In 1981 the 1st floor of the single men's quarters was converted to office accommodation for the Divisional Command and further CIB functions, overcoming congestion in the main building.

7. The old structure of two cells was extended in 1963 to provide two additional cells and exercise yards.

Currently there are three cells for adult males, exercise yards and the remaining cell for juveniles or adult females.

8. The team rostering system was introduced at Murray Bridge in January 1982 after a full workload study of the station had been conducted. The four-team system was implemented at the request of the members at the station in preference to a five-team system which had been suggested by the Officer-in-Charge, Organisational Service. Approval of the four-team system was given as it provided a better coverage per shift with the personnel available. On its introduction the four-team system was recognised by personnel involved as an improvement to local policing. One other Country Divisional Headquarters Station, Port Lincoln, works a similar roster to Murray Bridge, and three Country Divisional Headquarters have no team roster.

RECREATION AND SPORT PROGRAMS

133. **Mr MEIER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport: What specific endeavours or initiatives are proposed to—

(a) increase people participation in recreation, sport and fitness activities in rural areas?

(b) increase the competence and personal satisfaction of people participating in their chosen activity in rural areas; and

(c) assist and encourage individuals and community groups to succeed in the provision of recreation, sport and fitness programs in rural areas?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The following program, projects and initiatives are undertaken in rural areas in recreation, sport and fitness:

provide services to 14 recreation centres through the country centre managers network

the Recreation Service Recognition Award in 1985-86 produced 80 per cent of the nominations coming from country organisations

under the Development Plan Program funding was provided to State recreation, sport and fitness associations to run programs in these areas in the country

cycle touring maps of country locations

canoe guides to the Murray River

bicycle events such as the Hawker to Glenelg cyclists tour

off-road recreation vehicles areas

camps and camping

funding of playgroups in country councils and community groups

funding of Local Government Recreation Development Plans

convening of South East Sinkholes Review Committee

funding under the Local Level Facilities Development Program

conduct of sports injury courses in the country areas

conduct of administrator courses in country areas

recipients of awards under the 'Sports Awards' for volunteers

conduct of coaching courses under the National Coaching Accreditation Scheme (NCAS)

the development of a 'community fitness promotion package' to promote the development of more community fitness programs in rural areas

planning is underway to establish a network of regional community fitness coordinators on a part-time basis to serve rural areas

courses are being developed in conjunction with TAFE to train fitness leaders in rural areas

Consultant for Aborigines conducts sports coaching clinics in country areas

Consultant for Aborigines provides advice to Aboriginal communities on recreation, sport and fitness

formation of the South Australian Aboriginal Sport and Recreation Association made up of members from Aboriginal communities

production of a brochure on 'access to the countryside for disabled people'

support the Recreation Association for the Elderly (RAE) to disseminate information to country people

public meeting in the country to discuss women's needs in the areas of recreation, sport and fitness

BOLIVAR SHOP STEWARDS

145. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: Will the Minister investigate whether the shop stewards at Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works have assumed the responsibilities of safety representatives and whether they are carrying out their duties without reference to other employees?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes.

GRAPHICAL INFORMATION

147. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. When the Department of Mines and Energy recently tendered for a graphical information system worth approximately $.5m, why were the various systems (including those of the successful tenderer) not benchmarked prior to a decision being made?

2. Were the purchase and procedures fully vetted by the Data Processing Board?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. The two lowest tenderers were evaluated by conducting benchmark tests.

2. While there is no requirement for the Data Processing Board to vet the tenders submitted or the subsequent purchase, an overview of the submissions together with the

basis of the recommendation was presented to officers of the Board.

POLICE FORCE

152. **Mr LEWIS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. What are the acceptable minimum weights for height for recruits to the South Australian Police Force?

2. Where do these weight for height ratios fit in relation to the National Health and Fitness Council's recommendations for the range of weight for each specific height and, if they are above the recommended median weight for height, why?

3. Have the likely consequences of the weight for height ratio minimum requirements in recruiting policy been checked with the National Health and Fitness Council to discover whether there is ever likely to be a close correlation between cardio-vascular diseases and the recruitment policy which might result in a higher incidence of cardio-vascular problems in the Police Force than in the wider population?

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

1. See tables below.

2. The National Health and Fitness Council use the same tables.

3. The issues raised are monitored by the Police Medical Officer and relevant areas of the Police Department. There has been no direct liaison with the council in recent times on this subject.

HEIGHT-WEIGHT TABLE
Based on body mass index

Male	
Height (cm)	Minimum Wgt (kg)
174	66.44
175	67.32
176	67.98
177	68.86
178	69.52
179	70.40
180	71.28
181	71.94
182	72.82
183	73.48
184	74.36
185	75.24
186	75.90
187	76.78
188	77.66
189	78.54
190	79.42
191	80.08
192	80.96
193	81.84
194	82.72
195	83.60
196	84.48
197	85.36
198	86.24
199	87.12
200	88.00
201	88.88
202	89.76
203	90.64
204	91.52

Female	
Height (cm)	Minimum Wgt (kg)
163	53.00
164	53.60
165	54.40
166	55.00
167	55.60
168	56.40
169	57.00
170	57.80
171	58.40
172	59.00
173	59.80
174	60.40
175	61.20
176	61.80
177	62.60
178	63.20
179	64.00
180	64.80
181	65.40
182	66.20
183	66.80
184	67.60
185	68.40
186	69.00
187	69.80
188	70.60

MOTOR VEHICLE TOOLING

170. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of State Development and Technology:

1. To what stage have plans been developed for the establishment of a heavy machinery plant for motor vehicle tooling at Woodville?

2. Which motor vehicle manufacturers were consulted during the research phase of the Tooling—Strategy for S.A. Industry Report and did any signify agreement with the concept?

3. What is the estimated cost of establishing such facility and on what basis is it to be funded?

4. When will a copy of the report be released?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. Before detailing the current level of progress on the National Tooling Centre proposal, two errors in the honourable member's question need correcting. Firstly, the current proposal does not envisage the 'establishment' of a tooling facility; it already exists—GMH has had such a facility there for many years. The National Tooling Centre proposal is premised upon the importance of that facility not being lost to Australia subsequent upon GMH's decision to quit the Woodville site. The proposal does include substantial development and upgrading of the present facility.

Secondly, the National Tooling Centre proposal will not only be for 'motor vehicle tooling'. Tooling is an important part of most manufacturing industry; while the needs of the automotive industry with respect to tooling are a very significant part of the current proposal, the tooling needs of the rest of industry are also included.

As to the proposal, a study conducted by the Department of State Development in 1983 found that the toolmaking capabilities of Australia were being eroded and that South Australia was being particularly affected. As a result, and related to the decision at that time by GMH to quit the Woodville facility, a tooling project team was established to examine the feasibility of that facility being used to the development of an enhanced tooling capacity. The report concluded that such a facility would be feasible.

Copies of the report were sent to about 100 Australian companies seeking their comment and indications of investment interest in the proposed facility. While many com-

panies replied that they strongly supported the concept, most felt that the proposal lay outside their own investment strategies. Notwithstanding those responses, attempts at attracting private sector support for the project are continuing.

2. All five motor vehicle producers were consulted on a regular basis during the eighteen months of the study referred to in 1. All were strongly supportive and extremely cooperative; there was a common concern that the national decline in our tooling skills base had gathered such momentum that it would now be difficult to correct.

3. For the purposes of testing the viability of the proposal, the project team worked on a capacity of 600 tooling hours per year and a capital investment of $21 million over six years. An additional $20 million was estimated as being necessary for working capital, bringing total estimated capital requirements to $41 million. In supporting the National Tooling Centre proposal, the State Government has indicated that the majority of the funds would have to come from the private sector; nevertheless, $5 million has been allocated by the State Government to the project over three budgets commencing with 1986-87.

4. The report was released in May 1986.