HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 22 October 1986

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

PETITION: PARKING FOR DISABLED

A petition signed by 174 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to introduce fines for wrongful parking in areas set aside for disabled persons only was presented by Mr Abbott.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: PROSTITUTION

Petitions signed by 121 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose any measures to decriminalise prostitution were presented by the Messrs Crafter and Robertson.

Petitions received.

PETITION: EDITHBURGH BAY NET FISHING

A petition signed by 30 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to legislate for the appropriate zoning for use of nets in Edithburgh Bay was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

PETITION: GLENELG MAGISTRATES COURT

A petition signed by 329 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.

QUESTION

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard.*

TEXTILE, CLOTHING AND FOOTWEAR INDUSTRIES

In reply to **Mr ROBERTSON** (16 September).

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Further to the question asked of me on 16 September 1986 by the member for Bright I submit the following information which summarises the South Australian Government's position regarding assistance to textiles, clothing and footwear industries. The South Australian Government has indicated, both in submissions to the Industries Assistance Commission (IAC) and representations to the Commonwealth Government, that it supports the adoption of assistance arrangements which will foster the development of more efficient and internationally competitive TCF industries. The Government has stressed the importance of a stable and predictable policy environment for these industries and has argued that any assistance reductions must be sufficiently gradual and moderate so as to avoid undue adjustment problems during the couse of industry restructuring.

The IAC has proposed four options for assistance reform, to commence in 1989:

Option 1: reduction in protection to tariff-quota assisted activities to a maximum tariff of 50 per cent in 1996;

Option 1 (a): reduction in protection to a maximum tariff, or tariff equivalent, of 25 per cent in 1996;

Option 2: reduction in protection to a maximum tariff, or tariff equivalent, of 25 per cent in 2001;

Option 3: reduction in protection to tariff-quota assisted activites to a maximum tariff of 75 per cent in 1996.

Common features under all IAC options include assistance reductions to be automatic; no industry monitoring required; no additional positive assistance for industry or adjustment assistance for employees required. The IAC has estimated that the following reductions in production and employment would result from its options. The IAC's preferred option is option 1.

	Production		Employment	
	Per Cent	Per Cent (Aust.)	No. (Aust.)	No. (S.A.)
Option 1 (7 years)	−14.3	−16.9	−18 600	−1 202
Option 1 (a) (7 years)	−21.2	−27.5	−30 300	−1 962
Option 2 (12 years)	−21.2	27.5	−30 300	−1 962
Option 3 (7 years)	−5.6	−7.3	−8 000	−511

The State Government has argued against the use of option 1 as entailing too rapid a reduction in assistance, with the possible consequence of company closures and large scale retrenchments which could threaten the long term viability of TCF industries. The Government has indicated its support for option 3. This option represents an important step toward assistance reform and the attainment of more efficient and competitive TCF industries, while not imposing undue adjustment pressures on these industries. As option 3 involves relatively moderate reductions in protection, spread over seven years, and as TCF industries will be amply forewarned of the new assistance arrangements, positive assistance to industry, additional to that already available, was not felt to be warranted under this option.

During the course of industry restructuring some TCF employees are likely to be faced with retrenchment. We have argued that it is necessary to lessen the adjustment burden on these workers through the provision of additional adjustment assistance. More specifically, it has been suggested that TCF industries be made eligible for the Labour Adjustment Training Arrangements (LATA) program, which assists workers to upgrade or broaden their skills with the aim of improving their employment prospects. The State Government is concerned that the new assistance package should be one which promotes restructuring towards a more efficient and competitive TCF sector in a manageable manner. To this end we will continue to communicate our views to the Commonwealth Government, prior to finalisation of the post-1988 assistance arrangements in December 1986.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

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

Judges of the Supreme Court of South Australia—Report, 1985.

QUESTION TIME

HIGH COURT

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Will the Premier press the Federal Government to appoint a South Australian to the High Court? As well as the vacancy caused by the death of Mr Justice Murphy, I understand that at least one and possibly two more vacancies are imminent with the retirement of sitting judges. No South Australian has sat on the High Court since it was established in 1903. Given the influence of the court over the States, the appointment of a South Australian to the court is long overdue. As the Federal Government is required to consult the States in making High Court appointments, can the Premier give an assurance that he will press for a South Australian to be appointed from among those within the State who are outstanding jurists of wide repute?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes. I certainly agree that it is long overdue for a member of our profession in South Australia to be appointed to the High Court. Over the years many people have had abilities that would have well fitted them for service on the High Court. It is also important that a court that has as its primary role the determination of constitutional questions *inter se* (that is, as they affect State and Federal relations) should have a broad regional or geographical basis. For there to have been no South Australian representation has been to the court's detriment as much as to South Australia's.

As I understand it, South Australians have been approached on at least two occasions to serve and, unfortunately, in both instances declined. One who immediately comes to mind was Chief Justice Way, at the time of the early stages of the formation of the court. It is rumoured that he was asked to be a member of that court but preferred to remain in South Australia. However, it is long overdue for a South Australian to be appointed and we will urge the Federal Government, as we have on other occasions, to ensure that we have representation.

An argument that is used against us in this regard is that we do not have a properly divided profession: that is, that we do not observe the strict distinction between the barrister and the solicitor as happens in the eastern States. However, that argument is nonsense, just as the argument is that solicitors are in some way disqualified from serving on a bench. Indeed, one of our appointments was that of a prominent member of the South Australian profession to our Supreme Court bench who was not a member of the bar as such, and I think that he has added considerable strength to the South Australian bench and there is no question that he has demonstrated his abilities as a judge. That is just a lot of legal snobbery which is used as an excuse not to search in States such as South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania for appropriate appointments.

In this context, I express my great regret at the unhappy way in which this vacancy on the High Court occurred. Whatever the controversy surrounding Mr Justice Lionel Murphy, there is no way his career should have ended in the dreadful way that it did and the personal pain of his illness, compounded I am sure by the disgraceful course of events over the past couple of years of questioning his judicial conduct and the way they were handled contributed greatly. Whatever is one's view of Lionel Murphy the person, there is no question that he made an extraordinarily substantial impact at all levels of the profession: as a barrister in the late 1950s; as a legislator, member of Parliament and reformer of the Senate in the 1960s; as an Attorney-General some of whose legislation had a major impact in social change and legal reform in this country; and latterly, as a judge of the High Court where initially he often found himself in a minority of one.

It has been interesting over the years to note that, as Mr Justice Murphy has been able to convince his fellow judges very often of the strength of his views in specific cases, increasingly Lionel Murphy was writing judgments with the majority of the court. That says a lot, not for the change of views on the part of the judges, but for the fact that some of the more radical interpretations and more modern approaches were obviously being appreciated by his fellow judges. I think that the past two or three years have been a tragedy in Australian legal history and I take this opportunity to express my great regret at the untimely death of Justice Lionel Murphy and to extend condolences to his family.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the next question, I advise the House that during Question Time questions that would ordinarily have been addressed to the Deputy Premier will again be taken by the Minister of Lands and that those questions ordinarily taken by the Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Fisheries and Minister of Recreation and Sport will be taken by the Minister of State Development and Technology and Minister of Employment and Further Education.

DTX AUSTRALIA LTD

Mr TYLER: Will the Minister of Labour investigate the company DTX Australia Limited regarding the company's inability to pay the wages of its employees in South Australia and as a matter or urgency take steps to ensure that those employees receive the wages which are currently owed to them? It has been drawn to my attention that no employee of DTX Australia Limited has received wages in South Australia for approximately three to four weeks. This has resulted in 12 employees being stood down with wages still owing to them from the South Australian branch office.

I am told that DTX Australia Limited which has its head office in Perth, Western Australia, still has seven people employed in South Australia as of last week and they are continually being promised payment of their wages. Further, I am told that currently the outstanding wages bill is in the order of $50 000 to $60 000. I am also told that as recently as September the company paid $2 million for a satellite. However, telephones at the Adelaide branch office have been disconnected and furniture is about to be repossessed. Will the Minister investigate this matter urgently?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will do as the honourable member suggests and, immediately Question Time is over, I will have the department investigate this company. If the facts are as stated, then clearly the company is in breach of an award—it has not paid its employees as per the award. I do not know from the details that the honourable member has given whether that would be a State or Federal award, but I will have that investigated and, if it is a State award

the Department of Labour will deal with it; if it is a Federal award we will contact the appropriate Federal inspectorate.

The action that can be taken initially, if the company is under a State award, is that the Department of Labour would attempt to negotiate with the company concerned and, if necessary, take action in the courts to recover the moneys owed. The details that the honourable member gave of the telephones being disconnected and the furniture about to be repossessed may well indicate that the company is about to go into liquidation or, in some other way, fold. If that is the case obviously the employees will be dealt with in accordance with the law in that respect which, I believe, is that the liquidator gets the first cut of any assets, then the Taxation Department comes in for what is owing to it, and then, I believe, wages rank third. Within the hour I will have the Department of Labour investigate this company.

GRAND PRIX TICKETS

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier reveal how many Grand Prix tickets have to be sold before the event can be telecast live in the Adelaide metropolitan area? Will the Government urge Grand Prix organisers to ensure that there is a full telecast of the race throughout South Australia? Last year a minimum of 100 000 tickets had to be sold before the race could be telecast live. I understand that sales this year have now reached this level, although media reports today indicate that a further 20 000 tickets need to be sold before there will be a go-ahead for a live telecast of the event.

For one reason or another, many thousands of people will be unable to attend the race. This applies particularly to those people in hospitals and other institutions and those who cannot afford the admission price for themselves and their families. The Premier said in the *News* on 1 November last year, when commenting on whether there should be a live telecast:

The Grand Prix is for all South Australians.

So that the public is aware of what conditions need to be met to ensure a live telecast in Adelaide, will the Premier reveal how many tickets must be sold first and whether he is prepared to negotiate with Grand Prix organisers on the basis that, once last year's ticket sales have been reached, the live telecast will go ahead?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: On the last point, it is worth bearing in mind that the capacity of the circuit has been considerably increased this year. Large amounts of money have been spent on increasing the number of stands and seats and also, in the general admission areas, by the use of mounding and platforms it will be possible for more people to see the event. The justification for that spending—

Mr Gunn interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, the member for Eyre has no problems. It will be broadcast outside the metropolitan area. The capacity has been increased and obviously we are intending to sell more tickets this year than last year, and I am confident that that can be done. I understand that there are fewer than 20 000 tickets to be sold. Obviously, as soon as all are sold the decision to telecast will be announced. I guess the best advice one can give at this stage is to say to all those people who are not sure whether they will attend is to get in and get their tickets, because they can be assured that the atmosphere and the excitement of being present on the track cannot be matched. Anyone who has been to the event will know that.

Certainly, I believe the event should be televised—no question of it. It is an event that ought to be accessible and ought to be made available to as many people in the State as possible. It is true that some people are either incapacitated or cannot afford to buy tickets to attend the track. So, it is most desirable that it be televised, but any television coverage is subject to conditions laid down, particularly in relation to ticket sales. I am not aware of what target there is, if indeed there is such a target, except for the stated intention, as with the football grand final, that a sell out will guarantee a telecast. As of today the best advice is for people to buy their tickets, and by so doing they will guarantee that it is telecast.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

GOOLWA/HINDMARSH ISLAND FERRY

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Transport inform the House whether Cabinet has reached a decision on the future of the permit system that has operated on the Goolwa to Hindmarsh Island ferry since 1982? The matter was raised during Estimates Committee B on 8 October by the member for Alexandra. During these proceedings the Minister observed—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: I will get to my explanation. The Minister observed that the matter of priority permits for island residents will shortly be submitted to Cabinet. I have constituents who have an interest in finding out the answer to the question, and that is why I am asking it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Alexandra is not the Minister of Transport, who is now being called on to answer the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has the call.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for her question. Obviously, she has constituents who are residents of Hindmarsh Island and have an interest in this matter. Those members who were here in the Estimates Committee proceedings would recall that the member for Alexandra raised the matter with me and at that time I advised him that it was my intention to recommend to the Government that the priority scheme be discontinued. At that time I gave due credit to the member for Alexandra for the representations that he had made on the behalf of his constituents—those people within the Goolwa district, particularly those from Hindmarsh Island. I do so again today. He has been strong in his support of their needs for a priority system.

The member for Alexandra makes a good point: I am in the process of dealing with the matter, and hopefully letters have been written to the honourable member, to the Chairman of the district council and to the other member of the delegation from Hindmarsh Island who came to see me. They should be in possession of those letters very soon. I have made a recommendation to Cabinet that the priority permit system be discontinued and Cabinet has accepted that. There will be some technical time delays.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Something like three years?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: No. There will be delays in preparing the necessary changes to the regulations, and they will have to come before the Parliament and I guess be subject to the subordinate legislation process. It was my decision and my strong belief that the ferry that services Hindmarsh Island is an extension of the road system in South Australia. As is the case with all other ferries, every taxpayer in South Australia should have access to it. I

understand completely the concerns of the residents, but nevertheless it is a public ferry and all people in South Australia should have equal access to it. That does not apply to emergency vehicles or transport of that nature. I expect that, if someone was going onto the island with a load of ice that was melting in the heat of a summer's day, they would get some priority. Certainly the police and ambulance, and vehicles like that, would get priority, as I imagine they get priority—

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: On all ferries.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Yes, on all ferries, as the honourable member informs me. The decision has been made because the system really was not working all that well, anyway. I understand that something like 310 permits have been issued. The degree of economic activity on Hindmarsh Island is increasing so there will be requests for further permits. I believe that sooner or later the decision will have to be made.

Prior to 1976 the ferry was under the control of local government. The Highways Department took control of it in 1976 and in 1982 introduced a permit system to provide priorities for those people who live on the island and for those who derive their income from it. That decision was made no doubt to give them an advantage to which they felt they were entitled. Members will understand that the delays of getting onto Hindmarsh Island are probably no greater than some of the delays that motorists and others would have to suffer at some of the busier ferry crossings on the Murray River on a very busy weekend.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: At Berri.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: At Berri, as the honourable member points out, and I understand the underlying reason why he mentions Berri. I will be writing to the honourable member (I have not signed the letters but they should be around the place somewhere at the moment), the council and the people of the island informing them of my decision. I do not believe that they will be happy about it, but, in the greater good for all citizens of South Australia, it is my firm conviction that Cabinet made the right decision on my recommendation.

DTX AUSTRALIA LTD

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: In view of the question asked this afternoon by the member for Fisher, will the Minister of State Development and Technology explain why he has not provided to the House the report that he promised on 28 August—almost two months ago—in relation to DTX Australia Ltd, and will he say how much Government assistance, if any, this company has received? In a question on 28 August, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition expressed concern about some activities of this company. In reply, the Minister promised to bring back a report to the Parliament, and this he has not done. I understand that Government assistance of up to $500 000 has been offered to the company following an IDC report last year. In view of the further concerns about the activities of this company expressed today by the member for Fisher, can the Minister now provide the promised report on the company and explain how much assistance, if any, the company has received from the Government? It does appear that, if the Minister had been able to provide the information more promptly, the member for Fisher's question would not have been necessary today.

The SPEAKER: Order! The last remark of the honourable member's question is out of order, and I suspect that he was aware of that.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I can firstly advise that it has been my every endeavour to keep this House as fully informed as possible about matters asked in this Chamber with respect to certain companies. I believe that my track record has been to provide very quick reports wherever possible. Indeed, with respect to this company and another company which was the subject of a ministerial statement by me yesterday, the honourable member will recall that the question was asked at the beginning of Question Time and, at the end of each of those Question Times, a supplementary statement was made by me providing as much information as could be gathered within a short space of time as a result of phone calls to the department. I believe that my *bona fides* in trying to keep this House fully informed are well established, and I reject the slur that has been cast on my attempt to do that.

As to the matter of DTX, I can advise that earlier this week—in fact on Tuesday—I was shown information that would be suitable for putting in *Hansard* in terms of a supplementary answer to a question. I have approved that information being typed up in that appropriate form. That does take clerical time to do. It came to me on Tuesday, and I expect to be in a position to have that in *Hansard* tomorrow. Given that a number of pieces of information were being awaited on this matter, that delay has not been in excess, given the fact that one critical piece of information in relation to DTX, namely, information given to the court in Western Australia, was available only last week.

That information, resulting in an injection of cash funds from Malaysia, became known to a court in Western Australia only a few days ago, and therefore any information provided before that time would have been incomplete. We have acted as speedily as possible, and that information will be provided to the House. The information contains reference to the report of last week whereby we understand that there is to be an injection of capital from Malaysia.

That injection of capital has satisfied the needs of some creditors, in particular the Australian Commissioner of Taxation, and, we believe, certain other creditors interstate and in South Australia. I am not in a position to state, and the reply that I will table tomorrow will not indicate, whether all creditors have been satisfied by that cash flow. The report also indicates that information has been tendered by the company that it envisages moving some of its operations offshore and that it looks to carrying on its expansion program in South Australia when financial circumstances permit. That information was contained in a release to the Western Australian Stock Exchange.

The other question is how much support is being received by the company from the Department of State Development. The honourable member, as a member of the IDC, would know that the conditions for payments of this sort are performance based. They are dependent upon certain job levels being achieved by the company, and I can say that those job levels have not been achieved, so the $500 000 that the IDC, a bipartisan committee, recommended be paid to that company on performance based objectives has not been paid, because the objectives have not been achieved to this date.

GAS SUPPLIES

Mr RANN: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say what is the State Government's response to the statement by the Managing Director of Santos, Mr Ross Adler, that his company proposes to double its gas exploration program over the next two years? In an address to the annual con-

vention of the Australian Gas Association, Mr Adler said that Santos was considering a two-year program of about 100 gas exploration wells in South Australia at a cost to the company and its partners of $70 million a year. That is double the existing drilling program. Mr Adler said that the proposed program would be directed at known targets and should enable more than 550 BCF of saleable gas to be confirmed over that period. He said that this would ensure South Australian gas supplies into the late 1990s and well into the next century. However, Mr Adler added that this proposal was contingent on the agreement of the South Australian Government to defer any decisions on other energy options during 1987 and 1988.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I thank the honourable member for this question, because it will give me the opportunity to bring the House up to date with the very important and vital matter of future gas supplies for South Australia. The statement by Mr Ross Adler, the General Manager of Santos, was extremely significant (and I believe that that has not been fully realised by the public in South Australia and perhaps even by the media in general) because, as far as I can recall, this is the first time that an offer of this nature has been made by the producers that was not contingent upon a price increase and/or some other pricing arrangement that had to be entered into by the Government.

At this stage I am not fully aware of the total detail of the proposal and that, of course, will be addressed by the gas task force, the establishment of which I announced a short time ago. The task force will pursue the matter of further gas supplies for South Australia beyond about 1992 and into the next century to put the matter completely beyond doubt. I think it would be fair to say, as I put to the very large number of delegates at the Australian Gas Association conference, that this new attitude and approach by the producers is to be welcomed because, hopefully, it will put beyond doubt the capacity of the Cooper Basin producers to supply South Australian needs well into the next century, and perhaps for years after that.

Of course, members are aware that there is a contractual arrangement which ensures that supply is available for AGL in New South Wales until the year 2006. That was not the case in respect of South Australia's needs. I think one of the most significant facts that I put to the AGA conference was that in 1984-85 electricity production from gas had been of the order of 77 per cent in terms of the total electricity used in this State, whereas in the subsequent financial year that amount had fallen to about 65 per cent. I think that that significant fact was finally brought home to the producers.

I also said at the conference that South Australia—or for that matter any other State—cannot plan on uncertainty. For our future energy needs the State must be in a position to take energy planning decisions based on fact. If one wishes to translate that into the oil and gas world (in this case the gas world), we are talking about proven and probable reserves and not possible pie in the sky types of acquisition. For that reason a proposal of this nature will ensure, I hope, if the full exploration program is carried out, sufficient finds to provide a quantity of the order of perhaps 550 billion cubic feet (or even more)—a quantity of gas that will be several years additional supply for South Australia, well into the 1990s, at the current and likely future usage rate.

In answer to the member for Briggs, discussions will take place this week between members of the gas task force and the producer representatives. Following those discussions I may be in a position to provide the House with a more accurate summation of the proposals and say whether the State will be sufficiently interested in those proposals to either continue the discussions or accept the offer that has been made.

MARIJUANA

Mr D.S. BAKER: Does the Premier regard a $5 fine—less than a parking fine—for possessing marijuana as adequate and, if not, will the Government appeal against such penalties? On 11 July this year, in the District Criminal Court, Arthur Dene Young pleaded guilty to a number of charges relating to cultivation and possession of marijuana. He was fined $50 for cultivating cannabis, a mere $5 for possessing cannabis and a mere $5 for possessing equipment for smoking cannabis—these last two penalties being less than a parking fine. There were two other charges arising from a later occasion when a tobacco tin containing cannabis was found along with smoking equipment and the judge also imposed $5 fines on both these charges.

The defendant had three previous convictions relating to Indian hemp offences. I understand it has been recommended to the Government that these penalties be appealed against on the basis that they are manifestly inadequate and do nothing to deter others from using cannabis or to encourage police to investigate and prosecute these sorts of offences. Any failure to appeal would be seen as a further indication of the Government's policy to go soft on marijuana users.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is debating his explanation. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The decision whether or not to appeal in any case rests with the Attorney-General. Obviously the Attorney makes that decision based on the advice that he receives in turn from the Crown Prosecutor. I will refer the question to my colleague for his consideration.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Morphett to order.

FIRE ESCAPES

Mr FERGUSON: Is the Minister representing the Minister of Emergency Services aware of recent public concern about the safety of fire escapes? I have recently received from constituents several letters relating to the poor safety aspect of fire escapes. It has been put to me that certain retail organisations are bolting doors when they have been especially erected as fire escapes. Similar propositions have been put to me in respect of restaurants and hotels, where laden tables have been put in front of fire escape doors. I do not intend to reveal the names of these organisations because they could rightly claim that they were being singled out, when the problem may be widespread. Perhaps the Minister may be able to draw this problem to the attention of the building owners. It has also been drawn to my attention that there is no inspectorate system as such anywhere in the world. The Thatcher Government tried for a while to operate an inspectorate system but found its cost too high. In this State, as in other parts, we rely on complaints that are made by the general public.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: This week is Fire Prevention Week, which I had the pleasure of opening last Friday at the Belair Fire Station, and I thank the honourable member for his question. I am not aware of the concerns expressed by the public in relation to these escape doors but, if the

position is as has been outlined by the honourable member, I consider the matter to be serious, especially in regard to restaurants, hotels and the like, and I shall certainly refer this question to my colleague for investigation and for him to report back on the results of that investigation.

MOBILONG PRISON

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister of Housing and Construction immediately investigate the tender procedures for the installation of the surveillance system at the Mobilong Prison? The tender for the surveillance system has been drawn up by the Department of Housing and Construction, and I have been informed that it has been done in such a way that only one company (a North American group) could supply the equipment. This is despite the fact that a South Australian company (Vision Systems Limited, based at Technology Park) can supply surveillance equipment already in use at Yatala Prison, the Remand Centre, Pentridge Prison and more than 300 other medium and high security centres world-wide, and has just won a major contract to supply surveillance equipment as part of a multi-million dollar security system for two NASA space-shuttle bases in the United States.

I also understand that Vision Systems equipment can be supplied at a substantially lower cost than the North American company's. It has been put to the Opposition that an officer in the Department of Housing and Construction has insisted on writing this tender with the specific North American made system in mind. I therefore ask the Minister to make immediate investigations with a view to ensuring that South Australian companies can also be considered for the supply of this equipment.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: It gets rather boring at this end of the Chamber and I sometimes think that my time is wasted when I come in day after day, prepared to do my bit for the Government, and that I receive money under false pretences. So, I thank the honourable member for his question. One would like to think that members of Parliament or certain companies, if they had concerns about security systems, would approach the Government on a confidential basis rather than air the matter in Parliament. I make that comment because we had a situation—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: It is nice to be asked a question and to be able to make them all laugh! When tenders were let for the security system at Yatala approaches were made from a rather disgruntled company that felt it had been unfairly dealt with. That company approached members of the Opposition and asked for support because it could not meet the tender system and it wanted pressure coming from the Opposition. They even went as far as trying to get access to reports of the Public Works Standing Committee. Fortunately, we were able to stop that, because what we were talking about in Yatala was a security system to stop prisoners getting out and, more importantly, to stop people getting in to get prisoners out.

One would have thought that the member for Murray-Mallee would have realised that when the people in question approached him. I understand that a company is unhappy that it was overlooked in the tender process. That has been brought to my attention as well as to the attention of the Minister of Correctional Services. Tenders have been put out. Before the Department of Housing and Construction allocates the contracts we will be carrying out an evaluation of the whole security system at Mobilong.

PARKING PERMITS FOR DISABLED

Mrs APPLEBY: Will the Minister of Transport consider repealing the provisions of Part IIID of the Motor Vehicles Act which relate to parking permits for the disabled and incorporate in these provisions—

Mr OSWALD: I rise on a point of order. It is my view that questions relating to suggested amendments to Bills are inadmissible during Question Time, Mr Speaker, and I ask you to rule accordingly.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Hayward to repeat the initial part of her question. The Chair's understanding is that she was referring to an existing Act on the Statute Book and not to any legislation before the House. Is that the case?

Mrs APPLEBY: Yes.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

Mrs APPLEBY: I ask the Minister to consider repealing provisions of Part IIID of the Motor Vehicles Act which relate to parking permits for the disabled and incorporate these provisions in the Private Parking Act 1965.

Mr OSWALD: On a further point of order. Mr Speaker, your office put out an instruction on inadmissible questions and one of them was 'suggesting amendments to Bills'. I submit that the member for Hayward's question is asking the Minister to comment or suggesting amendments to Bills.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morphett is quite correct that a guide to that effect exists, but it refers to Bills currently before the House. On the understanding that there is no Bill of that nature currently before the House, I rule that the question is in order.

Mrs APPLEBY: I also ask that the Minister consider reciprocal arrangements for the recognition of interstate parking permits in South Australia and, further, that he address the possible change to a uniform parking permit to be designed for use by all disabled persons throughout Australia. The present system is operating well in the existing circumstances. However, given that this Government is in the process of bringing in amendments to the Private Parking Act of 1965, it would seem relevant at this time to address these matters as part of the package to update and provide a more effective delivery of this important assistance to disabled persons.

Legislation to provide parking permits to disabled persons came into operation in January 1979. In May 1983 the legislation was amended to broaden the criteria under which a parking permit was issued to include a person who has a permanent physical impairment that excludes use of public transport and who is severely restricted by speed of movement. At present in South Australia 2 900 persons, 4 per cent of whom are children, are issued with permits and 693 registered owners of motor vehicles have applied for and been granted registration concessions under section 36b.

As is obvious from the figures, the majority of permit holders are being transported by other persons, and the permits are issued on medical recommendation. It would be beneficial to disabled persons to have access to permits and renewals at a local venue, such as council chambers. It should also be noted that special parking concessions are at present granted by councils. It is for these reasons that I seek the Minister's consideration of the incorporation of this section of the Motor Vehicles Act into the Private Parking Act, thus ensuring all aspects of disabled persons' private mobility and access to parking are clearly defined and administered effectively for the enhancement of the lifestyle of disabled persons.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for her question and congratulate her on her con-

tinued effort to obtain reasonable parking facilities in South Australia for handicapped people, who are so often overlooked by able-bodied people, particularly around shopping centres etc. where parking spaces set aside for handicapped people often are occupied by people with no handicap at all. As I understand it, Part IIID of the Motor Vehicle Act is operating satisfactorily but it may well be, as the honourable member has stated, that it should be within the Private Parking Act. I will certainly have my officers look at the matter, and I will discuss it with the Minister of Local Government to see whether between the two Ministers we should recommend to the Government that the amendment mentioned by the honourable member should be implemented. This is a serious matter, and I acknowledge the importance of the question asked.

These provisions should rest within legislation that is more appropriate, and if the Private Parking Act is the appropriate place for it we will ensure that that is where it will rest. In addition, the uniform parking permit will be looked at as well as the reciprocal arrangements between the various States of Australia. I will bring down a report for the honourable member as soon as I am able.

NATIONAL WAGE CASE

Mr S.J. BAKER: Will the Minister of Labour confirm that the South Australian Government will, at the forthcoming national wage case, be supporting the demands of the South Australian trade union movement for full wage indexation, that is, no discounting from 1 January next year with a similar rise six months later?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: No, I cannot confirm anything of the sort. I am not sure—apart from what I have read in the paper—whether the Trades and Labor Council will be putting that position to the next national wage case. I am not sure that that is the situation. The ACTU will, on behalf of the trade union movement, as is normal, put the trade union position to the national wage case. I would be very surprised if the UTLC will be involved in proceedings before the national wage case at all.

Mr S.J. Baker: You will not be making a submission?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: To the national wage case? We may well be making a submission—we usually do. At this stage—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It may well be that we support the union movement, but it will not be the UTLC.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham and the Minister of Labour between them seem to be trying to devolve a system of supplementary questions. If the House wishes to have supplementary questions, they should change Standing Orders to allow for them. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am trying to help him, Sir. He obviously does not realise the procedure. I shall go through it slowly for the member's benefit if for no-one else's. The procedure is that the national wage case is decided in the Federal commission and the parties who appear before the commission, including employers, the unions (which are invariably represented by the ACTU), the Federal Government and State Governments, all put their views forward. That is the usual procedure. Nobody has contacted me to suggest that the procedure will be any different from that.

Whether the Trades and Labor Council of South Australia will put a separate submission to the national wage case, quite frankly I would not know. I would be very surprised if it did. It would certainly be unique within my experience and in my memory if that were the case. Given that it is highly unlikely to happen, I do not think it is something on which we should speculate. As regards the State Government's position to the national wage case, that will be decided when the Federal Government has concluded its negotiations with the employers and the ACTU. When they arrive at a position, State Cabinet will consider the position of the various parties, make a decision and pass it on to the national wage case, as we always do.

BUILDERS LICENCES

Mr GREGORY: Will the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place, undertake such action as is necessary to ensure that persons who have paid and been granted a restricted licence by the Builders Licensing Board are recorded within the board's records as having such a licence? I have been approached by a constituent who sought as a bricklayer to have his restricted builder's licence reactivated this year. In late August he received a letter from the Commercial Division of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs. Dated 21 August, the letter states:

> I am pleased to advise that at the meeting of the Builders Licensing Board held on 30 July 1986 your application for a licence was approved. The licence has been granted to you for a period of one year. The prescribed fee for the licence is $30. Please return this letter with your remittance within seven days so that the licence may be issued.

Also attached to that was a receipt dated 14 August 1986 made out in this person's name for the sum of $30 with a note stating, 'Being payment for licence No. R18325'. On Monday of this week the constituent approached me, somewhat agitated because he found out on Friday that the Builders Licensing Board was advising people that he did not have a licence. It came about because he had tendered for some work for a solicitor, who rang him and said that she would like to give him the job because his quote was the lowest but that she was unable to do so because she had checked with the Builders Licensing Board and was informed that he did not have a licence.

My constituent rang the board and was advised by a clerical officer that that was the fact: he did not have a licence. He created a bit on the phone and was put through to a senior officer, who advised him that he did not have a licence. My constituent then advised the senior officer of the letter, the receipt and the number on the receipt, and the senior officer's response was, 'It appears that you have a licence.' He then asked the senior officer to ring his builders labourer, who was a bit upset because he was of the view that, if the person for whom he was working did not have a restricted licence, his insurance would not have covered him as an employee of the bricklayer. I am not sure, but apparently in the building industry if a person does not have a licence the insurance is not valid. Consequently, if the person suffered injury, he would not be covered by insurance.

The other aspect is that, if a person does not have a licence, the client is not required to pay. On that basis, this person went to see the solicitor on Tuesday morning and had another discussion with her. The solicitor telephoned the board and was again advised that he did not have a licence. From the solicitor's office, this person again spoke to an officer of the board. He then explained the situation. Indeed, he went to the board and saw a Mr Streeter, who was most helpful and assisted him. He was told that it

would be at least a week before the board could change its records.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Has the honourable member completed his explanation?

Mr GREGORY: I was waiting for the monkeys opposite to keep quiet. That person is most concerned, because he has realised that the incorrect information given by the board in respect of his having a licence has meant that over the past three months he has had great difficulty in securing work. He explained to me that he has been pricing his jobs below the going rate but he still has not obtained work. He does not want this to happen to him again or to other people who have applied for and been granted a licence but then, on checking with the board, have been told that they do not have one.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. I will refer the matter to the Minister of Consumer Affairs for investigation so that both builders and consumers are protected in the future.

MARINE INSURANCE

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Has the Premier received a request from the Prime Minister for the State to drop the stamp duty on all marine insurance contracts and, if he has, what is the Government's decision? An article in today's *Financial Review* states that the Prime Minister made this suggestion to all States following the Victorian Government's decision to lift this form of stamp duty and its abolition in the Australian Capital Territory. The duty is payable on internal and external transit of all goods in South Australia and it is payable at a flat rate of 8 per cent on all premiums. The Victorian move in particlar means that South Australia could lose much of this form of insurance business unless it agreed to the Prime Minister's request.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I believe that this matter was also reported a couple of weeks ago. We have received a request from the Prime Minister and are analysing and discussing it with our State colleagues and considering the implications. Our preliminary assessment is that it is a sensible thing to do. There will not be any overall costs to revenue because, in fact, these transactions occur offshore to a large extent at the moment. The idea is to try to bring them onshore. Obviously, if that is to be done, we would like to ensure that the opportunity is available in South Australia. We have not yet completed our assessment, but I hope to respond to the Prime Minister shortly.

GRAIN TERMINAL

Mr DUIGAN: Will the Minister of Marine advise the House what, if anything, is being done to provide a deep draught grain terminal at Outer Harbor? There has been a progressive increase in the size of grain vessels which has been associated over a period with the decreasing number of ports that can accommodate such vessels. It appears that Port Lincoln has the only deep draught grain berth and there is an obvious need for additional deep water facilities.

I understand that representations have been made to the Government for a deep draught grain berth to be provided east of Spencer Gulf. As a substantial proportion of South Australia's wheat harvest is exported and, in the absence of a deep draught grain terminal, much of that export wheat would leave South Australia by road and, therefore, leave Australia through other ports, what action is being taken to keep Port Adelaide competitive in terms of facilities as well as cost?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I thank the member for his question. There is much interest in this matter but, unfortunately, there is also some confusion. I have received many approaches from wide and far and, of course, the member for Goyder is vitally interested in this matter because the port of Wallaroo is in his electorate. One of the committee's recommendations is that the deep draught grain terminal be situated at Wallaroo. I think the best way to explain the current situation is to cite the reply that I have been sending out to the people who have approached me, as follows:

> The South Australian Seaport Development Committee (comprising representatives of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd., United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia Inc., Australian Wheat Board and Australian Barley Board) commissioned a study by a consultant to determine which location would best serve the grain industry as a deep sea port for loading grain grown east of Spencer Gulf. That report was received by the committee and it is common knowledge that Wallaroo was favoured as the primary deep sea port.
>
> Before deciding upon its own attitude to the report, the committee sought comment from a number of interested organisations including the Department of Marine and Harbors (DMH) and Australian National Railways (AN). Both DMH and AN have indicated to the committee that in their opinion the report is based on a number of questionable assumptions. This is not to say that the conclusion of the report is necessarily wrong, but rather that it cannot be accepted as proven without re-examination on the basis of more appropriate assumptions.
>
> The committee has accepted this point of view and has decided to convene a technical committee to re-examine the issues involved using a new set of guidelines. The Director of Marine and Harbors has received formal confirmation to that effect and, as requested, will nominate a representative to serve on the technical committee.
>
> The Government is not, at this point in time, opposed to or supportive of the report and its conclusions. Rather, it is concerned that the extent of the grain industry's probem east of the Gulf is properly identified and the best course of action to serve the interests of both the industry and the State is determined. The Government, through DMH, will cooperate with the industry in re-examining the issue in order to arrive at a conclusion in which all parties may have confidence.

That is the current situation. I do not know how long the newly formed technical committee will take to bring down its final recommendations.

Mr Meier: How many members will be on the committee?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I am not sure of the size of the committee, but it would be the technical committee plus anyone that the committee seconds to provide information. As I mentioned, the Director of Marine and Harbors has been requested by the committee—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: It is not my committee, nor is it the department's committee: it is a committee of the grain industry and its representatives, and the committee will coopt onto its membership anyone it wants in an advisory capacity.

PUBLIC WORKS STANDING COMMITTEE

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Lands): I move:

That, pursuant to section 18 of the Public Works Standing Committee Act 1927, the members of this House appointed to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works have leave to sit on that committee during the sittings of the House.

Motion carried.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Land Tax Act 1936. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: 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

In 1985-86 the Government introduced a simplified land tax scale which reduced the impact of the steep increases in land values in recent years. That modified scale introduced a general exemption of $40 000 and reduced the number of landowners liable for tax from about 100 000 to about 21 600. The general exemption and the simplified scale reduced land tax which would otherwise have been payable by approximately $8 million.

During 1985-86 two factors have contributed to further increases in land values: the Valuer-General has implemented a computer-based system of property valuations which has enabled him to bring all valuations up to date in the one year and to dispense with the calculation of equalization factors; and the values of commercial and industrial properties have continued to increase although there has been some levelling of values of residential properties. Therefore the Government proposes to modify land tax liability for 1986-87 to ensure that the calculation of land tax on up to date land values does not impact too harshly upon taxpayers.

Land tax rates will be varied by increasing the threshold level by 50 per cent to $60 000. This will mean that the number of taxpayers will remain substantially the same as last year. In addition, for 1986-87, liability for tax will be reduced by 25 per cent of that part of the tax calculated on taxable values between $60 000 and $200 000 and by 10 per cent that part of the tax calculated on taxable values in excess of $200 000. Further relief will be given by removing the metropolitan levy on that part of the value of land held by a taxpayer in the metropolitan area which does not exceed $200 000. The 10 per cent rebate in excess of $200 000 will also apply to the metropolitan levy.

Section 12a of the Act provides for certain associations to be treated as 'partially exempt' and thereby taxable at the concessional rate of 2c for every $10 of value above the threshold (i.e. a tax rate of 0.2 per cent). The Government now proposes that such land be entirely exempted from tax. This will provide significant benefit to over 200 associations holding land which is used for sporting and recreational purposes and for the benefit of ex-servicemen and women and their dependants. In total, these measures will provide relief of about $11 million to taxpayers in 1986-87. Apart from these major changes, the Commissioner for Statute Law Revision has included a number of other provisions.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. It is proposed that the principal provisions of the Bill be deemed to have come into operation at midnight on 30 June 1986. The Statute Law Revision amendments will come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 3 amends section 10 of the principal Act, which is the section specifying exemptions from land tax. Proposed new paragraph (i) is an amalgamation of the existing paragraph and section 12a (1a) of the Act. It is proposed that a total exemption be available to associations established for a charitable, educational, benevolent, religious or philanthropic purpose if the relevant land is intended to be used wholly or mainly for that purpose or if the income from the land is to be applied for that purpose. Proposed new paragraph (ia) is similar to existing section 12a (1) except that land that has been partially exempt under that section will now become totally exempt.

Clause 4 provides for the repeal of sections 11 and 11a of the principal Act and the substitution of a new provision. The new provision has the same effect as the existing sections except that provisions need no longer be made for an equalisation factor as the Valuer-General now operates a computer-based system of property valuation which enables him to bring all valuations up to date and dispense with the need to introduce such an adjustment.

Clause 5 proposes a new section 12 containing the scale of land tax. The general exemption from the tax is to be altered from $40 000 to $60 000. Furthermore, the metropolitan area levy will only be imposed on land where the taxable value exceeds $200 000 and will only be calculated on so much of the value above that amount. A partial remission of tax is included for the current financial year.

Clause 6 provides for the repeal of section 12a and is consequential on the amendments to section 10.

Clause 7 provides for the making of various other amendments to the principal Act which are being made in conjunction with the proposed reprinting of the Act. The proposed amendments are contained in a schedule to the Bill and in most cases either eliminate unnecessary or outdated material or revamp provisions so that they accord with modern drafting practices. Some of the more noteworthy amendments are as follows:

(a) New section 4a (and the repeal of section 6). The new provision is consistent with the Government Management and Employment Act 1985.

(b) Repeal of section 9. This provision is to be dealt with as part of new section 73.

(c) New section 33. This section is being revised to accord with modern day practices. In particular, it is not proposed to continue the practice of requiring companies to appoint public officers for the purposes of this Act. The practice has fallen into disuse and land tax is being levied and enforced against companies without the need to rely on proceeding against a public officer. Most companies are unaware of the requirement to appoint a public officer and no real advantage is afforded by requiring them to do so. This outmoded imposition may therefore be dispensed with.

(d) New section 73. This is an amalgamation of sections 9 and 73. (The penalty is being revised from $40 to the more appropriate level of $200.)

Mr OLSEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.C. Bannon:

That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to.

(Continued from 21 October. Page 1313.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I rise to comment on matters dealt with by the Estimates Committees. I refer, first, to the

structure of the two Estimates Committees that I attended. Regarding the Estimates Committee that considered expenditure on recreation and sport, it seems ridiculous that in a three-hour session there was, by agreement, a 20-minute break in proceedings only one and a half hours after proceedings commenced.

Ms Lenehan: Whom do you blame?

Mr INGERSON: I am not apportioning blame: I am saying that the system should be corrected.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Not only are there too many interjections: there is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr INGERSON: A system that prevents proper questioning in a short period needs changing. I do not say that that is the fault of the Government but the rules should be reviewed and possibly changed where a Committee has insufficient time. I was also a member of the Estimates Committee that considered transport and I commend the Minister of Transport and his staff for the way in which they handled the questions and the answers given. Unfortunately, I had the questionable privilege of being a member from this side who had to put up with the filibustering and nonsense of the Minister of Health for most of the day.

As one of my colleagues said yesterday, 12 or 13 questions were asked and answered in a three-hour session of that committee. I believe that that action by the Minister was not the intention when the Estimates Committee system was set up, and that it should be investigated by the Government and stopped. Many of the answers from the Minister were well received by members on this side, and there was no need for his answers to be repeated three or four times by members of his staff.

Mr Hamilton: Are you reflecting on the staff?

Mr INGERSON: No. The staff gave excellent answers, but there was no need for the Minister to filibuster. The same Minister told us on that day how great he was, yet a couple of days ago he said on radio station 5DN that it was okay to catch the big marijuana crooks and that it was okay to let the kids experiment. That is the kind of Minister we have contolling the health estimates, and these things should be brought to the attention of the public.

I also sat for a short time on the Attorney-General's Estimates Committee, and I wish to refer to a matter to which the member for Mawson has also often referred—the poor nature of the research facilities that we have in this House. The Government should investigate the research facilities provided for members, the possible use of word processors in the Parliamentary Library, and the introduction of the CLIRS system, which is an excellent system that all members should support. Indeed, only at lunch time today another worthy gentleman commended this system.

Regarding the transport estimates, the State Transport Authority and the Government have a significant problem, which will continue in the future unless dramatic changes are made. As I said during the estimates debate, the Director-General of Transport clearly commented in a paper that, between now and 1995-96, $1 billion must be spent by the Government purely and simply to enable the STA to continue to operate: $860 million is the estimated operating deficit, and $242 million will be required as capital expenditure. With the aging of the railways equipment and replacement of buses, the STA can do little about the capital expenditure, but this Government must be worried about the operating deficit of $860 million.

In this regard, improvement in work practices and in the use of public transport and routes is an important issue. In the budget documents, the Premier clearly stated that energy was being wasted and that he was concerned about the cost to the public purse and about the uneven level of services provided by our outmoded transport system. We all recognise that the transport system has grown in a topsy turvy way. Indeed, much of the expansion in our transport services has taken place at the request of members on both sides of the House.

However, the time is quickly approaching when we will have to stand up and be counted because we cannot continue to allow the projected deficit of $1 billion to occur over the next 10 years. When questioned during the estimates debate, the Minister said that two reviews of the system were currently being conducted. The first of these reviews concerns the costing system and the need to come to grips with the better use of manpower.

When asked whether casual labour would be part of the rostering system, the Minister of Transport immediately rejected that suggestion, but I believe that it is difficult to consider reorganising a work practice rostering system without taking into account casual labour, because in our transport system, as in all other transport systems throughout the world, there are two peaks and a significant trough between those peaks. The only way it has been handled in any practical manner overseas is by using casual labour—but it is not called that overseas—during the peak periods. The other interesting factor overseas is the introduction of the private sector to help cope with the peaks and lows.

The other area of review that has been looked at is industrial relations performance, where I believe that most significant improvements can be made in the area of work practices. When questioned on the major inquiry announced some three months ago by the Minister (who said then that he did not know when it would be introduced), he continued to say during the Estimates Committee that he did not know when it would be introduced. However, he did indicate that he was prepared to look at the levels of service. Both the Opposition and the Government recognise that if one drives around the city after 8 o'clock at night, irrespective of which suburb one is in, many routes have virtually no usage. That area needs to be looked at not only in terms of the times that buses run, but whether the large buses we use today are the way to go.

Another area that needs to be considered is work practices. A significant number of practices have grown up in the award, not because there has not been agreement between management and employees—because it has occurred that way—but, as the Prime Minister said, because the practices developed in many areas over the years need to be looked at and changed. The questions of overtime payments and some practices in relation to the cleaning of buses—many buses can be cleaned only after hours because that has been an agreement made over time—need to be looked at.

In his report *Looking at the Future*, the Director-General (Dr Scrafton) mentions half a dozen alternate methods, including the para transit systems, the use of smaller buses, and the extended use of taxis. As the Minister pointed out, another area of significant concern is the 43 per cent increase over the past four or five years in the cost of servicing the capital debt. While the Minister was not able to answer the question at the time, I wonder whether this significant increase in capital debt is perhaps due to refinancing methods through SAFA. The Premier may be able to say whether a significant increase in the capital debt or the interest side of the STA is the result of the current charges being put on the STA by SAFA.

I am glad to see that the STA has recognised one of the propositions put forward by the Liberal Party at the last election: the closure of Roadliner. In fact, the Government

has decided to close this unprofitable trading exercise. During the Estimates Committees we asked the Minister what other areas of commercialisation—which is now the buzz word in Government—practices have been looked at. It was suggested that catering and other commercial practices would also be investigated. I commend that action by the STA, because any practice that should be carried out by the private sector or not at all should be encouraged if it can reduce the cost significantly.

I was concerned, as were my colleagues, to note a very significant cutback in funds for the promotion of road safety. We were told that there was a general move by the Government away from the promotion of road safety towards other countermeasures. Unfortunately, we did not have time to find out what these countermeasures are, but we established that a very commendable road safety program is to be launched during Grand Prix week by the Grand Prix Board. I look forward to that with interest, and if it is successful we will be able to commend the Government for that initiative. However, we are within two or three days of the Grand Prix and nothing has yet occurred.

Concern has been expressed many times by a colleague of mine in another place in relation to random breath test legislation. Unfortunately, 15 recommendations of the select committee that investigated random breath testing have not been implemented. One of the most significant was for the allocation of more money to enable extra officers to be placed on the road and more equipment to be purchased. Although that course was recommended two years ago, it has not occurred.

Although, during his budget contribution the Premier announced that significant funds would be put into this area, nothing has occurred. It concerns me that, with the rapid rise in the road toll—which I believe is almost as high now as it has ever been in this State—we have a significant reduction in funds and none of the countermeasures are being implemented to attempt to reduce the toll.

There is no doubt that the legislation which we supported in relation to children in motor vehicles is excellent. However, one needs to talk continually to the public to make people realise that the individual has the responsibility and is the controlling factor in any road safety program. The Government should continually remind the community of that, and it disappoints me that funds for this promotional area have been significantly reduced. I believe that road safety should have a bipartisan approach, but that does not mean that we will not continually point out the inefficiency and ineffectiveness of the current Government's road safety program.

The Estimates Committee discussed the school education system, and how it would enable young people to be better trained. Although we have a system in the schools that will enable that program to be expanded, it has been there for some four or five years and nothing has happened. The Government should look at how we can train younger people in the community to recognise the three points: the danger of excessive speed; the danger of alcohol; and the use of drugs when driving. There is also the need to remember what the road code is all about: that you are not the only person on the road, and that common courtesy and commonsense will avoid the majority of crashes that occur.

The committee also discussed the road safety strategic plan put forward by this Government, hopefully to be introduced during the next three or four months, when Parliament will be given an opportunity to significantly debate that control. Another area I have thought about for a long time was brought forward by Dr Scrafton in his *Future* report and is now accepted by the Minister. I refer to the need for various services to be brought closer together: in other words, a need to bring together under one portfolio the STA, the Highways Department, perhaps the Marine and Harbors Department, and the Transport Division, so that administration costs can be reduced to a minimum and so that we can have a flexible funding program where, instead of the present dedicated system of moneys going from certain pools into Highways, we would have a system where the moneys could go into one major pool and priority decisions be made, in the better interests of the State.

The other area of concern that we discussed was Federal and State funding of roads. The Federal Government this year has maintained the amount of money that is going to come to the States, which in fact means an 8 per cent reduction in real terms. What that means to the State is that in particular the country roads and development of country roads will be significantly slowed up. We already have had examples in the last few days where the Government has decided, through the Highways Department, to reduce the road gangs on the Strzelecki Track. We have had significant reductions of road gangs in other northern parts of the State, and that is a very serious problem for this State. Whilst they are dirt roads, they only need two or three vehicles over them consistently along with bad weather, they quickly break up, and then it is difficult for them to be restored to a reasonable state. This is occurring principally because of a significant reduction in Federal funds and because the State funds have not continued to match the Federal funds one for one.

It was also interesting in the discussion that we found we no longer have a north-south corridor, that we no longer are going to have the option of having a third corridor or major corridor in the north-south area. That is catastrophic and is a significant and wrong decision made by this Government because it now no longer gives the option for the construction of a third and most significant major corridor. We have the third arterial road coming in as a third option at the top of the Darlington corner and we have only two roads in future to go down—at widening of either Marion Road or South Road. The third option, looked at not only by the Liberal Government but by the previous Dunstan Government, was to have some day a corridor that would run down the middle of those two roads. We now no longer have that option, purely and simply because of the lack of finances and Government expediency in needing to sell off those properties. It is a tragedy for the State, the city of Adelaide and all people who live in the southern suburbs.

We now have a new grandiose South-Eastern Freeway option. When we look at the current options we see one option starting at $100 million, one at $125 million and one at $150 million, and the possible promise by this Government that the freeway may be built within the next five years. If one looks at Federal grants made this year in the national highway area one will find that the total grant for national roads is some $46.1 million. That grant is for all national roads for the whole of the State. For us in the future to be able to look at a South-Eastern Freeway as our major option in the existing thought pattern we would need significant increases in Federal funding for that major project. I am not suggesting for a second that it may not occur, but what about all other priorities we have in the State? What about all of the other national roads, all other country roads and the finishing of the O-Bahn? That has already been put back because of lack of Federal funding. How can we suddenly dream of building a rather expensive South-Eastern Freeway extension?

The last matter I will mention is my concern in the sport and recreation area. During the Estimates Committee I

mentioned the announcements made by this Government and put forward (and will do it again) the sort of facility announcements we have had over the last three years. We have had the small bore rifle facility announced eight times between September 1983 and September 1986. The hockey stadium was announced 10 times between 1984 and September 1986. A State recreation centre was announced four times, commencing at a cost of $20 million in July 1984 and escalating to $55 million for completion as announced on 27 July this year. The sports and entertainment centre, first announced in April 1985, was announced six times between then and 25 September this year. The velodrome was announced six times between 22 June 1984 and 6 August 1986. The weightlifting stadium was announced five times between June 1984 and July 1986. How could we possibly expect anybody in the sporting community to believe that this Minister or this Government has the interests of sport at heart? That is the sort of nonsense program we have had announced in the last two to three years.

The last two Auditor-General's Reports have commented that the running costs of the Aquatic Centre still have not been negotiated. Yet, we had the Minister being game to say during the Estimates Committee, 'The Auditor-General has got this all wrong—in fact, we have negotiated an agreement.' In the next voice he said, 'The reason the agreement has not been negotiated is that we have a poor indenture.' Either someone is right or someone is wrong. I would like to place my trust more with the Auditor-General than with the Minister. No doubt exists that the Auditor-General is more likely to be right than the Minister.

The other area of concern is the casino and its effect on the leisure dollar. I strongly support the casino; although I have left a few dollars there on occasions, I support the concept of having a casino in this State. What is causing concern in the sporting community is something which I hope this Government will quickly recognise, namely, that the $250 million turnover is coming out of the leisure dollar industry in this State from which the Government is benefiting by some $12 million. The only beneficiary of that $12 million is Treasury.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: No, Treasury is the only beneficiary. The problem is that the TAB turnover is down some 10 per cent on last year. In the Estimates Committee one of the smart comments made was that I had got it wrong. Since then the General Manager of the TAB has confirmed that the turnover of the TAB is down 10 per cent in this quarter compared to last year and that the increase of .08 per cent compares to some 11 per cent for the same quarter last year. If honourable members had done their homework they would have known that I was right.

The other concern in the racing industry is that attendances are down significantly, as is bookmaker turnover. With the casino we have redistributed the leisure dollar. That is okay, provided the Government recognises that in redistributing the leisure dollar decisions have to be made to put it back into areas of most concern. Since it is taken out of the sporting area the Government must look at the concerns of the racing industry and licensed clubs, because they are being affected by keno and bingo. They have been affected largely by the freeing up of the licensing laws.

They are being affected by the massive drop in the traditional lottery area. They are being affected by the dramatic loss of business as far as the beer tickets are concerned. Whilst we have a very encouraging and good movement of dollars in the Casino, we also have a very significant problem developing in the sporting and licensed clubs area, and it is something that this Government will have to recognise and do something about in its term of office. There is no way that this Government can continue to take the dollars out of the leisure industry and not recognise that it also has to put money back into that industry.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: I said that three years ago.

Mr INGERSON: I know that the former Minister said it three years ago, but nothing happened. Now we have an opportunity where this Government can actually put its money where its mouth is. It can recognise that the sporting and licensed clubs area is suffering significantly from a very successful Casino which, as I said earlier, I support very strongly.

The other area of concern in relation to the racing industry is the possible introduction of a racing commission. I look forward with interest over perhaps the next six or so months when this Government attempts to convince not only the galloping code but also the trotting and greyhound codes that it can, with its usual bureaucratic nonsense, attempt to introduce a racing commission. I also look forward with interest to see how the Minister will walk what I believe is an impossible tightrope, because I know that the galloping industry, the greyhound industry and the trotting industry are all totally opposed to it, so he will have a very interesting exercise.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): Thank you, Mr Speaker, for the opportunity to speak to the Appropriation Bill. As a new member, I was pleased and eager to have the opportunity to sit in on the Estimates Committees and listen and learn—

Mr Duigan interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: The member for Adelaide sat in on most of them, too.

Mr Duigan: Not as many as you though.

Mr D.S. BAKER: He was probably less fortunate than I was. I listened to what was said and learnt from questions asked by shadow Ministers. I was also of the view that it would provide an opportunity to me as a new member to ask some of the questions that were pertinent to my electorate. However, in most cases, we were unable to do this because time just ran out. From the opening statements of the Minister before each committee, it became quite clear to me that the whole committee exercise was a confidence building exercise for the Minister and a chance for that Minister to impress on his assembled colleagues on whom he leant for advice if needed that really their presence was quite superfluous. I must exclude from that the Minister of Lands, who used his advisers very well. It also put pressure on some of those advisers to keep on their toes to make sure that the answers they gave were not subject to further questioning by us. I compliment the Minister of Lands on the way in which he handled his committee.

The length of answers given by Ministers in most cases was a disgrace. Very few Ministers made any attempt to confine their answers to the questions that were asked, and they ended up, in a lot of cases, turning the answer into a point scoring farce. I am sure in the future that we have to look at this political point scoring that goes on in the committees because, if people have genuine questions to ask, I am sure that the Chairmen of those committees should confine the Ministers' answers to the point. I agree with the principle of the committee system, but surely we must not allow it to waste as much time as it has over the past two weeks. In particular, I was astounded, as a new member, to see time after time Ministers not allowing their officers to answer questions. Many of the figures that could have been supplied were not given. The Minister glossed over the question without providing facts and figures which,

in a lot of cases, were required not only for the member's electorate but also for information that we would want to debate at a later stage in this House.

I turn now to some of the committees that I was fortunate enough to sit on and discuss some of the questions that were asked and answers given. For the Attorney-General's Department, we discussed the $3.9 million that was provided for legal services to the State. One of the great problems that we have in this State is an ever increasing number of Government employees and the continuing interference of Government, intruding on the private sector. The interference occurs in areas which I contend the private sector can handle more effectively and more cost efficiently. If there is any doubt in any member's mind in this House that the Government is not starting to take advice in relation to some of the measures that this side of the House has been putting for quite some time now, one has merely to look at the STA Roadliner service, which was allowed to run at a staggering loss for several years.

I have recently had submitted to me cases where quotes were given on jobs that could be done by private enterprise for 50 per cent of the cost. Of course, they could not be allowed to continue to operate. Already STA loses $100 million of taxpayers' money in this State, and the Labor Government had to take the advice that we have been giving it for some time and disband the operation.

The other area in which we find that the Government has taken some advice from our election campaign is the selling off of Housing Trust houses to the tenants. I welcome both of these commercialisation initiatives that this Labor Government is now pursuing. My concern relates to the quite spurious argument which is often put forward, namely, that the figures given by departments that do compete with private enterprise are the complete cost structure of that enterprise. This is nonsense, and one of the thoughts put to the Attorney-General was that the cost of providing legal services to the State should no longer be under his department but apportioned to each department or area of Government to which that service was rendered. To his credit, the Attorney will look at that proposal, which I will further follow up with him.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: But the end result might not be any different.

Mr D.S. BAKER: The end result might not be any different, as the member quite correctly said, in the overall budget. However, the end result will be that each Government department will have to account for the legal services used and the legal advice given. If it does compete with private enterprise in any business that in our opinion can be better done by private enterprise, we will be able to better assess the total costs of the running of that enterprise. I am quite happy for Government to compete with private enterprise provided that the rules are the same for both sides. I admire the Attorney-General for listening to that argument, and I look forward to seeing that allocation to those Government departments which seek the use of his officers the most, and which will, therefore, pay for that advice.

The next area that concerns me especially in the Attorney-General's Department is the Electoral Act. An amount of $182 000 was spent after the last election on checking polls to see if people voted only once or did not vote at all. After this investigation, which took some time and the results of which were only just ready for the information of the Estimates Committees, and after an expenditure of $182 000, it was found that only one person had voted twice. That is a considerable amount for that type of investigation. However, it was also found that 60 000 people failed to vote at the last State election. The reply of the Electoral Commissioner, Mr Becker, to one of the questions I asked was:

> About 60 000 people failed to vote at the election, about half of whom were sent 'please explain' notices. A number of people rung in or attended at polling booths to tell us that somebody would not vote because of illness or because they were out of the State. We followed up 30 000 people and accepted most of the excuses given. We narrowed the number to 4 000 to whom we sent summonses for not giving a valid or sufficient reason for not voting, or for not replying to either of the two notices sent to them.

The Hon. Mr Sumner butted in at that stage and said:

> Not of the summonses. Information that I have is that only 700 have actually been served. The remaining electors within those 4 000 cannot be located.

So, of the 4 000 people who did not reply to queries, 3 300 could not be found. Furthermore, in relation to the figure of 60 000 persons, 30 000 were removed automatically because people who were over 65 years of age or people who offered reasons at the polling booth on the day were excused. I hope that the Attorney-General and Ministers in other areas of government achieve a better result than following up 60 000 people and finding that summonses can be issued to only 700.

I believe that we have learnt from this exercise that any excuse, whether or not it is valid, is accepted. About 50 per cent of those people were automatically not followed up when they did not cast a vote at the last election. It is accepted by most people that voting for the House of Assembly is compulsory but, automatically, all those of 65 years or more were excused, and 3 300 people whose names were on the electoral roll could not be found. Surely this has to be a bit of a joke. Are those names to be added to the missing persons file? Will we follow up what happened to those people? Will we enforce compulsory voting in this State, or will we scrap it and let South Australians vote if they feel the need?

It is a fact that South Australia was one of the last States to introduce compulsory voting in 1944, and it is also a fact that there is no compulsory voting for the Legislative Council. In 1944 the Legislative Council declared that it would not choose to follow the House of Assembly and make voting compulsory. If this trend continues and if the Labor Government, which is so chock full of these reform ideas, continues in this vein, I would have thought it was about time that compulsory voting was scrapped in this State and voluntary voting introduced.

Mr Duigan interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: Despite the interjection, I point out that there was a famous case about eight years ago whereby one of my constituents (and there is no need for me to reiterate how well informed people in my district are)—

The Hon. J.W. Slater: He was not a constituent of yours then.

Mr D.S. BAKER: He is a constituent of mine, but at that time he was a constituent of the former member, Allan Rodda. That person was summonsed for not voting, appeared in court and fought his case, saying that he did not vote because he was not attracted to any of the candidates. He did not want to put an informal vote into the ballot box. The case was dropped: it was found that his case was proved and that in fact he did not have to vote. It is very interesting for people in this State who do not want to vote to know that there was no appeal against that case. I am led to believe that the Government took advice and did not want to appeal. Again I say that, if this Government is so full of reform ideas, it is time we looked at optional voting.

The next area I would like to discuss involves the startling revelations of the Minister of Correctional Services. I believe that many people in South Australia are concerned about the Government's easy parole system and think that it is making a mockery of gaol sentences in this State. I was very concerned to learn that all prisoners in this State receive payment for being in gaol although, initially, that payment is quite small and, according to the Minister the payment is made for toilet requisites, smokes and other small items like that. The Minister was quick to point out that that payment was very small.

However, I was staggered to learn that prisoners who are in gaol at Her Majesty's pleasure and sentenced to hard labour also receive a basic payment for any work done in and around the gaol. It seems to me that it is bad enough if someone is in prison, especially if he is sentenced to hard labour and, apart from looking after his day-to-day requirements, there should be no burden on the State.

Mr Oswald: Are they paid overtime?

Mr D.S. BAKER: I thank the honourable member for raising that matter. Worse is to come. I asked the Minister whether prisoners were paid overtime, and the reply was that they are paid not only overtime but also penalty rates. I cannot believe that the public of South Australia would concur in that. It is an indictment on our correctional services system that people who are confined to gaol, sometimes for quite horrific and violent crimes, are paid overtime or, as the Minister put it, dirt money.

I do not notice victims of crime being recompensed too often. I concede that people sometimes work outside normal working hours. The Minister said that we cannot expect prisoners to work outside the normal working hours. I did not think that he had that option—nor should he have it. This issue should be publicised in the community and representations should be made to the Minister of Correctional Services to correct this most blatant anomaly in the payment of prisoners.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: What do you think they get paid? How much?

Mr D.S. BAKER: In answer to the honourable member's interjection, I agree with the basic amount, but I disagree that they should get any further payment at all. I might ask, 'Why are people in prison?' Are they in prison to show that if they work overtime they can earn more money? What about people who cannot get a job and are not in prison? They get only the minimum amount.

We will take the matter further. I think it is totally unjust, and it is a burden on the taxpayers of this State. After all, we know that it costs something like $58 000 to keep a prisoner in the prison system. That is horrific. Anything that we can do to lower that cost surely must be to the benefit of this State. During the Estimates Committee examination of the Minister of Correctional Services I was also concerned about the detection of drugs within the prison system. The committee discovered that not only is there a drug problem in the prisons (as the Minister readily identified) but more importantly there is a drug detection problem. The Minister said that it is becoming more and more difficult to detect the entry of drugs into prisons.

I am concerned, because coming before this House is some quite horrific legislation to decriminalise marijuana. If the use of marijuana is decriminalised (and I hope that it is not), seeing that smoking is allowed in prisons, I cannot see how the drug detection problem will not become much more difficult with the smoking of marijuana taking place. I think the public at large are starting to learn about the problems that will accrue if the well-known—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member that he is not allowed to refer to a Bill that is before the House. It is quite likely that the Controlled Substances Act Amendment Bill will be debated today.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, the Bill has not been introduced into this House.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Mitcham is quite wrong, because the Controlled Substances Act Amendment Bill was introduced in the House yesterday. It is listed on the Notice Paper in front of him and may well be debated today. I point out to the member for Victoria—and I am sure that he can accede to my request—that Standing Orders do not allow him to refer to a Bill that is before the House.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I apologise, Mr Deputy Speaker. I possibly misunderstood the information I had received.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I accept what the member for Victoria has said. He may well not have known that the Bill was before the House, but it is my duty as Deputy Speaker to remind him of the situation. I request the member for Victoria not to refer to a Bill that is before the House.

Mr D.S. BAKER: As I was saying, during the Estimates Committee I specifically raised the problem of marijuana smoking in prisons, and I received a response from the Minister of Correctional Services. I am quite happy not to refer to the Bill before the House. I reiterate: if there are problems at the moment in detecting drugs in prisons and it transpires that the use of marijuana is legalised (while smoking generally continues to be allowed in prisons), surely it is time for the Government and the Minister to ban smoking in prisons. The Government is considering banning the smoking of tobacco in taxis, which surely interferes with the rights of individuals. Smoking in buses and trains is already banned. Not only do we allow prisoners to be paid overtime and receive other extra payments but they are also allowed to smoke. It appears to me to be an unusual anomaly, if we are going to ban smoking in taxis, that we continue to allow smoking in prisons. I can see very grave problems in the future in relation to controlling drugs in prisons if smoking generally continues to be permitted in our prisons.

I turn now to the Woods and Forests Department and some of its commercial operations. In particular, I am concerned with the department's inability to keep up its performance in the commercial realities of the market place. Over the past few years there has been a very large demand from vignerons and primary producers for creosote treated pine posts from the Woods and Forests Department. However, it appears from an answer to a question put to the Minister that he and his advisers are not aware of this problem. I refer specifically to creosote pine posts and an answer given to the Estimates Committee, as follows:

> With the measured rounds, the run is usually on one or two specifications and, as the wood comes out of the forests, there is a range of sizes. From time to time pressure is placed on one of those sizes. Of course, the material has to be air dried, treated and then dried off. I am surprised that the problem described has arisen.

There has been a shortage of creosote pine timber for primary producers and other users for three years. On many occasions the problem has been brought to the attention of the Woods and Forests Department by the United Farmers and Stockowners, by individual producers and by their elected members. With the financial constraints placed on the department because of its debt structure and its financial viability generally, I would have thought that any area where there was an increase in demand would be acted upon with

some haste to try to take advantage of the market that is available.

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: Well said. I thank the member for Gilles for his most intelligent interruption. However, I think this is an indictment on the department, and it is one that we will follow up. It is a profitable market, and it would be one of the few profit-making areas for the Woods and Forests Department: one has only to read the department's balance sheets to see that. If the department is so tardy that it cannot react to obvious commercial pressures, I think it is time that we had a good look at the Government's involvement in SATCO and similar organisations because of the lack of commercial viability.

The other area that I questioned the department on is the proposed (yet unproven) technology to commence what is called a scrimber operation in the South-East. This operation was announced with great vigor just before the last election—and it was announced, appropriately, in Mount Gambier. The mill is to be in the electorate of Victoria, so I do not know why Mount Gambier was the place to announce this great new industry which is about to begin in the South-East. As I have said, the product is called scrimber. On close questioning of the Minister, we found that the technology is not yet available, even though the land has been purchased in the electorate of Victoria. The Minister also said that the technology may not become available for this operation for quite a time yet.

I am concerned that there are moves afoot to have a timber yard in the South-East not only to sort out timber for the scrimber operation (which is obviously a long way off) but to take over the chipping of timber and sell it to APCEL Pty Ltd, which is the largest paper-making enterprise in South Australia. There is one problem with this grand announcement in Mount Gambier that the operation would create 40 new jobs: it was not pointed out that, if this operation sold wood chips to APCEL (at the moment it processes the chips itself), although it would provide 40 jobs for the Woods and Forests Department, it would immediately eliminate 35 APCEL jobs.

The people employed in that area, not only management but the unions, question closely the need for this mill. I, too, question why the Woods and Forests Department or SATCO should get involved in commercial operations that will affect private enterprise employment because, whether Government members agree or not, there is no question that the private sector can handle those operations much more efficiently and profitably than the Government can. All of a sudden we saw that this grandiose scheme had been pushed further and further under the carpet.

The Estimates Committee system needs reforming. I was horrified at the time that was wasted in committee. If only the political point scoring could be eliminated, as well as the long statements and answers by Ministers, members from both sides might be given more time to ask questions, thus obviating the need for them to place questions on notice.

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

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I endorse the remarks of my colleague the member for Victoria concerning the Estimates Committees. Often they are a futile exercise because of the excessive length of time taken by some Ministers in answering questions. I use the term 'answering questions' in the loosest sense. Perhaps I should say 'responding to questions' because on those days on which I sat on a committee only one Minister responded reasonably concisely to questions, thus enabling more questions to be asked. Other Ministers, however, showing that they had less grip on their portfolios, engaged in much rhetoric and filibustering which limited the capacity of the committee to obtain information.

The information sought by Opposition and Government members was of a factual nature designed to enhance our understanding of how the departments operate and how the State is run. However, some of the responses, notably those from the Minister of Tourism, could only be described as vacuous talk. There was little substance, and the range of her answers prevented the committee from asking more questions. Her performance contrasted with that of the Deputy Premier who, as Minister for Environment and Planning, responded to a great number of questions. He did not answer every question, but certainly the brevity of his answers enabled many questions to be asked and answered. Further, Mr Deputy Speaker, your tolerance as a committee Chairman enabled the Opposition to have a fair go on the environment Estimates Committee, and members appreciated that. I also sat on the Estimates Committee that dealt with community welfare, and there I was extremely frustrated by the range of replies by the Minister (Dr Cornwall).

Mr Rann: You asked three times as many questions as Government members.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: That may be so, but it does not in any way affect the reality that the Minister's answers were excessively long and went way beyond providing the factual information sought. Members want details: they do not want rhetoric or filibustering. Unfortunately, however, that is what they got.

I now wish to refer to two of the many issues that emerged from the portfolios in which I have a special interest and responsibility: first, the future of the Black Hill Native Flora Park, which was dealt with by the Estimates Committee on environment and planning; and, secondly, the status of domestic visitor nights which was dealt with by the Estimates Committee on tourism.

Most members know the history of the Black Hill Native Flora Park, which goes back well over a decade. Originally, the Athelstone wildflower garden was administered by the Campbelltown council. In 1974, the Black Hill Native Flora Park was set up by the Dunstan Government, its goals being to promote research and the cultivation of native flora. I believe that Mr Dunstan foresaw that the facility would provide easy access for visitors to South Australia, especially international visitors, to native flora in this State in a way that was not readily obtainable elsewhere in Adelaide or in other States. The park was further developed by the establishment of the Black Hill Trust and, under the Tonkin Government, that trust was given resources and administered them in a cost-effective way, with great dedication and enthusiasm.

When the Tonkin Government left office, the Black Hill Trust was operating with a director and a staff of about 12. This area is one of the most interesting parts of the hills face adjacent to Adelaide. There is a definite micro climate in the Black Hill area which enables the cultivation of a wide range of species.

Mr Lewis: From personal experience, I can say that it is very unique.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Yes. The member for Murray-Mallee has a personal interest in the area and is therefore well informed about it. The people of the surrounding area have a great affection for that national park and a great commitment and caring spirit. Since the administration of the present Government, that flora park has

been starved of resources, and its neglect is evident. I visited the park in Easter of this year, admittedly at the end of a long dry summer, and found that plants were dying from heat stress and that the arid zone garden was overrun by weeds. However, it was obvious that that garden had been totally neglected for the previous two years. Indeed, no staff or resources had been made available to maintain it. In fact, the National Parks and Wildlife Service had had to stop watering the garden (and this was in an area where ferns were growing alongside an artifical creek) because it could not afford the expense of pumping and could not pay the electricity bills, let alone the water rates. That was neglect of a serious order.

The man-made lake that had been established in a quarry by the trust was stagnant and unkempt, and substantial trees in the area were literally on their last legs because of lack of water. Weeds up to 2 m high were growing around the car park at Black Hill, and the whole area gave the impression of a neglect that would deter prospective visitors from viewing it. Indeed, I would have been reluctant to take someone from another State or another country into the garden to see the flora because there was little to see apart from weeds.

Mr Lewis: In direct contravention of the undertaking given by the former member for Coles, the then Deputy Premier, Des Corcoran.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Indeed. It is also in contravention of the undertaking given by the Government to the Campbelltown council that the wildflower garden would be maintained. Certainly, there is access, but the maintenance of the garden is in a pathetic state. In May this year I challenged the Government to clarify its position on the future of the park and pointed out that the park was being starved to death by a denial of funds to function as it should, and that it almost seemed as if the Government wanted to discredit Black Hill before it destroyed it entirely. I pointed out that Black Hill has the potential to become one of Australia's foremost centres for propagation display and research of native flora. Certainly, it is Liberal Party policy to develop it along those lines. In the Estimates Committee I raised the question with the Minister, noting that there was no allocation for Black Hill nursery for recurrent or capital expenditure in the National Parks and Wildlife budget.

The response I received was that the function had been transferred to Botanic Gardens and the Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service was asked to explain it to me. Mr Leaver stated that the facility does not really rest very well with national parks responsibilities, that it is a horticultural responsibility—and I do not argue that it is a horticultural responsibility—and that it would be better managed within the framework of the Botanic Gardens. It can only be well managed in the framework of Botanic Gardens or any other administrative arrangement if it is provided with a reasonable budget.

As I said, when we left office it had a staff of a dozen, of whom two were scientific research staff. The staff at Black Hill has now been reduced to three, and how that place can fulfil its stated function with a staff of three is difficult, if not impossible, to see. There is no clerical assistance to the scientific professional staff and only one person to maintain the wildflower garden and, diligent though he is, it is an impossible job for one person.

I understand that three weekly paid positions currently working in the nursery will become vacant and not be refilled at the end of the financial year. Effectively, there will be three permanent transfers from Black Hill leaving a staff of only three. No decision has apparently been made, and the Minister acknowledged this, about the future of the wildflower garden which is a very important botanical asset of the State. No decision has been made about the future of the arid zone garden, and the word that one hears locally is that this might revert to a 'wilderness area'. In fact, it already has reverted to a wilderness area in the sense that it is unkept and overgrown with weeds. Mercifully, because of the amount of rain we have had during the winter the substantial trees will be given the moisture to survive another hard summer, but it does not look as if they will get any help from the Government in the form of pumping or water.

In short, Black Hill is losing its identity. It is certainly losing its capacity to attract visitors, and it is a tragedy to think that the investment that taxpayers, Commonwealth and State, have put into the development of that park is now being allowed to run down to the point where it has deteriorated beyond what could have been believed five years ago when we were in government.

The other issue I want to refer to is the Minister of Tourism's handling of her portfolio. Indeed, I might bring into this her predecessor's handling because results speak for themselves. As Minister of Tourism between 1979 and 1982, I commissioned an investigation into tourism in South Australia by Mr Rob Tonge. I remember vividly that one of the statements made in his report, which helped to change the face of tourism in South Australia, was that tourism was one area where one could judge by results, and that there was no other real yardstick: if visitors increased and visitor satisfaction increased that was the one and only yardstick by which a Government's policy could be judged.

Let members of the Government realise that for the past four years there has been no growth whatsoever in domestic visitor nights in South Australia. All the ballyhoo, all the hype, all the lip service and all the alleged committment to tourism has resulted in a graph which shows a straight line from 1982 to 1985 in terms of domestic visitor nights. It is true, as the Minister said, that there has been a growth in the number of visitors. However, it does not matter whether two visitors stay 10 nights, 20 visitors stay one night, or four visitors stay five nights—there is still no growth.

Mr Duigan interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The interjection by the member for Adelaide is correct. He is referring to the current year and to informal figures, not to ABS figures, which are not yet available. I am talking about the past four years, 1982-83 to 1984-85, and for those years there has been no increase. Without that increase it does not matter how many more people come. If they come for shorter stays there is no greater demand for beds, meals or any of the associated services that go with that demand. Therefore, there is no greater generation of economic activity and no creation of jobs.

For four years the present Minister of Transport administered the portfolio and the last year has been under the present Minister's administration. The present Minister is lucky because she happens to be in office in the Jubilee year when there will be a natural growth. Whatever she does or fails to do will not influence the fact that there will be a natural growth simply by virtue of the historical fact that it is our 150th Jubilee and a lot is happening in relation to it. Last year was also the first Grand Prix, which generated its own numbers, and they certainly will be reflected in the 1985 figures when they eventually come out.

I am talking about the four years previous to that, and there was no growth. That is a very serious indictment of the Government, and it is intensified by the Minister's completely extraordinary statements when asked if she will

set targets for growth and what those targets will be. First, she said:

> The growth of what?

That was explained to her. Then she came forward with the euphemism of the year:

> Visitor nights have remained reasonably stable during the past couple of years.

In other words, there has been no growth whatsoever. In response to my statement, 'We have apparently made no progress in four years', the Minister, uncharacteristically honest, said:

> I agree wholeheartedly with the member.

In other words, she admitted that the Government has made no progress in four years. I then went on to ask the Minister what targets should be set. Her reply was that she was not going to fall into the trap of the member for Coles by setting targets, and said that the Government simply wanted to increase overall numbers. If she regards it as unsatisfactory to set targets, I wonder how she views the fact that the Australian Tourist Commission, on behalf of the Australian Government, regards it as desirable, indeed, essential to set targets and has set targets of percentage annual growth.

I believe that 10 per cent is a realistic target, and it coincides with the target that the Liberal Party set for intrastate, interstate and international visitors for the current term of government. It would be very hard to maintain 10 per cent beyond that, particularly in terms of intrastate and interstate visits, because one is working from a continuously increasing base and it is hard to build 10 per cent annually on a continuously increasing base. However, if it is good enough for the Australian Tourist Commission to do it for the nation, why is it not good enough for this Minister of Tourism to set realistic targets for tourism in South Australia?

The fact that she quite obviously refuses to do so indicates to me that she is frightened of targets, because if you set targets and fail to meet them you can be seen to have failed to meet them. She would rather quite obviously not set a target so there is nothing to meet and no-one can say that her policies have failed. As it is the Government's general target simply to increase visitation to South Australia is so vague, so fluffy and so useless as a target that if we have one more visitor the Government could say that it has achieved its target. In an industry as important to South Australia as is tourism it is irresponsible and, indeed, negligent of the Minister not to set targets.

A number of issues were not answered during the tourism Estimates Committee. I found it incredible that the Minister did not have available the figures on which the graph circulated to delegates attending the South Australian Tourism Conference was based. When those figures do come to light I believe that South Australia should scrutinise them very carefully indeed because they indicate that, despite all the talk and despite the fact that the Government claims to have increased promotional funds, the fact that we cannot compete with other States on a marketing budget indicates that we are at a grave disadvantage and unlikely to increase our visitor numbers until the Government really puts its money where its mouth is with tourism.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): The first matter to which I wish to draw the attention of the House is my belief that the Parliament itself ought to be master of its own budget appropriations, master of its own destiny and, indeed, it should not be the Government. It is a view that I have held for a long time and a view that I am more compelled to speak out about now in more passionate terms than previously because of my more recent involvement in the Parliament's Joint House Committee and the Library Committee.

There are a number of ways in which it would be possible for the Parliament to require the Government to pay revenue to it. As you would know, Mr Deputy Speaker, it would take only a motion of this Chamber to simply require the Government to pay so much money—X dollars, whatever that is ($200 000 or $2 million)—and the Government would then be compelled to comply under the threat of being able to obtain no other legislation through the Parliament. Apart from that there are a number of mechanisms by which the Parliament itself could determine how the Government paid money to the Parliament to provide the resources necessary for the Parliament and members of it to function appropriately. We should not be directed by a Government; Governments should be directed by the will of the Parliament. Having made that simple blunt statement of my personal position, I will leave it and refer to it again as the years roll by and my constituents bless or curse me, whichever way one looks at it, with continuing responsibility in this place.

I wish to take up where I left off prior to the budget Estimate Committees in consideration of the substance of the youth survey that I did last year as part of International Youth Year. I refer members to the material contained in *Hansard* of 23 September at page 1088, where I drew attention to the survey for the second time and provided some useful information about results obtained to illustrate what I thought to be a very useful exercise.

It took me an enormous amount of time and personal resources, as well as money, over and above what has been provided to me to manage my electorate office. I used finances that otherwise would have been available to other members in the same position as personal income. I have not previously explained that 2 120 young people received the survey questionnaire and 442 or 20.85 per cent of them returned it. I have mentioned that response rate before because it illustrates an enormous response which anyone in professional marketing would regard as being outstanding. It is not just unusual but unprecedented, in my experience, that any questionnaire receives such a response. There was no compulsion on the recipients to respond.

The first section was interesting, as it concerned the respondent and their family life, and out of the total number of 442, 25, which is a sixteenth, or 6 per cent to 7 per cent, live in step family situations. It is important to recognise that the average size of families amongst the respondents was bigger than that for the State but I guess that that is understandable since they all live in rural communities or substantially rural communities. It was also interesting that to the question, 'Are you single or married?' 95.7 per cent gave an answer and, of that 95.7 per cent, 8 per cent were married and 92 per cent were not. It is equally interesting that well over 80 per cent of all respondents to the questionnaire at large, even though they did not respond to the question totally, expected to marry at an average age of 23.

To the question 'Do you have any children?' there were 15 replies: eight stated they had one child and seven already had two children even though, in looking at other information in the raw data on a regression analysis, none was over 22 years of age. It seems to rest easy with other information the survey produced about attitudes to marriage, where people said that they would marry, as I have pointed out: of those who were single 91.5 per cent expected to marry, and that comes out at 408 in all of the 450. I asked the respondents to indicate whether they had any difficulty in getting other people to understand them, and the alarming percentage of 27.2 per cent said that they did

have difficulty whilst the balance, 72.8 per cent, said they did not have difficulty.

I asked if it was easier to explain something in writing, and 26.3 per cent of the respondents said 'Yes' and 73 per cent said 'No, it was not.' That 73 per cent found that it was easier to explain it verbally. They were asked if their schooling taught them enough about communication, and in percentage terms there was a 60/40 Yes/No split.

In the second section, I asked about their education. It transpired that about 9 per cent of the respondents had left school in 1979 and 19.1 per cent had done so in 1984. I seek your leave, Madam Acting Speaker, to have inserted in *Hansard* a purely statistical table which gives the breakdown of the numbers, the year and percentage of respondents leaving school. It is not otherwise incorporated in *Hansard* and is purely statistical.

Leave granted.

SCHOOL LEAVING STATISTICS

In what year did you leave school?

Replies	413	93.4 per cent of Total per cent	
1978	2	0.5	
1979	35	8.6	
1980	48	11.7	
1981	64	15.5	
1982	76	18.4	Main 6 year period
1983	83	20.1	
1984	79	19.1	
1985	25	6.1	

Mr LEWIS: They were asked at what level they left school, and 95 per cent responded to this question. Of those, fewer than 1 per cent left school at year 8, 4.3 per cent left school at year 9, 16 per cent or thereabouts left school at year 10, 36 per cent left at year 11, and 42 per cent left at year 12. A couple responded who left to continue further education. It is interesting to note that in 1980, of those people who left school that year and responded to the questionnaire, the proportion that had reached year 12 was not as great as the proportion who left school in 1984 having reached year 12. Indeed, over time there was a tendency to stay at school longer. That is more dramatic in these figures than in figures which have been quoted by educators as being relevant to the rest of the South Australian population. I therefore seek leave to incorporate that table in *Hansard* for the benefit of educators. It has not been incorporated previously and it is purely statistical.

Leave granted.

SCHOOL LEAVING STATISTICS

At what level did you leave school?

Replies	420	95 per cent of Total per cent
Year 8	3	0.7
Year 9	18	4.3
Year 10	70	16.7
Year 11	150	35.7
Year 12	177	42.1

Left to continue education 2 (0.5 per cent).

Mr LEWIS: If members or other people wish to obtain information about the subjects that were studied by the respondents according to the year in which they left school, and the numbers of those respondents in each of the years of leaving school when they did those respective subjects, that information is available. I will not attempt to explain it to the House, as I believe it to be convoluted. It is better to see it as block data. I asked the respondents to give me their reasons for leaving school and to indicate into which of four categories their reason would come. A total of 17.3 per cent said that they were bored, 26.1 per cent said that they needed employment, 24 per cent said that they left to continue education elsewhere, and a massive 32 per cent gave other reasons—and they were a wide variety of reasons.

I was surprised because I had done a preliminary survey to determine what was considered to be the three main reasons, and the preliminary survey indicated the three reasons I have given, even though in the final response, the large number of other reasons like parental pressure to leave school and take up work seemed to loom larger. People chose to indicate that in their responses.

When I asked whether or not they thought that the education at their school was adequate, 68.6 per cent said they thought it was and the remainder said they thought it was not. So, if the subjective appraisal of their students is any indication, at least the schools in Murray-Mallee have some distance to go. I do not reflect upon the staff or the efforts that are made by individual members of school staffs. I am merely reporting what the students who had left school during those years felt about their respective schools. I am equally sure that they were happier with their schools than perhaps people in the metropolitan area would have been if the same questionnaire had been circulated to school leavers in the metropolitan area.

I have already given the House on a previous occasion the information about the attitudes of the students to their parents, and about how the respondents themselves considered what their parents thought about them. I will not take the time of the House to repeat it. In section 4 of the questionnaire about work and adult life, I found that of the 92.5 per cent that answered the question whether or not they were employed, 75 per cent or thereabouts said that they were and 24.3 per cent said that they were not. So, in that age group it tends to be about the same as it is elsewhere in the State. I asked how people leaving school in that age group felt about seeking their first job, and I received 84.8 per cent responses. In a table which I now seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* is set out the attitudes, varying from easy and immediately successful, through satisfying, laborious, frustrating and depressing, to impossible.

Leave granted.

JOB SEEKING

How did you first find Job Seeking?

Replies	375	84.8 per cent of total per cent
Easy and immediately successful	182	48.53
Satisfying	78	20.80
Laborious	26	6.93
Frustrating and depressing	78	20.80
Impossible	11	2.94

Mr LEWIS: It is notable that 48.53 per cent found that they were immediately successful in finding work. An additional 20.8 per cent found that it was satisfying to seek work, only 6.93 per cent found it laborious, but more than 22 per cent found it frustrating, depressing or impossible to get work. I asked if they were still doing the same job, and well over 50 per cent of them were. I asked also the 46.34 per cent, if they were not doing the same job, how many jobs they had had since leaving school. I do not have a regression analysis on a year of leaving school basis, that is, the number of years that the respondents have been out of school. That is available to anyone who wants it, but, of those who had more than one job, over 70 per cent had had three or fewer, and very few had had more than five jobs.

When asked whether they were doing the kind of work they would like to be doing, 78 per cent said 'Yes', so there was a good deal of job satisfaction, but the balance said 'No'. I asked those who were not satisfied whether they would like to change their occupation and, funnily enough, 10 per cent said 'No', so that tended to indicate to me that they would rather see changes to the way in which the workplace was being run than change the nature of their vocation.

I asked the respondents to indicate why they thought there were high unemployment levels, particularly among young people in Australia, and I worked out a score system for the five options that they could choose. The first preferred reason given for the high unemployment level was multiplied by five and so on—that is, the second preference was multiplied by four and the fifth preference was multiplied by one, and thus the points were obtained. Funnily enough, the two reasons cited most often were that 'young people do not try hard enough to find work' and that 'there was insufficient training'. Each of those reasons obtained scores, by that means, of 1 124 points; the view that wages were too high accrued 825 points; and 405 points accrued from the view that bosses were too intolerant of the efforts of young people who work for them. 'Other reasons' accrued a score of 689 points. To a straight question about whether or not youth wages were too high, 43.6 per cent said 'Yes' and 56.4 per cent said 'No'.

In section 5 I asked about the things that the respondents did in their leisure time, and I discovered that there was a wide and interesting variety, although I will not bore the House with the details. The survey indicated how various leisure time activities compared with useful information through regression analysis with other parts of the questionnaire. I found that 69 per cent belonged to clubs, and 31 per cent were not members of clubs. That means that formal leisure time activities, and so on (as many of us have suspected for a long time), are not pursued by the vast majority. I would not call 69 per cent in this context a vast majority. In fact, 31 per cent prefer unstructured leisure time activities that do not involve formal group organisation.

I can provide the House or anyone else who is interested with a norm graph of the amount of money that respondents who belong to organisations pay for their membership subscriptions to those organisations, the number of organisations to which they belong, and a regression analysis between this and other questions in the questionnaire. I was curious to note how many attended church and how often, and I found that more than half simply do not attend church. That is an important point when one considers the responses to section 6. However, 11.8 per cent never miss church. I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* a short table that indicates the range of behaviour.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Gayler): Is the table purely statistical?

Mr LEWIS: Yes.

Leave granted.

BEHAVIOUR STATISTICS

About the things you do for leisure time activities, recreation hobbies etc.

(1) What the the two or three most important activities for you in this category.

This does not have any raw data responses. (Huge list available on request—useful for regression analysis).

(2) Do you belong to any clubs?

Yes	305	(69.0 per cent)
No	137	(31.0 per cent)

(3) If anyone is interested in a norm graph of the amount of money which respondents pay for membership of organisations, and the numbers of organisations to which they belong, and a regression analysis between this and other questions within the questionnaire, then I can make that information available.

(4) How often do you attend church?

Replies	408	(92.3 per cent)
Not at all	208	(51.0 per cent)
3-4 times a year	78	(19.1 per cent)
A fair bit	31	(7.6 per cent)
Fairly regularly	43	(10.5 per cent)
Never miss it	48	(11.8 per cent)

(5) How often do you go out socially?

Replies	412	(93.2 per cent)
More than five times a week	43	(10.4 per cent)
More than once a week	245	(59.5 per cent)
Once a week	71	(17.2)
Less than once a week	53	(12.9)

(6) Do you read books for relaxation?

Replies	349	(92.6 per cent)
One or more a week	53	(15.2 per cent)
One or more a month	99	(28.4 per cent)
Hardly ever	154	(44.1 per cent)
Never	43	(12.3 per cent)

Mr LEWIS: The question 'How often do you go out socially?' received the following responses: more than five times a week, just over 10 per cent; more than once a week, nearly 60 per cent; once a week, about 17 per cent; and less than once a week, 13 per cent. So, 13 per cent of the respondents simply do not go out. I was quite amazed by that last statistic. I asked whether they read books for relaxation and I asked them to quantify it: one or more books a week, only 15 per cent; one or more books a month, a bit over 28 per cent; hardly ever, 44 per cent; never, 12 per cent.

I asked, 'Do you read newspapers and magazines?', and 97 per cent said 'Yes'. A number of interesting reasons were given why they read those newspapers and magazines, ranked in order of priority. I asked, 'Do you listen to the radio up to 10 hours a week or more than 50 hours a week?' I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* a short table that gives the responses. I assure the House that it is purely statistical.

Leave granted.

LEISURE STATISTICS

(7) Do you read magazines or newspapers?

Replies	416	(94.1 per cent)
Yes	405	(97.4 per cent)
No	11	(2.6 per cent)

Questions 8 and 9 are available on request.

(10 and 11) Do you listen to radio?

Replies	355	(80.3 per cent)
Up to 10 hours a week	133	(37.5 per cent)
Between 10 and 20 hours	84	(23.7 peer cent)
Between 20 and 50 hours	108	(30.4 per cent)
More than 50 hours	30	(8.4 per cent)

Mr LEWIS: I also seek leave to insert in *Hansard* a table that indicates the amount of television by category up to 10 hours a week or more than 50 hours a week in a range of four points to demonstrate that behaviour.

Leave granted.

LEISURE STATISTICS

(12) How much TV do you watch each week?

Replies	390	(88.2 per cent)
Up to 10 hours a week	129	(33.1 per cent)
Between 10 and 20 hours	136	(34.8 per cent)
Between 20 and 50 hours	115	(29.5 per cent)
More than 50 hours	10	(2.6 per cent)

Mr LEWIS: Thirty, or 8.4 per cent, of the respondents listen to the radio for more than 50 hours a week and 10, or 2.6 per cent, of the respondents watch television for more than 50 hours a week. I find that disturbing. Equally disturbing was the fact that almost 30 per cent watched television for more than 20 hours but less than 50 hours. Members must remember the points I made about attendance at church, and so on. I asked how the respondents felt

about the penalties imposed for breaking the law, and I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* a five line table that indicates the range of opinion from 'Much too harsh' to 'Totally inadequate'.

Leave granted.

LAW AND ORDER

In general how do you feel about penalties for breaking the law?

Replies	370	(83.7 per cent)
Much too harsh	9	(2.4 per cent)
Harsh	16	(4.3 per cent)
About right	117	(31.6 per cent)
Too soft	195	(52.7 per cent)
Totally inadequate	33	(9.0 per cent)

Mr LEWIS: Of those respondents who said that the penalties were about right, too soft or totally inadequate, the percentage of people was more than 90 per cent. I was astonished to find that 31.6 per cent of these young people said that the penalties were about right; 52.7 per cent, more than half, said that they were too soft; and 9 per cent said that they were totally inadequate. I was amazed at that. In answer to other questions relating to the four worst crimes and crimes that were overrated by the media, the subjective opinion on the last question was that drink driving was being overrated by the media. That is the opinion of young people about drink driving. I believe that means that we have an education problem. Chasing random breath testing, spending more money in that area, and doing other things like trying to prosecute people for drinking are unlikely to bring about a change in drinking habits.

I would put the view strongly, based on that information, that we need to engage in a far more effective education program than we have hitherto.

Another question dealt with concerned whether there were enough police in the community. In reply, 57 per cent said 'Yes' and the balance 'No'. I asked them whether they thought police spent their time correctly and the replies were in about the same proportions as those to the previous question. A regression analysis of these factors is available. Some interesting facts emerge from the survey. One correlation concerns the year in which the young people left school as against their marital status. This tends to bear out my earlier remarks about their intentions to marry. About 40 per cent of those who left school at the end of 1979 were married by age 21, a further 14 per cent in the next year, and a further 11 per cent by the end of 1981.

A further table deals with the level at which the respondents left school and their difficulty in getting people to understand them. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a short table showing the correlation between the year at which the respondents left school and their perceived difficulty in communicating.

COMMUNICATION FACTOR

What level did respondent leave school C.F.? Do you have difficulty getting people to understand what you tell them?

	Have Difficulty	Have No Difficulty	Unanswered
Year 8	1	1	1
Year 9	6	11	1
Year 10	28	39	3
Year 11	36	111	4
Year 12	39	136	2
Continued Education	—	2	—
	110	300	11

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

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

METROPOLITAN TAXI-CAB ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 September. Page 1242).

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I support in principle the changes that are effected by the Bill but, in supporting the Bill, I wish to express several concerns on behalf of many private entrepreneurs who are directly involved in this industry. In 1956, the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act was revised and a board of 12 members established. In 1973, the membership of the board was reduced to eight, and at that time considerable discussion ensued concerning the way in which the board was functioning. In 1985, a select committee was appointed to review the structure of the board and to make recommendations on the general running of the taxi-cab industry.

The select committee, which reported in May 1985, recommended the establishment of a board of 11 members, as follows: two representing the owner drivers; one the radio service companies; one the Employers Federation (representing the Taxi-Cab Operators Association); one a driver currently employed in the industry who was a member of the Transport Workers Union; one to be elected by the Adelaide City Council; one with local government experience; a member of the police; and three members appointed on the recommendation of the Minister, one involved in the tourism industry, one with managerial and entrepreneurial experience and one with the knowledge of the transport industry.

The select committee recommended that a large board of 11 members be established but, as the Government considered that this number was large and unwieldy, the Bill provides that the board shall have only seven members. However, the content of the board seems to be in line with the recommendation of the select committee, the only omission being, surprisingly, a member of the Police Force. In Committee, the Opposition will ask the Minister why the proposed board does not include the Police Commissioner or his representative.

Concerning membership of the board, the Opposition will require an assurance from the Minister that the Minister's nominees will not be bureaucrats. The industry, which has expressed great concern on this point, wishes to be assured that such nominees are not all public servants—that they are in fact industry representatives and not just purely and simply bureaucrats. Again, in Committee I will seek such an assurance from the Minister.

In his second reading explanation, the Minister made several statements that I believe are inaccurate and on these matters the Opposition requires the Minister's comment. The first of these matters concerns the Minister's statement

that the Government has successfully introduced the one licence plate system and, although that may be argued administratively, a little time spent talking to the owner drivers of taxi-cabs around the city will reveal that considerable concern and ill feeling exist in the industry about the introduction of the new system. Therefore, the Opposition will require the Minister to amplify his statement that the one plate licensing system has been introduced successfully.

Another matter of concern involves a suggestion that two persons shall be nominated at the request of the Minister by a body or bodies representing the interests of persons engaged in the metropolitan taxi-cab industry. I understand that in the last few days there have been significant changes in this area. Perhaps the Minister will indicate the effects of these changes. Indeed, I believe that one company has pulled out, and the Opposition would like to know what the effect of this will be on the TCOA as a nominating body. I do not object to that organisation nominating members of the board but, because of the changes in the past few days, the Minister should comment on this matter.

In his second reading explanation, the Minister said that no longer will a Transport Workers Union representative necessarily be the industrial relations representative. As he would know and as I am now aware, only a few taxi drivers are members of the Transport Workers Union. If there is to be a person with industrial relations input it would be much better for the industry if a broader concept applied than just purely and simply a member of the TWU. If a member of the TWU has that broad knowledge then we would not be too concerned about them being involved.

There has been some concern about the appointment by the Minister of a chairman. Again, I ask that the Minister clarify why it is important that the Government appoint the chairman. It seems to me that the seven people on that board could adequately decide who should be chairman. It may end up being one and the same person, but it is interesting that not only does the Minister wish to appoint three people to the board: he also wishes to make certain that one of the seven is appointed chairman by himself.

As the change to the board is, in principle, roughly that recommended by the select committee, we approve of it. One area of concern is that in making up the board the select committee said that there is a need for owner drivers to be directly represented. While the Minister's second reading explanation indicates that, the words used in the Bill are not specific enough to ensure that an owner driver, and not just a person who has a taxi-cab driver's licence, is that representative. I know that the Minister said this during the second reading explanation, but it is an area of concern to many people in the industry because, as the Minister would know, the industry is principally one of small business where the owner is the driver and conducts his business and, in the past, has not been seen to be reasonably represented on the Taxi-Cab Board. The select committee spent a lot of time looking at owner driver representation on the board, and its final conclusion clearly sets out the need to ensure specifically representation of the owner driver.

Before turning to the responsibilities of the board, I take the opportunity to mention a few important issues in this significant change. In establishing a new board, we are saying that the rules of yesterday need to be changed, and that we really need to start again. If we are to do that we need to recognise some of the problems and issues at stake, so that the board, when it is formed, can quickly look at these issues and do something about it.

I take this opportunity to indicate some of the issues that have been clearly put to me. First, a matter that has been around the industry for some time concerns the TCOA. While it is said to represent, in theory, some 80 per cent of the industry, there is much questioning as to whether the TCOA really is a representative body. While I understand its constitution where the radio service companies had a direct interest in it and the independent owners now have representation on the board, there is a very strong feeling in the industry, and particularly among the significant number of independent owner drivers who belong to other associations, that while the TCOA argues to be representative of 80 per cent it should not be the only body that is considered when looking for nominations for the board.

I recognise that in the end the Minister has to make a choice, but it is important in this debate to again remind the Minister that there is some concern that the TCOA is not the only body that could be nominating independent owner drivers. Obviously, the other two groups are the Cab Owners Association and the very small but vocal Independent Association. Their argument is that in any democratic process they believe they should be heard. As I said previously, there is no question that the one plate issue, while it was supported by both sides of the House, is not a dead issue.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: Well, it is being supported, in any case. Whilst the Minister has said that it has worked very effectively, if he were to travel in a few cabs and talk to some of the owner drivers he would realise it is still an important issue that will not disappear very quickly. As I mentioned earlier, owner driver's rights need to be preserved. In fact, there is a suggestion that some of their rights under the regulations are to be taken away, and the previous board attempted to take away one important right, namely, choosing whether taxi radio alarm systems should or should not be compulsory. However, I understand the safety benefits of belonging to an all encompassing system.

It is unrealistic in an industry, where principally all the drivers are owner drivers and small businessmen, that they should not be brought under some bureaucratic system which makes sure that they toe the line on a particular safety measure. As long as they are seen to be recognising this and doing something to protect themselves, then I believe that right should be maintained. Another controversial issue is whether we have enough taxi-cab licences and need to extend the number of licences. In discussing that with the owners, no-one has indicated a need for that, and I understand that clearly. However, it is an issue that the board will have to confront very quickly. South Australia does not have a cooperative for the supply of radio messages. A number of people are talking about this, and whether or not it gets off the ground is up to the individual because, like any cooperative, unless individuals decide to work together that matter has virtually no legislative backing. However, the board will need to look at it and have an influence on it.

The effect of the TWU and the unionisation of the industry is an area that is causing concern. It may be very slight, but because few companies are involved in the industry it would be easy to make it a closed shop, and many people are concerned about that. We hope that the Minister will not only advise the board about that but comment on it in this House.

The final issue that relates not to the Bill but to another Bill that may be in this House soon is the banning of smoking in taxis. I commented on the alarm system, and the Government needs to be aware in this matter that one is taking away an individual's right to decide what occurs in his business or on his premises, which in this case happens to include a four-wheel motor vehicle. After all, these

people own the business—the cab—and should be able to stipulate smoking or non-smoking.

An area of concern is that there has been no consultation at all with the industry and there was purely and simply a decision of Government dropped on individuals within the industry. Many of the drivers are concerned that their rights and privileges are not being considered at all in this instance. It is better that I do not repeat words used by them to describe the individual who might have brought in the legislation. However, the drivers are concerned that their rights are being taken away without any discussion with the industry or the individuals concerned.

The second section of the Bill relates specifically to the new responsibilities of the board, and we support it because they are in line with the recommendations of the select committee. We recognise that in today's world, compared with 1956, the industry has to have a totally different face. It needs to be more entrepreneurial, to be given the opportunity to expand and change, and be given the right to look at new ways of using a taxi. I would hope that one day the Minister might even consider it in reducing the STA deficit. We will wait to see what happens in that area. We very much support this entrepreneurial change.

We have a couple of other queries in relation to the term of office of the board. It is not clear in the legislation that the recommendation that the Minister has made in his second reading explanation can be achieved. We will question that at the Committee stage. The final area of comment is that, in introducing a brand new board and setting up some brand new functions, one of the very important comments that the select committee made was that we need to introduce a new appeals system. I note that with this legislation there has been no introduction of a new appeals system. The select committee went into the problem of judge and jury at considerable length. As a consequence it recommended that a special appeals committee, separate from the board, should be set up.

I had the privilege, prior to coming into this House, of being on the Pharmacy Board and we had the same situation of judge and jury. It is an impossible situation in which to place members of a board when a person is before the board because a wrong has been committed. They then nominate a couple of people *via* the Act to sit on a special committee. Having been pulled up they then sit down as the jury, make a comment as to whether or not the person is guilty under appeal, and then come back to the board and say what is now the penalty. A system exists, even with the changes, of judge and jury. It is a pity that the Minister has not taken the opportunity to correct that position.

The other point made by the select committee was the need to set up a standards committee to look at the service that taxi-cabs were giving to the public; in other words, we had a committee that would not only look at taxi-cabs and their operations but look at how the consumer was being affected, whether consumers were being looked after, whether the cabs were clean, and what sort of service was offered. It is a pity that that aspect has not been looked at.

Some other small areas mentioned by the select committee involve an investigation into the role of radio companies and I have mentioned that briefly in talking about a possible cooperative. It referred to the possible introduction of a taxi industry development fund to look at ways and means of developing some entrepreneurial promotion scheme as it relates to the industry.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport): I thank the Opposition for its general support of the Bill, and accept that it could be described as a Committee Bill because many questions could be asked at that time. I will respond to some of the statements of the shadow Minister. At the outset I state that this is the second stage of a process of action the Government is taking in response to the select committee report. The first was the decision to move to a one plate system, and I am interested in the comments of the honourable member. I had not heard those comments myself. It was my understanding that, while there was certainly a deal of unhappiness and resentment within the industry when the decision was made to move to a one plate system, there has been by and large an acceptance that it is here to stay and that the industry generally has been able to get together much more effectively as a result of that decision than it had hitherto achieved.

The second action we have taken as a Government (and I announced this last year) was to bring in the legislation to constitute the new board and to set the objectives of the board. It is important that we have a new board established. The honourable member has canvassed that because it is the new board that will be required to administer the new regulations. Currently an officer in my department has almost completed a review of the regulations. Many of the issues the honourable member has raised today, whilst not part of this legislation, are in fact part of the regulations. That review is almost completed and I hope to have the opportunity before the end of this month to make some statements about that. So, the second part of the process is now under way.

The third part of the process is a review of the regulations. The honourable member mentioned that he felt the Government should have introduced with this legislation something to do with appeal provisions, etc. They will be picked up in the review of the regulations and the Parliament in due course will consider them either through subordinate legislation or any necessary further amendments to the Act. I appreciate the Opposition's acceptance of the Government's move towards a board smaller than that recommended by the select committee. We gave that subject much consideration and thought that the recommendations of the select committee, whilst valid in their own right, that the board should comprise 11 members, was unwieldy. So, the Government tried to refine it and make the board more efficient.

Nevertheless, at least four of the seven members of the board will be recommended to me, as Minister, by the organisations they represent. I will have a nomination from the Adelaide City Council and will be bound, I should say, to accept it. As Minister, I am not one who requires a panel of three and then chooses the one I feel most suitable. I tend to operate from the viewpoint that, even if a panel of three is given to me, I will accept the preferred nomination of the body represented. The same thing applies to the Local Government Association. They know who best will represent their view, and I will be bound to accept their nomination.

The question about representation from the industry was one with which we had difficulty in arriving at the appropriate wording of the provision. It certainly was our intention to have a representative from the industry and one who participated in the industry—an owner driver, if you wish. What we did not want to do was deny the right of the taxi-cab industry body to nominate to me, as Minister, the person it felt would best represent the industry. That might well have been a taxi-cab owner driver or a driver. The industry itself might have felt that it would be best represented by somebody who was a driver. That was really a decision it could make. I was not going to circumscribe

its ability to nominate to me the best person it felt it had available.

The reason why we have not written into the legislation the Taxi-Cab Owners Association (the TCOA) is that at this stage, as the honourable member has pointed out, the industry has not been able to unite, as we hoped it would, and develop a constitution and be able to democratically represent the total industry, or even 80 per cent to 85 per cent of it. So, we did not write into the legislation from which bodies I would be seeking the nominations. I would still want to speak to those people who represent the majority of the industry, but unless the industry can get itself together and it can be quite clearly shown to represent the majority of the people within the taxi-cab industry, then the Minister has, within this provision, the right to accept a nominee of a body or bodies representing the interests of the person engaged in the metropolitan taxi-cab industry, which includes all those bodies the honourable member has referred to.

I would much rather a system where the industry is represented or there is a body representative of all the industry that can take a democratic vote within its own organisation and give me its preferred nominee or nominees. If it is unable to do that, then the provision allows the Minister to take what action is necessary to ensure that there is a fair representation. So, I think the honourable member's concerns and those of the people who have contacted him should well be looked after there. I must get back to my original statement: it is my earnest wish that the industry can get itself together, combine as one, have a constitution that represents them all, and have a democratic vote of all the people in the industry and recommend to me as Minister the preferred representatives.

The honourable member asked why we have deleted the police representation. As Minister of Police in a previous Government, I am aware that many of our senior police officers are sitting on committees around the State—very worthy committees—doing work that really it is not necessary for them to do. I think the Commissioner of Police would not greatly disagree with what I am saying. Any advice that the Police Department can render to the Taxi-Cab Board can be obtained by an officer of the board or the Chairman of the Taxi-Cab Board contacting the police and making the appropriate inquiry, if in fact an inquiry is needed. As the honourable member is aware, there is a process whereby anybody who wants to go into the industry fills out a form so that the Taxi-Cab Board can refer it to the Police Department to obtain information with the approval of the applicant.

There is no need for a member of the Police Force, as a representative of the Police Force, to be on the committee. That does not deny people who are in the Police Force or any other professionals from being appointed as individuals. It is normal Government practice for the Minister (or the Governor, in fact) to retain the right to appoint the Chairman. I do not know any of the honourable member's colleagues in Government who did not ensure that they, as Minister, would recommend to the Governor who would be the Chairperson of any of the committees that they established under Statute. It is common Government practice, one that I strongly support, that the Governor, through the advice of his Minister, should appoint the Chairman of the committee.

Questions about the alarm, taxi-cab licences, and closed shop, etc., are really for the Taxi-Cab Board to address. I do not think I will be contributing anything to the debate by canvassing them widely here, except to say that, because of the nature of the industry, I cannot imagine that a closed shop would be developed. If it was easy to organise the industry, the industry would be organised, but it is a whole group of small enterprises which quite obviously do not want to be organised. If that was the case, I am sure that the TWU would have already done so, but there is not a very high representation of the TWU in the industry and it is acknowledged. We have acknowledged that by not writing into the legislation a requirement for a representative of the TWU.

I believe that the board itself will benefit from people who have a good understanding of industrial processes, and that covers a wide field, as the honourable member has pointed out. That was written into the legislation. That also applies with the other two nominees or appointees of the Minister who have expertise in tourism and the transport industry.

In relation to the term of office, I appreciate the honourable member's pointing out to me that he would raise this matter. I have made my own inquiries and am led to believe by my legal advisers that the clause is appropriate to do what the Government is seeking to do. It seeks to appoint a board but to appoint some members for four years and some members for two years so that they then roll over and the whole board does not retire at the one time. The provision was worded in such a way as to allow the Minister to appoint persons for less than four years. They can then be appointed for the next four years when the appointments come up. They can be appointed after two, three or four years so that there is a rolling change in the membership.

I point out also that it might very well be the case—and I have no views at the moment about who should be appointed to the board—that at least four of them will be nominated to me. There may be an instance where an excellent person will be available for membership of the board for only two or three years, and I really think the Government and the taxi-cab industry should have the freedom to take advantage of that should the situation occur. I understand that the honourable member will be raising other questions in the Committee stages.

The smoking issue will be dealt with by a piece of legislation that is currently being debated in the Upper House and will be debated in this place. I am a member of the Government and, as it is Government legislation, I think it is rather futile for the honourable member to ask me to support it. As a Minister of the Government that has brought that legislation to the House, of course I support it. He would find it curious indeed if I were to say otherwise.

The second matter is in respect of the alarm. I think the decision about the alarm was the proper decision that the Taxi-Cab Board should make. I know that it was very strongly opposed by a section of the industry that took recourse to legal action to preserve what they considered to be their rights. As I understand it, they had some success in that legal action. Nevertheless, that does not mean that the decision of the Taxi-Cab Board was in any way a corruption of the rights of the board, in a sense. I do not believe that they exceeded their rights in trying to ensure that the industry was a safe industry, not only for the workers within it but also for the customers. Some owners who drive their own taxis do not have a worker or employee driving it for the rest of the 24 hours. All taxis should be on the roads for 24 hours, but not all are—and that probably relates to another query that the honourable member raises about numbers of licences, and I am not in a position to answer it.

Not all taxi operators who have licences are on the road for 24 hours a day, but they are licensed in that regard. Where a taxi owner has an employee, that taxi owner has a responsibility towards that employee: he must ensure that

at all times the employee is provided with appropriate safety measures. That was one of the motivating reasons for the Taxi-cab Board supporting the installation of alarms in all cabs. That matter is being dealt with elsewhere. I do not believe that the board acted inappropriately, although that is what the independent taxi owners believe.

I appreciate the support of the Opposition for this measure. It is another step towards ensuring that Adelaide continues to enjoy the best level of public transport in Australia, and I believe that the taxi industry is essentially a part of that system.

I want to make one further comment: I believe that when people in the industry argue about the Government's right to make decisions (and the installation of alarms and other decisions that the Government has made are involved) they should understand that the value of the taxi licence is primarily due to Government legislation. This is a protected industry. One cannot get into the industry unless one purchases a licence from a licence holder or the Government provides additional licences. Therefore, the value of the licence relates primarily to the limited number. Certainly, a licence holder can improve his or her service or cab: they can provide an excellent standard of service and thus they might get a little more custom. The value of a cab licence is $60 000, and we can be absolutely certain that that value is a result of Government legislation.

Mr Ingerson: It has nothing to do with people not smoking in cabs.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: No, but we can be absolutely certain that the value of any licence would decrease dramatically if the Government was to say, 'Let us deregulate the industry' or 'Let a hundred flowers bloom' so that there are a thousand licences. That is why it is there. People disagree about the Government's right to impose requirements on the industry because they say that individuals purchase their licence and spend all that money, but those people misunderstand that the protection for that investment is Government legislation. That is what protects the investment and ensures that, if someone buys a licence for $60 000, they can sell it for $65 000 or $70 000 in 12 months. That is because the Government ensures the value and the viability of the licence—there is no other reason for it. I am prepared to debate that point at the appropriate time, but the legislation does not cover that area. I was merely responding to a statement made by the honourable member. I thank the Opposition for its support.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Constitution of board.'

Mr INGERSON: Will the Minister clarify whether the words 'one of whom shall be the holder of a taxi-cab driver's licence' mean an owner driver?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: No, they do not. I pointed out that that would be our intention. The clause has been worded in that way to provide the industry with the opportunity to select from within the total industry the people who will best serve their purpose. I can assure the honourable member that an owner driver will be a member of the board, if that is the undertaking he wishes from me, but I do not want to circumscribe the right of the industry to make a recommendation to the Government about who best represents it. As the honourable member will note, the Minister also has the right to make nominations to the board.

Mr INGERSON: I thank the Minister for that explanation: it is an assurance that the select committee requested, and the second reading explanation stated clearly that was to be the case. But the Bill does not seem to provide that. I accept the Minister's assurance. Will the three representatives of the Minister, as provided under clause 3 (2) *(d)*, be bureaucrats? I do not necessarily mean people with experience of a taxi-cab: I refer basically to those outside the bureaucratic system.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I have not considered that matter, but I do not believe that any of them will be bureaucrats. There would have to be some fairly strong persuation for me to appoint as a member of the board someone from the Public Service or a bureaucrat. I intend to appoint people from outside the Public Service.

Mr INGERSON: There will be a time limit in relation to nominations. How will that be applied and what time limit does the Minister envisage?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will ascertain what time limit we propose: that has not yet been established. It will allow the Minister to make an appointment if one of the representative bodies refuses to do so.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—'Repeal of s. 5 and substitution of new sections.'

Mr INGERSON: I want to refer to some of the statements made by the Minister in relation to the number and value of licences. I would support the Minister's argument that the Government, by protecting the size of the industry, in fact guarantees a value on the licence, and that value is now about $60 000. I do not support the Minister's argument that onerous conditions, such as the implementation of the smoking ban—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am not quite clear to which part of the clause the honourable member is referring.

Mr INGERSON: I refer to new section 4a in relation to the provision of an effective and efficient service. I want to ask the Minister questions, but I would like to make a brief explanation first.

The CHAIRMAN: I apologise to the honourable member. I was having trouble in connecting his remarks to the clause.

Mr INGERSON: An onerous condition could be the application of a radio alarm if it is not required or desired by the individual. The fact that smoking is not allowed in taxi-cabs is an onerous condition but it does not in any way increase the value of the cab. I understood that the Minister thought that the imposition of onerous conditions would do that. The fact that they control the industry does that. What is the Government's attitude to increasing the number of licences?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: At present, I have no proposal before me to increase the number of licences. That would be a matter on which the new board would have to make recommendations to me as Minister. I had no such recommendation from the previous board.

Mr INGERSON: Is the provision concerning the safety of the public and of taxi-cab drivers included in the Bill as a result of previous difficulties experienced by the board in making rules and regulations about the radio alarm system? Does this provision give the board the power to enact a regulation that would encompass all taxi drivers?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The short answer is 'Yes'. However, we need to ensure that the functions of the board are made clear. Certainly one such function is the safety of the public and of the drivers. The board would have to consider all decisions made in pursuance of that function. The problems experienced in the introduction of the radio alarm system would be one reason for clearly stating in the legislation that this is a function that the board should fulfil.

Mr INGERSON: In his second reading explanation, the Minister referred to statistics that the board should provide and economic reviews that it may be required to undertake. In making that statement, what did the Minister have in mind?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: At this stage I have no proposals before me except this Bill. The regulations are being reviewed, and many of the matters that are being addressed by the honourable member may well be dealt with in that review. Until the new board is appointed I do not intend to act. It is only appropriate that I should wait until the new board is appointed before suggested changes to the regulations are canvassed. The new board will review the regulations, but I have no recommendations to make to it at this stage.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 9) and title passed.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): On behalf of the Opposition, I accept that many regulations must be enacted quickly. Constant consultation takes place with the industry because some of these matters are touchy and their consideration requires maximum input from the industry and the Government. The Opposition will closely consider any changes in the regulations when they come before the Subordinate Legislation Committee.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member has my assurance in that regard. I realise that members opposite will look closely any new regulations when they are submitted to the Subordinate Legislation Committee.

Bill read a third time and passed.

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

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

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): It will come as no surprise to members that I wish to talk about the painters and dockers issue, which will not go away in a week, a month or six months. The Premier's actions yesterday in this regard were totally reprehensible. He knows, as every other member knows, that the reports on the painters and dockers indicate that, under threats and intimidation, extraordinary sums are being paid across the Port Adelaide wharves to allow ships to move. The Premier said yesterday that he would allow shipping companies to come forward in the full glare of the spotlight so that they could make their allegations. However, I remind him that the shipping companies at Port Adelaide have already come before the Costigan Royal Commission and the Sweeney Royal Commission but have received no justice as a result.

More importantly, rather than talk about individuals, we should talk about South Australia, because anything that adversely affects South Australia damages its reputation and should be stopped immediately. Behind the Premier's statement is his reliance on the intimidation that remains within the system to bury the issue. As everyone, including the Premier knows, the shipping companies cannot come forward because, if the threats are not sufficient to stop them, the ability of the painters and dockers to tie up the ships under their control in any Australian port will mean the end of business for the companies.

He knows that that puts them in a very invidious situation. If he believes that there is some truth in the matter—and there have been two reports that have shown that there is some truth to the problems on the waterfront—a simple investigation by his departments would clearly show that there are problems. However, we have no guarantees or undertakings from the Premier. It would be a simple matter of the Premier's instructing one or two of his officers to find out whether there was any truth to the allegations. He could send them down there to talk to the shipping agents and the painters and dockers. If that process was followed the Premier would find that the allegations were true.

If he finds that the allegations are true the Premier has only one course of action, and that is to either rid the Port Adelaide wharves of the painters and dockers or apply such stringent controls on their operations that the port once again becomes workable. If people wish to look at these reports, they are in the Parliamentary Library. As this House has been told, 60-odd pages of the Costigan report are devoted to the South Australian wharf situation. Members opposite know that social security fraud and other matters were evidenced by Costigan. Cargo stealing and work practices were also evidenced.

When we talk about work practices, we are talking about work paid for but not done, workers who did not exist, and work that did not exist. Costigan made no secret of the fact that people who were dead or missing were suddenly turning up on manning schedules in Port Adelaide. Suddenly this phantom labourer would be in Port Adelaide and be charged up to the painters and dockers. He knows that if there was a need—

Members interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: The member for Newland says that she does not understand. Perhaps she should visit the wharves and have discussions with the shipping agents and the painters and dockers to get their points of view. She would then understand that there are difficulties on those wharves, and that this is doing no good to South Australia's reputation.

The painters and dockers readily admit that they are tying up clean ships and that they have demanded that those ships be cleaned again because of an agreement among union members, backed up by the ACTU, that the only cleaning that shall be done on coastal shipping shall be done by the painters and dockers, irrespective of whether those ships were clean when they came into Port Adelaide and irrespective of the fact that they can pass the survey. This cleaning is carried out at exorbitant rates.

If members go to Port Adelaide they will also find that the timing for the work involves a rather interesting practice. The longer this union keeps on the pressure the quicker that the agents will agree to their demands. Perhaps members should ask the agents how they have got on with some of the international shippers when they have to ring them and say that they could not get the ship moved unless they paid $5 000, $10 000, $16 000, or $38 000 to move the cargo. The shippers ask the agents whether they can negotiate a better deal, so they go back to the painters and dockers but are told that they will not decrease the price or that they will drop it by only $1 000. This is related not to the cost of cleaning the ship but purely to the demands placed on the ship agents.

Inevitably the owners of the ship say to the agents that it is costing a fortune to have the ship tied up in Port Adelaide—leaving aside the cost of the cargo, the waiting and tying up a ship's time, the wharf charges and not delivering the grain on time. There is also the cost of running the ship. When the owners add up the dollars they realise that if they remain in port another day it will cost an extra $10 000, $20 000 or $50 000, depending on the nature of the ship and the agreement. They then say that they can get out of port straightaway if they pay the exorbitant rates. If they do not get out of port, they cannot deliver, and there have been ships that have not been able to deliver because of the practices on the Port Adelaide wharves. Those practices exist not only on that wharf but on wharves right across Australia.

It just so happened that Costigan identified Port Adelaide in one respect, and that was in relation to work practices. The painters and dockers will readily admit that they are after the skins of the people who are bringing in ships from overseas. There is an agreement in relation to coastal ships and, if they find out from their interstate colleagues that a ship has been cleaned by painters and dockers elsewhere, it is left alone. If it has not been cleaned, then they insist that it be cleaned at Port Adelaide.

However, international ships are fair game. What appals me more than anything is that members on the opposite side, and indeed the Premier, are willing to let these practices continue. The Premier believes that we can continue to allow extortionate demands to be placed on international shipowners. I do not know what the members of this House think about the reputation of South Australia or Australia, but it is something special to me. We have enormous problems with unemployment, yet time and again the work practices that operate—and I have identified the wharf at Port Adelaide—indicate to the rest of the world that we cannot deliver. In fact, we allow people who are committed to extortion and threats to continue to practise on the wharves.

I wonder, with the weight of evidence behind these two reports, why no action has been taken. Is it because some of these painters and dockers drink at the Colac Hotel—and we all know the link with the Colac Hotel? Is it a fact that when it comes to round-up time, when a ship comes into port, the Colac Hotel happens to be one of the places that has to be visited to collect labour?

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

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): Recently the Prospect City Council opened a village called the Little Adelaide Village, which was that council's contribution to providing a greater variety of housing, particularly for elderly people from the Prospect council area. It was also a demonstration of how a guarantee of security of tenure can be provided to people who wish to move into retirement villages. The Prospect City Council has provided to the Little Adelaide Retirement Village its imprimatur, support and backing.

Earlier this year I referred to the continuing population decline in some of the inner city areas and the need for councils in those areas to address themselves to that decline and provide a greater range and variety of housing types to ensure that people continue to be attracted to those areas; and, more particularly, to provide a range of housing types so that people would not have to move out of their areas as the houses they had been living in for many years perhaps became too large for them.

The example of the Little Adelaide Village is one which shows the Prospect City Council picking up both concepts. The village provides a complex that is suitable and adequate for people who have spent many years living in Prospect. This major housing initiative is a shining example of the entrepreneurial flair of local government. The 20 units comprising Little Adelaide Village are a first for local government in South Australia and are a major breakthrough in a practical way to ensure that local people can stay in the community that has been part of their lives for many years. Often when the children in a family move away and establish their own home the parents find that the family home is rather too large to manage and it is necessary to find a smaller unit. Those smaller units are often not available in established suburbs.

On this occasion the Prospect council has aggregated a sufficiently large package of land and put on it 20 units of one and two bedroom capacity to ensure that those people who have been part of Prospect do not have to move away from it. Retirement villages offer independence and guarantees of maintenance. New Government legislation will also guarantee a permanency of occupancy and will set down guidelines for the return of capital. But even before the State Government has introduced legislation for these guarantees, they have been provided to the residents of the Little Adelaide Retirement Village on the initiative of the council itself. This again indicates the capacity and preparedness of council to provide support to the people of its area.

The council has established a reputation over many years of doing all that it can to prevent its population from falling and to ensure that the community is well served by its local authority. It has attempted to provide an extended range and choice of housing types so that Prospecters do not have to move out of the district. It has attempted to provide an extensive range and choice of community and social services so that the people of Prospect are well and adequately served. There is no doubt that this new venture is a practical way of offering a service to Prospecters who know that the council is very much behind them in their desire to stay in their own area.

The initiative of the council, whilst new in the resident funded housing arena, is not its first in the housing area. It had in fact been involved earlier in a joint housing arrangement with the Housing Trust in that it provided land on which the Housing Trust was able to erect units, again primarily for people from Prospect and the northern suburbs. That joint initiative between the council and the Housing Trust was an excellent way of extending the range of housing choices available to people of the inner city areas and a way in which council contributed to the very large total combined cost of establishing new houses in its area.

Joint ventures have been entered into by the Housing Trust with a variety of councils, churches, voluntary care organisations and other groups referred to in the recent annual report of the Housing Trust. The community contribution of suitable building sites and assistance with the provision of services for the aged complements the provision of the bricks and mortar by the trust. That was the first occasion that the Prospect council moved into the area of providing accommodation for aged people. It was not, however, the first occasion on which the council became involved in aged care. Many years ago it appointed an aged care officer and one of the first of her concerns (and her continuing concern that led to the establishment of the Adelaide Village) was the provision of appropriate housing for people of the district. That first exercise was the Nailsworth Village, which provided a range of accommodation types for people of the northern suburbs and which is now ensuring that Prospect stands far ahead of many of the

councils in providing a range of services to their ageing residents. It includes social services, transport facilities through the use of the community bus, and a whole range of other services which I believe are making that area a very positive place in which old Prospecters can live.

Mrs Appleby interjecting:

Mr DUIGAN: As the member for Hayward has indicated, it is a shining example of the way in which councils can cooperate with the Housing Trust and provide opportunities for their people to continue to live in their own environment. A number of other initiatives have been taken recently by the Housing Trust in attempting to particularise and identify areas of housing need.

The Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, and in particular the local government community housing program, has set aside funds specifically to promote local government's involvement in the planning and provision of public housing. In addition to this area of aged housing, research will also continue into youth housing and the housing needs of the disabled.

The final point that I would like to make about the Little Adelaide Village and the way in which it has been established by the Prospect council is that it in fact moves councils from being involved in the planning of development to being involved in the promotion of particular sorts of developments in their districts. It is an example that will be picked up by many other councils throughout the State and will ensure that they continue to provide and plan for public housing in the inner metropolitan areas. I applaud it and congratulate the Prospect City Council.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I wish to use the time available to me this evening to raise yet again the issue of Eastern Standard Time and the proposal that the Government has before the House. More particularly, I will comment on a petition that I presented to this House yesterday with 11 182 signatures. Whilst that number is impressive, the important part that needs to be explained to the House is that all those signatures were collected in less than two weeks. In fact, to be more accurate, the wording of the petition was checked with my office on the Friday morning and it was to be ready by the following Thursday week. Assuming that the person responsible for checking the wording and then printing and distributing the petition forms would hardly have had a signature collected by Friday evening, 11 182 signatures were collected between the Friday evening and the following Thursday week.

That, Mr Deputy Speaker, demonstrates the depth of feeling that is held within my community and, I believe, in the wider part of South Australia, to this proposal of the Government. I say that with some conviction because, in addition to the residents on Eyre Peninsula who signed that petition, 313 signatories came from the mainland. I use the term 'mainland' referring to that part of South Australia this side of Spencer Gulf. So, the feeling is there. Those 'mainland' people were on Eyre Peninsula and saw the petition form, realised the ridiculous nature of the exercise, and were only too willing to sign. In most cases, a petition with 313 signatures is a large petition to come before this House, but one with 11 182 signatures I believe is probably the largest petition ever presented from a single electorate to this Parliament. That is something that this House needs to take into account. It needs to be pointed out loud and clear, that if the Government proceeds with this proposal, it will do so in direct defiance of the will of the people, and it will be on their shoulders if they proceed with it.

There has been considerable publicity, backwards and forwards, about the rights and wrongs of this issue. Quite frankly, I do not believe that the Government researched the issue before it went headlong into it. It has Ministers saying different things about different subjects on the issue. We have Ministers trying to defend the issue on the basis of a referendum on daylight saving. Eastern Standard Time and split time zones have nothing to do with daylight saving, yet the Government (and in particular one Minister) is running around this State saying that, because we have had a referendum on daylight saving, people would accept Eastern Standard Time and split time zones.

I point out that Eastern Standard Time and split time zones were both unconstitutional at the time the referendum was held. It was not then possible to have Eastern Standard Time or split time zones. Those factors are being misused and confused in the eyes of the general public. I will highlight some of the problems. I have related many of them already, and I apologise for that, but I have to use every minute available to me in this House to get the message across of some of the dilemmas that we have.

An article appeared in yesterday's *Advertiser* headed 'Regional TV Service Lobbies MPs to Block Time Zone Split'. I do not think that members of this House have even stopped to work out that issue. The report states:

> Several program standards would be affected if the State adopted two time zones.
>
> Preschool programs at 3.30 p.m. in the east would be televised at 2.30 p.m. in the west, which was an adults-only time.
>
> Children's programs between 4 p.m. and 5 p.m. would be shown between 3 p.m. and 4 p.m. in the west when children would not be out of school and during viewing time from 3 p.m. to 3.30 p.m. when programs are labelled 'Parental Guidance Recommended'.
>
> The *Midday Show* would be seen at 11 a.m. in the west and on weekdays national news would be at 5.30 p.m. and at 5 p.m. on weekends in the west.
>
> The submission says this is far too early for the working population and virtually in children's viewing time.
>
> 'Particularly serious are Adults Only-rated programs which, when screened in their correct time in the east at 8.30 p.m. will be seen by the West Coast at 7.30 p.m. which is PGR time, and at 7.30 p.m. it would be obvious that a large percentage of children would be still viewing,' it says. 'Locally produced programs, like Regional News/Sport, currently televised at 6 p.m. would then be at 5 p.m., a time when West Coast people would still be at work.
>
> Audience surveys throughout regional Australia highlight the importance and popularity of local news. Finally, with GTS closing down each night at around 11.30 p.m., the West Coast would have no commercial television after 10.30 p.m.'
>
> The submission says commercials are classified by the Federation of Australian Commercial Television Stations and are given a rating which determines in what time zone they can be played. 'Therefore it is quite possible for an AO commercial for underwear, personal or intimate products, alcohol, etc., played quite legally at 8.30 p.m. onwards on the east to be seen from 7.30 p.m. onwards on the west,' it says.

It is needless for me to point out that that is in fact illegal. The report continues:

> 'In revenue, GTS could suffer as a percentage of clients would withdraw advertising from prime programs that are in unpopular time zones. Certainly local revenue from the West Coast would be affected as people will not advertise if they feel their market is not available to them. If revenue is affected then undoubtedly so is employment and development.' The submission calls on MPs to vote in the 'best interests' of South Australia and reject the dividing of the State.

I could go on further with that issue but that is just one little aspect in the media. I guess I could comment on some of the other media proposals that say we should adopt Eastern Standard Time. My view is that, if we adopt Eastern Standard Time, we will become the lackey to the Eastern States. We will have relayed news services from Sydney and Melbourne and we might have a local tag at the end, but South Australia's identity will go by the wayside.

My secretary has advised me that some concerned elderly citizens contacted my office today about the time changes and more particularly about elderly people being able to

make use of the concession time for Telecom. We all know that Telecom allows phone calls at a concessional rate after 10 p.m. Elderly people require that, particularly those on a pension. However, we now find that elderly people in my electorate, if this legislation goes through as suggested, will in fact not be able to contact relatives or friends in the eastern part of the State because it will be after 11 p.m. in the eastern part of the State. It therefore becomes quite ludicrous for Telecom to suggest that any benefit can be arranged. Effectively, it dissociates or disfranchises Eyre Peninsula residents from the ability to avail themselves of that concession. Furthermore, what about all the parents, and more particularly the students in colleges, wishing to avail themselves of phoning their parents? Sure, they can contact them by ringing from this end—that is, at the student's expense—but as we all know, most of the contact has to come the other way.

It is just another one of those little issues that has not been thought out. The Government has said that it will consult with interested parties, but I say here and now that it has not consulted with interested parties on Eyre Peninsula. It has not consulted with any of the cities of the Iron Triangle area. At a meeting of the Spencer Gulf Cities Association only last Sunday the representatives of each of the towns—Port Lincoln, Port Pirie, Whyalla and Port Augusta—stood up independently and declared their total opposition to the introduction of Eastern Standard Time. It was soon after that that the Minister of Labour, the member for Whyalla, associated the referendum on daylight saving with the introduction of Eastern Standard Time. I am not sure how ridiculous this situation can get, but I believe that the ridiculous aspects have been highlighted: the Government is now starting to talk about drawing lines around Roxby Downs and Woomera for convenience. What about those who will be disfranchised?

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

Motion carried.

At 6.22 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 23 October at 11 a.m.