HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 24 October 1984

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

PETITIONS: ANTI DISCRIMINATION BILL

Petitions signed by 86 residents of South Australia praying that the House delete the words 'sexuality, marital status and pregnancy' from the Anti Discrimination Bill, 1984, and provide for the recognition of the primacy of marriage and parenthood were presented by the Hons J.C. Bannon and E.R. Goldsworthy and Messrs Ashenden and Mathwin.

Petitions received.

PETITION: PORNOGRAPHY IN PRISONS

A petition signed by 29 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to withdraw pornographic material from prisons was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

A petition signed by 24 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ensure that the course in early childhood education at Magill campus of the South Australian College of Advanced Education be retained in its present form was presented by the Hon. G.J. Crafter.

Petition received.

PETITION: WEST BEACH GOLF COURSE

A petition signed by 261 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to oppose the closure of the existing Marineland par 3 golf course, West Beach, until a new course is completed was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: X RATED VIDEO TAPES

A petition signed by 133 residents of South Australia praying that the House ban X rated video films in South Australia was presented by the Hon. B.C. Eastick.

Petition received.

PETITION: SIMS BEQUEST FARM

A petition signed by 57 residents of South Australia praying that the House support the retention of the Sims bequest farm, Cleve, in its current form was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

PETITION: PORT WAKEFIELD RANGE

A petition signed by 67 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Federal Government to reject any extension of the Port Wakefield Proof and Experimental Range was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that written answers to a question without notice and a question asked during Estimates Committee B, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard.*

ACCOMMODATION GRADING

In reply to **Mr MAYES** (2 August).

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The matter of tourist accommodation grading has been referred to the South Australian Tourism Industry Council, which is presently undertaking research prior to putting a submission to the Australian Standing Committee on Tourism (ASCOT). The Council has appointed a subcommittee which will seek the opinions of similar councils throughout Australia and endeavour to put a national viewpoint. I have also sought the views of the South Australian Association of Regional Tourist Organisations who have indicated they will support any sensible system that evolves.

As for the Department of Tourism's view, the subject has frequently been canvassed. There is little doubt that a national uniform system of grading accommodation would help travellers. However, the real issue is whether, in view of the availability of the existing guide—'Australian National Tour Guide'—which is widely circulated to motorists in Australia, the production of a national guide by tourist organisations would be cost effective. The subcommittee of ASCOT will address this issue.

TRAVEL DEMAND

(Estimates Committee B)

In reply to **Mr OSWALD.**

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The latest projections of travel demand for Adelaide produced by the Department of Transport for the period 1981 to 1996 were based on the most recent (i.e. March 1982) median population projections prepared by the Department of Environment and Planning and the Interdepartmental Forecasting Committee adjusted to take account of the difference between the 1981 population estimates on which they were based and the 1981 estimated resident population figures produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics from the 1981 Census of Population and Housing. The population projections produced by the Department of Environment and Planning in 1982 incorporated the Government's preferred sequence of development for metropolitan Adelaide. In the south they assume that development will follow the sequence Hallett Cove/Happy Valley/Morphett Vale East/Seaford.

The Department of Environment and Planning and the Interdepartmental Forecasting Committee have not yet released revised population projections for metropolitan Adelaide. Work, however, is in progress on them and it is expected that they will be released in late 1984 or early 1985.

The population projections used by the Department of Transport for the local government areas of Noarlunga, Marion and Happy Valley (formerly urban Meadows) together with those produced by the Department of Environment and Planning in 1982 are shown below, as follows:

	Population of Local Govt Areas (persons)		
	Noarlunga	Marion	Happy Valley
Department of Environment and Planning*			
1981	59 350	70 150	19 900
1986	63 500	73 800	26 800
1991	76 400	77 150	31 300
Department of Transport			
1981**	62 630	68 780	20 490
1986	66 992	72 324	27 604
1991	80 602	75 607	32 239
1996	101 688	73 882	31 423

* Department of Environment and Planning, *Projections of Population, Household Formation and Dwelling Requirements 1980-2011 for Adelaide Statistical Division, Sectors and Local Government Areas*, Forecasting and Land Monitoring Unit, March 1982.

** Australian Bureau of Statistics, *Estimated Resident Population by Age and Sex, Local Government Areas, South Australia, 30 June 1981*, Cat. No. 3204.4, January 1984.

Because the Department of Transport produces projections of demand for each of the traffic zones shown on the attached map and not individual suburbs, it is not possible to provide separate figures for Trott Park, Sheidow Park, Reynella, Happy Valley, Morphett Vale East and Hallett Cove. The table below provides a rough breakdown of the population projections which were used.

Suburbs	Zone Nos	Population (persons)			
		1981	1986	1991	1996
1. Trott Park, Sheidow Park	231	2 833	4 995	6 641	7 759
2. Reynella/Hallett Cove/Morphett Vale East/Happy Valley	230, 232, 236, 237, 241, 243, 245	28 480	35 778	49 636	55 473

The growth in population in Reynella/Hallett Cove/Morphett Vale East/Happy Valley reflects the effects of the Government's preferred sequence of urban development in the south.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER: I have to advise the House that the honourable member for Elizabeth has this day tendered his resignation from the Public Accounts Committee.

QUESTION TIME

SHOP TRADING HOURS

Mr OLSEN: Will the Deputy Premier say whether the Government will grant extended shop trading hours during December and use this as a trial to gauge consumer demand for extended trading in South Australia? All recent opinion polls on this question suggest that there is strong consumer demand for extended trading hours. In a statement in the *News* of 20 July this year the Deputy Premier said that the Government would have to be convinced that there is a strong consumer demand before making any move to extend hours. However, the Government has done nothing further itself to gauge the extent of that demand.

There are also important groups within the community—particularly small business—which are opposed to extended hours and a trial period would allow the problems, as well as the demand, to be further assessed. The Deputy Premier has said that the new trading hours in New South Wales are not operating as smoothly as possible, suggesting that the New South Wales system, which phases out casual workers and imposes higher overhead costs on retailers by increasing penalty rates, is the only means of introducing extended hours.

Many people have complained that the Government has adopted a completely closed mind to the important question, taking instructions only from the union movement and ignoring the wish of consumers. The Deputy Premier was quoted this morning as saying that the Government could not agree to extended trading hours during December if the union will not support the move. I ask the Deputy Premier to reconsider that attitude and to allow extended trading during December as a means of more effectively gauging the demand as well as the problems involved in a permanent extension of shop trading hours.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I shall deal first with one of the comments made by the Leader in explanation of the question, although we all know that commenting is not in accordance with Standing Orders. However, let us deal with that in any case. The Leader said that I am quoted this morning as having made some statement like 'If the unions do not agree, then I will not.' I have made no statement this morning to the press in relation to that matter. I have at this stage—

Mr Olsen: Not last night?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I have not made any statement; it is as simple as that. A few weeks ago I made a statement, which I will come to in a moment, but I wanted to clear up that matter. If someone has made a statement on my behalf and I am not aware of it, I have to live with that, I suppose, but I have not made a statement at the moment.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: A Ministerial—

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I do not think so. I do not think that my Ministerial advisers or my Ministerial press secretary have made a statement without informing me of it. So, let us get the facts straight: I have not said that unless the union agrees I will not introduce Saturday trading. What I did say some weeks ago was that—

The Hon. D.C. Brown interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The ABC may have reported me as having said that, but I did not say that. I said a lot of other things to the ABC, but I did not say that. I have not been on radio (on voice); let me clear that up. What I said some weeks ago when this proposition was put to me was that if arrangements could be achieved similar to those made in New South Wales by way of agreements and the like and that the parties—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I will deal with small business, too, in a moment. If the parties could get some sort of agreement and came back I would make recommendations to the Government. That did not necessarily mean, either, of course—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: You didn't have to do anything then.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I would have had to change the legislation, of course, and that is why I am here: I am a legislator, after all.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: We will get to that in a moment, too.

Mr Olsen: We are going to get to a lot in a moment.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: We are: we will get to that in a moment, too.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Six interjections in three minutes is inviting a long answer.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: They will get a long answer. Let us put the facts on the table: that is what is happening

in New South Wales—and it is the only area that has moved at this moment. I went to New South Wales particularly to look at the situation there, and I say unequivocally that there are now too many shopping hours in New South Wales. That is as clear as crystal and there is evidence (in fact, I will put up a report to Cabinet on Monday) substantiating that fact. Thursday, Friday and Saturday afternoon are exaggerated shopping hours. Every business man to whom we have talked made that specific point. One of those will go—mark my words. I suggest that it is most likely to be Friday evening.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: That is the seventh interjection.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Premier has the floor.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Most of the business men to whom we spoke within the framework of the big shopping centres were having meetings the very weekend that I was there to determine whether or not Friday night shopping should remain; so, I forecast that Friday night shopping will not be on a continuous basis in New South Wales, but that Saturday afternoon trading may be successful. There were some people there. We looked at trade from 11.30 a.m. to 4 p.m. and there were not many people around after 2 p.m., either: let me make that point.

However, there were some until that stage. I am not convinced, irrespective of what polls have been taken in relation to consumer demand in this matter, because, rather than do nothing, I have had a departmental inquiry going on for some months. It is probably eight or 10 months since we commenced the departmental inquiry and the plain facts are that no-one can agree in South Australia to a consistent position. When the Leader makes the point that there is a groundswell of opinion amongst small business people and large business people who want extra trading hours on Saturday mornings, let me make very clear—

Mr Olsen: Talk about consumers.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: There is a split so wide that one can hardly imagine it will ever be retrieved in the RTA about this matter. In fact, on this very question that the Leader has asked, they had to have two meetings to come to a decision. The first voted against asking for an extension of full Saturday trading hours. The second reversed that vote—I will not tell the House the vote—by a very small number. As a consequence of that, a group of people came to me on Monday morning representing some 87 organisations that are totally opposed to trial periods of Saturday afternoon trading, or trading on a continuous or full-time basis; so, do not let us be of the opinion that there is a consistent thread about what people want in South Australia in relation to shop trading hours, because there is not.

The RTA itself does not have its game in order, and the same thing applies in New South Wales. There is a split in the Retail Traders Association in New South Wales over this issue and three sets of different circumstances apply in award conditions in New South Wales; so, this is not an easy question to answer. However, more importantly, and one of my very major concerns about this matter, is that I believe that consumers have a pretty good go in Adelaide. We are a very small city for a start. We have Thursday night trading in the suburbs and Friday nights in the city, and it is simple to interchange where one wants to shop. It is 20 minutes from almost anywhere—25 minutes at the maximum—if one wants to shop in the city and live at the bay or somewhere else; or vice versa—one can go out on Thursday night. For quite some time people in South Australia have had a fair amount of liberal shopping hours and have enjoyed and used them.

The second point that worries me greatly is that strong evidence exists in New South Wales that those people referred to as strip traders will go to the wall. Very powerful evidence exists to support that argument. In fact, they invited me to go along three strips, as I did, and one could not find a person buying from those who were trying to sell. Let us not believe that this is a simple matter. It is all right for the *News* to write editorials and say that we should not do this or that. Before I do anything about the matter, I want to be positive that the steps that I recommend to the Government will be the right ones for South Australia and South Australian people.

Finally, it is very interesting indeed that the Leader of the Opposition should raise this question, as I happen to have some correspondence signed by the Minister of Industrial Affairs and dated 25 November 1981. Addressed to Mr Thomas, of all people, State Manager of G.J. Coles, the letter states:

Dear Mr Thomas,

I refer to your letter of 3 September 1981 in which you sought permission to open certain of your stores to 9 p.m. on 7 September 1981 for a special family Christmas shopping night and your letter of 16 September 1981 in which you asked that all shops in South Australia be allowed to remain open until 6 p.m. on Saturdays 5, 12 and 19 December 1981 to cater for Christmas shopping.

Both of your applications were discussed at length with my Ministerial colleagues in Cabinet and, after giving full consideration to the applications, it was decided that neither can be granted.

Not only did we find that the then Minister of Industrial Affairs was refusing a Christmas shopping night as a special family arrangement—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Three Saturdays were involved—members were not listening.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: So what? What is the point?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Further, a press release of Thursday 5 November 1981 stated:

The State Government will not allow major stores—

'stores', plural—

to trade on Saturday afternoon during the weekend before Christmas.

I make the point that Mr Thomas was making the request on behalf of the RTA at that stage. We can get to more correspondence if members want to carry that on. The press release further stated:

Announcing Christmas shopping hours today, the Minister of Industrial Affairs, Mr Dean Brown, said the Government had refused a request from the Retail Traders Association—

I wonder how comfortably he is sitting now—

to allow trading until 6 p.m. on Saturday 19 December. Mr Brown said late night shopping until 9 p.m. would be permitted in both the central and metropolitan districts on Tuesday 22 December, Wednesday—

and so on, at 5.30 p.m., the usual time—

The Government had also decided that all shops would be closed on Saturday 26 December. This would ensure a four-day holiday. Mr Brown said that, as usual, 'exempt' shops would not be affected by the changed trading hours and would be able to open when they wished.

There was a clear indication by the then Government that it was not prepared to grant those four Saturdays. That is a fact of life. I should mention one other matter while I have the opportunity, namely, that I have still not received (although there has been paper talk) a request from the Retail Traders Association or anyone else to open those shops on a Saturday.

GEMSTONE INDUSTRY

Ms LENEHAN: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say what action he is taking to ensure that the South Australian gemstone industry is able to make the maximum possible contribution to the economic development of tourism in this State? The background to this question relates to representations made to me in respect of the development of the gemstone industry through mining, cutting, polishing and setting. It has been put to me that there are considerable potential economic benefits for South Australia through the generation of a wide range of employment in the gemstone industry and, in particular, in the opal industry. As 90 per cent of the world's supply of opal is mined in South Australia, the opal industry can play a major role in attracting visitors and tourists to South Australia.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I thank the honourable member for her question. I am pleased to indicate that a good deal is being done to ensure that South Australia's gemstone industry is able to increase the role that it already plays in the State's tourist industry. Honourable members will be aware that the Gemstone Industry Working Party, established by the previous Government (and I support that effort on its part), presented me with its findings late last year.

These recommendations included some specifically related to tourism and others which would have undoubted spin-off benefits in this area. The working party's suggestions included the establishment of a national gemstone collection based in Adelaide; the recognition of opal as Australia's national gemstone; an investigation into the establishment of a national gem trading centre in Adelaide; and Government assistance for an exhibition of gemstones to coincide with each Festival of Arts (one took place earlier this year). Another suggestion included Government adoption of South Australian opal and jade as promotable images; and increased promotion of the State's gem industry by the Department of Tourism.

Follow-up action is occurring on most of these recommendations, although I am sure that honourable members would agree that achieving some of them, such as a national centre, may take a little longer than it took to work up the idea.

Early in September the Government implemented another of the working party's recommendations—the formation of a Gemstone Industry Advisory Council. Membership of the council will comprise the three progress and miners' associations at Coober Pedy, Andamooka and Mintabie, the Australian Jewellers Association, the Australian Gem Industry Association, the Gemmological Association of Australia and the Department of State Development. I expect the first meeting of that group will take place before the end of the year.

Two of the council's specific terms of reference are relevant to the honourable member's question. These are to examine ways and means by which the local gemstone industry can encourage tourism in the State and to provide assistance and advice for gemstone exhibitions. The council is expected to meet six times a year and the Government expects it to become a source of much useful advice on all aspects of the gemstone industry. I noted that the honourable member's question referred to what we might collectively group as the processing of gemstones, a considerable amount of which currently takes place overseas rather than in Australia.

Finally, as the Premier mentioned recently in the House, a film entitled *Opal* has been produced for the Department of Mines and Energy by the South Australian Film Corporation. Some time ago, the Minister for Tourism and I had the pleasure of seeing that film at its original release. I can say that it maintains the very high standard in my opinion, which of course will be subjective, that we have come to expect from the South Australian Film Corporation. That film will create a greater awareness, both in Australia and overseas, of the size and importance of the State's opal industry.

STOREMEN AND PACKERS UNION BAN

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Deputy Premier ask the Storemen and Packers Union to lift bans at the Port Stanvac oil refinery on the processing of crude oil from the Mereenie fields in the Northern Territory? These bans have been imposed in a demarcation dispute between the Storemen and Packers Union and the Australian Workers Union. They have already led to stand-downs in the Northern Territory and amongst transport workers in South Australia. I have been advised that the bans are causing storage space at Port Stanvac to fill up and that, in the longer term, they may cause oil companies to reassess the reliability of South Australia as a processing centre for that oil from the Northern Territory. Because this dispute has serious implications, I ask the Minister whether he is prepared to take action to seek a lifting of these bans?

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The honourable member ought to grow up.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: She sounds like a little pussy cat. Now that the frivolity has ceased in regard to what I thought was a very serious question, I point out that in the first instance it always amazes me when I receive a question of this nature from the Opposition why the proposition has not been put to me by those people who are being affected. I have heard nothing about this dispute from either the unions or the employer organisations involved in it. The honourable member is fully aware that I interest myself in a lot of disputes in South Australia, and I can say quite honestly with some success, and, having the opportunity of settling—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The success rate is just a fact of life.

Mr Ashenden: Self praise is no recommendation.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I would urge employers that, if they are having difficulty, rather than having this matter raised in the public forum of Parliament, they ought to give me the opportunity of settling a dispute before it comes here, because there is nothing worse than having to try to fix up a dispute once it has become inflamed in the public arena. I will have this matter investigated: I shall get someone working on it this afternoon. I reiterate to employers or anyone else for that matter—unions, the Trades and Labor Council, or anyone else—that, rather than airing the problem in the public arena, with the great possibility of inflaming the situation, I would have appreciated the Deputy Leader's ringing me this morning, in which case I could have had something in train already.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: No, I had not been made aware of this. I am aware of most things going on in this State, but I have not been made aware of this and I am convinced that my office has not been made aware of it, either. However, I will certainly follow up this matter this afternoon.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I will certainly follow it up.

WHYALLA PROMOTION

Mr MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Local Government take up with the Whyalla council a matter concerning the attitude of a few councillors who seem to be pursuing a 'knock Whyalla' policy, when the State Government is currently in the process of sending to London the Deputy Mayor of Whyalla in an attempt to sell Whyalla to British industrialists? I would point out to the Minister that the ABC—

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The member for Whyalla's question appears to breach the guidelines that have been distributed to all members relating to matters under the control of local government bodies.

The SPEAKER: To avoid wasting time, I will think the matter through and call the member for Whyalla as soon as I have reached a conclusion.

TAFE COLLEGES

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Will the Minister of Education immediately provide additional funds to TAFE colleges to prevent cuts in programmes for physically and mentally disabled students, business studies and other vital courses, and the laying off of hourly paid lecturers? A crisis is developing in TAFE colleges because of funding cuts imposed by the Government. The following cuts have been notified to me by TAFE students and members of college councils: at Gilles Plains college no special education courses will be provided next year. This will include the deletion of five courses for physically and mentally handicapped students from Gepps Cross Special School, Hillcrest Hospital, Strathmont Centre, the Phoenix Society, and also one woodwork class for the Royal Society for the Blind. Also, next year the Gilles Plains college will no longer employ specialist lecturers in building certificate studies. There will be no first year intake into the meat inspection certificate course, no new intake into the dental hygiene course, and no introduction of new post trade classes or advanced certificate classes in dental technology.

In addition, at Gilles Plains, there have been devastating cuts in business studies courses which will involve the laying off of 10 lecturers within the next few weeks. At the Yorke Peninsula Technical and Further Education College cuts will have to be made in the small business management courses because of funding cuts at the Adelaide TAFE, which provides staffing. At Regency Park, the travel consultants course, which is of six months duration, has had to be deleted from the 1985 programme.

Courses in 1985 for the mentally and physically disabled will not be continued at Croydon Park TAFE, and the 1984 courses have been reduced by 50 per cent for term 3. At Tea Tree Gully TAFE, the following courses are being deleted next year because of funding cuts: adult literacy; business studies and women's studies. These cuts make a complete mockery of the Minister's promise at the last election that the ALP was committed to growth in the field of technical and further education, and they must be reviewed immediately to ensure that vital work in this area does not come to an end.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I find that question somewhat unusual coming at this time, since we have just finished the Estimates Committees proceedings, when we spent six hours discussing the Education Department and the Department of Technical and Further Education.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: We discussed on that occasion a number of aspects relating to the TAFE budget which resulted from a question from my colleague the member for Elizabeth, who asked about access courses at the Elizabeth Community College. In other words, the issue of concern about access courses had already been flagged in this House. I expected that we would have some considerable questioning about this matter in the Estimates Committee on that day, but that turned out not to be the case.

Let us now look at the situation with regard to global TAFE funding in South Australia under this State Government since its election in November 1982. Let us first of all recall that during the period of the former Government 1979 to 1982 there was a decline in real State effort for TAFE funding under the former Government.

The Hon. H. Allison: That's not true.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Mount Gambier says, 'That's not true.' I suppose he challenges the comments of the Commissioners of the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission in that the points they were making were not valid. If that is the point that the honourable member wants to make, I suggest that he take up that issue separately with them. However, it is not backed up by the advice of the Department, nor is it backed up by correspondence that exists in the files of the Government. In the 1983-84 and 1984-85 Budgets, the maintenance of or increase in State effort has been the case. Indeed, in the 1984-85 Budget there has been a 1 per cent increase in real terms in the TAFE budget.

Let us get to one problem that still results from that, and I acknowledge that a problem does result from it. I want to challenge the issue by saying that there has not been a reduction in TAFE expenditure in real terms by this State Government in its current Budget. However, the problem is this: we certainly have had a situation where there has been an upturn in the economy and an increased demand for apprenticeships. That is good news: there has been an upturn in demands for apprenticeships.

We also have a situation where other courses are continuing according to pre-set planned levels in the 1983-84, 1982-83 and 1981-82 Budgets. Unless we curtail courses in mid stream, it is natural to assume that those courses will be given the opportunity to continue. That therefore results in one problem that has taken place, and that is, that, if there is a sudden increase in one stream, let us say stream 3 courses, the resources have to be found within the TAFE budget, even with an increase in real terms.

The increase in stream 3 activities has put pressure on other areas of TAFE activities. There has been a pressure on prevocational activities. There has also been a pressure on stream 5 access courses. I am very concerned about this issue, as I indicated in my answer to a question earlier by the member for Elizabeth. Indeed, as each issue has been drawn to my attention the issues have been examined as closely as possible to determine whether the decisions being made by colleges are the most appropriate decisions. One example is a college which has been raised by way of a question in this House and which has proposed at the outset to reduce by 50 per cent its adult literacy offerings under stream 5.

That was examined by the Department and by myself as Minister. The effect for 1985 now is that there will not be a 50 per cent cut in that programme, but indeed it will be at about the same level as it was in 1984. In regard to that access education area, globally it will be about the same as it was in 1984. Nevertheless, there is a more substantive question involved: as changes in demand occur across stream levels of TAFE, it is necessary to ensure that certain areas do not suffer more than others.

It has always been the case that stream 5 has tended to be the area that has had the pressure put upon it with any budgetary changes or effects of changes in demand. I have referred to the South Australian Council on Technical and Further Education (SACOTAFE), under the Chairmanship of Tom Morris, a request for a study be presented to me in the first part of next year—so that it will be taken into account in the 1985-86 Budget—on ways of ensuring that the financial instruments used by the Department in terms of allocating its resources between colleges will be equitably borne across the three principal areas of TAFE activity, be they streams 1-4 (vocational and professional training), stream 5 (access education) or stream 6 (enrichment education).

So that if there does have to be any budgetary reallocation within the Department, it will be shared across those three equal priority areas of the Department of Technical and Further Education. That should then give us some permanent understanding of how resource allocation can take place in the Department of Technical and Further Education so that the situation that existed not only in this Budget but in previous Budgets under the former Government likewise would not have the initial effects it has had.

Each particular area raised by the honourable member will certainly be investigated. As I mentioned, an earlier example raised in this House involving adult literacy was investigated and resulted in some change-around. We will endeavour to do the best we can within the resources available.

I conclude on two critical points relating to this issue: in 1984-85 the TAFE budget in real terms (not money terms) is 1 per cent up on last year. I also point out that under the previous Government they were being criticised by CTEC for reduction of staff effort. The other point is that I regard it as critically important that SACOTAFE should provide both the Department and myself with advice on how the allocation of resources between the three equal priority areas of TAFE equally benefit or equally have to take account of budgetary circumstances in that Department.

WHYALLA PROMOTION

Mr MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Local Government ask the Whyalla City Council to support the State Government move and send the Deputy Mayor of Whyalla to London to sell Whyalla as an industrial base to British industrialists? I point out to the Minister that the ABC saw fit last evening to interview two Whyalla councillors on *Nationwide,* I suspect simply for a biased and damaging reason, so far as Whyalla is concerned. As I am concerned to see that the State Government is doing all in its power to assist and sell Whyalla, I ask the Minister to point out to the Whyalla council that it has its role to play in that selling programme.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I would be only too happy to ask the Whyalla City Council to support the decision of the State Government to send a representative from Whyalla—that is, the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Hill—to three business migration seminars in Europe being arranged by the Commonwealth Government. South Australia's participation in that programme will include a representative from Whyalla. That is one constructive way that this Government can assist Whyalla in achieving the expanded industrial economic base that it is looking for so desperately.

Having had the opportunity to see a significant part of last night's ABC programme on Whyalla, I really thought that it was quite a negative report, because I was in Whyalla on Sunday to open the International Food and Wine Fair for 1984, which was attended by 16 000 people. That showed a quite surprising resilience and confidence in Whyalla. A considerable community spirit can be tapped in Whyalla by people who want to go there and establish an industry, but negative reporting on the ABC or anywhere else will discourage people from going to Whyalla. Some very important points were made last night on the ABC programme.

One was the difficulty for school leavers in obtaining any sort of employment in Whyalla and what was seen as a lack of facility for young people in regard to entertainment. Those points are valid and need to be addressed, of course, particularly regarding employment. However, what I noticed (and I wonder whether this was the reason why the honourable member opposite took a point of order, so that the question could not be asked) was that the remarks of the so-called independent Labor candidate for Whyalla were given fairly large coverage on the ABC, whereas the local member's views were not sought at all.

The views of the Mayor of Whyalla were not asked for at all, and no view was put on the ABC last night which challenged the negativism that came through. I do not know that the ABC actually reflected all the comments made by the people who featured on that programme. They may have been more positive in some of the comments they made which did not suit the general picture that the ABC was putting over. However, I believe that the Whyalla City Council supports the Government's initiatives. I believe also that the Whyalla City Council has endorsed the Government in its support for the clothing factory and the Stony Point development, a development that should be the base for further industrial expansion in the Whyalla area.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: A grubby little programme.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition may describe it as a grubby little programme: that is his view if he wishes. I am not describing it in that way, but he is entitled to his own view on what the ABC shows. All I am saying is that, as a member who used to represent part of Whyalla, I feel that there is a very positive attitude in Whyalla that can be tapped into. I think that we should be looking at that aspect and promoting it, while at the same time not rejecting or neglecting the fact that there is a very serious unemployment problem in Whyalla which falls very largely on young people whom we all share a responsibility to assist. However, I felt that a rather one-sided viewpoint was put forward last night. I will be asking the Whyalla City Council to support the State Government in its efforts, and I am sure that that support will be forthcoming.

PREVOCATIONAL TRAVEL CONSULTANTS COURSE

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: What action has the Minister of Tourism taken to prevent the plans of the Department of Technical and Further Education to scrap the six month prevocational travel consultants course at the Regency Park College of TAFE next year? The prevocational travel consultants course at Regency Park was developed in consultation with the travel and tourism industries to provide much needed broadly based training for young people entering the industry. The course develops skills in customer contact, product knowledge, basic foreign languages, airline fare calculation, and reservation and booking skills.

There is a high level of employment following graduation and, unlike many prevocational courses, a high level of female participation. The tourism and travel industries regard this course as an essential component in the industry's efforts to lift the level of professionalism, especially with the approach of the Jubilee 150 and bicentennial years,

when large numbers of international visitors will come to this State. In view of the Government's expressed commitment to increase professionalism in the tourism industry, it is a tragedy that the Minister has allowed this situation to occur.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Does the honourable member want to ask me a question or is he quite happy to leave it to the member for Coles?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am certainly aware of the decision that has been made and, as members opposite would be pleased to report, discussions are ongoing between the Minister and me so that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: —a resolution to this matter can be found. I take the point that the honourable member makes about the importance of developing expertise in the tourism industry. We certainly need to upgrade the skills, and one way to do that within the industry is to have tertiary based courses available for tourism in South Australia. Nobody denies that: the Minister of Education, the Government and I as Minister of Tourism certainly do not deny that. It is relevant to make the point that the new Adelaide TAFE college that will be coming on stream next year will have, as a major part of its programme, tourism based studies.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I wonder if they'll congratulate us then.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am sure that when that happens congratulations will certainly be flowing from the shadow Minister, although I am not sure whether her colleagues will join in these congratulations. I am in the process of discussing this matter with my colleague and the Department and, hopefully, we will be able to resolve the matter of adequate forces for tourism based courses in South Australia.

AMDEL

Mr GREGORY: Given AMDEL's improved financial performance and its broadening horizons in new areas, including occupational health monitoring, agriculture, and food processing, as well as its recent penetration into supplying services to the oil and gas industry, is the Government considering any means of facilitating the organisation's expansion?

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Proposals are currently being developed to restructure AMDEL into an independent company. This could have a number of advantages. I am glad to see that the honourable member, who is normally somewhat shielded from public view by the pillar, is taking an interest in the reply to the question. If proposals being developed were to proceed, it would enable the use of equity funding to restructure the balance sheet and provide funds for growth of AMDEL. AMDEL's experience indicates that a company structure would improve its image in the markets which it serves and would assist in presenting it as a national client-oriented organisation.

The restructuring contemplated would provide consideration in the form of a suitable shareholding arrangement which would recognise the contributions of AMDEL's present contributors or sponsors, but at the same time provide an injection of new capital and the opportunity for involvement of other major client groups. I stress that I will advise the House when more detailed proposals are available (as this is a general outline of the possible restructure) and the Government has had an opportunity to evaluate more specific proposals.

More importantly, I understand that the management of AMDEL will advise employees and appropriate unions this afternoon that such proposals are being considered. Accompanying any restructuring will be recognition of the rights and privileges of AMDEL's employees. The proposals should be seen as offering considerable opportunities in terms of professional satisfaction and career advancement.

The proposals will not prejudice the current ability of AMDEL to continue providing support services to the South Australian Government; in particular, AMDEL will continue to act as the analytical and mineralogical laboratory for the Department of Mines and Energy. Such a company structure would be a further step in the development of AMDEL, which had its genesis in the Research and Development Branch of the Department of Mines, and would certainly allow it to achieve its full potential as a major research, development and consulting organisation based in South Australia, but operating nationally.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE HOUSING AUTHORITY

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Education now acknowledge that he misled the Estimates Committee when he said that the Government had decided to establish a Government Employee Housing Authority? The Minister told the Estimates Committee that the Government had decided to establish a Government Employee Housing Authority.

However, the Minister of Housing and Construction at his Estimates Committee and again yesterday told the House that no such decision had been made and that the whole matter had been referred to a committee for consideration and, further, that that committee had not yet reported. I therefore ask the Minister to resolve this conflict in the interest of those Government employees who are concerned about rising rents as a result of this move.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: First of all, I take the opportunity to inform the House of something that follows on from my colleague's answer yesterday. In celebration of his twentieth anniversary of his time in Australia, I paid the Cabcharge fare home last night, and I look forward to repeating it on his fortieth anniversary.

The honourable member's question needs one point of clarification following the explanation given by the honourable member. At the end of his explanation the honourable member said something about 'avoiding rent increases', or some such thing. The honourable member ought to know the policy which was not varied by the previous Government but which has been in place for some years now, and that is that rent for Government employee housing should be 80 per cent of the equivalent Housing Trust rental for such houses. The rent increases that have been applied under this Government have been to achieve that policy level.

The Teacher Housing Authority rent increases that applied in 1983-84 of about 19 per cent maximum (subject to dollar rounding) and 16.8 per cent (subject to dollar rounding) this year were to achieve that policy. As a result of that, a personal perusal of the rents actually being charged for next year by the THA reveals that the majority of THA houses in 1984 will not be paying rent increases as high as the 16.8 per cent, because a number have already achieved the policy rent figure. So, the statement made at the end of the honourable member's question is irrelevant to the question at hand. What has happened to the Government's policy on the Government Employee Housing Authority?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Before the last election I put in my policy as one of the commitments I made—and the member for Torrens is well aware of this—that we would investigate the concept of having a Government Employee Housing Authority—that we would do more with it than did my predecessor, who had that report sitting on his desk for 18 months without taking any action at all. We established a committee to investigate whether or not such an authority should be established. That matter has now been considered by Cabinet and Cabinet approved the principle—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: —of the establishment of a Government Employee Housing Authority.

Mr Meier: Someone is wrong.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Goyder makes a point that someone is wrong—I wish he would listen because this now comes to the crux of the matter and it indicates that there is no disagreement between the Minister of Housing and Construction and me: to accept in principle one point, namely, the principle of the establishment of a Government Employee Housing Authority is quite different from the actual establishment of such an authority. One has to go through a number of other areas first; one is the practics of the issue—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: —namely, what one will do with regard to the actual administration of such an authority.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The other point is what one would do with regard to the rent policies to be adopted by such an authority. Cabinet has established a committee to report to it on the practics of how such a Government Employee Housing Authority would actually operate, and it is that report to which my colleague referred in his Committee. It is also that report on which we are waiting so that we can then determine the actual form that the Government Employee Housing Authority, which we have approved, will take when established. The policy matter will be determined by Cabinet.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM

Mr PETERSON: Will the Minister of Tourism refute the statements printed in a Brisbane newspaper maligning South Australia as a tourist destination? The column 'Two a.m.' in today's *Advertiser* states:

> In a letter to the editor of the *Courier Mail* newspaper published in Brisbane on 5 October, R. Conrads, of Everton Park, writes from Adelaide 'to inform readers of an unpleasant experience they should try to avoid—a visit to Adelaide'.

Mr Conrads writes:

> This city [Adelaide] is bitterly cold, rains all the time and is quite dirty. South Australia itself is flat, barren and treeless. It appears that when the State was first settled it was cleared of all its natural vegetation.

The next comment is the part that really hurts, namely:

> One part of Adelaide is called Port Adelaide; we were told it rivals Constitutional Dock in Hobart, but it most certainly does not. The port area of Adelaide is so dirty and run down it is beyond description—

that hurts—

> and all the time they keep spouting a motto called SA Great. Well, anyway, we have had enough and we will never return.

We are often told in this House, and I believe it, that tourism is one of the great futures for South Australia. I believe, as I am sure most members of this House do, that intrastate tourism is as important as any other aspect of tourism. Reports such as the one to which I referred cannot do anything other than harm our image on an Australia-wide basis. Will the Minister comment on this matter?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is debating the matter.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The article to which the honourable member referred was drawn to my attention. Whilst I am not chauvinistic about South Australia in its attitude towards other States, I am prepared to listen to criticisms and certainly to take action where people who have come to South Australia have been unhappy with their holiday experience. I regret any such instances of that nature that are brought to my attention, but in those circumstances I try to do what I can, although one cannot do too much after a holiday experience is over.

The article to which the honourable member referred draws a lot of conclusions with which I certainly could not agree, and, as the persons concerned come from Brisbane, I think some of the comments that were made are quite outrageous. First, I do not think any of us could be responsible for its being cold and raining while someone is visiting Adelaide. That would be an unusual experience in Adelaide, I might say, because the proportion of days of sunshine a year compared to that in other cities is such that one is more likely to get a sunny day while holidaying in Adelaide than in any other Australian capital city. Further, for a Queenslander to comment on how wet it is in Adelaide is I think a bit strange, having regard to Queensland's climate. Further, for someone who comes from Brisbane, I imagine, to say that Adelaide is a dirty city is going beyond the pale.

Last week we had a visit from the Mayor of Austin in Texas who said that one of the most remarkable things about Adelaide was that it is one of the cleanest cities that he has ever seen anywhere in the world—and he is a widely travelled person. He said that Adelaide was quite remarkable in that respect and that it indicated to him the great pride that the citizens of Adelaide had in their city—and that includes Adelaide and its environs. He made a great point of that. Port Adelaide is a very important part of Adelaide, and that location is included in that overall image of cleanliness and pride.

At the moment a major development programme is being undertaken in Port Adelaide which is significant in terms of any major programme being undertaken in Australia, and will be a credit not only to Adelaide and South Australia but also to Australia. I would encourage Queenslanders to reject the sort of singular criticisms of South Australia, as referred to, and would encourage them to come down and have a look at South Australia for themselves, in which case they would see that it is not a flat treeless plain. I really do not know whether that chap actually got to South Australia at all. He might have been waylaid somewhere! His capacity to misunderstand is matched only by that of the Premier of Queensland—I would not be surprised to read that he had made comments similar to those referred to.

I shall certainly take up the matter with the *Courier Mail* in order to point out to Queenslanders who may have been misled by such an ill-informed article that the truth is somewhat different, that they should come to Adelaide and that we can guarantee them a very enjoyable experience about which they will want to go back and boast to their friends and families. South Australian tourism must continue to grow and thus be one of the growth industries of which we can be proud.

TOW TRUCK ROSTER SCHEME

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Will the Minister of Transport suspend the operation of the accident towing roster scheme for at least three months to allow the operation to be replanned after close consultation with the towing industry? I have received by telephone or letter many criticisms concerning the operation of the accident towing system which can be summarised in two examples. First, the average number of tows per roster is about half of what was estimated by the Government. Therefore, some companies have lost more than 80 per cent of their business. Secondly, each company must maintain at least two tow trucks and employ four people on a continuous roster. However, one company received only three tows in the first week of the system, and that means that that one company, employing those four people, had a total income of about $120 in that week, and from that it had to pay four people and run the business.

A third criticism has been raised about the considerable delays occurring in getting tow trucks to accident scenes. Two different people who have been involved in accidents have told me about their recent experiences. First, an accident occurred at Wingfield at 6.30 a.m. on 16 October. One owner walked 2 km to the nearest telephone to call for a tow truck. That person could not remember his vehicle's registration number and the policeman answering the telephone call told him to go back, record his number and to return and report his number so that he could get a tow truck. He walked 2 km back to his car, then walked the 2 km back to the phone, telephoned again and gave his number to the answering service. At that stage the man, who was by then late for work, obviously, left by taxi for Port Adelaide, where he owned a business and where his staff were waiting to be let into the business. The tow truck had to go to Port Adelaide to get the towing authority signed. The tow truck arrived at the accident scene at 9 a.m., after having been called at 6.30, 2½ hours after the accident occurred. When the tow truck operator got to the accident scene, he found an elderly man who the previous week had been in hospital. He was still at the accident scene with the other car waiting for a tow truck to come to that car. His tow arrived about 2¾ hours after the accident had occurred.

The next case concerns an 18 year old lad who last Wednesday was driving a car along Goodwood Road when a major accident occurred at the intersection of Goodwood Road and Springbank Road at 7.40 a.m. One vehicle was a complete write-off and it blocked all but one traffic lane until it was towed away. Tow trucks were called within five minutes of the accident but the first truck arrived 50 minutes later and the second truck 55 to 60 minutes after the accident. Peak hour morning traffic on these major arterial roads was banked up for over an hour as a result of that delay.

I could quote plenty of other cases to the Minister, but I will not take up the time of the House. I stress that these are not isolated criticisms; I have a stack that have been brought to my attention. I point out to the Minister that the accident towing roster system is now in an absolute shambles and needs to be replanned and withdrawn while it is being replanned.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I am fully aware of the criticisms that have been made about the towing roster system.

Mr Ashenden: Are you going to do something about it?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: If the honourable member would like to settle down for a few minutes, he will hear. We fully expected some teething problems, and many of the problems that have arisen have been ironed out.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: These are basic fundamental problems.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I have heard the criticisms about delays, and I am particularly unhappy about that. However, work is being done to try to rectify that situation. I am advised by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles that at the moment all accidents are being attended to within 10 to 12 minutes. We are merely asking for this legislation to be given an opportunity to operate and to settle down. The legislation is fully supported by the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce, and a similar scheme has been operating successfully in Victoria for two years.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: That's not true.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: It is true. I do not see any reason to delay the tow truck roster system at all. The matters involved have been under debate since about 1977 and the Act which gives legal status to the roster system was passed during the period of the last Government in 1981. This Government proclaimed the Act in March to be in force from 2 September this year. At that time it placed before the House a set of regulations which basically had been drawn up during the period of the previous Government. Since that time modifications to the regulations have been made but, rather than make them more stringent and onerous on the tow truck industry, they have satisfied complaints from the industry, and the regulations are now in force.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: And the industry is complaining.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The industry might very well be complaining, but there is continual liaison between the tow truck inspectorate, the Registrar of Motor Vehicles and the industry. The Registrar has allowed a number of exemptions for periods up to six months to allow members of the industry to overcome some of the short-term problems that are caused by these regulations. I am sure that most problems will be adequately catered for by the discretion allowed by the Registrar, and the problems of a structural nature will be referred to an industry based review committee, which I am sure will be able to solve the problems that are occurring.

The complaints about and the furious opposition to the roster scheme have come from a small section of the industry which from the outset has been totally opposed to the introduction of the new roster system. I have met them from time to time, and they made it quite clear that they are determined not to see this legislation work. They want the regulations thrown out the window, and they will not be satisfied until that is done. Despite the protest through the rallies that they have conducted, I am convinced that that group represents a majority of companies within the industry; and the majority of companies in the industry supports the tow truck roster scheme and the legislation introduced by the former Government in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

TAXATION

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): I move:

That this House urge the Federal Government to implement a research programme to measure the economic impacts of Commonwealth and State taxation and charges.

I am reminded of the statement of Winston Churchill that, broadly speaking, human beings may be divided into three categories: those who are killed to death; those who are worried to death; and those who are bored to death. Unfortunately, he forgot about the fourth category: those who are taxed to death. Today, I wish to put forward this proposition in all sincerity, because I believe that a review of the whole system of taxation is long overdue.

I do not deny the need for taxation: we need it and Governments need it, but it must be the most efficient and effective means of collecting taxation that minimises the externalities and maximises the benefits. It is relatively simple to find out what is happening in Australia today as far as taxation is concerned. For example, I note that whilst the gross domestic product (in current dollar terms) has grown from $102.57 billion in 1978-79 to $163.86 billion in 1982-83—a rise of 59.8 per cent—over the same period taxation has increased by some 75 per cent. It is no secret that, in most areas, since the Second World War there has been a continual escalation in taxation.

Importantly, in the past four years, we have seen an increase in the proportion of tax from 28.9 per cent of gross domestic product to 31.6 per cent. That is an increase of almost 3 per cent in taxation as a proportion of the gross domestic product. If we extrapolated that on the basis of what may happen over the next 60 years, we would find that the total tax take would then be some 86 per cent of the gross domestic product. That means that everything we produced in this country would be in the hands of the Government. That concerns me greatly because there is not only the problem of the amount taken from the Australian constituency but the way in which it is taken. A review of this situation is long overdue. I seek leave to have a purely statistical table showing gross domestic product inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Gross Domestic Product and Taxation 1978-79—1982-83

	Gross Domestic Product $ billion	Commonwealth, State and Local Taxation $ billion	Per cent
1978-79	102.57	29.62	28.9
1979-80	115.67	34.47	29.8
1980-81	131.87	40.65	30.8
1981-82	149.65	47.28	31.6
1982-83	163.86	51.86	31.6
Growth 1978-79—1982-83	59.8%	75.1%	

Mr BAKER: On the question of what happens to taxation and gross domestic product when one has an increase in proportion, the fundamental problem is that the more taxation that is taken of the country's efforts as measured by GDP the lower is the incentive to produce and the process of production is stifled. I wish to develop that argument. I note that here in South Australia taxes have increased by some 327 per cent over the past 10 years, whilst the consumer price index has increased at a rate of only 60 per cent of that figure. We do not have any domestic products that we can compare for the State, but I am sure that if we did that would show that production that has come from this State has not grown at the same rate as taxation.

I will refresh members' memories in relation to State taxation: in 1982-83 it represented $411 per head, in 1983-84 it was $493, and it is estimated at $569 for 1984-85. Under the Labor Administration there will have been a 38 per cent increase per capita by the end of this financial year. I will now develop two areas: one is the proposition of the relationship of taxation and gross domestic product; the other is the specific role of Governments in the taxation process.

One of the reasons I have brought this matter forward is that over a number of years we have seen gross mistakes made by the Federal Government in levying taxes. For example, we had the disastrous brandy excise tax during the mid-1970s which decimated the brandy producing industry, particularly in South Australia. The bureaucrats in Canberra had somehow determined that a very large increase in excise should be placed on brandy. Finally, 40 per cent of the industry was lost, and there was a substantial loss of employment.

In fact, the Government revenue that finally resulted from this increase in excise was lower than the revenue collected previously under the old excise. Through ignorance and negligence in Canberra, one of our local industries was effectively nearly destroyed. The Government did the same thing again with our fortified wine, but fortunately that decision was reversed. It imposed an excise on fortified wine at the time of distilling and expected producers to bear that cost over the maturation period. As most people would understand, whilst the tax was paid in one year it could be up to seven years before that cost could be recovered.

I am also reminded of tyre retreading, a matter that was brought to my attention. One of my constituents runs a tyre retreading business. The Federal Government, in its wisdom, decided to impose a 25 per cent sales tax on tyre retreads. That meant that the dealer was required (within 30 days) to forward the taxation on to the Commissioner. Unfortunately, what was little understood by the bureaucrats in Canberra was that in this industry there was a 45 day credit line that was always utilised, so not only was there this tax which had never been paid before and which was 25 per cent of sales (which is quite massive, if people think about turnover in the industry) but people had to pay that money prior to receiving a return or prior to getting money for their sales.

I understand that at least two firms in South Australia could not pay that taxation, and one of them went bankrupt. I am pleased to report to the House that the decision made in the courts is that sales tax cannot be imposed on secondhand goods.

Mr Evans: They are still doing it; they refuse to abide by the court decision.

Mr BAKER: The member for Fisher says that the Taxation Department is still imposing the tax. It appears that it does not even abide by the rules of the court. I am hopeful that the decision will be sorted out very quickly. The point is that in each case a tax has been imposed. There has been significant loss to the industry in that the process under which the tax has been imposed ignores the impact that is likely to occur. I am sure that, if people in Canberra who help make decisions understood some simple lessons of supply, demand and elasticities of the demand, none of these taxes would have been imposed in the way they were.

As I have said, I am not opposed to taxation; but it should be efficient and equitable. At the moment there is considerable debate about various forms of taxation that should be adopted by Federal Governments. I have spent much time in this House expounding the proposition that taxes cost jobs. The important relationship is that, if that taxation creates greater benefits than the jobs lost in the community, much will have been gained from it. That is a simple proposition, but of course it is difficult in monetary terms to reach that fine balance. However, if people want to review our taxation system they will find that it is regressive in many areas.

Honourable members would have noted that, since the State Labor Government came to power on 6 November 1982, 149 State taxes and charges have been increased: a truly memorable effort! It is important that all Governments understand that taxation must be a last resort. It must be used wisely and effectively. In the armoury of taxation methods at the disposal of the State Government we have land tax, stamp duties, business franchises, including cigarettes, liquor and oil, pay-roll tax, motor vehicle charges,

statutory corporations charges, and the various regulatory charges and fees by various organisations.

Most of the charges in our State taxation armoury are not product specific, as are many of the Federal charges. They do not directly impact on the consumption of a particular product, but they impact on the health of the State. I spent some time when I was talking about housing considering the escalation in stamp duties collected by the Government directly as a result of the increase in the sale and price of housing, and the problems that that caused to the home buyer, particularly those on lower incomes, was quite significant. It is my belief that some restructuring of the level of stamp duties should have been undertaken to take into account the vagaries of the market.

We are now in the process, because of the boom in residential and commercial values, of having an increased revenue flow to the Government in the form of land tax. Again, land tax is a taxation that has a drag effect on business. It is quite simple to show that a business that pays $1 000 or $ 2 000 in land tax has not that available money to invest, employ staff, or whatever. The Premier himself has mentioned the fact that pay-roll tax is a regressive tax: it is a tax on jobs. That view is shared by both sides of the House, I am pleased to say. However, the problem, of course, is that it is a very significant part of the taxation collections in this State. Without that form of revenue the State budgetary situation would be beyond the critical point. We are all hopeful that at some stage we can do away with pay-roll tax because of its very negative effect.

Questions about the taxation of statutory corporations and the moneys that flow to the Government from the Electricity Trust of South Australia and the South Australian Gas Company have been brought into focus recently because of the increased prices of electricity and gas. Again, the Government has been quite happy to receive this revenue. It has received some windfall from these areas, but it has been at the cost of the State. Jobs have been lost. Our competitive position *vis-a-vis* the rest of Australia has deteriorated; so, by the very process of taxation, the very process of taking money in the form of those charges that are imposed by the State Government, we are reducing the opportunities available to South Australians and indeed the prosperity of South Australia.

The principle I now wish to expound is that we have these various forms of taxation, but each of them should be put under the microscope to determine whether in fact there are more equitable ways of raising the same amount of revenue. In the case of the Liberal Opposition, of course, we would look towards raising less revenue, but I think that most members on both sides of the House can agree with the general proposition that some real reforms are required in the taxation area.

I have put forward a list of criteria that I think would be useful in looking at the impacts of taxation, whether it be State, Commonwealth or local. I have set down six criteria which should be analysed and on which values should be placed. The first and most important is the impact on employment. What is the change in demand for domestically produced goods and services as a result of this taxation? The second is the cost of collection. We know, for example, that taxes such as the financial institutions duty are very cost effective in terms of the State Government's revenue because it receives a cheque through the post or down the line from the various financial institutions, but it is a costly mechanism for the financial institutions themselves which means that the return to people placing their moneys with them is reduced; so, the cost of collection then falls back on the consumer. Quite often one will find that the cost of collection is almost equal to the value of the revenue raised.

The third criterion is sectional disparities. Does the burden fall more heavily on those with a reduced capacity to pay? I think that it is fair to say that, whatever taxation system we have in this country, it should be fair to one and all. It should not place greater burdens on those sections of the community which have a reduced capacity to pay. My fourth criterion is the inflationary impact. My fifth criterion is compatibility with other forms of taxation and my sixth is disincentive to produce or earn. I believe that if all forms of taxation that are introduced went through that filter and we seriously assessed them for the six criteria I have laid down we would then get back to what I believe is honest Government. We could clearly show every time a taxation is increased in this country what the job loss will be. We would then have Governments having to satisfy the electorate that that job loss would be more than offset by the benefits that will be reaped from the way the money earned would be deployed. I believe that it is essential that we do start to get some honesty in this area because we will continue to drift along in the same fashion as we have, particularly over the past 10 to 15 years, and continue to retard the growth of Australia.

I have outlined particular areas where product taxes have an impact. I would now like to consider the Commonwealth's options for taxation and perhaps refer to some of the criteria that I have set down as far as taxation is concerned. Under the armoury available to the Commonwealth, of course, it has the ability to get revenue through the system of excise, tariffs and import duties, income tax, which is the most important form, company taxation and sales taxes.

I will go back to the points I mentioned earlier about specific product taxes and specifically address sales tax. In the case of the brandy excise, where the Federal Government decimated the industry, it would never have been introduced if it had been put through the criteria because the first criterion would have said that the impact upon employment would be significant. If the wine tax went through the criteria it would have been found to have a sectional impact, but would also be incompatible with the decrease in excise on wine imports thereby making our home product more expensive on the market. If I look at the current restructured tax schedules, under the sixth criterion of incentive or disincentive, it is wrong fundamentally that 60c should be imposed on all incomes over $37 000. If each of the criteria is strictly adhered to, we would then get to a situation where each form of taxation would have to be categorised and the impact would have to be known.

I assure members that mechanisms are available today to do just that. We know, for example, that the IAC reports continually on the question of industry assistance and takes into account tariff barriers. Many of the reports are not proceeded with because of political stances. Nevertheless, it is an on-going review body and is there to look at the cost effectiveness of the industries that require assistance. It is also there to review the schedule of tariffs which protect the industries concerned. I believe the same principle has to be implemented in the taxation field.

The principal reason for my continually raising this question is that fundamentally taxes cost jobs. I compare it to Newton's third law of motion which says that action and reaction are equal and opposite. If we put up taxation we decrease jobs. That can be clearly shown by examples that I have quoted where South Australians have been disadvantaged through decisions made by ignorant beaurocrats in Canberra. It can be clearly shown that, on the State sphere, we are becoming less competitive because of State taxation and increases recently applied in South Australia.

My basic premise is that, if everyone understands the negative impacts of taxation first, we can get the right structure to our taxation and the right package of taxation.

That means that once we have that right package of taxation we will use far more carefully those funds that taxpayers pay, because Governments will know that, by increasing taxation, they will have lost maybe 10 or 100 jobs. Governments must know that their responsibility is to ensure that the 100 jobs lost are somehow put back into the system, either through changes in the incentive schemes or through employment initiatives. The impact of taxation should never be misunderstood.

Currently in the Federal sphere we have had a fairly interesting debate on the merits of value added taxation, taxation splitting in the family, capital gains tax, death duties, and gift duties. I contend that, before any politician gets his hands on the Treasury and makes decisions on these matters, that they should go through the six criteria I have laid down and, in fact, we should do a review of all other forms of taxation that exist at the same time. I have suggested in this motion that the most appropriate place for taxation review is in Canberra, because some of the major taxation measures come from the Canberra sphere and are the ones that most fundamentally affect Australia's prosperity. They can, in fact, do much of the research needed in the State sphere. If this motion is agreed to, representations will be made to Canberra. In fact, the Commonwealth Government is serious about jobs and employment, we will be in a far better situation in forthcoming years to serve the Australian constituency with a greater sense of purpose and a greater deal of efficiency than we have for the last 15 to 20 years.

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

MORPHETT ROAD

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): I move:

That, in view of the congestion of traffic on the roads going north to Adelaide from the Southern areas of Christies Beach, Noarlunga and Lonsdale, particularly on Brighton Road, and also because of the anticipated 10 year completion time of the recently announced new road to the South, this House urges the Government to reconsider its decision not to open and upgrade Morphett Road from Seacombe Road to Majors Road.

I hope every member of this Parliament will support my motion. I reflect on an announcement in the *Advertiser* in 1979 wherein the previous Minister of Transport is quoted in part as saying:

In 1970 the State Government declared a 10-year moratorium on freeway development in Adelaide and Mr Virgo, the tough ex-union president, predicts the ban will remain indefinitely.

We see that we had a 10-year ban by the Minister of Roads and Transport and now we have a 10-year delay in relation to the building of this new road and the axing of the proposed freeway that was to run through to ease the colossal problems that exist in the traffic going from south to north, in the morning and vice versa in the evening time, causing shocking pressure on Brighton Road in particular.

We have a minor alternative to ease the situation in the meantime, namely, to open up Morphett Road. It appears that the Minister is under extreme pressure from somewhere (and it is certainly not local government). I suggest that the pressure is coming from Caucus. I believe the Minister would be worried about the situation and would have brought it up in Caucus. I suggest that reasonable members who recognise the ordinary problems of people in the street would say in the Caucus room, 'Yes, Minister, we see that shocking problem to Mr and Mrs Everyday and we will be glad to ease that problem if we can. We will support you, Minister, in putting forward a proposition to open up Morphett Road.' There is nothing difficult about that. From the heartfelt feelings professed by some honourable members opposite, I would have thought that they would be the first to come to the aid of the Minister who, no doubt, has fought hard and long for this but has been turned down by Caucus. That is the only thing I can work out as to why the Government is not intending to upgrade and rebuild Morphett Road from the southern end to Majors Road.

I return to the announcement made by Mr Virgo, a previous Minister of Transport who had a particular hate for transport corridors, alternatives, freeways, and so on. He said:

I believe the present road system should be made to carry its maximum volume of traffic and roads such as South, Goodwood and Marion Roads, the main north-south arterials, have not yet reached that maximum.

This was only five years ago. I can inform the Parliament, if it does not know (and I suppose that it does—I am sure Mr Geoff Virgo would know) that these road systems have gone beyond their maximum capacity. The former Minister also said:

We can also take more positive steps, such as the elimination of bottlenecks, to allow more free-flowing traffic which will go a long way to improving the situation.

The one attempt that has been made at the Emerson Crossing on South Road has gone well, but there are still some huge bottlenecks occurring all the time and at different places. There is the shocking one on Brighton Road and at the Hove Crossing, which caters for about 135 trains per day and which holds up Brighton Road traffic, which comprises about 26 000 vehicles. The prediction by the previous Minister five years ago has certainly come to a head a lot quicker than he thought it would. He thought that there would not be the problem. The article further stated:

Mr Virgo is convinced the public of South Australia will use public transport.

That may all be very well, but most of us know from experience that the ordinary man in the street and his wife have a car and they use their own transport in preference to public transport. It is all very well to try to force these people into using public transport but, to do that, one has first to provide it. In some southern areas, such as Karrara, Hallett Cove and so on, there is no public transport except the train. What happens if one lives five kilometres from the train? Does one walk? Without doubt, the train service is excellent from the south to the city—no one would argue about that. However, there is the problem of getting to the train—not everyone lives along the train line.

If one is to rely on public transport, as suggested by Mr Virgo, then it must be provided. It is the Government's responsiblity to do that if it will not open up the north-south freeway in those areas: it should provide public transport to those people. Mr Virgo further said:

It's true that we must make public transport more attractive to the public, but really the decision is being made for most of us.

He goes on to refer to the cost of petrol, but that has not worked out that way, anyway. He continues:

Although I would not altogether rule out the possiblity of a freeway along that route I would say it is far more likely that a public transport corridor will be built instead.

The former Minister believes that a light rail system is the answer to the problems of energy conservation, pollution and traffic jams. He might have thought that five years ago, but I would bet my bottom dollar that he has changed his mind since then. If one is to provide trams (that is, light rail), one has to have the place for them. I do not think the answer is light rail transport for the southern areas.

The answer is to open up Morphett Road from Seacombe Road to Majors Road which is in the metropolitan area and which has now been barricaded. Let me remind the House that buses coming up Seacombe Road from the Marion shopping centre travel three-quarters of the way up

the steep hill before they turn around. So, to say that it is far too steep is a ridiculous argument. I would defy any engineer to look me in the eye and say that Morphett Road is far too steep and far too dangerous to be opened. I am asking not for it to be made a freeway but the road that it was supposed to be, which would ease the traffic problem and allow the commuters from Trott Park, Hallett Cove, Karrara and down south to get through. This would ease the colossal problem occurring on Brighton Road.

I remember (as this House would well recall) when the present Minister of Transport (Hon. Roy Abbott) announced the axing of the north-south corridor or freeway (whatever one likes to call it; it all means the same thing). At that stage seven Mayors from the southern areas joined together to crtiticise that decision and to point out if possible to the Government that the Minister's decision was entirely wrong.

Those Mayors apparently met with the Premier (Mr Bannon) at that time. There was the Mayor of Meadows (Mr Geoff Simpson); the Mayor of Unley (Mr Dennis Sheridan); the Mayor of Mitcham (Mr Keith Pearson); the Mayor of Marion (Mr Ted Newberry); the Mayor of Noarlunga (Mr Morris Hunt); the Mayor of Willunga (Mr Gordon Symonds); and the Mayor of Brighton (Mr Lionel Byers-Thomas). These Mayors approached the Government to say what a colossal blunder the Government had made in axing the north-south freeway because it involved more than the traffic from the south: it involved also traffic going to and from the Port Adelaide container depot, traffic going through the city to interstate and other areas, and along the death defying South Road as it now is. Anyone who wishes to travel along South Road during peak hour traffic would never volunteer to do so—they would be crazy; they avoid it like the plague. At this time it is worse than riding the wall of death in the circus.

Mr Hamilton: Really?

Mr MATHWIN: Yes. At that time Mr Geoff Simpson said:

> We remain unconvinced by the Government's arrangements for axing the corridor and do not believe alternatives have been adequately investigated.

Then the Premier stepped into the picture and told the southern councils to forget any hope of the north-south corridor being built. The article stated:

> Mr Bannon said the decision to scrap the freeway had opened up enormous possibilities for planning and development in the future.

'Enormous possibilities' should have been 'enormous challenges'. The Premier used the wrong words: he should have made it an impossible challenge for people to plan some other way to get into the city and the northern areas of the city other than by a north-south freeway. The chickens are coming home to roost and they are doing so pretty rapidly. One has only to see the chaos that is occurring on Brighton Road at present to realise that.

The Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. Don Hopgood), who lives in that area, is reported in the *Hills Gazette* of 24 August 1983 as saying:

> . . . the Government was looking at alternatives to the corridor in overcoming future traffic problems.
>
> The Government believes in controlled development in the south to prevent over-population which would put undue pressure on present and future transport systems.

However, on 10 January 1983 the same Minister, who said that care must be taken in the planning, building, development and over-population of this southern area, which he himself should be concerned with because his electorate is in the area, made a further announcement a few months thereafter.

Following the announcement that 6 000 homes would be constructed at Morphett Vale East I, together with other people, said publicly that that would cause widespread traffic problems in Adelaide's southern suburbs. That opinion is shared by my colleagues, of whatever political persuasion, who represent electorates in those areas. We know from local experience what will occur and of the problems which already exist and which will be compounded by the building of a great many more houses. The article in the *News* of 10 January stated that:

> A spokesman for the Environment and Planning Minister, Dr Hopgood, said Mr Mathwin's fears were premature. 'It is not as if 6 000 homes will be built overnight,' the spokesman said.

Of course, if they were built overnight it would be a problem, but surely the Minister does not think that the massive increase in the number of homes in that area will not cause problems in relation to roads and the development of the area and for the commuters from those areas. Of course, they will not all work in the area in which those houses are built—that would be a ridiculous proposition to put forward. Big problems exist at the moment, and they will be compounded with the construction of 6 000 more houses. The increase in construction that is occurring in districts like Morphett Vale, Hallett Cove, Karrara, and other areas is quite considerable, and the pressure on the roads and services will continue. The Trott Park area, in the area of the member for Mawson, has developed rapidly. Most of the people living in these areas have their own transport and commute to and from work to the north. They have the choice of travelling either on South Road or on Brighton Road. However, why should they not be able to go straight across and then down Morphett Road? That would be possible if those silly barriers were removed and the road was made.

I believe that the Government's decision to axe the north-south freeway was shocking. It was a bad decision that will cause drastic problems over the coming years. Shocking and drastic problems already exist. As I have said, in regard to traffic flow on Brighton Road, more than 26 500 vehicles a day use that road. Further, 130-odd trains use the Hove crossing daily, which means that the boom gates halt traffic at the crossing that many times a day, and that causes delays. Bus services (which incidentally are non-existent in some parts of the south) to Hallett Cove, Karrara, and places further south such as O'Sullivan Beach, and so on, will not be able to service those areas adequately. The bus service that now travels on Morphett Road should be able to continue up Morphett Road to Trott Park: it is the quickest way to the big shopping centre at Marion, which most people use. It is ridiculous that the buses cannot get through there at all. It is imperative that the Government do something about Morphett Road and about the shocking situation that exists at present.

Only yesterday the traffic line-up at 5.15 in the afternoon on Ocean Boulevard and Brighton Road from Majors Road well down to South Brighton was nose to tail—over some 3 or 4 km in length. In this day and age and in regard to an area about which the Government is supposed to be worried there should be more concern for new residents. However, a further 6 000 more houses are going to be built in the south, and the Government says that it will not do much about it—that it will take 10 years to build some sort of facility. Yet a road is already there that is barricaded up and not being used. That road should be upgraded, and that would not be a major project because it is not very long.

The roads have become a terrible obstacle for commuters travelling to and from work. They are subjected to difficulties daily. I say that we of the southern areas just cannot wait 10 years for relief from this situation. It is criminal to expect the public to submit to a further 10 years of frustration, worry and of running the gauntlet when going to and from work.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: It is all very well for the member for Mawson to say that it is untrue: she does not have to go that way. All that the member for Mawson has to do during the times of heavy traffic is travel to Glenelg; she does not have to go up the hill in all that fast traffic.

Ms Lenehan: You do not know what my movements are. Incidentally, you do not go up the hill.

Mr MATHWIN: Of course I go up there because I live at Seacliff.

Ms Lenehan: But you do not go over the hill.

Mr MATHWIN: My office is near to where you live, but I live at Seacliff.

Ms Lenehan: You do not travel over that hill as do the people that you are talking about, so be honest.

Mr MATHWIN: I am being honest all right—there is no doubt about it. I am surprised that the honourable member is not using her influence on the Minister in relation to this matter, because it one of great concern to her constituents.

Ms Lenehan: What about the Darlington intersection—that is being upgraded and widened.

Mr MATHWIN: But Morphett Road is a main metropolitan road but is barricaded off, as the honourable member would well know, and the Government is refusing to upgrade it. The upgrading of that road would ease the plight of some of the honourable member's constituents who now must travel on either South Road or Brighton Road to get to and from work. I am surprised that the honourable member is not putting some pressure on the Minister to help her constituents. The member for Mawson, the member for Brighton (Mrs Appleby) and I were successful in getting the discriminator at Brighton to help the train problem. We were very successful there, and I appreciate the help that I got from the members for Mawson and Brighton. We joined forces and added strength to our cause, and the gentle persuasions of the ladies was a great factor in our being successful in that venture.

I believe that if the member for Mawson were to support me and we were to go hand in hand to the Minister, we would be successful in our attempts to try to get something done for people in the southern areas. I would be more than happy to go with the member for Mawson hand in hand—I would even open the door for the honourable member! I believe that between us we could move mountains! It is rather terrible that in this matter some people are not considering the future problems that will occur. In relation to the Minister's action so far, there is no guarantee of a final solution to the problem. I believe that that is not good enough, that it is unfair and that the situation is a downright disgrace. I ask members to support my motion.

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

PITJANTJATJARA LAND RIGHTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr GUNN (Eyre) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act, 1981. Read a first time.

Mr GUNN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to bring the Pitjantjatjara land rights legislation basically into line with the legislation that this Parliament passed granting to the people of Yalata rights over the land at Maralinga. During the course of the Select Committee hearings, it was made abundantly clear to the members of that committee that the existing Pitjantjatjara legislation contained many anomalies and problems that the Parliament ought to address. That Select Committee held 22 public hearings and conducted some informal discussions and meetings. It was made clear by the mining industry, by persons who wished to have reasonable access to the lands and by the Pitjantjatjara people themselves that there were some anomalies that ought to be addressed.

The purpose of this Bill is to put into effect the solutions to the problems which were brought forward during that debate. I took the opportunity of not rushing this legislation, and I questioned the Minister of Community Welfare and the South Australian Minister of Aboriginal Affairs during the Budget Estimate Committees to ascertain answers and give the Government an opportunity to clearly indicate whether it was prepared to bring legislation before the House to rectify the problems. When the Minister concerned clearly indicated that the Government was unwilling or unable to do that, or just not concerned about the problems, the Parliamentary Liberal Party believed it was its responsibility to try to rectify them.

This legislation is not radical; it does not go as far as many people would like it to go, but it certainly sets out to address those problems. I believe that the mining industry would be reasonably satisfied with it, and it provides for people who have unfortunately been denied access to the north-west of South Australia some reason why they should not enter those lands.

I still believe that it is quite wrong that persons in South Australia who wish to visit the north-west of the State have to write to Alice Springs before they can be granted permission to travel through that area. It was the initiative of the Parliamentary Liberal Party that brought the Pitjantjatjara land rights legislation into effect, and during discussions which led up to that legislation certain undertakings were given and certain undertakings reached. Unfortunately, those undertakings which were entered into in good faith have not been honoured and we cannot stand by idly and see developments that ought to take place in those areas (the developments which would give those communities some degree of independence which I am sure they want) frustrated by the actions of white lawyers and white advisers.

The proposals we introduce in the legislation are the same as those that apply to the Maralinga lands, and they invoke the relevant provisions of the Mining and Petroleum Acts. That is not unreasonable. The opportunity for people to travel on those well recognised roads in the north-west of the State is not, in my judgment, unreasonable. I believe that the opportunity for the Commissioner of Highways to be involved is a reasonable course of action to take, and one or two other matters have been clarified in relation to the Motor Vehicles Act and provisions which the Pitjantjatjara people themselves requested.

I believe that the Parliament will soon have to address the problem of Mintabie, where there ought to be security for the people who live there. I will address that matter in another Bill that I intend to introduce soon. However, in an endeavour to obtain bipartisan support, I have introduced this measure because I believe it is overdue. It will be in the interests of not only the Aboriginal communities who live in the north-west of the State but of all South Australians to have both pieces of legislation uniform. I believe that when the Parliamentary Committee set up under the Maralinga legislation takes evidence, it will be able to assess both areas. I think that it should be made clear that the public views on land rights have changed quite considerably over the past few years.

I believe that the general public supports reasonable land rights but I do not believe that they are prepared any longer to accept a situation that has taken place in the Pitjantjatjara area, that is, people being unreasonably denied access and unreasonable claims being made on people who wish to go there and prospect. The BHP Hematite exercise has clearly

demonstrated the need for this legislation. I believe it is unfair, unwise and politically dishonest to continue to allow the people concerned to have their mistaken belief that they can have rights—and substantial rights—that are denied the rest of the community. Those rights are virtually the opportunity to prevent proper exploration and an opportunity absolutely to deny access to the area, and there are many other provisions to which the rest of the community are not entitled or do not expect to be entitled. I believe it is not necessary for me to give any further explanation, because the House has had the opportunity to consider at length the report of the Maralinga Select Committee, which covered in detail all the areas referred to in this Bill.

I would say to the House and community that that Select Committee is probably one of the foremost Parliamentary inquiries into land rights which has taken place in this country, and all the evidence is there to support this proposal. Therefore, I commend the Bill to the House and seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 makes a consequential amendment to the arrangement section of the principal Act. Clause 3 places new definitions in the interpretive section. The first definition is of 'exploratory operations', being prospecting or exploring for minerals under the Mining Act, 1971, or exploring for petroleum under the Petroleum Act, 1940, and the second definition is of 'sacred site', being part of the lands that are of fundamental importance to the traditional owners. Clause 4 inserts a new Division 1A relating to a register of sacred sites. The provision would enable Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku to identify sites on a register and prevent unauthorised disclosure. The register would be relevant to an application to explore or mine upon the lands.

Clause 5 proposes an amendment to section 19 of the principal Act and would require Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku to provide the reasons for a refusal of an application for permission to enter the lands. Clause 6 amends section 20 of the principal Act so that the provision would be similar to a comparable provision in the Maralinga Land Rights Act, 1984. Proposed new subsection (9) requires the Minister of Mines and Energy to confer with the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and the parties in an effort to resolve a deadlock. An arbitrator may finally be appointed. Under subsection (11), the arbitrator would be either a judge of the Supreme Court or a legal practitioner of 10 years standing when the application related to the carrying out of exploratory operations, or a judge of the High Court, Federal Court or Supreme Court, or practitioner of 10 years standing when the application was for actual mining. Clause 7 inserts a new section 20a in the principal Act. It is similar to a provision in the Maralinga Land Rights Act, 1984. The effect of the provision would be that upon an application for a mining tenement in respect of a part of the lands, the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs would consult with Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku to determine whether a sacred site on the register would be affected. If so, steps could be taken to preserve the sacred site.

Clause 8 proposes amendments to section 21 of the principal Act by striking out subsections (4), (5) and (6) and replacing them with a new subsection (4) similar to a provision in the Maralinga Land Rights Act, 1984. The new subsection is intended to specify clearly the payments that may be made to Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku and those that may not. Clause 9 relates to that section of the principal Act that regulates payments made to Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku in respect of mining operations on the lands. The amendment would restrict payments made in respect of exploratory operations to those that are or would become payable under the Mining Act, 1971, or the Petroleum Act, 1940. Clauses 10 to 13 relate to roads that are to be delineated by a map that is to be incorporated into the Act. These roads are to be given the same status as the Stuart Highway and the Oodnadatta to Granite Downs Road.

Clause 14 provides for a new section 34a that would provide that roadworks carried out upon roads comprising road reserves are to be considered as roadworks upon roads within the meaning of the Highways Act, 1926. The provision would effectively allow the Commissioner to expend moneys held under that Act on roads that are on the lands. A similar provision appears in the Maralinga Land Rights Act, 1984. Clause 15 inserts new sections 42a and 42b. Section 42a is intended to overcome any argument that might be raised that because there exist restrictions upon access to the lands any particular part of the lands does not constitute a public place. It also provides that the Road Traffic Act, 1961, and the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959, apply in relation to roads on the lands. Section 42b applies regulations under the Pastoral Act, 1936, to any depasturing of stock upon the lands.

Clause 16 inserts a new paragraph in the regulation-making powers of the Act. The paragraph provides for the creation of a model form of agreement that could form the basis of negotiations between Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku and an applicant seeking to carry out exploratory operations upon the lands. Similar provision was made in the Maralinga Land Rights Act, 1984. A regulation providing for such an agreement could be made only with the approval of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku. Clause 17 provides for the insertion of a new schedule to the Act that would define various roads for the purposes of other amendments of this Bill.

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

WATER SUPPLY SCHEMES

Mr GUNN (Eyre) I move:

That in the opinion of the House the Government should immediately allocate $4 million to the Engineering and Water Supply Department so as to allow commencement of work on the most urgent of the 34 uneconomical schemes currently listed by the Department; and in each succeeding year to provide at least $2 million so this programme can continue.

This matter is near and dear to my heart, having lived in an isolated community all my life and being fully aware of the problems of that isolation. The Government has a responsibility to make a reasonable attempt to provide those communities in South Australia which currently do not have any form of reticulation with a reasonable supply of water. In 1984, to tell people (as the current Minister has done) west of Ceduna and Denial Bay that the E&WS Department does not have the funds available is absolutely ridiculous. I was completely amazed at how the Premier could pluck out of the air in excess of $3 million to repair the Festival Theatre Plaza. There was no equivocation and no thought; the money was just provided.

However, to provide a few million dollars to supply water not to the house just past the gate—to these people—is like trying to draw a wisdom tooth; it is just about impossible. Not only is the current attitude unfair: it is unreasonable. Visiting a place such as Hawker, one sees that people have to put up with the poorest water one can imagine. One can go around to those isolated areas of South Australia to see the lack of adequate supply at such places as Terowie, American River, Venus Bay, Port Kenny, and so on. How-

ever, if this motion was put into effect it would give the E&WS Department at least the opportunity to make a start. I do not accept the argument that the money is not available, because I have on previous occasions given details to the House at great length of where the money could come from.

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

Mr GUNN: It is all right for the Minister to make sarcastic remarks, but $100 million can be found to subsidise the State transport system, $5.8 million to subsidise the Festival Theatre and another $3 million-odd to repair the plaza. There is the Jam Factory, and so one could go on through the Auditor-General's Report. There is no argument—$140 million has been found to bring in the O-Bahn system, a very good system, which I support. Money can be found at the drop of a hat for all sorts of projects. We can spend $7 million odd in the Education Department and millions of dollars elsewhere but, when one wants a few million dollars just to put some pipelines down to help people, one would think that we were making the most unreasonable request.

It is in the interests of the people of this State that an urgent start be made to some of those proposals. I cannot accept that the funds are not available to the Government because, as I have demonstrated in only a few cases, money can be found for all sorts of projects. The Premier will be able to find the money to help organise the international motor race in Adelaide. I do not object to that, but I find it amazing how the funds can be so quickly obtained.

Therefore, I hope that the House and the Minister will support this proposal, because it will have lasting benefit for the people of this State. It will help with production; in many cases it will help the tourist industry; and it will create employment both in construction and on a long-term basis. Therefore, I sincerely hope that the Minister on this occasion will support the measure and take action to implement the proposal. I commend the motion to the House.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER secured the adjournment of the debate.

DEREGULATION UNIT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gunn:

That the Premier immediately re-establish the De-Regulation Unit in the Premier's Department and that the Unit immediately examine all Acts of Parliament, Regulations, permits and licences with a view to reducing unneccesary Acts, Regulations and control and rationalising legislation.

(Continued from 17 October. Page 1197.)

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): This motion is one of the utmost interest to all responsible members of Parliament. Indeed, it is a matter of concern throughout the community. We do proliferate legislation in this place and in other Parliaments, as those that have passed before us have done. We need to ensure that there are mechanisms to review the need for and effectiveness of existing regulatory and other measures that we have enacted over the years. The motion moved by the member for Eyre raises these very issues.

This matter is the subject of considerable activity by the present Government (as it was by the previous Government) and has been the subject of a report to this Parliament. It has also received consideration and been debated in this House. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

KANGAROO ISLAND TRANSPORT RATES

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. Ted Chapman:

That this House:

(a) strongly opposes the space rate increase and operational cost-recovery policy applicable to M.V. *Troubridge* and its proposed replacement as announced by the Minister of Transport on 18 April 1984;

(b) recognises that the 25 per cent increase in rates for 1984-85 and the CPI plus 10 per cent increase to apply each year thereafter until full cost recovery is achieved will cause considerable hardship and place an unfair and unprecedented burden on the residents of Kangaroo Island; and

(c) calls on the Government to rescind that charging policy and to replace it with a schedule of space rates which are comparable with those applying to other forms of mainland public transport over similar distances.

(Continued from 12 September. Page 800.)

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Transport): I have read the member for Alexandra's speech, and at the outset I share with him a concern for the future of residents on Kangaroo Island. The Government is well aware of difficulties they face both in the nature of the country that they farm and because of the isolation of their Island.

This problem is very hard to address. It is a matter that has been considered from time to time over the years, and the present Government has had a very hard look at it. We are attempting to overcome some of the problems. The member for Alexandra in his argument has often claimed that the islanders should not be disadvantaged compared with any mainland residents or residents who live a similar distance from the capital city. I must say that they are very admirable sentiments and that, indeed, over the years Governments have attempted wherever possible to make sure that there is considerable equity in these very matters. However, one thing that must be faced is that Kangaroo Island is just that—an island— and it should not be compared directly with communities that are similar distances by road from Adelaide.

Inevitably, differences will occur both in lifestyle and access to facilities. I refer to schools and hospitals and contact with the wider community, and those difficulties are caused purely because there is a water crossing. The honourable member's motion is directed mainly at the rates charged for cargo and passengers between Adelaide and Kangaroo Island. I can understand the honourable member's interest in these matters. However, the broader question of what sort of service needs to be provided must be tackled first. It seems to be forgotten that for more than 10 years the *Troubridge* service to Kangaroo Island was operated by the private sector. It was only in 1972, when losses started to develop, that the Government took over the service in recognition of its obligation to support the residents of Kangaroo Island.

However, let us remember that for most of that time it was a private enterprise service and costs of running the service were obviously recovered with some profit being made. One of the things about which the honourable member is complaining in regard to the Government's present policy is that we are attempting over quite a long period of time to achieve a level of cost recovery for this service—not necessarily total recovery but a reasonable level of cost recovery—and this means a subsidy continuing on operating costs and reducing over those years, whatever number of years may be determined.

The service started exhibiting losses before the Government took it over, but the rate at which those losses have increased has been quite startling, to say the least, and I think that the member for Alexandra is quite aware of those escalating costs.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: I suppose it's reasonable to assume that they would be automatic in view of the increased staffing as negotiated with the unions over a period?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Yes, and the Government is attempting to be reasonable about the outcome of this very problem. In 1984 dollar values the losses have gone from about $800 000 in 1972 to well over $3 million in 1983. Obviously, however, that level of subsidy was unacceptable, and I am sure that even those on the island would agree. With the *Troubridge* reaching the end of its economic life, the Government faced up to the question of tackling in the most efficient way possible a new service to the island. As the honourable member knows, the *Troubridge* report canvassed all the options, including short crossings, and a very cheap vessel to carry cargo only from Cape Jervis to the island. Although in the past these schemes seemed attractive, one would realise when the overall picture was considered that they would provide no advantage to the islanders and would cause unacceptable investment and running cost increases to the trucking companies, for instance, that presently use the *Troubridge* service.

The *Troubridge* report canvassed the question of charges for the various commodities and passengers as well as the question of a cost recovery programme. The report also suggested some design parameters for a more efficient replacement vessel, and the one thing with which we all agree is that the sooner we get an efficient replacement vessel in the water the better it will be for the residents of the island and the taxpayers of this State, who are currently underwriting the *Troubridge* operation.

The honourable member well knows that I have been prepared to discuss and negotiate the cost recovery programme. However, to do this efficiently we need to wait until a realistic cost estimate for operating the new vessel is at hand. I have indicated to the honourable member and the various deputations from Kangaroo Island that the period of time involved in the cost recovery programme might well be varied and that the Government will do everything possible to reduce the base on which that cost recovery programme is developed. We are not in the business of squeezing Kangaroo Islanders: we are not in that business at all. We do not want to squeeze the islanders dry. We want to see them operate efficiently and profitably, but we certainly believe that a more reasonable system than the present one needs to operate. So, the increases foreshadowed in the cost recovery programme totalling 25 per cent in the first year have already been applied, and they must be applied even if there is no other reason, because there has been no increase in charges since 1981.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Does the Minister recognise that those charges have been exorbitant in the meantime compared with any other trucking or transport system, public or private, around Australia?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: There has been no increase since 1981 and I have told the honourable member previously that the Government had already taken a decision on those increases, and the problem relates to the cost recovery programme. What just levels of comparison there should be between the *Troubridge* service charges and those applying to railway freight movements on the mainland is still a matter of debate. I accept that. I admit that that is a matter that still needs to be addressed, but, given the different market in which rail freight has to exist with heavy competition from road and a totally different basis for operations, I do not think that AN freight rates, purely and simply, are a fair standard on which to base *Troubridge* charges.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: So, because of the isolation you are exploiting that community.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The honourable member must face the fact that islanders did pay the cost of the service before 1972 and they must be prepared to pay a reasonable proportion of those costs in 1984.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: In 1972 we had several operating alternatives.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): Order!

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The member for Alexandra has said to me that he accepts that there ought to be reasonable charges and reasonable costs, and that is what we are endeavouring to address. I believe that the basis on which the new rates are being charged is a simple system and over a period of time will be equitable. It will also encourage the most efficient and effective use of the vessel. That brings me to the particular vessel. The *Troubridge* report did set some design guidelines for a replacement vessel, which guidelines have been widely canvassed. In fact, a broadly based committee representative of all interests has been looking at the design of that replacement vessel.

However, the Government has been concerned to keep the costs, both of building and especially of operating the new vessel, as low as it possibly can. As Minister, I had my own personal concern that the vessel as detailed in the *Troubridge* report might not be the most economical vessel in the circumstances, and on that basis I asked for advice on alternative no frills vessels, and I believe that we have made some headway and that we are close to having an ideal vessel to replace the *Troubridge.*

In broad terms, we are looking at a design based on vessels currently in service with known characteristics and, more importantly, a known cost base of operation formulated on a type of modern offshore supply vessel. The vessel will have limited passenger accommodation designed to cater for drivers of trucks and passengers wishing to accompany their cars. The vessel will have conventional but efficient engines. Details of this alternative will shortly be put to the Troubridge Design Committee and then will be made available to other interested groups on the island.

I am hopeful that we are close to a vessel that will be acceptable to all concerned. Its main characteristic is that it will provide a most cost effective service and, therefore, cause a minimum cost burden to the community. It has not been easy to reach this stage, as the member well knows. Even on the island there are many conflicting interests who have been pushing strongly for different vessels and different operations. I think we will achieve an acceptable compromise in their attitudes.

The Government has amply demonstrated its concern for Kangaroo Island with our work on the *Troubridge* and the Government's support for *Philanderer III.* Our willingness to invest in transport services to the island is obvious. The efforts being made by my colleagues, the Minister for Tourism and the Minister for Environment and Planning, also demonstrate the Government's commitment to the future of Kangaroo Island.

Only last night I received a deputation from the island to look at the impact of the increased tourist trade and what it means in terms of camping facilities, the shortage of proper water supply on the island, roads and all provisions on the island, for that matter. In many ways the member's motion in my view is a little premature. He is aware that negotiations are still in progress, and the Government has demonstrated its willingness to listen to and discuss all questions that the member for Alexandra has raised. I have said repeatedly that we are willing to have discussions the matter with him, farmers, and everyone involved and interested in this issue on Kangaroo Island.

That process is continuing. I certainly am not claiming that we have found all the answers, but I am confident that we will find an acceptable solution that provides for a replacement vessel for the island at a cost that the islanders and this State can afford. If we can achieve that, hopefully it will satisfy the majority. That is what I am attempting to do and I hope that we will be able to achieve that.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): The Minister yet again has lost sight of the thrust of the motion before the House. This afternoon he has canvassed a range of subjects associated with transport to and from Kangaroo Island generally and avoided the real question of operational costs recovery policy around which the motion is framed. This afternoon the Minister has read to the House a statement prepared by his staff which touched from time to time on the subject of the motion; but, otherwise he canvassed a whole range of ship designs, the makes of vessels previously servicing the area and vessels that may potentially service the area. He did so, to the extent of canvassing, on behalf of his Government, its involvement in *Philanderer III*, the facilities servicing that vessel, and so on.

I have no argument with (indeed, I support) the move that the Government has made in relation to its effort to promote traffic to and from Kangaroo Island to establish and upgrade the port facilities at both Penneshaw and Cape Jervis and to assist in the introduction of a further *Philanderer* vessel to service those two respective ports. I also support the Government's move to prepare itself for the replacement of the existing *Troubridge* but, as I have indicated previously, the Minister has run away from the real nub of the argument of the day. He knows as well as I do, and his officers and progressively the Kangaroo Island community knows, that a replacement for the *Troubridge* is at least three summers away and that we are not at this time arguing about the detail of that replacement project: we are arguing about a policy of cost recovery associated with the existing vessel as introduced by the Minister earlier this year—a policy of cost recovery that is unprecedented in any Australian public transport system, whether it involves air, land, rail or sea.

This Minister has set a precedent in this respect which will, as the Mayor and councillors colleagues of the Kingscote and Dudley District Council have demonstrated to him on deputation, destroy a community that has worked hard since the settlement of this State to establish a valuable primary producing community and, potentially, an extremely valuable tourist community to South Australia and the nation at large. In one fell swoop the Minister has introduced a recipe that will bring that community to its knees. He knows that as well as we know it. To date he has done little about considering the impact involved. He talked about the impact on the community at large as a result of additional traffic and passengers by way of tourists entering the area via the *Philanderer*—again very relevant subject material, but it is not relevant to this motion.

I am extremely disappointed, and I take this opportunity to express disappointment, not only on my behalf but also on behalf of the citizens of Kangaroo Island generally, that the Minister has chosen to stray from the subject at hand, from the thrust of the motion and, indeed, to snow the argument with a whole lot of waffle about subjects that are relevant in their own right but clearly irrelevant to the matter of operational cost recovery of our shipping service.

The Minister talks about comparative figures for the losses applicable to the shipping service when it was owned by private enterprise as against the losses that apply to that service today. If one takes into account the inflation rate on the Australian dollar, one sees that the losses today are in real terms no greater than they were 10 years ago. It is a farce and a snow if ever I have heard one for the Minister to stand up in this House and try to convince the Parliament otherwise.

I am extremely disappointed that the Minister should choose to duck for cover in this situation when the seriousness of the subject deserves Ministerial attention of a real kind. Since coming into the transport portfolio in this State, the Minister has performed as a victim of his own bureaucracy. He is indeed a classical candidate for the ABC programme 'Yes, Minister'. The policy that he has adopted in this instance in relation to the *Troubridge* operation between mainland South Australia and Kangaroo Island has been worked on by his officers over a period of years dating back to the days of the Hon. Geoff Virgo, who was man enough, understood the subject enough and recognised the impact of its implementation enough, not to be sucked in by that staff or bureaucratic recommendation.

Whilst the Liberal Party was in Government between 1979 and 1982 there was but one increase in the rates applicable to the *Troubridge,* and it was a nominal increase at that. The reason for that increase may well have been justified at that time. I was not in Australia when it was brought before Cabinet and applied to the *Troubridge* operation. However, it happened. It happened on that isolated occasion during our period in Government because the Government of the day rcognised that the rates applicable to the *Troubridge* were absolutely outrageous.

Whilst it was not prepared in an escalating financial climate to reduce those rates, it was prepared to commit itself to a policy of ultimately applying to that service rates similar to those applicable to services over comparable distances on the mainland, all of which is outlined in the motion.

For the Minister to perform in the way he has yet again today demonstrates to me that he never did have a grip of the portfolio with respect to the shipping aspect and, in whatever flowery terms he likes to describe his position as a consulter and negotiator prepared to discuss this and that, that is quite superfluous to the real problem. I am extremely disappointed, after delaying the response to this motion over a period of weeks now, that he should come up with a statement, as I say, prepared and delivered in such a way, showing an absolute lack of sensitivity to the position of those people on the Island.

I conclude by simply saying to the Government generally that it is about time it recognised that communities of the kind we are discussing, geographically isolated from the rest of the State, are still at this stage South Australians; they are entitled to a fair deal, along with all other South Australian citizens, and are not therefore to be subjected to the level of exploitation to which this Minister has subjected them, which is quite unprecedented in Australia's history.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, D.C. Brown, Chapman (teller), Eastick, Evans, Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Meier, Olsen, Rodda, Wilson and Wotton.

Noes (21)—Mr Abbott (teller), Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, M.J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Plunkett, Slater, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Blacker, Mathwin, and Oswald. Noes—Messrs Bannon, Peterson, and Trainer.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gunn:

That in the opinion of the House all citizens of South Australia who are connected to the Electricity Trust grid system, electricity undertakings managed by district councils or corporations and those undertakings operated by the Outback Areas Development Trust be charged on the same basis and that the 10 per cent surcharge which applies in certain areas be abolished and those undertakings operated by the Outback Areas Development Trust

which charge at a greater rate than any other country area be placed on the same charging schedule as Metropolitan Adelaide.

(Continued from 17 October. Page 1199.)

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy): In previous years when a motion not dissimilar to this has been moved by the member for Eyre, he has indicated at least one thing which must be recorded in his favour, and that is that he has been very consistent in representing the viewpoint, as he puts it, of the people who are located in the more remote parts in the State. At the beginning of the honourable member's remarks in moving the rather wordy motion, he reminded us of the number of times he has put forward a motion of this nature. He said:

Unfortunately, I have received only marginal support.

I thought that that was an excellent remark and no doubt it was given a lot of thought by the honourable member before he made it. Perhaps a more accurate description of what has transpired is that on three occasions he put forward a motion not dissimilar to this to the Government of the day, which was of the same persuasion as his own, and he received no recognition whatsoever for the proposition. It is essentially the same proposition now.

The honourable member went on to say, at least with respect to the upper West Coast areas and those electricity consumers on whose behalf he was speaking, that about $390 000 was necessary to ameliorate the additional charge (as he sees it) they are to pay for their electricity. He pointed out correctly that the figures he had given had come from information supplied to him by the Government and were based on 1982-83 figures.

I am not suggesting that that has special significance: I simply want to get it accurately in context that we are talking about figures that relate to the completed 1982-83 year. That is perhaps a fairer way (and I mean no disrespect to the honourable member) of looking at this question of whether there should be any degree of subsidy provided so that those consumers involved can receive their electricity at metropolitan cost plus 10 per cent. Considerable subsidies are already paid by the Government to ETSA. In relation to consumers who are serviced by bulk supply through local government and other schemes, an annual subsidy of $1 650 000 is paid. On average that represents $209 per annum per consumer.

In regard to diesel generated electricity provided to people in the more remote areas of the State an average annual subsidy of $1 430 000 is paid, representing some $1 039 per consumer. I think all members would agree that that is a very high figure. The total of those sums, $3 080 000, is the amount of subsidy paid by the Government to ETSA to ensure that consumers receive electricity at metropolitan cost plus 10 per cent.

If the metropolitan cost only were to apply to consumers in the West Coast area, the annual subsidy would amount to some $3 500 000. I am not suggesting that that should have prevented the honourable member from moving this motion, but in relation to motions or Bills put before the House all members are entitled to as much detail as possible in regard to the costs which may be involved and, in this case, the costs which presumably the House is asked to remove in order to provide assistance to the consumers concerned. In considering this motion, I think members should consider additional factors, which I will outline on a subsequent occasion. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

NORTHERN ELECTRICITY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Gunn:

That in the opinion of this House the Government should proceed to build a 240-volt power line to Wilpena then on to Blinman.

(Continued from 17 October. Page 1200.)

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy): I suppose one could argue that this shorter motion has merit because of its brevity and straightforwardness: it can be clearly understood on a single reading. However, I would suggest that a great deal of information should be considered by members before deciding whether or not to support the motion. To extend the grid to Wilpena would involve an extension of 55 km above ground using 11 kw rural phase to Wilpena homestead, and approximately 3 km of underground 3-phase to the chalet, to maintain the aesthetics of that attractive tourist area. To extend further to Blinman involves a further 65 km of above ground power lines, or more if a circuitous route was required to maintain the scenic attraction of the area.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: If the member for Mallee will be patient I intend to provide information of considerable interest to all members. I hope that the honourable member will allow me to do that. An 11 000 or 13 000-volt SWER (single wire earth return) line from Wilpena to Blinman may just have the capacity to provide power to properties on the route and meet the current requirements of Blinman, but to encourage tourist development at Blinman it is very likely that rural 3-phase power would be required right through to Blinman. Of course, that would mean additional cost. The capital cost of such an extension is very great. Based on very recent ETSA estimates, it is expected that the minimum capital cost of an extension to the Wilpena Chalet would be $1.1 million.

Mr Lewis: That is underground?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Not underground. I suggest that the honourable member does not try in his usual fashion to see whether he can divert me. I am sure other members of the House are interested in these facts, even if he is not, and I intend to provide them. The capital cost of the extension would be very great. The cost of further extension to Blinman would be about $450 000 for single phase power or about $800 000 for 3-phase power. That amount would service only the Blinman township and five or six other consumers.

Monitoring of power used at Wilpena over the last 18 months initiated by the Energy Division of the Department of Mines and Energy, in liaison with the Department of Environment and Planning, PBD and ETSA, has demonstrated that the annual consumption at Wilpena is approximately 130 000 kWh per quarter in the first and third quarters and 137 000 kWh per quarter in the second and fourth quarters. Experience elsewhere has shown that, although powered caravan sites can create sharp peak loads, annual consumption per site is generally low, being no more than 1 000 kWh per site. The honourable member suggested that a need exists for more powered caravan sites in the area of the chalet, and accordingly I have provided information about that matter.

Further, in the National Parks and Wildlife management plan for the Wilpena National Park it is stressed that the current camping area should remain as a camping area rather than be developed as a caravan park. This constraint and the area available would restrict the number of powered sites that could be made available and limit the required maximum demand to a level that could be supplied by the existing generation capacity. Using the existing generators,

the annual fuel bill is approximately $100 000, to which a further $20 000 should be added for maintenance, etc. The ETSA tariff charge for this consumption of electricity would be $60 400. Hence, for an investment of $1.1 million an annual saving of about $60 000 might be achieved in operation costs. Clearly, capital costs could not be recovered within five years, as was suggested by the honourable member when speaking to his motion.

Any member would realise that it would take a long time to recover that capital investment at that rate of return by way of savings. A more sophisticated discounted cash flow analysis performed by the Energy Division, taking capital costs into consideration, has indicated that the levelised cost over a 20 year period of both mains electricity and the existing diesel generation system would be about 30c per kWh, with the existing diesel generators being the slightly cheaper option of the two. From Wilpena to Blinman the economics are even less favourable. Despite the fact that peak loads at the end of the line at Blinman could make three-phase connection necessary, the average consumption for all consumers on the line is unlikely to exceed 50 000 kWh per quarter, even with further tourist development at Blinman, as was suggested by the honourable member. This would lead to a levelised cost of about 45c per kWh for mains power.

The honourable member has brought forward this proposition, but what are the problems with the existing arrangement, if any? Over many years, diesel generators in outback use have proven their reliability. However, for maximum fuel efficiency and minimum maintenance they need to operate close to their maximum output. In practice, diesel generators are normally sized to ensure they can supply the expected maximum peak loads, which are often five or six times the normal load in domestic situations, and are more than twice the normal loads measured at Wilpena. For this reason, consumers reliant on diesel generators must choose in typical installations between the inconvenience of careful load management to achieve the maximum fuel and cost efficiency from their diesel generators (operating them only while substantial demand is needed), or alternatively to operate them continuously for convenience, often at very low load, and thereby incur higher fuel and maintenance costs.

Connection to the grid has been perceived to be the only way to overcome this problem in the past, relying on the much larger ETSA system to spread peak loads. I guess there is some sense in the consideration of that approach. However, investigations by the Energy Division of the Department of Mines and Energy have highlighted the rapidly rising cost of applying that solution to remote area power supply and have shown that alternatives are available which can provide equal reliability and convenience to mains power (that is what it is all about), but at a lower cost and without the environmental and aesthetic problems involved in the extension of power lines. These alternatives, such as battery inverter systems and rural parallelling of diesel generators, have the added advantages of being potentially suitable for remote areas where technical as well as economic reasons make extension of the grid impossible.

If we are to say that economically it is not sensible for the extension of the grid system to Wilpena and Blinman, are there alternative systems that have sufficient merit and will provide reliability and continuity of service that one comes to expect from the ETSA grid system? The answer to that is 'Yes'. One system which is finding increasing use in remote areas interstate and overseas involves charging a battery storage from a diesel generator which operates for only part of the day but at maximum efficiency. Power for the remote application is supplied as 240 volts AC from a solid state inverter, which has the advantage of virtually no moving parts in the ordinary sense and therefore the maintenance of a solid state inverter relates to electronic items and electricity only, and clearly there have been great advantages in the technology associated with solid state inverters. These are used extensively as back-up power supply in the metropolitan area for computer installations where reliability of supply is paramount, and are finding increasing use in outback homestead installations interstate.

Clearly, computers in the metropolitan area are so designed that it is imperative and important that there is not a failure of power supply. I remember from my own experience (although it was quite a while ago) that situations arise when a back-up power supply is needed for a computer and if solid state inverters are used for that purpose there must be a reliable and proven source of supply. As I have already mentioned, clearly there are applications for these solid state inverters in remote areas.

The Government has secured part funding from the Commonwealth Government this year through the National Energy Research Development and Demonstration Council (NERDDC) to install a three-phase battery/inverter (based on a system already proven for computer uninterruptible power supply duties) at Wilpena as a demonstration project. This would involve the largest unit of this type to be installed for remote area power supply use. Although the equipment is well proven in other applications, the Department of Mines and Energy, in liaison with the National Parks and Wildlife Service of the Department of Environment and Planning, is currently ensuring that the total system design will be totally satisfactory for use at Wilpena.

It has been calculated that use of this system at Wilpena could save about $50 000 per year in fuel and diesel maintenance costs, similar to that achievable with mains electricity, but for a fraction of the capital cost. Current estimates indicate that the total installation will cost less than $200 000, including monitoring equipment. One might compare that with the $1.1 million I mentioned earlier. The NERDDC funds will cover $69 000 of this cost. It should be stressed that this project is a demonstration project to considerably improve the effectiveness, fuel efficiency and reliability of the existing system at Wilpena. Further reduction in costs could be achieved for future similar installations from the experience to be gained. Smaller scale single phase diesel battery inverter systems for homestead use are already starting to demonstrate the savings which can be achieved. One system in the Flinders Ranges, for example, is known to be supplying all the domestic needs of a homestead 24 hours a day, seven days a week, with a very small diesel generator operating only 40 hours a week, for a relatively small initial cost.

Most of this information is coming from the Energy Division of my Department. The technological improvements in these areas are such that no longer is it necessary to consider only one solution to the problem of outback supply, for example; that is, running more lines and extending a grid at a high cost. One point not mentioned is that losses are always associated with the generation and distribution of electricity always. The extension of grids increases the length of line and the loss increases accordingly. Lost power is not consumed by the consumer but it has to be generated by the generating authority (in South Australia, ETSA). It has to be paid for, and it appears in consumers' tariffs and their accounts.

The attraction of such investigations (the demonstration project at Wilpena, and so on) is that, as well as providing a more economic basis for the operation of existing diesel generators, they help to prove up reliable batter/inverter systems which form an essential component of modern remote area power systems, both existing and future.

What about the future? Is it going only to be diesel and solar state inverters or are there other possibilities in the offing? Once again, the answer to that query is 'Yes.' Significant steps are being made in renewable energy electricity technologies, such as wind generators and photovoltaic cell panels, the remote energy generators of the future. The Energy Division of the Department of Mines and Energy is very active in these fields in terms of the wind energy monitoring programme and technology review, which was announced by me earlier this year, and in pursuing various photovoltaics investigations and possible development and demonstration projects.

Besides gaining Commonwealth assistance in demonstrating the large scale battery inverter technology at Wilpena, the State is involved in the preliminary investigation of a possible joint Australian-Japanese project to power a solar village using photovoltaics. Wilpena has considerable recognised advantages as the site for such a demonstration project, providing an opportunity for siting the collector panels in an environmentally acceptable way, while providing all the power needed from the sun. Such an installation, if secured, would be a world leader in such high technology, creating a great range of opportunities in industry, technology and tourism. The investigatory work currently being undertaken by the Department and the proposed battery/inverter project at Wilpena provide a very sound basis on which the State's case for location of a large photovoltaics project at Wilpena can be based. At this stage, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SALINITY

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. P.B. Arnold:

That this House condemns the Government for failing to initiate any meaningful discussion with the Federal Government and Governments of New South Wales and Victoria to expedite the necessary salinity mitigation works for the Murray Darling system, and calls on the Premier to convene a Heads of Government conference as a matter of urgency.

(Continued from 17 October. Page 1208.)

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): Guess what, Mr Deputy Speaker? When Bannon fights, South Australia is supposed to win. In this instance, it has done anything but.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: We have heard that before from you.

Mr LEWIS: Yes, and I will talk about that again in a minute. Let me address myself to the remarks made to the Chamber by the Minister when he responded to the member for Chaffey, who moved this motion in the first instance. The works to which the Minister referred—that is, the salt mitigation interception works at places such as Noora and Rufus River—were already in progress when the Government came to office. For the Government to claim that it has continually and effectively addressed the matter put before the House by the member for Chaffey is just ridiculous.

In no sense has it done that, other than in a negative sense. I will explain that. However, before I do so I want to point out to the House that the call for further investigations, or at least the stated need for delay in further investigations of three years or more, is nonsense. We have already been investigating this problem for more than three years; it needs only another 12 months. A substantial part of the information upon which we should be acting is already well known to the Minister and officers of his Department. He cannot escape that fact. They have let him know. We are aware of that.

I want to address those matters to which I referred in the second instance and undertook to explain to the House. Negative has been the record of this Government in relation to addressing this problem. It has effectively removed the incentive for the improvement of irrigation practices that would substantially reduce the groundwater flows back into the river; they are saline and contribute to that increasing salt load downstream.

The best of our water in South Australia from the Murray River is the worst of that of New South Wales and Victoria. They have finished with it and they do not really care what standard of quality reaches our border or what happens to it beyond that point. Not all the water which increases the salt load in our river flows across the border in the main channel of the Murray River at the surface. A great deal of it comes across the border subsurface. Whilst good attempts are being made to mitigate those undesirable and increasing intrusions into the water table and into the main channel, nonetheless, by removing the incentive to improve irrigation practices, this Government (the Bannon Government, which wants South Australia to win and which we therefore imagine would want the Riverland to remain viable into perpetuity and not be killed off by increasing levels of salinity) has destroyed our prospects of being able to achieve that.

To delay is to compound the problem at an exponential rate. It is not just an arithmetical projection: spend $10 now and one will get so much improvement. If one delays spending that $10 one cannot get the same amount of improvement for this future investment given that it is $10 October 1984 time. Indeed, it would cost much more than $10 in October 1984 dollars to achieve the same result. So the longer we delay the greater will be the expense and the more will be the damage. The longer we delay, the more we are putting off deriving the real benefits that will come from the work which must ultimately be done, unless we are to be condemned by posterity for having done nothing.

It is clear that the weak pacifist Premier we have got who has no stomach and no guts for this sort of negotiation is at the base of our problems. So, far from winning we are losing and the sooner the Government recognises that it must address the problem it has got with its leadership, thereby enabling it as a Government to effectively address particular problems of this kind, the better off South Australia will be because whenever Bannon goes into the ring we lose.

In this instance he has no inclination to get into the ring with the other Heads of Government (to whom the motion refers and whom it calls upon him to join). Discussion and further research of the kind in which he is participating and in which he is suggesting his Minister should participate are a waste of valuable time, because meanwhile New South Wales and Victoria are quite happy to sit back and wait; it does not cost them anything. They do not have to spend any money, and they do not care.

They do not have to do any work, and they do not care. It suits them, and we are letting them get away with it. We are irresponsible because we allow them to continue being irresponsible. We should front them and expose them for what they are. The least that we can do then is to require and urge the Leader of this Labor Government, the Premier, to get himself into the ring or get out of the way and allow someone else to get into the ring to sort out those two Governments and the Commonwealth and to restore the kinds of programmes which were scrapped by the Prime Minister—I am talking about the current Prime Minister; not the one after 1 December—in the bicentennial programme of Murray water improvement that was in place prior to the time that the current Prime Minister came to office.

Everyone in this country cares about the Murray River except when it comes to doing something about it. As a result of the scrapping of that sort of programme, the on-farm connection grants that would and did enable people to improve their irrigation practices by installing irrigation systems which use less water, by applying less water (and thereby contribute far less to the groundwater springs salt load re-entering the river), have gone by the board, and the depressed state of the Riverland economy does not make it possible for those people to pull themselves up by their boot straps. Restoring this programme would ensure that irrigators and water users farther down stream would have a secure and reliable supply of reasonable quality water in the future.

I join this debate with some vigour because of my concern about the people whom I represent (and the broader population—over 85 per cent of South Australians)—who depend for their livelihood on this great river and the water it contains. What a tragedy it is that over the last two years we have seen this Government—in the past 18 months joined by the Hawke Government—do nothing. That is tragic! If members opposite have any conscience at all and any concern for the future of the river system on which we depend, they will support this motion and by some means or other those same members opposite will ensure that the leader of their Government, be it Bannon or anyone else, addresses the problem forthwith.

Mr EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:

That this House condemns the Government for its policy on uranium enrichment which has lost to the State a billion dollar project which would enhance the economy of South Australia very significantly.

(Continued from 12 September. Page 803.)

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I understand that the member for Florey will speak on this matter in a few moments, but I would be prepared to contribute some remarks on it, because I believe that this is a very important matter that needs to be debated in this House. The Deputy Leader has moved a motion that is quite typical of the kind of motion he is wont to move in this place. He is full of condemnation and all sorts of hyperbole. However, I believe that what is needed is the kind of steady approach for which this Government is noted, and I know that the member for Florey has spent a lot of time examining this issue and is eager advise the House of his thoughts on this matter. So, with those comments I indicate that I look forward to hearing what he has to say. I must say that it will certainly be more useful than the comments we have heard from the Deputy Leader.

Mr GREGORY (Florey): On 12 September the Deputy Leader moved a motion in this House relating to the building and operation of a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia.

Mr Lewis: We know that, Bob.

Mr GREGORY: I thought that I would remind you of it. In reading the Deputy Leader's speech, I wondered whether he was talking about visits to the Pilbarra to look at gas exploration. In regard to building a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia, really, all that the honourable member said was that the policy of our Party had 'lost to South Australia a billion dollar refining industry—an industry that is probably the safest part of the uranium cycle. A uranium enrichment facility is the type of operation that one would compare with, say, a copper refinery, copper smelter or steel works that turns the raw material into a usable commodity.'

That really concerned and amazed me, because it illustrated a lack of understanding that the member for Kavel and members opposite have about an enrichment facility. It is not as though it was just a flight of fancy on 12 September. On 26 September 1984 the member for Todd said the following:

> ... investment of $1 000 million in this State, which would have been the minimum amount spent if a uranium enrichment plant was built here, particularly after the tremendous amount of ground work undertaken by the previous Government, and in light of the facts put to me at Tricastin in France where there is an enrichment plant, although not of the type that would have been built in Australia.

I do not think that anyone knows what could have been built in South Australia at the time. The information available from research centres on enrichment plants is very difficult to find. However, I think that it is fair to say that it would be very costly to build an enrichment plant in Australia. Whether or not jobs would be created is another problem, but we then have to think about the technology that would be used, who would be operating it and who would pay for it.

There are several uranium enrichment plants in the world, but none of those plants are owned by private enterprise. In fact, in America the Government operates the uranium enrichment plant that used to do all the enrichment in the world. However, it is now doing only 35 per cent of the enrichment, and it is subsidised by the Government. The plant that the member for Todd and other members visited when they had their tour of Europe in the middle of this year is also a Government run facility, and I think that they just went there with big eyes and a preconceived notion that 'We want this and we want that and it will cost something'. They are very costly things to operate and, if we were to have a uranium enrichment plant in Australia, particularly in South Australia, and if a Government was silly enough to go ahead and guarantee one, we would find that we, the people of South Australia, would be subsidising the enrichment of uranium for the rest of the world: that is what we would be doing.

We would not be doing what the Russians are doing, that is, enriching the world's uranium, because they want to get hard currency. The latest information I have been able to obtain on enrichment is available in the 22 September issue of the *Economist,* in an article that referred to the sinking of the *Mont Louis* off the coast of Belgium, when 225 tonnes of uranium hexafluoride bound for the Soviet Union was put at some risk. The article made quite clear why the *Mont Louis* was taking uranium to the Soviet Union in the first place. It states:

> It should not have caused such surprise that the cargo was going to the Soviet Union. Sending uranium from Western Europe to be enriched in the Soviet Union is common enough ... Enrichment is needed to make uranium usable either in power stations or in nuclear weapons. Because it is so capital intensive, only the Americans, the Russians, and two European consortia undertake it on a large scale. Some 10 years ago, America had a monopoly in the international enrichment business. Today, it has only about 35 per cent of the market. In the early 1970s, the Americans started raising prices, and setting stiff contractual conditions. This drove their European customers to look for other sources of supply.
>
> France, in partnership with other countries, including Iran, set up Eurodif, which uses an energy-guzzling gas diffusion process for enrichment. A plant was built at Tricastin, which has be be fed by large nuclear reactors. Eurodif had intended to build another plant for exporting enriched uranium, but the Shah of Iran was to put up 20 per cent of the money, and the plan fell through after the Iranian revolution.
>
> Britain, West Germany and Holland set up an enrichment consortium called Urenco, having decided to try the unproven gas centrifuge technology. Work had been done on this by German

scientists during the Second World War, but it had never been put into practice.

The Europeans also turned to the Soviet Union, which had been enriching uranium for military purposes since the late 1940s.

The article continues:

Although Eurodif and Urenco can provide as much enriched uranium as West European countries need, their energy authorities use the Soviet Union's facilities because they are keen not to repeat their mistake of the early 1970s, when they found themselves at the mercy of a single American supplier. The cheapness of Russian enrichment also puts pressure on Eurodif and Urenco to keep their prices down.

It also talked about the possibility of the development of a new process using a laser. It is important that the House knows how much uranium has been contracted by European countries for enrichment in the Soviet Union. I have a short table which works on the basis of tonnes over what is known as a separative work unit. It is a technical formula for energy units and roughly 120 tonnes are required that keep a 1 000 megawatt station going for a year. The table is as follows:

European contracts for uranium enrichment in the Soviet Union

	Tonnes/SWU*	Delivery span
Austria	1 075	1979-1989
Belgium	1 300	1979-1985
Britain	1 000	1980-1989
Finland	7 441	1979-2000
France	4 630	1979-1983
Italy	4 225	1979-1983
Spain	7 484	1979-1990
Sweden	2 530	1979-2000
West Germany	16 547	1979-2000

As I said earlier, it is difficult to get information on uranium enrichment. Some people have been lulled or conned into believing that we could have a process in Australia that would be of some benefit. I doubt very much whether the benefit would be to Australia because, as I said earlier, we do not use enriched uranium for making atomic weapons or in nuclear power stations.

Whilst some people opposite talk about nuclear power stations here for South Australia, they are pie in the sky ideas without any reality, because these people have not gone into the costs and do not appreciate that, if we were to have a nuclear power station in this State, we would finish up with a ridiculous situation where we would have to be getting massive supplies of power from Victoria just so that the plant could be overhauled. When one takes into account those considerations, one realises and appreciates that we are talking about a pipe dream, a dream of unreality and one that will cost the people of this State considerable money.

One can read a number of technical papers and not so technical magazines that are available in the Library on problems associated with the nuclear industry and its fuel cycle. Nothing is more damning than a report that appeared in the *New Statesman* published on 18 November 1983 referring to British Nuclear foul-up instead of British Nuclear Fuels Limited. It talks about what has happened with the dumping of radio active waste around the Cambrian Coast. When one reads that article subject to a documentary on Yorkshire television, one sees that it makes interesting and alarming reading—so much so that if people read it they will appreciate that even the best assurances of people in this industry about how there would be no effect on the population or on the land mean nothing. Of course there would be, and that article spells it out very clearly. To indicate how callous they are, I will read a portion as follows:

The intention, he said, had been to discharge fairly substantial amount of radioactivity as a part of an organised and deliberate scientific experiment. The aims of this experiment would have been defeated if the level of radioactive discharge had been kept to a minimum.

That is part of the statement. It said that the aims of the experiment would have been defeated if the level of radioactivity discharge had been kept to a minimum. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

AUSTRALIAN OLYMPIC TEAM

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Olsen:

That this House records its appreciation of the performance of South Australian members of the Australian Olympic team in Los Angeles; recognises the assistance which the South Australian Sports Institute has given to our Olympic athletes; and urges the Government to continue to give full support to the Institute which is making a significant contribution towards lifting the standards of sporting performance in South Australia—

which the Premier has moved to amend by inserting after the words 'Los Angeles' the words 'and Paralympians in Stoke-Mandeville' and by leaving out the words 'urges the Government to continue' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'commends the Government for continuing'.

(Continued from 19 September. Page 999.)

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I support the motion. No doubt exists that the 1984 Olympic Games in Los Angeles was probably the pinnacle of sport in South Australia. It was a delight that South Australians had a record 32 persons in the Australian Olympic team in Los Angeles. In 1956, when the games were held in Melbourne and Australia picked its largest team, South Australians made up 20 of the total of the 314 competitors, or 6.3 per cent. This year Australia was represented in Los Angeles by 250 competitors with South Australia's 32 making up 12.8 per cent. They came from a wide range of sports—13 compared to nine in 1956. We were all delighted that these 32 young South Australians had the opportunity to represent not only their State but also their country. Some of the South Australian representatives included the following: Glynis Nunn, who was a gold medallist in the heptathlon; Pat Mickan, basketball; Linda Douglas, gymnastics; Julie Nykiel, basketball; Sue Watkins, hockey; Marina Moffa, basketball; Sandy Pisani, hockey; Donna Quinn, basketball; Andrea Chaplin, fencing; Anna McVann, swimming; Bruce Frayne, athletics; Peter Hadfield, athletics; Mike Turtur, cycling; Gary West, cycling; John Watters, cycling; Dean Lukin, weightlifting; Gavin Thredgold, rowing; Chris Pratt, yachting; Chris Tillett, yachting; Lisa Martin, marathon; Robyn Grey-Gardner, rowing; Sylvia Muehlberg, shooting; Chris Blake, archery; Scott Wooden, canoeing; Trevor Smith, hockey; Adrian Berce, hockey; Bob Booth, rowing; Tim Willoughby, rowing; Glenn Beringen, swimming; John Bentley, rowing; Richard Lumb, yachting; and Donna Gould, 3000 metres. There is one other person whom I have suddenly remembered.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Bruce Frayne.

Mr BECKER: I am not sure whether I mentioned Bruce Frayne. However, there is one young representative from the hockey team who lives in my electorate and whose name escapes me for the moment, but before I finish my speech I will mention his name. Because he attended the Sports Institute in Western Australia and went to Perth to participate in the scholarship of the Australian Sports Institute, on occasions he was not considered a South Australian, and that was wrong, because he was a South Australian born athlete, and he has represented South Australia in Australian championships—a first class hockey player. I sympathised with the hockey teams, both the men and the women, because I feel they did extremely well.

This motion recognises our young people, the main one being Glynis Nunn, who won a gold medal and in doing so was the first athlete who I can remember from South Aus-

tralia to win a gold medal in the heptathlon. The other person who of course captured most of our imaginations was Dean Lukin, who participated in the super heavyweight (that is, 110-plus kilogram class), lifting 412.5 kilograms, a Commonwealth and Australian record and, in the clean and jerk, 240 kilograms, which was also a Commonwealth and Australian record. Dean Lukin, I suppose, epitomises the typical true blue Australian sportsman, and everyone was delighted when he came through with his gold medal; he made it look so easy.

In track and field, I have already mentioned the heptathlon performance of Glynis Nunn; she scored 6 390 points, an Olympic, Commonwealth and Australian record and a magnificent performance. In the men's swimming—the 200m butterfly—Jon Sieben's time of 1.5704 was a world, Olympic, Commonwealth and Australian open record. Then, of course, there was the cycling, bringing us the other gold medal, in the 4 000m team pursuit, the members of which were Kevin Nichols, Michael Grenda, Michael Turtur (a South Australian) and Dean Woods, who competed in 4.25.99 minutes.

Australia did reasonably well in the medal tally although it is a pity that we consider the performance of our athletes in the Olympic Games on that basis. Even though Australia won four gold, eight silver and 12 bronze medals it was well down the field from naturally the leading country on this occasion, the United States, which won 83 gold, 61 silver and 30 bronze medals; Romania, which won 20 gold, 16 silver and 17 bronze; West Germany, 17 gold, 19 silver and 23 bronze; and China (competing for the first time in many years), 15 gold, eight silver and nine bronze. However, it must be considered far more important to have had the opportunity to compete and, with the backup support and the excellent work of the South Australian Sports Institute, our 32 South Australians were fortunate in being able to represent their country.

I, like my Leader, want to pay tribute to the South Australian Sports Institute; to its Chairman, Mr Geoff Motley; to the Director, Michael Nunan; and one other person who I believe has had much to do with the achievement and the successes of the Sports Institute, who helped and guided me back in the early 1970s when I proposed that South Australia have a Minister of Recreation and Sport who, when it was proposed that we have a Sports Institute, wanted it to be a centre of excellence—Jess Jarvis. His contribution to athletics in this State and this country has been superb. We are very lucky indeed to have people such as Jess Jarvis who have made a wonderful, long and outstanding contribution in this area. It must have been a great thrill for Jess Jarvis to see so many South Australians do well at the 1984 Olympic Games. I hope that we can retain his services for many years to come.

The motion has been amended to include our disabled Olympians. By tradition, the Paralympics are normally held in the country that holds the Olympic Games. On this occasion for various reasons, America did not. Certainly, President Reagan had many appeals made to him to support the Paralympics but he chose not to, and that of course was a pity.

However, the Paralympics were held in England, and again we were delighted to note the record and performance of the South Australians who represented their country. The South Australian team of 10 athletes and three officials was part of a 58-strong Australian team that competed in the Eighth Paralympics in Stoke-Mandeville, in England. Probably the best performance and consistently the best performer was Libby Kosmala, who clinched four gold medals and world records. In the air rifle event, Libby, 41, eclipsed the world records in the prone event with a score of 395 from a possible 400; standing with 381/400; kneeling position with 396/400; and the gold medal for the world aggregate record. Libby, in the *News* of 8 August, said:

> If I had shot the way I was shooting in training I would never have won so many medals. It just all seemed to come together in the competition, and I shot better than I have ever done before.

The article continues:

> Libby, competing in her fourth 'Olympics,' is a mother of two boys, 6 and 2. The South Australian gold medal winner was Strathalbyn grandmother Barbara Caspers, 58, who took three gold medals and world records and one bronze medal in the air rifle event against men. She was the only woman quadraplegic shooter allowed to compete in the men's competition.
>
> She took gold medals in the prone and standing positions, bronze in the kneeling event and shattered the world record for the aggregate. South Australia's Julie Russell won a silver medal in the first official paraplegic marathon, and bronze in her speciality, the pentathlon. South Australian champion marathoner, Robert Turner, was a member of the four-man team which won bronze in the 4 × 400 metre relay. Australia finished sixth in the medal count with 55 medals—18 gold, 16 silver and 21 bronze. The Games involved 1 100 competitors from 40 countries.

I know Mrs Kosmala well, and it was my pleasure earlier this year to present my perpetual trophy to Libby Kosmala as the disabled sportswoman of the year. No doubt from her performance on this occasion, again I may well have to repeat that presentation when the Sportswomen's Association has its next presentation. But, most importantly, those who are disadvantaged, our disabled members of the community, have the opportunity to represent their State and their country in an Olympic Games in another country.

I cannot speak highly enough of these people's dedication, devotion and hard work in bringing themselves up to the standard necessary to compete in the Olympic Games, when one considers that our athletes were competing against representatives from 39 other countries, whose populations are far far greater than that of Australia, and certainly South Australia.

It was a wonderful performance by our disabled people, a performance that we have come to expect. Libby Kosmala has attended four Olympic Games, and over the years our athletes have performed very well indeed, having achieved a high standard of excellence. The camaraderie between our Olympic athletes and the disabled athletes is superb, and no doubt this helps our disabled athletes and promotes pride in wearing the Australian colours at the Games.

The Olympic Games have had a very colourful history. It is probably the greatest event that mankind has endeavoured to promote in the interests of peace. It would be a wonderful thing if all countries in the world could compete in the Olympic Games without any difficulties. Greek legend says that Hercules introduced the first Games when he challenged his four brothers in a foot race around a circle 600 ft in diameter. The winner was crowned with a branch of wild olive, a symbol of strength and endurance. Greek Games were held for thousands of years in villages at religious ceremonies in honour of the Greek gods. Later they came together at one festival every four years.

Then they lapsed for hundreds of years until King Iphutus in the ninth century BC revived them to help stop his people warring, and he chose the site of the Temple of Olympia for them. The first Olympic Games were held in 776 BC and were held regularly for nearly 12 centuries. Only free Greek citizens were allowed to compete, and they wore only loincloths or competed in the nude. No women were allowed to watch or take part. What a tragedy that was, and what a tragedy it would be if that were the case today, because the best performances in the Olympic Games have come from our women. We would be in diabolical trouble without them.

In the Los Angeles Olympic Games we saw many innovations. In fact, in 1932 women competed in only three sports—athletics (track and field), fencing and swimming—

and only 14 events. In the 1984 Olympics, women competed in 15 sports and 75 events. The glory of winning is always associated with the Olympic Games, and they are the pinnacle in regard to representing one's country, but there are many other levels and standards of international competition. I believe that the ambit of the motion should be extended a little further: it refers to Olympians and the disabled but, for instance, two young South Australian women performed outstandingly this year at the World Lightweight Rowing Championships in Montreal.

I commend those two young South Australian women for their achievement. They are members of the Australian Lightweight Women's Eight who were silver medallists at the championships. Because lightweight rowing is not an Olympic sport, Amanda Cross of Athelstone and Karin Riedel of Mitcham did not receive the acclaim that was accorded to the Olympians. Nevertheless, their achievement and performance at Montreal puts them in the forefront of any sport. The championship was rowed over 2 000 metres, and the Australian time was 6 minutes and 20 seconds, two seconds behind the winning United States team. Amanda and Karin are both aged 18, which is unusually young for women rowers to achieve such distinction.

They have sacrificed employment opportunities and the pursuit of tertiary education in order to reach the peak of training necessary for international competition. Their dedication ranks with that of the Olympians. Both girls have been Australian National Pairs champions, and they compete regularly interstate. They are members of the Adelaide University Boat Club, which raised the greater proportion of the funds necessary to send them to Montreal. To raise in excess of $4 000 in two months was a significant achievement for such a small club. Unfortunately, there was no State Government grant provided. The club was assisted in its efforts by the members for Coles and Mitcham, who this evening will host a reception to honour Amanda Cross and Karin Reidel for their contribution to rowing and to Australian sport.

Rowing is a very costly sport and receives no subsidy or sponsorship at this stage. I think that that is a tragedy. South Australia encourages amateur sport at all levels, and we should do all we can to encourage the establishment of a centre of excellence to cater for all fields of amateur sport. The dedication, devotion and hours spent by the young people involved (and I refer particularly on this occasion to Amanda and Karin), as well as the financial strain on those people and their parents, is considerable.

No doubt, without the support of my colleagues the members for Coles and Mitcham and their friends it would not have been possible for Amanda and Karin to represent Australia at Montreal. They represented Australia with distinction, and we commend and acknowledge them for what they did, and I hope that they will be able to continue to represent South Australia and Australia for many years to come, perhaps one day bringing home gold. The benefits and experience gained from such participation can be passed on to other young South Australian men and women striving for excellence in sport. The young women to whom I have referred were fine ambassadresses for Australia, and we salute them for the contribution they made at the Lightweight Rowing Championships. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT STAFFING

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:

That this House deplores the lack of action by the Minister of Education in not bringing schools which are under their quota of ancillary staff up to the allocation which has been notified to them for 1984, thus causing particular hardship and lack of educational opportunity in affected schools.

(Continued from 19 September. Page 997.)

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens): In continuing my remarks on the motion, I want to make two or three points. Before taking office, the present Minister of Education made a commitment on behalf of the Labor Party that as Minister he would not invoke clause 13 (3) of the school assistants award. He said also that a Labor Government would not oppose an application made by the union for the removal of clause 13 (3) from that award. Making a promise like that has a penalty: by not invoking clause 13 (3) (dealing with the compulsory removal of school assistants at schools that are over entitlement) the Minister has created a problem in schools, because now many schools are under entitlement—in fact well under the 5 per cent corridor. The Minister must provide the funds—about $250 000, I understand—that are required to correct this serious situation.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Ingerson, Lewis, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (20)—Messrs Abbott, L.M.F. Arnold (teller), M.J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Plunkett, Slater, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Gunn and Mathwin. Noes—Messrs Bannon and Trainer.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

[*Sitting suspended from 6.4 to 7.30 p.m.*]

TOBACCO SALES TO CHILDREN (PROHIBITION) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

RACING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 September. Page 1007.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): It gives me pleasure to put the Opposition's point of view on this Bill. As it is principally a Bill which is involved with administrative procedures, it is not the intention of the Opposition to spend a lot of time in discussing it, but there are several areas about which we would like to ask some questions. As we have discussed the Bill widely with the racing industry and with many of the organisations concerned, there are a few areas that we believe need to be discussed. I would like to divide my comments into the four sections as mentioned by the Minister in his second reading explanation. First of all, I would like to talk about the phantom race meetings or, as has been put to me, the Clayton meeting, the meeting when you are not having a meeting. I just point out to the Government that we totally support the attitude of enabling racing clubs to proceed with this function, but there are a couple of areas upon which we would like to question the Minister.

The first one, as mentioned by the Minister in his second reading explanation, is that one of the reasons for being

asked to introduce this action was the fact that there was a considerable loss at some meetings when they have been called off or cancelled. I would like to ask the Minister how that would relate to the comparative costs of having a very low attendance meeting and how those statements match up. In his explanation he did mention that the main reason for wanting to introduce these meetings was as a result of inclement weather. We would like him to further explain what he means by inclement weather and how the time frame for calling off these meetings would work. I think it is fairly important to owners, trainers, and also for the public to know at a reasonable time on the day that these meetings have been called off. We would like an explanation from the Minister as to how he sees the calling off of these meetings taking place.

The Minister has also mentioned that, as well as inclement weather, there were other unforeseen circumstances. Since we believe that it is principally because of inclement weather that these meetings ought to be changed and allowed to be run, we would like a further explanation from the Minister as to what he means by 'other unforeseen circumstances'.

The group most concerned with the running of these phantom meetings was the bookmakers. I think that group has a legitimate question to ask of the Minister. They note that because these meetings are likely to be significantly smaller in number, they were hoping that they would not be expected to field in the same sort of numbers required and expected of them at a traditional race meeting. We would like to ask the Minister as to how the scrutineering of the bookmakers would be carried out and how some sort of a roster system, or whatever, was going to be used in requiring bookmakers to field at these meetings.

The second area the Minister discussed was the area of cross code betting. The Opposition supports the amendment that has been introduced, because, first, it is purely and simply to validate a previous function and the Opposition has no objection to that. Of course, it also enables the cross code betting and the placing of funds in the particular area, as far as codes are concerned, to continue. We support that area. As far as the fixing of dates of meetings is concerned, there is no question that the Minister does on these particular occasions,where he has to make quick decisions, need to be able to make available to the public and to the clubs concerned in fairly quick time the cancellation of or the change in dates. We would support any function which would enable the Minister to do this quickly and in a correct manner.

The fourth and final area of this Bill relates to the powers of the Betting Control Board. We support that amendment. Of course, we recognise that it is an extra method or an intermediary step on which the Board can act in the whole area of the control of bookmakers and we would consequently support that. With those few comments to the Minister, and hoping we will get some answers to those comments, I have nothing further to add.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I take note of the comments made by the member for Bragg and some of the questions that he raised in this debate. I make the point again, as I did in my second reading explanation, that all of these amendments are supported by the industry, and indeed are basically housekeeping arrangements as far as the Racing Act is concerned. A number of points were raised by the member for Bragg. I refer, first, to phantom meetings. The South Australian Jockey Club particularly has requested over a period of time a change to the Racing Act to enable it to take certain action in situations of inclement weather. That is basically the whole purpose of the exercise, and honourable members may may recall that on two occasions this winter the racing industry has experienced such difficulties. In fact, there was one meeting where I think three events were conducted and the meeting was then abandoned. The whole purpose of the exercise is to allow, in circumstances of that nature, that the meeting be abandoned, but with the continuation of betting on Sydney, Melbourne and interstate.

Before I get on to the Betting Control Board, I might mention that it is the usual practice of the club, along with the people affected, particularly the jockeys whose life and limb are at some danger in regard to participating in certain track conditions, that an inspection of the track is carried out early on the Saturday morning, if it is a metropolitan meeting. Arising from that inspection a decision is made as to whether or not the meeting will continue. I believe that in the past chances have been taken in relation to life and limb, not only of jockeys, but of the thoroughbred horses that compete. So, the whole purpose of this exercise is to minimise that risk as much as possible.

I introduced the amendment at the request of the racing industry, and I would expect that the track would be inspected early in the morning of the day on which the meeting was to take place. In those circumstances, a decision could be made early on that day, which would mean that the South Australian Jockey Club, which under the Act administers racing in South Australia, would decide, in conjunction with the persons affected (that is, the jockeys and representatives of the owners and trainers), whether or not to abandon the meeting. It may be difficult in those circumstances for the Betting Control Board to contact every bookmaker who had a permit to operate at that meeting, but I would expect that as many as possible would be advised that the meeting had been abandoned and that all of them would not field on that date at that meeting.

In this respect, we have a unique position in South Australia whereby all bookmakers can bet on all interstate events as well as local races, whereas, in Sydney and in other places interstate a bookmaker may bet only on the local races or only on interstate events. I saw this practice in operation at Randwick only last week. At Queensland metropolitan clubs, only about 25 per cent of the normal attendance can be expected when the meeting is abandoned, and only about one third of the normal number of bookmakers would be required to attend to bet on interstate meetings.

I suggest that the Betting Control Board would permit sufficient bookmakers to attend to meet public demand. This amendment will be in the nature of an experiment, if it operates at all, and I hope that circumstances do not arise to require it to operate. The amendment is a safeguard in respect of the bookmakers, the totalizator staff, and the caterers who have been engaged for the day and it will provide an opportunity for bookmakers to operate on a businesslike basis. The Betting Control Board does not anticipate a problem when a local meeting is abandoned, after all the bookmakers arrive at the course. This situation has arisen previously and has been handled by the Board's betting supervisor in attendance. A problem could arise if the decision to abandon the meeting were not taken early enough in the day. Such a decision would be up to the South Australian Jockey Club or the club that was conducting the meeting. A decision to abandon the meeting would have to be taken early in the morning so that not only the bookmakers but the public at large could be advised of such action.

This amendment is really a safety measure and certain decisions will have to be made by the club involved: for instance, whether an admission fee will be charged. Indeed, there may be a dispute in respect of that matter and a final decision would have to be taken by the South Australian Jockey Club because no events would take place on the

course that day, although people would be able to bet on interstate events. Other decisions could involve the provision of full totalizator facilities and catering facilities and whether the derby stand and the grandstand enclosures would be open. Such decisions would be taken on the basis of experience and would be made by the club conducting the meeting.

The member for Bragg referred to unforeseen circumstances. Again, it is difficult to say what these might be, but I made clear to the Trotting Club, the Jockey Club and the dog-racing people that this legislation was not intended to cover a situation that might result from an industrial dispute. We do not know what might happen in future, and the purpose of the amendment is to meet the situation where a meeting is abandoned because of difficulty in using the track and the risk to the safety of horses and riders.

The honourable member also referred to the gazettal of changes of dates. From time to time that matter has given rise to problems. At the beginning of the racing year, in August, I receive from representatives of the three racing codes their racing calendars for the ensuing 12 months. From time to time, because of circumstances (for instance, inclement weather or insufficient nominations) a meeting may be transferred to another date. Occasionally, over the past couple of years, especially at country meetings, very little notice has been given me, as Minister, of a change of date, which I must approve. Consequently, the meeting has been held prior to its gazettal in the *Government Gazette* as required under the Racing Act. So, technically, that meeting should not have been held, and the purpose of this amendment is to ensure, according to advice that I have received from the Crown Solicitor, that such a meeting is conducted legally.

I am happy that the Opposition is supporting the amendment relating to the powers of the Betting Control Board to control and discipline bookmakers, because I understand that there is no opposition from the bookmaking fraternity in relation to this provision. A bookmaker receives a licence and then subsequently receives a permit to operate at a specific meeting on a certain date. Recently, a licensed bookmaker was charged and fined for indulging in illegal SP bookmaking. That is an unusual occurrence and the Board found that it did not have the power to suspend that bookmaker's licence or even his permit. The Board therefore wishes to ensure that in future similar cases it will have the power to suspend that permit of the bookmaker who offends in that way. I am not aware of any section of the bookmakers who oppose that amendment.

Basically, these provisions are housekeeping amendments that are being enacted in the interests of the industry generally. Indeed, they have been requested by the industry. These amendments were initiated by the Racing Industry Advisory Committee, which, when my Party came into Government, I set up because I realised that the three codes had hitherto had little or no opportunity to consult and needed Government help in that respect.

The Racing Industry Advisory Committee has been well received by the three codes. However, some difficulties are very hard to resolve. There are still differences, but at least the committee has given people an opportunity to air their views. As I said, a large proportion of the amendments have come out of discussions with the Racing Industry Advisory Committee. I thank the member for Bragg for his support for the amendments, which are, I believe, in the interests of the racing industry generally.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

Mr INGERSON: I thank the Minister for his explanation of the term 'other unforeseen circumstances', because there has been considerable concern about whether the industrial dispute area was included, or what the attitude towards it was. I thank the Minister for clarifying that position. I am quite sure that the industry generally will be happy to know that that is the Minister's clear intention.

The other area on which I would like to comment is that there is no question that the call-off time for a meeting is a very critical area in this whole process. As the Minister said, let us hope that it does not happen, but, because we have legislated for it, it is probable that it will. It seems to me that apart from the bookmakers to whom I have referred and the public we need to consider the very real expense for owner-trainers. If a meeting is called off at 11.30 am, we could be almost assured that a very large percentage of country owners and trainers would be well and truly on their way to the track by then.

I understand that the Minister cannot do anything within this legislation to change that, but I think we should at least express an opinion to the SAJC that this is a problem that it needs to well and truly consider. Hopefully, the call-off time will be as early as practicable on a Saturday morning for a race meeting or in the afternoon for trots and/or dogs.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Again, I am pleased that the member for Bragg supports the point regarding industrial disputes and legislation: that certainly is not the intention of the legislation. The honourable member raised another matter in relation to racing, trotting and greyhound clubs, which I believe would act responsibly on behalf of their clients—the public, bookmakers, totalizator staff, catering staff and, of course, owners and trainers, who would be somewhat disadvantaged if the decision was not made in sufficient time so that those persons were not disadvantaged. If owners and trainers were bringing their horses to the course after a decision had been made late in the morning, it would jeopardise and disadvantage them financially.

The South Australian Jockey Club, any of the other codes or a country club would be remiss if they did not make their decision known early in the day. The present procedure is that there is first an inspection (usually at 7 a.m. on a Saturday) to decide whether the track is safe. That decision is usually taken in association with jockeys, and the owners are also represented. So, there is representation now. The advantage of this is that the risk that has been involved previously will not now be taken. Perhaps we have been lucky. Earlier this year three events were conducted and a meeting was then abandoned. I believe that we are minimising the kind of risk involved for horses and riders if a race is run on an unsafe track. Although risks have been taken in the past that should not have been taken, this legislation will minimise such possibilities. We should ensure—and I say this sincerely—that the South Australian Jockey Club, the Trotting Control Board, the Greyhound Racing Control Board and country clubs are responsible and will advise those involved as early as possible on a race day.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—'Revocation of permit.'

Mr INGERSON: Will the Minister explain what the appeal provisions are, if there are any? Do any other appeal provisions apply?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: No; there is no appeal provision. In the past the Board has had the power only to suspend a particular bookmaker's licence. Once a permit is issued, the board has not had on opportunity to revoke it. I understand that the Betting Control Board supports this amendment, so that those involved have power to suspend or cancel a permit which is issued sometimes six weeks or two months

ahead. At present, they do not have that power, but we are giving them that power, rather than cancelling a particular person's licence.

That is the difference. They will be able to suspend the permit granted to bet at a certain venue (such as Victoria Park), at a particular meeting. Of course, that permit can be revoked, whereas presently they have to take more drastic action and cancel a licence. The honourable member raised a question about appeals. No doubt, that would take its normal course. However, there is no appeal provision, as I understand it, in the Act at the moment in regard to this permit or to suspend a licence. However, there have been very rare occasions when a person has taken civil action in court. That provision exists for everybody, but I understand that there is no provision in the Racing Act for a bookmaker to lodge an appeal against a decision of the Betting Control Board.

Clause passed.

Clause 8 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 August. Page 688.)

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): The Opposition supports the passage of this Bill through the House but we would like responses to some questions that were raised in another place during the debate, and assurances were given by the Attorney-General that responses would be available in the House of Assembly. The Bill seeks to provide that, where a person accused of an indictable offence wishes to rely on an alibi at his or her trial in either a District Criminal Court or the Supreme Court, he or she must give notice to the Crown Prosecutor of the intention within seven days after he or she has been committed for trial by a court of summary jurisdiction.

This Bill seeks to establish the mechanisms by which that is achieved. The notice of the alibi must be in writing and, as we have said, it has to go to the Crown Prosecutor. It must contain a summary setting out with reasonable particularity the facts that are sought to be established by the evidence. It must also give the names and addresses of witnesses by whom any evidence is to be given and other particulars that might be required by the Rules of Court. There is a provision that the fact that notice of an alibi has not been given does not render any evidence at the trial inadmissible. However, the fact that notice has not been given may be the subject of comment by the justice to the jury. It does not have to be, but it may be.

The United Kingdom Criminal Justice Act, 1967, did in fact put in British Statutes legislation very similar to that incorporated in the Bill before us, and we understand that the British Act is still in force. The United Kingdom legislation arose from recommendations made in 1967 by the United Kingdom Criminal Law Revision Committee. Recommendations were made to that committee, we understand, largely because courts were discovering that there was a business of marketing or selling alibis amongst members of the underworld. So, trying to overcome that practice, the Criminal Law Revision Committee decided that the Crown should be given formal notice of an alibi largely to prevent any delays in the proceedings of the court. It could mean a delay of a week or two at considerable cost and, of course, the alternative to not having a delay would mean that the Crown would go to a case cold, would not have all the facts of the alibi before it, and would not have researched the evidence that was suddenly thrust into the court.

Of course, an alibi may take any number of forms. A very clear cut alibi would be where a person said that he or she was many miles away from a place where a crime was allegedly committed, in which case that would be a very clear example of an alibi defence. However, there may be cases where the alibi was not nearly so clear cut and where a person may admit to having been in the vicinity of an offence when it was committed. They may admit even to having been on premises where an offence was committed but deny that they were there at the specific time that the offence took place. It could mean that very precise checks would have to be made by the police—the prosecution—in order to ascertain the veracity or otherwise of the accused's alibi. In its ninth report on evidence the United Kingdom Criminal Law Revision Committee stated:

> In our opinion there is a strong case for amending the law so as to deprive accused persons of the privilege of keeping back a defence of alibi until the last moment. A rule which enables the accused to deprive the prosecution of the opportunity of investigating the truth about a defence clearly calls for some justification if it is to be kept. The rule has been defended on the ground that there is no substantial need for any change, that in any event the prosecution and the court can comment on the failure of the accused to mention an alibi, and that there is nothing so special about alibi defences as to justify making an exception in respect of them to the general rule that the defence are not obliged to disclose their case to the prosecution.
>
> It is also said that the accused, especially if he is in custody, may have difficulty in finding a witness to a good alibi in time to comply with the requirement to give notice and that in any event there are practical difficulties about the police interviewing alibi witnesses in order to investigate their story. But for reasons which will appear below we are satisfied that, whatever should be the law as to disclosure of the defence in general, alibi defences at least are a special case, that provision ought to be made for giving notice of those defences and that the practical difficulties, if they exist, can be overcome.
>
> We believe that it will contribute substantially to the breaking down of false alibis if notice of an alibi has to be given in advance. The present law gives two particular advantages to the defence. First . . . the police may be unable to investigate the alibi before evidence of it is given. It will therefore be of help to them if particulars have to be given before the trial. Secondly, if an alibi witness is kept out of sight till the moment when he is called, the prosecution are deprived of the possibility of finding out something about him which can be put to him in cross-examination and may lessen the value of his evidence. For this reason elaborate precautions are sometimes taken to prevent the police from finding out who the witness is to be until his name is called and he comes into the witness box.

The shadow Attorney-General in another place was of the opinion that that statement by the committee was adequate justification for amending the South Australian Criminal Law Consolidation Act to accommodate that procedure. We believe that there has not been any particular difficulty in South Australia, but obviously this Bill will provide for a time should such a contingency arise. However, one other matter to which reference is made by that Criminal Law Revision Committee in its report relates to interviewing witnesses identified as being able to give evidence of an alibi on behalf of an accused. I quote from the Committee's report, as follows:

> Since the object of the requirement to give the names of alibi witnesses is to enable the prosecution to investigate the alibi, we have no doubt that it follows that the police should be able to interview the witnesses, as is done in Scotland. This may give rise to difficulty if allegations are made at the trial that the police acted improperly when interviewing a witness. The trial would then be complicated by the introduction of further issues of fact for the jury. In order to lessen these difficulties it would in our opinion be desirable that chief officers of police should give instructions that before interviewing a proposed alibi witness the police should, whenever possible, give the solicitor for the defence reasonable notice of their intention to do so and a reasonable opportunity to be present at the interview. We do not suggest that it should be the practice to arrange for similar facilities for the accused himself in the uncommon case where he is not legally

represented, especially as he may be a long way from where the witness is to be interviewed and may be in custody; but in these cases we suggest that the police should try to arrange for the interview to be in the presence of some independent person.

As was pointed out in another place, no mention of that was made by the Attorney-General in the second reading explanation, nor was it included in the second reading before the House of Assembly. So, the Attorney-General did undertake to provide that information in the House of Assembly. He did not say that he would give any assurances and we accept that if assurances are not possible we will still not oppose the legislation.

However, we do make reference to that because in the January 1975 issue of the *Criminal Law Review* there is a comment that the safeguard to which reference was made in the previous quote has not in fact been followed in practice, notwithstanding that assurances were given in the United Kingdom Parliament that the practice would be adopted. So, given the fact that assurances were given in the United Kingdom that the practices have not been followed, we were looking for some assurance that in South Australia at least some procedure would be followed by the police.

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I support the Bill and do not propose to speak at length. The Bill provides that a defendant must notify the prosecution if he proposes to rely on an alibi by way of defence. As the second reading explanation outlines, the Bill does not render evidence inadmissible by reason of failing to give notice, but the failing to give notice may, nevertheless, be the subject of comment to the jury, and that would be disadvantageous to an accused person should he put himself in the position of not giving adequate notice.

As I understand it, the current practice among the bar in South Australia has always been to give the police the requisite notice that they are relying on an alibi as soon as practicable after the committal proceedings have ended. The alibi is defined in the legislation as the defendant being at a particular time in a particular area at a particular place. Because the practice of the legal profession here—defence lawyers—has been to follow basically the procedure outlined in the Bill, it will not cause any great change in South Australia.

The United Kingdom has had a similar provision since 1967, requiring an accused person to give notice of an alibi. New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania and Queensland all have similar provisions. It is of interest to note that it was recommended by the Mitchell Committee in its second report that the notice of alibi be seven days. The legal profession has generally followed, since the Mitchell Committee reported, the recommendations of that committee.

The motives behind the legislation are really quite clear. There are probably two essential motives: one that it would disadvantage the police quite severely (and in practice has done so in the past) in that they would not otherwise have an opportunity to adequately investigate an alibi raised at trial. Today many kinds of evidence have the potential to take the prosecution by surprise, particularly because of the intensive investigation often required in scientific evidence and in cases that rely upon forensic evidence. The prosecution could otherwise be in a position of being taken by surprise at trial by the raising of an alibi and, because extensive investigation may be required, it places the prosecution at a severe disadvantage and would not otherwise be in the best interests of the administration of justice.

There is a benefit to an accused person because, under the current set-up, if an alibi is raised at trial and rebuttal evidence is then given by the Crown (supposing it is not a matter that required forensic evidence but rebuttal evidence was led by the Crown), the Crown then has almost the last say to the jury, in that this may be prejudicial to a defendant to have the Crown, after the closing of a defence case, call further evidence.

They are the two essential motives behind the legislation. Requiring the defence to give notice within seven days of committal will alleviate these types of problems and be in the best interests of the administration of justice in South Australia. It will facilitate the conduct of trials in South Australia and ensure that all defence lawyers adhere to the procedure. It will not cause any difficulty in South Australia, because the legal profession has, in general terms, followed the procedure contained in the Act.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I acknowledge the Opposition's support for this measure. The member for Mount Gambier mentioned that, in another place, the Hon. K.T. Griffin had sought an assurance that the police would interview witnesses, after receiving notice of alibi, only in the presence of the accused's solicitor. The Attorney-General undertook to pursue that assurance, but indicated to the Hon. Mr Griffin and the Legislative Council that the Bill would in all probability be passed in this place even if the assurance was not forthcoming. I appreciate that the point was acknowledged by the member for Mount Gambier. The Attorney-General has taken up this matter with the Commissioner of Police, who has indicated that he is not willing to issue an instruction that witnesses are to be interviewed only in the presence of the accused's solicitor.

I will refer briefly to some of the wishes of the police. The Attorney-General has indicated that he does not see any need to distinguish between interviewing witnesses where the accused has, in an interview, raised an alibi and witnesses whose existence is revealed in a notice of alibi. That is certainly a most valid conclusion. The Bill is based upon the English law that resulted from the Ninth Report of the Criminal Law Revision Committee. The request for this legislation has come from the Police Department and law reformers following some cases in this State that have created considerable difficulties for the police in pursuing a prosecution.

One case of which I will inform the House involved the calling of 16 alibi witnesses in the space of two days, necessitating frantic police inquiries as the trial proceeded. I can recall that trial, as I was involved in another trial at the same time. I recall that one of the alibis was that the accused was at a race meeting on a particular day and that it would be proven that no race meeting was held in South Australia on that day. I remember the prosecutor describing the elimination of that alibi as being like a snow flake falling on hot asphalt. Unfortunately, it is not so simple to disprove other alibis, given the limited opportunities for police to pursue their inquiries.

Mr Griffin's comments have obviously arisen from some proposals of the English Law Revision Committee and subsequent comment in the Criminal Law Review. As a matter of general principle, the Government is opposed to any requirement which fetters the ability of police officers to ask questions of anyone they believe may be able to assist in an investigation. An incomplete investigation is not in the interests of justice and could quite likely prejudice a suspect or accused person. One must ask as to the need to interview a witness in the presence of the defendant's solicitor. What is the solicitor's role in those circumstances? He is not acting for the witness. If it is so that the solicitor then knows what the witness has said, he can find this out by interviewing the witness subsequently, anyway.

As to the notice that the witness will be interviewed by the police, it is assumed that the Crown Solicitor would advise the defendant's solicitor, as a matter of professional

courtesy, that police officers will interview the witness. Given that a witness need not speak to the police, anyway, it is not seen that a need exists to give an instruction to police officers to conduct these interviews in the presence of the defendant's solicitor. In the final analysis it is up to the witness whether he or she wishes to be interviewed and in whose presence that interview is to take place. I trust that those comments may assist the House in understanding the role of the police in this matter and, indeed, in assuring the House that no threat exists to the administration of justice by the measures proposed by the Government and passed by another place in this amending Bill.

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

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 September. Page 910.)

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): The Opposition also supports this Bill, which seeks, first, to give more flexibility to a justice dealing with a warrant for non-payment of a fine or other penalty and, secondly, to provide a more effective procedure for dealing with statements of prosecution witnesses in committal proceedings.

Members may realise that at present a warrant of commitment can be delayed for any reason by any justice. This Bill seeks to defer that right of interference that a justice may have until after a warrant has been issued and then, by application, the justice may give it his consideration and may decide to defer the implementation of the warrant.

In my experience, over the past 30 years in the South-East, I have become aware of the problems involved. In fact, I did spend some little time in a debt collecting agency, something which I did not enjoy one little bit. One is always collecting too slowly for the creditors and much too quickly for the debtors. It is hard to be popular with any part of the public under those circumstances. However, one thing which did happen and which impressed me quite considerably was that while the creditors were very often anxious to obtain a warrant of commitment on the grounds that it was all too frequently regarded as money in the bank—people would pay on a warrant of commitment whereas they disregarded summonses and unsatisfied judgment summonses—very often the police officer would knock on the door and say 'I have a warrant of commitment here. You have to go into prison,' and then the person who owed the money would say to the policeman, 'Well, look, I prefer not to go to prison and, if you just hang off for a little while, I will be able to pay this money.'

The policeman was then placed in the invidious position of having found the person on whom to serve the warrant, and then being asked to defer the warrant when he did not have the legal power to do so. All he had the power to do was serve the warrant and put the person in gaol. Those humanitarian policemen have for decades been going along to serve warrants and have made a valued judgment on whether to not only defer the serving of the warrant of commitment but also whether to collect money, to hold it at the police station, and not to give a receipt because the issuing of any receipt which can then be produced by the debtor would automatically invalidate the warrant of commitment. They would go to the court and say 'I have a receipt for part payment of this,' and the warrant would be completely invalidated. The policeman would hold the money and, when he finally received the full amount, he would present that, issue a receipt for the full tote odds and the warrant of commitment would not have been served.

That is a fairly loose arrangement. It places responsibilities on the police which they should not have. This legislation provides for the justice to defer the serving of a warrant upon application by the debtor. In another place the shadow Attorney-General requested information from the Attorney-General regarding the fact that the application has to be made to a justice who is a clerk of the court. We were seeking information as to whether it was necessary for all those applications to be made in that fashion or whether they could not be made to a justice of the peace.

The Attorney-General said that the reason was an administrative one, and that an application to suspend the execution of a warrant should only be made to a justice who is a clerk of the court and not to any justice of the peace because the Courts Department was developing a system of keeping track of warrants, the execution of which had been suspended. If a person could approach any justice and make an application, the tracking of those applications could become quite chaotic and warrants could be suspended without the court system knowing anything about it.

Another question was whether the Attorney-General would consider extending the scheme of community service orders introduced by the former Liberal Government with some success, and whether the Government intended to extend community service orders across the State. Of course, it would need additional resources to do that. I believe that the Attorney-General said that the matter would be looked at. Could the Minister in charge of this Bill give us some reassurance on that also? We support the legislation.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I thank the Opposition for its support of this measure. I refer to the matters that were raised in another place by the shadow Attorney-General; they have been explained by the Attorney-General to the extent of knowledge available to the Government. However, I might add some further comments which may assist the honourable member and the House. Section 83(1) provides:

> . . . the justice may, if he deems it expedient so to do, postpone the issue of such warrant for such time and on such conditions (if any) as he thinks just.

The present amendments give justices who are also clerks of court no more power than they have now, but it allows them to exercise that power at a later time.

Concerning community service orders, I think all honourable members see the merit in that programme. However, there are some administrative difficulties in allowing such orders to be granted across the State. However, substantial progress is being made within the provisions of the current Budget for a substantial increase in the availability of those orders in South Australia. That will assist in the administration of justice and will be an ongoing programme, not just with community service orders but with other types of alternative non-custodial sentencing within our criminal justice system.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): Recently a copy of the Hamilton *Spectator* newspaper of 9 October was sent to me by a mate of mine, Blue Kennedy. It reported a dispute that arose in the pastoral industry at Coleraine, in Victoria. I was very upset to read about the dispute, because it involved an

industry with which I was associated for some 23 years. Not many disputes occurred in that industry. Over those many years there was the odd strike, but disputes did not occur which resulted in violence and shooting. However, tonight is the first opportunity that I have had to speak on this matter and to make clear that what has been shown on television and printed in some newspapers is to my way of thinking quite incorrect.

A programme on television showed the New Zealand shearers saying that they had not been given a fair go, that they had come out here to work and had been stopped from doing so. That is a complete falsehood. Those New Zealanders (and I have with me a paper from New Zealand to which I will refer later if I have time, an article in which concerns at least one of those shearers who was involved in the dispute) in actual fact are scabs in any language—that would be the case whether they were New Zealanders, Australians or people from anywhere else. Their whole aim is to act as scabs. It might seem a bit strange to be bandying around the word 'scabs' in Parliament, but I can assure you, Sir, that this is a very important facet of the industry.

Previously I was involved with the Australian Workers Union, and I am still very proud to hold a ticket of that union. I was very proud to be in the industry. In making these comments about the dispute tonight, I point out that unfortunately more violence will occur in the industry because of the attitude not only of New Zealanders but also of some Australian scabs who are not satisfied with going into the industry and abiding by the award conditions, which have been fought for over the past 100 years.

Mr Baker interjecting:

Mr PLUNKETT: The stupid idiot who was interjecting would not know anything about the industry, and it might be better if he stopped his ears from flapping and listened to the comments of someone who recently has been in the industry and who spent a lot of his life associated with it. I am trying to explain just what is happening, but the honourable member probably does not want to know about it. I would like to outline a portion of my experience not only as a shearer but also as an organiser.

Mr Lewis: Were you an organiser?

Mr PLUNKETT: I was an organiser of the Australian Workers Union, and I am very proud of that, too.

Mr Lewis: For how long?

Mr PLUNKETT: For 10 years. Back in about July 1974, I received a report from some shearers that the award conditions of the Federal and State pastoral awards were being broken, and I was asked to visit a four-stand shed at Lameroo. I found that the owner, who had had very good relations with the local shearers for many years (they had done the job with no disputes over that time), had taken it upon himself to bring out four scab shearers. Those shearers were not members of their own New Zealand union, but in the strict sense, were scabs. They did not want to abide by such things as a five day week, a half hour tea break in the morning and afternoon and an hour for dinner, and those sorts of things.

The homestead was a good half mile from the shed and they had an arrangement that a button would be pressed to warn those in the shed that an organiser was on his way. I do not know what happened on the day when I arrived at the property, but the warning was not received. When I got to the shed the four shearers were using what was known at that time as the merry widow comb, which is the wide comb that has now been approved. Commissioner McKenzie handed down his decision on that matter, but I still think personally that the decision was incorrect. I found that the four New Zealand shearers at the shed were not one bit interested in the conditions laid down by the union. They worked 10 hours a day, seven days a week. They also had no shed hands; their wives did the picking up in the shearing shed. They were also using accommodation that had been banned from use because it was not up to standard. That was accepted by the local shearers and they used to commute locally.

The property was about 20 miles out of Lameroo and the local shearers used to shear there in the daytime and return home at night to their own accommodation. But that was not good enough: these New Zealand shearers used that accommodation that was not fit to be used. All the stipulated conditions were broken. Are Australian workers, whether they be shearers or workers in other industries, who are working under conditions for which their forefathers fought over the past 100 years, supposed to turn around and submit to a scab, whether it be a New Zealander or a person from anywhere else? I am not saying by any means that all New Zealanders who come to Australia are scabs. I have had a fair few mates who have been from New Zealand who have come out here and abided by the conditions in relation to the shearing industry and who have been very good members of the union.

I have referred to the incident that occurred in 1974 to illustrate the fact that those sorts of people are the ones who are still causing disruption in the industry. The majority of farmers and graziers accept that hard work is involved and that it is done by hard workers and that there has been very little disruption in the industry. Shearers earn fairly big money, but they must pay big taxes and they even have to put up with the sort of people who come out here who are scabs. But I add that they did not just jump out of the ground yesterday. They have been trained in New Zealand. Tongans have been trained over there for a fair few years by certain unscrupulous graziers, one of the reasons for which is to break down the conditions of shearers which have been fought for and won over the last 100 years.

With those comments I would like to read a short portion of an article that was published in the *Waikato Times* of 10 October 1984. Under the heading 'New Zealand shearers "industrial rats" ', the article states, in part:

> Nomadic New Zealand shearers—at the centre of an Australian controversy over the use of wide combs and breaches of other Australian award conditions—have been labelled 'industrial rats' by a New Zealand trade union official, New Zealand Workers' Union Auckland branch secretary Geoff Watts yesterday said non-union New Zealanders openly breaching award conditions were bringing his members into disrepute.
>
> The Workers' Union represents New Zealand shearers and shedhands. Mavericks had been accepting sub-standard accommodation including tents and were often accepting far lower conditions than were provided by Australian shearing awards, Mr Watts said.

Because of the 10 minute time constraint I do not have time to go right through this matter, but I will speak further on it on a later occasion. I want to make it understood on this occasion that I am not criticising all New Zealand shearers. I spent 23 years as a shearer and spent a long time in shearing sheds.

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

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): That was a real treat. I guess the member for Peake, by virtue of the attitude he has just expressed to the House about the decision made by the court in connection with the use of wide combs in the shearing industry—

Mr Plunkett: The conditions of scabs, not wide combs. You want to listen. You ought to clear the beard away from your ears.

Mr LEWIS: I did hear him say, with respect to the member for Peake, that he did not agree with the decision of the court, that it was wrong. That is fair enough. The member for Peake is entitled to that view, but quite obviously

that view is at the root of the problem that has occurred in Coleraine, where there has been an outbreak of violence. The other matters referred to, along with other standover men in the union, are merely a fabrication of an excuse as to why that outbreak of violence occurred when two men were shot. If that is the kind of behaviour which the member for Peake believes to be reasonable, it is a sorry commentary on his values and responsibilities in this place, where we make laws which we expect the people we represent to abide by. It is disgraceful that that kind of comment can be made and let go unchallenged, because it encourages the kind of civil disobedience and violence which every Australian ought to condemn, and I do.

The member for Peake obviously believes in this approach, this doublespeak. The member's views would be tantamount to saying that it was justifiable in another context for people to attack other people. This occurred at Roxby Downs recently where people clearly engaged in violence and civil disobedience and broke the law but claimed that Western Mining provoked them into that law-breaking behaviour by legally proceeding with the mine. It is, to my mind, quite scurrilous and despicable. I just do not understand how any reasonable human being can encourage that kind of behaviour and justify it on the basis that the other party at whom they are directing their violence, misbehaviour and general disobedience is provoking them when that other party has done nothing more or less than they are entitled to do in law.

I note also that the member for Peake does not understand, nor will he ever accept, that there could ever be a co-operative of workers, because I know that there are now a number of people who are shearers and who are members of a co-operative. In that situation no one individual is the contractor. They contract jointly and severally and provide from amongst their ranks not only the people to shear the sheep, but also the shed hands, roustabouts and cooks. I see nothing wrong with that. I was astonished as to his sexist remark that the wives of the men concerned should not have been involved in doing the work in the shed. I see no reason at all why there should not be women shed hands, women shearers and women woolclassers.

Mr Ferguson: Provided they are paid the same.

Mr LEWIS: They are in Russia. I do not know they are not in Australia. I have never heard any one of them complain.

Mr Ferguson: You would be an expert on Russia.

Mr LEWIS: I would certainly know more about the wool industry in Russia than I dare say you would.

Mr Ferguson: I concede that. You would be an expert in Russia.

Mr LEWIS: That was not what I said. I do not see the necessity for the member for Peake to justify what has clearly been illegal and unprovoked violence by attempting to divert attention from the real reason for it.

Since that was going to be the first part of my remarks, I want to turn now to other problems which are at the present time confronting the Australian rural industry scene. What we need to remember is that things in life for most Australians in urban situations may be fine and there may be some unemployment that causes distress for those people who cannot get jobs and their families. However, we need to remember that 60 per cent of Australian farmers have incomes of less than $149 per week. I mention that figure because, at the time that I was able to obtain it, it was the dole for a married couple with two children. What is more, at that time 70 per cent of them had insufficient income to service living expenses and debts.

Some other comparisons which honourable members need to bear in mind when they are considering the cost burden imposed by increasing demands for higher wages on our export income earners, primary producers who are price takers (they cannot fix the price of their labour or the products they produce from it), is that for 1972 a tonne of wheat would buy four tonnes of superphosphate. In 1982 a tonne of wheat would only buy one tonne of superphosphate. In 1980 a tonne of wheat would buy 250 litres of diesel, and in 1982 a tonne of wheat would only buy 80 litres of diesel. In terms of trade that is quite a fall off, especially where it relates to the latter.

By contrast, in terms of trade as they relate to, say, a mechanic, in 1973 a mechanic on about $100 a week, which is what mechanics were paid for a 40-hour week, could buy 10.4 loaves of bread for one hour's work. In 1983 the mechanic on $250 for a 35-hour week could buy 9.2 loaves of bread for that hour's work. There was not a substantial depreciation in the purchasing power as expressed in loaves of bread, one of the staple supplies in the mechanic's consumer bundle, not anything like the order which has occurred in the rural sector, and yet Australia continues to rely and depend on farmers for the income we earn from our exports to our overseas customers.

If we continue to ignore the implications of escalating the costs of the goods and services which farmers use, which costs they cannot pass on even though the rest of us in the community by and large can, then we do so at our own peril, because we will ultimately find we will not be able to finance the kind of lifestyle to which we have become accustomed, and the sooner members of the Government recognise that fact, whether they be in this Chamber or the Federal arena, the better off we will all be. At the present time Australians are living beyond their means. Public debt continues to escalate at a rate far greater than the ability of the economy to service it. That has meant that there has been an increase in the tax burden as a percentage of the total incomes of every Australian. If that continues it will destroy the incentive which has existed to encourage people to work and produce. In due course there will be no sheep to shear; there will be no jobs to go to; there will be no conditions of employment and it will be a question of get what you can while you can. That will be tragic. That is what I am warning this place about today.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): During this grievance debate, I wish to refer to the products for which Australians in the next two months will spend more than $150 million. I refer to the sale of pre-christmas toys. Mothers and fathers are now beginning to shop (if they have not done so already, they will soon do so) for toys for their children for the coming festive season. Unfortunately, many of these toys (some produced in Australia but mainly overseas) will provide danger to their children unless they are closely looked at. Many members will recall that in May of this year the Consumer Affairs Department banned a product that was known as the wonder growing pet toy. This toy, which looks like a sweet, doubles its size within an hour of being immersed in water and can expand to 120 times its original size within 24 hours. If swallowed, it could swell in a child's throat or stomach and could not be expelled from the body or detected by x-rays.

It became necessary for the Consumer Affairs Department to ban the toy, although most South Australian traders had agreed not to sell it. However, the problem was related to the selling of this product through many of the small sales outlets. The Department had tested the toy and found it to be extremely dangerous. It had been banned in the UK, in Sweden and in Thailand.

The range of hazards that are found in toys and other products for children is unbelievable in a society that pretends to be concerned with children's safety. The people who are most concerned in South Australia are the Trades

Standards Advisory Council. The Australian committee concerned is the Commonwealth-State Consumer Products Advisory Committee, which looks at the co-ordination of safety for toys throughout the whole of the toy market in Australia. This committee has been meeting regularly for many years and has decided that the best way to tackle safety problems with toys is not by way of legislation but by adhering to the standards that are set both by the Commonwealth Government and by the State Governments.

There has been great difficulty in providing for Commonwealth-State complementary legislation in this area. The Consumer Affairs Department has been very vigilant in this area, and some of the things at which it has been looking and which it has either banned or in respect of which it has changed regulations or insisted that warning labels be attached are as follows: candles with inflammable greased coating and a hydro-pneumatic racket. Safety standards have been agreed to in relation to folding tables, two children having been killed in other States because of the construction of folding tables and a new standard has been devised for all States in respect of folding tables. I refer also to the banning of the coating of tris-phosphate, a product which produces a flammable fabric, which has been banned for safety reasons.

The Consumer Affairs Department has also investigated regulations in respect of snorkel tubes, which have provided many problems in the past, as well as cosmetic products where heavy metals have been used. There has been a similar experience with erasers where heavy metals have been used; certain erasers have been banned and warning notices affixed to others. Safety matters in respect of roller skates and even tattoo removing kits have also been attended to and, where necessary, banned. Some balloon blowing kits have been banned because of the dangerous chemicals and carcinogenic matters connected with this item, and so the list goes on.

Unfortunately, however, a huge range of hazards is to be found in toys and other products for children, the vast majority of these items coming into Australia from overseas. The *Advertiser* of 10 April 1984 reported that a range of imported toys had been discovered to contain killer poisons. The Federal Government has banned toy prawns and frogs made from cane in Thailand. The Home Affairs Minister, (Mr Curren) stated that poisons were in the seeds used in the toys. The seeds were often placed as eyes in the cane novelties made in the shape of animals. The seeds contained a poisonous substance known as abrin, one seed containing enough toxin to kill a child if chewed and ingested. The seeds are about 6mm long, round in shape, mainly glossy, and bright scarlet in colour with a black tip. The seeds are attractive to children who might be temped to taste them.

Both the Federal and State Departments are constantly monitoring these hazards, but the problem is so great that mothers and other parents shopping for Christmas toys at this time of the year should remember the hazards involved. One of the unpleasant surprises that one finds in considering this question is the example of a doll's feeding bottle imported from Hong Kong and attractively packaged to make it appealing to any small girl. The bottle even came with water in it ready to be used at once. What is more natural than a little girl giving her doll a drink and then providing one for herself or for a friend? What she could not know was that the water came straight from Hong Kong harbour and was so contaminated as to produce serious gastro-enteritis in anyone even sipping it.

One problem facing the Consumer Affairs Department is the inadequate labelling which denies a measure of protection. Even if the children could not read the labels, the parents could at least take notice of them if they were provided. Many of the imported toys, however, do not contain warning labels, and this is also true of toys that are imported from many English speaking countries. Providing a warning notice on a toy sewing machine, for example, which has a sharp needle is all that can be reasonably expected from a manufacturer, but not even a baby's rattle, which was sold in Australia and from which the plastic covering could be removed to reveal 10 razor sharp steel prongs, had a warning notice attached to it. Some people have suggested that many dangerous toys that are prohibited overseas have been dumped in Australia. Countries such as America, Britain and Canada have clamped down on the worst of these toys and, as a result, many overseas manufacturers who have geared up to make an attack on these markets have been left with thousands of banned toys. It has been suggested that they try to recoup their investment by dumping such toys in Australia.

One of the toys recently banned by the Consumer Affairs Department was from a company that wanted to get rid of 60 000 dummies that had been banned in Canada. I was extremely interested to see that in Sydney, to mark World Consumer Rights Day, a new network of people had been launched to search out dangerous products throughout Australia. More than 500 stores across the country will be monitored by women to spot whether or not hazardous goods are on the shelves. These monitors will tell the Commonwealth-State Consumer Advisory Committee of the dangerous goods. This group of people mentioned, for example, the problems in respect of wooden toy boxes with heavy lids. These are of the same style which led to the deaths of 21 children in America and which are still being made and sold in Sydney. The group also mentioned an air bed that was banned in New South Wales in April 1983, but not in any other State.

It is essential that a group of people such as this are ever vigilant against the dangers to children from toys. It would appear from my investigations that the Consumer Affairs Department, the Commonwealth-State Consumer Products Advisory Committees and the Federal Minister for Consumer Affairs are all doing the best possible job in this area but, notwithstanding that, the volume of toys entering Australia from many countries of the world is making the task extremely difficult, and parents must certainly be on their guard when looking to buy Christmas toys for their children.

Motion carried.

At 9 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 25 October at 2 p.m.