

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 23 August 1984

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. T.M. McRae) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: VOLUNTARY SERVICE AGENCIES

A petition signed by 18 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to subsidise charges to voluntary service agencies and to keep any price increases within the parameters of wage indexation was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

PETITION: KINDERGARTEN UNION

A petition signed by 18 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to reconsider its intentions to disestablish the Kindergarten Union and to allow it to remain under the care and control of the Minister of Education was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

PETITION: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

A petition signed by 13 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ensure that the course in early childhood education at the Magill campus of the South Australian College of Advanced Education be retained in its present form was presented by the Hon. Jennifer Adamson.

Petition received.

QUESTION

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

FORENSIC SCIENCE CENTRE

In reply to the Hon. D.C. WOTTON (2 August).

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Dr W.J. Tilstone took up his appointment as Director, Forensic Science Division, on 30 April 1984. Upon his appointment he was fully briefed by representatives of the Cramond Committee on the progress of its deliberations and the potential for the Splatt Royal Commission to have some impact on the findings of the committee. Since that time, Dr Tilstone has been heavily involved in discussing the deliberations of the committee with the senior managers of the Forensic Science Division and with the relevant managers in the Police Department.

He has met on at least three occasions with members who have been drafting the report of the committee and has attended meetings with the full Cramond Committee. Dr Tilstone's contributions to the Cramond Committee have been comprehensive, covering all aspects of its terms of reference. He has played a leading role since his appointment in the drafting of its report, and he is leading an assessment of the implications of the Splatt Royal Commission Report for forensic science.

GRAND JUNCTION INDUSTRIAL ESTATE

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

Grand Junction Industrial Estate, Wingfield.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

CAR REPAIRS

Mr **OLSEN**: Can the Premier say for how long the Thebarton workshop of the Department of Mines and Energy has been servicing the private motor vehicles of departmental officers, and will he investigate whether any other departments are indulging in similar rackets involving the improper use of Government facilities? A circular dated 8 August signed by the Principal Engineer in the Drilling and Engineering Services Division of the Department of Mines and Energy invites all departmental officers to have their private cars serviced and repaired at the Thebarton workshop. I understand that this facility has been available for some months to some departmental employees, and that this circular was written to extend the invitation to all officers of the department, that is, the whole department.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Four hundred.

Mr **OLSEN**: Some 400 of them. The circular states that the labour charge is \$18 an hour, which is \$7 an hour below the average price charged by metropolitan service stations in Adelaide. This work was to be done in Government paid time by Government employees using facilities funded by taxpayers, to give public servants the privilege of a cut price car service not available to taxpayers. It is important that the Premier indicate for how long this racket has been occurring, whether it is available to other Government departments in this State, and what action he, as Premier, intends to take to ensure that no other Government departments are offering the same service to public servants.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I suppose that question contained a considerable amount of innuendo and misuse of words. To take an example, the word 'racket' might well be the Leader's view of what he thinks he is asking about, but it is not my view.

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Let me deal with the questions that have been asked, and I must refute the kind of words that have been used to describe the activity. The first question concerned how long this had been happening. A few months ago it was put to me by the Department's Drilling and Services Division at Thebarton that there had been a downturn in the work load in that area owing to a phenomenon common throughout Australia, a down-turn in mineral exploration generally.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: If the member for Todd listens without interjecting he may hear something that will benefit him. The situation that I have described is not new in this section. Indeed, the former Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy) would have known at the time his Government was summarily kicked out of office that that situation was developing at Thebarton. I see that he does not disagree with that statement, as he usually disagrees with statements that I make. In fact, there were people who were likely to be under-employed whilst being, as the Leader of the Opposition has already said, on the Government payroll. However, let me come back to the question concerning when this operation began.

I think that it was in April that it was put to me that insufficient work was available on a temporary basis in this section of the Department. It was also put to me that some work could be usefully done in the workshop if the employees working there could have their vehicles repaired. In response, I said that I understood the position; that, if such a thing were done on a strictly commercial basis as a limited operation for fill-in work, I would approve of it; and that, in order to ensure that it was done on a strictly commercial basis, it should be done through the social club at the depot concerned, so that there could be no possibility of malpractice occurring.

Mr Ashenden: How much an hour was to be charged?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The amount to be charged was to be that which was charged by that section in all of its operations. Members would do well to consider that the operation at Thebarton is a recharge operation: that is, the section depends for its operations on earning capacity in relation to work done for other Government departments and for the private sector. Until a few years ago it was not possible, for example, to get drilling done in South Australia except by the Government drilling operation. However, that situation has now changed to a degree. The Government has always been out in the market-place acting commercially and providing services.

Mr Oswald: Who takes the liability for poor workmanship?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The liability is obviously covered by my instruction that the work should be done on a strictly commercial basis. What is more, that has happened—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The money involved has been paid to the Department in the normal way, the same as in respect of other operations carried out in that area. I have already told the House that I insisted that it be on a strictly normal commercial basis, just as are the section's other operations. What subsequently happened is something about which I share the same concerns, to a degree, as the Leader of the Opposition, because an officer at that depot, without reference to his superiors or to me—

Mr Oswald: Are you going to stop it?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: If the honourable member will be patient he will hear the answer. An officer ought to extend the service by sending out a circular to all members of the Department. The date of the circular was that given by the Leader, namely, 8 August. What then happened ought to be noted by the Leader. He made no comment on it. Attached to the circular was another piece of paper setting out the conditions under which the service would be available, specifying that it would be at the correct rates and that (and this is what is involved in the original scheme also—the small fill-in scheme of a limited nature that I authorised) all parts, materials, oils or whatever else was necessary were to be supplied by the person seeking the service or through the social club, so that there could be no chance whatever of an unfortunate incident occurring there also. That information was accompanying the circular to which the Leader has referred.

On 8 August the circular went out, unknown to me or to senior officers in the Department. As soon as it reached the senior level of my Department I was telephoned by the Director-General and the whole scheme was cancelled on that basis, because it was never intended to do other than provide a very important factor for the work force at Thebarton, namely, that of morale. There is nothing more soul destroying—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: There is no conflict with private industry. They were not in the market place soliciting work

until the issue of that larger scheme, as described in the circular. That was stopped immediately.

Mr Olsen: Where did you get the notice from?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The notice never reached me directly; it was sent to all members of the Department.

Mr Ashenden: How embarrassing!

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: There is nothing embarrassing about it. The embarrassing thing is that I feel compassion and sorrow for the officer at Thebarton who sent out the circular, because I think he would realise now that he should have consulted with his superiors. Let us not be too condemnatory, because that officer was concerned and showed what I believe should be described as misguided zeal in this matter, in that he was trying to ensure that the work force was gainfully employed at the normal charges that prevailed in that area. The cancellation occurred on 14 August. The circular was dated 8 August and was brought to my attention on 14 August. I assume that the senior officer concerned at Thebarton did not include me on the mailing list, as I did not receive a copy.

If members examine the dates concerned, I think they will find that 8 August was the middle of the week—a Wednesday or a Thursday. A Friday ensued, and then possibly the circular went out, having been printed on that date. It would not have been seen by anybody over the weekend. I believe 14 August was a Tuesday or Wednesday. Whilst it seems that six days was a long time, the weekend intervened. Also, the date on the circular (presuming it was not dated ahead) was the day it was printed, and it would have been a day or two later that it reached the members concerned. The officer concerned has had a discussion with the Director-General and now realises that he should have not acted in that fashion. I believe that that is where the matter should lie.

ROXBY DOWNS

Mr MAX BROWN: Is the Minister for Environment and Planning in a position to outline to the House the arrangements which have been made to ensure continuing Aboriginal access to areas within the new miscellaneous lease applying at Roxby Downs? I understand that some Aboriginal people, including the Kokatha People's Committee, are concerned to see that they can continue to visit the area and sites of significance to them. Also, I understand that the Minister undertook to endeavour to negotiate for continued rights of access.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Honourable members would be interested in the arrangements that have been conveyed this day to the Secretary of the Kokatha People's Committee. When I announced my intention as Minister of Lands to resume part of the pastoral lease and to provide a miscellaneous lease over the project area to the Roxby joint venturers, the Kokatha Aborigines raised the question of their continued access to sites of significance to their people. On behalf of the Government, I then made it plain that I would seek to secure arrangements that would allow them continued access to the area.

My colleague the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and I met with representatives of the Kokatha people to discuss access arrangements, and discussions have also been held with the Minister of Mines and Energy and Roxby Management Services. The Kokatha people have expressed in very strong terms their wish to have complete and unimpeded access to the mine and the project area, and the right to camp and erect structures in the area. On the other hand, as with any mining site with heavy equipment and operating plant, the joint venturers were concerned to ensure safety

at the site. For practical purposes, they wished to see Aboriginal access under defined terms and conditions.

Having regard to the concerns of each of the parties, the Government has now finalised arrangements for access on terms and conditions which respect the rights of Aboriginal people with a legitimate interest in the area and at the same time satisfy the reasonable concerns of the Government and the company regarding safety and security at the mine site. I have written today to the Kokatha People's Committee advising it of the access arrangements, and for the benefit of members I will briefly outline the arrangements by quoting from portions of the letter to the Kokatha People's Committee, although the whole of that letter can and will be made available to honourable members. The specific portions which set out the conditions are as follows:

The conditions mean that Kokatha people can visit the places that are important to them inside the project area, during daylight hours, provided that they let the company know who they are and why they want to visit the area. They also need to give the company 24 hours notice.

For safety reasons, all people entering the project area will be under the general guidance and direction of the company personnel, and groups cannot be larger than five people. There will be some areas, for example, inside the pilot plant that cannot be visited. There may be occasions, for example, when major operations are being conducted, when people will be asked to defer their visit to a later date.

Access will not be permitted during the current protest demonstration and any similar activities. These arrangements will be checked regularly to see whether they are working satisfactorily or whether changes need to be made.

Those conditions have been conveyed to the Kokatha People's Committee today. We see it as a reasonable system that will both secure the legitimate desires of Kokatha people to visit areas of claimed significance to them and at the same time ensure that the concerns of Roxby Management Services in relation to safety provisions can also be carried out.

SALES TAX AVOIDANCE

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I direct my question to the Premier, although he may pass it down the line. Will he investigate whether any parts obtained by the Drilling and Engineering Services Division of the Department of Mines and Energy to service the private vehicles of departmental employees were purchased by the Government, thus avoiding sales tax?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I could have passed it down the line, but I guess the answer is that I will get a report from the Minister.

RAYTHEON ORGANISATION

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Premier advise the House on the progress of negotiations between Telex Computer Products and the Raytheon organisation regarding the future of the Raytheon plant at Hendon? As the Premier would be aware, I have written to him on a number of occasions expressing my concern about the retention of existing industries and small businesses within the Albert Park electorate. As the Premier would also be aware, I have expressed my concern about the future of small component industries and of General Motors-Holden's, by which many of my constituents are gainfully employed. Therefore, can the Premier give any assurances to those employees that their employment is not in jeopardy?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The securing of the Raytheon company for South Australia was, in fact, undertaken by the previous Government. I recall that both the then Minister

and the Premier saw it, quite rightly, as an achievement in the high technology area. I understand that Raytheon intended to set up its operations in Sydney. However, it was prevailed upon and offered certain incentives to come to South Australia, which indeed it did. Some of those incentives were fairly generous, but it did give us a chance to obtain the establishment of a major international computing company in Australia, and to ensure that it was located here in South Australia.

Unfortunately, of course, despite very big predictions of increases in employment and activity, Raytheon, while operating profitably in its Australian and South Australian operation, was obviously not performing to the extent or specifications required by the parent company. In fact, recently we were confronted with a crisis in relation to that complex when Raytheon International effectively put its Australian operations on the market and decided to sell out. That posed major problems for the South Australian Government. Apart from the expenditure involved in the various concessions, and so on, which had been given to assist Raytheon establish itself, and the loss of employment that would result, we were also committed under the agreements made by the previous Government to the acceptance of certain systems supplied by the Raytheon company as part of the deal. There was going to be a problem in relation to our own supply.

Clearly, the Government had to try to take some action on the matter but, because of the international nature of the transaction, we were confronted with a very difficult problem. We made representations to the Federal Government. In particular, we encouraged a group of employees who believed that they would have the possibility and skills (and I think that they probably would have had them) to take over the operation and try to run it themselves as a solely South Australian operation. But, of course, that would have required considerable financial commitment. I know that at the Federal level there was uncertainty about whether such a proposition was workable and whether the group which may have had the skills and techniques had the resources to make it a success. In other words, we could have been confronted with yet another crisis.

But, ultimately, it depended on whether or not the parent company was prepared to sell to that group, and it showed some reluctance to do so. However, we supported that move. At the same time, a number of other prospects were being looked at, one of which was the company to which the honourable member has just referred—Telex Computer Products Incorporated—an American company which had some interest in the plant and the Raytheon sale. The danger always in this area is that we could have had taking over the plant someone who intended to close it and consolidate operations somewhere else, or see it as a take-over in order to capture that segment of the market, which would have been to South Australia's detriment.

In fact, Telex Computer Products has now made an international agreement with Raytheon and has taken up its products on a world-wide basis. As a result, it has also taken up products emanating from South Australia. Under Foreign Investment Review Board guidelines and other Federal requirements we were asked to give our views. We have supported that, but on the condition that the work force and plant in South Australia be maintained. I understand that it is a successful and profitable operation, despite the parent company's desire to get out of the field.

I am now able to announce that the take-over has proceeded and that negotiations have been concluded successfully. Telex Computer Products will take over and run the operation. It has said that it is committed to maintaining the work force and the plant and, indeed, is discussing expansion plans. The Government will certainly lend all the

assistance that it can to ensure that those expansion plans come to pass. The company will continue to produce some Raytheon products as well as assembling products of its own. In time, the company intends to add to its operation the manufacturing of its own products, if the economics come good on that, and we are confident that that will be the case. The company is advertising for more staff and has indicated strongly that it believes that it has a viable operation which can be expanded in future and that it is confident in the future of South Australia as a high technology manufacturing area. I am pleased to advise the honourable member that the crisis has passed: the plant has been saved, and we hope that it will be expanded and developed.

VEHICLE REPAIRS

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Has the Minister of Mines and Energy investigated why payments made by officers of his Department for the service and repair of their private vehicles at the Department's Thebarton depot were made to a social club treasurer; how much these payments amounted to; and what has happened to the money? In reply to a question from the Leader, the Minister said that payments had been made to the Department in the 'normal way'. The circular to which the Leader referred in his first question states that:

On completion of work on an officer's private car, the owner will pay the social club treasurer for labour costs and parts prior to the release of the vehicle.

If this is the normal way in which payments are made in the Minister's Department, I suggest that it is a very improper method.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members, in explaining their questions, not to comment or debate a topic.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I am surprised that the member for Torrens has raised this matter as I was at some pains to explain how I wanted to ensure that the procedure operated on a distanced basis. I am referring to the totally limited fill-in scheme, and not to the subsequent matter that was aired in the circular to which we have both referred already. I pointed out that there ought to be an intermediate stage, that the money did not go from, say, a bloke who says to a foreman, 'Will you fix my car?' Obviously, I would never consider approving such an operation, however limited it might have been. When members opposite hear words such as 'social club' mentioned, they appear to infer that the money has not reached the Government.

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: It was paid to the social club, on the basis that I have already outlined, so that as an individual transaction it could be on an open basis. In explaining his question, the former Minister, who ought to know better, pointed out that the vehicle would not be released until all money due had been paid. Is that not a fact? That is actually what the honourable member read out by way of explanation. The social club was mentioned to me in the discussions to which I referred and which took place originally as being a suitable 'vehicle' so that there could be no fiddling with the money. There has not been any fiddling with the money, and it was a simple transfer medium.

MORTGAGE DOCUMENTS

Mr KLUNDER: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Attorney-General to look at the standard mortgage documents with a view to ensuring that they be simplified

and that marginal notes be inserted to indicate what the text actually means?

I recently signed a mortgage document (the first in 20 years) and I must admit I signed it without understanding it. It was a standard contract from a large bank. I have since checked with a number of people who have also recently signed such documents and none of them understood what they signed either. The reason for such a lack of understanding is not difficult to find. The document is long, complex, and written in obtuse legalese, full of expressions like *mutatis mutandis*, *ab initio* and *pari passu* which cannot possibly be understood by the general public. To illustrate the difficulties, I quote one single sentence from this mortgage document, and I stress that it is a single sentence. Subclause (g) of the general introduction reads:

Also interest upon all such moneys as aforesaid or on so much thereof as shall for the time being be owing or payable or remain unpaid without (unless the Bank otherwise in writing agrees) allowing credit for any credit balance in any account or accounts of the Mortgagor and the Debtor or either of them either alone or jointly with any other person with the Bank at the rate of respective rates—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KLUNDER: The honourable member had better wait until I finish and he can tell me then what it means. The sentence continues:

agreed upon in writing if any and in the absence of any such agreement then without prior or other notice to the Mortgagor or to the Debtor at such rate or rates as the Bank from time to time determines; except as otherwise provided by the terms of any agreement in writing relating to the whole or part of such moneys such interest shall accrue from day to day and shall be computed from the day or respective days of such moneys being paid or disbursed or becoming owing and at the end of every period of such duration as the Bank may from time to time determine and ending at the end of such day as the Bank may from time to time determine (with power in the Bank to vary from time to time the length of such period or the day or days on which such period ends), or, in the absence of any such effective determination, at the end of each period of one calendar month ending at the end of the last day thereof the interest accrued due up to and including such day upon any such moneys in respect of such period or any part thereof shall (if or to the extent to which it has not already been paid) commence and thereafter so long as the whole or any part thereof shall remain unpaid shall continue to carry interest at the rate aforesaid and such accrued but unpaid interest may at the option of the Bank be debited against the Debtor or in the case of interest upon moneys lent paid or advanced to for or on account of the Mortgagor or to for or on account of any other person as aforesaid at the request of the Mortgagor or for the payment of which the Mortgagor is liable to the Bank as hereinbefore—

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Far be it from me to interfere in what the honourable member is trying to convey to the House in such an unprecedented address during Question Time as ever accompanied a question. However, I ask whether you would confine the honourable member's explanation to what might reasonably be described as being an explanation to a question.

The SPEAKER: As I understand Standing Orders, provided the matter is not debated or commented on—

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: With due respect, the material is such that the several paragraphs that have been read from the document by the honourable member have in no way related to the original question.

The SPEAKER: There are two points: first, the question of relevancy. I rule that it is relevant to the original question. I regard the sentence as being quite simple, actually—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER:—and the Minister should have no difficulty in dealing with it. It is relevant, and I rule that way. On the question of the length of the information, I understand that, provided that there is no debate or comment, I

cannot stop the honourable member. The honourable member for Newland.

Mr KLUNDER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I have probably made the point that I wanted to make, and I shall not bore the House with the rest of the sentence. I have so far read less than half of the sentence, which is over 800 words long. I take the point that the honourable member may have a question of his own that he wishes to ask. However, the point is still made: it is impossible to understand what the sentence means.

The SPEAKER: That is comment and debate. I find it simple, even if the honourable member does not.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have ruled accordingly: that that was a comment. I ask the honourable member to wind up his explanation.

Mr KLUNDER: The purchase of a house is often the most important transaction that people undertake, and a mortgage document as difficult to read as this is indefensible. Will the Minister representing the Attorney-General ask his colleague to see whether it can be simplified or explained in simple language?

The SPEAKER: Before calling the Minister representing the Attorney-General, I should make another point in relation to the point made by the honourable member for Alexandra. Honourable members may stop an explanation at any time, with no reason given, simply by calling 'Question'. When that has happened, however, proceedings in this House have not been too happy. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. As to the point so clearly made by his reading part of the 800-word clause referred to, and as you, Mr Speaker, have said, this is a common clause that is well understood by lawyers and other persons practising in this area. However, obviously it is not understood by many people who see a mortgage contract only once or twice in the whole of a lifetime, and it is, as the honourable member said, a vital document. I suppose that this example shows the expertise that resides in the legal profession to explain a complicated transaction in precise detail so that it is understood with a degree of certainty by practitioners and indeed by the courts when the matter is in dispute. So, the end result is designed to protect consumers, but the process whereby that route is taken may well harm consumers. Therefore, it is in that context that I will ask the Attorney-General for a report in order to see whether some other form of explanation or some assistance cannot be given to consumers who enter into such contracts.

THEBARTON WORKSHOP

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy admit that the circular from the Drilling and Engineering Services Division of his Department inviting all departmental officers to have their private vehicles serviced at the Thebarton workshop identified that this workshop has a significant surplus of staff? Further, will he redeploy such excess staff to ensure that taxpayers' funds are not wasted? The facts revealed in the circular referred to earlier indicate that this workshop has sufficient staff to operate as a large service station for the servicing and repair of private motor vehicles, as well as undertaking normal departmental work. The circular demonstrates that taxpayers' funds are being wasted by overstaffing of this workshop and that the excess staff should be redeployed.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The three-part question asked by the former Speaker of this House is probably legal and I will try to answer it. The reply to his first question is 'No', because there is no basis for his second and third

questions. Earlier, I said that I had approved certain matters on a limited basis for a temporary period when no other work was available. Amongst the other conditions that I placed on my approval was that the other work normally carried out took total precedence over the scheme, if we may call it that. I am not referring to the scheme which emanated in an unauthorised circular. The heart of the matter is that the circular to which the honourable member referred to base his case was never authorised, should not have been issued and, as soon as it was brought to our attention, it was cancelled.

SANTOS OIL DISCOVERY

Mr GREGORY: My question is directed to the Minister of Mines and Energy —

An honourable member: As usual.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members to allow the honourable member to get on with his question.

Mr GREGORY: Can the Minister provide any further information to the House on yesterday's oil discovery by Santos in the Gidgealpa 17 well in the North-East of this State?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Yes, I can.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I should have thought that honourable members would be interested in this information—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: If the member for Coles thinks that she has read it all in the paper, I invite her to say whether she has done so after she hears what I have to say. I can inform the honourable member that I had a briefing by officers of my Department and also a direct briefing by telephone from Mr John McArdle of Santos. So, it may be that I am in possession of somewhat more information than is the member for Coles. Mr McArdle said, in relation to details of this spectacular find, that while the Cooper Basin producers were not yet ready to take on the Middle East the Gidgealpa 17 discovery was extremely pleasing. The Department of Mines and Energy says that yesterday's test flow of 3 206 barrels a day from the well was a record for South Australia, the previous record having been 3 170 barrels a day from Strzelecki 4. The Department says that Gidgealpa 17 was being drilled as a permian gas development works. The major oil flow encountered yesterday from the Jurassic Hutton Sandstone in the Eromanga Basin was totally unexpected.

Is the member for Coles claiming that she was aware of that information prior to my advising the House of it? The producers have told the Department that, following evaluation of the Hutton oil discovery, Gidgealpa 17 will be drilled ahead to its primary objective, the gas sands of the Permian Toolachee and Tirrawarra formations.

The past two months have seen a particularly successful period for oil discoveries in South Australia, all by the Delhi-Santos consortium. I will not detail all of them but suffice to say that there have been five oil discoveries within a period of about two months. I would have thought that honourable members opposite would welcome any additional information about that rather than try to hide and put their heads in the sand about such an important matter relating to the revenue and the future of this State.

38-HOUR WEEK

Mr OSWALD: Will the Minister representing the Minister of Health inform the House what deal the Minister of Health has made with unions in our hospitals over the

timing of the implementation of their campaign for a 38-hour week? In either March or April this year, a committee was set up to investigate the implications of the implementation of a 38-hour week in our hospitals. I am advised that all contributions to the committee had to be in by the second week in May. It has been put to me that three months has now elapsed, and that despite questions from the union rank and file nothing has happened, nor has there been any reaction from union leadership. It has also been put to me by rank and file union members that a deal has been struck between the union leadership and the Minister of Health to ensure that there would be no demands and no stirring, and that without this deal the unions would have gone out on strike by now.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I was interested to hear the honourable member say that it was put to him that it has been three months from May until the current date. But, I will refer this matter to my colleague in another place and have a report prepared for the honourable member.

SUBLIMINAL TAPES

Mrs APPLEBY: I ask the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs, whether he will urgently instigate an investigation and report into the availability of subliminal tapes and the usage of such tapes. Concern has been expressed to me about the accessibility of subliminal tapes through magazine advertising, door to door selling, at mind power seminars, video shops and even mail order. From a readily available pamphlet, I would like to read to the House the types of tapes listed:

- Weight loss,
- Stop smoking,
- Concentration,
- Memory improvement,
- Self-confidence,
- Relaxation,
- Good study habits,
- Develop enthusiasm,
- Creative thinking,
- Relieve stress and anxiety,
- Money—prosperity, and
- Subconscious sales power.

In investigating this concern I have found that it has not been established that anyone is doing anything wrong. The concern that has been expressed is about the potential misuse of this type of programme. There is also deep concern about persons or organisations that put the human mind through irregular stimuli for the purported good of the recipient. The people supplying the tapes and the participants are not trained professionals and, in many cases, they are not fully aware of what is on the tape, but only what it is supposed to do. It has been expressed that concern is one thing and dealing with the matter is another.

From my inquiries it would appear that these programmes do not breach the Psychological Practices Act as it is at the moment. However, it is conceivable that some of the Acts administered by the Department of Consumer Affairs may be breached in the future by such practices and consumers led or induced to make purchases that they would not otherwise make.

I have been told of a situation in America where a chain of stores used subliminal tapes to lessen shop stealing, which was running higher than the State average. It was reported that after the trial period there was a marked decrease in this activity. It has been put to me that, if this exercise was reported correctly, perhaps the same practice could be used to increase sales of items or increase the use of credit cards. It is with these points in mind that I seek an investigation and report.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for her most interesting question. Naturally, it is unclear whether there is a problem with respect to the use of these tapes in the community, but that matter should be investigated by the Minister of Consumer Affairs and, I suggest, perhaps also by the Minister of Health in another place. I will be pleased to refer this matter to those Ministers for their assessment.

GLENELG FORESHORE REDEVELOPMENT

Mr BECKER: Can the Premier inform the House whether yesterday's announcement of redevelopment of the Glenelg foreshore will prevent the establishment of a major entertainment and recreational centre at West Beach? I understand that in a speech on 2 November last year, when opening the new premises of the Karidis Corporation in Light Square, the Premier revealed details of a proposed Disneyland type project to be built on West Beach Trust land at West Beach, estimated to cost between \$22 million and \$25 million. I believe that the Premier said that the project would be completed in time for the State's 150th Jubilee celebrations. I met Mr Karidis earlier this year to discuss the project and I believe that finances were being arranged with overseas sponsors. I am concerned, as is everyone else who read this morning's *Advertiser*, that the project may now be in doubt.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I saw the article to which the honourable member has referred. I do not see that there will be an essential conflict between the two proposals. Rather, they could be seen to be complementary in their application. In relation to the Glenelg proposal, which was publicised yesterday, I stress, as has been stressed throughout, that it is still very much in the proposal stage. The finances and details of what planning approvals, and so on, are needed are yet to be carried out.

At the moment, it is a development proposal. In fact, the Government's contact with it has not been more than simply an initial presentation and proposal. Obviously, a number of elements have to be drawn together. Departments need to be involved in assessments and in looking to what sort of support is required (the developer has suggested that he will not seek direct financial support) to turn that project into a reality. So, there is a lot of work to be done down the track. In the case of the theme park (Mr Karidis' proposal to which the honourable member referred), there has been considerable discussion between the West Beach Trust and the Karidis organisation. Mr Karidis has also had, as the honourable member mentioned, overseas interests involved who are interested in being investment partners in the venture. A number of other problems and details of the overall project have to be investigated. It must fit into the overall development of the West Beach Trust area as a complementary activity; in other words, as is required in terms of the use of that land.

The Government remains convinced that it is a very sensible and ideal location for the sort of theme park as described, and we have been assisting with liaison between Mr Karidis and the West Beach Trust in their negotiations. However, there is no firm commitment to the proposal in terms of starting dates, or anything of that kind. Of course, on other occasions theme park type proposals have been put forward; it may be that if the proposal as envisaged by Mr Karidis does not go ahead, some other substitute proposal will take place. However, at this stage I cannot report any further progress in terms of the West Beach Trust and Karidis negotiations.

TOURISM PROMOTION

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Tourism initiate negotiations with the Federal Government, first, to introduce South Australian promotional display material at the Adelaide International Airport and, secondly, in respect of the future extension of facilities, particularly the refreshment and bar facilities at the airport? During a recent inspection visit to the Adelaide International Airport by the Minister of Tourism's Caucus committee it was noted that, first, there was no material in the form of photographs, posters or wide screen video presentation material promoting South Australia. Secondly, in discussions with the airport manager it was pointed out that, because of the location of the bar and refreshment facilities, overcrowding and inconvenience sometimes occurs, particularly at peak periods. It was further pointed that the future provision of a mezzanine floor would solve both the problem of providing adequate bar and refreshment facilities and of providing an adequate viewing area for visitors.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Yes, I will take up this matter with the appropriate Federal Minister in an endeavour to ensure that the facilities available at the international airport are adequate to meet demand. I think it would be appropriate for me to make a joint approach with my colleague the Minister of Transport. The Department of Tourism was very much involved in the early stages of the preparation of plans for the airport. Initially the plans provided for facilities that certainly would have been more adequate than those that are there now. The reasons given for the curtailment were shortages of resources and funds. While the facilities at the airport are adequate, they do not meet the needs of South Australians and travellers as well as some would wish.

The lack of video or promotional material for South Australia at the airport is noticeable. It is a matter that I will take up with my Federal colleague to ensure that interesting and exciting aspects of South Australia as a tourist destination can be promoted more effectively within the international airport. Perhaps the people who are leaving South Australia will not be convinced by the material and people coming into South Australia have made the decision to come here, anyway, but those who are in transit certainly might be encouraged to come to South Australia on their next trip if suitable material was available to convince them to make that very good decision.

WINE TAX

Mr INGERSON: Will the Premier repudiate criticism of the wine industry by the Minister of Agriculture? Yesterday the Minister of Agriculture described the wine industry as the most disorganised industry that he had ever seen. I have been informed that today he reaffirmed that statement in another place. The Opposition has received complaints today that such statements will not help South Australia to mount an effective case against the imposition of the wine sales tax. On 31 August last year the Premier said in this House that political rhetoric put South Australia's case against imposts on the industry at a considerable disadvantage. Therefore, the Premier should repudiate statements made by the Minister of Agriculture yesterday and today.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not feel any need to repudiate the Minister's statement. The Minister has had a very close relationship with the wine industry. At this stage I certainly do not wish to emphasise problems within the industry, although I think we would be very silly to ignore the fact that there are such problems. Indeed, one of the issues involved concerns the differing attitudes within the

industry towards matters such as a wine tax. It is quite clear that in terms of both restructuring, marketing, the future of the industry and matters such as excise, there has been considerable division of opinion amongst some of the major companies. It is very hard indeed, as the Minister has said, to get a unified industry view.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As the Leader of the Opposition says, when that exists, obviously it means that one cannot present a unified approach on a particular issue. I guess the important thing to note is the ownership structure of some of the wine companies. A tremendous change in ownership has occurred over the past few years, which has seen, for instance—

Mr Ingerson: That has nothing to do with the question. The Minister has made a joke and you are supporting him.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Alexandra to come to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I suppose that I am being foolish in trying to treat this as a serious question instead of an attempt at cheap political grandstanding.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have been doing the honourable member the courtesy of treating his question as being a genuine one to which he wanted a reasonable response, with some facts about the industry. However, it is clear that neither he nor other members opposite are interested, and I will not continue.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Why don't you admit you can't answer it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Are you aware of what he said?

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Alexandra to come to order.

FARE INCREASES

Mr TRAINER: Can the Minister of Transport explain the apparent discrepancy in the figures published in the press regarding the recent STA fare rises? Some constituents have been confused by press reports about the recently announced fare increases, and the author of the cartoon in this afternoon's tabloid also appears to be confused regarding the South Australian fare structure. Some headlines claim fare rises of up to 20 cents and others say that the maximum rise is 10 cents. The average fare rise is claimed by the STA to be 9.1 per cent and the member for Davenport claims that the average rise is 11.8 per cent. The member for Davenport also claims that there have been fare rises of 60 per cent since the last election. Can the Minister explain how those differences have occurred?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I thank the member for his question. All members should understand that the current ticketing system used by the State Transport Authority can only cater for 10 cent money values.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Why?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: It is not possible to introduce a 5 cent fee.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: All you have to do is to give them a direction.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: You might think it is possible, but my understanding is that it is only possible to have a 10 cent money value.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Minister to refer to honourable members by their district, and I ask honourable members who are interjecting about 5 cents or

10 cents and whether or not there are machines, to discuss it with the Minister afterwards.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I said on Tuesday when I announced the fare increases that they were only minimal. I think that the *Advertiser* headline claiming a 20 cent rise in fares was quite dishonest because it had to go to the length of calculating a return trip to get the maximum possible increase and to make a story of it.

The Hon. D.C. Brown interjecting:

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The member for Davenport leaves the *Advertiser* for dead when playing with figures. He is always quoting percentage rises in fares but he does not care how the figures are calculated, as long as they support his own argument. A few months ago the member was claiming a rise of 43 per cent, quoting from his bundle of leaked documents. The 43 per cent was the STA calculation arrived at by its own overall averaging formula, and the member thoroughly agreed with the calculation at that stage. However, the STA formula when applied to Tuesday's announced rises gives a figure of 9.1 per cent, as the member for Ascot Park correctly announced. But, apparently that did not suit the member for Davenport. He came up with a figure of 11.8 per cent by his own strange method of calculation. However, if the member had used this method on his leaked documents he would have come up with a figure of only 10.4 per cent. However, he did not want that because it did not suit him.

Obviously, the honourable member is very flexible: he likes everything both ways. He then made the claim that the Bannon Government had increased fares by almost 60 per cent, using the Davenport formula. I agree that this formula shows that this Government has increased fares by 54 per cent since coming to office, but now we find who is the real winner in the hypocrisy stakes. When we look at the Liberal Government record, we find that the Davenport formula shows that fares rose by a whopping 81 per cent during its term in office. We still have 27 per cent to go to catch up with the Liberal Government.

In the cartoon in today's *News* the lady is asking how much it is for a trip to Noarlunga if she goes via Marion. The answer to her question is that the trip is free because we did not increase the fares for pensioners. The pensioner lady in that cartoon can travel free to the Noarlunga centre under this Government's formula.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES OF TOWN OF GAWLER

The Legislative Council transmitted the following resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

That the joint address to His Excellency the Governor, as recommended by the Select Committee on Local Government Boundaries of Town of Gawler in its report, and laid upon the table of this Council on 16 August 1984, be agreed to.

At 3.5 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill provides for the repeal of section 53 of the Prices Act, 1948. Section 14 of the principal Act empowers the Governor to proclaim specified goods and services to be declared goods and services. Sections 21 and 24 empower the Minister of Consumer Affairs to fix and declare maximum prices at which declared goods and services may be sold or provided. Sections 22a and 22f empower the Minister to fix and declare minimum prices for wine grapes. Section 53 of the Act provides that these powers, and the orders made in pursuance of them, expire on 31 December 1984. From 1949 to 1978, section 53 was amended annually to extend for a further year the period for which declarations made under the abovementioned sections would remain in force and during which further declarations could be made. In 1978, the section was extended for three years, and similarly in 1981.

It is significant to note that at no time during the 34 years since the Act was passed has Parliament rejected a proposal for extending the operation of these powers. It is also significant that Parliament has increased rather than decreased the period of operation. In these circumstances, it seems quite unnecessary to retain the provision requiring triennial reaffirmation of these powers. After all, it is always open to Parliament, by a subsequent Act, to repeal them or suspend their operation.

Furthermore, the removal of section 53 will avoid the risk that some future Bill to extend the time limit in the section may not be passed before the deadline by virtue of the ever-increasing volume of business considered by the Parliament.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 repeals section 53 of the principal Act, which provides that the price control provisions of the principal Act shall cease to have effect at the end of this year.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on the question:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for consideration of the Bill.

(Continued from 22 August. Page 491.)

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): I immediately take up the answer that the Minister of Transport just gave to the House and say that I am willing to lay before this House the full details as to how I made my calculation that the STA fares have increased this time by 11.8 per cent. The calculation was simple. I took the three figures quoted (the fare that went from 60 cents to 70 cents, the fare that went from 90 cents to \$1 and the fare that went from \$1.30 to \$1.40) and the three percentage increases, and I averaged them. I challenge the Minister of Transport to now lay before the House the details as to how he achieved the percentage increases of which he spoke today. In fact, I will challenge the Minister to come up with realistic figures to show that the average increase in transport fares under a Liberal Government was 81 per cent. He could not justify that. He has used shonky figures, and it is about time that the Minister revealed how shonky those figures are.

After this speech I intend to go down to the Minister's office and to take up the challenge that I threw across in Question Time today. I will give him my figures, I will show him how I reached my average of 11.8 per cent, and I will ask the Minister to give me his figures. The Minister also challenged my statement that State Transport fares

have increased by 60 per cent in the last 15 months. On 30 July last year the then acting Minister of Transport put out a statement which was reported in a newspaper (I am sure the Minister knows of it, because he is nodding, indicating that he does) that average transport fares increased by 47 per cent last year. Add to 47 per cent 11.8 per cent and you get near enough to 60 per cent. That is no magical mathematical calculation: it is a simple addition of 11.8 per cent and 47 per cent.

I now refer to the dangerous intersection of Highway 1 and the easternmost road leading out from Port Pirie—the exit from Highway 1, coming from Adelaide into Port Pirie—as well as the exit crossing on Highway 1 at Port Pirie. It was at this location, unfortunately, that on Easter Sunday this year three women were tragically killed. I have raised this matter previously in this House and have indicated that the truck driver involved (Mr M. G. Luckman of Merrylands, New South Wales) wrote to me very much concerned about how unsafe that intersection was. I asked the Minister in this House to take appropriate action, not only to ensure that traffic stopped at the intersection but also to rectify the intersection on a curve in Highway 1 where traffic travelled, legally, at speeds up to 110 km an hour.

Mr Luckman wrote a detailed letter to the Minister of Transport in April this year, and I am disgusted to find now that the Minister has not even bothered to reply to a letter that raised serious doubts about a very unsafe intersection on Highway 1. I was amazed when I received a further letter from Mr Luckman raising certain points but also expressing disgust at the lack of a reply from the Minister. I now ask the Minister to apologise to Mr Luckman for not replying to his letter and to explain to the House why he has not even gone to the bother five months later of replying to a detailed letter sent to him concerning an unsafe intersection.

I happened to be in Port Pirie with the shadow Cabinet last Monday. After a worthwhile meeting we had a lunch, attended by 90 people, where I met members of the Port Pirie City Corporation and of the Port Pirie District Council to discuss road matters, especially road funding. Those people are very much concerned with what they see as the long-term deterioration of our road network, especially the roads in their district. We discussed at some length the two unsafe intersections of Highway 1 with roads leading from Port Pirie. One person at that lunch said that he had now lost four personal friends at one of those intersections as the result of four accidents, and he highlighted the unsafe nature of both those intersections and how little had been done.

While I was in Port Pirie, I saw one of the intersections and found that the only change that had taken place since the fatal accident on Easter Sunday was the erection of a 'stop' sign in place of a 'give way' sign and the erection of a 'prepare to stop' sign some way back from the intersection. Because of the nature of the corner, and because of the many people who have been killed at that intersection and at the next intersection 1 km or 2 km down the road which also leads from Port Pirie, it is time that drastic action was taken—even, if need be, the construction of an overpass so that traffic coming out of Port Pirie that needs to go to the other side of Highway 1 can use the overpass. The death toll over the past 15 years warrants such drastic action being taken.

From that discussion I was amazed to find what was new and relevant information about the state of the intersection on Easter Sunday. I was told that the bitumen paving through the area had been resurfaced before Easter and that at Easter, the worst weekend of the whole year in terms of road deaths, there were no white line markings on the road. It concerns me greatly that, on a major intersection on

Highway 1, at Easter the Highways Department had apparently not bothered to put in any line markings to indicate the edge of the road, the centre of the road or where to give way. Even though there are traffic islands there, such white markings may have had a significant influence on any accident that occurred or could have occurred at that spot.

I ask the Minister to take up immediately with the Highways Department the matter of ensuring that, when roads are resurfaced, they are not left in an unmarked state for a considerable time, as apparently happened on this occasion, and especially that Highway 1, which is our national highway around Australia, is not left unmarked over the Easter weekend when traffic frequently uses it and when statistics suggest that dangerous circumstances will prevail.

Mr Hamilton: How many deaths have there been there over the past 11 years?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I do not know the exact figure, but the locals quoted the story that I have given this afternoon. For the sake of the people of Port Pirie and other users of Highway 1, it is time that more drastic action was taken in this regard. I ask the Minister of Transport to present to this Parliament a report on the number of deaths at these two intersections over the past 15 years and to say why that section of Highway 1 was left unmarked by white lines during Easter and for a considerable time before Easter, and why action was not taken by the Highways Department to see that that sort of unsafe intersection was not left unmarked.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Lenehan): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I appreciate the fact that the Minister of Community Welfare has delayed his departure from the Chamber, because I wish to raise a matter which should be addressed by Parliament in a bipartisan way. I hesitate to move a substantive motion at this stage because in its initial stages the area to which I refer is not one of State law: it concerns the Family Law Act and the problems arising from that Act on the State scene, not the least of these being in the area of the Minister of Community Welfare. As a member of Parliament with an electorate office, I am even more concerned today than I was perhaps two years ago with the frequency with which people come through the door seeking assistance in matters associated with access to their children or, more particularly, in trying to come to grips with the way in which they perceive that the law deals with them as one or other of the aggrieved parties to a marriage breakdown.

Frequently, the custody of children is involved and in many such cases it is the woman partner of the marriage who has the custody of the children and the husband, or previous husband, who has access to them. Some men who claim that they have been denied proper access to their children are so frustrated as to perhaps regrettably put themselves in jeopardy along with their wives and with the court, and subsequently the children are right in the middle of a social tug-of-war that does no credit to either side. But, more than that, the court takes the blame, and I suspect that it may be the court that is responsible for some of the frustrations and misery occasioned to the children and the general family. Those are harsh words to say about a court. Perhaps I should say that it ought to be related to the courts system, or perhaps it should be related to aggrieved parties' comprehension, or lack of it, of what a solicitor should be doing for them.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: It's also a constitutional problem. A convention in this very room rejected a solution to the problem.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: There are other aspects to that issue, and defeat on one occasion should not necessarily

mean defeat for the future. I believe that there was in the debate to which the Minister refers, involving the Constitutional Convention, a difference of opinion as to approach and authority in this matter, and it behoves a Parliament (hopefully, it may be this one: we have been the forerunners of change in the past and there is no reason why we should not be in the future) to take a bipartisan approach in order to find a solution which will take away the frustration and misery which exists out there and with which we have all, as members of Parliament, come into contact.

Not only is the Minister of Community Welfare vitally involved but also many other parts of the State Government are impacted on by this type of activity, for example, the Police Force. The Force has plenty to do without having to be in the middle of family squabbles. Frequently it becomes a family squabble of some considerable size, and a lot of heat and friction are evident because of the frustration generated with the breakdown of communication stemming from what the law says and how it says it.

One of the great problems to which I refer in mentioning the law or the courts system breaking down is the inability of either of the two parties to stand in court and be heard on what has taken place. It may be said that, because they have a solicitor, that is where the spokesperson role comes in. It may be said that they should also go in for their own protection and the protection of their rights with their solicitor who can advise them or speak for them. However, for a person who is not conversant with the law to be denied the opportunity, in simple language as he or she knows it, to put to the court the problem is to increase the area of frustration and exacerbate that problem.

It involves not only the Police Force but also the schools, as a number of tangles finish up with some conflict on the school campus. Teachers or principals have to spend a number of hours counselling children who are obviously distressed because they are the meat in the sandwich or are in the middle of a tug of war. There is the problem of a parent who has been denied access and approaches the child in or near the school yard. Problems involve neighbourhoods, as people feel at risk with conflict radiating from a family at loggerheads.

I have not yet addressed (and do not intend to do other than identify) the massive problems that arise with the division of property. In many cases the frustration and problems are such that there is no property left, as a result of hassles that have taken place. Sometimes destruction occurs within a house because of frustration venting itself in the form of physical violence or damage to the point where there is virtually no property left. Then, the family or individuals involved become a charge upon the community.

I have not attempted to address all the problems that arise, but it is inevitable that, in this day and age, in recognition of the increasing problem that I perceive (and I have checked with colleagues on both sides of the Chamber) there be an increase in the number of such cases coming into electorate offices for assistance. It is a plaintive cry for help and advice on what to do. The lack of concentration which the breadwinner or nominal breadwinner can apply to his or her job, the number of occasions on which they have lost their job because of the involvement of worrying about what the children are doing, when they will see the children again, and so on, are all matters that should concern this Parliament, even though it was the Commonwealth Parliament that was responsible for the passage of the Bill. An urgent need exists for either back to back legislation or a better appreciation of all elements in this matter.

If one wanted to add an emotive streak, one could pick up the problem that has become public, namely, the harassment of the Judiciary associated with the Family Court,

particularly as witnessed in New South Wales. Whilst we have had a good record here, evidence exists of harassment with the system right across Australia. That is the way members of the Judiciary and leading practitioners of the law are talking at this stage. If there is so much public criticism and concern, it is because there is a major problem. We are sitting on the edge of a crater and sitting with a ticking bomb in our midst. I would like to believe that, now that I have raised the issue on this occasion without developing it into a substantive motion of any kind, we may across the Chamber or through some other means come forward with a form of words that can be put to this Parliament as a starting point to assist in a massive decrease of the misery abroad about it and the other problems which exist.

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

Mr BECKER: Madam Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): I wish to refer to the shocking remarks made by the member for Ascot Park recently in the Address in Reply debate. He reflected on all members of this House and the way in which we are going about our jobs in stating that we are quite incompetent. In the *Advertiser* the Government Whip was quoted as saying:

The debate time in the past three weeks has been wasted.

The honourable member is absent now and spends little time in the House. He is often absent when speeches are being made. In the time available to me in the Address in Reply, I considered it important time, indeed. The honourable member went on to state:

Most of the speeches are like the essays that teachers used to require at the beginning of the term along the lines of 'What I did during my holidays.'

That honourable member is about to depart on a Parliamentary trip to the Isle of Man. I wonder when he returns to this Chamber whether he will talk about what happened while he was away. Will he refer to the fact that in the Isle of Man they still flog people for rape? Will he enlighten the Parliament as to what happens over there or will he say nothing?

The honourable member says that back-benchers should be given a more important role than just division fodder. That is all very well, but members who have had experience on both sides of the House well know that the Address in Reply debate allows members to deal with electorate matters. When I first came here, a member's time for an Address in Reply speech was two hours but the Labor Government reduced it to one hour.

Is the honourable member saying that we do not have enough time or that we are here too long? In the Address in Reply in 1982 the time spent was 27 hours; in 1982-83, it was 26 hours; in 1983-84, it was 27 hours. Does the honourable member wish to reduce the debating time for the Address in Reply to about 13 hours? Is that what he is saying? Does he want to reduce the opportunity for the Opposition to be able to voice its problems within this place?

I remind the member for Ascot Park when he suggests that we are working too hard that this Parliament has been in recess for many months. It went into recess from December to February and from 10 May to 2 August. Is he suggesting that he is overworked in this place? I should think not! If the honourable member wants more time for other things he should speak to his Government, talk up in Caucus and get some people to support him in suggesting that we spend more time in here looking after our electorates. Some members prefer to be in their electorates—some

members have told me that, and that is fair enough. I like to do that myself, but one has plenty of time during the recess to move around one's electorate. After all, one has a duty to one's constituents, to stand up and represent the people in this House where the laws are made. One should be able to speak up at any time and support the different activities within one's electorate.

I am sure the Minister of Mines and Energy, who entered this place with me, would agree that every time changes are made in the House to make things smoother, the back-bencher has lost out. Some time ago a deal was made with the then Attorney-General (the present Chief Justice) that members ought to be able to grieve every day provided the sitting finished before 10 p.m. However, during the last session there was hardly any grievance time given to the back-benchers. The Whip on the other side thinks that the debating time for the Address in Reply is far too long. It would be better for the honourable member to go into his Party room and talk about the situation generally amongst members of Parliament. The situation is getting worse.

Another matter of concern is that there is practically no courtesy shown at all by some members. Members are encroaching into other members' districts without notifying them. In many cases I am ashamed of what happens because, if one allows this to occur, the system will deteriorate. I had an example this week when a member two electorates from mine brought in a school from the middle of my electorate. Had she approached me and said, 'My son goes to this school and they have asked me if I would like to bring the school in', I would have been quite agreeable to it. When my son attended Westminster school I said to the Hon. Geoff Virgo, 'My son wants to come in. He has asked me but the school is in your electorate.' He said, 'That's all right, John, you bring the school in.' That was arranged weeks beforehand. One does not arrange for school visits in a matter of days. However, I found out about a Brighton High School class coming here about 10 minutes to 12 when the member for Mawson was already in the Gallery with the school class.

Should this continue I will be forced into the position, because I have been around a long time, of lighting many fires in the honourable member's district so that she will spend all of her time putting them out, with no time left to develop any other part of her electorate. That will fix the matter, and it will start a mini war for those people who encroach and pirate into other members' districts. That is not wanted, and it is quite wrong for that to happen. It is about time that all members in this House realised that there are certain courtesies, principles and rules to be abided by. One should notify their colleagues, because we are supposed to be colleagues, no matter which side of the House we are on. We go to citizenship ceremonies and smile across the chest of the Mayor, while at the same time wondering whether we will stab each other in the back when we get into the passage.

In this Chamber we debate hard and perhaps at times we do make enemies, but the moment one walks outside that ought to be forgotten. That is how it always was in this House, no matter how hard the debater was. There was no more difficult a debater in this House in my time here than the Hon. Geoff Virgo. We never saw eye to eye here, but we extended certain courtesies towards each other. He would always recognise me at any functions we both attended and that is a common courtesy. It is also a common courtesy that, if honourable members go into another member's territory, they inform the elected member that they are going in or have been invited there.

I understand another lady member brought a boy scout group from another member's district into the House not long ago. We have a number of females here, and it is about

time that they learnt the rules and lived by them. That is only fair. I have given fair warning, and if it occurs again or comes anywhere near it the war is on.

Mr BECKER: I draw attention to the state of the House and I would appreciate, Madam Acting Speaker, your using your position to advise the Government that it is its responsibility to maintain the quorum of 17 members.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I will address myself this afternoon to a number of matters relating to the procedures of this House and the way in which I believe they can be improved. Recently, I was fortunate enough to spend a full day and a half in the House of Commons in the Palace of Westminster. I could not help but be impressed by some of the procedures used in that Parliament as they are far superior to those used in the House of Assembly in South Australia. The present situation undoubtedly gives the Government a tremendous advantage over the Opposition in a number of areas.

I refer first and specifically to Question Time, which in the House of Commons is conducted in a manner that provides an opportunity for information to be elicited and provided. Question Time in the House of Commons is organised in a manner that I think gives Ministers a huge advantage because only one or two Ministers are required to answer questions each day and all questions are on notice. Therefore, a Minister can be fully briefed on questions he will be asked, whether from the Government or the Opposition benches, before he enters the House. This means that other Ministers do not have to waste time in the morning preparing themselves for questions that they will not be asked. Let us face it, a Minister of the Crown has a vitally important job to do in running South Australia. Under the system I have just mentioned there is no need for a Minister, unless he is going to be on call, to spend hours being briefed to answer questions that he might be asked. Ministers of the Crown, therefore, spend their time on what they should be spending their time on, namely, running this State. At the same time, members of the Opposition have a big advantage under the system just mentioned because, if a Minister does not answer a question that he has been asked, or if he does not answer it satisfactorily, then members are able to ask supplementary questions.

In this Parliament a question can be asked of a Minister, who may or may not choose to answer it. Also, the Minister may or may not choose to pour what can only be called a bucket over the Opposition and may completely avoid and evade the question asked. In the United Kingdom system a Minister cannot do this, because if he does not answer the first question a supplementary question will be asked, and if he does not answer that supplementary question further supplementary questions will be asked until an answer is provided. If Question Time was being organised in that way an advantage would flow to both the Government and the Opposition. Ministers would not have to waste time being briefed on possible questions. Then, when a Minister's turn to answer questions arrives, he will be fully briefed on those questions because they will be provided in advance. Therefore, the Minister's time will be used in a much better way. At the same time, members of the Opposition, and the Government, will also have the opportunity to continue pressing the Government until the reply they seek is forthcoming.

Members opposite, for some reason, object to what I am putting forward. I assume that the reason for this is that the present Government has abused Question Time far more than certainly any previous Government of which I have become aware, either since I have been here as a

member or from my reading of previous *Hansard* records. Most questions asked of the Premier and Ministers of this Government by their back-benchers have been provided on notice. That is all I am saying. It is a good idea. Why should a back-bencher not advise a Minister that he or she will ask a question? But, at the same time, I believe that idea should be extended and used in the way in which it is used in the House of Commons.

Also, we saw today the Minister of Mines and Energy, who is present, take more than a quarter of an hour to answer the first question asked of him by an Opposition member. Much of his answer was repetitious. If the Minister had been advised that that question was to be asked he could have been fully briefed and answered in two or three minutes. This is certainly what happens in the House of Commons. Questions are asked very succinctly and briefly. If the Opposition is not happy with an answer it receives, it has every right to continue questioning the Minister to elicit the information it seeks. I believe that that is an excellent way to conduct Question Time.

The next thing that impressed me about the systems used in the House of Commons was the way in which Ministerial statements are handled. The present Government has abused this system unmercifully. Ministers sometimes use Ministerial statements to convey vital information to the Parliament, but generally to rubbish the Opposition or to make political points. When a Ministerial statement is made in the House of Commons, it can be debated as soon as it is completed. Members can question the Minister on his statement and then debate it. I believe that this is only fair, because Question Time and Ministerial statements in this Parliament are used purely and simply to score political points, which is to the Government's advantage.

When an Opposition member asks a question the rules that bind behaviour in this House are very clear and strict in relation to what that member can include in the explanation relating to that question. But, those rules do not bind the Minister. Therefore, the Minister has a huge advantage in that he can then get up, and is not restricted in any way at all as to how he answers that question. He can go off at a complete tangent and use the opportunity purely and simply to rubbish a particular member of the Opposition, the Opposition in general, or to make political point after political point to which the Opposition cannot respond. I ask the question: is that fair debate? I think that any fair minded person would have to answer 'No'.

If we were able to ask supplementary questions, then a Minister who was evading the point would very quickly find that the sort of abuse which is presently used in Ministerial answers in this House would no longer be relevant or of any use and we would get back to a Question Time of more civilised dimensions, as is the case in the House of Commons. Also, on the topic of Ministerial statements, a Minister can stand at 2 p.m. in prime television viewing or media time and make any statement that he wishes, whether it is accurate or not. The Opposition cannot attack the Minister on a statement he has made in the South Australian Parliament. In the British Parliament this is not the case. If, as I said previously, a Minister makes a Ministerial statement, he is immediately subjected to questioning about it. In other words, the Opposition is therefore able at the same time as the Minister to place before the House the way it feels about the matter that the Minister has raised. Again, as in Question Time, Ministerial statements in this Parliament give a blatant advantage to the Government and place an Opposition at a serious disadvantage.

I think that we would all agree that the whole point of the Westminster system is that one has Her Majesty's Government and Her Majesty's Opposition. Many a person has stated that the strength of a Government frequently depends

upon the strength of an Opposition. However, when an Opposition is gagged far more than is the Government, when the Government has far greater opportunity to attack an Opposition than has the Opposition to attack the Government, when a Government or its Ministers have virtually open licence to say what they like in answer to a question without any restriction under Standing Orders, and when a Minister can make a Ministerial statement without any restriction under Standing Orders, yet at the same time the Opposition is very much constrained by Standing Orders, then that is not a fair system of Parliamentary debate.

This Parliament should look closely at the two areas I mentioned. It should make changes to Question Time, which would give advantage to both the Government and the Opposition. I stress that because I think it is important. At the same time, it would give the Opposition an equal chance to make points in relation to those raised by a Government in Ministerial statements. This would be a step towards democracy. After all, the Mother of Parliaments finds it suitable, which is a strong recommendation for introducing such a system into our Parliament.

Mr BECKER: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House. I request that a quorum of 17 members be maintained.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I refer first to the matter of occasional care for children. Throughout our electorates there are hundreds of flats in which mothers are bringing up children, and in many cases adequate backyard play areas are not available for the children. The same situation applies to children who live in units and homes where often there is nowhere for the children to play with other children. I think the Government has been negligent in not addressing itself to this problem. Although the Government has instituted the formation of the Children's Service Office and the suggestion has been made that under its umbrella this problem will be addressed, the reality is that that office will not be responsible for the provision of occasional care for children. It will have a watching brief, but that is quite different from actually having a responsibility to provide adequate occasional care.

It is occasional care for children that mothers in the community are looking for. The Government has a responsibility to provide it. I know that it is an expensive process, but we must move towards providing more occasional care facilities in the community. Single mothers, or mothers who perhaps are living on their own due to social or marital circumstances, should at least be able to arrange for their children to mix with other children and also ensure that they themselves get some relief from having to look after the children. Many mothers desperately need relief for a few hours a week so that they can relax and perhaps do something of their own while the children are being well cared for elsewhere. A request to consider the matter of occasional care facilities for mothers in both single and married situations is not asking too much of the Government.

Another matter that I have noticed while travelling around my electorate (and I am sure many other members have noticed this) concerns the increasing number of elderly recluses in the community—mainly women, although there are some men—who stay at home for perhaps two reasons: some do not want to be associated with the community, while others have no friends to go out to meet. A programme has been initiated in my electorate where volunteers seek out these people and invite them to attend fortnightly lunches, and the like. Only by the careful use of grants made for various purposes has this been made possible. Volunteers are able to go out and help these people. The Government

must further expand this approach. These people must be identified. We cannot rely entirely on medical practitioners and social workers to identify problems because on many occasions those officers do not do so. Goodness knows what the percentage of people in this situation is—it might be only 5 per cent or 10 per cent of the elderly community—but we have a big responsibility in this area, and the Government should take this matter on board. This is a genuine concern. I do not believe it is a matter of waiting until the next Government comes in. Certainly, we will be picking up the matter, but I think the present Government should move quickly on the issue.

I refer to a meeting that I attended a couple of weeks ago of the Southern Region of Councils at which we were addressed by the Minister of Transport. He praised his decision in regard to the axing of the north-south corridor, because he knew that the local State members present as well as the local councillors were supportive of his stand. I represent an area affected by the axing of the north-south corridor, and I do not share the Minister's views. What may be right for suburbs north of Anzac Highway is certainly not right for those to the south of Anzac Highway. The Government announced recently a \$45 million road project to be undertaken over the next 10 years to provide an additional transport corridor to bring residents over the hills face from the southern regions. Although everyone would agree that it is a step in the right direction, that will still provide no relief for those travelling from the southern suburbs on the Adelaide Plains.

The Minister recently criticised my friend the member for Glenelg when he brought to the attention of the Government the fact that problems will arise in years to come due to a massive increase in the number of cars travelling from the south when the development involving another 6 000 homes at Morphett Vale East proceeds, as well as other substantial subdivisions in the area. The Government has made no provision whatsoever for this increasing traffic. It has axed the north-south corridor but has made no provision for what will happen when those vehicles arrive at the Sturt Road, Darlington area. This is an absolute disgrace. I do not know whether or not it is due to a succumbing to political pressure from the Ascot Park area—goodness knows. I want to place on record the reaction to this, not from politicians but from those involved in local government, in particular, the Mayor of Marion, who is the Chairman of the Southern Region of Councils. An article in the *Guardian* stated:

State Government plans to build a \$45 million southern arterial road will still leave motorists in the south stranded. [Marion Mayor Ted Newberry] claims it will lead to traffic chaos on roads throughout the whole of the Marion Council area.

He is quite right; there can be no argument with that statement whatsoever. It continues:

Mr Newberry said the State Government plan for a 9-km road to link Sturt Road to Tonsley Park and the Reynella by-pass was a step in the right direction—

with which we all agree—

but did not go far enough north. He said the road would help to relieve a traffic bottleneck at Darlington, but would cause even more congestion on major roads in the Marion council's area.

As I represent an area encompassing parts of the Marion and Glenelg council areas, I agree with the concerns expressed by my colleague the member for Glenelg, who has shown so much concern. I am absolutely amazed by the attitude of my colleague the member for Brighton, and even more amazed by that of my colleague the member for Mawson, who some time ago indicated her support for the axing of the corridor, well knowing that her Government was about to build thousands of homes in the southern region as well as further subdividing the area, and that in 10 years time

traffic will be funnelled out of the area like bees coming out of a beehive. However, they have remained quiet and no provision has been made whatsoever in regard to facilitating that traffic when it hits the Marion council area.

There will be excess traffic travelling on Morphett and Brighton Roads as well as all the intermediate roads. That traffic will then eventually end up on South Road. The Government has turned a blind eye to the problem. I know that the member for Brighton is embarrassed about the matter. The district that she represents (which will bear the brunt of the traffic problem) is marginal. However, her hands are tied behind her back: she cannot object to what has occurred because that would be going against the Minister's wrong decision. No doubt the member for Mawson is well aware of the amount of traffic that will be channelled down from the area that she represents, but undoubtedly she must be stifled due to having signed the document indicating that she must remain loyal to whatever idiotic decisions are made by the Minister of Transport.

Both honourable members are intelligent people and both know what is going to happen when the traffic spews out on to the southern plains. They know that we will not be able to handle it unless we can get a corridor built from the Darlington area through to Anzac Highway. That is the problem that is not addressed by the Government. It is a problem with which local members, if they happen to be around long enough (I know some of the honourable members will probably not be around long enough to address the problem), will have to deal. We will have a dreadful problem working out what to do with this traffic as it comes out on to the southern plains. The decision is a disgrace but it is not too late for the Government to change its mind and have another look at what will happen when the traffic which moves from the southern regional development spews out on to the Adelaide Plains. I assure the House that it will be a total disaster.

Motion carried.

Bill taken through Committee without amendment.

Mr TRAINER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I am pleased that the Premier is here as I start this grievance debate, although he might not stay long enough for me to get across the point I wish to make. I am concerned that the South Australian Community Recreation Association Inc. has been asked by the South Australian Taxation Office to pay pay-roll tax for the first time. The request is for the body, which was originally the South Australian Youth Clubs Association, to pay pay-roll tax for the people it employs back to 1981. The sum involved varied from year to year but it went as high as \$30 000 in one year. The \$30 000 was for payment to a few people at the top to administer a community organisation, an organisation which uses its employees to co-ordinate a huge army of volunteers to work for the betterment of society.

That organisation, which is well known to all members of this place for the good work that it does in the community (again I emphasise that its name is SACRA), is exempted by the Australian Taxation Office as a public benevolent institution, and for the purposes of the Federal Act it does not pay taxation. A letter from the State Taxation Office to

the Association dated 29 January 1969 acknowledged that SACRA was exempt from receipts duty. Now, that same Department is claiming that it wants SACRA to pay pay-roll tax. In a letter dated 19 June 1984, the Engineering and Water Supply Department stated that SACRA was within the meaning of a charitable organisation under section 88 of the Waterworks Act, 1932, and it gave this association the benefit of being a charitable organisation.

There is no doubt that SACRA is a public benevolent institution. There is no doubt that every member of this House and any member of the community who has had any contact with that body would agree that SACRA is an organisation that works for the benefit of many sections of our community. Quite often the clubs, whether at places like St. Ives or St. Bernards, or elsewhere, provide recreational facilities in areas where there are many people in the lower socio-economic groups who could not afford to pay their instructors if they were not volunteers. If the Government, through the Premier, does not make representations to the State Taxation Office to stop this push for pay-roll tax to be paid on the wages of the employees of SACRA, it will mean only one thing: fewer services will be available to the community in areas where they are badly needed. It could also result in more unemployment. The member for Brighton shakes her head but, to a body such as SACRA, \$30 000 a year is the equivalent of at least two people full time or three people part time being employed by that body.

Let me take this a step further. If the Government is determined to claim the money through the State Taxation Office back to 1981, that means that SACRA must find even more money and may have to put off some people they have already employed. So it is not a matter of being able to employ more people in the future: it is a matter of saying that some of those already employed will have to be dismissed.

This whole sad story arose because about 18 months ago the group that ran the disadvantaged children's camp at Echunga found that it was going into debt badly and could not retain the property and give the service that it was providing for disadvantaged children. So, it asked SACRA to take over the service, and SACRA agreed to do so provided that the Echunga camp site was transferred to it. That meant that there had to be an application to the Lands Titles Office to transfer the title of the property.

If real estate (that is, land or buildings) is transferred in this State, stamp duty must be paid to the Government. This organisation, on applying to transfer the property, argued (justly, in my view) that the requirement of stamp duty should be waived in this case because, according to the Commonwealth Taxation Department, the Engineering and Water Supply Department and, as late as 1969, the State Taxation Office in respect of receipts duty, it was an exempt organisation. However, this application prompted the State Taxation Office to claim that SACRA would have to pay pay-roll tax, as well as stamp duty on the transfer of the property.

This matter is at present before the State Taxation Office by way of a letter of appeal asking it not to continue to ask for the money. As a person who has been associated with SACRA and privileged to be affiliated with it as President of a youth club, I know there is great concern that such a demand should be made. I am not even sure that the Premier or the Government is fully aware that the State Taxation Office is asking SACRA to cough up this large sum. I hope that my plea is taken in the right vein and that the Premier will ask the State Taxation Office what benefit the Government would derive by taking \$20 000 or \$30 000 a year from this body (indeed, it could be an even greater sum retrospectively to 1981) when that body is carrying out a service that is important to the State Government, because

if that body was forced into liquidation, or became less effective in the community, Government agencies that are paid for by the taxpayer through the Government would have to pick up a greater work load, and \$30 000 or a slightly lesser sum would not employ many people in the Government agency field to provide the same service as SACRA is providing.

I make the plea on behalf of SACRA, which has a great track record of service and which, according to the Government agencies that I have quoted, falls under the heading of a public benevolent or charitable institution and has been listed as such, that the Government does not try to observe the letter of the law, dot every 'i' and cross every 't' in relation to pay-roll tax. The Government should tell this body that it is exempt from the tax. SACRA's annual wages bill is about \$500 000. Unlike football and cricket clubs that employ professional players, it enjoys the services of a team of volunteers who provide a community service. I ask the Government to take up the challenge and leave SACRA alone in relation to pay-roll tax.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I wish to continue the remarks that I was making in a recent adjournment debate regarding the potential of job creation in my district. I wish to deal with observations that I made during my recent overseas tour and to compare conditions applying in certain countries with those applying here in my area in relation to the sale of food and drink. I previously referred briefly to the serving of food and drink in other countries and to advantages that we in South Australia might have in considering changes to our system.

I looked at this section of the tourism industry in both Italy and Greece, and I found that both those countries were able to use the tourist dollar much better than we have thus far been able to do. The only country with similar licensing laws and perhaps laws relating to restaurants to those in Australia is the United Kingdom. The general restrictions on hotel trading hours and the hours during which a restaurant may serve alcohol in the United Kingdom seem to be detrimental to that country's ability to exploit the tourist dollar fully.

On the other hand, it was my pleasure to be able to observe the tavernas in Greece and the restaurants in Italy. During the high summer season, in both Italy and Greece, restaurants, tavernas and eating houses fully utilised the outdoors. There appeared to be little restriction on the hours during which liquor could be sold and, in addition, liquor seemed to be freely available in kiosks, supermarkets, delicatessens and other areas. Any eating house seemed to be able to provide for the sale of alcoholic liquor with a meal, and it was pleasant for the tourist to be able to obtain liquor and a reasonable meal at any beach kiosk.

Many restaurants in both Italy and Greece appeared to use public grounds; that is, part of parklands, part of a footpath or part of a village square. Further, local authorities allowed restaurants to erect temporary overhead shades for protection against the sunshine. It would seem to be most desirable for job creation purposes that similar restaurants be allowed to operate in Australia. My observation of the outdoor restaurants of Greece and Italy is that they can capture the tourist dollar, create employment, and generate more income in specific areas. In order to see the creation of restaurants of this nature, there would need to be a relaxation of local government regulations, and this aspect should be seriously considered.

During my study tour I took special note of the opportunities available to the local population to create job opportunities through tourism. Many jobs were created for local people by allowing them to sell a large variety of goods to the tourists on the beach and in nearby areas. I refer spe-

cifically to small-time vendors, mostly carrying their own goods, who were allowed to sell such goods to the tourists in practically any situation. Many vendors set up stalls on the side of the road, and some carried their goods around in a tray similar to that used to peddle sweets and icecream at interval time in our local picture theatres.

In some instances, barrows and carts with four wheels or sometimes carts like a normal wheelbarrow were used. These vendors sold peanuts and other nuts, postcards and printing material, balloons, shoe-shines, fruit, ice cream, flowers, sweets (mostly home made), religious tokens, bread, dough-nuts, ornaments, tablecloths and other art and craft items.

I personally found that these people were not intrusive and that they were prepared to accept 'No' for an answer and move away with good grace. This seems to me to be one of the ways in which people may be able to utilise the tourist dollar in a job creating way. Not only were the sellers employed but also the manufacturers of the goods were also involved in producing work for the tourist. At the moment, there would be some difficulty in copying this system, because various council regulations are designed to protect the normal shopkeeper. It seems to me that many of the goods that were sold would not normally be sold through normal channels in our country because of the inconvenience of people having to go to their nearest shopping outlet. This is one area of job creation that may well also be looked at.

As far as arts and crafts were concerned, I can visualise further job creation through the better marketing and sale of our goods. In many of the overseas beachfronts that I visited, crafts of all sorts were on display and available for sale. Pottery, leatherwork, jewellery, paintings, needlework, crochet, tablecloths, knitting of various designs and articles were always readily available for sale to the tourist. I also suggest that this is an area in which better marketing techniques and a relaxation of regulations may allow a greater job creation for local people to sell to the tourist industry.

Certainly, a better marketing approach is necessary in this area. It was my experience in other countries that art and crafts were on sale where the tourists were, unlike South Australia, where the tourists are invited to go to where the arts and crafts shops are. I could visualise selling of local arts and crafts made in the Henley Beach area, and I would advocate that perhaps a market day or a market half-day on a Saturday or a Sunday in Henley Square or in front of the Grange jetty might be an idea worth pursuing.

There are other possible new areas for tourism expansion. The Research Services Branch of the English Tourist Board provided me with information relating to the expansion of tourism in Britain. It seems logical that this information may be of some value to the tourism industry in my electorate. There appears to be several continuing trends in relation to the way in which people will spend their time on holidays. These trends include sightseeing generally and visits to historic places and buildings, gardens and countryside in particular—major activity on many holidays.

More people seem to be pursuing hobbies and other special interests on holidays. Activities with a broadly educational element and a personal involvement have been growing at the expense of spectator and other passive activities. More people are engaged in physically active leisure pursuits, ranging from walking to more energetic participation in sports. The main implication for these trends for holidays are thought to be a major growth of activity and special interest holidays; sightseeing and the growth of hobbies and special interests, most of which can be pursued in a relatively short period of time and within a relatively short distance from home and leading to an increase in the number of short holidays, weekend breaks and day trips; that hobbies and special interest activities lend themselves to being packaged as holiday products, and specialised press

and organised leisure groups provide access and opportunities for promoting them; and that packaging of holidays provides opportunities for suppliers of accommodation, such as hotel chains, tour operators and intermediaries such as travel agents.

In view of this type of research, it seems logical that in my electorate the provision of opportunities for special interest groups should be pursued. Recently the Department of Agriculture in South Australia has been prepared to conduct schools for amateur fishermen at the Henley and Grange jetties. In view of overseas research in this area, it would seem logical that this practice ought to continue and be expanded. It seems likely that special schools and instruction in water sports, swimming, fishing and other areas of special interest connected with the sea and its surrounding environs should be encouraged.

Several overseas organisations have taken the opportunity to document and explain to the local population the economic impact of tourism to their particular area. I believe that this is a step in the right direction. Some local people are hostile to incoming tourists because they cannot see the advantage that the tourists bring to the local population.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): All members, and certainly South Australians, were quite amazed at the size of the proposed development announced yesterday for Glenelg—a \$220 million jubilee project funded by private enterprise. This project will extend the existing groyne at Glenelg into deeper water and will involve reclamation of beach areas. Some 450 units will be built, together with an international hotel and a shopping centre. The fun park will be extended and improved on and there will be a sailing club and a large local marina. The project looks absolutely superb on paper, and reads and sounds well. We have been informed that the developers have already spent \$500 000 in this area. It is a pity that local residents were not contacted first.

Two issues immediately come to mind: first, the problems of access for public transport to the road system. On some days at certain times people on the north peninsula (the area bounded by the Patawalonga and North Esplanade) are locked in because of the incompetency and stupidity of planners in the past. The only major outlet from north peninsula southwards is over the King Street bridge, which becomes a hopeless bottleneck under certain traffic conditions. The only alternative is to travel north along Military Road to West Beach, and that area cannot carry the increased volume of traffic.

This project is designed and planned to more than double the population on the north peninsula. There is a gap where the Glenelg sewage treatment works is located and then we find another 5 000 caravan berths at the West Beach Caravan Park. The whole area that was once a pleasant residential environment is about to be destroyed in the name of progress and development but, more importantly, in the name of the holy tourist dollar. One would not convince me in a million years that these things are for the betterment of local residents.

Local residents will be driven out and may as well pack their bags and go now. Nobody will give a damn about them. Yet, they have pioneered the area, paid the rates and put up with all the hassles in the past. All these people will receive for their efforts and endeavours is, 'We don't want you; you may as well go.' This advice has come from a couple of the local councillors. I have news for the developers! I like the idea of the boat marina. I saw Marina del Ray in Los Angeles and suggested in my study tour report that perhaps Glenelg should look at a similar proposal. Of course, in America these boating marinas are built by the Defence Department, which bears the huge capital cost. The area is then handed over to the local authority, which adds the fine

tuning of car parks and boating marina, and the authority receives the income. Perhaps the developers should have looked at Henley Beach, Semaphore or somewhere else. But, certainly the location they have picked is not ideal.

Whilst we want to get rid of the sand bar, I have been informed of certain difficulties over the years. The area selected has a soft clay bed. Limestone, which comes up through the clay and sand, is also present. When the locks were built many years ago across the Patawalonga mouth it was very difficult to obtain a hard solid foundation. At one stage one of the locks started to sink. A tremendous amount of initial construction work will be required to obtain solid foundations in the reclaimed area. This goes against all advice received over the years in relation to coast protection and proper coastal planning and design, and flies right in the face of two master coastal plans which have been released in the past 15 years and which cost taxpayers of this State tens of thousands of dollars.

I wonder just how much thought was given to the project, or whether someone is on an ego trip making a grandiose announcement that \$220 million will be spent some time in the next 20 years. This will cause heartaches for many people who have made the area their home and who cherish that location. It will cause difficulties and hardship. Of course, to oppose any project or development, one is anti-development, and is classed as a greenie, smellie or something else. That is not it at all. More common sense should have been adopted in the initial stages, because announcements such as this can be irresponsible if the project is not carried out. I cannot see this one getting off the ground.

If an announcement was made that work was to start today on a \$220 million project, and \$15 million was to be spent in the next 12 months, one knows what is going on and what will happen. One also knows that at least the groundwork has been done. But, to make a preliminary announcement such as this is meaningless. As I said, it will cause much hardship and anxiety for people who have made the area their home.

The Karidis plan for West Beach was announced at the opening of the new Karidis building. At the time the Premier opened the building the ink on the plans had not dried. He announced at that time a \$22 million Disneyland-type project

for West Beach. Although I was unable to attend that opening (having been invited), some months later I looked at the plans, which had been modified. I was informed that the project would cost about \$17 million, and that was dependent on 900 000 visitors or tourists coming through the development in the first 12 months. It was also certainly dependent on no other similar project being established within the metropolitan area.

If one is to build a Disneyland-type venture, one does it properly or not at all. One cannot get much for \$17 million. Anyone who has seen Disneyland in America would realise that the developers would be well advised to develop a mini-Disneyland, but one would certainly have to spend tens of millions of dollars to build anything like Disneyland. We simply do not have the population or ability in Adelaide at this stage to attract tourists to make such a project viable.

Simultaneously, another project has been announced. The Railway Signal Society, I believe, intends to build a railway museum to house railway signals and signal boxes almost in the same location at West Beach, and to run a steam train from that land near Tapleys Hill Road, across the West Beach Trust land (which was the old West Torrens council rubbish dump), along Military Road, across the Patawalonga, across the entrance to the King Street bridge (which would make it absolutely chaotic if and when the steam train did run), around Adelphi Terrace and on to Wrigley Reserve, the scratch 1 reserve used by lacrosse and other sporting bodies.

Glenelg is a central point and attracts much attention. I know that we would like to see publicity occasionally given to the Henley Beach area, as that would give that city an opportunity to develop. These huge plans are announced periodically, but they never come to fruition. So, it is not surprising if the residents become cynical. In the meantime, it is cruel to place local residents in a situation of not knowing what will happen; this naturally makes them feel anxious.

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

Motion carried.

At 4.35 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 28 August at 2 p.m.