HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 11 February 1988

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

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Controlled Substances Act 1984. Read a first time.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It relates to the penalties which are applicable to the trafficking and growing of cannabis. Unfortunately, in our community we have seen an increasing trend towards the growing and importation of large-scale cannabis plantations. In fact, recently the police made drug arrests where plantations of the order of 300 to 800 plants were not uncommon. This trend, if it continues, will certainly place a growing stress on the drug law enforcement authorities in his State and will certainly contribute to the supply of this illegal drug in our community.

Under the present law, it is necessary to be convicted of being in possession of more than 1000 growing plants in order to receive the most severe penalties which the law allows—a $500 000 fine or 25 years imprisonment. This limit, in my view, is simply ridiculous. One thousand plants represents an enormous crop and, indeed, represents an enormous potential profit to the drug traffickers concerned, when one considers that one individual plant can be worth anything from $1000 to $2000. That would give a crop of some 999 plants a potential street value of between $1 million and $2 million. It is my view that this limit needs to be significantly reduced. The Bill before us proposes that the limit of 1000 plants should be reduced to 100 plants—a 10-fold reduction and the other relevant quantities of related substances are reduced proportionately.

The actual penalties applicable under the Act are not changed; what is changed is the threshold at which the more severe penalties become applicable. Quite clearly, those who seek to grow such drugs for their own consumption would need less than 10 plants and, at the most, one could suggest that a maximum of 20 plants would be involved in personal use. Those people who grow between 10 or 20 and 100 plants will attract the medium penalty under the Act, but those who grow more than 100 will, under this Bill, become liable for the most severe penalty.

I stress that it is my view that those who are engaged in the production of large scale plantations are clearly doing so with a view to trafficking in the drug, are probably linked to organised crime in one form or another, either directly or indirectly as the financier, and, quite clearly, the police need the impetus of these large-scale penalties to be applicable to somewhat smaller plantations. It is clearly an absurd proposition for anyone to suggest that the growing of 300 to 400 plants is a minor offence. The limit of 100 plants will provide a much more secure and realistic basis for our drug law enforcement, and on that basis I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr BLACKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMES (CONFISCATION OF PROFITS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Crimes (Confiscation of Profits) Act 1986. Read a first time.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Crimes (Confiscation of Profits) Act is a relatively recent innovation in this State, although some mechanism has always existed to recover the profits of certain criminal activities. The new Act, introduced by this Parliament recently, has now been in force for a reasonable time and several confiscation suits will be launched by the Attorney in order to recover the alleged profits of illegal activities in this State. However, it appears that the view held by some members of the judiciary is that, when a convicted person is likely to be subject to the confiscation of profits legislation, the imposition of a penalty for the original crime should be postponed until such time as the confiscation of profits action has been resolved by the courts.

The implication is that the original court will impose a lesser sentence as a result of the confiscation of profits from that activity. At the early stage at which the law is now implemented, we should ensure that the rules are clear cut and that everybody knows the implications of profiting through criminal activity. Accordingly, the Bill would require the courts to ignore the potential question of the confiscation of profits when fixing a penalty for the original offence and would allow the Attorney to proceed with the confiscation of profit action in the courts, notwithstanding any question of penalty in the original jurisdiction. This is much fairer, since it is quite inequitable for a sentence to be adjusted in accordance with other independent action by the Attorney to recover the profits of the original crime.

No person should be allowed to profit from criminal activity especially when one considers that the major areas of profit in this context are through drug dealing. The legislation should be allowed to take its full and natural course and should not be subject to amelioration by those members of the judiciary who would wish to view this legislation in a different way to that which Parliament originally intended.

It is a short Bill which simply requires the judiciary to disregard any potential action under the confiscation of profits legislation and allows it to proceed immediately with sentencing, notwithstanding the potential future action of the Attorney in seeking to recover the profits of illegal activity. I commend the Bill to the House on that basis.

Mr KLUNDER secured the adjournment of the debate.

EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Evidence Act 1929. Read a first time.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill seeks to make it unlawful to publish a person's name when they are accused of any offence in any court in the State. As members know this matter has been the subject of much debate in the community. I ask that members seriously consider this matter. I know that it is unlikely that this Bill will pass in this session and that it will probably need to be reintroduced next session. I first raised this matter 2½ years ago when I tried to amend a Government

Bill. I am aware that recently the member for Florey has expressed interest about this matter, but I am not sure whether he was suggesting that we go as far as this Bill suggests. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

This Bill seeks to change the law in the best democratic method—to protect the 'not guilty'. It does not close the courts to the public. All people will still be entitled to sit in the court and hear the evidence. This, of course, includes reporters. In the early days of course there were no televisions, wirelesses, and the like. Likewise, many could not afford newspapers, and many people never saw or read them.

Today, a juicy allegation against an individual can be transmitted worldwide within minutes, regardless of a person's guilt or otherwise. Unfortunately, an allegation that makes a headline today quite often hardly rates a mention if the individual is found not guilty. Why should a person's children be taunted at school, and snide remarks be made in the street towards an accused and/or their family when there is no more than a charge laid because of an allegation? Where is the justice in that?

If a person holds a position as a teacher and, for example, they are accused of stealing and the whole community is informed by the media, what chance has that person of retaining the position in that school, even when found not guilty?

Where do you go as a bank employee or teacher once tainted by publicity of an alleged offence of which one is found not guilty? How does a family with both partners working, one being accused of an offence, with public victimisation making it impossible to live in that community, even after a not guilty verdict, relocate? If the allegation is serious enough the media makes sure that there is no place in Australia that one can be immune from the taint. Where is the justice in an allegation being published against a member of a family in which there may be students doing the last part of their critical university studies or exams? If that mental trauma is enough to cause them to not achieve the result that they need to enter further education or a trade course, and if after they obtain their exam results a minute mention is made somewhere in the back pages of a paper that the allegation against the family member was not proven, is that justice?

In this Bill I have not attempted to cover one other point that I believe society would accept as a fair proposition, and that is to make it illegal to identify the relatives of an accused person whether or not that person is found guilty; because the relative happens to hold a position of public office or is a prominent business person, some in the media may mention the relative. What the heck has it got to do with seeking justice to have one's relative's misdemeanours or alleged misdemeanours tied to one's name? It is a pretty poor way to obtain a headline.

The media have a role to play in our society and some play it more responsibly than others, but that is understandable because that is the case in every profession or walk or life. That just displays that we are human. However, I often wonder why some media people go to extremes to the point of even making representations to court to have persons names released when the court, through its wisdom, has found reason to suppress the name.

I am convinced that the vast majority of people in the community believe that all names should be released or all suppressed and, if it was put to a referendum, the community would vote in favour of the principle of all names of accused people being suppressed unless they are found guilty, except for the provisos I have attempted to accommodate in this Bill.

I have included the provision to attempt to make it unlawful to publish material here that would be unlawful if published in any State or Territory of the Commonwealth where the action was taking place from which that material originated. I seek to do that, because I believe that, now that the ALP is moving to make it its policy—and I applaud it for that—to suppress the names of accused, this may cover the enthusiastic media people who want to publish material in a State other than where the action in law is taking place.

I am conscious that this Bill will not pass in this session of Parliament because of the huge backlog of private members' business, but I hope that my actions give the Government the impetus it needs to move in line with its State Party policy in making this law more democratic.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 seeks to allow the commencement date to be made by proclamation.

Clause 3 seeks to amend section 68 of the principal Act to define newspapers.

Clause 4 seeks to insert a new section 69aa which intends to make it an offence to identify a person charged with any offence unless they have been found guilty, or they wish their name to be published, but where there is an alleged victim the victim also agrees, or the court agrees to a police request to have a person's name released in the public interest or the court of its own volition believes it in the public interest to release the identity of the person. Definition of identity includes name, address, race, sex and occupation. It also makes it an offence to publish material in regard to proceedings under law in another State or Territory where that State or Territory prohibits such publication.

Clauses 5, 6 and 7 are consequential.

Mr DUIGAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

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

That this House condemns the Minister of Labour and the Premier for subverting the will of the Parliament by issuing proclamations to force retail trading on Saturday afternoons and demands that no further action be taken to extend Saturday trading beyond the month of February until such time as—

(a) an inquiry has been conducted by the Minister of Consumer Affairs and a report presented to Parliament on the following matters—

(i) the impact of increased costs associated with Saturday afternoon trading on the profitability of retail traders in shopping centres and shopping malls and the likely effect on prices of retail goods;

(ii) the future of Thursday night and Friday night shopping in the longer term; and

(iii) the problems facing motor dealers unable to purchase or sell vehicles on Saturday afternoons;

(b) legislative changes have been made which remove the right of managers of shopping centres and malls to force retail traders to open on Saturday afternoons and which ensure full and adequate protection from landlord intimidation; and

(c) Government support for wage demands by the Shop Assistants Union (SDA) currently before the State Industrial Commission, has been withdrawn.

This motion concerns retail trading hours and the extended trading issue. First, it condemns the Government for subverting the will of the Parliament, and in particular con-

demns the Minister of Labour and the Premier. Secondly, this motion seeks an inquiry into the impact of the proclamations made by the Minister of Labour for the months of January and February. The areas I have asked the Minister of Consumer Affairs to look into include the increased costs associated with Saturday afternoon trading, the impact on the profitability of retail traders, the price of retail goods, consumer concerns, shop assistants' concerns, and a variety of other matters.

The other area, of course, is Thursday and Friday night shopping. We know from experience in this State that that could be at risk if there is a movement in trade. I refer to the particular problems associated with motor vehicle dealers. They have been to the Minister of Labour and received short change from him on those issues. There is the question of protection for retail traders who are operating under leasing arrangements where there are more than six shops involved. Finally, there is the concern that was previously expressed about wage demands placed before the State Industrial Commission.

With the indulgence of the House I do not intend to spend a great deal of time on this debate. Certainly, I thank the member for Elizabeth for facilitating debate on my motion. I wish to provide an opportunity for Government members to respond within the timeframe allowed and, given that it is now 11.15 a.m. it will be possible, if I keep my speech brief, for Government members to do that. I would particularly like the Minister to respond.

It is worth taking the House back to the original debate and the concerns expressed by the Opposition at that time which have now come to fruition. The items on the agenda as far as we were concerned encompassed extended hours being on a voluntary basis. The Minister disregarded everyone in relation to that matter and said, 'If you want to trade, you can trade.' However, 2 000 people assembled on the steps of Parliament House to express their dissatisfaction about the situation. A large number of that strong-feeling contingent were small retail traders who are in a situation where they have no option in regard to trading, yet day after day the Minister regales people over the airways and says, 'If you want to open, you can.' We know that they cannot. Why does the Minister continue to mislead the public in this regard?

The question of costs is serious indeed. Members opposite have bandied about comments about social justice. What could be more socially just than having the cheapest goods possible on the market for the people of this State to buy? If there are cost implications, they should be well researched and understood. We know that the price of goods will increase as a result of this move. We do not want that to happen. We want South Australian consumers, and particularly the people who cannot afford to pay increased prices, to benefit from any changes. Certainly, we do not want them to be charged higher prices. As to wage demands, the Government has not fallen back from its original position of support—a quite extraordinary position. It is the first time in the history of the State Industrial Commission that a State Government has intervened in this way.

These were the matters debated in this House and they are important matters. The Parliament refused to pass the Bill, because none of these concerns were satisfied. The Minister and the Premier refused to have an investigation into the matters that I raised; they refused to look at the cost implications; they refused to look after the little people. And now we hear somewhere down the track that, because there is much anger directed at the Premier, the Attorney-General is saying, 'We will fix up leasing arrangements.' I understand that he is having great difficulty in that.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: They are going to have an inquiry into debt.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Government is also to have an inquiry into debt. Perhaps the Minister ought to talk to small shopkeepers. These are matters of great import: they are the matters that Parliament adjudged the Bill was deficient in in the first place. The Opposition believed that we should know what we were doing before we did it. The House should note my comments about support for extended trading hours under particular conditions. The Minister of Labour and the Premier decided that the Government would take a unilateral decision to change the rules although Parliament had clearly said, 'No'.

Mr D.S. Baker: They are two bob dictators.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes, they are two bob dictators, as my colleague the member for Victoria states. I have done some research and all the fears that were expressed in Parliament at the time are now coming to fruition.

I will now spend a little time taking the House through what has actually happened out there in the real world. We know that January was a trading disaster. I ask all members on the opposite side of the House who have any particular interest in small business or in the rights and needs of the consumers actually to go out and talk to the small business traders. For once in their lives they should get off their backsides and go and talk to these people. It might be an eye-opener, and members opposite may well discover that the anger in the community that has been generated by this action by the Government will flow on for at least two years and it will still be there at the time of the next election campaign. That may be the only compelling reason to shift the Government's viewpoint on this matter. If that is the case, then so be it. The Government will not shift its position because it has a feeling for poor people or because it has a feeling for small business in this State. However, if the Government believes that the bottom line could be electoral failure, it might take the necessary action.

I have canvassed an extraordinarily wide number of people in the retailing area, including shop assistants and retail traders right across the board. Everybody agrees that January was one of the worst trading months ever experienced in this State. Every store, except some food outlets, namely, the coffee shops and icecream shops, had an extraordinarily abysmal January. They made significant losses right across the board. During the month of January, because of poor trade and the high costs of staying open on Saturday afternoon, the membership of the Retail Traders Association, the major protagonist of this move, suffered quite heavy losses.

The February situation is somewhat different and is very clouded by a number of factors. There is no doubt that the major stores have picked up some trade on Saturday afternoon. There is no doubt also that one or two of the major centres have also picked up trade on Saturday afternoon. This increase has been accompanied by various promotional efforts such as the flea market in the Mall last Saturday. We knew that the back to school trade would increase significantly the patronage through the doors of the major stores.

Members interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: If members opposite do not wish to listen, they will bear the brunt. They are certainly not interested.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr S.J. BAKER: The facts of life are that, to date, I am unaware of any major store making a profit over this six

week period. I can certainly say that a very large number of small traders have made significant losses because of the Saturday afternoon trading situation, but that is of no concern to a Labor Government. In fact, when addressing the land tax issue, the Premier of this State said, 'If you don't like the heat in the kitchen, get out', or, more importantly, he said, 'If you are in an expensive locale, go and trade somewhere else, like up at Oodnadatta, so that you don't have to pay a land tax Bill.'

In this regard the same principle has been applied to the treatment of small business. Nobody has made a profit out of this little venture, which means that, somewhere along the line, we will lose a lot of business and small traders in this State who in the long term can drift only one way, and that is to the larger enterprises. That is their aim.

Mr Oswald: What happens to bankruptcies?

Mr S.J. BAKER: What happens to bankruptcies? I have received a significant number of phone calls from people in business who have said, 'We are going to the wall and, if this continues, it is only a matter of time.' As everybody would appreciate, they are under grave difficulties. Just recently it was reported in the newspaper that some 18 shops on Unley Road had closed. People in the centres are under great pressure and they will not be able to pay their bills.

We have seen some reports in the newspaper from spokespeople from the RTA and Westfield. All I can say is that somebody is not telling the truth. Let me tell the House why they are not telling the truth. They said that 750 000 people walked through stores during the month of January. I can only say that a mathematical genius must have been operating at the time, because it was the worst January in trading records. The people who did keep count were those who actually looked at their tills at the end of the day, and they found that their trade was well down on the equivalent period last year.

We know that 1987 was not a particularly good year. In that regard, when the rally was held outside Parliament House, I spoke to a shop assistant from one of the major stores, and that lady said that she was very concerned because, if trading continued in that vein, there would be no jobs tomorrow. That statement was made by someone who worked in one of the major retail stores. They are the people who were doing no custom and standing around on Saturday afternoon. I am not here to debate whether indeed there will be a demand in the long term for extended hours. That is not the purpose—

Members interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: If you want to read the speeches that I gave at the time—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Notwithstanding the disorderly interjections that are coming from the right of the Chair, the honourable member for Mitcham must direct his remarks through the Chair and not directly to members opposite.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I said that three matters had to be satisfied before there could be any agreement on that Bill, and the Opposition's stance on that matter has not changed. You know what our position is, because it has been quite clear from the very beginning.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham meant to say 'they know'.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Members opposite know well what the position is.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Henley Beach has interjected sufficiently for one day.

Mr S.J. BAKER: If members are unsure, I suggest that they go back and read the second reading speeches and the report of the debate that took place at the time so that they can refresh their memories. Our position has been totally consistent since then and, indeed, for a period of three years.

In a nutshell, the trading situation overall has been nothing short of disastrous for most people in the industry. One must question, then, why Mr Blevins should insist that they stay open when they are not making a profit. How can anybody justify being forced to stay open when there is no profit and no trade? Yet, Mr Blevins refused to address that issue.

Mr FERGUSON: I must take a point of order. Members in the Chamber must, I understand, refer to other members by their correct title and not by their name.

The SPEAKER: At the time of the alleged offence I was seeking advice on another matter but I did, I think, hear the general gist of the remarks to which the honourable member for Henley Beach has drawn my attention. I therefore remind the honourable member for Mitcham that he must refer to members by their correct title.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Florey is not assisting the debate; nor is the member for Eyre.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Thank you, Sir. Just to explain—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! For the honourable member for Florey to interject after being reprimanded comes very close to contempt of the Chair.

An honourable member: Put him out!

The SPEAKER: And the Chair receiving advice of that nature from the honourable member for Morphett is also close to contempt of the Chair.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I have spoken to a very large number of people on this matter. Indeed, I have a file, which members may wish to look at, that is now some nine inches thick involving people who have responded and expressed their point of view. Although I have not had a viewpoint expressed by the major retailers, I certainly have had one expressed by the small business people—the little people of this State who are being crushed by this Government, whether it be in relation to land tax, regulations or water rates, when they do not even have a tap in their shop; these people are getting crushed. I will briefly explain how people are surviving out there. The owner/operators in the small centres have had no easy options. They have simply had to work the extra hours. Most of them are working more than 60 hours already. Most of them—

Mr Gregory interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: The member for Florey said 'the people with Rolls Royces'. I am pleased that the member for Florey has actually said to this House—

Mr GREGORY: On a point of order.

Mr S.J. BAKER: —that all the small traders out there are running around in Rolls Royces.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Florey has a point of order.

Mr GREGORY: My point of order is that the member for Mitcham has a very poor memory. He cannot even repeat what I said in interjection.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order. The Chair does not look kindly on members from either side attempting to make political points—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham will resume his seat while the Chair deals with a

second expression of disrespect for the Chair from the honourable member for Morphett. I point out to the honourable member for Morphett that that is something that will not be tolerated under any circumstances. The honourable member for Florey and other members on both sides, who have been tempted to do so from time to time, should refrain from trying to express political points under the guise of making a point of order. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: It is quite obvious that members on the other side are attempting to have this debate extended until 12 o'clock so that they do not have the opportunity to respond. I have a certain amount of material and I said I would keep it as brief as possible, but it is quite impossible to do so when we have a continual barrage of interjections. If those interjections cease, I will be able to put a concise case. That case relates, first, to small shops in centres and malls. These have been the areas most significantly affected. People are simply not coming to these small centres. Saturday trading figures are well down on last year's efforts. They are particularly concerned that they will not be able to sustain their level of trade well into the future.

The people in that situation comprise two separate groups—the small people who own and operate their shops and the others who rely on employees to look after their shops. For the owner and family who actually run the shops, they have simply had to work the extra hours. They cannot afford to employ an extra person on Saturday afternoon, so most of those people work more than 60 hours a week, and members opposite would understand that. Most of them have just had to extend their working hours.

I do not know whether members opposite have had owners in tears on the phone because they are finding that not only is their profitability decreasing and their losses increasing, but also that their family life is being destroyed in the process. No-one, but no-one, can tell me that this Government should be embarking on a course which has ramifications of that nature. As a generalisation, almost everyone I have spoken to in that situation, in the small centres, is in very difficult circumstances. If members opposite have seen the way these traders' land tax bills have increased in the past three years, they may have some appreciation of the problems that they are facing. When we consider those shops employing staff to run the business, we find that there is a direct cost impact. All shops now have to comply with the 38-hour week, which was phased in on 1 February. So, immediately they have a 2.5 per cent increase in the costs of employing labour. Saturday afternoon work, with its high penalties, has added, on average, an additional 10 to 15 per cent to the wage bill. To restore parity, the price of goods sold will have to rise by about 5 per cent to cover the cost of Saturday afternoon trading for those people. Most shops at this stage are absorbing the costs to maintain patronage. The major impacts of extended trading for shops in this category have been reduced profits or increased losses, staff lay-offs and, in some cases, the threat of bankruptcy.

Those bearing the heaviest burdens are shops which require professional expertise to be available at all times, for example, pharmacies, electrical retailers and newsagents where the prices of goods are fixed. Spare a thought for the newsagents: they cannot change prices and they cannot recoup increased costs. The prices of the *Sunday Mail*, the *Advertiser* and the *News* are fixed, as is the price of greeting cards. Almost every item in a newsagent's shop is fixed. They do not have the ability to pass on increased costs, so what must they do? They have to live on a much reduced profit. Large losses have been incurred by shops that sell perishables, for example, bakehouses and fruit and vegetable shops. Previously excess produce could be disposed of quite readily on special after 11 a.m., but at 2 p.m. or later in the afternoon is no longer practicable.

Information from independently owned supermarkets states that whilst in relation to food items January was a little bit up on last year's figures—although January happens to be the worst trading month of the year on all fronts—they are finding that February is down. So, the independently owned supermarkets are finding that their patronage has reduced considerably during the month of February and we know where that is going; it is going to the major stores who are supporting this initiative.

I want to briefly address the question of costs. I know from my detailed research and the responses that I have received that, on average, if Saturday afternoon trading becomes a reality in this town and if wage demands succeed, the price of goods will increase by 8 per cent in Adelaide and across country centres in order to keep profits at the present level. Remember that there are not too many people who are making a profit. I refer members to my second reading speech where I detailed the difficult retail trading situation in this State. South Australia has the worst performance in the whole of Australia. In the space of three years it has lost some $340 million worth of trade, yet the Government is now saying, 'You are all going to pay an increased price'.

Let us talk about the consumers. What I am about to say is based on my research and the figures that I have been provided with by the various traders. If Saturday afternoon trading becomes a reality and there are no trade-offs for any shortening of the working week, and if the wage demands succeed then the poor people of this State will have to pay 8 per cent more for their goods. Members opposite talk about social justice. What social justice is there in foisting these sorts of price hikes on people who can ill afford them? Is this not the most fundamental of items on the social justice agenda: keeping goods and services at prices that people can afford? I invite members to respond to that item. How the hell do they think people will be able to afford prices like that when we already have the wages situation which has been kept on hold for some time? Real wages in this country are falling, except in certain industries such as the building industry where they have some marvellous deals going with the Arbitration Commission and the Government. Generally real wages are falling and the household budget is getting tighter.

There is to be an inquiry into debt. We know that South Australia is the most poorly placed of any State in relation to debt. We know that the plastic card has had an enormous impact on the spending habits of this country.

Ms Gayler: Do you want to abandon it?

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will explain for the edification of the honourable member, who seems to be a little bit thick around the ears that, because the market has been saturated and consumer debt has reached the stage where either people are going to become bankrupt or the banks are going to say, 'No more', there is no capacity at all to increase consumption in this town.

We cannot have any more consumer dollars spent in this town than are already spent. With increased costs and prices we will have fewer goods bought. If members opposite cannot understand that fundamental fact, perhaps they should not be in this Parliament—in fact, I am sure that they should not be in this Parliament. Harking back to the situation of the shop assistants, I have had a number of representations from them stating, 'Mr Blevins said it would be voluntary and of course it is not.' In a number of situations where there is a small number of staff, there is

simply not the capacity to suddenly bring in casuals. That is no more evident than in specialised areas needing expertise. One cannot just ask an unemployed person or someone else to come in for a Saturday afternoon: it is simply not possible. So voluntary participation is a joke.

I now refer to the actions of landlords. I believe that what has happened in this town is quite disgraceful. If the landlords—and I refer only to a certain few: the bigger ones, those with a vested interest—had a modicum of sense they would have talked this matter over with their traders. I will not start naming them here: perhaps I will do so in reply, depending upon the quality of the reply from the opposite side. However, if they had a modicum of sense they would have sat down and discussed it with their tenants and said, 'Look: it's a partnership. The small traders and big traders have to live comfortably together. We cannot do without either one,' and they could have reached agreement.

However, they prefer to say, 'You will open. I don't give a damn what you say: you will open.' In some areas that has led to massive losses, some of which have been incurred by people who can ill afford them. The members of the RTA believe that the long-term profit situation will improve for them at the expense of the small traders, so some of those members can afford to take short-term losses.

This debate could be extended for a very long period, because it is a matter of grave concern to many people in the industry. They are talking about survival: I am talking about their survival. I am talking about the cost of goods to the consumers, about the rights of individuals and about the rights of this Parliament, and I call upon the Government to respond in the time available (we have some 15 minutes left in this debate). If we cannot have the Minister of Labour to respond, I suppose that we will have one of the hacks from the back bench. However, I would like the Minister to respond and say why he subverted the will of Parliament. I want him to respond to the questions of the leasing arrangements which suddenly have become an issue, because the small people have said, 'Enough is enough.'

I want him to respond to the issue of the ultimate cost being paid in human and monetary terms, and I want a response to the wage demands and to know why the Government is taking this extraordinary measure. We have had a consistent policy from the very beginning, and I believe that it is important that, if we are going to have extended trading, it be implemented in a way which will assist the consumer. I believe that it should be done in a way which will assist the people of this State.

If indications are similar to those interstate we will find that if Saturday trading does take off—which it may well do—Thursday night trading will diminish. We know also that in New South Wales, for example, a number of the major traders have simply closed down on Friday nights. So be it.

It is known that there will have to be a change. Traders simply cannot trade for 55 hours a week and make a profit. In the long term, this so-called initiative by the Government to give people greater access to trading facilities in this town could defeat the purpose. Spare a thought for motor vehicle dealers. They have been to see the Minister, but with no joy. One cannot buy a car on Saturday afternoon. Franchise dealers are being forced by motor vehicle manufacturers to open up on a Saturday afternoon because it is now regarded as normal trading hours. The Minister's only response to that little dilemma is that the franchise dealers should go and tell their boss to get nicked. That is the quality of the response from the Minister of Labour.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: That is a direct quote from the Minister. The whole episode has been handled distastefully by the Premier and the Minister of Labour. I ask that the Parliament endorse the suggestion that we go no further than February until some of these very important questions are sorted out.

Mr GREGORY (Florey): I continue to be amazed by the zig-zagging of members opposite when it comes to the philosophy of their Party. Never has that been more clearly demonstrated than on the question of shopping hours. I do not know whether they belong to a small Party operating only within this State. They all claimed credit for the Liberal victory in the by-election for the seat of Adelaide but, although in three of the major mainland States their Party has adopted a policy for no controls on shopping hours, in South Australia they march to a different tune. This illustrates that their ship of State is like a dinghy without a rudder and they have forgotten what the oars are for.

I am interested in their description of 'little people'. Last night on television I watched one of those little people pull up at his place of business in a Rolls Royce. I would love all the little people in my electorate to be able to afford a Rolls Royce. I would also like them to be able to own their own home and a second property which would attract an exemption from land tax if it were valued at under $60 000. They are the little people! The argument put forward by members opposite ignores the people who want the right to go shopping, and if I have ever seen hypocrisy on this matter it has been that coming from members opposite.

I remember that the former member for Davenport, who was a Minister in the Tonkin Government and who, before the surprise win at the 1979 election, touted that there would be a relaxation of shopping hours, said that there would be shopping on Saturday afternoons and implied that it would be permitted on Sundays as well. In the position that I occupied before coming to this place, I visited him in his office in Adelaide House and asked him what he was doing about shopping hours. With a smile on his face he said that it was a very difficult question, and I agreed with him. The Liberal Government amended an Act of Parliament, which expresses the will of the people—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr GREGORY: The member for Mitcham complains about members interjecting on him, so he should not interject himself.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham was given the protection of the Chair. The same protection is extended to the member for Florey.

Mr GREGORY: That Act, providing for the extension of shopping hours on any day and at any time, was supported by the former member for Davenport in his capacity as Minister of Industrial Affairs. That is precisely what the present Minister of Labour is doing: acting within the ambit of an Act of Parliament, an Act which is supported by the members of the Lower House.

That is what is happening today. Members opposite should not suggest that people are subverting the will of Parliament and that people are doing something illegal. It is not illegal. The member for Mitcham, with his limited intellect and knowledge of the law, knows that as well. He is perpetuating untruths. That has never been better illustrated than when he said that the Premier had commented that people who could not pay their taxes can go and conduct their business at Oodnadatta. The Premier did not say that. Further, the honourable member could not even repeat accurately my

interjections. When he is doing this sort of thing he ought to do it properly.

People want to be able to shop as family units and they want available the facilities of the bigger stores. The actions of members opposite are denying this to those people. I shall never forget the times that I had to go to employers and put to them that they ought to re-employ sacked workers because they had taken time off from work so that they could do their business and shopping, because they were working all sorts of hours. To say that people should not have the opportunity to shop at weekends is hypocritical. When driving or walking anywhere on a weekend one finds that many shops are open—they are there for the convenience of people. Why can't all the other shops be open? I find it amazing that the philosophy of members of the Liberal Party in this State is so out of step with that of everyone else. They do not understand what free enterprise is all about. They parade themselves as being the champions of free enterprise while, at the same time, they want to limit people.

Mr Oswald: What about the bankruptcies in this State?

Mr GREGORY: The honourable member talks about bankruptcies in this State. Most of those bankruptcies involve people who work for their living and get paid wages. The reason they have gone under is that they are not getting enough. This brings me to another point: the member for Mitcham moved in this House that the Government desist from supporting a wage application for shop assistants. Collectively, they comprise the lowest paid group of people in this State. They have no superannuation, and members opposite want to deny them the right to have superannuation. The member opposite forgets to say that they are prepared to receive less per hour for working on Saturday afternoons for some trade-offs. It would cost less if the claim was made for working on Saturday afternoons than it does now. Perhaps the member for Mitcham could work that one out, if someone gave him a great big calculator with large figures. I refer now to the effect of the price of goods. I have always understood that reasonable competition brings about a levelling of the price.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr GREGORY: I think it is a very good argument. We have a Trade Practices Act, and the ACTU ran a shop and busted price fixing—which the Liberal Party did not want busted—so that workers could buy white goods, clothing, and everything else at a cheaper rate than was available. It was all right for members of the Liberal Party because those in the know could get things from employers at discount. But workers and others can now get discounts and obtain goods at the lowest possible price. That is what we have been able to do for competition. Members opposite want to parade themselves around as being somehow the champions of small business. I find it amazing, as when they were in Government all they did was deny small business the opportunity of operating.

The present Government has done a few things to help small business. We have repeatedly increased the exemption on land tax. We have established the Small Business Corporation and have encouraged small businesses to participate in those programs so that they can run their businesses effectively. Of course, I know that members opposite are so ignorant about things that one of the real reasons why small businesses were going under was that the people who were in them did not understand how to operate them: they were not trained and did not understand them.

We were peddling that fact in the trade union movement because we wanted employers who could run their businesses properly to stay in business and keep our people in employment; and we did not want to have to chase employers for wages that they could not pay. There was an effective working party to help small business. The previous Bannon Government amended the Commercial Tenancies Tribunal legislation so that landlords could not become better than Rackmann at ripping off rates from tenants in shopping malls. Members opposite were not keen to do that when the member for Coles, as Minister of Health, introduced the Commercial Tenancies Tribunal legislation in this place.

Mr Meier interjecting:

Mr GREGORY: The honourable member would not remember, as he was not here at the time. We have also increased the exemption for small business payrolls. That is not a bad effort for a Government which, supposedly, does not understand or feel for small business people. I point out to members opposite that your definition of small business is peculiar.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to address his remarks through the Chair.

Mr GREGORY: The members for Mitcham, Eyre, Goyder and Morphett (who are the only members opposite at present), and the member for Davenport (who has just walked in), do not know what small is. Members opposite want to ensure that people who live in the suburbs and want to shop as a family unit cannot do so.

The other reality of being able to shop on Saturday afternoon is not, as the member for Mitcham says, a case of being forced to stay open but rather an opportunity to stay open. In the eastern States about 10 per cent of shops stay open—not all of them, as he would pretend. They stay open because the type of business and the business level set the hours that they stay open. If car dealers do not want to stay open on Saturday afternoon, they do not have to. The relaxation of trading hours does not force people to close.

The honourable member made great play of $340 million not being spent in the shops. It is not being spent in shops because the Arbitration Commission has listened to the pleas of the employers and those who parrot the view that workers should not have wage increases. I challenge the member for Mitcham to stand up and tell us when he has ever championed wage increases for workers. His motion is to deny support for a wage increase for workers but, if it was forthcoming, there would not be a $340 million deficit in shopping expenditure. I am of the view that if this continues we will see a levelling out with those shops wanting to remain open doing so and those that do not remaining closed.

In that way the South Australian public will be best served. It will not be best served by the sectional interests that members opposite have supported on this occasion. They are so far out of step that, if the tune the Liberal Party band was playing had its members marching one way, the South Australian branch would be going the opposite way. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

An honourable member: No.

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave is not granted.

Members interjecting:

Mr Oswald: Don't be bloody offensive.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Morphett to order. The Chair deliberately paused to allow for possible negotiations to discreetly take place between members of both sides.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Morphett. The honourable member for Florey.

Mr GREGORY: I misunderstood the arrangement made by our Whip. We on this side honour those arrangements and I no longer seek leave to continue.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ALCOHOL DRY AREAS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gunn:

That this House calls on the Attorney-General and the Government to immediately grant the authority to district councils to be able to declare 'dry areas', that is, to prohibit the consumption of alcohol in certain areas so as to protect law abiding citizens from drunken and unruly behaviour caused by the irresponsible use of alcohol.

(Continued from 3 December. Page 2477.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I again bring to the attention of the House the difficulties that have been experienced in certain sections of my electorate and in other parts of the State by the unruly and uncontrolled behaviour of some people. As a result of this action, the average law abiding citizen has been put to great inconvenience, has suffered personal property damage and has had motor vehicles vandalised. Quite disgraceful behaviour has taken place in areas where the public should be able to freely enjoy themselves without interference, threat or intimidation.

This matter has been discussed, debated and considered by Governments for a long time. It is now time for action. I am disappointed that the State Government has taken so long to consider the application in relation to Ceduna. If anyone had been in Ceduna recently and had become aware of what has been taking place I am sure that they would immediately have responded. If the complaints that I, the District Council of Murat Bay and others have made had been raised in marginal electorates, then action would have been taken months ago. It is a matter of out of sight, out of mind.

I have endeavoured to be responsible in promoting the 'dry areas' debate. I have not set out to make outrageous comments that will attract media attention. The time is rapidly coming when the community is entitled to have its wishes acceded to. Its request is not radical or outrageous. It is unfortunate that the reports compiled by officers of the Health Commission were insulting. One of the reports contained about 13 pages quoting Al Grassby—and we know what sort of a character he is, what sort of nonsense he used to peddle around the community and his current predicament. That was the nonsense that those people had to put up with. I commend the motion to the House and, in the interests of the average, law-abiding, decent citizen of this State I urge the Government to act on it forthwith.

Mr S.G. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

PRIVATISATION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gunn:

That this House supports Senator Evans' call to privatise some Federal Government agencies.

(Continued from 3 December. Page 2478.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): This motion has attracted considerable attention. Members of the House are aware that in the 1985 election campaign the Liberal Party was subjected to a deliberate campaign of misrepresention and misquoting in an attempt to deceive the public of South Australia. The Public Service Association and other fringe groups associated with the Labor Party endeavoured to misrepresent the policy that the Leader of the Opposition (John Olsen) was putting to the people of this State.

What has happened since that occasion? We now have the Housing Trust attempting to privatise many of its properties. It is encouraging people to buy their trust homes. However, the Prime Minister said that that was illegal and improper, and that it would not be allowed to take place. That nonsense was ped[illegible]d through the media of South Australia. Let us go further. Senator Evans has been advocating the privatisation of the Commomwealth Bank, Qantas and other Federal Government instrumentalities. We know that this will take place, because the Commonwealth Government does not have the financial resources to provide these organisations with the capital they need to continue to play an important role in the community.

In my judgment there can be no logical criticism made about selling 49 per cent of the shares in the Commonwealth Bank. Australian Airlines or Qantas. The emotive arguments advanced by people opposed to such sales are based purely on political rhetoric and not upon logic or commonsense. It will be most interesting to hear from Government members the arguments that they will put to defend the anti-privatisation campaign in which they were engaged at the last State election.

We know that the Government has privatised Amdel and various other instrumentalities and it is proceeding to provatise in other areas as well. Therefore, I commend the motion to the House and ask members to support Senator Evans' call to privatise some Federal Government agencies. From time to time we have had this emotive response put forward that people would privatise Telecom and services would be reduced. Of course, that is merely a smokescreen and a red herring drawn across the argument.

The facts are that the Prime Minister supported Telecom's time charging proposals, because he knew that if he put forward this particular proposal there would be some chance of his taking a step backwards on time charging and that he would be in a position to sell off certain sections of Telecom that could be undertaken more effectively and efficiently by the private sector. Therefore, I commend the motion to the House.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 December. Page 2479.)

Mr GREGORY (Florey): I indicate to the House that members on this side do not support the Bill moved by the member for Mitcham, because it destroys a basic right and freedom of trade unions and their associations. However, I am pleased that the member for Mitcham sees that this is an important matter. I will now read to the House a portion of *Hansard* of 3 December 1987, as follows:

This is an extremely important matter about which I feel very deeply. It really goes back to a basic human right, namely, the freedom of association. Once the freedom of association it taken away, we lose at least one of the very important tenets that we believe in.

What the member for Mitcham is engaging in through this Bill is an attempt to take away from people the right of association with each other, collectively at their workplace, the right to reach decisions, and the right not to associate with people who do not want to join their association. That is what he is taking away.

Members interjecting:

Mr GREGORY: The member for Kavel who has not been here for a while says that it is baloney. I do not want to reflect on the honourable member and his ability to understand, but I have been led to believe that he was once a schoolteacher and does understand how the English language works. Certainly, as a former Minister of the Crown he ought to know that, when people have the freedom of religion, they also have freedom from it. In this case the member for Mitcham wants to take away from workers their right to collectively bind together, to take decisions together, and to say. 'We do not want to work with the person over there who will not join our association.' That is what they want to do.

They want to take away from people that right—that very fundamental right. What the honourable member is saying is that everyone who does not want to pay for their RAA membership should have the same services as people who join the RAA.

The union's activities in the Federal Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, and the State Industrial Commission, affects the working conditions of all those people at the workplace. The member for Mitcham seems to have taken over the mantle of the former member for Glenelg, Mr Mathwin, who used to run one of these things up every time that he could on the basis that he was once a trade unionist. But he jumped the fence and went to the other side; he thought that employers should be able to do what they liked with their workers. It seems to remove the right of people to associate.

Look at the reality. A number of considerably large industrial concerns in this State are run by people who have been—and still are—very prominent in the Liberal Party. These people would not have non-unionists on their premises, because the reality of Australian industrial law is that, as incorporated associations, by the nature of their objects and rules, unions have the right to negotiate on the part of the people who work there. They have no right to negotiate with individuals, and the boss—

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

Mr GREGORY: As the member for Davenport might say, the bosses then negotiate with each worker, and then usually underpay and give them conditions less than everybody else has. One has only to compare history with what is happening right now. I wish that the member for Davenport would visit a few 'over paid' outworkers—the people who work for half a dollar per garment. He would not know them even if he fell over them. He should look at the sheds in the western suburbs where women work, day and night, for substandard wages and in substandard conditions so that somebody else can make a bundle of money. Those women are being exploited, and nothing has changed for outworkers.

If the member for Davenport cared about this matter, he could read an 1890 report on outworking in this State. Nothing has changed since that time. I venture to say that, if the trade union movement took a case to the Industrial Court to abolish outworking or, if we were to move an amendment in this House so that the Industrial Conciliation Commission could outlaw outworking, the people opposite would come up with some spurious argument to continue this iniquitous system. We know that that is exactly what they would do, and they should not try to say something else.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr GREGORY: The member for Hanson knows that breaches of the award cannot be prosecuted when there is no award. I was very intrigued by the reference on 3 December by the member for Mitcham to a number of people who had approached him. He stated:

In fact, I receive at least one telephone call, one visit or one letter a month from someone who has been intimidated by a member of the union movement.

I do not regard myself as being intimidating. I have been told by employers that I used to get angry and that I intimidated them, but I do not know whether or not that was right. I do not think that 12 in a year is sufficient to warrant an Act of Parliament which would remove from everybody their right of association and their freedom to associate collectively and to reject having to work with people who do not want to pay their way. That attitude is supported by members opposite; they support people who do not want to pay their taxes.

They support employers who dodge paying the appropriate rates. They have taken consistent action in this place to ensure that in the trucking industry people are unable to get a proper rate for long distance truck drivers, and they are underpaid. They have supported this action and, this morning, we have even had the experience of the member for Mitcham moving a motion calling upon the Government to desist supporting a wage increase which would be a package for, collectively, the lowest paid workers in the State. That is what they do and that is their record: they support people who do not want to pay their way and tax dodgers. In other words, they want to ensure that people who do not want to pay their way are supported. Then, in the conclusion of his address to this House on 3 September, the honourable member said:

I promised members opposite that a final draft of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment Bill which will be before Parliament prior to the next election shall include the question of secret ballots.

I often wonder about the industrial experience of members opposite, and just how good they have been in that area. The member for Hanson has been a President of the Bank Officers' Union. That union is now affiliated with the United Trades and Labor Council, the membership of which is growing and which has adopted a more militant action against the oppression of their employers.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GREGORY: My discussions with the member for Hanson indicate that even when he was there he fought for the rights of workers, and I do not take that away from him. However, when I cast my eyes over the collection of people opposite who make up the Opposition I find very few who have had any of what could be called real industrial experience. They have had a lot of dreams and a lot of thoughts, and they have gone into a lot of theories on the matter, but they have had no hard, practical experience. I often imagine what would happen if one of them was confronted with a secret ballot in relation to strikes. If they were to read the secret report of the previous Minister of Labour (Hon. Dean Brown), who was then the member for Davenport (and who would not let the report out of the safe; he tried to hide it, and took it with him when the Liberals lost Government), they would find that magistrate

Cawthorne—who, I think, has now been elevated to the position of Deputy President of the Industrial Commission—made it quite plain that all the literature and experience in Australia indicated that secret ballots were not the solution to strikes.

People opposite are naive enough to think that strikes were caused by me, when I was a union official, by some of our colleagues in this place, and by union officials acting on behalf of workers in the work place. That is patently false. They know that, or perhaps they do not. They have myths which they perpetuate, myths which, like other things, will fade with time. The reality is that workers take strike action because they are fed up, and they will not go back to work until they want to return. Sometimes they go back because they have won and sometimes because they can see no future in their action. However, they do not regret it. As shown in the secret report which has subsequently become public, only four, up until that time, did not result in a rejection.

The other aspect of this matter is that it is no good saying, 'These are the demands that we will place before the employers. We have a secret ballot and go on strike in support of it,' and then saying, 'Oh, we are terribly sorry about that; you had better have another meeting of the people because we want to do this and do that.' That is not on. It is a firm position, and you must have a secret ballot to get them back, because you cannot go against majority decisions. I have been at many work place meetings where we have conducted secret ballots. On returning to work, after we conducted the first meeting, I said to the bloke who proposed it, 'You wanted secret ballots. Do you want to have one for this?' He replied that he was not going to put up with all that baloney. I must admit that he was a bit more forthright in what he said about it.

He said, 'I know exactly how everybody in this workplace voted. I know how they will vote on this one.' He suggested what the votes would be, and that is precisely what happened. We know from experience that it just does not work. It is a furfy put forward by people who have no knowledge or understanding of the position.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr GREGORY: The honourable member opposite starts talking about Margaret Thatcher and Great Britain as though we have something the same as they have in England. That just shows the lack of knowledge, the lack of intelligence, the lack of diligence on his part, because he would know that our industrial relations scene is entirely different to the one in Britain. We may have come from Britain, and our historical roots may have come from the British system of trade unions but, like it has throughout the rest of the world, it is now different. Like our form of Government, the trade union movement a long time ago broke away from the system in the United Kingdom.

Whilst some people may refer to it fondly, we do not go back to it, not like members opposite who want to keep on going back all the time in the parliamentary sense, in the legal sense, literally on bended knee. Our system is so different that you cannot transplant what is in the UK out to Australia.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

Mr GREGORY: I can count, and we do keep agreements on this side, for the benefit of the member for Morphett, unlike things that have happened on the other side from time to time.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr GREGORY: And the member for Mitcham is the worst offender when it comes to keeping agreements.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr GREGORY: Murray-Mallee, I have been corrected. If ever the people of South Australia are unfortunate to have another Liberal Government with the member for Mitcham as the Minister of Labour (if he ever gets to that position), sure we will have secret ballots; we will still have disputes and we will still have employers getting cross with the employees and vice versa. Life will go on, and workers will be able on their own efforts to achieve their own social justice at the work place.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I could not let the honourable member's lack of logic pass unremarked in this debate, because I did interject early in his vociferous remarks and he suggested that, as a former teacher, I should understand what he was saying. The thesis he was thrusting upon us was that we do not force people into a certain religion; they can opt out. Then, by some convoluted mental process, he likened this to the position in relation to unions, which is precisely the point—

Mr Gregory interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: In fact, the honourable member did say that. 'We have got religion' he said, 'but we don't force people into it', which is precisely the point the member for Mitcham is making, and the vast majority of the community in this country makes every time an opinion poll is taken. This is about the only opinion poll that does not make a Labor Government around Australia jump. There should be freedom of association. Just as we have religion but we do not force people into it, so we have unions. The honourable member, by some mental process, says that this is the same but we should force them in.

It is a completely false proposition, and runs counter to any notion which subscribes to this idea of freedom of association and which is supposed to be fundamental in any free society and any democracy. They say, 'He can choose not to join', but the option open to him then is that he can choose to get on the dole queue. What sort of option is that? It is an absolute travesty of justice; it is an absolute travesty of freedom; and it is absolutely abhorrent to all but the most blinkered trade unionists in this country, and they are in a very small minority.

The fact is that every poll that is taken around this nation indicates that people believe the union movement has far too much power and that compulsory unionism should never be countenanced in this community which is reputed to be free. I believe that this is the biggest assault on that sense of fair play and freedom that we encounter. The honourable member who has just spoken says that we cannot look at Britain. I do not know why we cannot look at Britain. Maybe the industrial relations system is not precisely the same, but the fact is that Britain was on its knees economically—absolutely on its knees.

It lost its markets and was uncompetitive; the union movement (the Trades and Labour Council) ran the country until that monster Thatcher came on the scene. There have been some fairly monumental battles; bloody battles. The coal strike is a case in point, but the power of the union movement in Britain is nothing like it was before the advent of Thatcher. The economy of Britain is now able to withstand stockmarket crashes and its currency can remain strong. That is because it can now make economic decisions in relation to profitability and competitiveness and the power of the union movement has been broken.

The fact is that the manifestation of compulsory unionism—and we had another example of it yesterday when we heard that everybody who wants to work for the Govern-

ment will have to be in a union or they will get no work—is, as I say, a complete travesty of the idea of freedom and runs counter to the deeply held convictions of the vast majority of people in this country.

I remember former Premier Burke in Western Australia talking about that monster, Charles Copeman, up in the Pilbara, this monster that took the unions on. He said. 'We do not want him in Western Australia'. I suggest that members opposite cast their eyes over an article in this week's *Bulletin* where this monster Copeman is interviewed by Tony Abbott, a former Catholic priest in training who gave it away and now writes for the *Bulletin*, amongst other things. I suggest that members read the article on Copeman about his views and what the depredations of the union movement are doing to the vast iron ore industry in that State with its couple of hundred restrictive work practices, which are absolutely absurd.

Working within the law Copeman managed to turn that industry around and make sure there were some jobs. They still pay award conditions. What is all this nonsense that we hear about not paying award conditions? We are not on about award conditions; we are on about restrictive work practices and uncompetitive so-called 'make work' schemes just to keep fellows on the payroll. It seems that it does not matter a damn whether you can compete nationally or internationally. That is what we are on about: we are not on about erosion of award conditions.

Have a look at this week's *Bulletin* article on this monster Copeman and what he has done to the economy of Western Australia. Premier Burke was happy enough to cuddle up with fellows like Connell and Co., the company that is now broke. It was a big contributor to the Labor Party, but Connell put the hard won taxpayers' funds into propping up his business. The article says that a fellow like Copeman who is prepared to take on these unions and the restrictive trade practices which are bankrupting the country is a monster. I suggest that the member for Florey should get his feet back on the ground. He says that we have no industrial experience. I bet that he has had precious little experience in trying to run a small business in this day and age.

Mr Gregory: Three of them.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I suppose they all went broke, and he opted for an easier life. Why are you not running those businesses now, I ask? You should get out in the present climate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Notwithstanding provocation from members opposite, the Deputy Leader must direct his remarks through the Chair.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr Speaker, the member for Florey is talking absolute garbage. He suggests that he has run three businesses. Why is he not running them now? He opted for the trade union official life, but let him get out there into today's climate. Let him go to the little corner store and the chap I called in to see on the Glynde Road; his land tax has gone up 300 per cent in two years; that is, he has to find $40 a week land tax before he opens the front door. Let the honourable member get out there and pay some of the taxes. He says that we have no industrial experience. There is damn all business experience over the road in those enterprises which keep this country afloat, and it is the Copemans of this world who knock out some of this union nonsense; who take them on and who will fix up this country, not this sort of mateship that says 'Join the union or you're a scab'.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Florey got a bit excited. I also have strong convictions on this, as have 78 per cent of the public polled around this country. The unions have far too much power, and compulsory unionism is an anathema to anyone who believes in a free society. Just read and digest those polls! All the garbage we might get from the fulminating of members opposite just will not wash with the average citizen. I do not know why the media do not play up the matter more. I suppose that they have compulsory unionism in the AJA; I do not know. If they were in tune with the public the practices of unions in this country would make headlines. Copeman is not a monster. It is fellows like Copeman who take on the unions and beat them at their own game who will save the nation.

Mr LEWIS (Murray Mallee): I will not delay the House very long, although I want to give the lie to this argument the member for Florey has been putting about the necessity for people to be in the RAA, and all that sort of nonsense. However, I will leave that for a future occasion and seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

TOMATOES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Meier:

That in view of the risk of excess concentrations of residual dimethoate in Queensland tomatoes, this House calls on the Ministers of Agriculture and Health to immediately reassess the acceptable level of dimethoate from the current level of 1 p.p.m; and in the interim, to stop the importation of dimethoate treated tomatoes until they can give absolute long term assurances about their safety to people who eat them.

(Continued from 3 December. Page 2484.)

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I was hoping that I would have been able to speak on this motion in a positive way. The motion called on the Ministers of Agriculture and Health to reassess the acceptable level of dimethoate from the current level of 1 p.p.m. and, in the interim, to stop the importation of dimethoate treated tomatoes until they can give absolute long-term assurances about their safety to people who eat them. However, as we would well appreciate that has not happened in the interim, and I have been more than a little disappointed with the way in which the Minister has handled this matter. In fact, in the magazine *The Grower* on 11 December the front page article is headed 'Dimethoate in Tomatoes', and the first statement from the Minister of Agriculture in that article is this:

In war the first casualty is the truth.

That is a statement with which I can only agree, but it is very, very disappointing that it would appear that the truth has been the casualty of the Minister, so far as I am concerned. I do not wish to rehash the points about dimethoate treated tomatoes, as I think that they have been well canvassed previously. However, I would state that an analysis of this whole issue, going back to November, reveals that on Monday, 16 November there was considerable evidence to indicate that the Minister had given an answer to at least one person—and possibly more—that he would not allow Queensland tomatoes into this State because of the possible health risk due to dimethoate treatment.

On Tuesday, 17 November I spoke with the Minister personally and expressed concern, which had been conveyed to me by many tomato growers, that there was some talk of these tomatoes being allowed in and that I hoped that the Minister would see the health risk. His answer indicated that, because the price for South Australian tomatoes had reached $6 per kilogram and because his department was

having trouble detecting illegally imported tomatoes, he felt he had no option but to allow in the dimethoate treated tomatoes. In other words, the health risk was put to one side because the high price of tomatoes was the key factor. This disturbed me at the time and, on reflection, it disturbs me even more.

Members may recall that at about Christmas time an outbreak of fruit-fly was detected in the city, and the Minister blamed imported tomatoes. I agreed with him on that, and through the media, not face to face, we had a fair bit of discussion. I made my comments and he made his on the subject, and he should have acknowledged that there was one chance in a thousand of the dimethoate treated tomatoes causing fruit-fly, but he would not accept that. I am disappointed that the Minister handled the issue in this way.

From a health point of view, it seems that the Government does not care too much. Only this morning I heard on the radio comments about the atrocious quality of the water south of the city. It reminded me of the quality of the water in much of the electorate of Goyder. I have mentioned this on many occasions and it appears that the sample tested by the E&WS of the water used by residents in the south of the city was such that the department stated that a person drinking it could not hope to remain well. If that is true, it is an indictment of the Government for not taking immediate action, and I will seek more information on it.

The Minister of Agriculture has not supported the South Australian tomato growers and, in the past week, I heard that the Minister is looking at the possibility of importing eggs so that prices can be lowered. He does not seem to be concerned about supporting local egg producers. He knocks South Australian industry, and more businesses will be put out of action. The Government has lost contact with the people, as was shown at the Adelaide by-election. It seems that it is not interested in getting in touch with them. It is an indictment of the Minister and the Government.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gregory:

That this House congratulates the Government for the new directions that the Country Fire Services is taking to ensure that firefighters are properly equipped and that all firefighting trucks are roadworthy and capable of providing firefighting capacity and safety for their crews,

which Hon. B.C. Eastick is proceeding to move to amend by adding the words:

but recommends that there exists an urgent need to improve the communication of Country Fire Board policy throughout the community particularly to Local Government bodies and the volunteer organisation and even more urgent need to assist the majority of currently declared unroadworthy fire vehicles to be restored to roadworthiness for the already existent 1987-88 fire season.

(Continued from 3 December. Page 2488.)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): When last speaking on this matter I moved that the member for Florey's motion be amended, which amendment I would like to believe the House can support, because it carries through and adds vital substance to the motion. I indicated earlier that one must also question a circumstance where a member of Government lauds the activities of one of the departments.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Generally, it is associated with trying to boost something. In this case, I acknowledge that the Country Fire Services has shown a very desirable improvement, albeit that on occasions the directions given have not been well understood and well communicated and, as a result, there has been quite a degree of resentment and difficulty on the ground with volunteers, with councils and with others directly associated with the activities involved. These views are embodied in my amendment to the member for Florey's primary motion.

The member for Florey's motion really goes only to part of the success of the revamped Country Fire Services. I have already indicated areas of difficulty, but other actions have taken place following the Public Accounts Committee's review of the Country Fire Services, that are equally important to this State in the delivery of fire services in country areas. Notwithstanding the large number of recommendations that were made by the Public Accounts Committee, the Government has not yet seen fit to implement some of the vital ones which give further substance to the Country Fire Services requirements.

Specifically, I draw attention to the matter of the line of command. The confusion has been permitted to continue in relation to who is in charge of a fire when it occurs. If there is an interface, is it the Metropolitan Fire Service or the Country Fire Services? If it appears to be in a national park, is it the rangers or people directly associated with the national park? If a fire occurs on Woods and Forests Department property, is it the departmental personnel who take over the responsibility? The inevitable circumstance has been played out again in recent times, since the member for Florey first put his motion to the House, in the disastrous Mount Remarkable fire, where again there was confusion and countermanding statements were made by individuals representing some of the subgroups involved. It had nothing to do with the Metropolitan Fire Service in this case, because it was well out of bounds and there was no interface there. However, again, there was major criticism of the lack of cooperation that existed at a vital time. I look forward to measures that will address this important issue being put to the House.

I personally looked at the matter when in California some eight months ago. I found there a set of circumstances not dissimilar to those applying in South Australia in that they have towns, fringe developments, brush land and hills country. I was very pleased, in discussions I had with its metropolitan fire service, the country fire service, the woods and forest department and the coordinators of emergency services, to find that they have a very successful manual which has been implemented and which is not dissimilar to the manual that exists for the various police forces on the American scene in which it is quite clear who has the responsibility: if it is in my patch I have the responsibility and all others comply with my direction; if it is in somebody else's patch I go along to help and obey the commands.

They go one step further which allows this attribute to be beneficial in the longer term: they have a scheme whereby the payment of services rendered between the dependant body and others is laid down again in the manual. There is no wondering whether, if I send my unit and it is badly damaged, who will pay for it. It is all sorted out by prior arrangement. If it cost me a considerable sum to have my crews in another area for an extended period, who would pay for their accommodation where other than the fire shed is used and for their loss of wages, and who will allow that effective work force to be in the field when necessary? They do not worry about it afterwards; they have it all mapped out. It is laid down—everybody knows what their contri-

bution will be, who will be issuing the commands and how they will be given.

It is working in a very integrated and effectual manner, something that is sorely needed in this State, although it is becoming more effective between the MFS and the CFS presently. The two groups have a will to recognise the responsibilities and recognise that the one enemy—fire—is there to be beaten, regardless of whether it is in my patch or somebody else's patch. The joint training currently taking place relative to the CFS with the MFS is producing a desirable result. A great deal more could be said about the needs of this integrated and improved service.

I am not critical that this line of command has not been brought in as late as October, November or even now to be effective in the current fire season. It needs to be brought in early in a parliamentary year so that it is effective from the beginning of the next fire season and everybody is fully aware of how it will work so that we will not have confusion in a fire period. I note particularly that one of the lines of command and necessities of the CFS in future will probably be resisted in some quarters but it is essential to give the line of command effectiveness. That relates to the position of the district fire control office, the truck fire control officer and those who take authority in the various units. In the past a great deal of authority has been through the old boy network.

A great deal of authority has rested with the person who has held the office indefinitely. This person knows so much that he does not have to retrain or raise his skills to the current level in order to recognise that fires of today involving some of the fertilisers used and sprays found on farming properties, as well as in warehouses in the event of country store fires, are entirely different from those of the past. The disastrous effect on anyone who is unfortunate enough to inhale burning plastic demands that the person who is in control of the fire or the directing of men and women be conversant with its dangers and able to safeguard the assisting personnel in a far better way than has necessarily been the case in the past.

Training opportunities have been available but they have not been taken up by a large number of people who occupy these managerial or official roles. I support the practice of requiring that a person who is going to be directing the destiny of others be able to give appropriate advice based on reality and on proper training.

This motion was brought into the House in a way which sought to laud the activities of the Government. I believe it would have been equally effective by looking at the realities and needs of the State rather than seeking to give benefit to the Government. In the budget debate I drew attention to the increase in funds made available by the State Government this year and its commitment over the next three years to upgrade the quality and nature of equipment. I believe that the $1.1 million available in 1987-88 and the balance to $5 million that will be available over the next three years is a highly desirable expenditure of funds for the benefit of the community as a whole.

Due to the wide interface between the Metropolitan Fire Service and the Country Fire Services, more specifically in the Adelaide Hills (which is a real danger area), it is necessary that the CFS be given the opportunity to upgrade its equipment. The standardisation of equipment has had a desirable effect. The manner in which a number of fire units were put off the road immediately before the fire season was unfortunate. Those associated with firefighting acknowledge the reality and benefit of better equipment for them as individual volunteers. However, they also are aware of a great deal of trauma in a number of areas and that some areas are still not adequately serviced because units have been put off the road.

The CFS, through its board, has endeavoured to correct that situation. Worthwhile discussions have been held between the Country Fires Board and individual services. I believe that over the next two or three years we will see a great improvement in the total service. By drawing to the attention of the CFS and those in authority the sentiments that are expressed in the amendment, the motion, with my amendment, will benefit the State. I seek members' support of both the motion and the amendment.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ANTI-POVERTY FAMILY PACKAGE

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Lenehan:

That this House congratulates the Federal Government on the recently announced anti-poverty family package which will provide extra assistance to those families most in need and further, the House requests the Federal Government to examine the consequences of the recently implemented policy relating to the payment of widows pensions and supporting parents benefits, such examination to include a review of the effectiveness of training and retraining programs specifically targeted at these groups.

(Continued from 12 November. Page 1875.)

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): The sentiments that the member for Mawson has expressed in the text of her motion are notable and honourable but the ignorance that is illustrated and demonstrated by the remarks that she made about the root causes of this problem are regrettable and deplorable, although they are the kind of comments and politics that I expect from her. An examination of the motion illustrates what I am saying about the member for Mawson's sentiments and her lamentable lack of insight into what causes these problems and the best way to address them.

The honourable member suggests that one can throw money at such problems to solve them, that they will go away or be otherwise resolved. That is not true. Moreover, the motion fails to identify the relationship of widows pensions and supporting parents benefits to those retraining programs or primary training programs now targeted specifically at such people.

Presumably the member for Mawson wants more money spent on training and retraining. Certainly, her comments in introducing her motion indicate that. However, if widows and supporting parents are looking after children in their care and custody, it is unlikely that they will have either the time to participate in training or retraining programs or the opportunity to use the service.

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

PETITION: WASHPOOL LAGOON

A petition signed by 539 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to recognise the Washpool Lagoon as a natural wetland and protect it from commercial development was presented by the Hon. D.J. Hopgood.

Petition received.

PETITION: FIREARMS

A petition signed by 180 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any changes to the regulations

governing the ownership and use of legal firearms was presented by Mr D.S. Baker.

Petition received.

PETITION: CHILD-CARE CENTRES

A petition signed by 38 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to retain the current staffing qualifications of child-care centres was presented by Mr D.S. Baker.

Petition received.

PETITION: TOBACCO PRODUCTS

A petition signed by 127 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government not to increase taxes on tobacco products in order to fund anti-smoking campaigns was presented by Mr Gregory.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr OLSEN: As this is a matter of Government policy affecting all departments, will the Premier explain to the House why union officials have been—

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: It will be interesting to see whether today the Premier again wants to duck any questions relating to this. Will he explain why union officials have been given much more power to determine how much Government contract work is let out to the private sector when this will allow union officials to resist and prevent the introduction of efficiencies which will save taxpayers' money?

I have in my possession a document dated 8 October 1987 which was prepared by the Minister of Labour's Industrial Liaison Officer and which sets out for all departments guidelines they must follow in determining whether the public or the private sector should undertake construction, cleaning and computer contracts worth several hundred million dollars a year. The guidelines require discussion with union officials in two stages. There is to be an annual meeting at which departmental review committees comprising equal numbers of departmental and union representatives discuss all capital works, cleaning and computer contracts and the proportion—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Are they the only two components?

Mr OLSEN: They are the only two components. There will be discussion on the proportion which should be let out to the private sector. Decisions at these meetings are taken by vote and must be forwarded to the union officials affected. There are also to be monthly meetings at which the issues discussed include union membership and past performance of contractors where they have done Government work before. However, there is no opportunity given for contractors affected by decisions of these committees to put their point of view. The working of these guidelines makes it very clear that they are intended to give union officials even more control over the amount of Government work which is let out to the private sector and which contractors will do that work.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: If you are showing so much interest in it, perhaps you ought to get a copy of the circular that has gone out—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: —and find out what is happening.

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

Mr OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have not yet called on the Leader of the Opposition to resume his remarks. The Leader of the Opposition will resume his seat momentarily. I reprimand the Premier for having interjected on the Leader of the Opposition. I warn the Leader of the Opposition that, if he introduces comment and debate, then leave for explanation of his question will be withdrawn. I also reprimand the Leader of the Opposition for not directing his remarks to the Chair. A member cannot refer to members opposite as 'you'. All remarks must be directed through the Chair. The Leader of the Opposition has been here long enough to know that. The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Many small business contractors have put the point that, as there is traditional union opposition to letting Government contracts out to the private sector, these new procedures will also give union officials much more opportunity to resist and prevent the implementation of efficiencies to save taxpayers' money, such as in the award of cleaning contracts worth $20 million a year where the Auditor-General has identified that industrial contractors would almost halve this cost.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the honourable member for his question. Let me say this about this Government: we have never ever shied away from the tough decisions. There is no question that traditionally there has been very strong resistance from the public sector unions to having the private sector involved in what they see as traditionally their work. That attitude has prevailed as long as I have been involved in the trade union movement and it certainly prevailed when the Opposition was the Government for the brief periods it has been in the past 20 years. There is nothing new in that.

What this Government has said to the trade union movement is, 'In certain areas, under certain conditions, we believe that the private sector does have a role in work that you have traditionally done.' We have gone to the trade union movement and stated very clearly that, in certain areas, we will introduce private contractors. The trade union movement has not liked that, but it realises that in certain areas this perhaps will not be such a bad thing. They have said to us, 'That is fine; that is even more contractors than the Liberals ever asked us for. Okay, we will sit down and talk about it. What are the rules? If you do not lay down some rules, if you send contractors into Government departments and onto Government sites, we will guarantee you industrial dispute,' and they will. But, as a responsible employer and as a responsible Government, we have drawn up some rules for contractors in the public sector. That is more than the Opposition did. It did not have contractors in the public sector. It was too scared of the unions. We were not scared of the unions. We talked it through with the unions.

Let us talk about cleaning contractors. What did the member for Mount Gambier do about cleaning contractors when he was the Minister of Education? Nothing at all! There are petty contractors now in the Education Department who are horrendously expensive and we want them out. We have given a commitment that we will not break their contracts, but we want them out. We can do it much cheaper. But we will not have contractors on Government

property, such as schools, who are not paying award rates and who, in some cases, are employing under-age children, where mum, dad and the kids clean the schools at night. We will not tolerate that. We will have award rates paid and we will have adults doing the work. That is what we will do. If members opposite support a system where award rates are not paid, where workers compensation is not provided and where, in some cases, children are used for cleaning, they can do that but we do not, and we make no apologies for it.

There are cleaning companies in this State which have come to the Government and said, 'We pay award rates and we have our employees covered for workers compensation.' They are very long standing, very reputable South Australian companies and they have asked, 'What is happening in this cleaning area? It is now virtually body hire.' In particular, women—and migrant women—are having to establish themselves as an individual business because the principal contractor says, 'You are no longer an employee. You tender for those offices on that floor and I have plenty of others who will tender less than you.'

That is the system that has grown up in the cleaning industry in this State. The Government is not trying to clean that up in the private sector. The unions and the private employers will have to sort that out themselves, but we are not tolerating that system in the public sector. If you support that you should talk to the South Australian companies that have approached us and said, 'We do not want this system'—and we agree with them.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Davenport has a point of order.

Mr S.G. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the Minister has referred to the Leader as 'you' in his answer to the question. He has pointed and said, 'If you support that,' and he has used that term on three occasions.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is considering the possibility that the Minister may have been using 'you' in the general sense that one uses when talking about members of the public in general or the way in which the word is interchangeable with the word 'one'. However, on reflection I believe that the Minister was erring in the same way as, earlier on, did the Leader of the Opposition. I ask him not to give the impression of referring to members opposite as 'you' but to direct his remarks through the Chair.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. When I said 'you' I was referring to the Opposition members of the Liberal Party collectively. In fact, I was actually pointing to the member for Flinders, who was doing no harm at all but if members of the Opposition support that system I am happy to argue that in the community. I believe that cleaners—and they are in particular women—work in most unsociable hours and are entitled to workers award rates of pay and compensation coverage.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Government will do whatever is required to bring that about. That certainly brought them to order, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Members opposite believe in the extension of the subcontracting system to a degree that members on this side do not; that is the difference. The Government does not believe in simply the body hire system; we believe that employees are entitled to certain minimum standards and will ensure that that happens. We also believe there is a role for subcontractors within the public sector, and we are introducing that. We are introducing it with the agreement of the unions on certain conditions with which we agree completely. The reputable employers in this State want to compete on a level playing field. They do not want to compete with fly-by-nighters, particularly in the cleaning industry, who last for five minutes, have one contract on a couple of floors of a building, disappear and the next day turn up under a different name. The reputable South Australian cleaning firms do not want to compete with that, and we agree with them.

TECHNOLOGY PARK

Mr RANN: Can the Minister of State Development and Technology provide this House with an update on progress being achieved at Technology Park Adelaide? On 2 February the *Advertiser* published a feature article on Technology Park in which it was argued that a subdued air hangs over the park and unnamed tenants were quoted as saying that companies were using old technology to implement new ideas on the cheap and that there was a lack of interaction with the Levels campus of the Institute of Technology as well as between tenants at the park.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am happy to provide some information to the House on this matter. I note that in the explanation the member for Briggs identified the article in the *Advertiser*, as did also by way of interjection the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in almost, may I say, a gloating sense at its doom and gloom statement about what may be happening at Technology Park.

The facts are that Technology Park remains one of the fastest growing parks of its kind in the world and I will identify on that matter in a moment figures that are presented by associates of the International Science Parks Association, of which Barry Orr is one of the international Vice-Presidents. He, of course, is the Executive Director of Technology Park.

As has been acknowledged on a number of occasions, Technology Park was, in the first instance, established by the former Government and this Government gave credence to what is happening at the park by substantive investments in it resulting in the success rate that we have today. It needs to be noted that a technology park does not automatically grow just because it is there; it needs a certain kind of judicious support, such as the multi-tenant facilities that are being established and the judicious use of the South Australian State Development Fund and other activities to help companies grow.

It need not necessarily have grown to the stage it has reached today in the absence of that. This area was set aside in 1982 and it could be equivalent to many science and technology parks. Since its inception this Government has enabled it to achieve an impressive growth rate. Some firms have written to the *Advertiser* complaining about the statements made in that newspaper concerning Technology Park Adelaide and I have received letters from companies in the same vein. These letters are available to members so that they may see these statements for themselves.

I have received a letter from Australian Flight Test Services Pty Ltd and signed by the Managing Director of that firm as well as by the Managing Director of Forensic Science Technology International Proprietary Limited. I shall quote the pertinent parts of that letter, as follows:

> Both our companies started life here at the Park, and although there were no handouts from Park management, the support, advice and flexibility provided by Technology Park Director, Mr Barry Orr, and his staff have been exceptional. For us, the Park offers tangible benefits:
>
> The availability of a Bureau Service at reasonable cost; this avoids the need for costly capital outlays at an early stage of company development.

The flexibility to expand facilities without the major disruption which would accompany relocation to larger premises at a different location.

The close proximity of other organisations dealing laterally with high technology.

Nothing is perfect, and problems can always be found (as Mr Hackett's article points out), but the Park was set up to encourage the development of new organisations in the business of finding and solving problems. That is what our companies are about, and for us, Technology Park provides an excellent environment. Overwhelmingly, that is the kind of response that we are getting from companies at Technology Park Adelaide. I have three tables of figures dealing with Technology Park Adelaide at the end of 1985, 1986 and 1987; with Britain's Science Parks in August-September 1987; and with United States Technology Research Parks in January 1986. I seek leave to have these statistical tables inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

TECHNOLOGY PARK ADELAIDE

	End 1985		End 1986			End 1987	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Forecast	Actual
Employment	250	135	375	388	500	480	567
Companies	12	14	18	29	24	n.a.	38
Buildings	4	3	6	6	8	n.a.	8
Built area	10 000	8 000	15 000 m²	20 000 m²	20 000 m²	n.a.	24 000 m²

A SUMMARY OF BRITAIN'S SCIENCE PARKS AUGUST-SEPTEMBER 1987

University/College	Name	Partners	Date	UKSPA Status	No. of Tenants	Numbers Employed	Total Area of Site (ha)	Floor Space (sq m)
Aberystwyth	Aberystwyth Science Park	U/DA	1985	M	5	25	2	2 000
Antrim (University of Ulster) and Queen's Univ., Belfast	Antrim Technology Park	U/DA	1986	M	4	50	30	3 700
Aston (Birmingham)	Aston Science Park	U/LA/P	1983	M	45	460	9	11 600
Bangor (University College of North Wales)	Menai Technology Enterprise Centre	U/LA	1986	M	2	14	0.4	370
Birmingham	University of Birmingham Research Park	U/LA	1986	M	8	150	3	2 970
Bolton Institute of Higher Education	Bolton Technology Exchange	U/LA/DA	1986	M	17	152	1	2 320
Bradford	Listerhills at Bradford University	U/LA/DA	1983	M	30	320	5	8 640
Brunel (Uxbridge)	Brunel University Science Park	U	1986	M	9	150	3	4 270
Cambridge (Trinity College)	Cambridge Science Park	U	1972	M	65	2 100	53	54 600
Durham	Durham Mountjoy Research Centre	U/DA	1985	M	11	50	1	3 340
East Anglia (Norwich)	University of East Anglia Science Park	U	1984	M	1	10	5	930
Heriot-Watt (Edinburgh)	Heriot-Watt University Research Park	U	1972	M	23	400	23	27 900
Hull	Newlands Centre at Hull University	U/LA/DA	1984	M	14	66	1	3 530
Keele (North Staffordshire)	Keele University Science Park	U/LA	1986	X	6	24	6	1 860
Kent (Canterbury)	Kent Research and Development Centre	U/LA	1986	X	1	10	4	1 110
Leeds	Springfield House at Leeds University	U/DA	1983	X	14	78	1	2 970
Liverpool Polytechnic and University of Liverpool	Merseyside Innovation Centre	U	1982	M	12	55	1	1 390
London (South Bank Polytechnic)	South Bank Technopark	U/P	1985	M	46	375	1	6 690
Loughborough	Loughborough Technology Centre	U/LA	1984	M	18	97	1	1 950
Manchester	Manchester Science Park	U/LA/P	1984	M	14	80	6	2 230
North East Wales Inst. of Higher Education (Deeside)	Newtech Science Park	U/LA/DA	1985	M	8	47	—	6 130
Nottingham	Highfields Science Park	U/LA	1984	M	14	160	7	2 880
St Andrews	St Andrews Technology Centre	U/DA	1984	X	3	30	0.3	1 150
Southampton	Chilworth Research Centre	U/LA	1984	M	14	120	10	4 270
Stirling	Stirling University Innovation Park	U/LA/DA	1986	X	11	65	6	1 210
Strathclyde and Glasgow	West of Scotland Science Park	U/DA	1983	M	12	70	25	3 530
Surrey (Guildford)	The Surrey Research Park	U	1984	M	28	1 000	28	28 520
Sussex (Brighton)	Sussex University Science Park	U	1985	X	3	65	10	1 300
Swansea	Swansea Innovation Centre	U/DA	1986	M	11	40	1	1 860
Warwick (Coventry)	University of Warwick Science Park	U/LA	1984	M	40	350	17	13 940
	Total				489	6 613	260.7	209 160

UNITED STATES TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH PARKS (UNIVERSITY-AFFILIATED DEVELOPMENTS)

Name	Date	Tenants	Area (acres)
Arizona State University Research Park	1983	3	323
Engineering Research Centre (Arkansas)	1982	0	23
Stanford Industrial Park (California)	1951	80	660
University of Connecticut-Storrs	1982	0	390
New Haven Science Park (Yale University)	1981	82	80
University Research Park at Lews (Delaware)	1979	0	100
Innovation Park (Florida)	1979	2	208
Central Florida Research Park	1981	14	1 400
University of Florida Research and Technology Park	1983	6	2 200
Advanced Technology Development Centre (Georgia)	1980	16	3
Evanston/University Research Park (Illinois)	1985	0	26
Purdue Industrial Research Park (Indiana)	1961	25	177
North Kentucky University Research/Technology Park	1980	1	75
Maryland Science Technology Centre	1983	1	466
University Park (MIT, Massachussets)	1983	0	27
Geddes Centre (Michigan)	1985	0	508
Ann Arbor Technology Park (Michigan)	1980	15	820
Dandini Research Park (Nevada)	1984	0	470

UNITED STATES TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH PARKS (UNIVERSITY-AFFILIATED DEVELOPMENTS)

Name	Date	Tenants	Area (acres)
Princeton Forrestal Centre (New Jersey)	1974	50	1 750
University of New Mexico Research Park	1965	2	90
Rensselaer Technology Park	1981	26	1 200
Research Triangle Park (North Carolina)	1959	47	6 551
University Research Park (North Carolina)	1966	11	2 800
University Research Complex (Ohio)	1981	3	200
Miami Valley Research Park (Ohio)	1980	3	1 500
Swearingen Research Park (Oklahoma)	1958	20	600
University City Science Centre (Pennsylvania)	1964	80	16
Carolina Research Park (South Carolina)	1983	1	580
Tennessee Technology Corridor	1982	97	2 200
Texas A. and M. University Research Park	1984	0	434
University of Utah Research Park	1970	51	320
Virginia Technology Corporation Research Centre	1985	0	120
Washington State University Research and Technology Park	1982	0	158
Morgantown Industrial and Research Park (West Virginia)	1983	8	670
University Research Park (Wisconsin)	1982	2	217

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the House for that leave. These figures, which members are welcome to see, indicate that in the first five years of the United States experience there were 19 parks as old as Technology Park Adelaide is now. Only six of those parks had more firms on them than Adelaide Technology Park and three US parks were close to the Adelaide Technology Park figure after five years' growth. In the United Kingdom, 30 science parks were established between 1972 and 1976, and, of those, only four had more tenants than has Technology Park Adelaide and only two had more employees working for those tenants compared to the position at Technology Park Adelaide.

Unlike certain other scientific and technology parks in other parts of the world, some companies in our park employ more than one or two people. Indeed, seven of them, out of a total of 38, employ over 25 people. When compared to the position in technology parks in other parts of the world, a ratio of seven out of 38 in this regard is not repeated in other circumstances. For instance, the discovery parks in British Columbia, which have been proved successful in many ways, cannot match the rate of success that we are achieving here.

It seems that the writer of the *Advertiser* article was keen to see failure and to report failure, as well as to write a gloom and doom story concerning South Australia, as are many Opposition members. However, of the companies within Technology Park Adelaide only three have been liquidated, gone into receivership, or been amalgamated with another company. The reason for such action may have been corporate difficulties.

From a study of small technology businesses throughout the world, it is known that the failure rate for such small businesses is 70 per cent within three years. Five years down the track, we do not have 70 per cent of 38 failing—we have three, with 38 still there, and that is indicative of the support work at that park. I mention again that Barry Orr, as a result of the creditable effort that has been achieved by South Australia, has been elected an international vice-president of the International Science Parks Association. The work that this Government has done in the creation of multi-tenant buildings and in the creation of the technology innovation program under the State development fund and other such activities has enabled the real estate exercise of the former Government to achieve something that is internationally recognised and accredited in terms of technology park development.

ARSONISTS

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Correctional Services indicate what arrangements his department makes to supervise and treat people who have been convicted of multiple arson offences once they are released? I refer to the case of Darren Mark Bing, who was convicted of lighting one of the disastrous Ash Wednesday fires. That fire resulted in the death of a woman—

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I raise a point of order. What the Deputy Leader is asking relates to a case that is now before the court. I deplore his raising something in this House that is before the court by specifically naming the individual concerned.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister can only raise a point of order; he cannot 'deplore' what the Deputy Leader did. I take it that the Minister implies that this matter is *sub judice* in that it is before the court. If that is the case, I will have to rule the question out of order.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have asked the Minister what arrangements are made by his department to supervise people such as Bing who have been let out on parole after serving only two years of a 10 year sentence. Whether he is before the court for lighting further fires is irrelevant to that question, I would have thought. It is a past event.

The SPEAKER: Order! The question is only in order in so far as it refers to administrative matters that do not in any way impinge upon a matter that would otherwise be *sub judice*, and can only be asked in that light. The honourable Deputy Leader.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have simply asked the Minister what arrangements were made to supervise Bing when he was let out. I seek leave to explain the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the Deputy Leader that in the course of his explanation he must be very careful not to link the question to any matters that relate to matters before the court.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I shall not refer to any contemporaneous matters or anything that is before the court but I shall refer to the historical record. The Ash Wednesday fire that Bing was convicted of lighting resulted in the death of one woman, the maiming for life of one person, to my knowledge, the hospitalisation of eight people, and injuries—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader will resume his seat. He is treading a very narrow line. There is a long tradition with parliamentary questions that they are ruled

out of order if they impinge in any way on justice being received by an individual before the courts. In the course of raising the question there is every danger that the Deputy Leader's question will do so. On that basis, I withdraw leave for any further explanation of his question. However, if the Minister has any reply that he wishes to make about the original specific point asked by the Deputy Leader, he may proceed.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, am I not permitted in my question to refer to the historical record which led to the conviction of Bing as a result of his lighting one of the Ash Wednesday fires which resulted in so much devastation and the conditions on which he was let out on parole?

The SPEAKER: Order! As the Chair understands it, the initial thrust of the question from the Deputy Leader referred purely to administrative arrangements in relation to the custody of an individual. That, *per se*, provided it goes no further, would be in order. The moment other matters are related to that issue, the Deputy Leader strays onto dangerous ground and I will rule him out of order.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We have a point of order from the Deputy Leader. Depending on that point of order, I will then call the member for Albert Park.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am seeking to indicate the seriousness of the situation which would require some special counselling and special treatment when Bing was let out on parole. I simply indicate the past history which illustrates the seriousness of the offence.

The SPEAKER: Order! I acknowledge the point the Deputy Leader is trying to raise. However, I remind him that, under the traditions of the House, explanations are only permitted in so far as is required to explain the question. I am convinced in my mind that whatever was intended by the original question can be understood by the Minister and most members of the House without any further explanation. Furthermore, under the traditions of the House, even if the Chair did not rule the matter *sub judice*, any member (and I hesitate to remind members of this as it may create a rod for my own back at some future stage) can withdraw leave for the explanation of a question. Does the Minister wish to reply to the question as so far permitted to be put?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The intention of the question is to prejudice a case before the court—no question exists about that. The naming in the House of a person who has a case before the court is absolutely deplorable.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader to order, and I caution the Minister. Regardless of any strong feelings that members on either side might have on this matter, they cannot impute improper motives to another member.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am merely stating a fact, and that is a fact.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader to order. If he does not cease interjecting forthwith when the Chair is trying to receive a point of order from a colleague two places away from him, I will name him. The member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: You, Sir, said that it was quite wrong for anyone to impute motives to members of this House. The Minister then said that it is a statement of fact. Is he, Sir, flouting the Chair?

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot consider that a point of order. I am waiting to hear the rest of the Minister's reply on this matter.

Mr S.G. EVANS: On a point of order, I am sorry that you, Sir, take it that way. You said that a member was not allowed to impute improper motives to any other member. The Minister then said that it was a fact. He does not know what the member's intention was.

The SPEAKER: Order! I appreciate the point made by the member for Davenport, but the fact that the Minister said, 'That is a fact,' is not relevant in itself. I was waiting to hear the next two or three sentences to see what was the fact. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The fact is that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has damaged and prejudiced the case of somebody accused before the courts. For somebody in Parliament to do that is absolutely appalling. However, the Opposition has done so in this Chamber and in the other place from time to time.

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the honourable Minister at this stage. This highlights the particular problem I was trying to draw to members' attention when I asked the Deputy Leader to desist from making any reference whatsoever to the case, because the difficulty we have is that, in his response, the Minister may well inadvertently make remarks that also prejudice the case one way or another.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is why the *sub judice* rule is so important and it is so important that it be observed. Of course, the Deputy Leader we understand, but I would have thought that the Leader of the Opposition would have had more respect for the proprieties of the courts and their relationship to Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: However, in relation to the general policy question, which was merely a smokescreen to prejudice this case, anybody who is on parole is on parole on conditions set by the Parole Board. That is why a Parole Board has been established under an Act of Parliament. It has the integrity of its own Act and it acts under it. I see no reason to quarrel with any action of the Parole Board. If members opposite have some queries, by way of substantive motion or when the Act is before Parliament, they can do something about it. It is not necessary, and it was particularly low and despicable, to use a question like that for the purpose of prejudicing the case of somebody who is before the courts. I think that that is an extremely low action by the Leader of the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Henley Beach.

Mr FERGUSON: I direct my question to the Minister—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I do not have a particularly thin skin, Sir, but the member for Murray-Mallee has just said that I am an accessory to murder.

Mr Lewis: Mr Speaker—

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That was the interjection from the member for Murray-Mallee. I do not want a retraction; I will deal with it myself after Question Time.

Mr Lewis: Mr Speaker—

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I just want the House and the public to know what a crazed individual the Opposition has.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: And, if the Opposition is supporting the honourable member's statement—

Members interjecting:

Mr Lewis: If you don't sit him down, I will.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to resume his seat and I name the member for Murray-Mallee for contempt of the Chair. Does the honourable member wish to give an explanation or an apology to the House?

Mr LEWIS: I do not know what I should be apologising for, Mr Speaker. Allegations were being made by the honourable Minister about an interjection from me which he did not hear correctly, imputing improper motives to me and, accordingly, abusing the Standing Orders. I looked in your direction, Sir, and you were disinterested in the proceedings. I attempted to attract your attention, but nothing happened, so I had to raise my voice, Sir, because I believed that the Standing Orders were being transgressed by the Minister. He was not raising a point of order—he was abusing me.

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is with extreme reluctance that the Chair will accept the explanation of the honourable member for Murray-Mallee.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask all members not to inflame an already difficult situation. As I said, I reluctantly accept the combined apology/explanation of the honourable member for Murray-Mallee, purely in the interests of the workings of the House and, by way of explanation, I point out that, at the time the Minister had commenced to raise his point of order (which on the surface seemed to the Chair to be a valid point of order), I momentarily turned to the Clerk for advice on the basis that I had not personally heard the exact words allegedly uttered on my left.

On that basis, I was asking for advice as to what had exactly been said to make it easier for the Chair to make a ruling. I therefore missed a few of the words of the Minister's point of order. At that stage, the member for Murray-Mallee began to interject heatedly in a way that reflected quite clearly upon the Chair. Nevertheless, in the interests of the proceedings of the House, I will accept his explanation and the naming is withdrawn.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Mr Speaker, you have indicated that you will not proceed with the action you have taken, but it does not provide an opportunity for this House to accept the explanation which was given by the member for Murray-Mallee. It was an unfortunate set of circumstances. I believe that he put the position correctly. He was referring to a situation which was referred to by the Deputy Leader and not to any other circumstance. The person—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Light is at this stage beginning to indulge in debating an earlier matter rather than raising a point of order on a naming which has since been withdrawn.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Two unfortunate circumstances appear to have been mixed up. I am pleased that it is not proceeding further.

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that it would be best if members put all of these matters behind them and we proceed with the next question from the member for Henley Beach.

CATS

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Minister representing the Minister of Local Government inform the House whether any further consideration has been given to allowing local government increased powers to deal with stray cat nuisances? The Wednesday 27 January 1988 edition of my local newspaper the *Weekly Times* stated at page 3 that wild cats were living in rocks on the beach and causing a general nuisance to the beach going public. The article suggested solutions to the problem, including the laying of baits, filling the rock spaces with sand so that cats have no place to sleep, and luring the cats into traps to be taken to the RSPCA.

Questions have been raised both in this House and before the Estimates Committees about increasing the powers under the Local Government Act to allow councils to control any problems they might have with both domestic and feral cats. I believe that for some years now the committee concerned with the Impounding Act review working party has been giving consideration to the problem of feral and stray cats. There is an understanding that no power currently exists for councils to take any action on the destruction of cats.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. I did happen to see the article on page 3 of the *Weekly Times* to which he referred. I was never too sure about the photograph of the cat. As I recall, the head of the cat seemed to be four times larger than the rocks around, so one imagined it was superimposed upon the rocks to make the point. The honourable member is correct in saying that there certainly was not the power under the Local Government Act when I was the Minister to enable local governments or the authorities to adequately control the behaviour of cats. Whether there has been any progress in the meantime, I am not certain. I will certainly take up the matter with my colleague, the Minister of Local Government, to ascertain the current position.

As I can recall, the problem is in trying to control the movement, if you wish, of cats. For a lot of reasons, a cat cannot be constrained in the normal household yard as can a dog. There is no doubt that cats, particularly feral and stray cats, can be noisy, offensive and smelly animals. On the other hand, a good family household pet can be a wonderful companion, particularly for the elderly. So there is a problem—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I find it interesting that two members opposite are critical of the problem that many people within the community find very stressful and that many local governments have been grappling with for many years and find a very difficult problem. It is not a problem that members opposite should treat as lightly as they are.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I would be happy to get on with it if I could be given the courtesy of members opposite to finish my response, as I was about to do. It is a problem. I am not sure of the local state of play within the Local Government Act. I know that for many years endeavours have been made to find an adequate solution to the problem. One cannot treat cats in the same way as dogs and the matter has been looked at. I will obtain a report for the honourable member in the House.

REGINALD SPIERS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Is the Minister of Correctional Services aware that the sentencing judge in the case of Reginald Spiers, in fixing a gaol term effectively of 3½ years from today, was influenced by the softer parole laws introduced by this Government? Mr Justice Olsson told the court

that he proposed to sentence Spiers today for conspiring to import a substantial quantity of cannabis resin:

> On the footing that . . . your level of responsibility and criminality was slightly, but not a great deal, less than that of Kloss.

The judge said that his task was:

> To attempt to achieve a proper sentencing parity as between co-offenders in relation to the one crime, bearing in mind their respective degrees of criminality.

Mr Justice Olsson made the point that Spier's co-conspirator, Kloss, was sentenced to 14 years imprisonment with a minimum term of six years, but that (and I again quote):

> Due to changes in relevant legislation he actually served a total period of four years and about three months.

In sentencing Spiers today to an effective term of just 3½ years, the judge's remarks clearly point to his inability to order a lengthier sentence, given the leniency extended to Kloss as a result of this Government's new parole system.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I think there is some confusion here. The article to which the honourable member refers does not—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is the only information I have. It does not refer to the non-parole period. My information is that the non-parole period was eight years, which would, if maximum remission was earned, give a minimum period of five years and six months in gaol. I believe that is very similar to the period of imprisonment that Kloss, who apparently was a co-conspirator, has served.

I am not sure what point the honourable member is making. It appears to me, from reading the article in today's paper, that Spiers will actually serve a longer period if he serves five years and six months (which appears to be the period that the judge has calculated) than the period that Kloss served. So, I am not sure what is the honourable member's point. Kloss was one of those fortunate people who was in the system when the parole laws were changed. When the Bill went through this House cases such as that of Kloss would not have been affected as regards parole—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is true. However, the Legislative Council, in its wisdom or otherwise, decided that the new parole laws would apply to those prisoners already in the system who had been sentenced under the old parole provisions. That was not the wish of the Government, but the Government went along with it as it must in this place bearing in mind the numbers in the Legislative Council. I will examine the honourable member's question as well as the transcript, and no doubt next week a member on this side will facilitate the clearing up of the point raised. If any member can say what was the non-parole period—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That may be his view, but that does not necessarily make it correct. If Spiers is to serve five years and six months, that is a longer period than was served by Kloss. Unless the member for Light can tell me what was the non-parole period—

The SPEAKER: Order! What the Minister is trying to do at present is the reverse of Question Time.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Well, next week will be plenty of time to clear up these points when the facts are before the House rather than the member for Light reading out something about which he knows absolutely nothing.

PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Transport call for a reassessment of the need for a pedestrian crossing on Beach Road near its junction with Majorca Road at Hackham West?

Members interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: This question may not make front-page headlines, but it is important to my constituents. In March 1986, I wrote to the Minister requesting, on behalf of many of my constituents, that either full traffic lights or a pedestrian-activated crossing be installed on Beach Road near the Calvary Lutheran Primary School. In November 1986, I received a detailed reply from the Minister stating that a number of improvements would provide protection for pedestrians but that 'the installation of a signalled crossing was not justified'. However, since then there has been a significant increase in the number of children attending that school and also in the volume of vehicular traffic using both Beach Road and Majorca Road. Therefore, as both vehicular and pedestrian traffic have increased, will the Minister call for a reassessment of the need for pedestrian-activated traffic lights near this intersection?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will require the Highways Department to reassess the effectiveness of the traffic management improvements that it put into the Beach Road-Majorca Road intersection. I will also ask the department to consider what changes in traffic patterns may have occurred since its study early in 1986. As the honourable member pointed out, there has been a significant increase in the number of children who wish to cross the road, and it is the view of the community which she represents that there has been a dramatic increase in the volume of vehicular traffic at this point. Having regard to those factors, I shall be happy to ask the Highways Department to reassess that intersection once more.

I point out to members that I have always tried to respond to their requests by asking the Highways Department to carry out a traffic assessment of the roads on which members have requested lights, pedestrian lights, etc. Even if the study had been only 12 or 18 months previously, invariably the traffic patterns had not changed. So, as Minister, I could repeat the report that was given to me previously. That practice ties up a lot of engineering expertise, and the department cannot afford duplication of that sort of work except where it is clear that circumstances have changed. As the honourable member pointed out, the situation has changed, in her view, and I am happy to ask for a new investigation. I make the point that a lot of resources are expended in duplicating information that is already in the possession of the Highways Department. However, each application will be tested on its merits.

PAROLE LAWS

Mr BECKER: Will the Minister of Correctional Services admit to the House that his Government's parole laws are weak in comparison with those applicable in other States of Australia? In a letter to the *de facto* wife of a South Australian serving a gaol term in Western Australia, the Minister refused to consider an application for transfer to a South Australian gaol to facilitate contact with his family and young children. In his letter, the Minister said:

> I am not prepared to reverse my decision, based principally on the fact that, by transferring to South Australia, Mr Romeo would serve considerably less time in prison than he would if he served his sentence in Western Australia.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the honourable member for his question. I regret that he has chosen to name a prisoner, whether he be in Western Australia or elsewhere, and I am sure that the prisoner's relatives will not be particularly pleased with the member for Hanson for doing so. It seems to me to have been totally unnecessary. The circumstances of the case are well known to me, the Minister of Education and a number of other members of the House.

The question of our parole laws and the length of time that prisoners stay in gaol are subject to constant examination by the Office of Crime Statistics. Preliminary statistics have been published, and they show that, in a majority of cases, the non-parole periods set by the courts are much longer than they were. By way of example, I point out that the average non-parole period for the most serious crime, for which the penalty is mandatory life imprisonment, is 13 years. Under the previous system, the average length of time that prisoners stayed in gaol was eight years and 10 months. It is clear that the courts have taken into consideration—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am sorry, Mr Speaker; obviously I will have to go through it again and in some detail. I was hoping to avoid that. The member for Mitcham interjected and said that, with remission, the 13 years comes back to eight years and 10 months. That is completely incorrect. The 13 years is the actual time that lifers are spending in gaol, the non-parole period spent in gaol. We have seen a considerable increase in the time that lifers serve in gaol. I had a meeting with about 20 of them at Cadell when I got this job and they wanted to go back to the system that prevailed until 1982. The lifers preferred the old system because they stayed in gaol for a shorter period—8 years and 10 months, on average. Now the non-parole periods being given are very much longer. Quite obviously the courts have had a look at the new system, as they ought to—we have now made it mandatory that they do so—and take into account the possibility for a prisoner to earn one-third remission from the non-parole period. We have made that mandatory, although the courts were already adopting that course. However, with an abundance of caution it is now mandatory.

Had the prisoner in Western Australia (named by the member for Hanson) been sentenced in this State, his sentence would have been considerably more than he received in Western Australia because of the differing systems. I have indicated that since the new parole system came in the courts have on average—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: You don't know anything. The courts have increased the length of sentences by about a third. Had that individual been sentenced in this State, the chances are (and it is all speculation) that his sentence would have been about a third more than he was given in Western Australia. I do not want to go into individual cases, although I am happy to do so if the relatives of the individual concerned wish the case to be debated here. In this case the answer is 'No, I will not have that individual.'

We are looking at the legislation to see whether it is possible to make provision for people sentenced under another system not to get the benefits of our sentencing program by coming here. That will certainly encourage me to accept some of these people who offend interstate. It will mean that the sentence they serve here would be as though they had served it in Western Australia, for example, and also as though they were sentenced here in the first place. I am currently having discussions on the matter with the Attorney-General. The inference that the honourable member drew from the letter was quite incorrect, and I deplore his naming the individual in Parliament.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. Frank Blevins: He does understand, but chooses not to. He is one of the very few who do understand.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is either interjecting or is continuing his answer from the sedentary position—either of which is out of order. The member for Adelaide.

FESTIVAL OF ARTS

Mr DUIGAN: Will the Minister for the Arts advise whether bookings for the 1988 Bicentennial Festival of Arts are as expected one month prior to the festival's opening? The 1988 Bicentennial Festival begins in less than four weeks. The program is extensive, with over 500 performances in the main program and nearly twice as many in the fringe program. The most recent reports in the *Advertiser* suggest that bookings were approaching the $1 million mark.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I appreciate the honourable member's question because this year the Festival of Arts is probably one of the biggest and most ambitious ever staged. That has been made possible by considerable support on a special one-off basis through such groups as the Adelaide Bicentennial Authority, an increase in sponsorship in part response to the bicentenary where the Adelaide Festival of Arts is seen as the major arts activity of this bicentennial year, the Australia Council, the Adelaide City Council and very considerable assistance from the State Government.

Box office is extremely important also and I am pleased to say the reports are that it is well on target at this stage. Something like $1.4 million worth of revenue has been raised from ticket sales, which is to budget. Indeed, some performances have already been booked out. Peter Brook's production of Mahabharata has sold out completely for the all-night marathon performances. You cannot get a ticket for them and the series performances are selling very fast. One or two other programs have been completely sold out.

All the evidence is that, despite a huge program this year, over 70 companies (more than 500 performances) and a very big Fringe activity also, audience and public response has been enormous. It is an important issue, not just as some sort of arts celebration, but the Festival of Arts is one of our major tourist events which gives us some international status and recognition. I think that that international status is confirmed by the participation and financial assistance this year from about 11 countries around the world. The Governments have contributed to bringing specific companies or performers here. We have seen that as being one way of increasing the number of quality items in the Festival at a time when it is very costly to bring activities from overseas. A tremendous amount of local activity is generated in consequence, but the point is that, based on the detailed study that was done in 1984 of the Festival of Arts, there is a multiplier effect of $11 for every dollar spent on the Festival budget and that is rather significant.

That means that, in terms of employment opportunities and simple expenditure in the community, the Festival of Arts is making a massive contribution. It is getting more expensive to stage and we are trying to look at alternative ways of making the money go further and sharing certain productions with other cities. For instance, this year some have been shared with Wellington, which is holding a Festival of Arts later this year. Further, there has been a streamlining of administration. I think it is well worth noting that the administration costs of the Festival have almost halved

as a percentage of the Festival budget during the past 10 years, so a lot of efficiencies have been developed. Apart from sponsorship, we are trying to ensure by various other means that the dollar goes further. There is no question that, at the moment, the Festival looks set to be a mighty success. I urge any members of the public who have not booked to get on to it as quickly as possible.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: COURT CASE

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister of Correctional Services imputed motives to me for my asking a question today, which he described as despicable. He suggested that I asked a question with a view to influencing a court case. That is a complete fabrication and is indirectly a reflection on the Chair. Mr Speaker, you allowed the question. I was giving some historical information as a result of approaches made to me by my constituents who were burnt out in the Ash Wednesday fires by a fire lit by Bing who was out on parole. It was the Minister—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Here we go again.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am giving factual information, Mr Speaker, and you allowed the question on the basis of the historical information that I was giving.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has a point of order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, again quite clearly in the spurious guise of making a personal explanation the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is breaching if not the *sub judice* rule then the *sub judice* tradition, or the Standing Order—whatever it comes under. In itself, that is bad enough, but quite clearly he is prejudicing a case that is before the courts.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister has made his point quite clear and it is a quite valid point of order. The Chair will be listening extremely closely to the personal explanation of the honourable Deputy Leader to ensure that it does comply both with Standing Order No. 137 and with any *sub judice* requirements.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. As I said a moment ago, the reason that I asked the question was because I have been approached by constituents who were burnt out in the Ash Wednesday fire and who were concerned as to the conditions which obtain when somebody is let out on parole. That was the question. It was the Minister himself who raised the question of a current court case—I did not mention it.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: You named him—

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr Speaker, this is a reflection on you. The Speaker allowed the question. I did not mention any current court case. I mentioned the fact that the person was out on parole.

The SPEAKER: Order! Notwithstanding the fact that the Deputy Leader has a natural relish for debate, he cannot debate matters: he can merely give a personal explanation as to his having been misrepresented.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. You allowed the question and the Minister said that I asked a question to influence a court case. I utterly refute that allegation, which in itself, I believe, is despicable. If that word is to be used to describe anyone's behaviour, it should apply to the Minister.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now debating other matters.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is what he called me.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is difficult enough when we have a personal explanation from somebody who allegedly has been reflected upon without, in the course of their explanation, their endeavouring to reflect upon others.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I simply want to get the record straight. The record is that I was referring to matters which were historical and which had been raised with me by people who had been grieviously hurt in an $11 million fire lit by Bing. It was the Minister who chose to raise any contemporaneous matters which may involve a current court case—I did not mention it.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SUPERANNUATION BILL

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Labour) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide superannuation benefits for certain employees; to repeal the Superannuation Act 1974; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Mr Lewis: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is not granted. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Superannuation in the public sector in this State has, as members of the House will know, undergone considerable investigation and review over the past two years. In 1985 the Government set up a committee of inquiry into public sector superannuation, chaired by Mr Peter Agars of Touche Ross and Co. The committee consisted of members from the unions and the private sector, as well as representatives from Government. The committee reported to the Government in April 1986 with a lengthy and complex report containing 74 recommendations. The scheme on which the Agars committee concentrated was the South Australian Superannuation Fund which covers public servants and employees of many public authorities.

A majority of the committee expressed concern that, whilst the State scheme only attracted 30 per cent of eligible employees as members, it was amongst the most generous public sector schemes in Australia. Whilst it was originally envisaged that the fund would meet 28 per cent of the total cost of benefits, the Agars committee reported that the fund was currently only able to support 17.5 per cent of the cost of benefits. The Government was therefore having to support 82.5 per cent of the cost of total benefits. A significant factor contributing to the fund's inability to meet 28 per cent of the cost of all benefits was the exceedingly generous concessions given to members who joined the scheme before 1974. The Agars report states that the value of the concessions granted to members of the fund in 1974 was 146 million (in 1974 terms). The State scheme has therefore been very generous to a relatively small proportion of Government employees.

Against this background of an expensive scheme which benefited so few employees, the Government decided in May 1986 that action was needed to reduce the average superannuation costs per member and produce a scheme better adapted to the needs of poential members. Accord-

ingly, the Premier announced on 30 may 1986 that the existing South Australian Superannuation Fund would be closed to new entrants. At the same time it was announced that a task force would be set up to look at the Agars recommendations and report to the Government on a suitable new scheme. The task force has an ongoing role in advising the Government on the future of all public sector schemes.

The task force has reported to the Government on a new scheme for public servants which has a significantly lower cost per member to Government. The new scheme proposed by the Superannuation Act Bill 1988 has an employer cost of 12 per cent of a member's salary compared to the 17 per cent of salary average new entrant employer cost under the existing scheme. This cost is in line with the new schemes being introduced by State Governments elsewhere in Australia. Furthermore, the cost of the new scheme is in line with the private sector schemes of the larger organisations.

One of the problems of the existing State scheme was that it failed to meet the differing needs of employees. The new scheme addresses these differing needs and at a lower cost per member to the Government. It is a responsible step for Government because of the significantly lower cost per member, and significant for employees because it introduces a scheme which is more equitable and better tailored to their differing circumstances.

The Government is committed to reducing the long term costs of the existing scheme. This will be achieved by increasing the percentage of a pension that may be converted to a lump sum. It is cheaper in the long term for the Government to pay lump sums than fully indexed contributor pensions, spouse pensions and children's pensions. However, because the existing scheme is a pension scheme and existing contributors have joined the scheme with an expectation of receiving an indexed pension in retirement, the Government will ensure that existing retirement entitlements will be maintained. In general, no new benefits are to be introduced into the existing scheme except for a preservation of benefits until retirement age option, the cost of which is being met as part of the '3 per cent productivity benefit' agreed to under the national wage case guidelines. In future, however, existing scheme members who resign early and do not choose to preserve a benefit for retirement will receive interest at the fund earing rate on their own contributions on leaving the scheme.

The Bill before the House represents the result of lengthy investigations, research, planning and consultation. The United Trades and Labor Council and the Superannuation Federation, which represents contributors and pensioners, both support the proposed new scheme and the proposed changes to the existing scheme.

The new scheme is a lump sum scheme with a split employee and employer benefit. An employee who joins the scheme will be able to contribute on a flexible basis at a chosen contribution rate between 1.5 per cent and 9 per cent of salary and on retirement receive his or her contributions accumulated with interest. Benefits are based on a contributor averaging 6 per cent of salary. Interest will be paid at the earning rate of the fund. In addition to the employee component, an employer benefit will be paid to the contributor. The maximum employer component will be 4.5 times salary based on a membership period of 35 years. The expected total of the employee and employer benefit payable at age 60 after 35 years membership is 7 times salary. Proportional benefits will be payable for shorter periods of membership. Members will be able to retire early after the age of 55 years. This is consistent with the existing scheme. The expected maximum benefit at 55 is 6 times salary. Maximum employer benefits will be based on a member paying the standard contribution of 6 per cent of salary for 35 years.

The scheme will provide a lump sum benefit to members who are retired due to invalidity. As all exits from the scheme over the age of 55 will be classed as retirements, the maximum invalidity benefit will be based on the age 55 early retirement benefit—that is a total benefit estimated to be 6 times salary consisting of an employer benefit of 3.86 times salary. In order to enable proper assessment of potential invalidity retirements, a temporary disability allowance will be payable to a member who is unable to perform his or her duties or other suitable employment.

The temporary disability allowance, at the rate of two-thirds of salary, will be payable for an initial period of up to 12 months. Government costs will be kept to a minimum through a proper assessment of an employee for total invalidity retirement. Under the new scheme, no employee will be able to be retired on invalidity by an employer unless the Supernnuation Board agrees to retirement. The emphasis under the new scheme will be on rehabilitation and retraining as much as possible.

The scheme will provide lump sum benefits to a spouse and allowances to dependent children on the death of a contributor. A maximum employer benefit payable to a spouse will be 3 times salary. In addition, there will be a refund of employee contributions accumulated with interest. Children's benefits are to be paid as allowances because the Government believes this to be the most appropriate form of benefit for children.

Under the new scheme, the estate of single contributors will receive as a consequence of death before retirement a share of employer benefits, vesting of employer benefits will be available to the estate of single people on their death, with the longer serving members receiving the greater percentage of the accured employer benefit. The new scheme will continue to provide a benefit to a member who is retrenched. However, benefits will be based on actual service provided to the employer. Retrenchment benefits will not be based on prospective service as under the existing scheme.

A significant feature of the new scheme is that members who resign from Government employment before attaining the age of 55 years will be able to preserve their benefits either within the scheme or by transferring them to certain approved schemes. This option will encourage greater mobility of the Government work force. It will also encourage grater participation in the scheme by female workers. In the past, female workers have been seriously disadvantaged by losing all their accured superannuation benefits on leaving the work force for family reasons. This will be a thing of the past. The new scheme allows all workers who join the scheme to leave their money in the scheme until genuine retirement after 55 years of age, and receive an employer benefit based on actual membership. As I have already stated, a preservation of benefits option is being introduced into the existing scheme as well.

The Government firmly believes that an employee or spouse who receives benefits under WorkCover should not, in addition, receive superannuation benefits to compensate for loss of future earnings. The new scheme has been designed so that the superannuation benefit structure dovetails the new WorkCover benefits. Notwithstanding this principle, where a contributor is still an employee but in receipt of workers compensation, the employee will still be considered to be an active member of the superannuation scheme. The restriction to prevent the 'double-dipping' of employer benefits will occur on the death or invalidity retirement of the

worker. In such situations though, the value of the accrued benefit to the date of invalidity or death will always be paid.

The Government proposes in the Superannuation Act Bill to introduce several changes to the existing scheme. In principle, though, no new benefits are to be introduced that have a significant cost impact on the Government. It is proposed to introduce a new flexible contribution rate system as under the new scheme. Members will be able to choose a level of contribution rate between 1.5 per cent and 9 per cent. In special circumstances a contributor will be permitted to reduce the contribution rate to 0 per cent. A period of zero contributions, except for approved periods of leave, will however be deemed to be a period of non-membership. This arrangement will introduce flexibility into the existing scheme. It may also have a tendency to reduce the Government's liability if significant numbers of members choose a lower level of contribution than the standard rate for maximum benefits.

Until now, members had no option but to maintain their existing contribution levels even in a period of financial difficulty. Flexible contribution rates provide more flexible superannuation planning. Members of the House will recall one of the reasons that led to the superannuation inquiry was the Actuary's recommendation that member contribution rates in the existing scheme be substantially increased. The Government has decided that, because of the closure of the scheme to new entrants and moves to reduce the long-term costs of the scheme, member contribution rates will remain at the existing standard levels.

As is proposed under the new scheme, a disability allowance will also be provided to potential invalid retirees under the existing scheme before their actual retirement. The aim once again is to control Government costs and rehabilitate or retrain where possible rather than automatically retire an employee on an indexed pension payable for life. Superannuation benefits under the existing scheme will also be dovetailed into the WorkCover benefits so that 'double-dipping' in employer benefits does not occur.

The most significant change to the existing scheme will provide an option for pensioners to commute greater portions of their pension to a lump sum. In general, new pensioners will be able to commute up to 50 per cent of their pension to a lump sum. Where the level of pension is below $8 000 *per annum* it is proposed to allow the whole pension to be converted to a lump sum.

In addition, all existing pensioners on pensions less than $12 000 *per annum* will be given an option to commute further pension to a lump sum. It is proposed to make this offer to existing pensioners later this year. Where pensioners do not wish to convert pension to a lump sum, the existing benefits will be maintained. Considerable long term savings will accrue to the Government if this option of greater commutation is picked up by existing pensioners.

The Agars committee strongly recommended increased commutation as a means of the Government reducing the existing scheme costs. The net savings to the Government come from the offering commutation at rates attractive to individuals and attractive to the Government. I emphasise though, that existing pensioners, including the many senior citizens under the scheme, will not be forced to take a lump sum. If any person wishes their pension to continue on the existing basis, a pensioner may simply ignore the offer that the Superannuation Board will put before them.

The Bill also introduces new structures for the Superannuation Board and the Superannuation Fund Investment Trust. In the future, both of these bodies will be chaired by persons independent of Government. The Government has also agreed with the Agars Committee recommendation that neither the Public Actuary nor the Deputy Public Actuary shall be a member of these bodies. The role of the Public Actuary will be one of an independent adviser to the Superannuation Board and the Investment Trust. The trust will in future consist of five members, of whom two will be appointed by the Governor. Both the United Trades and Labor Council and the Superannuation Federation will nominate a member for the trust. The board already has a similar five member structure. The structure of these bodies is in accordance with the Federal Government guidelines on superannuation trustee bodies.

The Bill before the House will establish a superannuation scheme for Government employees that is comparable with standards set in the private sector and which is cost effective and equitable. I accordingly commend the Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 repeals the 1974 Act.

Clause 4 provides for interpretation of the Bill. The definition of 'adjusted salary' accommodates the problem of the amount of salary to be used when calculating benefits payable to a part-time or casual employee. Subclause (3) *(b)* provides that the actual or attributed salary of a person employed on a part-time or casual basis will be taken to be the salary that the contributor would have received if working full-time.

Clauses 6 to 10 provide for the continuation of the South Australian Superannuation Board.

Clauses 11 to 16 provide for the continuation of the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust.

Clauses 17 to 20 provide for the continuation of the South Australian Superannuation Fund.

Clause 21 provides for reports to be made by the board and the trust to the Minister.

Clause 22 provides for entry of new contributors.

Clause 23 provides for variable contribution rates and also for the salary on which contributions are based.

Clause 24 deals with contribution points. A contributor contributing at the standard rate of 6 per cent of salary accrues one point per month. The rate of accrual varies proportionately with the rate of contribution so that a contributor contributing at 9 per cent of salary will accrue points at 1.5 per month. However, subclause (5) provides that when calculating accrued points for benefit purposes the accrued points cannot exceed the number of months in the contributor's period of contribution to the fund. Therefore, the only reason to contribute at a rate above 6 per cent is to compensate for a period of reduced contribution or to build up the contributor's interest in the fund.

Clause 25 is included to enable the Government, when negotiating with a person whom the Government particularly wants in the Public Service, to offer attractive terms as to superannuation. Such persons are usually people in mid life who have already proved themselves but who, because of their age, would otherwise only obtain marginal benefits from the scheme.

Clause 26 is self explanatory.

Clause 27 sets out benefits under the new scheme on retirement.

Clause 28 provides for benefits on resignation. The clause allows a contributor to preserve his benefits or to carry them over to a new fund.

Clause 29 provides for benefits or preservation on retrenchment.

Clause 30 provides for a disability pension under the new scheme. The pension can be paid for a period not exceeding 12 months (except in special circumstances) and is designed to allow a period for assessment before a contributor is paid benefits on invalidity.

Clause 31 provides for benefits on invalidity.

Clause 32 provides for benefits on death.

Clause 33 is self explanatory.

Clause 34 provides for a pension payable on retirement under the existing scheme.

Clause 35 provides for a pension payable on retrenchment.

Clause 36 provides for a disability pension in the existing scheme.

Clause 37 provides for an invalidity pension.

Clause 38 provides for a pension payable on the death of a contributor.

Clause 39 provides for resignation and preservation of benefits under the existing scheme.

Clause 40 provides for commutation of pensions based on commutation factors prescribed by regulation.

Clause 41 allows for medical examination of invalid pensioners at the instigation and expense of the board.

Clause 42 enables the Minister to require an invalid or retrenchment pensioner to accept appropriate employment. If the employment is not accepted the pension can be suspended. If it is accepted the pensioner gets full credit in terms of contribution points for the period that he was not employed.

Clause 43 provides for the date of commencement of a pension.

Clause 44 provides for a review of the board's decisions by the Supreme Court.

Clause 45 provides for the effect of workers compensation on pensions. A pension whether paid to a former contributor, his or her spouse or a child will be reduced by the amount of workers compensation. A pension paid to a former contributor will also be reduced by any wages of salary earnt by the pensioner. These provisions only apply to a pensioner who is below the age of retirement.

Clause 46 provides that benefits payable to a spouse under the Act must, if the deceased contributor is survived by a lawful and putative spouse, be divided equally between both spouses.

Clause 47 provides for the indexing of pensions.

Clause 48 provides for the application of money standing to the credit of a contributor's account after all benefits have been paid under the Act.

Clause 49 provides for the payment of money under the Act where the person entitled is a child or is dead.

Clause 50 prevents assignment of pensions.

Clause 51 enables a liability of a contributor under the Act to be set off against a benefit payable to the contributor under the Act.

Clause 52 enables the board to provide annuities.

Clause 53 provides for continuation of the Voluntary Savings Account.

Clause 54 gives the board access to information.

Clause 55 recognises the complexity of the subject matter of this Bill and gives the board some latitude in applying its provisions to the varied circumstances that are likely to arise in its administration.

Clause 56 is a standard provision.

Clause 57 permits benefits to be paid in a foreign currency in certain circumstances.

Clause 58 provides for the making of regulations.

Schedule 1 sets out transitional provisions. Clause 1 provides for continuity of membership. Clause 2 provides for standard contribution rates for continuing contributors. Clause 3 provides for the opening of old scheme contributors contribution accounts. Clause 4 preserves a present advantage enjoyed by certain contributors who joined before the commencement of the present Act. Clause 5 provides for the number of points to be credited to old scheme contributors. Clause 6 sets out certain provisions relating to members of the Provident Account. Clause 7 provides for the continuation of limited benefits. Clause 8 preserves increases resulting from excess unit additions. Clause 9 preserves neglected unit and fund share reductions. Clause 10 provides for continuation of pensions. Clause 11 abolishes the Provident Account and the Retirement Benefit Account. Clause 12 ensures the continuation of arrangements made under section 11 of the existing Act. Clause 13 provides for continuity of the elected members of the board. Clause 14 provides that any person who resigns from the old scheme on or after 1 January 1988 may preserve his benefits under the provisions of the Bill.

Schedule 2 gives the value of C for the purposes of clause 34 (2) of the Bill.

Schedule 3 gives the values of D, E, F and G for the purposes of clause 34 (3).

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

FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 December. Page 2504.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): The Opposition supports the Bill with but one amendment. The Bill amends legislation which was assented to on 20 December 1984 and which sought to clarify the relationship between the various—

Mr LEWIS: Mr Acting Speaker, on a point of order. I ask you to rule that the Minister of Labour is out of order in that he came to my place in this Chamber, verbally abused me, using expletives in the process, and threatened me. Will you therefore rule whether or not the Minister is a fit and proper person to be in the Chamber?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Robertson): That is not a matter on which I, as Acting Speaker, can rule. I will take up the matter with the Speaker and the honourable member will get a ruling from him. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Acting Speaker, in what circumstances do you accept responsibility for the conduct of business in this Chamber where you feel incompetent to do so? Am I not entitled to the protection of Standing Orders?

The Speaker having resumed the Chair:

The SPEAKER: Order! Neither the Acting Speaker nor I have any first hand knowledge of the matters alleged by the honourable member for Murray-Mallee. I suggest that, if he has a particular view that he wishes to have debated by the House regarding the honourable Minister, he take up the matter in private members' time by way of a substantive motion.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: As a witness to the events to which the member for Murray-Mallee has referred, I do not think that it would profit the House much if I were to relate them here because that would only inflame a difficult situation. The Minister crossed the floor and spoke to the honourable member. I saw trouble looming, so I went up there and heard what the Minister said. I suggest that you, Sir, take up the matter with the member

for Murray-Mallee and the Minister if we are not to have brawling in the precincts of Parliament.

The SPEAKER: Bearing in mind that the Chair has for the past two years always tried to ameliorate quarrels between members, I will take up the Deputy Leader's suggestion and give it due consideration. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I was explaining to the House that the 1984 Act tried to establish the relationship of children born by *in vitro* fertilisation and artificial insemination techniques as regards their parentage and a number of other aspects. It is interesting that in the three years since that matter was dealt with by this Parliament an excellent select committee has spent an enormous amount of time tackling the difficult questions that have been forced on us by technological change. Indeed, the medical and scientific fraternity will continue to push the bounds of our existing legislation much further than we would wish and it will be incumbent on Parliament to move ahead of technology and to understand the changes that are taking place around us so that we can properly provide for such changes in a legislative framework.

I remind members of what was passed in 1984, and subject to a sunset clause until the deliberations of the select committee had been completed. It defined fertilisation procedures for the first time and included a definition concerning *de facto* relationships. It created retrospectivity in the legislation in that it applied to those children who were born as a result of these techniques before 1984 but it did not vest right of property at that time. The bearer of the child was deemed to be the mother of that child and the consenting male in the family relationship was deemed to be the father. It clarified the situation of donors to artificial insemination techniques by stating that they had no parental right to the resulting offspring.

In its time, it was a far reaching Bill and many of the matters arising have been determined. It can be seen by the small number of amendments that this Bill encompasses that Parliament generally got it right in 1984, although other legislation has since been dealt with by both Houses concerning controls that should be placed on artificial insemination procedures. Those matters were debated long and hard by this House and in another place, and it is not my intention to repeat those arguments. If the readers of *Hansard* want to get a grip on some of the more important questions, I refer them to those debates.

This Bill adds to the 1984 amendments in several ways. It increases the scope of the fertilisation procedures to include gamete intra-fallopian transfer techniques which involve ovum transfer. This was not considered at the time but it was generally agreed that reference to this particular technique should be included in the Bill. Probably the most major change to this legislation is the outlawing of surrogacy. The IVF select committee made recommendations on this matter but the Bill takes them one step further by prohibiting advertising. It provides that surrogacy contracts are illegal and void, that a person who has paid another to negotiate or arrange a surrogacy contract may recover the money paid, and that a person advertising the willingness to enter into a surrogacy contract or seeking another to enter a surrogacy contract, or who is willing to negotiate a contract on behalf of another, commits an offence for which a maximum penalty of a $4 000 fine or 12 months imprisonment applies. The Bill does not deal with a person who has paid money to another in consideration for a surrogacy contract, although the select committee suggested that it should be in the legislation, and this is the tenor of the amendment.

It was my intention, in discussing this matter, to split the Family Relationships Act Amendment Bill into two parts, one relating to children born of IVF procedures and the resulting relationship between the parents and the child of that procedure, and the other relating to artificial insemination procedures. It complicates the question to do so but it was my belief, and I expressed this opinion last night, that IVF procedures should be available only to married couples. In keeping with that, I thought it appropriate that the family relationships legislation, which determines the relationship of the offspring, should reflect my desire and not just be a general acceptance that *de facto* relationships are acceptable in the AID and IVF programs. Last night, this Chamber chose to refuse my request and it is not my intention to prolong the debate on the benefits of splitting the Bill, setting separate relationships for those who have participated in the *in vitro* fertilisation program and for those involved in the artificial insemination program.

The Opposition is satisfied that, through the process of the select committee and its efforts to grapple with some very difficult problems, Parliament has come up with what must be seen as a reasonable compromise on a very complex set of questions. Because much of the material has been considered in another debate, I will not prolong my speech. If people have difficulty understanding the point of view held by Parliament, they should refer to those debates, rather than they be regurgitated here today. In commending the amendment that is before the House, I state that the Opposition supports the Bill.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I support the proposition. The points that I wished to make in the course of my remarks have already been made and it is not my intention to delay the House.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I support the legislation. The issue has been well debated in this place in the past 24 hours and was the subject of considerable discussion in another place, although I cannot refer to that. This issue has been around for a long time, perhaps decades. On numerous occasions since 1980, a constituent of mine has endeavoured to win Government support for surrogacy contracts. It has taken up much of the time of Crown Law and the respective Attorneys-General over the period to rule that South Australia will not countenance surrogacy. I am pleased that it will be on the Statute Book, but it may not be in the form that I would wish because it could have been dealt with satisfactorily in another piece of legislation.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport): I thank members who participated in the debate. I acknowledge that the extensive debates that have proceeded in this place and in another place have covered the question of surrogacy, although it may be under cover of a different piece of legislation. I apologise to the House and the member for Hanson because last evening I mentioned that the Family Relationships Act Amendment Bill had been debated and passed in another place. In fact, it was introduced into this House by my colleague the Deputy Premier, so I fully understand the point that the honourable member made in the Committee stage yesterday.

I am pleased that the Opposition has indicated its support for what I believe is very critical legislation. The package of legislation, the Reproductive Technology Act Amendment Bill and the Family Relationships Act Amendment Bill, is, as a number of members have stated (and I agree heartily), very important legislation. If we do nothing else as members of Parliament in our time here, having been in

this place when this legislation was put on the statute books, we have served the State of South Australia very well. I ask all members to support the legislation.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—'Insertion of new Part.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I move:

Page 2, lines 26 to 29—Leave out subsection (3) and insert new subsection as follows:

(3) A person who gives any valuable consideration under, or in respect of, a surrogacy contract or a procuration contract may recover the amount or value of that consideration, as a debt, from the person to whom the consideration was given.

The Opposition has attempted to ensure that the Bill is consistent with the recommendation of the select committee. Whilst the law, interestingly enough, says that if a contract is null and void, there is generally no right of recourse in regard to obtaining moneys paid. This is a separate situation from a very sensitive viewpoint. We are not talking about trading children but about the desire of infertile couples to achieve parenthood. They may, for a variety of reasons, resort to saying that there is no other method by which they can have a child and will therefore pay a woman to bear the child. It is quite common in many countries and surrogacy exists in this country also. The select committee ruled under those circumstances that the money should be recoverable not only for the procuration, that is, the agent who secures it, but also for the people who are intent on achieving parenthood and break the law by entering into a contract.

A number of questions exist on surrogacy, and I will ask them after dealing with the amendment, in which I have a particular interest. I have pleasure in moving the amendment and ask that it be accepted by the Committee. It is in keeping with the report of the select committee and the wishes of this place.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Government opposes the amendment. I am advised that it is not in accordance with the select committee report. In due course this matter will be brought to the attention of the Attorney-General so that, if he so desires, he can give it further consideration. A person who organises a surrogacy will have their money refunded, but the donor or father, in the view of the select committee, should not have the money refunded for two reasons: first, in the unlikely but possible circumstances where the father through court action could have custody of the child and could also have the money back, the woman not only loses the child after giving birth to it but also loses the money. Secondly, it applies in the case where the mother has the child and the money would be useful to her in maintaining the child. Those two valid reasons exist for opposing the amendment.

Having said that, I am happy to have the matter referred to the Attorney-General so that consideration can be given to it when the debate proceeds. I do not want to go further than that on the measure unless the Committee wishes me to do so, other than to say that it is a package to go through the parliamentary process and the Government will be opposing the amendment.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister has already given an undertaking to refer the matter to the Attorney-General and it will be debated accordingly in another place. I point out that the person procuring is probably committing a greater illegality for which there is no defence than the person who is a principal contractor. By that I mean that if the law proscribes that the contract is illegal, the person who is the go-between in the process in my mind does not have a direct interest in parenthood himself or herself, thus creating a greater offence than the person who desires to attain parenthood through this method.

We know that IVF and AID procedures can only work so far, and if the female or wife is infertile through all the procedures those couples may, for all the very right reasons but all the wrong reasons under the law, pursue surrogacy as an alternative. The pursuit of surrogacy in that situation is far less open to criticism than the person who negotiates an illegal contract. With those few words, I understand the Minister's undertaking and will not pursue the matter any further.

Amendment negatived.

Mr OSWALD: This clause refers to a surrogacy contract. Is such a contract something that must be in writing to be enforceable or would a verbal contract under those circumstances be sufficient? If one could establish that two parties had entered into a verbal contract to establish surrogacy motherhood, which had gone through to conception and birth, can the mother be prosecuted as it would be difficult to prove?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member in a sense has answered his own question, as he is right. We would be able to prosecute people involved in a verbal contract but would need to be able to prove to the satisfaction of the court that such a verbal contract existed. It does not have to be in writing: a verbal contract is sufficient illegality to breach the provisions of this legislation.

Mr OSWALD: Does the remuneration have to be specifically in currency? The Bill provides that 'a valuable consideration' in relation to a contract means consideration consisting of money or any other kind of property that has a monetary value. Could that definition be extended to people who are later offered free accommodation, free meals, free entertainment, or the free use of motor vehicles? How could that be quantified to obtain a prosecution?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Those instances cited by the honourable member should be regarded as property. This is new legislation and, as always, it will have to be tested in the courts. If some of the reservations raised by the honourable member about obtaining proof are proved to be valid, I am sure that the matter will come back to Parliament in order that we may rectify any shortcomings in the legislation. The short answer to the honourable member's question is 'Yes', those instances involve property and are covered by that subclause.

Mr S.J. BAKER: As the Minister would be well aware, a member of the Upper House who has left this place was a very keen proponent of surrogacy contracts as a means of assisting those people who could not have children through artificial or natural means. In the American situation we can talk about trading children where very large sums of money have been paid and, when either party has reneged, some extraordinary difficulties have arisen. Situations have occurred where a person has contracted but they have found that the child was handicapped; that contract has been avoided, and no money has been paid. By the same token, women have entered into a surrogacy contract and, once they have seen the baby, they have said, 'I want to keep the baby.'

I think it is appropriate for this Parliament to say, 'We don't want to see a trade in children in that sense. We don't want these sorts of disappointments to arise in South Australia.' However, another set of surrogacy relationships occurred recently in South Africa. I think the would-be grandmother actually bore the children for her daughter and son-in-law. When is there a contract and when is there not a contract? In the South African situation, where the matter is within the family and no incestuous relationship is

involved, would that be regarded as a contract for surrogacy, or would it be seen as a humanitarian provision?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member has raised an exceedingly valid point. I understand that the situation described by the honourable member where a grandparent to the child born of the arrangement wishes to carry the baby for her daughter or a family member would not constitute a contract and would not breach the provisions of this Bill. The select committee found that you cannot legislate against what is clearly a family relationship. Those decisions are made within a family. That is the decision of the family and the child resulting from such arrangements is in no way part of a contract and it does not constitute the sale of a child. If those circumstances prevailed in South Australia (and I acknowledge that the opportunity is always there in a very caring family relationship for that to occur), people would not be in default or in breach of this legislation.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The member for Morphett raised a question about consideration after the event. There is no doubt in my mind that, if the baby was delivered to the contractor and some form of consideration was given, that would be subject to the various laws that we have made here. That could involve property, a free holiday, or a wide variety of considerations. It may well be that the wording will have to be changed. However, in surrogacy contracts, as I understand, it is quite common for a large amount of maintenance to be paid prior to the birth of the child. Women may be willing to enter into a contract on the basis that they can live in a comfortable situation and be provided with things that probably they have never had before in their lives on the basis that, when the baby is born, it will be the baby of the couple who contracted for it. I suppose that it is a legal question, but does that fall into the same area as the issue we are talking about, or is it outside the provisions of the Act?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: My advice is that that would come under 'valuable consideration' in relation to a contract as described in clause 6.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): I will quote directly from an article which appeared in the *Bulletin* of 22-29 December last year. The article, which was written by Laurie Oakes, is entitled 'Labor's welfare watchdog to range wide' and makes the following points:

> One-quarter of all personal wealth is owned by 1 per cent of the population. At the top end, 90 000 Australians own $125 billion or $1.5 million each ... At the bottom, more than 2.6 million Australians depend on social welfare benefits. To understand what this means in concrete terms, imagine the wealth of the top end per cent being redistributed. It would provide a modest suburban home and a Ford Laser for every member of the bottom 20 per cent.

It appears that for the majority of this century wealth in this country has been outlandishly concentrated in the hands of the few. Further, it appears that that concentration of wealth is unjust and, I suppose to the great regret of a number of people of my political ilk, the trend towards that concentration appears to be continuing.

It is regrettable to me that taxation rates have fallen so that the top marginal rate is now below 50 per cent. The company tax rate has also been decreased in recent years and the practice of double taxing company profits has been thrown out the window. It seems to me, though, that the aggregation of wealth in the hands of a few, and the talents of the few who aggregate that wealth, is such that even a progressive tax on personal and company profits would have little effect on the distribution of that wealth. It may in fact be successful in channelling a little more to the 2.6 million on the bottom of the social pile, but I doubt very much whether it would change the rank order of the wealthy 1 per cent at the top end. This is partly because much of that wealth is in the hands of holding companies, and I suspect that a good deal of it is transferred to accounts overseas and held in accounts in various tax havens around the world.

If Federal Governments threaten the top 1 per cent and threaten to tax business, in particular, big business, more heavily, this country is faced with the threat of a flight of capital and the net result of that is that no Government in this country in my memory has been prepared to increase tax rates and actually try to derive more wealth for the bottom 2.6 million by taxing the top 1 per cent. Indeed, before the last election, the paragon of the Melbourne business community, John Elliott, made quite explicit threats that the activities of Elders would be moved offshore if tax rates were not lowered. That little ploy was more or less successful, of course. It was an attempt at blackmailing a Federal Government and it was one of a very long succession of similar attempts which have been made by big business in this country to my memory.

John Elliott is not a poor man. It is widely recognised that he has been a great success in this country, and he was clearly successful on this occasion in representing the interests of his shareholders and, more particularly, the interests of the 1 per cent who control, own, possess and manipulate the significant proportion of wealth in this country. He looks after shareholders and his constituency very well. I wonder how well he represents the other constituency, the constituency he has in his position as President of the Liberal Party. I wonder how well he represents the poor and depressed that the Liberal Party now seeks or purports to represent, and I wonder how much he represents the struggling middle class of small business people in this country. I doubt whether he represents the people that his Party now claims to represent—the traders, the small business people—very well at all. I suspect that the care and compassion now being evinced by members opposite and their colleagues in the Federal sphere is fairly shallow. I suspect that if we scratch a little harder, we will find that their true feelings are rather more like John Elliott's feelings—in other words, they are more concerned to represent the top 1 per cent than the middle brand of Australian politics.

It is also true to say that Federal Labor has not exactly been entirely devoid of rich friends, and I think it is a point worth noting in the aftermath of the Adelaide by-election that it does not do a great deal for Labor's image to be seen swanning around, as it were, with the very rich of this country. I think it does very little for the Labor Party as a political entity in this country to be seen to be championing the cause of the wealthy 1 per cent rather than the cause of the 2.6 million who are currently on social security benefits.

In fact, the *Sunday Mail* of 16 August last year contained an article which gave a listing of the so-called members of Australia's elite club, in which the billionaires, the $200 million men, the $100 million men and the lesser lights

were listed. Amongst that list, of course, we find Kerry Packer with a personal wealth of $1.3 billion and Peter Abels with a personal wealth of $35 million. I suggest to the House that those people and Labor's apparent friendship with that group does very little for Labor's image.

The whole privatisation debate may even be about the selling of Australian Airlines to Ansett under Peter Abels. Indeed, Peter Abels himself has made abundantly clear that he would like to see a monopoly in the Australian internal airline industry and that he would very much like to be part of it. If Australian Airlines is to be privatised, it seems to me that it would be a very peculiar decision and one which lacks any sense of financial and fiscal credibility. From the Federal parliamentary research library we find a set of figures produced towards the end of last year showing a total equity in Australian Airlines of $752 million, of which $174 million is shareholder funds. The return last financial year on those shareholder funds was 21.65 per cent. Not bad for a struggling public enterprise which is alleged to be on its last legs and which some people in this country would have us sell up to the highest bidder, and I have no doubt who the highest bidder would be!

The 1 per cent of the Australian population who control that vast quantity of wealth not only want to monopolise the productive bits of the Australian economy, the productive bits of Australian public enterprise, but are also responsible for the majority of Australia's foreign debt. It has been alleged, according to OECD figures, that while Australia has the second lowest ratio of Government debt to GDP in the OECD (and we are fed this line continually) the public sector in Australia is too large and too inefficient and there is a great need to privatise. The same figures indicate that the private sector is responsible for 70 per cent of Australia's overseas debt, and that the private overseas debt for Australia is increasing at twice the rate of the public overseas debt. It is quite clear from those figures that the private sector contribute far more to Australia's current economic problems and Australia's balance of trade problems and that talk about privatisation of the public sector is so much cant and poppycock that it ought to be roundly rejected by Australians of all classes.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): That has to be the greatest lot of poppycock I have ever heard in this place. If you are successful in this country, all the Labor Government wants to do is tax you or tear you down. I have never heard so much poppycock in all my life. Some of the people mentioned by the previous speaker have spent most of their time in the past 12 months sitting in the hands of the Prime Minister. It has been publicly seen and not denied, yet those people have been very successful. It is okay if you support the Labor Party but it is not okay if you support the Liberals. That is the greatest lot of nonsense I have ever heard. Members who get up in this House and say that success is not important obviously have not done anything themselves. It is about time a few of the people who criticise those in business who have been successful started to employ a few people instead of being academic and standing in this House and quoting the greatest lot of tripe I have heard for a long time.

I want to talk about the continuing saga of the Crouzet ticketing system. Again, on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of this week we found that the multi-trip tickets were not working. A massive amount of revenue was lost by the STA again this week. And why? Because the children went back to school and, on asking why this could occur, we find that the STA has known for some time that the tickets may not work. One operator on one of the bus routes yesterday said that 85 per cent of the tickets in the morning run were gobbled up by the machine. What an amazing system! This is new technology introduced by this Government with the consideration of the STA, and what a terrible system! In the past couple of months, everything seemed to go quiet. Yesterday I asked the gentleman who rang me about this, 'Why has it all gone quiet?'

He said, 'Because the bus drivers are sick and tired of reporting the problems to the depot.' What a disgraceful situation! Yesterday, I understand, the two-way radio system was jammed because of the number of bus drivers ringing in to report the problem of these ticket machines going berserk again. What about the hold-ups and delays? What about the concern expressed by the people whose tickets have been gobbled up? They have to go to North Terrace to collect their tickets, and they are not even guaranteed that the tickets can be collected the next day. What is worse, they have to buy another ticket so that they can collect the ticket that has been gobbled up by this inefficient system. What an amazing set-up!

What about the procedure where the driver has to take the person's name and address? He takes it to the depot. Once it is in the depot it is checked by the depot supervisors and that information goes by courier to head office to be checked again. The ticket, of course, goes along with the system for the ride. The amazing part about it is that the public has to pay again because of this inefficient system that initially was to cost $4 million and is now heralded to be costing in the order of $16 million. What a mistake, what a muck-up by the STA in relation to this system!

We then find that the bus staff passes are not working. These passes are required to set and validate the machines each day. They have had to be changed three times because the software has had to be updated each time to minimise the software problems. That is what has happened with this Crouzet system. It is not an adequate system and it has not been properly tested. As a gentleman from one of the other statutory authorities said to me the other day, 'If we had put this thing in without it being checked we would have been drawn and quartered.' Yet here we have a system that has been put in by the State Transport Authority and is still having problems. On Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of this week there was massive misuse of the ticketing system, with no increase in revenue, but the system was put in to cut out fraud and increase revenue, but after six months we are still having basic problems.

Let us talk about the portable validators. The union complained in the early stages about the weight of the validators and possible problems. I understand that every day at least half of the validators go flat because the batteries are not working. Why is that so? I understand that, once the generating system reaches a temperature above 30 degrees Centigrade, the recharging system will not work. The batteries of the validators are being half charged, but they are registering as fully charged. How could this Government possibly have purchased a system for about $16 million if the batteries do not work in the validating machines? Why has the recharging system not been checked to ascertain that it does not work in temperatures of more than 30 degrees? General temperature readings between September and January show that not too many days are cooler than 30 degrees. So, here is another fundamental part of the system which is breaking down because initially it was not checked to see whether it would work at 30 degrees Centigrade.

Mr Meier: A bit like the free barbecues.

Mr INGERSON: Yes, a bit like the free barbecues, as my friend said. It has been necessary to change the software in these machines to get a more up-to-date system and

prevent the fraud that was occurring. As I have said previously in this House, there has been fraud not only at the consumer level, where the tickets are not being validated or people are skipping through the validating system, but also at the bus driver level. It is interesting that we have had to do that and update those machines at least three times.

What about the more important issue of revenue? The Minister has not yet told us of the revenue readings, but the people in the depots say that the revenue is down by at least 30 per cent every day. Where is that money going? What is the current debt of the STA because of this new ticketing system? What really is going on with the collection of moneys within this system? As I said before, it is purported that the cost of the system is now some $16 million. Will the Minister come clean and tell us about that? What is the real cost? Is the Government going to sue Crouzet? Is there a law suit in progress? What is likely to happen with the contractual arrangements between Crouzet and the Government? Will the Government just sit there for the next six months and do nothing about this because it is frightened to come clean and tell the public that the system does not work? Is the rumour true that at Regency Park all the old ticketing systems have been reconditioned so that we can go back to the old system when the new system is scrapped? I have been told that at Regency Park all the old machines are being done up, because this is the greatest muck-up of all time.

Last of all, what about the issue that has been around for some three months and has been further discussed in the past couple of weeks? I am talking about the rumour that the Government is going to sell the Aldgate system to Briscoes. Privatisation! We were rubbished and told it would not work. I understand that the system is being looked at, not only at this level but by the overseas experts that are here, to suggest that areas such as the Hills, in a close community, can be privatised and sold off to save the STA some money. If it happens, good luck. Let us hope that it is done, but perhaps the Minister can come clean and tell us what is really happening with this ticketing system that started off to cost $4 million and now looks like costing the State over $16 million.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I wish to spend a few minutes this evening to pay a tribute to a living legend in Australian politics. I refer of course to my personal friend and former Federal ALP parliamentary colleague the Hon. Michael Jerome Young. Mick Young was born in 1936, the same year as myself; in fact, he is about two months younger than I am. He is a unique person. He left school at an early age and commenced a spectacular rise to prominence in Australia. He began as a rouseabout in the New South Wales outback, in the shearing sheds, and progressed to become a shearer. He went on to become a union organiser, South Australian Labor Party Secretary, Federal ALP Secretary and Federal member for Port Adelaide, which seat he has held for the past 14 years.

Overall, Mick Young has spent 31 years in the Australian Labor Party. His rise from rouseabout to senior Federal Cabinet Minister, with the near certainty of becoming this nation's Deputy Prime Minister, has certainly been unique. I liken him, not only because of his rise from the bottom but for his ability and greatness, to the legendary Ben Chifley, whom I believe to have been Australia's greatest Prime Minister.

Mick is a very capable person, with an uncanny ability to read the electorate and fully understand ordinary working people's problems and fears. He also possesses a great ability to understand complex legislation and issues. His friendly and jovial manner has always made him well liked and popular wherever he goes, and in whatever circle he cares to mix he is always a very popular person because of his attitude and nature. Mick could be very aggressive and an attacking person in the House of Representatives. We have seen this many times. However, his ability to mix humour with his attacking remarks has earned him the respect of people on all sides of politics. I doubt very much whether Mick has a real enemy in the world.

The first time I saw Mick Young at close hand was when he became Secretary of the South Australian Branch of the Australian Labor Party. In that capacity he visited the Woodville plant of General Motors-Holden with the then Premier (Don Dunstan). I still remember his outstanding and stirring contribution that day, when he spoke without notes. Indeed, I have never heard a speech before or since to equal that performance, and it has left a lasting impression with me.

Mick's obvious talents were quickly recognised by senior ALP people and he soon became Federal Secretary of the Party. In this office he masterminded the most successful election campaign in Australia's history which saw the election of the Whitlam Labor Government in 1972. Mick entered Parliament in 1974 as Federal member for Port Adelaide on the retirement of Fred Birrell, and he has held the seat ever since.

After the disgraceful events of Remembrance Day 1975, Mick was promoted to the Opposition front bench as Labor spokesman in various areas, and he continued to perform extremely capably. When the Hawke Labor Government was swept into office in 1983, Mick was given the new and prestigious portfolio of Special Minister of State. In early 1987, he was promoted to the position of Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs and Minister for Local Government and he held those portfolios until his recent retirement from the Federal Parliament. He is still currently National President of the Australian Labor Party.

Mick's achievements and performance within the Parliament and his capacity as a Minister are well documented, so I shall not go into those matters now. However, I should like to speak briefly about Mick as the local member and the representative of the working class people of Port Adelaide. There is one thing in this life that is almost impossible to do: for an outsider to come into Port Adelaide and be universally accepted by Portonians. However, it is a measure of Mick's unique ability, character and adaptability that he was able to come into the Port and be quickly accepted and indeed loved as a true Portonian.

Probably the most dangerous thing that an outsider can do is to come into Port Adelaide and criticise Mick Young. The offender would be lucky to escape with his or her life. This fierce support for Mick Young has been earned as a result of his terrific rapport with the people and his willingness at all times to mix with and talk with ordinary people about everyday issues. Mick Young's ability to get down to the grassroots has meant that he can mix equally as well with people in the local hotel at the Port as he can with overseas dignitaries and even members of the royal family. He has that unique ability.

I know of many cases where Mick has gone out of his way personally to help individuals or families that have suffered illness, financial hardship or family loss. That kind of deed is not publicised, because Mick would never allow it to be, but the good news gets around the district, especially on the extensive Port Adelaide grapevine, so some of Mick's good deeds have become known. However, many of the good things that Mick has done will never be known. He

has certainly done many valuable things that were not part of his role as Federal member for Port Adelaide.

A major part of Mick's influence in the Port Adelaide area (indeed, on the nationwide scene) was his setting up of the Port Adelaide ALP Federal Electorate Committee in 1975. This was the first such committee in Australia and others have been set up since then following Mick's initiative. Sine then, he has built a branch and a committee, and he has developed an electoral process within that FEC that has worked like a well oiled machine. As a result of Mick's direction, the Port Adelaide FEC has become the most financial ALP branch in the nation.

Various innovative initiatives have been taken by Mick Young as a result of his work on the local FEC. My colleague the member for Albert Park reminds me that one of these has been the ALP Scholarship Trust in respect of which Mick was a prime mover, because it was on his suggestion that the trust was formed. I have been a member of the trust since its inception and it is now in its fifth year of operation. As a result of its activity, many people of all ages and backgrounds, especially young people in the area, have benefited immensely. They have been given a chance in life and money has been allocated to send them to all sorts of institutions to study at levels from matriculation to university. People have even been sent overseas and to other States to attend important functions such as seminars and conferences, so that they will benefit by being enabled to pursue certain disciplines.

This year it was great to have one of the original scholarship recipients (Bob Churches) become a member of the trust. Bob has received a scholarship each year and thus has been given the chance to go through Teachers College and become a highly qualified teacher. He has passed his exams with flying colours and will now help administer the trust. A measure of Mick Young's fairness in his approach to the selection of scholarship holders has been his insistence that recipients need not be Labor voters. The only requirement is that they must live within the Port Adelaide Federal electorate.

I should like to talk at greater length about Mick Young, but I am running out of time. So, I will finish with the wish that this great Australian and his wife Mary have a happy retirement. Mick Young has well and truly earned it.

Motion carried.

At 4.37 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 16 February at 2 p.m.