HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 24 August 1982

The SPEAKER (Hon. B. C. Eastick) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

PUBLIC FINANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

PETITIONS: CASINO

Petitions signed by 313 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Federal Government to set up a committee to study the social effects of gambling, reject the proposals currently before the House to legalise casino gambling in South Australia, and establish a select committee on casino operations in this State were presented by the Hon. Jennifer Adamson and Messrs Ashenden and Crafter.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answers to question, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos. 8, 43, 69, 72, 73, 83, 89, 92, 93, 99, 122, 141, and 145.

PIE CART

In reply to **Mr SLATER** (28 July).

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The Adelaide City Council has amended by-law No. 10—street traders. The amending by-law, which I tabled on Tuesday 10 August 1982, is now subject to scrutiny by the public and the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. The Minister of Local Government has advised Mr Oram to contact the Secretary should he wish to appear before the Joint Committee.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Adelaide College of Technical and Further Education—Light Square.

Ordered that report be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MICROPROCESSOR

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am pleased to inform the House of a major breakthrough in the Australian high technology industry. Delivery has been taken from America of the first very large-scale integrated silicon chips designed in Australia, in fact, here in Adelaide. These are the first to be designed outside America and open up exciting prospects for developing high technology enterprises here. I am proud to say that the design work was centred on the C.S.I.R.O.'s very large-scale integrated project at Frewville. The team there is headed by Dr Craig Mudge, a South Australian with a world-wide reputation in this work.

The importance of this development is that from now on Australian users of silicon chips, whether researchers or firms planning large-scale production, can now design custom design chips to their exact requirements here. Having been out to the centre again this morning, the fourth generation computer chips which they are now designing and which have the capacity of 100 000 transistors can now be designed in 10 man-years compared to 120 man-years using the more conventional techniques used overseas. For example, one ambitious project is known as the bionic ear and is likely to result in restoring hearing to many people suffering from particular forms of deafness. I am sure that all members will join with me in congratulating the C.S.I.R.O. team, Dr Craig Mudge and the senior management of C.S.I.R.O. on their achievement which is both a symbolic leap forward in our technological development and will also put Adelaide on the world map as a leader in this field of endeavour. I am delighted to say that the Minister for Science and Technology is also making a formal announcement in Canberra today on this breakthrough.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Industrial Affairs (Hon. D. C. Brown)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Rules of Court—Industrial Court—Workers Compensation Act, 1971-1982—Workers Compensation Rules—Appeal Procedures.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. H. Allison)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Classification of Publications Act, 1973-1982—Regulations—General Regulations, 1982.

II. University of Adelaide Act, 1971-1978—By-laws—Traffic.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. M. M. Wilson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Road Traffic Act, 1961-1981—Regulations—Traffic Prohibition, Enfield.

By the Minister of Marine (Hon. M. M. Wilson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Boating Act, 1974-1980—Regulations—

I. Clayton Bay—River Murray.

II. Blackfellows' Caves.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: The House is advised that any questions that would normally be answered by the Minister of Health and the Minister of Tourism will be taken this afternoon by the Deputy Premier.

ESCAPED PRISONER

Mr BANNON: Will the Premier immediately suspend the Chief Secretary pending a full explanation to this House—

Members interjecting:

Mr BANNON: It may be a laughing matter to members opposite but I suggest that they treat this matter seriously.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BANNON: Will the Premier immediately suspend the Chief Secretary pending a full explanation to this House as to why a security rating system which, according to the Chief Secretary himself, was known to be inadequate and unsatisfactory as long ago as June was still in place last weekend allowing James George Smith to escape and, if not, why not? Today's *Advertiser* carries a report of the Chief Secretary's press conference yesterday at which he defended himself by blaming the staff of the Correctional Services Department for the escape last weekend of convicted murderer, James George Smith.

He admitted, moreover, that he had been aware for some months that the possibility of such an escape was likely because of a security rating system which was 'inadequate and unsatisfactory'. This is an important question. Members on this side of the House have reported to me that they are being asked by their constituents why the South Australian community was left defenceless when a Government Minister knew that they could easily be threatened by a dangerous escapee.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader is nothing if not predictable. The answer to the question that the Leader has asked would not take long to write down. It is, no, I will not suspend the Chief Secretary because there is no indication whatever that such an action would in any way be justified, other than in the imagination of the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader is guilty of exaggerating the situation to some extent, but that does not detract from the fact that the occurrence at Riverton is one that has very properly been condemned by the Chief Secretary. However, the Leader of the Opposition was in error when he said that the Chief Secretary had been aware for some months that an escape was likely. That is not what the Chief Secretary said, and the Leader should look very carefully at the transcript (obviously he does not have a transcript, but he should look at what was said).

I find quite puzzling this question and the attitude that has been expressed by the Opposition. Despite the Opposition's record in these matters, its attitude is puzzling. The security classification system to which the Opposition referred has been in operation for a number of years (I think at least 12 years and possibly longer) and it was in operation during the entire course of the Labor Government's term of Government.

I remind honourable members of a particular incident which took place on 8 September 1973 when a group of 15 prisoners, including 3 convicted murderers, were given permission to take part in a puppet show at the Royal Adelaide Show. On the final day of that show two of those convicted murderers escaped. They were extremely dangerous prisoners at the time of that incident: one had served six years and the other three years of a life sentence.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Why didn't they change the system then?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I would have thought that, following that incident, the Labor Government would have instituted an immediate review of classification procedures, but it did not.

Mr Keneally: You have had three years.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I find rather interesting the attitude that has been expressed by the Opposition. The present Government's record in regard to the Department of Correctional Services is one of which we can be very proud.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Rubbish; it is lamentable.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I shall repeat what I have already said, despite the protestations of the member for Elizabeth, the alternative Leader, in this matter: the Government has achieved more during its three years in office than was achieved by the previous Government during its 10 years in office. Previously there was insufficient executive support staff. Indeed, repeated requests for more staff were made during the previous Government's term of office, but they were denied or totally ignored. This Government has increased staff (I think 49 is the exact figure) since it came to office, and this was done at a time during which staff ceilings were being contained in other departments.

Mr Keneally: How many were at Riverton?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I can give those figures to the honourable member if he wishes me to. The Government has installed surveillance equipment and metal detectors. We have upgraded security fencing, and another initiative has involved the expansion of the dog squad. All those matters have resulted in a record which in recent times has been extremely high.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: I'll say: with the shooting of prisoners with a shotgun.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: At this stage we have found that the eight prisoners who attended the function at Riverton were escorted by four officers. I do not think anyone could find anything about which to quarrel concerning that staffing. The whole question of this security system has been addressed by the Chief Secretary. Indeed, it is a matter of record that the security ratings committee has been asked to look at the whole question of classifying prisoners of this kind. There is a difficulty and there always is a difficulty involved in this, but, as a result of discussions between the Chief Secretary and the new Executive Director, instructions have been given to change that security rating system. As the Chief Secretary has said, it is a matter of regret that this escape occurred only a matter of days before that system was to be changed.

However, there is no doubt at all that the Chief Secretary has discharged his duties perfectly satisfactorily. In fact, he has already instituted the necessary changes to that system. However, there are very great difficulties, and it is all very well for members opposite to stand in their places and criticise without in any way addressing themselves to the difficulties that exist. I thought that perhaps I should point out what a former Attorney-General, the Hon. L. J. King, who is now the Chief Justice, said to this House at the time of the puppet show incident to which I referred. He stated:

> It is regretted that there exists no objective or subjective testing that is totally accurate in these circumstances, and such a committee can exercise its judgment only on all the evidence available. There were no grounds for rejection of these two people in particular, or of any of the group in general. When it is considered that this committee, which has been in operation since 1960, has selected thousands of prisoners for Cadell, other institutions and all the other activities mentioned, it is apparent that it has an excellent record, and it is extremely difficult to suggest a better method.

The former Government was not prepared to act. We have acted and I believe, as I said, that the measures that have been adopted since this Goverment came to office have been very successful indeed. They have been hampered by the build-up of unsatisfactory conditions over past years. I must agree with the Chief Secretary—in the circumstances, the escape was indefensible, and I am quite certain that the honourable gentleman has made his position perfectly clear. I am quite satisfied that the action that had already been put in train by the Chief Secretary before this escape occurred was indeed the correct action to take, and I only regret that it was not possible to institute those changes to the classification system before this happening at Riverton.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

Mr MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Industrial Affairs been approached by a representative of the Rundle Mall traders in regard to an extension of shopping hours until 5.30 p.m. on the day of the John Martins Christmas pageant on Saturday 13 November? If so, will the Minister explain to the House the Government's intention in regard to the extension of shopping hours?

I have been approached by a number of shop assistants in relation to this problem. I have also spoken to the Secretary of the Shop Assistants Union, Mr Boag, in relation to this matter. The shop assistants in particualr are very concerned that, if this is allowed to happen (and I agree with them), it will be the thin end of the wedge for Saturday trading. What is the present situation?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: First, I once again spell out to the House, as I did several weeks ago to the member for Flinders, the Government's policy. We certainly have no intention of changing the Shop Trading Hours Act in relation to extended trading. I take up the specific case to which the member for Glenelg referred. First, I am well aware of the honourable member's representations, particularly in regard to the employees involved, and I realise that on a number of occasions he has taken an interest in this area and in the welfare of the employees. I indicate that several months ago—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will continue his reply.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I did not intend to answer the interjection from the court jester. Several months ago, I received an inquiry from someone representing the retail interests of the Rundle Mall and the Rundle Mall Management Committee, in regard to the possibility of extending shop trading hours on the day of the John Martins Christmas pageant. Having had that discussion, I was somewhat concerned when I found that there had been no consultation with the representative bodies, because I believe that the Rundle Mall Management Committee is made up of a number of different groups, including small traders, big traders, the city council, and others.

Mr Hemmings: And Government members.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I realise that. It is a representative body, though, of the traders and the Adelaide City Council, so I have asked those people to consult with those representative bodies and, as I understand, the letter has come in today but I have not yet had a chance to read it. I have asked the Manager of the Rundle Mall Management Committee to discuss the proposal with me. I can indicate that the Government is aware that the request is there and that there is some disagreement with that request. I have had a number of telephone calls to my electorate office.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Yes. Certainly, the Government will be taking into account the views of the different bodies when it is considering that application. No final decision has been made by the Government. I ask the member to let all those people who have been in touch with him know that the Government has not made any final decision. It will do so after it receives the final application and considers all the evidence and support for or submissions against the proposal.

ESCAPED PRISONER

Mr KENEALLY: Will the Chief Secretary say whether he holds himself responsible to the people of South Australia for the safe custody of prisoners committed to his charge and, if he does not, will he say why not? The escape of James George Smith from a minimum security situation at Riverton at the weekend has shocked and, indeed, threatened the South Australian community. The Chief Secretary has sought to blame the prisoner assessment system and his department for the escape of this dangerous prisoner. In fact, he denies knowledge of Smith's presence outside Yatala.

The Chief Secretary claims to have been aware in June that the assessment procedure was defective and has announced that a review of the system is in progress. However, he took no action to suspend the application of the security rating system, knowing of the dangers that he claimed were inherent in it. As a consequence, the escape of Smith has occurred. In these circumstances, how can the Chief Secretary claim to have no responsibility to the citizens of South Australia for this escape of a dangerous criminal?

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: First, let me quote something that is patently obviously to anyone who understands the Westminster system of government, in that responsibility always came back to the responsible Minister of the day. Having said what is patently obvious and what every member of this House ought to know, let me now get on to some of the details to which the member has referred. First, the member said that I was aware that Smith was a member of that team. That is untrue, and I did not happen to notice the member at the press conference yesterday afternoon, so I do not understand how he and his Leader can get up and indicate that that is what I said. I did not say that at all.

In the short period that I have been responsible for this portfolio, we have appointed a new Executive Director. Following his appointment and my concern in a number of areas, we proceeded to look at the administration and management procedures through a range of areas within the department's area of responsibility. I point up to the member that one of those areas was the security rating system. As a result of my discussion 15 days after his appointment, the Executive Director actioned, by minute to the department, the review of that situation.

That was further followed up on 17 August by another report detailing some of the criteria that ought to be used in a security rating system. The procedure was that on Thursday this week a meeting was to take place to formalise the establishment of those procedures within the institution. Had I been aware that Smith, someone who had a life sentence and had served only four years of that term, was a member of the team, I would not, of course, have condoned it.

That is why initially I sought an explanation and justification for his inclusion in the team, and I do not think that that is defensible. Any security rating system that we establish within the department will be a public document and it will be defensible in the public mind. That is the objective that we are going to achieve.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: It will be defensible in the public mind. Let me clearly indicate the hypocritical nature of the Opposition during the 15 years for which this security rating system has been operating in this State. There was an incident in 1973 that highlighted the need to review it. Despite the need to review it, no action was taken, because it is patently obvious that the former Labor Government was very tolerant of these matters rather than its taking a firm line. That former Government decided not to act, and did not act during the time that it was in office. Likewise, the Mitchell Report gathered dust from 1973 to 1979. No action was taken by the former Government. The old catchcry 'no votes in prisons' certainly rises to the fore on the performance of the Opposition when in Government. One should match that to what this Government has done over the past three years. We have increased the surveillance

equipment in this State to the most sophisticated in this country. That is undeniable. We also have, as a point of interest, the lowest escape rate of any mainland State in Australia, and I can assure members that that was not the case in the 1970s. Let us compare like with like, if members opposite want to stand up and attempt to criticise, because they do not have the basis on which to do it in this House or a public forum: they do not have the record behind them to achieve it, whereas this Government has. Indeed, it has performed exceptionally well in relation to correctional services in this State.

The Government has taken policy decisions and administration decisions. It has restructured the executive branch of correctional institutions to inject a professional degree of administration which, I point out, the Touche Ross Report indicated was needed in correctional institutions in this State. The Government acted on the Touche Ross Report as soon as it was humanly possible for it to do so. I suggest that members opposite cannot turn around in three months a system that has been operating for 15 years.

However, I point out that since I have been responsible for this portfolio, since the appointment of the new Executive Director of the Department of Correctional Services, action has been taken to correct a number of anomalies in the system. This has been the first available opportunity with the new permanent head to take that course of action in this State. People ought at least to be able to recognise the actions that this Government has taken and, more particularly, those actions that have been taken in recent times to overcome some of the anomalies in this system.

I do not condone at all what happened on Sunday. Rehabilitation programmes are a very important part of the correctional system in this State and, indeed, in any State. The C.F.S. programme has been operating for 25 years.

An honourable member: And you suspended it.

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: I will come back to the honourable member's interjection in one moment. That programme has been operating for 25 years, without one escape. We did not hear any comments from the Opposition about the Hills fires during the summer period and the work done by C.F.S. at Northfield; nor did we hear about the constructive capacity that it had given in a number of other areas.

Quite clearly, they are blinded by their own inactions, trying to draw out some short-term political capital that clearly, on the record, is not there and is not available for them to draw out in the public mind. There is public concern about it, and I recognise and support it. I did something about it in June: there is going to be action.

Mr Keneally interjecting:

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: The system has been suspended as of yesterday, because I was not aware that people such as murderers with life sentences could after four years be released on programmes like that. If I had known about that before, of course, I would have suspended the practice. As of now, no person with a long-term sentence, murderer or other person of that category will be released into any work programme or any facility such as that without my prior knowledge. The background details of every participant in the C.F.S. programme will come to my desk prior to that unit starting again its work in the rehabilitation area. I am quite sure that within the department there are people able and willing to man that unit but who do not have the background that one Mr Smith had.

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: Let me refer to one other aspect and that is the performance over the past three years of this Government. We, of course, initiated a royal commission: we instructed—

Mr Hemmings interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Stuart for using the name of a member in this House which is not the name by which he will be known in this House.

Mr HEMMINGS: Mr Speaker, I used the name 'Allan'.

The SPEAKER: I apologise to the member for Stuart and warn the member for Napier.

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: This Government started to lay the groundwork from day one to initiate the changes that were needed in the correctional institutions in this State. There was the royal commission, commissioning the Touche Ross Report, in relation to the management and structure of the Department of Correctional Services. Much credit has to go to my predecessor for initiating that action so that the groundwork could be laid in order to overcome some of the anomalies existing in this system. At least, members opposite ought to recognise that factor. It has been a record in the life of this Government of performance and action. Moreover, I instance my involvement during the past two months, in policy development discussions with the Director of the department, to bring about necessary changes. We are achieving these changes, but they cannot be achieved overnight and at least members ought to recognise that fact, also. It is the decisive and responsible action taken by this Government that will correct the anomalies unfortunately existing, not just in recent times but over a decade or more, in correctional institutions in this State and condoned by the former Government.

I have no doubt that in three weeks or so the member for Stuart, the member for Elizabeth or someone else will be saying how terrible it is that rehabilitation programmes at Yatala have been denied the people concerned and that the Government has been taking too hard a line on them. It will not be long before the Opposition is taking that attitude.

MARREE SWIMMING POOL

Mr GUNN: Will the Minister of Education ensure that the Northern Regional Office of the Education Department gives top priority this financial year to the request from the Marree school council to have a swimming pool built on the school site? The Minister would know that the Marree school council has been concerned at what appears to be unnecessary delays in this proposal and there would be no doubt in anyone's mind about the urgent necessity for the people of Marree to have this benefit. I understand that the local community has raised about $4 000 and that funds are available through the Outback Areas Community Development Trust, but that both these sources of funds will not meet the total estimated cost of the swimming pool. Will the Minister therefore ensure that all necessary action is taken to have the project put into effect as soon as possible?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I note the honourable member's continuing concern for his electorate and in particular this issue, which has been before the Education Department and the Outback Areas Trust for some months. In fact, the matter does have high priority within the Education Department. As the member for Eyre has indicated, the Outback Areas Trust was considering it a few months ago, I believe, but I have not yet received formal advice from it as to the subsidy it is prepared to allocate to the project. I understand it could be as much as $12 000 or so which, coupled with the $4 000 the community has, would go a long way towards the total cost of the project, approximating $30 000 to $35 000. I will take the question back to the Education Department and keep this matter high on the priority list and I will ascertain as soon as the Budget is announced how quickly we can implement the request.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move the following motion:

That this House, having noted the replies to questions by the Premier and the Chief Secretary, calls on the Premier to immediately suspend the Chief Secretary from his office as Minister in charge of correctional services until such time as the House is given a full explanation of why he allowed a security system, which he knew to be inadequate and unsatisfactory, to remain in use, thus allowing the escape of James George Smith; such suspension to remain in force until 4 p.m.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier heard the warning issued earlier to the member for Napier, and he should heed it.

Mr BANNON: We have had two questions from this side of the House on what is an important issue of the day. We make no excuse for raising the issue in this forum. In fact, it could be said that we are taking a cue from our predecessors in Opposition who constantly, and on many occasions without justification, raised such issues. In fact, they made great importance of it, especially at the time of election campaigns. The issue is a vital and important one, and explanations must be made to this House. The reason that we believe such suspension should operate immediately is that, as the Chief Secretary himself admitted in response to the member for Stuart, this is a question that can involve Ministerial responsibility, and he has recognised that principle of Westminster Ministerial responsibility, which is certainly at issue in this case. The exact facts and exact degree of responsibility that the Minister must take on himself have not as yet been established. Questions aimed at establishing them have not drawn a satisfactory response.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would ask the Leader not to attempt to establish them now. The motion he is moving is for a suspension of Standing Orders.

Mr BANNON: I am aware of that, Mr Speaker; I do not seek to establish them now. I simply draw attention to the fact that, as the motion itself states, an attempt was made to establish such reasons; they were not satisfactorily disclosed to this House; and, as a result, we are forced into having to debate it. I would hope that, in view of the response the Government has given so far, it does not shrink from the debate. Every response given has been unacceptable in terms of that very principle of Ministerial responsibility that the Minister himself has espoused.

As reported in today's newspaper, the Minister has made certain admissions as to his information about the state of the security system. That is very relevant indeed in terms of the motion we are moving. Were those admissions correct? Has he been correctly and adequately quoted? If so, why is he, with the Premier's support, able to sustain the position he has attempted to sustain in this House? I am not able at this stage of the debate to canvass those issues, and I do not intend to do so. However, the reports are clearly there in the paper today. The words of the Minister, as to his knowledge, are quoted, and they have been, in a sense, confirmed by both responses we have had today.

It could be argued that it is pointless for the House to debate this motion because the Premier has responded directly to the substance of it. However, I suggest that that is not a valid argument. He has said 'No', and he said that that was a predictable answer that he would make to a call for suspension. I suggest that this motion will allow the question whether that is a predictable answer—and, more importantly, whether it is justified on the part of the Government—to be explored fully. We are told we are exaggerating the situation, and no doubt the Premier, unless he chooses to accept this motion, will suggest that that is so.

I do not believe that the Opposition is exaggerating the concern felt about this matter. Also, I do not concede that the Opposition is exaggerating, particularly when we have been given assurances constantly by the Government concerning safety, security and improvements in the prison system. Those aspects should be explored as part of this debate. The details of what the Government claims to have done and whether it has been effective should be explored. We have had one Chief Secretary forced to explain his record before this House on a number of occasions.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader has previously been advised that he is to address himself to the motion to suspend Standing Orders.

Mr BANNON: I am suggesting, Sir, that this suspension is justifiable, because on a number of occasions the previous Chief Secretary was forced to defend his record in this House, and he attempted to do so. He has now been replaced by a new Chief Secretary, who, at the time of taking over we were assured was taking over a system that was impeccable in all respects. We were told that all the sterling work that had been done during the previous 2½ years had been completed and that it was simply a matter of the new Minister's taking up that system, as it was running, and getting on with the job.

The response to questions today and the Minister's press statements concerning this incident prove that that is not the case. The House deserves a full explanation and not simply the dismissal of the matter to which we were subjected during the course of Question Time today. It is not good enough for the Government, if it intends to refuse leave on this matter, to take refuge on the excuse that previous Governments may not have done anything about this matter and that the situation has gone on for years. The fact is that we are dealing with a contemporary situation and admissions by the Minister about which the Premier attempts to scoff, trying to dismiss them.

The Opposition believes that this is a matter of urgency and that the fears of the public and the concern expressed by those within the prison system (the warders, themselves charged with administering the system and who have already through their union expressed concern about the problems) should be explored fully in this House. The Government was given a perfect opportunity to do so during the course of questions, but has signally failed to respond. Therefore, I urge the Government to accept this motion, face up to the record of the new Chief Secretary and try to defend it.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I said earlier that the tactics of the Opposition in this matter would be predictable. I am not quite sure whether I would go so far as to say that their tactics are pathetic—

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: —but I would go very close to agreeing with the Deputy Premier in this matter. I will not attempt to canvass the matter as the Leader of the Opposition did, but he knows perfectly well the requirements in regard to moving a motion of no confidence, which is what this motion amounts to. The Leader knows, as does his Deputy, that it is a matter of convention and courtesy to notify the Government by 12 o'clock, which is the arranged time. No such notification was given, and of course the fact is that the Opposition considered what political capital it could best make out of this issue. I am not sure whether the Leader of the Opposition rose when he did because of the member for Elizabeth's indication of his intention to ask questions on this matter. Be that as it may, there were three ways of dealing with such a matter: one, as a matter of urgency, which would have required a letter to you, Mr Speaker, before 1 o'clock; the other, as a motion of no confidence which would have required notification to the

Government by 12 o'clock; and, thirdly, as a matter to be ventilated during Question Time.

Mr Keneally interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: When there was no urgency or no-confidence motion, I thought that the Opposition had learnt something after all and that it intended to ventilate the matter by way of asking questions. Just because the questions asked by members of the Opposition have been satisfactorily answered by the Chief Secretary and me, the Leader of the Opposition cannot suddenly decide now that he wants to change tack or tactics, which is obviously what he has done.

Just because the Leader does not feel very happy about the answers that have been given (most of his concerns which have been expressed publicly have been answered) and just because he is not satisfied, there is no reason for him to want to change the Opposition's tack now. Certainly, that is no excuse for his failing to observe the regular procedures, the courtesies, and the general practices of this House. On that basis alone I would refuse leave to suspend Standing Orders.

Quite apart from anything else, I believe that the Leader has come to realise that perhaps he has tackled the question wrongly. I do not know. Perhaps the Leader does not think he will get enough coverage and this motion is a method of trying to beat up the issue and keep it going even longer. The whole question concerns every member in the community. There is no point at all in suspending Standing Orders to allow a debate such as the Leader suggests now. We must now get on with the job of ensuring that nothing like this ever happens again. I repeat, I am sure that the suspension of Standing Orders will not in any way change the Chief Secretary's determination to ensure that such an incident does not happen again.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (17)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M. J. Brown, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (22)—Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, and Schmidt, Mrs Southcott, and Messrs Tonkin (teller), Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Corcoran, Crafter, and McRae. Noes—Mrs Adamson, and Messrs Billard and Evans.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

QUESTIONS RESUMED

OIL SPILLAGES

Mr RANDALL: Will the Minister of Environment and Planning indicate to the House what measures the Government has taken to make sure that the companies involved in the transport of oil in South Australian waters are aware of environmentally sensitive areas? As the Minister well knows and as the House is well aware, I have a number of times pointed out to the House the dangers of oil spillage along the foreshore of the electorate that I represent. There are also many other areas within South Australia that are environmentally sensitive areas and I believe that the Minister, in the compilation of information, should make available to those companies transporting oil information to make them aware of the dangers of such a spillage. I know that the Minister has taken appropriate measures and that he is well aware of the need to make sure that suitable means of grappling with these spillages are available, should they take place, but I wonder whether—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr RANDALL: —the oil companies realise where the environmentally sensitive areas are.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: There have been a number of requests over a long period that a map be prepared indicating the areas where special protection is required in the event of an oil spill along the South Australian coast. In fact, at a recent meeting of the Australian Environment Council the subject was discussed at great length and I believe that the majority of States are moving towards the production of such a map for that purpose, so I am pleased to be able to inform the honourable member that the Department of Environment and Planning has now produced such a map, which is particularly important for the environment of South Australia.

It is designed, as the member has suggested, to help companies associated with transporting and refining oil and those associated with the exploration and protection of offshore resources. With the extra activity that is taking place around the coast at present, that is important. The map identifies fauna species that are especially sensitive to oil spills and will assist in the drawing up of various emergency plans and cleaning-up operations should the need arise. The map also indicates where more specialised advice should be sought in the event of an oil spill.

Detailed information contained on the map covers biologically sensitive areas, areas that are sensitive for mammals, birds, prawns, scale fish, rock lobsters, and so on, and their breeding grounds and beaches. Much work has been done with the Department of Fisheries in obtaining this information. The map also has three areas that have been enlarged. They are the Adelaide metropolitan area from Port Noarlunga to Outer Harbor, the Port Lincoln area from Thistle Island to Tumby Bay, and the Ceduna area from Gascoigne Bay to the Western Australian border.

The map was prepared by the marine pollution section of the Department of Environment and Planning with assistance of the South Australian Museum and the fisheries research branch of the Department of Fisheries. If any members of the House on either side would like to have a copy of that map I would be happy to make one available and if they would see me afterwards I will make sure that that is provided for them. Just to answer the member for Henley Beach, we believe that it is quite an achievement as far as the State is concerned and I would invite the honourable member to look at the map and make it available to any of his constituents that require it.

ESCAPED PRISONER

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Has the Chief Secretary, or his departmental head or any other officer in the department under his control or responsibility (I think 'responsibility' is the word he used before), given directions that excursions of prisoners outside of the prison establishments be frozen, at least for the time being, and is he aware that in the current warm spell his direction has meant that the Cadell area is without a country fire service? Inexperience is no excuse for panic, and in this afternoon's *News* a statement appears that prison authorities have stopped the trusty system while investigations are being made into the escape of Smith. I have been informed by persons at Cadell that the effect of the suspension of the trusty system has been that the Country Fire Service in that area has been suspended. If that is so, it obviously indicates a degree of panic on the Minister's part.

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: It did not take them long, did it? I would have thought that a question like that would have taken three or four weeks but they actually had the hide on the same day—

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: He's in conflict with his Leader.

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: Yes, it is a total contradiction. Members opposite say that because we place these restrictions on the programme because of the events of recent days we are being unrealistic in our approach. If anything has highlighted to the public of South Australia the difference between the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Elizabeth and their approach on these matters, it is the questions we have had today. I did not think that they would have the hide on the same day to ask questions of that nature. What a classical example for the people of South Australia to see. Yes, those trusty programmes have been suspended and they will stay suspended until I am satisfied that every member of the crew that goes out on the Cadell fire unit is not of the category that Mr Smith was last weekend, and, until I am satisfied of that, that fire unit will not leave that depot.

As regards the programme, those details are currently being collated and should be in my office, if not late today, by early tomorrow so, once I have been satisfied that the composition of the crew will meet what I believe is the public demand for being released into the community to participate in these programmes and, when I am satisfied that adequate steps have been taken in this regard, those programmes will be reintroduced.

I said that I believe that the fire service—the rehabilitation programme of the Northfield C.F.S. unit—is a valuable one. It has given 25 years of good service. I want to introduce it as soon as possible but not with any risks. And my action is not over-reacting at all; it is just responding to a situation that has developed and it is ensuring that the public is safeguarded in this matter. I would have thought that that was decisive, responsible action on the part of a Minister who was responsible for areas of this nature. But I repeat: I am amazed that this contradiction in approach from the members of the Opposition should be highlighted so graphically to South Australia as a result of the questions that I have received today.

TRAIL BIKES

Mr GLAZBROOK: Can the Minister of Environment and Planning advise what action could be taken to tackle the ever-growing problem of young trail bike riders using the area known as the O'Halloran Hill Reserve? This reserve, which stretches from Ocean Boulevard in the east, Main South Road in the west, and Majors Road in the south, and to Seaview Downs and Seacombe Heights, has become a haven for children and young people riding their trail bikes. Residents have requested that controls be implemented to prevent young people from blazing trails through this area, causing consistent noise problems, danger to residents and more importantly to the riders themselves, let alone the damage being done to the environment. Last February a 15-year-old boy was riding through this area along a track when he hit a hidden boulder which caused him to fall off his bike. This accident resulted in concussion and hospitalisation. This boy was an experienced rider on the normal approved type of track, but in the O'Halloran Hill environment he found that things were slightly different. Residents are anxious to know what can be done to control this problem and the nuisance attached to this type of activity, and are looking to the Minister for some assistance.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I am aware of the problems associated with the O'Halloran Hill Reserve. I am also aware of the interest that has been shown in that area by the member for Brighton. Some time ago I visited the reserve because of the concern that had been expressed over a long period by local residents. A number of problems are associated with that reserve. It is a vast area of land that has been acquired. Difficulties exist in relation to ownership of the land, three or four departments, including the Highways Department, the Engineering and Water Supply Department and my own department, being involved. Officers from these departments are drawing up a plan to overcome the problem that the member for Brighton has brought to the attention of the House today.

I referred some weeks ago in this House to the positive action that was being taken in regard to off-road vehicles and trail bikes, and this is one area in which we hope to take some action. The area is far too large to fence completely, although we are trying to look at the most appropriate areas that should be closed off. The police are also aware of the need to protect the area and are keeping a close eye on the reserve itself. There is a need not only to protect the local residents from noise and nuisance but also, as the honourable member has indicated, to examine the safety of the riders and the public alike. Many people go into the area just to walk and spend time, on a very casual basis, and those people need to be protected also.

I am certainly aware of the problem that the member for Brighton has brought to my notice again, and I assure him that the departments involved in relation to the ownership of this area are looking at bringing down an appropriate plan in order to overcome at least the major problems associated with the trail bikes that are using that reserve.

PRISON TRUSTY SYSTEM

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: My question to the Chief Secretary follows the question by the member for Elizabeth. Has the Chief Secretary taken alternative steps to replace the trusty system by way of providing officers or anyone else as a C.F.S. unit crew, or is Cadell an area that is left temporarily unprotected? I listened intently to the reply given by the Minister to the member for Elizabeth, and it seems that the Minister has frozen the trusty system. It would also appear from his answer that the Minister has taken no alternative steps to ensure that the C.F.S. unit that is normally operated by the trusties can now operate. I would be concerned, as I am sure would be the public of South Australia, whether the Minister in taking that action has thought about the possibility of fire and has created some alternative system to operate in its place.

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: It is obvious that the Deputy Leader, realising that the member for Elizabeth has demonstrated a totally different approach from that being taken by his Party, is attempting to wallpaper over the difference so that the split does not look as great as it is. I make no apology for having issued the directive that that programme be suspended until such time as crew members of it will have a rating. Crew members of that unit will not have the same rating category as I believe Mr Smith had. Quite obviously, Mr Smith should not have been in the crew that took part in the events last weekend. It is not realistic and obviously the Deputy Leader does not even understand the system. If a fire eventuated, and it involved an emergency, officers within the institution would take other action. That would be an automatic situation—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: What other action?

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: That would be an automatic situation and, if honourable members opposite cannot understand that, they just do not understand that common sense ought to prevail in emergency situations. Good grief!

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You have taken no alternative action at all.

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: As I said, this matter is being resolved expeditiously. The files are coming down and once they have been reviewed and the ratings of these people are such that it is believed they can take part in these crews without the public being concerned or alarmed, these programmes will be reinstituted forthwith. These are good programmes that have a valuable part to play, but should not comprise persons like Mr Smith, quite obviously. Yet, we hear no alternative being put forward by the Opposition. On the one hand, they say that it is a terrible thing to do and, on the other hand, as soon as we take corrective action we are accused of overreacting and depriving the community of support facilities. Good grief, that comes from an Opposition that is bereft of ideas, bereft of performance in its own field, and certainly it comes from an Opposition that is in difficulty because of contradictory remarks and conflict between its members in their approach to matters of this nature.

GEPPS CROSS DISPUTE

Mr BECKER: Will the Minister of Agriculture say whether all the stock purchased by butchers at the Gepps Cross saleyard before the commencement of the current industrial dispute have been slaughtered? Several butchers in my district have contacted me over the past 24 hours because they are anxious to know when regular supplies of meat will be restored.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Last week when the strike commenced at Gepps Cross there were a number of stock in the yard that had been purchased on that day and on the previous day. Most of the livestock, including cattle, sheep, pigs and lambs, were lined up at various levels for the purposes of slaughter. A significant proportion of that stock has been redirected to other licensed abattoirs in South Australia for slaughter. However, it is true that a number remain in the yards.

A report as current as this morning, indicates that those stock are being attended to the best of the ability of the officers who remain on duty at those works. They are being fed, watered and cared for as well as one could possibly expect in the circumstances. It has been further drawn to my attention that an officer of the R.S.P.C.A. has been in and out of those premises during the whole period and that the welfare of those stock, in relation to whether or not they should be shifted to other premises for slaughter, is being considered. The licensed abattoirs are so choked up with goods that they cannot handle all the stock that are on hand, and the underlying request is that the owners of that stock, particularly of lambs and pigs, should be able, in the circumstances to have it slaughtered in other than licensed abattoir premises.

Work is being done to facilitate that. It rests entirely now on the report of the R.S.P.C.A. as to whether, in its view, the welfare of stock is in sufficient jeopardy to justify what might be described as something of an unusual move. In October last year we took the unprecedented action of taking stock to premises that were not licensed abattoirs and, in particular, to licensed slaughterhouses. If this occurs later today or tomorrow, in the interests of stock welfare, and those stock are slaughtered in licensed slaughterhouse premises and not in abattoirs, I can assure the House that it will be done only in the presence of a D.P.I. inspector.

Regarding the supply of meat, I am somewhat surprised to learn that butchers are having difficulty, because I am assured by Samcor management and other sources that indeed there is still a steady flow of meat and that there is no strike difficulty in any other slaughterhouse or abattoir premises in South Australia. I know that Samcor commands a significant amount of the State's killing trade, but I cannot accept that there is a real problem at consumer level. It is appreciated that those butchers who go out independently and buy their stock and, under contract, have them slaughtered at Gepps Cross would be experiencing some difficulty at this time.

I know also that other licensed abattoir proprietors and managers throughout the State are doing their level best to cope with that sort of demand in the interim period. It is hoped that the matter can be resolved so that any adjustments to the award, which is the basis of the argument on that side, will ultimately be adjustments that apply to all slaughtermen and abattoir workers in South Australia, that the time for implementing or adopting any new award rate is simultaneous with all personnel involved, and that we do not have an out-of-step situation where the employees at Samcor are on one level of an award for a week or more whilst awaiting that level of award to apply across the whole of the industry.

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

REFERENDUM (DAYLIGHT SAVING) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 11 August. Page 387.)

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): The origins of the Bill are contained in a policy pledge made by the Government when in Opposition and reaffirmed after it came into office that it would hold a referendum on the question of daylight saving. We had to wait until this Bill came before the House to see precisely in what form the Government would ask the question. It has been a matter of considerable speculation over the past two or three years as to precisely what the Government was seeking to achieve by this measure. Unfortunately, the Premier's second reading explanation has not really given us much further explanation. All that the Premier says, apart from describing the purpose of the Bill in terms of its machinery operation, is that it will enable members of the public to express their views on the continuance of daylight saving in South Australia. He also said:

> Honourable members will be aware of the continuing debate, particularly within some sections of the community, on the issue of daylight saving in South Australia.

That is certainly true. There has been continuing debate. However, I suggest that it has not been a one-sided debate. Certainly, there has been some debate, particularly amongst those on the West Coast of the State, who believe that daylight saving disadvantages them. There has equally been considerable debate in many circles in the metropolitan area and in other sections of the State about whether or not the period of daylight saving should be extended. Indeed, support, particularly from business groups, has been clearly evidenced for South Australia to go on to Eastern Standard Time, bearing in mind that the meridian under which we operate goes somewhere through western Victoria.

A number of questions have been asked as part of the debate in the community. The fact remains that since 1971 we have had a system of daylight saving in operation in this State. Although it is true that questions about it have been raised by groups on occasions, nonetheless there seems

to have been a fairly widespread acceptance of it. Why then would the Government be moving to introduce a referendum? What was the origin of the promise to do so? One can only refer to a debate on the question that occurred in this Chamber in October 1975 when we saw a number of members speak, all of whom except one are still with us. Those members with us include the Deputy Speaker, the present Deputy Premier, the member for Flinders (who has had a continuing interest in this because of the attitude of some of his constituents), and the member for Goyder. All spoke on this issue at that time.

It was clear that a group of members (and it was through a private member's motion by the member for Eyre) supported daylight saving either being abolished or being put to some sort of referendum test. So, 12 years after the introduction of daylight saving we have this proposition before us. I have already made clear, after examining this Bill and its ramifications, that the Opposition will firmly and unequivocally support the retention of daylight saving. For all the arguments that have been adduced in favour of change, we believe that the overwhelming support of the community should be gained for a 'yes' vote in the coming referendum. That will be our clear and unequivocal position.

In saying that, we recognise that there are some sections of the community to which I referred earlier, namely, the business community, that would like to be in line for purposes of trading, transactions and more efficient business practice with the Eastern States. Also, some residents of South Australia, particularly those on the West Coast of the State, would like daylight saving modified. In relation to the latter sector, I suggest that some arrangements could be made that might meet their objections. It might mean a delayed starting time for schools, for instance, if one of the problems is getting children off to school in the early and late periods of daylight saving. That is something to which the member for Flinders has addressed his mind and may refer in the course of the debate.

Be that as it may, I recognise that that section of the South Australian public does have some interest in the matter and that perhaps arrangements ought to be looked at in respect of it. As to the referendum itself and the question that is being asked therein, the Opposition believes that the advantages of daylight saving are such that it should be retained. It has been a bonus for South Australian families. It has allowed people to enjoy sport and recreation in daylight after work. I think that the question of personal life style and the enjoyment of its advantages with the longer hours of sunlight after work finishes is something that people will find acceptable.

The Opposition will certainly raise that matter as an important reason why people should vote 'yes' to the referendum and thus not put daylight saving under any sort of threat, as the Government proposes to do by this referendum.

The second level of that argument is equally important, namely, the question of whether or not we should add to the confusion that is already evident in the time differential between the various States. I know that the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, for one, believes that it is high time that we resolve what it describes as the fiasco of daylight saving in Australia by having some sort of national policy on the matter. The Opposition would support that, as we believe that it would be in our interests as a State which is keen to attract investment and which relies heavily on its relations and trade with business markets in the Eastern States and in the interests of big business here if South Australia is in as close conformity as possible in time terms with the Eastern States.

That is not to say that necessarily there is strong support for South Australia to adopt Eastern Standard Time, although one must recognise that effectively it cuts off two hours of a working day if one includes the half hour at the beginning and at the end of the day as well as the half an hour when the normal lunch time does not line up. There are ways of overcoming that half hour differential. It becomes very much harder indeed if there is a one and a 1½ hour differential. At the moment, I would say that the time differential is one of the advantages that South Australia enjoys over Western Australia, in that South Australia, in terms of time, is in closer conformity with the Eastern States and their business houses. For South Australia to go its own way and not to continue with daylight saving because of the results of a referendum would put this State at a severe disadvantage at a crucial time when the State does not need any such disadvantages heaped on it.

South Australia already has a major problem in attempting to be competitive and to pull itself out of the current depression that has been so evident in South Australia. Why add to those problems in the business sense by getting even further out of kilter with the Eastern States? On the contrary, rather than have a referendum that would threaten daylight saving, we should be affirming positively by negotiation with, and representation to, the Eastern States that some sort of uniformity of practice applies throughout the summer months. I have already mentioned that travel and tourism are involved, and again they are important areas for which as close as possible uniformity should be maintained.

I suggest that all those reasons support the stand that my Party is taking, namely, that if this Bill is carried and a referendum takes place (and the question is 'Are you in favour of daylight saving'), we should be campaigning as vigorously as possible in support of the 'yes' case. Someone must take up that challenge, because the Bill makes no real provision for the proper advocacy of a 'yes' case.

At some considerable expense every elector is to receive from the Electoral Commissioner a pamphlet containing the pros and cons of the question. I am not sure what qualifications the Electoral Commissioner has concerning his writing out such cases for and against, or whom the Electoral Commissioner consulted in collecting the various arguments involved. However, these pamphlets are to be prepared and issued to every household in South Australia. It is suggested in the second reading report that:

> The Government is confident that the Electoral Commissioner is best placed to analyse these issues and place them before the electorate in an objective way.

I do not know about that. I would have thought that the cases for and against ought to be argued by people who are informed and committed to either of those cases, so that a full canvassing of the issue can be put before the people of South Australia. The Opposition is committed, and as a political Party we are prepared to say that we are committed. I would certainly make the offer that, if cases are to be put for and against daylight saving, an opportunity should be given for any group or institution that is advocating either case to have an input into either case as presented. I would be very happy indeed for the Opposition to take up the argument in favour of the proposition. If that is not to be possible under the Bill, I would sincerely hope that the Electoral Commissioner, in canvassing the arguments for placement in the leaflet, would consult with various parties concerning their arguments and how they can best be communicated to the electors in South Australia.

Equally, the member for Flinders might feel that it is appropriate, if he is in favour of a case against the issue, to have some of his views incorporated into whatever pamphlet or leaflet that the Electoral Commissioner will send to all electors. As I have pointed out, if expense of that nature is to be incurred, those who are qualified and committed should be able to put their cases.

Taking into account the promise made by the Government, I do not think it is incumbent upon the Opposition to oppose the Bill, whatever reservations we have about it. However, I point out that the Opposition has a number of reservations, the chief one being that we do not believe that daylight saving should be placed in jeopardy in this way. I say that on the presumption that the Government will feel bound to take account of the result of that referendum, although that has not been explicitly stated. Perhaps the Premier can respond to that point in the course of his reply. Presuming that the Government will put into effect the opinion of that referendum, daylight saving should not be put in jeopardy in that way.

However, the Government maintains that on the basis of its promise it is obliged to do so. That is fine and the Opposition accepts that. The Opposition will not oppose the Bill, although we point out that there are defects in it. Also, I would like to put clearly on the record here and now the fact that the Opposition believes that the system that has operated since 1971 is an acceptable one, which has provided positive benefits to the South Australian community, to individuals and to those involved in business, tourism, and the like, and that it should be maintained.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I support the Bill, simply because the Government has a mandate for it. I cannot accept the bleatings of the Leader, and I am surprised that he thinks that he or his Party can take over and put the case for the 'yes' vote.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: What kind of expert advice can he give?

Mr BECKER: What sort of expert advice can he give? Why is it necessary for him to give it? He is not the only one who supports daylight saving in this State. Obviously, he did not research the matter very well, and he did not do his homework. The Leader should have looked at who voted and how the voting went on 15 September 1971, when the daylight saving legislation was introduced. From page 1491 of *Hansard* we find that, of the 30 members who voted for the introduction of daylight saving, only 12 are left in this Chamber (four Liberal and eight Labor). The four Liberals are myself, the members for Fisher and Glenelg, and the Premier: the Labor members are the members for Whyalla, Stuart, Unley, Playford, Hartley, Mitchell, Gilles, and Adelaide.

The present Chief Justice made a brilliant statement, interjecting on the member for Eyre in that debate, but I will not repeat it and reflect on him. Nine members were against the Bill, all from the country and all members of the Liberal Party. The whole point is that, when a referendum on any issue is sought, it is not a Party issue: it is an issue on which everyone has the right to vote, and the Government is simply asking the people to indicate whether or not they are satisfied with daylight saving, and the Government will abide by the findings. I suggest that members look at the 1971 debate, because the matter was well covered by the then member for Flinders, the Hon. John Carnie, who talked about time zones, meridians, and so on. He put the point of view for the electors of that district.

In 1968 I launched a campaign in Port Lincoln on behalf of the Bank Officials Association seeking wage and salary increases and improved working conditions, including the introduction of daylight saving. I received no criticism at that time from members on the West Coast in regard to daylight saving. I can appreciate the problems faced by some of my colleagues in the country and the issues that have been brought up, particularly in regard to the West Coast. We must remember that Central Standard Time is based on the meridian 142 degrees, which runs exactly through Hamilton, in Victoria.

As one moves across the State, one goes through the meridians of 138.35 degrees at Adelaide, 135.51 at Port Lincoln, 137.35 at Whyalla and 133.42 at Ceduna. The difference in time is about four minutes for each degree. Even if daylight saving is continued, on average, in summer the sun rises at about 5.30 a.m. so it would not make that much difference on the western border of South Australia or on the West Coast—perhaps about 20 minutes. The people who are subjected to daylight saving on the West Coast (from the figures of the Bureau of Meteorology) would not be worse off than they are in the middle of winter.

In other words, about 15 minutes of sunshine would be gained. I am sometimes amazed at the argument put forward by those opposed to daylight saving. I would not like to see this develop into a Party-political issue. It would be a tragedy if that happened, because it would defeat the whole purpose and the idea behind the holding of a referendum. If we are to obtain the opinion of the people, I appeal to all honourable members to remove Party politics from this issue.

What the individual member does is up to him, but I stand fast by the decision I made on 15 September 1971. I enjoy daylight saving and I will certainly continue to support it. If the referendum is carried I would like the Government, at some time in the future, to consider extending daylight saving for an extra month to take in the whole of March. Every other year we have the Festival of Arts in South Australia and I believe it would benefit from an extra month of daylight saving. Much is said about tourism, but that is not the main reason for supporting daylight saving. My main reason for supporting it is because of the greater opportunity for leisure and recreation time, and because it is economical.

I think the people of South Australia, if daylight saving is defeated at the referendum, will find that it will have a considerable economic impact. Daylight saving was extended for an extra month in New South Wales and for three weeks in Victoria to save energy. In my opinion there is no doubt that daylight saving can be beneficial in relation to energy conservation. Electricity is dear enough in this State let alone in other areas of Australia. There are also other economic factors to be considered from a commercial point of view. All of these points have been debated many times and were well covered in the debate in 1971. I do not believe there is any point in going over all those issues again, except to say that I will reject any amendments because I believe this is not a Party-political issue.

Mr SLATER (Gilles): I will speak only briefly on this matter, as I think the Leader has covered it fairly adequately. I have always been a supporter of daylight saving. The member for Hanson has read the results of the debate in 1971 and has indicated that I was a supporter on that occasion. I still support daylight saving. We have had that experience over the past 11 years and I believe that the overwhelming majority of South Australians support it. The type of climate that we in South Australia experience in the summer months is conducive to outdoor activities, particularly in the area of recreation and sport.

It is extremely advantageous to sporting bodies and to participants to have the opportunity for training and also to be able to conduct sporting events in the twilight hours. Many of us have been to athletic meetings that are conducted in the twilight hours in summer, and we would not be able to conduct those meetings without operating on daylight saving. However, I believe that many sporting bodies have not taken full advantage of the opportunities that exist to use these extra daylight hours in summer to conduct twilight meetings in other sports.

I believe that there are advantages, particularly in the metropolitan area. Perhaps I am speaking as a metropolitan member, but I appreciate the disadvantages that can occur. I am sure the member for Flinders will indicate some of the difficulties that exist in his area on the West Coast because of the time factor and the fact that the time meridian, I understand, lies somewhere near the Victorian border. Nevertheless, the majority of people reside in the metropolitan area.

The Leader has made a significant point, and I think we ought to be trying to obtain some degree of uniformity among the States regarding daylight saving. We recall that last year Victoria and New South Wales had daylight saving and, if I remember correctly, New South Wales extended the period of operation for an extra month. Queensland did not have daylight saving. There is a story about that, but I do not think that it is worthy of repetition in the House at present. I stand to be corrected, but I do not believe that Western Australia had daylight saving last year.

Mr Rodda: Why won't Joh have it up there?

Mr SLATER: I will tell the member the story later. Seriously, it is important from a time point of view to try to get some degree of uniformity among the States regarding daylight saving, because the present position creates problems. I refer to one problem, namely, that of air schedules. They have an impact on people travelling from State to State and may have an influence on the wishes of people regarding the tourist industry. There are economic factors, such as the extra hours of daylight reducing the demand for power. There is also an opportunity in summer for people to use the beaches in daylight hours after they have finished work for the day. I think certainly that those advantages outweigh very strongly any disadvantages that may occur, particularly in the Adelaide metropolitan area. I believe that the general public in South Australia support strongly the retention of daylight saving. The point has been raised that the Government has a mandate for this referendum. I question that statement somewhat.

I know that the Government has a mandate for many things, when one goes to an election, but the Premier indicated to the people in general that there would be a referendum on daylight saving at the next election. Personally, I believe that such a referendum would be a waste of taxpayers' money, because daylight saving over the past 11 years has been accepted by the public. The referendum will only confirm the strong belief of the people of South Australia in daylight saving.

I repeat: I would like to see a great degree of uniformity in relation to other States, although I do not know how we will achieve that. It is always difficult to obtain uniformity on such matters between States, but at least we should try. The point has been made that perhaps if there were all Labor Party Governments in the Eastern States a greater degree of uniformity could be obtained than presently exists. I am a supporter of daylight saving and I support this Bill, although I do not agree that we should be holding a referendum. I believe that a referendum, as proposed, will have a result overwhelmingly in favour of a 'Yes' vote. Certainly, as indicated by my Leader, I will be supporting a 'Yes' vote.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I support the Bill, as far as it goes, because it does reflect the undertaking to honour a commitment given before the last election and repeated immediately after that election that a referendum would be held in respect to daylight saving. I said that I supported the Bill 'as far as it goes', because I have had much correspondence on this matter, and I have raised often in this House the difficulties experienced by my constituents, by people living in the district of Eyre and people living in the western part of South Australia.

On 21 October 1981, in response to a letter that I received from the Pinkawillinie Women's Agriculture Bureau, I asked the Premier whether, when the referendum on daylight saving was held at the next State election, the Premier and the Government would consider having alternative questions in the referendum to provide for a reduction in the period of daylight saving. I then gave an explanation and in reply the Premier stated:

> The actual questions to be asked have not yet been considered, but certainly I undertake to the honourable member that we will examine the possibilities. There is, I think, a very well developed recognition of the difficulties that some residents of South Australia experience as a result of daylight saving. There is no question that people on the West Coast, in particular, have specific difficulties with time and with their farming activities. Be that as it may, it will not be possible at any time to bring in a separate daylight saving zone to affect one part of the State and not another.

I do not think that that really was part of the question. The report continues:

> It will be necessary, of course, for the entire State to be affected. Nevertheless, the question that the honourable member has put forward will be kept in mind when the time comes to formulate the questions to be submitted to the people at the referendum.

It is at that point that I take up this debate, because I am disappointed that the Bill, as far as it goes, refers only to a straight 'Yes' or 'No' question. It does not give any alternatives or take into consideration the views of other people and the various sections of the community across the State. In putting up such a referendum as this, I believe that it is a little ambiguous because one could easily put up a referendum to the people of South Australia such as, 'Should we have speed limits on our roads, yes or no?'

Now, that is a type of question in relation to which, obviously, when the response comes back, it would be for the Government of the day to go ahead and set down the speed limits that were to be imposed. But just to ask whether there should be speed limits in South Australia is an ambiguous question and, I believe, in exactly the same way we have an ambiguous question under this Bill, because nobody really knows or is given the opportunity to put into effect what the real implications are and the disadvantages that there can be.

The Leader of the Opposition, I think, endeavoured to entice me into indicating some of the concerns that I have, representing an electorate in the western part of the State. I guess that concern is well and truly documented and it is well and truly backed up. When I say it is 'backed up', I would like to quote just a long list and I could quote the letters, in fact, of the number of people who have written to me, and the number of organisations. For example, earlier this year the Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association unanimously supported a proposal, and I take into account that some of the Iron Triangle councils are involved in that. They unanimously supported a proposal that the time meridian should be shifted for the South Australian standard time. That is a very sweeping matter and it almost needs a constitutional requirement to change that. But when one looks deeply at the implications of that it could well and truly totally obviate the need for daylight saving at all. It would be a pretty fair compromise for all people across the State.

An honourable member: Where would you put it? What meridian?

Mr BLACKER: One hundred and thirty-five. The Ceduna Area School Welfare Club has written to me totally opposing daylight saving. The Ceduna Area School Council has written to me in similar terms. As I mentioned, the Pinkawillinie Agricultural Bureau, the Yaninee Agricultural Bureau and the Warramboo C.W.A. have written to me. Incidentally, I believe this very subject has been debated this week at the State C.W.A. conference. People from Wilmington and from

Naracoorte have contacted me, as have the Darke Peak Welfare Club, the Cummins Area School Council, the Cummins Area School Welfare Club, and the Tumby Bay Area School. I think that really the crux of the whole situation is the effect on school children. That is the principal concern of the majority of the people in those particular areas.

Shortly I will quote from some of the letters I received to highlight the difficulties that these people are experiencing. I think the member for Gilles invited me to make some comments on some of my reasons, because he was saying that daylight saving was a great recreational thing, that people could play their round of golf after work, they could carry out many other social and recreational activities in the hours of daylight. I guess if I were in that situation I would take advantage of it. However, there are very large sections of the community who require that time to make a living.

It is not a recreational period for them. It is a time of work and I would like to go one step further and talk about the grain growers of this State and the implications that this particular legislation has on them. Not only cost wise, it is inconvenience wise for them, and it concerns the capital investments that they have, plus the penalty rates that they must pay on the operation of silos in order to keep those silos open for sufficient time in order to handle the harvests. These are all on-cost implications to those people residing in those areas. I now take up the protestations of the member for Hanson. We have a situation where, because of the moisture content of the grain, which involves a statutory requirement Australia wide, the grain has to be of a certain maximum moisture content. Every person who has any connection with the land will know that it is very seldom before 1 o'clock in the afternoon that one can actually start reaping on an average harvest day.

When the machine starts reaping it fills the first truck. If the farmer is lucky he can deliver one truck load of grain before the silo shuts. The only alternative the farmer has is to outlay literally thousands of dollars so that he can store that grain until the next day. A small, 300 bag, transportable silo costs about $1 600 and a farmer would require three of those, costing up to $4 500, immediately this legislation is passed. That is only part of the story.

Because of the inconvenience of not being able to deliver to the silos during the times I have just mentioned, those farmers must provide storage bins at considerable expense (which, incidentally, only provide a storage capacity sufficient for one day), or find some other alternative. There are other problems that must be dealt with also. Someone asked, 'Why not open the silos after 5 p.m. to receive grain?' We can do that, but at penalty rates. All of those penalty rates are absorbed by the grain grower in the administration and handling costs of his grain.

These matters result in every aspect of the chain of production occurring in a harvest period being compounded to the detriment of the people. If we could get the people who negotiate award rates to agree to a flat rate of pay for a given number of hours a day, then maybe that could be negotiated, but I do not know that that would help with this problem. In the meantime, why penalise farmers and grain producers in a way such as this? One can apply the same logic to dairy farmers and people of that nature.

I have mentioned previously that I have much correspondence relating to the effect of this legislation on schoolchildren. I think it should be obvious to all members of Parliament that a child in reception or year 1 who has to board a school bus at 7.10 in the morning is being treated grossly unfairly. I have received numerous letters about students having to travel long distances (one letter I have here refers to a distance of 54 miles) to attend school. We could all say that that is a problem that is a legacy of the previous Government's closing the smaller schools. Nevertheless, it is a compounding factor which is influencing the lives of these children. I do not think it is reasonable for anybody to expect a child to board a school bus before the sun is above the horizon, but that is happening.

Mr Becker: We are only talking about half an hour.

Mr BLACKER: The honourable member says that we are only talking about half an hour. We are not talking about half an hour, because the time meridian that should normally apply to South Australia runs through Warnambool in Victoria.

Mr Keneally: What happens in mid June?

Mr BLACKER: Do you propose that this should go on for the whole of the year? I am interested in the honourable member's comment because I know the way his council voted.

Mr Keneally: I am just asking a reasonable question.

Mr BLACKER: I would like to quote from a letter I received from a school bus driver from Mount Drummond, as follows:

> I drive a school bus to Cummins Area School and my departure time each morning is 7.20 a.m.

So he is not one of the earliest ones to leave home. The letter continues:

> I have a seven year old son and this means he has to be up by 6.30 a.m. at the latest. When daylight saving is upon us this means he is up at 5.30 a.m. The schoolchildren get very distressed travelling home in the heat (I might add, so does the driver), as we travel into the sun morning and night. Any extension to daylight saving is definitely not needed, nor is daylight saving. Also, to the farmer, this extended time is not needed as the day is quite long enough.

I have another letter that I received a couple of years ago which states:

> With the event of a good harvest farmers are to be forced to handle grain unnecessarily. As the moisture does not come down until at least 12 o'clock, which in effect is 1 o'clock by saving time, and silos close at 5.30 which in effect is only 4.30, farmers are then forced to find ways of storing grain and in most instances it is tipped on the ground to be contaminated with dirt and rubbish, downgrading the finished product.

He then goes on to talk about the effect on schoolchildren. I do not think there can be any doubt that the farther west one goes in the State the greater the impact will be. The question is whether the greater metropolis will bulldoze the whole issue through and go over and above the needs and the reasonable request of these people. The member for Gilles referred to the recreational facilities of which he can take advantage during that time. That is okay; it would be very nice to do that, but it does not apply to self-employed people, particularly those involved in agricultural pursuits.

This issue is probably more contentious than it should be, because in 1896 the standard time adopted for South Australia was based on the meridian 135 degrees east. That meant in effect that there were three time zones across Australia: Eastern Standard Time, Central Standard Time and Western Time, with one hour difference between each. Three or four years after that time standard had been adopted, which incidentally is eight, nine and 10 hours ahead of Greenwich Mean Time, an amending Bill was introduced. The reasons for this were stated in *Hansard* on page 703 of 19 October 1898, which reads:

> The Government were approached by the secretary of the Chamber of Commerce, who wrote this letter: 'I have the honour to call your attention to the fact that commercial cablegrams are generally delivered in the morning, and in consequence of the present arbitrary law by which the Adelaide time is made one hour later than that of Melbourne and Sydney, South Australian merchants are placed at a great disadvantage, their competitors having one hour to act on the cablegrams before the local commercial men are in receipt of theirs, and it is therefore considered necessary by the committee of this chamber, in the interests of the commercial community and the public generally, to move for

some alteration so that the colonial times might be as nearly as possible assimilated.

I think it would be appreciated that the reasons for which Central Standard Time as we know it today was introduced no longer apply. We do not carry out business by cablegrams: we have telexes and other far more sophisticated machinery and equipment that enable it to be done instantaneously. The whole impact of time differences between States and nations is totally immaterial. The reasons for the Bill being introduced in the Legislative Council in 1898 no longer apply. Reference is made in the second reading speeches on that Bill to the importing and exporting of commodities between what we now know as States. At that time we were importing from the eastern colonies and exporting back to them. All the reasons given in the second reading speeches in the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly at that time are totally irrelevant in today's business world.

I know that some people in the commercial field would still argue that, but within my district I have many businesses heavily involved in direct exporting not only to other States but also to other countries. I know for a fact that the communications that take place in those firms are instantaneous; they can use the telex machine, type out a message and wait for a reply from Japan or another part of the world. As I have said, the whole reason for standard time does not apply.

The Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association put up a proposal at the last meeting held at Whyalla. Some of the supporting evidence given to that meeting (and this explains the situation simply and directly) says:

The basis for the global standard time zones is that all places, throughout a zone of longtitude 15° side and centreing on a meridian that is a multiple of 15 (30, 45, 60, etc.), have a local or standard time equivalent to the mean solar time at the central meridian.

Three such meridians traverse the Australian Continent, namely, 120° E. (through Western Australia), 135° E. (through South Australia) and 150° E. (through New South Wales). Australia therefore has three time zones which vary by one hour, with Western Australia being eight hours ahead of Greenwich, South Australia nine hours, and New South Wales 10 hours.

South Australia's time zone has been set at 9½ hours ahead of Greenwich, which means that our time is taken from the 142° E. meridian which passes through Warrnambool. This has the effect that all of South Australia is always experiencing a form of daylight saving, the amount the time is ahead of the sun increasing the further west we travel.

The inconvenience of daylight saving to those people in the west of the State would therefore be less were South Australian time to be based on the correct global time zone, that is, the 135° E. meridian—nine hours ahead of Greenwich.

The following the resolutions were unanimously passed by the Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association:

(1) continues to express opposition to daylight saving especially while South Australian time is not based on the correct global time.
(2) ask the Government to fully publicise argument for and against daylight saving at the time of the promised referendum.
(3) ask the Government to give consideration to basing South Australian time on the 135° E. meridian.
(4) strongly oppose any suggestion that there be a common time for South Australia and the Eastern States.

Further, I understand that a letter was conveyed to the Premier and in brief the reply indicated that to alter the meridian would require an amendment to the Act which would not be appropriate until after the referendum.

This highlights the point I raised in the first instance. Does one have a referendum first and then tell people the various alternatives afterwards, or does one tell people what the alternatives could be and allow them to have a say in that particular issue? That is the reason I have foreshadowed some amendments to the Bill. I believe that that is in accordance with the undertaking given by the Premier on 21 October 1981 that he would take into consideration the request of the Pinkawillinie branch of the Women's Agricultural Bureau—the idea of providing alternative questions. That bureau's request related to the reduction of daylight saving so that it operated quite specifically within the days of the school holiday period. In effect, it reduces daylight saving from each end so that any implications or impact of daylight saving would, in effect, only take place during the school holiday period and would totally obviate the problems that occur with school buses at the moment.

I reiterate that I cannot speak too strongly in favour of the people in the western part of the State. We do not say that these alternatives should be forced upon any section of the community. What we say is that rather than have a straight 'yes' or 'no' question, let the alternatives be put to the people and give them an opportunity of having a say. Some people have said to me that they could not accept the proposals I have suggested because they are too complicated.

Quite frankly, that is a reflection on the integrity of the public. We are not really dealing with people who do not know what it is all about. It is stated in the Bill that explanatory notes will be prepared. I cannot for the life of me see how any returning officer could embrace all the alternatives concerning people in the western part of the State. How could they all be incorporated in a simple explanatory note? I do not believe that they can. The best way is to provide the alternatives to the people, let them have a say and give them an opportunity to express their viewpoint so that the Government and the Parliament of the day can make a reasonable assessment and judgment of those points. I have foreshadowed possible amendments which I hope will be considered by the House at the appropriate time and which I trust will be given the consideration they deserve.

Mr RODDA (Victoria): I could not let the debate on this Bill pass without saying one or two things about it. I have a lot of sympathy for what the member for Flinders has had to say. In the major towns in my district—Bordertown, Naracoorte, Penola and Millicent—during daylight saving we see the twilight golf tournaments and other sporting events that are popular during the late afternoon and early evening. On the other hand, the primary producer, the dairyman and the mothers have a different view. The only way to determine the issue is through a referendum.

Mr Keneally: Will daylight saving lengthen the twilight of your career?

Mr RODDA: The honourable member is getting back to his old form, and he has had some practice today. Daylight saving, from my viewpoint as a grazier, is a damn nuisance. As a member of Parliament or as an urbanite, I can put up with it. That is the tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee situation of daylight saving. Where I live is six minutes ahead of the clock, whatever that means. I know in the past that, during daylight saving, children were going to Langkoop school in the dark, and that children at the border were being picked up in 'morning twilight' to go to school in Naracoorte. When we look at the districts of the member for Flinders and the member for Eyre, we realise that children are going to school in the dark and coming home in the heat of the day. This involves a domestic problem, and mothers have the horrible task of getting children to bed when the sun is high in the heavens and not being able to get them out of bed in the morning.

I have received protests from dairy farmers and their wives. The cows may not mind the time of the day when they are required to give up their lacteal reserves, and morning milking is all right, but there is a problem in the afternoon, when cows are brought in during the heat of the

day, and the time for the milk pick-up is advanced by an hour also.

I think that the only way to resolve this conflict of requirement and opinion is through the voice of the people. I have met some people in the cities and towns who do not like daylight saving, but I think that a great preponderance of opinion is for it.

I have discussed the matter with my constituents, and probably one of the places where the people were the noisiest about it was Mundulla, which is some five miles south-west of Bordertown. The people of that town were terribly vociferous in their protestations about the continuance of daylight saving. There is a very fine bowling club in that town which is another thing to consider.

Mr Hemmings: That is important?

Mr RODDA: I would think that there would be a 100 per cent 'No' vote in Mundulla.

Mr Hemmings: How many people are there?

Mr RODDA: Probably 130. You know, little fish are sweet, although I suppose that the member for Napier eats only big fish—probably shark! I simply want to point out to the House that there is a divergence of opinion in the electorate that I represent, and there are some strongly held opinions. It seems that the only democratic resolution of the situation, therefore, will be by means of a referendum.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I am sure that members do not need reminding that this is not a debate on the pros and cons of daylight saving; basically, it is a debate on whether or not a referendum should be held to decide whether or not daylight saving should apply in this State. The proposal for a referendum is the result of a commitment first made by the Liberal Party in 1977, and again made in 1979, that a referendum would be held at the time of the next election.

Many varying views have been expressed in the community. Daylight saving is a system that is either loved or hated by people throughout South Australia. I would say that the various views that have been expressed range from the opinion that South Australian time should conform with Eastern Standard Time, which would vastly disadvantage people (even more so than the disadvantages that the members for Flinders, Victoria and Eyre have frequently pointed out), to the opinion at the other end of the spectrum that South Australian time should be one hour behind that of the Eastern States, which is another view that has been put forward in this Chamber by a number of people.

The fact that the Opposition supports with such fervour the retention of daylight saving would be of little comfort to those people in the country who really feel that their views should be taken into account. I believe that the people of South Australia should have a chance to express their views. I think that a referendum is the only logical and appropriate way of dealing with this matter. I certainly do not believe that it should be a matter of Party politics. This matter affects every single member of the community, and in those circumstances, and in honouring the promise that was given, the Government believes that every member of the community has a right to express a point of view.

The member for Flinders raised the matter of alternative questions that could be put during the course of the referendum. The matters which he put forward (and which were also put forward by the member for Eyre and a number of other members representing country districts) were considered carefully by the Government, but the more suggestions that were raised, the more the Government realised that it would be totally impossible to cope with every possible variation that was presented to us by way of a questionnaire. Indeed, it was realised that there would be so many details that it would cloud the issue beyond the possibility of extracting any sensible resolution.

For that reason, we believe that the question must be simple; it must address itself to the principle involved, and it does do that. The member for Flinders has listed a number of organisations that have contacted him expressing one point of view. May I point out to the honourable member that members of each of those organisations, under the terms of a referendum, will have an opportunity to express their views directly in the referendum. They will not have to go through the organisations of which they are members. Basically, this means that the principle will be decided by the people and, I repeat, by the people who belong to many and various organisations. This process has the advantage of leaving the Government free to make the necessary adjustments from time to time.

I would caution all members against leaping to conclusions on this matter. I well remember a referendum on shopping hours which I think everyone in the Government at the time believed would be overwhelmingly carried in one way and the result of which was quite a surprise to the Government and to everyone else. It seems to me that, if we take as an example the fact that this referendum could be passed in the affirmative so that people say they support daylight saving, it would give the Government an opportunity to make the necessary adjustments to come into line, for example, with daylight saving arrangements in other States, so there is no added confusion when it comes to the dates on which daylight saving should apply, as was experienced recently with the unilateral adoption of an extra month of daylight saving in New South Wales. The Government would also have the opportunity and the flexibility to take the necessary steps to minimise adverse effects on people in the community, including people in the country and in business. Again, it is not the base of this referendum Bill to go into the various methods that would be used, the adjustment to hours of opening, and so on. The point is that, if we have too many questions and variations, we will lose sight of the underlying principle and we will not get a positive determination. I respect what the member for Flinders has said. His views have been expressed by many other people in our Party. However, I believe there is only one way of tackling the problem, and that is to let the people make up their minds on the principle, so that we can then work from there.

One other matter was raised—the preparation of the arguments for and against. It is necessary that such arguments be presented; after all, it is a matter of custom and it is necessary having regard to the very basic principles of ensuring that both sides of the question are clearly put to the people. But let us be fundamentally honest about this. I believe that most people have already made up their minds, anyway. Daylight saving has been operating for a long time and, quite frankly, most people know whether or not they favour it. I very much doubt whether people will be swayed one way or the other by the arguments that are put forward. Nevertheless, I believe they ought to be put, because that is a basic principle in democracy. However, I doubt whether the arguments will make a great deal of difference. The people will have a chance to put their opinion into effect in the ballot box. Regarding the question of qualified and expert advice, I take the point raised by the Leader, but I think it would be difficult to know from where these expert or qualified people will come.

Mr Hemmings interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The member for Napier has answered my question by indicating that he is an expert on the matter. I think everyone is an expert on the matter, has a point of view and can argue one way or the other, almost as eloquently as the member for Flinders put his point of

view. The arguments must be circulated, but I do not believe that there will be any real change.

Most people are now waiting. This matter is not of great controversy in the community: people have settled down to the stage where they are waiting for the referendum to express their point of view. Let me say that the Government will abide by the decision that the people take at the referendum.

The preparation of the cases for and against will be left to the Electoral Commissioner. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to forward suggestions to the Electoral Commissioner, that is fine. Many other people have done that. There is a certain sameness about the arguments on either side. I do not believe that any new or startling information will be brought forward. I understand that the Electoral Commissioner is the one person who will not vote in this referendum. I am quite sure that he is the best qualified person to prepare and administer this referendum.

The Government will abide by the decision taken by the people at this referendum. Once a decision has been made we will make certain that daylight saving, if it is passed, will be implemented, with consideration given to all of the difficulties that it has caused in the past to see whether they can be minimised in the future. If it is not passed and the people express their opposition to daylight saving, again, we will know exactly where we stand.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Interpretation.'

Mr BLACKER: Mr Chairman, I seek your advice on a procedural matter. I have circulated a series of amendments, the real impact of which relates to clause 4. All my remaining amendments are consequential on the passage of clause 4. Is it possible to deal with clause 4 first and then recommit clauses 2 and 3?

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest that the honourable member canvass his arguments in relation to this clause and use it as the test clause.

Mr BLACKER: Mr Chairman, are you suggesting that I canvass my arguments in relation to clause 4 now?

The CHAIRMAN: It appears from reading the honourable member's amendments that it would be necessary for all his amendments to be carried if his wishes were to be put into effect. Therefore, I will permit the honourable member to canvass his arguments in relation to this clause, as I understand his other amendments are consequential. I will allow the honourable member to canvass all of his amendments and use clause 2 as the test clause.

Mr BLACKER: I move:

Page 1, line 9—Leave out 'question' where twice appearing and substitute in each case 'questions'.

I believe that any member who has read my amendments will understand, their import. As I explained in my second reading speech, I wish to change the basis of the one 'Yes' or 'No' question to be put at the referendum to four alternative questions, which will give voters an alternative choice. The first part of my amendment rewords the question proposed by the Government, as follows:

> Are you in favour of daylight saving beginning on the last Sunday in October in each year and continuing until the first Sunday in March of the following year?

In effect, that is the *status quo*, the situation which presently applies. That question requires a 'Yes' or 'No' answer. My second question is as follows:

> Are you in favour of daylight saving beginning at the beginning of the summer school holidays in each year and continuing until the end of those holidays in the following year?

That gives effect to the suggestion put forward by the Pinkawillinie Women's Agricultural Bureau and other organisations on Eyre Peninsula who have complained most bitterly about the effect of daylight saving on schoolchildren, particularly those attending infant and primary schools. In effect, it gives the voter an alternative choice: one is daylight saving as we now know it and, secondly, daylight saving for a reduced period and applying for the school holiday period only.

Question No. 3 is, 'Are you in favour of daylight saving if standard time in South Australia is moved back by half an hour?' This is, in effect, one of the questions that applies with the alteration of the time meridian, as suggested and presented by the Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association, the Country Women's Association, and others.

The fourth question is, 'Are you against daylight saving and in favour of moving standard time in South Australia back by half an hour?' One of those has the effect of an impact of an hour and a half as compared to a half hour impact when it is taken into account with daylight saving. I believe that the four questions are fairly simple and straightforward. The fact of having four questions at a referendum is not new. That has applied at Federal elections when referendums were held on four totally different subjects, and in this case these all relate to daylight saving.

I believe that explanatory notes could easily be prepared by the electoral officers to adequately describe the impact of these questions. It is not a case where we are talking about or delineating between a longitude of 138 degrees, 135 degrees, 142 degrees, or whatever. No technical data is involved in the questions. Basically, it is a matter of philosophy and as things would occur every day and in everyone's own language. It is easily understandable and one that could be easily promoted, I believe, by various sections of the community each of which was wanting to promote its own particular cause.

I have pleasure in presenting this amendment, hoping that the Committee will consider it. If I may pre-empt things a little, I say that I have asked a few members about the matter, and there is some concern with a couple of the questions but another seems to have some support. However, I am in favour of all questions being presented, because I believe that would result in a truly representative opinion of the people throughout South Australia, irrespective of the area in which they reside. I believe that the referendum will have the effect that we will see the locality differences showing up in the results as they are returned booth by booth. I ask the Committee to support the amendments *en bloc*. However, clause 2 will be used as a test case.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Unfortunately, if one were to admit these questions, there would be a whole host of other questions that could legitimately be admitted also. While I am not in any way reflecting on the member for Flinders, he has put forward a selection of questions that he believes would be valuable, but there are equally very many other people who would like to have a number of other questions asked, and many of them perhaps would conflict with the sense that he has put forward in his amendments.

Thus, I think the whole exercise would be unworkable in those circumstances. We have looked at the matter carefully. We gave due consideration to the matters raised by the Women's Agricultural Bureau and other people who obviously have been in touch with the member, but there is no way in which we can have a whole range of questions without dealing with the principle, and the principle is the only way in which this can be dealt with. Therefore, I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr BANNON: I have studied this amendment. I certainly agree with the principle behind it, and in the past I have said publicly that, if we are going to have a referendum on daylight saving, it would also be useful to have a more

precise and more explicit opinion from the electorate on questions relating to daylight saving.

However, the problem develops that, as the Premier has said, we must try to select which questions are most appropriate to be asked, and everyone has a different idea about that matter. Secondly, I think we must try to ensure that people understand precisely the questions that they are being asked and the implications of their answers.

I do not believe that the questions, as set out in this amendment, do that. In fact, I suggest that the way in which they are worded—and it is questionable whether one can avoid this problem and whether one must fall back on the principle, as the Premier suggested—would make the answers to those questions difficult to interpret. If one just looks at the internal problems with some of the questions, it may be that under question No. 1 people are in favour of the *status quo*, which is clearly the intention of the member for Flinders. However, that may not be recognised by the person answering the question. That person may not be aware that that specifically is the *status quo* and may think that the last Sunday in October sounds good, although he does not like the first Sunday in March. Does such a person answer, 'Yes' or 'No', or does he adjust it?

That confusion could be compounded if the person concerned moved to the next question, which refers to the summer school holidays. People could legitimately answer 'Yes' to both questions Nos. 1 and 2, because in some way they are complementary rather than contradictory. Clearly, the member intends that they should be separate questions and, if one answers 'Yes' to one, one must answer 'No' to the other, particularly in the case of questions Nos 1 and 2. However, we could get an answer 'Yes' to both questions because people were concentrating on whether they favour daylight saving over a specific span being the important aspect of the question.

Question No. 3, 'Are you in favour of daylight saving if standard time in South Australia is moved back by half an hour?', could be a confusing question to a voter, particularly referring to the next question, 'Are you against daylight saving and in favour of moving standard time in South Australia back by half an hour?' They may say, looking at those questions, 'Yes, I am in favour of daylight saving, but I am not, if standard time is moved back by half an hour.' However, if that is the price for daylight saving, I might vote 'Yes', even though the question is aimed more importantly at the question of standard time in South Australia.

The final question could yield two answers. It asks, 'Are you against daylight saving and in favour of moving standard time in South Australia back by half an hour?' An elector reading that may think, 'I am against daylight saving but I am not in favour of moving standard time in South Australia back by half an hour. How do I answer that?' The simple answer is that that question must be read in relation to the other four questions. I suspect that many voters, even supplied with notes to assist them, as suggested, would find that all very confusing, and that confusion would then show up in the answers that they gave and, as I said earlier, lead to tremendous difficulties of interpretation which, far from guiding the Government in its policies, would only keep the issue much more cloudy.

Certainly, while there is merit in the concept of trying to ask some other questions, it seems a pity, in a referendum which will cost money and where a case for and against is to be circulated, we cannot get a more definitive public opinion. In the circumstances, it is better left as it is, and I intend to oppose the amendments.

Mr BLACKER: I am concerned at the Premier's initial comment that a whole range of amendments could come forward. I understood that the Parliament of South Australia was in this Chamber and that, if there was a place for amendments to come forward, it should be in this Chamber. To my knowledge, no other amendments have been circulated. Surely, it is proper that the amendments be debated on the floor of this Parliament and that this be a decision not necessarily of a political Party or of anyone else but of the Parliament that the amendments be duly considered. If what the Premier says is correct, namely, that a whole range of other amendments could come forward, surely this is the place where they should come forward. In my view, this is the only place where I can move them, and this is the right and proper place for that to occur.

The Leader of the Opposition raised doubts about confusion that could arise around the four questions. I do not believe that that is the case, because anyone who has thought about daylight saving or who has an impact on daylight saving surely could understand the explanatory notes that obviously would accompany this. For example, the only explanatory note for question No. 1 is that it involved the *status quo* and one would not really need any more than that, as everyone knows what the present situation is.

I do not really see that as a problem at all, because the explanatory notes can be put forward. I relate back to the referendum that was held with the Federal election some years ago, when four questions on four totally different subjects were asked and the explanatory notes that needed to accompany that were very complex and confusing to the average voter. I believe that the Leader of the Opposition is selling the general public short by believing that they would be confused on this issue, and I say the same to the Premier. If this goes through as the Government says, it will involve the majority of the people saying, 'We are going to get "No" vote on this, so we will wipe our hands of daylight saving, and it will be pushed into the back shelves and we will never have to raise it again.' That is the part that concerns me.

I believe that this is so carefully worded in such a way that the result is obvious to everyone, and it makes the need for a referendum quite superfluous and meaningless, because the response that will come out will be so one-sided that there will be no opportunity for those in need to express a point of view other than to say 'No', and that vote could get wiped out by a majority of three to one, and that will be it.

If the result is 55 per cent as against 45 per cent, where do we go from there? If we had these alternative questions, at least there would be an expression of opinion by the public that the Government of the day can then take on board, and it could look at alternative ways of accommodating those wishes. I cannot accept that the explanation given by the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition can be justified in this instance.

Mrs SOUTHCOTT: I sympathise with the member for Flinders and country people, because this is a very difficult situation. I have been looking very carefully at the amendments in the hope that I could perhaps support them but, having listened to the arguments on all sides, I believe that it is best to leave the questions simple, and not to tie us into something that would be difficult to change. I believe that it is within the powers of the Government of the day to make any of these possible arrangements as suggested in the amendments, if it is persuaded, and that it is much better to have a simple clear-cut question.

I disagree with the member for Flinders, as I find that these amendments would confuse the public greatly and confuse the issue. We would get so many different combinations of answers, that could be interpreted in different ways that it would make it very difficult.

Although I was attracted to allowing people in the country a choice of answering 'Yes' to the question on school holidays only, when one thinks about it, the thought of having daylight

saving for six weeks or seven weeks of the year really does make it rather ridiculous, especially when one considers the situation in the rest of Australia. We had enough examples last year of the chaos at the end with different closing dates. I would strongly support the suggestion by the Leader of the Opposition that we should try to get some sort of uniformity throughout Australia, particularly in the interests of the business community, in relation to some sort of uniform date of starting and closing. The efforts would be better directed in that way, and we should leave the question as a simple one so that there is room to manoeuvre.

Mr PETERSON: I, too, have been looking at the amendments, and I must say that it would confuse the issue. The first point made in the major amendment is that daylight saving will operate from the last Sunday in October until the first Sunday in March of the following year, and that is, I understand, the situation now. That obviously is a clear-cut one. The second question is this:

Are you in favour of daylight saving beginning at the beginning of the summer school holidays in each year and continuing until the end of those holidays in the following year?

That seems to me to go against what the member for Flinders was speaking about earlier. The farmer, for instance, will still have his problems during that period. The children going to school will be relieved of their early rising problem, of course. I do not know whether that problem applies particularly to the country, because when I am on the road early in the morning I see many young children in the metropolitan area, especially those going to private schools, waiting at bus stops early in the morning because of the distances they have to travel.

The other point made by the member for Flinders concerned farmers' grain not being ready to be taken to the silo until 1 o'clock. I am confused about that. There is an adjustment of only an hour a day. It might make the difference of one less load being delivered in a day. However, if it is 1 p.m. before the farmer can get his first load in, I cannot see that staggering the time by an hour should make any significant difference. The honourable member also spoke of the outlay in relation to silos, but that situation would still exist because of the present situation. The third question to be asked at a referendum if the amendments are accepted is:

Are you in favour of daylight saving if standard time in South Australia is moved back by half an hour?

The fourth question is:

Are you against daylight saving and in favour of moving standard time in South Australia back by half an hour?

I believe that those questions are confusing and that most people in the community do not know about those times, although I do not say that people could not be educated, in time, to make a decision about this matter.

I think the feeling in the community about this matter is either black or white; people either like daylight saving, or they do not. I believe that the majority of people in the State, and particularly in the metropolitan area, want daylight saving. That is some 900 000 out of 1 400 000 people, so I suggest that the majority of people will be in favour of daylight saving. I believe that daylight saving was a major plank of the present Government's election platform and a matter about which it has a mandate to put this question. I think this matter should be kept to a straightforward 'yes' or 'no'. 'Do you want daylight saving or do you not?' I do not support the amendment.

Mr BLACKER: I would like to make some comments about the remarks of the member for Semaphore. There is no disagreement at all about a referendum; I think we all accept that. What I suggest in my amendments is that the referendum should present questions more applicable to the community than those requiring a straight 'yes' or 'no' answer. To my mind, asking a question which requires a 'yes' or 'no' answer is a waste of time and taxpayers' money. It is obvious that the member for Semaphore has not walked alongside graingrowers' trucks lined up at a silo and talked to farmers about daylight saving. If he spoke to carriers he might get a different viewpoint, because the carriers know that if farmers are forced to store grain in bins then they will have a better opportunity of getting that business. If farmers have the time, then they will cart their own grain, but if they do not have the time and have to provide storage facilities there is a better chance for carriers to get that work.

The member for Mitcham made a comment which I thought was off the track when she spoke about giving people certain opportunities. My amendment does not force any view on any person in any part of the State. I am saying that, because of the range of opinions that exists throughout the State, people should have a chance to express their view.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Let me say once again, with great kindness to the honourable member, that this is not a Bill to determine whether or not we shall have daylight saving in South Australia. It is a Bill to determine whether or not we shall have a referendum on daylight saving in South Australia. If, indeed, the will of the people is that daylight saving is to be continued, then all of the matters canvassed by the honourable member today, and others if he wishes, will be considered by the Government in determining exactly how daylight saving can be implemented in the future.

Mr BLACKER: Perhaps I have been under a misapprehension. I understood that the Bill quite clearly stated the wording of the question and that the reply would be 'Yes' or 'No' to whether or not we shall have daylight saving. If that is the case, and it comes in the affirmative (that we retain daylight saving), I understand that the *status quo* will remain. Am I to assume from the Premier's comments that the matter will be brought back to this Parliament for further debate on the continuation of daylight saving and the manner in which it will be continued?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I have already made quite clear to members that one of the reasons for having a question as simple as this, dealing with the principle only, is so that if in fact the wish of the people is expressed as supporting daylight saving it will leave the Government free and flexible to take whatever measures it can to minimise the adverse effects on various sections of the community, for instance, the primary producing community on the West Coast and the business community. How, I am not in a position to say yet. It would be quite wrong to say. Indeed, that is the whole purpose for having a referendum with one simple question dealing with the principle.

Mr BLACKER: Does the outcome of this referendum have any binding effect on the Government?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I think I have made that fairly clear on a number of occasions: yes.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

While the division was being held:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There being only one member on the side of the Ayes, I declare that the Noes have it.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr RUSSACK: I do not wish to keep the House more than a few moments. I understand that this is the operative clause which provides for a referendum. I did not have an opportunity to speak earlier and I realise that this Bill is purely to set up a referendum. Because of the attitudes and very strong feelings of people in my electorate, I consider that the Government is doing the right thing and that it is fulfilling a promise given at the last election. Because of the difficulties experienced in the rural areas, I feel that this matter involves consideration between hardship and enter-

tainment or recreation to many people. I support some of the remarks made by the Premier earlier when he said that we may get a surprise. I think that there may be a surprise.

Mr Langley: At the next election.

Mr RUSSACK: The member for Unley may get a big surprise in the electorate of Unley.

Mr Langley: I'm retiring unbeaten.

The CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member continues to interject, he may be retired from the Chamber.

Mr RUSSACK: The member for Unley and the member for Goyder have something in common: we are both going to retire undefeated. There are many people in the metropolitan area, particularly young mothers with families, who find daylight saving a hardship. I support this clause and also support the Bill. I consider that it is a good thing for the people of South Australia to have another opportunity to have a say on this matter.

Mr BLACKER: I do not wish to proceed with the remaining amendments standing in my name as the test clause has put the substance of my amendments.

Clause passed.

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Question to be submitted to electors.'

Mr BANNON: I am using this clause as a vehicle to ask a question about the case that the Electoral Commissioner is preparing by way of leaflet. There is nothing in the Bill about this. Can the Premier say how the money is to be appropriated for that and what means are available to people to ensure that their views are taken into consideration by the Commissioner in the course of preparing this case?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Electoral Commissioner has been asked to prepare the case and to take into account the views expressed by various members of the community. There is an appropriate appropriation made for this purpose, as will be seen in due course.

Mr BANNON: Can the Premier say what the amount of the appropriation is and what the total cost of the referendum will be?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am sorry that I do not have that exact figure with me at this stage. I noted in the pulls that the cost of the referendum was quoted at $3 000 000 to $4 000 000, whereas in actual fact the printed word said three stroke four million dollars, which in my view is three quarters of a million dollars. We are going to save a great deal of money because there is no expense involved in the employment of returning officers and polling booth staff. That will already be taken into account with the election arrangements. I am not going to tell the honourable member when that is, either.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Will you try to give us a surprise?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am sure the honourable member will be surprised. A small amount of overtime will be involved in handling the matter. There is no great urgency to do the counting. They will probably go through in a week without any additional sums at all. The major sum will be in the distribution and printing of the arguments and in the printing of the ballot-papers. I have not got the exact figure but I will ascertain it for the honourable member.

Mrs SOUTHCOTT: I understand that at the next election it is likely that the Electoral Commissioner will be distributing to all homes an educational leaflet similar to that used during the Mitcham by-election and similar to that being used for the Florey by-election. A campaign is being undertaken to educate members of the community on electoral matters, particularly on the closing time of 6 p.m. and on matters relating to postal voting. It would appear to be quite simple to have encompassed in that small pamphlet the additional facts relating to the referendum and some of the main points. I do not envisage that there will be any need for all points to be canvassed in a pamphlet put out by the Electoral Commissioner. It may be necessary to draw attention to the main points. However, I am sure the media will be the appropriate forum where all Parties can express their views on the case.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 10) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 August. Page 388.)

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I indicate that the Opposition will be supporting the Bill. I am on record as supporting the concept of land tax as an equitable tax. It is one that provides for a tax to be levied on a share of the proceeds of economic growth. The community and community-related activities create the value of urban land and, indeed, set the value of any land. It seems only reasonable that, in terms of fixing a fair and equitable taxing system, recognition should be made of that value and the community should be entitled to share in the value which it has created.

My views are derived considerably from the writings and philosophy of Henry George. I do not agree in all respects with George's case but I find it an attractive and valuable concept. The elements of it which remain in our tax system are to be commended. To the extent that this Bill is able to make the imposition of land tax fairer and to close some loopholes whereby tax is being avoided, it is to be commended. That is the primary reason why we support it.

I refer to the equitable base of land tax which does in fact provide a form of growth tax which, again is fair growth because it is based around prosperity and increased value within the community. Therefore, it is not taxing something that does not exist or imposing a burden where that burden is unreal. In the past it has been a fairly significant contributor to State revenue. Of course, the current Government has abolished land tax on a principal place of residence, which I think was a move that was certainly welcomed, although one wonders whether or not the abolition of land tax has been more than made up by rapid increases in water and sewerage rates, both of which are also based on property values; they come out of the same pocket as did land tax and, compared with the annual land tax payments formerly paid by householders, water and sewerage rates are very much higher and more significant.

I turn now to the specific provisions in the Bill. The exemptions provided for by clause 4 to land owned by bodies under the control of local government, under that section of the Local Government Act where joint projects can be undertaken, seem eminently sensible and certainly conform to the principle that exemption has been provided. If a new authority is to be established for a joint or co-operative project, exemptions should also apply. Indeed, I suggest that such co-operative projects, whether for garbage disposal or anything else, are a very desirable thing, particularly in those areas where amalgamation of local government bodies may be desirable in the interests of efficiency, but which may not be practicable or politically possible. In those instances, the more that joint activity can be encouraged, the better. Anything that would appear to be a bar to that, such as the possibility of becoming liable to a particular form of taxation, is to be discouraged. The amendment is one that the Opposition would support.

Clauses 5 and 6 provide for total or partial exemption of land held by non-profit bodies. It is intended that residential projects undertaken by non-profit bodies will receive some land tax concession. A specific example has been given

concerning a proposal at West Lakes where an association is being formed to house aged persons as a specific non-profit project. Exemptions provided for by the amendment seem to be desirable as a matter of public policy. Certainly, this provision could assist in the development of things such as housing co-operatives and other non-profit ventures of that kind.

There are many things that can be done effectively in the area of housing provision, and I refer to matters such as financial arrangements which have yet to be fully explored. We certainly need a stimulation of the housing and construction industry in this State. To the extent that this amendment encourages projects along those lines (and, I suggest, further schemes of arrangement on a non-profit basis), it should be supported, because such projects are attractive.

I appreciate the specific reference to the provision of cottages and homes for aged persons. Obviously, there will be an increased need in our community for these places as our population ages. Any barriers to the formation of projects such as those should be removed where it is in the public interest. From information I have been given in regard to this Bill, I would certainly say that such projects are in the public interest. I would appreciate a little more information concerning the nature of partial exemption which, I understand in the terms of the amendment, would apply to areas contiguous to the place of residence, as such.

Clause 7, together with any consequential clauses, relates specifically to avoidance of land tax. The whole question of tax avoidance is very important and has been raised at the national and State levels. There is no question that one reason why tax levels are as high as they are, particularly federally, is that so much avoidance of tax has been occurring. On past occasions when I have raised this matter in Parliament, particularly following fairly vigorous action taken by the Victorian Premier, the present Government and the Premier have somewhat understated the urgency of the problem, particularly as it relates to the avoidance of State taxation.

We know that there are avoidance schemes and that some State taxes are apparently quite easy to avoid. I believe that is a matter of considerable concern, because it is totally unreasonable that certain people in the community, usually those on the lower incomes with less disposable resources, are paying their fair share while others, usually with higher incomes and with more disposable resources and the ability to hire ingenious legal and other advice, can escape their responsibilities in terms of paying tax. That is quite wrong: it puts the whole system under strain immediately and causes resistance to the payment of tax, creating enormous problems in terms of good government.

The Premier of Victoria, Mr Cain, who has really managed to get this issue into the public prominence and released reports which prompted the Federal Government to take more vigorous action, has done a great service for the whole Australian community. In looking at tax avoidance, however, we should not only concentrate on Federal taxes but also consider the people who pay their fair share of State taxes. On that general basis, I support the provisions established by the amendment, particularly under subclause (3).

The main form of land tax avoidance is to try to split up the ownership of parcels of land amongst a number of people, and in this way the multiple holding tax, or aggregation of holdings and progressive tax rates, is avoided. This amendment seeks to prevent the use of trusts as devices for land tax avoidance, splitting ownership between the number of trustees who hold the land for trusts. However, I draw the Treasurer's attention to two specific aspects of the amendment in regard to what he said in the second reading explanation. Referring to new subsection (3) contained in clause 7, he stated:

> This provision should, to some extent, prevent the use of trusts as devices to reduce the incidence of land tax.

I would be interested to know to what extent and why it cannot be done completely. Referring to new subsection (5), the Treasurer stated:

> This provision may be of some limited use where there are discretionary trusts, and the identity of the beneficiary cannot be ascertained with certainty.

That is even more tentative than the first reference—'may be of some limited use'. Will the Premier extrapolate a little and say why he is not confident that this will pick up the problems of avoidance and why it seems to be beyond the powers of the draftsmen or the State to do so? However, in saying that, I indicate that, to the extent that the Bill seems to be closing these loopholes, so much the better. Clause 15 is more than a machinery matter and seems to be a sensible move in terms of changeover of title, and so on. The debt owing in respect of land tax can be ascertained quickly and can be discharged by the issuing of a certificate.

That will completely reduce uncertainty in land tax transactions between purchasers and vendors. It has been indicated that while the system is put into place there will still be a time lag or changeover period, so that a different proclamation date is provided. That seems to be very sensible. Certainly, I think the powers envisaged under clause 15 are to be welcomed now that we have technology at our disposal to make that certification in the short time required. With those remarks and few queries, I indicate the Opposition's general support for the Bill.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I support the Bill because I believe it has a worthy objective in its attempt to assist particularly some of the aged home complexes in relation to which local government and housing authorities are endeavouring to provide development. From that point of view I add my support to the provisions that have been included in the Bill in relation to tax avoidance. I think the Leader's comments in relation to tax avoidance in the community were apt. I think every endeavour should be made to stamp it out. As the Leader rightfully said, every time someone avoids tax it is an extra burden on the genuine taxpayer. To that degree I think this legislation is extremely worth while.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I am grateful to members for their support for this measure. I think the Leader raised only two major queries. In relation to avoidance, quite frankly I cannot think of any way in which it is possible to quantify just exactly how successful the proposed measures will be. Obviously we know that they will go some of the way; only experience will tell how far. Basically it is a question of putting these measures into effect, monitoring the situation very carefully indeed, and taking further measures if they appear to be necessary.

The second reading explanation is absolutely correct. In fact, it would not be correct to say that we could quantify the extent of the discretion, where the provisions could have effect in discretionary trusts and where the beneficiary cannot be identified with any degree of certainty at all. I cannot be any more precise than that. I suspect that no-one else can be, either. Experience will be our guide.

In relation to partial exemption, the Leader would know very well to what purpose this measure is directed. It has been set out very well indeed in that one example relating to the West Lakes development. As it applies to occupiers,

when members of an association occupy a particular development, there is no problem. Of course, they will be fully exempt under the terms of this legislation. However, in such developments two things must be kept in mind. First, in developments such as that there will be property or accommodation set aside for sporting and recreational purposes that will be part of or adjacent to the living complex. Technically, they are not occupied as a principal place of residence, but they are an integral part of the complex. It might be an indoor or outdoor bowling green or it could be clinical premises for a chiropodist or doctor. It is an integral part of the development, but it is not the sort of thing normally associated with the principal place of residence. Nevertheless, as it is part of the whole development and, in my view, an essential part, that portion of the property will be partially exempt.

There is another matter that will also apply. There is in that group, particularly self-funded accommodation of that kind, a spirit abroad whereby, of the total number of units made available by some of these communities, one, two or three of those units are made available on a benevolent basis, shall I say, to people who are, for one reason or another, on hard times, and not able to occupy the units in their own right.

I think that is a very praiseworthy and creditable attitude, but, again, what happens in those circumstances is that, while the members of the association themselves own the additional units, the units are not occupied by members of the association. Nevertheless, they are still part of the whole complex. They are non-profit making. I believe that it is entirely appropriate that they should have some ability to benefit from this concession, and that is one of the other reasons why the partial exemption has been put in.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Exemption of certain residential land from land tax.'

Mr BANNON: This is the clause relating to the exemption from land tax.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: This is the total exemption.

Mr BANNON: Yes, this is the total exemption clause, and the clause dealing with section 12a is the one that talks about partial exemption. I am using the clause as a vehicle to raise this question of exemption. Here we are dealing with non-profit bodies with particular aims. There is also the question of those persons who currently live on their business premises.

I ask the Premier whether, in looking at the particular problems raised under this scheme, the justification for which relates to the total exemption for residential purposes, he also considered the question of those people who occupy the same premises as those on which they have their business, and who, of course, at the moment attract full land tax. I understand that there is no exemption there, whether total or partial.

I do not know the revenue implications of the matter, or any other aspects, but I am thinking not only of delicatessens but also of places where there may be a garage that is used as part of the business, or something of that nature. Has this matter been considered under this general question of general exemption, and has the Government any policy on it?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: This matter is one of great difficulty. It has been exercising the mind of the Government and the department for a long time. It is not possible to lay down any hard and fast rules, although it may be desirable to make the full concession available to certain people. For instance, doctors who practice from home come into one category, and the case to which the Leader has referred, of people who may live on the same premises as a shop, where the shop, in fact, is the bulk of the building, are in a rather different category. It is an extraordinarily difficult thing to quantify.

We are still looking at the overall question but, whenever letters are written to me, as they are from time to time on various matters, I am largely obliged to say that at present we have already given significant concessions regarding land tax on the principal place of residence. We will continue to keep the matter under review, but at present there is not a great deal we can do about it.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (6 to 16) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

RACING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 August. Page 509.)

Mr SLATER (Gilles): This Bill seeks to amend the Racing Act by deleting subsection (2) of section 105, relating to the registration of betting premises at Port Pirie, and this will, in effect, allow the betting shops in Port Pirie to continue after 31 January 1983. When the amendments to the Racing Act were before the House in 1981, this matter was raised by the member for Rocky River. That came as quite a surprise to members on this side, as not one of the betting shops in question is in the electorate of the member for Rocky River, and one would have thought that the parties interested in retaining the betting shops at Port Pirie would at least pay to the member for Stuart the courtesy of advising him, as the member for the district, of their desires.

However, those people chose the member for Rocky River and, despite that member's impassioned plea in the House on that occasion, he was given short shrift by his own Minister of Recreation and Sport, who would not accept the amendment.

The Minister said then that it was a recommendation of the Committee of Inquiry into the Racing Industry that the betting shops should not continue after 31 January 1983 and, as such, he could not support the amendment. The committee at that time considered the question of betting shops, and at page 42 referred to the matter. At page 43, the report states:

> The committee heard submissions from representatives of the Port Pirie bookmakers; also received a number of letters from individuals and organisations supporting the retention of the shops. However, the committee is not persuaded that there should be any change to the policy embodied in the Racing Act of giving a monopoly of off-course betting to the T.A.B.

Basically, that was the extent of the committee's comment. When this matter was before the House previously, I was unaware of all the circumstances involved. However, I did say that I had been to Port Pirie twice. I had frequented the betting shops about 15 or 20 years ago, and I said that I was most surprised about the condition of those shops. I described them as some of the scruffiest places I had ever seen.

I revisited Port Pirie in January this year and took the opportunity of looking at all the betting shops. Further, I discussed the matter with prominent members of the Port Pirie community, including the bookmaking fraternity and, as a result of our discussions and the fact that I had looked at the betting shops whilst I was there, I have to say that there certainly has been some improvement over that period, although I believe that there is still room for greater improvement in providing comfort for patrons. I will refer to that matter again later.

As a result of my discussions with people at Port Pirie, I said that I would support the retention of betting shops and that I would move a private member's motion to that effect. In fact, I have such a private member's motion on the Notice Paper at the present time. I also said that a Labor Government would amend the Act. Arising from my visit and interest and the actions that I undertook, the response from the Government was to establish a Cabinet—

Members interjecting:

Mr SLATER: The Minister may laugh, but I ask whether, if I had not taken the opportunity of going to Port Pirie and making the comments that I made after my visit, we would be debating this matter in the way that we are debating it today. So, the Minister can laugh. I am fairly sure that the Government has responded to my comments. It went through an exercise of appointing a Cabinet subcommittee comprising the Minister, the member for Rocky River and, I understand, the Hon. Mr Burdett. I believe that it is a matter of political expediency that they have now introduced this Bill. I will support the Bill, because I believe that it is in the best interests of the residents of Port Pirie that the betting shops should be retained.

We ought to look first at the history of the Port Pirie betting shops. In 1934, the then State Government passed legislation to legalise off-course betting in South Australia. It seems that the main reasons were that, with the depression, the racing industry was on the verge of collapse and that illegal betting was prevalent. We might consider that history may now be repeating itself. Anyway, racing clubs gained no revenue from this activity and, with the advent of the licensed betting premises and revenue gained from the turnover tax from the bookmakers holdings, the distribution of money to the racing clubs at that time assisted with the continuation of the sport. The betting shops continued in operation until racing in South Australia was suspended during the Second World War. After the cessation of hostilities, racing was resumed, and betting shops in South Australia were not automatically reopened.

Applications for betting shop licences in country towns were required to be submitted to a tribunal, which consisted of members of the Betting Control Board. Hearings for resumption of licences were conducted in 1946. At the completion of those hearings, three towns in South Australia were granted licences: Peterborough, Port Pirie and Quorn. Those centres continued operation until 1947-48 when, for some obscure reason that I have not been able to ascertain, a further investigation was conducted and the Quorn and Peterborough licences were discontinued.

That left Port Pirie as the only town in South Australia with licensed betting premises, and that situation still applies today. The operation of betting shops at Port Pirie continued without any moves for their discontinuation through the 1950s and 1960s. Assurances were given by Governments, both Labor in 1965-68 and Liberal in 1968-70, that the shops would continue, and that attitude prevailed during the time of the Labor Government in the early 1970s.

In 1976, with the advent of the Racing Act following the Hancock inquiry into racing, moves were made to phase out the bookmakers in Port Pirie. I understand that a meeting between the bookmakers, the then member for Port Pirie (Mr Ted Connelly) and the then Minister of Recreation and Sport (Mr Casey) was convened and held early in 1976. It was there suggested that the betting premises be closed by 1980. However, a compromise was reached, and the date of closure was decided as 31 January 1983.

This agreement was accepted somewhat reluctantly at that time by the bookmakers. However, the decision was subsequently written into the Racing Act as section 105, which provision we are debating today. My discussions at Port Pirie and consideration of all the historical factors lead me to support the retention of betting shops at Port Pirie. If the bookmaking fraternity had made contact with the member for Stuart, and the relevant facts had been known to me when we last debated this matter, members on this side of the House would, no doubt, have supported the retention of betting shops and the deletion of this provision.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: You would have supported the amendments put forward by the member for Rocky River?

Mr SLATER: Had I known all the circumstances surrounding the situation at that time, I would have supported the retention of these betting shops. However, I was not aware of that because of the very nature of, and the manner in which, the amendment was moved at that time by the member for Rocky River. I did not have an opportunity to know the full facts at that time. Certainly, the member for the district did not know the full facts. Had I known the full facts at that time (and I am now speaking for anyone else), would have supported the retention of betting shops.

There is no doubt that the Government has been forced to review its previous attitude to this matter following my investigations and comments. It is very clear to us all (and this has been agreed on by both sides) that there is overwhelming support from the people of Port Pirie for the retention of the betting shops there. There are a number of reasons for that. First, there is the historical aspect. It is clear that a number of organisations in Port Pirie strongly support the retention of betting shops. Members might recall that I presented a petition to this House containing 1 500 signatures of residents of Port Pirie who wished betting shops to be retained.

That petition was supported by local government, sporting groups and church bodies. I hope that we are not, as indicated in another matter, making Port Pirie a city of sin by giving people the opportunity to gamble in that town. The petition has been supported by church bodies in Port Pirie, and the Chamber of Commerce and the Trades and Labor Council support the retention of betting shops.

An honourable member: Friends of the Earth.

Mr SLATER: I do not know about Friends of the Earth. I do not think they have considered the matter. As a point of interest, in the 1979-80 financial year, the betting shop turnover in Port Pirie was $4 600 000. The return to Government in turnover tax was $116 000, calculated on 2 per cent of the turnover of local racing and 2.6 per cent on interstate events. It is an important aspect of revenue to Government. The percentages were increased, by amendment to the Racing Act, to 2.3 per cent and 2.9 per cent respectively from January 1981.

So, the return to Government from the activity of betting shops at Port Pirie is very significant. I understand that there is only one T.A.B. outlet at Port Pirie. It is reasonably patronised, particularly in the field of multiple betting. It is strongly believed (and no doubt quite justifiably) that, should legal betting be discontinued, there would be an upsurge in illegal betting. It would be fairly obvious, because of the nature of the operation which had existed for so many years, that that would occur. Personally, I believe that we ought to be taking the strongest action possible to minimise the opportunity for illegal betting in South Australia.

I noticed comments made on this matter by the Hon. Mr Laidlaw in another place. He suggested that not only should Port Pirie have the opportunity to retain the betting shops, but also that other country towns be considered in that regard. The argument could be that, if country towns had the opportunity to have legal betting premises, it may minimise the amount of illegal bookmaking occurring in those towns. It is only a supposition on my part, but it would appear that it may be the case that that problem could be overcome.

I have made the point that in the early days the betting shops in Port Pirie left a lot to be desired in regard to comfort and convenience for patrons, and that considerable improvement has taken place over the past 15 years. However, it is apparent that further improvements could be made for both the comfort and convenience of patrons. It must be appreciated that the licences have been under threat since 1976, and for that reason the proprietors of betting shops no doubt have been reluctant to undertake any upgrading or structural alterations because of the threat of closure in January 1983. I believe that when this Bill passes the licensed bookmakers' premises should be allowed by the Betting Control Board to have seating and other comforts for patrons, a great number of whom would be elderly people who may have to walk two or three kilometres to patronise the betting shops.

At present there are no seating arrangements at all. Whilst I was in Darwin on another matter, I took the opportunity to observe the betting shops there which provide comfortable seating for their patrons. I believe that the provision of the same type of facilities at Port Pirie would be a move in the right direction, especially in regard to the comfort of elderly patrons.

The Betting Control Board should ensure that certain standards are maintained and that as far as possible the comfort of its patrons is one of its prime considerations. The argument against providing such facilities is, of course, that people may stay there, which was a problem that supposedly existed in the betting shops in South Australia in earlier days. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that the betting premises in Port Pirie are conveniently located next to a hotel. Hotels have seating arrangements for their customers, although not everyone frequents a hotel, as that is one's personal decision. The point that I make is that betting shops should at least provide seating as part of a certain standard of accomodation for their patrons. At present there are seven betting shops at Port Pirie which employ—

Mr Keneally: How many is that?

Mr SLATER: It is either six or seven. The report of the committee of inquiry states:

> There are six licensed off-course bookmakers operating in seven shops.

So, there are seven shops and six bookmakers. Those establishments employ full time or part time about 120 people licensed by the Betting Control Board. Also, there is indirect employment for cleaning, and the like. There is no doubt that the salaries and wages received are spent and circulated within the town. Therefore, such establishments have a significant effect not only on the social aspects of the town but also on economic factors. So, in these times of economic down-turn, precipitated by the economic policies of the Tonkin and Fraser Governments, I think it is important to maintain employment, particularly in a town such as Port Pirie. The Minister laughs again—

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: You're so amusing.

Mr SLATER: If the Minister is prepared to look at the situation he would realise that many people are unemployed. No doubt my colleague, the member for Stuart, would be able to give the Minister some figures in relation to the town of Port Pirie, and I am sure the member for Whyalla would be able to do likewise in relation to Whyalla. So, the Minister may laugh, but it is a fact that employment is very important to a town such as Port Pirie, and 120 people in such a community is fairly significant. On the basis of the points I have made, I strongly support the retention of the betting shops in Port Pirie. I support the Bill and I ask other members of the House to do likewise.

Mr MAX BROWN (Whyalla): First, I want to point out to the Minister that I have been tempted to seek to amend the Bill. I make no apology for having given that temptation much thought. I was interested to hear the member for Gilles point out to the House the betting turnover from the Port Pirie betting shops. I would suggest to the Government that the betting tax payable on that turnover would be very significant. If in past years there had been a legal form of betting in Whyalla similar to the betting shops of Port Pirie, the tax payable would be even more significant. I intend to go to some lengths in comparing the activities of the legal betting shops in Port Pirie with the situation which is exactly opposite and which existed in my own city of Whyalla.

The history of this Bill is chock full of inconsistencies. For reasons perhaps best known to previous members of Parliament, Port Pirie has had licensed bookmaking premises for years, to the exclusion of other cities in the State. The question of retaining these betting shops is still subject to varied views, and I say that quite sincerely. It might be interesting to look at some of the reasons that are currently given for the retention of the betting shops. One could say that the most important reason that is put forward is that these premises provide a form of employment, and there is no doubt that that is so.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: 140 people.

Mr MAX BROWN: The Minister says 140 people. In a city like Port Pirie, as in other areas, the retention of 140 jobs is very significant. Another reason given for the retention of the betting shops is that they have become part and parcel of the community life of Port Pirie. The member for Gilles covered that point particularly. Another reason given was that, if the betting shops were to be disbanded in early 1983, there would be an immediate upsurge of illegal S.P. bookmaking. I find that particular reason quite significant in regard to the situation in my own city. It was also alleged that the bookmaking shops have no significant effect on the T.A.B. operations.

Mr Slater interjecting:

Mr MAX BROWN: My colleague shakes his head, but that reason was given. I understand that one T.A.B. office operates in Port Pirie and, from memory, about four, not counting sub-agencies, operate in Whyalla, so there is some significance. Another reason given was that the Government receives 1 per cent of bookmakers' turnover. I have already dealt with that question and I have pointed out that that situation is not insignificant. In passing, I would like to refer to an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* of 4 November, with a glorious photograph of a betting shop in Port Pirie (which I will not name). I would like to deal with two or three statements that were made in that article. It was stated:

> The Port Pirie punters are angry at the decision. They say the shops provide a better, faster service than the 'impersonal' T.A.B. offices and their closure will only lead to an increase in illegal S.P. betting in the town.

I will deal with that matter later. The article continues:

> Mr Christie said he believed the decision would lead to the start of S.P. betting in the town.

I understand that Mr Christie is a bookmaker in Port Pirie. He said it will lead to the start of S.P. betting in the town. To me, that is a very significant remark. The other part of the article that I will highlight referred to a wellknown bookmaker in Port Pirie as follows:

> Harry Madigan, who owns one of the betting shops, said the closure decision was 'disgraceful'.
>
> 'It's terrible . . . it's outrageous. I just can't understand it,' he said. 'They're doing harm to nobody. They've become a way of life here.'

All I can say in relation to that is that I presume from Mr Madigan's remarks that a legal bookmaker is doing no harm to anyone in the community. If that is so, why in blazes is not the Minister allowing fully licensed betting shops in other areas of this State?

Mr Slater: Where there is no T.A.B. agent.

Mr MAX BROWN: I would argue with my colleague about that. All the reasons for retaining betting shops in Port Pirie could be used in turn to support the setting up of betting shops, if in no other area, certainly in the city of Whyalla. I add that they could be used to support the setting up of betting shops in other major country areas. If one were being truthful about this measure, one would have to say that the passing of this Bill will create the greatest joke of all time, if it were not so serious. I have no reason to believe that this Bill will not be passed, so it will be a joke.

Perhaps we should look seriously at the history of these particular shops. It is true to say that prior to the Second World War betting shops were part of our national environment. The member for Gilles outlined that very well. It is also true to say that, when it was decided that betting shops in our community were no longer regarded as proper or rightful for those innocent people who frequented them, in our wisdom we outlawed them. For reasons that I am at a loss to understand, these shops were retained in Port Pirie. No-one has yet given me a feasible explanation for their retention.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I do not know either, and I agree with you.

Mr MAX BROWN: As I have said, that shows how inconsistent it is.

Mr Slater: They might have had a good local member in those days.

Mr MAX BROWN: It may have been that, and it may have been a rotten Minister. That is all I can suggest. I venture to say that Port Pirie has benefited from that decision through the employment created in the shops and through the lack of illegal betting in that city. The Government has also received a benefit from the operation of these shops, and the people of Port Pirie have retained their law abiding status over the years because they can bet in these shops legally.

In comparison, I turn to the other side of the penny. There would be no better example of the other side of the penny than the activities associated with what was illegal betting in my own city of Whyalla over the years. Betting shops were discarded in Whyalla in the early 1940s. Since that time illegal betting has become rampant in the Whyalla community. I am not speaking out of school when I say that. Despite periodic raids by police and some fining, some gaoling or both, the practice of S.P. bookmaking continued.

In fact, on one occasion I recall one wellknown S.P. bookmaker from Whyalla being imprisoned in the illustrious Port Augusta gaol. When he was released people approached him and asked him how it went and what it was like in there. He said that he did not hold too much, but he was still bookmaking.

I suggest that the practice of illegal bookmaking in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s in the city of Whyalla was condoned, ignored, or not talked about. It became a way of life. I suggest to the House that, particularly in the boom years of Whyalla, S.P. bookmaking, together with two-up and sly grogging, played a part in the way of life of that community. Since that time, as everyone knows, sly grogging has disappeared because of the legal extension of hotel hours. Some illegal betting has disappeared because of Totalizator Agency Board operations, and I believe it has completely disappeared for the time being because of the activities of what I can only call a crooked cop.

I suggest that, if legal bookmaking shops were in existence other than in Port Pirie, the city of Whyalla is one country area that should be considered. I also suggest that, if over the years legal bookmaking shops had been in operation in Whyalla as they have been in Port Pirie, the density of S.P. operations in Whyalla would not have existed.

This may be ironical, but I suggest that the illegal operations to which I am referring, in many ways over the years, have played a very important part in subscriptions to local charities and sporting bodies. Charitable organisations and sporting bodies have been the great losers because of the tightening up on S.P. bookmaking. I am speaking only from the point of view of my own electorate. By my remarks, I do not wish any member or anyone else to get the idea that I am a great defender of illegal gambling. The position is quite the opposite.

I believe that, because of our attitude and the conservative laws in this State on the question of gambling, we have forced good decent people into the world of illegal gambling. The rather stupid position is that the people of Port Pirie, having had legal resources available to them for betting, have been the good people of the State and, because we do not wish to have them degraded into the world of illegal betting, we are assisting them by passing this Bill.

I suggest that, if we were to put any semblance of consistency into this debate or if we had put consistency into debates over the years on this question, we would be amending the present Act to allow legal bookmaking in other areas, particularly country areas of major population density.

I suggest to the House that this debate is a shambles. All the reasons that can be given by the Government to retain the Port Pirie betting shops can be similarly used to support the establishment of betting shops in other country areas. I would even suggest that, if it was not for the activities of a crooked cop, S.P. betting would still be in existence in Whyalla today and, despite the activities of that crooked cop, I have my own suspicions about possible S.P. bookmaking still existing.

The member for Gilles said in his speech that about six or seven bookmakers are operating in Port Pirie, and that is so. I suggest that there are probably as many legal bookmakers operating in Whyalla. The only difference is that the Whyalla bookmakers—

Mr Slater: They've got to go to the course.

Mr MAX BROWN: That is so. As I said earlier, that situation makes crooks out of decent people. The fact remains that, if one bets on course, and there are many occasions when one can go on course in country areas, one can then legally bet with those bookmakers. There is no argument about that, at all, because the tax turnover is provided. Conversely, if there is a mid-week race meeting, and it is not a registered meeting, a bettor cannot legally bet with those bookmakers. What a farce that has developed into, to say the least.

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

Mr MAX BROWN: During the adjournment, many members said that they believed that I had completed my comments, but that is not correct. I have referred to past S.P. bookmaking operations in Whyalla, and how those operations were a way of life. I point out to the House, and particularly to the Minister, that one of the most colourful and the biggest holders of bets in this country, and at one time in this State, is a registered bookmaker who resides at Port Lincoln.

In the past it was a kind of joke that, if one wanted to obtain a bookmaker's licence, it should be an illegal one. I suggest to the Minister that one of the biggest bookmakers operating on course at present originally was an S.P. bookmaker in my own city. As I have said, this sort of operation, together with other illegal operations, was a way of life in my own city. However, if we had been afforded the opportunity of having a legal situation, particularly for bookmaking, similar to the system that has applied in Port Pirie over

the years, my life in Whyalla as a leader of the trade union movement might have been much easier.

I can vividly remember in the past that the trade union movement operated a fortnightly cabaret but it was illegal because at that time 6 o'clock closing was in operation. At one cabaret some outsiders created a disturbance. Quite rightly, we called the police, who stated, when they arrived, that we had done the right thing in approaching them. Unfortunately, while the police were solving the problem at the cabaret, some other idiot outside the cabaret let down their tyres. Subsequently, the Superintendent of Police at Whyalla—and I am not talking out of turn now, because I believe he is dead—called me up and told me that he wanted to see me and my officers, so we had to 'front' to see the Superintendent. He had a tape recorder running during our visit and, I remember his telling us the facts of life. He said that he knew such functions went on but, because of isolation and as the law was just so stupid in regard to this situation, the police tolerated the position. During the course of that interview, the Superintendent asked me specific questions.

He said, 'What do you think about this two-up game that's operating?' At the time, I was innocent of the situation but he said he was not. In fact, he amazed me, to be quite truthful, because he said at that time that he did not intend to close down that operation, as he believed that, by having it illegally but fairly operated, the police knew where everybody was and if they wanted certain people they knew were to come to get them.

That was the situation in the city of Whyalla, and I say that it was completely illegal. I do not believe for one moment that I would be honest if I said that that sort of situation did not exist. The point that I am making in all this fiasco—and that is what it is—is that on one side of the gulf we saw fit to make something legal, allowing people to operate quite legally and do so virtually with a halo around their head, whilst on the other side of the gulf, where similar circumstances prevailed, it was illegal to take part in such activities and there was certainly no halo around the heads of people in that area.

I believe that at some future time consideration ought to be given to broadening the present operation involving bookmaking, because to be realistic, if we are going to pass this Bill and aim at some consistency, allowing for the operations of betting shops at Port Pirie, all those reasons that can be advanced to substantiate this argument are certainly justified as far as the city of Whyalla is concerned, as well as other areas, I suspect.

I do not believe that the Minister out of the goodness of his heart, will suddenly say tonight, 'Yes, I am going to put an amendment in,' but I suggest to him that future consideration be given to extending this type of operation to major country areas.

Mr KENEALLY (Stuart): As the member in whose electorate all the betting shops at Port Pirie are situated, I have a great deal of pleasure in supporting the Bill. There is obviously some agreement between members of the Government and members of the Opposition that these premises at Port Pirie ought to continue, so I imagine that the progress of this measure through the House will be quick. As has been pointed out by previous speakers, the continuation of betting shops at Port Pirie certainly has the support of the community. I am repeating what has already been said when I say that the tradition of Port Pirie seems to incorporate the facility of being able to place a legal bet in licensed premises when a race meeting is in progress.

Many of the customers of Port Pirie licensed betting shops do not live in Port Pirie at all but come from many of the centres surrounding Port Pirie, including the town in which the member for Goyder previously lived and where the Chief Secretary lives (Kadina) and the city in which I live, that is, Port Augusta. There are people in all these areas who are regular customers of the betting shops in Port Pirie. It has also been said, and I repeat, that the illegal S.P. betting at Port Pirie (if it happens at all—and inevitably it does in most towns, anyway) occurs less than it does anywhere else.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Much less.

Mr KENEALLY: Much less, as the Minister says. The basic arguments for the retention of betting shops at Port Pirie have been eloquently put by two of my colleagues, the member for Gilles, to whom I pay great tribute for the measure we have before the House tonight, and the member for Whyalla. There is no doubt that once the Government amendments to the Racing Act had proceeded through this House during the last session that that was that end of the Port Pirie betting shops so far as this Parliament was concerned. It was only because of the actions of the member for Gilles (the shadow spokesman for recreation and sport), in visiting Port Pirie, meeting the licensed bookmakers, discussing their problems and looking at their premises that the Government was encouraged to take action. It is all very well for members opposite to laugh. I am not point scoring or cheer chasing here: I am stating a simple fact of life.

The member for Rocky River, as he then was (now Chief Secretary), moved an amendment in this House to ensure that betting shops at Port Pirie were able to continue. I supported that measure despite what I considered were some unfortunate aspects of the approaches made in relation to local members. That is past history and no longer relevant, so I do not want to bear on that. However, it is a fact of life that that amendment was moved and that the Government defeated it because it was an amendment to a Government Bill and the Government in South Australia was opposed (as was its spokesman, the Minister) to the continuation of betting shops at Port Pirie. Therefore, that amendment was not supported.

I think it is totally irrelevant for Government members to say that the amendment failed because the Opposition did not support it. It was a Government Bill introduced by the Minister and there happened to be an amendment moved to it. If the Government had supported the retention of betting shops at Port Pirie that amendment would have been supported and carried. The fact that that did not happen meant that no matter what the Opposition did there was no hope that the betting shops at Port Pirie could be retained.

Subsequently, the member for Gilles, who had some rather harsh statements to make in this House about betting shops in Port Pirie—legitimate criticisms based on his previous experience which was some years out of date, as he now acknowledges—went to Port Pirie as a result of receiving an invitation from local bookmakers to view the situation there. As a result of that visit, the member for Gilles gave a firm undertaking to the people of Port Pirie that he would introduce a private member's Bill to extend the life of betting premises at Port Pirie. That motion could have received the total support of Opposition members. It was then that the Government felt, 'We don't want to be at any sort of disadvantage at Port Pirie on this question, so we will establish a Ministerial committee to rush up to Port Pirie,' to do exactly what had already been done and to obtain information it already had access to. It then made a big press announcement and media statements that the Government was going to look at the possibility of supporting betting shops at Port Pirie.

At that time the Opposition did not wish to make any cheap political capital out of this matter because it supported what the Government had then decided to do some weeks

or months after the decision had been made by the Opposition. As I said a moment ago, there is no reason to try to score points or go cheer chasing on this matter because we are all at one. What has happened in the past is probably a fact of life in so far as politicians are concerned. The matter has been resolved, but I thought I ought to put the record straight.

Mr Rodda: Are you jumping—

Mr KENEALLY: The member for Victoria ought to be very kind to me; I have a tradition of being kind to him in this House. I thought we were friends and I would appreciate his letting me make my speech without those telling interjections that tend to put me off my train of thought.

The member for Gilles mentioned a critical factor in this whole discussion. Certainly the retention of betting shops at Port Pirie ought to be supported by everyone in this House. Also, the proprietors of those betting shops at Port Pirie ought to be encouraged in whatever appropriate form to improve the standard of those shops. Last week I inspected improvements carried out by one licensed bookmaker on his premises. They are quite substantial; he has spent a lot of money. The paint job is good; he now has carpet on the floor, etc. It was an expenditure that he could not be expected to provide when it seemed certain that the betting shops would be closed in 1983.

This Parliament has an amount of goodwill with the bookmakers at Port Pirie that ought to be taken advantage of so that the premises can be upgraded. One upgrading which the member for Gilles has promoted is the provision of adequate seating accommodation for some of the elderly patrons of the betting shops. I know that the bookmakers themselves will be very sympathetic to the Betting Control Board allowing them to do what they believe to be appropriate in providing facilities for their patrons. After this Bill's passage through the Parliament, I hope the Minister will quickly direct the Betting Control Board to require bookmakers at Port Pirie to provide more comfortable facilities for those who subscribe so richly to the livelihood of the bookmakers.

The member for Whyalla made a very telling speech. He has highlighted the anomaly of this legislation. I live at Port Augusta and have the same pressures placed on me as does my colleague living in Whyalla. The Minister said he was born at Port Pirie, so he should know what I am saying to be true. There is a great deal of parochialism and competition between the cities in the Iron Triangle. People in Port Augusta and Whyalla are known for their desire to place the odd bet or two with a bookmaker, either legally or illegally. The betting public at Port Augusta have never come to terms with the fact that licensed premises exist at Port Pirie. Yet, in Port Augusta, if one wants to place a bet other than at the T.A.B. (where many people seem not to want to place a bet), it can only be done illegally. Although it is an illegal activity, S.P. bookmaking at Port Augusta thrives.

I do not anticipate that that statement will suddenly result in the gaming squad arriving at Port Augusta, or Whyalla for that matter. I have never been able, as a non-punter, to come to terms with the fact that a licensed bookmaker, who is able to field at all country race meetings, is unable to take a bet in Port Augusta or Whyalla—where there are a number of licensed bookmakers—on a Saturday when the race meeting is elsewhere. It seems to be not a difficult proposition to extend the principle that we are now applying to Port Pirie to other centres where licensed bookmakers reside. If there are five or six licensed bookmakers at Whyalla, I see no reason why they are not able to take legal bets on the weekend or when there is a race meeting. The proper way to do that is to have a licensed betting shop.

I have never felt any desire to contribute to the well-being of bookmakers, although I have never felt any reason to oppose their legal existence. I think I said during a previous debate that some of my earliest memories are those of my father and mother, both of whom liked to put on their sixpence each way at the licensed betting premises at Quorn. I do not believe that those betting shops contributed in any way to the lowering of the social *mores* of the township of Quorn. It certainly did not; in fact, I believe that those premises provided a very good service to those people who liked to have a bet or two.

I agree with the member for Whyalla that there are anomalies here, but I point out to those who might have some doubts about supporting this measure, at the same time believing that if Port Pirie is to have licensed premises other centres should have them, that if we allow the licensed premises at Port Pirie to disappear we will never have an example that can be used to encourage the establishment of licensed betting premises elsewhere.

Further, I believe that the continuation of the betting premises at Port Pirie encompasses a social experiment that we ought to continue. Governments can then view this vexed question of T.A.B. and illegal betting. The licensed premises at Port Pirie can give an indication of how they work to those people who would prefer to place a legal bet or a T.A.B. bet as against an illegal bet. If the premises at Port Pirie are allowed to operate, they will continue to do that.

There are in South Australia a number of centres where one can place neither a legal bet at licensed premises such as those at Port Pirie nor a T.A.B. bet. The only way that people in a number of towns throughout South Australia can have a bet is to place an illegal bet, and thus in a sense become criminals. The member for Whyalla made a very strong and valid point.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: They can have a telephone account with the T.A.B.

Mr KENEALLY: The Minister believes, because he is middle class and because he has never experienced anything else but middle-class values, that all country residents have access to a telephone, to which they can rush and telephone someone at Port Pirie, for example. Not all people who live at country centres have rich friends; some of them are poor friends of the Party that I represent. They do not all have telephones, are not able to make trunk calls, and quite often back losers, which adds to the loss already incurred had they used the telephone. I am pointing out that there are in South Australia a number of law-abiding citizens who like to have a bet, but who, because of what we think and our narrow attitudes towards gambling, are forced to become criminals, and I do not think that that is good enough.

I support this measure not only because of the traditional rights of the citizens of Port Pirie but also because the measure is just and because I have no objection to there being licensed premises at Port Pirie, or anywhere else. As I pointed out during the casino debate, I do not intend to move amendments that would allow for licensed premises elsewhere, but, if a member was to move amendments accordingly, I would certainly encourage my Party to support them.

I support the Bill, and I hope that the House gives it prompt passage and that within a few days the citizens, and particularly the bookmakers, of Port Pirie can spend their well-earned cash on improving their premises and providing a better service to all those who take advantage of those facilities.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): Briefly, I want to express my opposition to this Bill. This matter was raised in this Chamber in the not too far distant past and was soundly defeated.

In many ways, I guess that I do not really have an axe to grind in respect of the pros and cons of the betting shops at Port Pirie. However, I find myself in a dilemma, as many of my constituents have approached me wanting to know why they cannot have access to betting shops as the residents of Port Pirie have. This would be the philosophy that I would adopt on this occasion: if it is permissible for one section of the community to have betting shops, why should not other sections of the community be given like treatment?

As was stated in the Minister's second reading explanation, in logical terms the betting shops should have been outlawed or not been permitted to continue after 1948, when there was an inquiry and when a five-year phase-out period was granted, in effect, to discontinue the betting shops by 1983. This was reinforced in a Bill that was before Parliament last year, and the matter now comes up again. My attitude has been consistent all along—that what applies for one section of the State should also apply to other sections. To that degree, I must oppose this Bill.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): I wish to speak only briefly, having changed my opinion on this matter since the provision was originally inserted in the legislation.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: That just shows the flexibility of some of us: we are not hidebound by constraints as are members opposite. We on this side can exercise a conscience and can reach a conclusion based on the facts and the weight of the argument. I have done that, and one of the issues that was uppermost in my mind in considering this matter in recent times was the quite excellent report that the shadow Minister of Recreation and Sport brought back from his personal visit to the fair city of Port Pirie. His arguments were so persuasive that I was swayed to support this measure.

I have also had the opportunity of listening very carefully to the arguments that the member for Whyalla advanced earlier today in relation to this matter. I must say that there was an irresistible weight of logic in the arguments that he put forward, and I would be interested to hear the Minister's reply to those arguments. It seems to me that inevitably when this legislation is passed (as we all know it will be) there will be demands from other country towns and cities for the establishment of betting shops. I would have to consider the matter very carefully before I would be prepared to support any further extension of betting shops. The effect of the Bill is to grant licences in perpetuity or at least until death do depart the holders of the licences.

Mr Keneally interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes, but I understand that they cannot be transferred: they must be reissued. That would leave it to the Betting Control Board to examine the matter and determine in the circumstances and in the light of Government policies whether or not these licences should be reissued. An issue which has been brought to my attention, which I do not believe has been canvassed yet but which is of some importance in this matter is that, once these licences are permanent, there will be potential for bookmakers or licensees to expand their operations greatly, because, from my understanding of the situation, except possibly for some betting shops in the Northern Territory, the betting shops at Port Pirie will be the only ones in Australia—

Mr Max Brown: Outside Darwin.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: outside Darwin (as the member for Whyalla says) which are licensed to undertake telephone betting by the Telecom system from anywhere in Australia. I think there is considerable potential, and it has been put to me by a bookmaker that this potential is likely to be realised, for these betting shops to become the lay-off bookmakers for Australia. Apparently, that is a real possibility. If that happened it would mean that Port Pirie would become the betting capital of this nation in relation to bookmakers. Undoubtedly, that would lead to the development of a considerable industry in Port Pirie, an industry which would provide a large increase in employment and which would become very important to the economy of that city. In the future, it could become the Reno of the North.

From the report prepared by the member for Gilles, the views of the people of Port Pirie, and their support for this measure, I have no doubt that any expansion in the betting activities of the betting shops would be greatly welcomed in Port Pirie and would be seen as a positive development in that city. Aside from that, any lay-off betting undertaken by bookmakers in Port Pirie would have an important spin-off for South Australia. The Government of the day will earn revenue as a result of that.

If large lay-off and telephone bookmaking became an important part of the activity, we could expect quite a fillip to the taxation of the State. I think that would be very worth while and useful. This Bill has my support. I hope that bookmaking in Port Pirie develops along the lines that I have been suggesting and I see no reason why it will not. Undoubtedly, if that does occur in the future, as I have said, we could see Port Pirie as the betting capital of Australia.

I do not wish to delay the House for very long. I merely comment that it is indeed a matter of some irony that, in the same month that this House demolished the proposal for a casino, we should be almost unanimously putting aside all of those moralistic arguments that we heard last week and indeed indulging in an extension of the wicked practice of bookmaking and betting in this State. It seems somewhat ironical that we should be passing this Bill almost unanimously. If my guesstimate of the numbers is correct I understand that only the member for Flinders is opposed to it.

Mr Slater: The Minister of Tourism is not here.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: That is a matter of some irony. As my friend points out, perhaps part of that arrangement is the absence of the Minister of Tourism. Possibly she could not bring herself to vote for the Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will speak to the clauses.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes, Mr Speaker, I will not proceed on the question of the absence of the Minister of Tourism. I simply conclude by saying that I hope the Bill has an early and safe passage.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: If not speedy.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: If not speedy. I certainly hope that it leads to a revitalisation of betting shops and businesses in Port Pirie and an expanded employment base for Port Pirie.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Recreation and Sport): It seems that any measure that I bring before this House draws a lot of interest from members, and let me assure the member for Elizabeth that the irony to which he referred towards the end of his remarks had not escaped me. Indeed, I tend to feel that my Parliamentary career will be remembered for my involvement in such matters as this, not to mention prostitution, casinos, betting shops, and gambling generally. I believe that I control about 70 per cent of the State's gambling.

Mr Rodda interjecting:

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Indeed. That is not really the way I would like to be remembered but nevertheless we do what we can.

Mr Slater: What about the O'Bahn bus?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: There is no truth in the rumour that there will be any gambling, nor is the O'Bahn bus a gamble. I will answer some questions that have been

raised by members and doubtless we can deal with more in Committee if members wish. First, on the question of consistency, to which the member for Whyalla and, in particular, the member for Stuart have referred, let us be quite frank. This measure is about an anomaly. The betting shops at Port Pirie are an anomaly and something must be done about them. Either they have to be closed or they have to be enshrined as we are proposing to do here.

That does not mean that the Government approves of the extension of betting shops throughout the community or that the Government approves of betting shops *per se,* but the situation in Port Pirie is unique and, as is stated in the second reading explanation, the fact that they were allowed to continue many years ago was an anomaly, when they were closed in other areas. I think the member for Gilles has referred to the other areas in which they were located. For that reason, a decision has to be made about whether to allow them to continue or to close them. The Government has decided that they are to remain.

That takes me to the next point, namely, that, the Government having taken that decision, the Betting Control Board will now see that those premises are upgraded. The member for Gilles has asked about that matter and I give him an assurance on it. I cannot say whether that will cover the question of seating in the premises but the speeches made by the member will be referred to the board. I have discussed the matter, obviously, and the Cabinet subcommittee that dealt with this problem interviewed the board, when this type of thing was discussed.

Members ought to realise that this does not mean that there is a blanket approval of betting shops. It is being done to correct an anomaly. If the argument that has been put by the member for Whyalla is to be taken and extended, there may possibly be a case for betting shops in country towns where there is no T.A.B. However, I remain to be convinced, and that will obviously be a matter for some time in the future. I do not agree with the member for Whyalla that there should be betting shops in cities such as Whyalla where the T.A.B. provides a service, however inconsistent that may appear to be with the situation at Port Pirie.

I guess that that does not convince the member for Whyalla. He holds his views very strongly, as do other members opposite, but that is where the matter rests at this stage. The most important aspect of the debate tonight has been the extraordinary performance by members opposite in trying to claim credit for this measure.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I understand that an honourable member in another place tried to claim credit for this measure. I am not 100 per cent sure, but I was told that one of those honourable gentlemen upstairs has claimed credit for this legislation, and I find that quite incredible. It has been a real circus tonight to see members opposite, in desperation, trying to claim credit for this Government's introducing this measure. I refer to the situation in which the member for Gilles found himself after the last debate. It has been stated by the member for Gilles, and particularly by the member for Stuart, that the member for Gilles made some unfortunate remarks in this place.

Mr Slater: They were not unfortunate—they were true!

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Perhaps unfortunate for the member for Stuart, then, about the betting shops in Port Pirie. The House was told that the member for Gilles went on a fact-finding mission to Port Pirie and brought back a report.

Mr Hemmings: A great report.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: A great report.

Mr Rodda: The Gilles report!

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Yes, the Gilles report. What happened was that the member for Gilles was dragged to Port Pirie, screaming, by the member for Stuart in order to apologise to his constituents. There is no doubt that that is what happened.

However, this Bill has been introduced because this Government, on the representations of the member for Rocky River, decided to investigate the matter. It appointed a Cabinet subcommittee, which went to Port Pirie to investigate the situation. That Cabinet subcommittee reported to Cabinet, which agreed that the legislation should be drafted, and the Bill is now before the House. Certainly, I am pleased to see the whole-hearted support that the Government has received for the introduction of this measure, and I am pleased to have been able to introduce a Bill that will help my old home town. Finally, let there be no doubt that this measure has been introduced by the Liberal Government on behalf of the people of Port Pirie.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Registration of betting premises at Port Pirie.'

Mr SLATER: Although I do not have the figures for last year, I do have the figures for the previous years, and I refer to the revenue obtained from the Port Pirie betting shops. I understand that all the tax collected is paid to the Government and that none of the funds collected support the racing clubs. I understand that this applies under section 98 of the Racing Act, under which moneys are received by the board under the Act, and shall be paid to the Treasurer for payment into the general revenue of this State. If that situation applies at present, what consideration might been given to amending the Act so that portion of the revenue collected from this source can be used to assist racing clubs?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The honourable member is right, as he knows, in saying that all revenue raised as betting tax from Port Pirie bookmakers goes to the Government. With the on-course bookmakers, half the revenue approximately goes to the Government and half goes to the racing club on which the bookmakers are fielding. The Cabinet subcommittee considered whether some form of sharing should be considered by the Government in connection with the premises of bookmakers at Port Pirie. I understand that the revenue is of the order of $120 000. It was considered in the light of whether, if the revenue was shared with the Government (and it is really a small amount in the overall scheme of things), the revenue should go to the racing track at Port Pirie or whether it should go into the general pool for distribution. It was a difficult matter, but in the end the Government decided that it would not and that the present position would remain.

I do not know whether there will have to be further amendments to the Racing Act in future, given the financial position that the codes find themselves in. I am not saying that there will be, but there could well be in the future; perhaps in a year or two there may be a necessity to look at the revenue going to the codes. The member for Gilles is well aware of the situation of the South Australian Jockey Club, not to mention the trotting industry generally. That would be the time to consider the honourable member's suggestion.

Mr SLATER: I accept that explanation. Can the Minister give me any information about the comparative takings of the T.A.B. at Port Pirie? If it is not available at this time I would appreciate receiving later the figures relating to the different types of betting, that is, the multiple betting factor as compared to the win and place situation. I know that those figures may not be available now, but it would be interesting to know exactly how much is held by the T.A.B.,

in comparison with bookmakers, and what form of betting it is.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I can help the honourable member in some respects. The Cabinet subcommittee did a thorough job in investigating the situation, and we obtained those figures. The turnover for the T.A.B. for the year 1980-81 (which at that stage was the last figure we had) was $750 000, of which $27 500 went to the codes and $27 500 to the Government. So, approximately $54 000 was the surplus that was distributed from the T.A.B.

The honourable member will be interested to know that the $750 000 represented 13.5 per cent of the total amount of money that was bet in Port Pirie at that stage. However thorough the subcommittee was, it did not get the figures for multiple betting. I will try to obtain those figures for the honourable member.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 12 August. Page 461.)

Mr KENEALLY (Stuart): I think members of this Chamber would forgive me if I said there was a certain feeling of *deja vu* created by this measure. I thought that the Parliament would be free of legislation being introduced, reintroduced and reintroduced again when the member for Victoria was no longer a Minister, because one can recall the situation that applied with regard to the Prisons Act.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hope that the honourable member will relate his comments to the Bill before the House.

Mr KENEALLY: Absolutely, Sir. That matter kept appearing before this Parliament for our consideration. The Minister of Fisheries is doing his best to outdo his illustrious colleague because a measure similar to the one we are now debating was first introduced into this Parliament on 4 March 1982 (Bill No. 134). We dealt with clause 6 and clauses thereafter which dealt with Commonwealth-State arrangements and joint authorities that related to the fishing industry in South Australia. The Opposition was in support of that.

The Government, being very suspicious of Opposition intentions, then felt compelled to introduce amendments to the Fisheries Act dated 1 April 1982 (Bill No. 159) which asked us to debate the same amendments to the Fisheries Act again—clauses dealing with Commonwealth-State arrangements and joint authorities. They were passed by the Parliament, but obviously the Government, because it had the wholehearted support of the Opposition, was a bit insecure and now, on 12 August 1982, we have the selfsame measures once again introduced to this Parliament seeking the support of the House of Assembly. I do not know how many times the Opposition needs to tell the Government that it supports this measure. However, it has done so at least twice before and is quite happy to give the Government its assurance that, once again, it will be supporting the measure.

There seems to be some technical reason why the Government has felt compelled to almost waste the time of this Parliament by reintroducing the same legislation. If that had been done correctly in the first instance we would not be here in late August 1982 still debating a measure which was first introduced in March 1982 and subsequently reintroduced twice. Those points may have been made in a somewhat jocular manner, but they are valid. This Parliament ought to be able to be sure that, when legislation is brought before it, it is operable legislation.

It is obviously embarrassing to the Minister, and frustrating for the Parliament, for it to be continually requested to debate the same matter time and time again. I have no intention of referring to the substantive matter in this Bill. It has already received the support of both Houses of this Parliament and I merely make the point that, if there is something different about this measure, the Minister of Fisheries ought to tell us what it is.

The Minister of Fisheries is obviously a capable chap. He may be able to tell us why we are, in late August, still debating a measure which we were assured in March was presented to Parliament in the appropriate form. The Opposition supports the measure, and there will be no attempt in Committee to forestall the passing of any of the clauses.

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN (Minister of Fisheries): There are none so blind as those who do not want to see. The member for Stuart does himself a great injustice by making the comments he has just made in this House. He had only to take a little recognition of the second reading speech to be fully conversant with the reason why this measure has been reintroduced to the Parliament at this time. The matter is out of the control of the State Government: it is complementary legislation, involving a responsibility with Governments in other States of the Commonwealth, as well as the Commonwealth Government, to have this legislation passed so that it may be enacted by 1 September or 1 October, by whichever date other State Parliaments can process the measure.

The provisions of the Bill are incorporated in the new Fisheries Act. Even one with the slight amount of knowledge that the member for Stuart has would understand that in preparing regulations for the new Act and, as is this Government's wont, in negotiating and discussing the provisions of the legislation with industry, it cannot be done in a matter of weeks or months. As a result of those negotiations, the regulations are not prepared at this stage. Therefore, the new Act containing these provisions is not on the Statute.

To comply with this complementary legislation throughout Australia, it has been necessary to tie in with the programme of other Parliaments in the Commonwealth to have the legislation reintroduced and processed so that the Commonwealth-State arrangements that are part of this legislation may be enacted. The member for Stuart does himself little credit in making inane comments merely for the sake of taking up time and speaking in a debate of this nature.

However, I thank the Opposition for its support. Indeed, it would have been very difficult for it not to have supported the Bill, because the provisions of this measure have, on a previous occasion, been supported by the Opposition. I commend the measure to the House.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN (Chief Secretary): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr SLATER (Gilles): Last Saturday evening, in company with my colleague the member for Albert Park and our respective wives, I attended a function at the Kaiser-Stuhl winery at Nuriootpa following an invitation from the proprietor of an organisation called Train Tour Promotions. I want to compliment the proprietor, Mr John McAvaney, for his ability and entrepreneurial expertise in promoting

what I believe to be a very unique aspect of entertainment and tourist promotion. I understand that Train Tour Promotions has been operating for about 2½ years. During that time it has proved to be very successful and popular and, indeed, I understand that the proposed tours for the rest of this year are already booked out, which speaks for itself in regard to the popularity of the venture.

The evening to which I refer consisted of a train journey departing from Adelaide at about 6 p.m. and arriving at the Kaiser-Stuhl winery at 7.45 p.m. During the train journey patrons were provided with drinks and savouries, and on arrival guests were seated in a very pleasant and convivial atmosphere at the winery. The food and service were excellent and discotheque music added to the evening's entertainment. The train departed on the return journey to Adelaide at about 11.30 p.m. This was an excellent promotion, indicating what can be achieved with the right entrepreneurial spirit and presenting a unique opportunity for Adelaide people and visitors to South Australia to enjoy the facilities that are available in this State. It is an entertainment and tourist venture worthy of merit. I compliment Mr McAvaney on his contribution in this area. There is no doubt that South Australia is in need of tourist promotion, especially in those areas of interest which have a degree of uniqueness and are not available in other States and which would be of particular interest to visitors to South Australia.

Last Sunday the Premier launched the South Australian Tourist Development Plan. This plan was the result of considerations of a task force comprising some 23 people. It was set up to put forward recommendations for the coordinated growth of tourism during the next five years. I have no doubt that members of the task force considered the question of tourist development and tourist growth. I have not as yet been favoured with the opportunity to peruse the plan in detail, so I must rely on the press statements concerning the plan. I trust that members of the House will be given the opportunity to obtain a copy of the tourist development plan that was launched last Sunday afternoon.

Members of the Government, particularly the Minister of Tourism and the Premier, have often told us that tourism is the third largest industry in South Australia, and they have said how it is labour intensive, and so on. Also, from time to time the member for Brighton tells us about similar aspects of the tourist industry. As I stated in this House last week, when I gave comparative figures in regard to the allocation in South Australia, the Government's Budget allocation for tourism in comparison with that in other States in real money terms does not really measure up.

Mr Glazbrook: It's still better than what was done earlier.

Mr SLATER: One must make a comparison with what has happened over a period in other States. Some of the smaller States make a more significant allocation in their Budget, and Tasmania is one example. Tasmania allocated $7 800 000 to tourism last year, and South Australia's allocation was $3 900 000. I hope that the Government will put its money where its mouth is. We will know tomorrow when the Budget is presented whether the Government will provide additional funds for the promotion, marketing and development of tourism in this State.

I have not had an opportunity to see the plan in detail, so I must rely entirely on the press statement that was made the following day in regard to the major strategies recommended in the plan. Some of the initiatives appear to be worth while, although many of them seem to be reruns of what we have heard over a number of years. The press statement reads:

Major strategies recommended by the plan include:

- Establishing representation in Western Australia, Queensland and New Zealand by the South Australian Department of Tourism as 'first priorities'.

I do not disagree with that. I have never indicated to the House or publicly that we should establish a representative in Queensland, but I certainly would not object to it. On previous occasions, I have advocated that we establish representation in Western Australia. If I recall correctly, one of the first questions I asked the Minister some two or three years ago was in regard to South Australia's having representation in Western Australia. It was further stated:

- An increase by the State Government in resources for the development and interpretation of the State's national parks and heritage.
- An approach to the Minister of Education with a proposal for creation of four-term school holidays not aligned with other States to minimise cyclical demand for tourist facilities.

I have some reservations about that strategy, and I ask the Minister whether it is proposed to offset some of the off-peak seasons or down-turns that occur in the middle of the year.

Mr Glazbrook: You've got to remember the strategy was worked out by outside people.

Mr SLATER: Yes, I understand that, but I would like to look at the plan. Other comments may have been made that will indicate exactly what this proposal means. I am working from the press statement, which gives limited information. It was further stated:

The plan aims to:

- Assist communication, co-operation and co-ordination between the Government and the industry, and raise issues of concern to tourism development.

I could not agree more. One of the problems in the past, and to some degree in the future, is that there has been a lack of co-ordination and co-operation between Government instrumentalities and industry in regard to tourism. Several other matters are mentioned in this report to which I do not have time to refer now, but I stress that we certainly need incentives to form a catalyst in South Australia in regard to tourism. It is disappointing that this House had an opportunity to promote one aspect last week but passed it up. We should not rely on the same old initiatives that have been talked about in the past. We do not need more consultative committees, boards, and so on: what we need is a sound, sensible, rational policy.

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

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I appreciate this opportunity to raise one or two matters of concern to me and my constituents. First, I refer to a matter I raised today during Question Time about the Marree swimming pool. I think the whole House would agree that, if there is one area of the State where the people are entitled to some assistance in relation to a swimming pool, it is Marree. If it is good enough to build swimming pools in the Riverland it is, to say the least, an absolute necessity to build one at Marree. My constituents have been most patient and, as the local member, I have been most patient, but my patience has now run out.

I put it to the House and to the Minister that the local community is prepared to provide $4 000. Its finances have been stretched, as it is already committed to providing funds for the upgrading of the airport, which will cost about $100 000. It is only a small community. I understand that the Outback Areas Trust will provide $12 000, but there will be a considerable shortfall. The community requests the Education Department to provide the remaining funds. I realise that funds are tight. However, I call on the Minister and the Government to favourably consider this matter as a matter of urgency.

The current situation is that the pupils and the community must swim in a dam. It has been brought to my attention that that is not the most satisfactory arrangement. Further, if they wish to use the facilities of a swimming pool, they must travel by bus over a very rough road to Leigh Creek, where there are excellent facilities. Therefore, I suggest that, if extra funds cannot be provided, the priorities in the northern region should be so altered to upgrade this project to top priority. I have discussed this matter with departmental officers for a considerable time and I know they are doing their best. I know that the Minister is sympathetic, and I believe it is time that action was taken to deal with this matter immediately.

I believe that positive action should be taken within the next few weeks so that work can soon commence on the swimming pool. I understand that there is sufficient room on the schoolgrounds to construct a pool, and the change-rooms, showers, ablution block and toilets at the school can be used. Of course, wherever possible it is preferable to use existing facilities if they can be provided. Having discussed this matter with departmental officers, I am aware that the Education Department, if it is involved, must ensure that the swimming pool is built to the highest standards possible. In no way can it be involved with a pool that leaves anything to doubt.

We all know that problems can occur if the correct procedures and the correct treatment in relation to a pool are not carried out. Therefore, I have no criticism of the standards laid down by the Education Department officers. In fact, I entirely support them, as I believe my constituents do. My constituents desire action to be taken to get this project off the ground as soon as possible. Although I do not know whether it is possible for the Outback Areas Trust to provide any more money, I sincerely hope it is.

The other matter to which I refer relates to a matter which has attracted some considerable media coverage over the past few days—the concerns that have been expressed about the Koonibba school. It was following one of my regular visits to the area that I took up this matter with the Minister and advised him that it was my view that the existing building not only left a lot to be desired but was totally unacceptable. On receipt of my letter, which was couched in fairly strong terms—I am not noted for writing lengthy letters, but I normally get straight to the point—I understand that action was taken by the Public Buildings Department and the appropriate engineers inspected the school and had a similar view to mine.

The community has expressed concern that the existing building be maintained, because a great deal of the history of that area is linked with that old building. I understand that the building was erected by the Lutheran Church and that it has been used as a school for a long time but, unfortunately, it has got into a poor state of repair. I hope that action will be taken soon, first, to provide alternative accommodation of a reasonable standard, to say the least, and, secondly, that action will be taken, if possible, to repair the building so that it can be returned to its original use, namely, as classrooms.

I have discussed the matter with my constituents there. They have expressed their concern to me in clear terms, and I agree with that concern. I believe that the Minister and his officers are now taking appropriate action, and I sincerely hope that this problem can be solved very soon because, it is important that these situations do not get out of hand. It is important that people, wherever they live in the State, have access to reasonable education facilities. I am only asking for reasonable facilities. One of the great problems that people in an electorate such as mine have is that, in isolated communities, the standard of education that can be provided in some of these communities is not as high as that which people in larger country towns or in the metropolitan area enjoy, so I am asking that action be taken to put the matter right as soon as possible.

The other matter that I wish to raise is the water problem facing my constituents at Andamooka. The Minister of Water Resources has been involved in discussions with the Andamooka Progress Association to have a new dam constructed. Members may not be aware that some time ago a new dam was built at Andamooka and considerable money was spent on it. Unfortunately, it was not a success. Because of a number of circumstances, it would not hold water. After considerable investigation, it was found that it could not be repaired and, therefore, it is necessary to construct a new dam.

The town is watered by some small soakages in the creek but during extremely dry periods, such as we are experiencing at present, water has to be carted from Woomera, a considerable distance away, at considerable expense. I believe that the time has arrived when funds should be provided to have a dam of suitable size constructed on a site that the committee and officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department consider to be the best in the area. The existing arrangement is not satisfactory. I hope that, when the Roxby Downs project gets off the ground, it may be possible to give the people a far more reliable and efficient water supply, but that is some time in the future.

I could give the House a long list of areas in my electorate that have difficulty in obtaining a reliable source of water. The people in some areas that have a reliable source have to pay a great deal for it. I mention Coober Pedy, where I understand my constituents are paying in excess of $45 per 1 000 gallons to have desalinated water delivered.

Mr Slater: We are just about paying that in Adelaide in water rates.

Mr GUNN: I do not think the member has done his calculations correctly. I do not think his constituents are paying $45 for 1 000 gallons of water. Then, in Coober Pedy the water has to be trucked to the premises by a contractor. That is not a satisfactory situation. I recognise the problems involved, because at this stage it has not been possible to find reliable sources of good quality water. However, I hope that in the near future that problem can be solved. I hope, too, that the Minister and his department will be able to take action to rectify the problem at Andamooka, as my constituents are looking forward to seeing this project put into effect as soon as possible. There has been considerable discussion, but so far there has not been much action. Therefore, I would appreciate it if the Minister and his officers can take the necessary action to get this proposal effected during the coming financial year.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): I want to take this opportunity to refer again to the over-reaction of the Chief Secretary in relation to the escape of the convicted murderer, Smith.

Mr Gunn: But you're contradicting your Leader.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: There is no contradiction about it and, if the honourable member listens until I have concluded my comments, he will understand the quite serious point that I am making. It is no good for the Chief Secretary to make comments like those he made, as reported in this morning's *Advertiser*, as follows:

> I am not pleased that under the existing system a person who is a convicted murderer is allowed into the community after only four years. I would like to see prisoners serving sentences for serious crimes not to be given minimum security status for at least 10 years.

Those statements indicate that the Minister has a complete lack of understanding of the security system that exists and a complete misunderstanding about the nature of the prison

system in South Australia, and its aims and objectives. Clearly, it is insufficient for the Minister simply to refer to convicted murderers as though they were one group or class of persons.

There is no doubt that anyone with a real knowledge of the prison system and penology will understand only too well that some murders are committed in moments of passion, involving motive circumstances, whereas others are purely cold-blooded murders by dangerous sorts of individuals.

Mr Slater: Psychopaths.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes, psychopaths and that type of person. Clearly, that sort of person should be locked up for a long time until the system is clear and certain that they are safe to allow back into the community. However, that does not involve the same circumstance as a person who is committed to prison for committing a murder that is basically a crime of passion.

It is ridiculous for the Chief Secretary to say that he would like to see prisoners serving sentences for serious crimes not to be given minimum security status for at least 10 years. The Minister has a review under way at the moment, and it will be most interesting to see whether it comes out with a recommendation which provides that prisoners serving sentences for serious crimes should not be given minimum security status for 10 years.

I would be willing to wager that we will not see such a recommendation coming from any review committee; nor will the Chief Secretary enforce one. The statement was made off the cuff, on the spur of the moment. It was a ridiculous statement which simply indicates the Chief Secretary's inexperience in this portfolio. He would have been far better advised, rather than running into a press conference to shoot off his mouth, to take counsel from his department and issue a much more cautious statement involving this matter.

There is no doubt that in the case of former prisoner Smith there may well have been some argument about whether or not he should have had minimum security rating. Certainly, there is an argument about that but, for the Chief Secretary in the circumstances to blanket all people in the prison system who have been sentenced for serious crimes to be classified as dangerous prisoners for a period of 10 years, is patently ridiculous.

This can be seen only as an over-reaction by this naive and inexperienced new Chief Secretary. It is a tragedy that, before he ran into print, the Minister did not take the opportunity of consulting with the officers of his department and possibly the Attorney-General so that he could have obtained advice from more experienced officers who would have been able to advise him of the facts and reality of the situation.

Apart from that, the Minister also overreacted, as I mentioned earlier today, in putting a blanket ban on any prisoners going outside the prison precincts until this review has been completed. That, as he admitted in the press this morning, has left not only the Cadell Training Centre itself but also the surrounding area without a C.F.S. service. That is a very serious step for the Minister to have taken. It is one thing for him to say that he is protecting the community by refusing to allow any further people out on C.F.S. activities; it is quite another thing for him to deny the community in that area the protection of a C.F.S. service. As the Minister said, it is 25 years since a member of a C.F.S. team absconded. I think one year in 25 years is not a bad record, and the Minister certainly did not need to overreact to this to the extent that he has done.

If there was any other mistake in the way that the Minister has carried on, it has been the ridiculous way that he has, in effect, denied the Westminster tradition and simply said that he is washing his hands of the matter; it has nothing to do with him; it was not his fault; and he has no responsibility for what has happened. The Minister has simply sought to blame the officers of his department, and I do not think that he can get away with that. Indeed, I do not think that he should be allowed to get away with it. Whether this is a serious enough matter for the Minister to be dismissed from office is a question that should properly have been debated in this House this afternoon. But, in defence of his Minister, the Premier refused to allow that to happen, and that is a rather shabby chapter in the history of this House.

As to the Chief Secretary's statement that he would like to see prisoners serving sentences for serious crimes not to be given minimum security status for at least 10 years, I would like to know what he has to say about the fact that some prisoners who have been incarcerated for life for murder have been let out of gaol in much less a period. In some cases, in my view, this has happened correctly; in others, that is not so. However, the Minister's own Government only last year allowed out on bail a convicted murderer, who had been convicted of killing 10 persons and who had been in prison, I understand, for less than 10 years.

So, the Chief Secretary is either completely denying and rejecting the policy of his predecessors and that which has been pursued by the department for many years in pursuit of the aim of reforming convicted persons or, alternatively, he has made an incredible blunder with this statement that he will have to retract in the future. I suspect that it is the latter. I think that we are going to see the Chief Secretary in a lot of hot water over the stupid statement that he has made, because undoubtedly when this review becomes public (and the Minister has said that it should be a public report), I have no doubt that it will not include a blanket provision which says that prisoners serving sentences for serious crimes will not be given minimum security status for at least 10 years. Nothing could be more absurd in terms of modern penology, and I have no doubt that this Minister will not introduce such a rule for the review committee.

I believe that the Minister has made a series of blunders and mistakes and ought to be called to account properly for those mistakes. Admittedly, he is a new Minister but, new or otherwise, the Minister must undertake the responsibility for operating his portfolio properly and effectively. He has not carried out that onerous responsibility in the current circumstances in the way in which he has operated and acted, and in those circumstances his position ought to be reviewed by the Premier.

Motion carried.

At 9 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 25 August at 2 p.m.