HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 21 August 1986

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

PLAIN LANGUAGE LAW

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I move:

That this House supports the encouragement of the use of plain language in legislation, legal documents and Government forms.

I wish to inform the House, in the short time that I have available, the reasons why other people in other countries have turned to plain language law. They have, in fact, introduced laws to force people to provide consumer and other contracts in a language that can be easily understood and also to provide the setting up of contracts in both larger type sizes and in a way that would be easily read for proper understanding.

It is not my intention to advocate the introduction of plain language law legislation, but I feel that the South Australian Government should be looking at introducing an advisory bureau to assist both private enterprise and Government for consumer contracts with the use of plain language. Several other States have already taken moves in this direction, but the Victorian Parliament installed Associate Professor Robert D. Eagleson in the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel of Victoria on 1 January 1986 to assist Parliament with the introduction of plain language. I believe this is a step in the right direction and, if time permits, I will explain further the role of Professor Eagleson in his capacity as adviser to the Victorian Government on the introduction of plain language.

The question that must be asked in the first instance is why this course of action should be undertaken. The problem is that consumer contracts are enforced on the theory that both parties have read, understood and agreed to every clause. For most consumers that theory is patent and absolute fiction. Nearly all consumer contracts are based on mass produced non-negotiable forms. Although some businesses have simplified contract forms in recent years, consumers still do not read the contracts they sign and would not have understood them had they to do so.

Furthermore, consumers often have no real alternative to signing such contracts. I have been guilty myself of signing contracts that I do not understand. This has been particularly so with motor vehicle transactions, seeking finance and other documents associated with the purchase and hire purchase of a motor vehicle. I feel sure that I am not on my own, because I would be very surprised if more than 10 per cent of people signing documents of this nature have any idea of what the contract involves.

South Australia in the past has sought reforms in this area by insisting that contracts be printed in sufficiently large type to provide for more easy reading. However, so far as I am able to ascertain, very little has been done in the way of providing for plain language within those contracts. Once having signed the contract, as I have stated before, the person signing that contract is supposed to know and understand everything that is contained therein, but this is usually very far from the truth.

So far as the overseas movement for the introduction of plain language is concerned, many of the initial moves for plain language were promoted by certain insurance companies. In the United States of America the law in New York State is of a kind that obliges people to look to the language of their documents. Other States have specific legislation where readability is reduced to a formula and others where a commissioner approves legislation. Perhaps these measures are too rigid for a South Australian system, but I believe it is time that the State Government was prepared to provide expert advice to assist in this area.

I believe that there is a large awareness now thoughout the world of the economic benefits which can accrue through cost saving by improving the comprehensibility of legal documents and legislation. The British Government has claimed recently that it is saving millions of pounds by redrafting forms and leaflets. The British Government has suggested that it has saved 13 million pounds as a result of a redrafting of a common form used for claiming social security benefits. In another instance, the customs and excise have, by redrafting another common form, reduced the error rate in completing the form from 55 per cent to 3 per cent, thus saving some 3 700 working hours.

I feel sure that many millions of dollars could be saved in the State of South Australia if we were prepared to take the plunge to provide expert advice in the fields of contracts and in the field of legislation to produce plain language documents. The Victorian Government, I believe, has given a lead by retaining Professor Eagleson in an advisory capacity to assist the Parliamentary Draftsmen.

As soon as the awareness of the problem becomes greater, especially among those providers of contracts, then the savings will become even greater. After a time, market forces will further encourage the rewriting of many documents. In America, the fact that plain language has been used in contracts has led to reduced litigation and has led to a decline in the number of invalid claims. Many American banks have also taken the step to rewrite loan forms, and I believe that this is a very worthwhile project for banks to emulate in South Australia.

Australia as a whole has been slow to realise the existence and nature of the problem, and might I add that South Australia in particular has failed to realise the significance of the problem. Whether there is a need for legislation which will encourage people to look at this matter is a question of debate. The suggestion has been made that legislation could usefully be introduced to allow the comprehensibility of a document to be taken into account in civil actions. I personally believe that there is room for this legislation because of the absolutely difficult nature of some of the contracts that are provided in South Australia. If legislation of this nature was introduced, then it is probable that the South Australian Government would be the first to be caught up by its provisions. Many of the contracts that arise both through Government sources and through statutory authorities are criticised because of their incomprehensible nature.

In the United States this legislation proved, in the first instance, to be directed against Government departments. The decision of the New York District Court, whilst ruling against the Department of Human Health and Resources on some matters, also instructed the department to rewrite its standard letters. Although I have not yet had the opportunity to study the standard letters that are being sent out from Government Departments I have no doubt that some would need to be rewritten in plain language.

There is a need, I believe, to encourage courts here to think along the same lines also. In Victoria, the Attorney-General has already introduced one significant change by ensuring that the word 'must' appear in legislation where previously the word 'shall' was used. I believe it is time for South Australia to think seriously about the introduction of plain English or plain language into both its contracts and

its legislation, and I would hope that in coming budgets we will see money put aside for the encouragement of this sort of venture. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Electoral Act 1934. Read a first time.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This is a quaint Bill, a small Bill, its objective being to bring in voluntary voting. Because it is so simple, I know that the House will have no difficulty handling the Bill. Considering the problems that compulsory voting has caused individuals over the years and the costs incurred by the State, one realises the benefit of returning to voluntary voting. Australia is one of the few countries of Anglo-Saxon background that have departed from having voluntary voting. This goes back to Queensland where in 1915 the Denham Government, a Liberal Government, was on the skids and decided that one way of trying to save itself was to bring in compulsory voting. That in fact failed and, subsequently, in the mid-1920s, the Commonwealth went to compulsory voting. Victoria followed in 1926, New South Wales and Tasmania in 1928 and Western Australia in 1936. It was not until the early 1940s that South Australia moved to the system of compulsory voting—the last State to do so.

So, politicians forced on the people of Australia—and I speak now only about South Australia—the legal obligation to go along to a polling booth to cast a vote. Parliamentarians were conscious of the fact that people could not be forced to vote and that all the Parliamentarians could do was to force them to go along to a polling booth, register, and take a piece of paper. People are not compelled to take a piece of paper in the case of the Legislative Council, because that is not compulsory; it is a voluntary act. Although people are handed both papers at the same time, they do not realise that if they so wished they could hand back the Legislative Council paper and say, 'I am not interested,' although if that occurred it would cause the Electoral Department all sorts of confusion.

I believe that we have a system that we should do away with. I realise that it is Liberal Party policy—it was before the last election—to go to voluntary voting, so I look forward to at least that support on this proposition. I suppose that as Parliamentarians we must decide whether voting should be a duty, an obligation, a right or a privilege. One could argue that it is a privilege, and I do. I say it is a privilege to be able to vote, to decide who governs the State or the country. Is it a duty? Yes, I would argue that it is a duty, but it should be a moral duty; it should not be a legal responsibility to do that, but one could argue that it is a moral duty.

But Parliament does not legislate for the morals of society. That has been argued here many times, but that is not an obligation of the State. Is it a right? Yes, and the right is protected by the compulsory enrolment component that exists in this country, even though it is not a compulsory enrolment for the House of Assembly. That is done only because the Commonwealth Act stipulates it is compulsory to enrol on the Commonwealth roll and people are automatically enrolled on the State roll. However, if people wish to do so they can decide not to be enrolled on the State roll, if they make that point at the time of enrolling on the Commonwealth roll.

So, the right, as far as legal right goes, to be able to vote is enshrined within our Commonwealth Act, and if people want to have that legal right all they need to do is take the responsibility that they are compelled to take of enrolling. There is no Act that forces them to go along to the polling booth and vote—it is just that that person at any time in their adult life, if they wish to cast a vote, has the opportunity or privilege to do so. We can argue that it is a responsibility that people should exercise, but I do not think that we can argue that they should be compelled to go along to the polling booth to vote.

As private members' time is crammed with much business I will not speak for as long as I would have liked on this subject. If I have an opportunity to reply I will expand my views on the arguments against if members in the House believe that compulsory voting should be forced on the electorate. I want to refer to some detail I received from the Electoral Department so that I can give members some idea of what it costs the Government to have compulsory voting. Some may argue that it is only a few thousand dollars and not millions of dollars, but it is a cost that is wasted when it could be spent on health, education, child care or whatever.

I will quote first the number of informal votes lodged for the 1979, 1982 and 1985 elections. I refer to the House of Assembly only. In 1979 there were 34 114 informal votes for the State. In 1982 there were 46 888 and in 1985 there were 29 287. The actual non-votes—the people who failed to go along and vote—for 1979 was 57 506, for 1982 it was 59 457 and for 1985 it was 59 218. The Electoral Department sent out (and this is an interesting aspect that I will not debate today) 30 000 'please explain' notices in 1985 whereas 59 218 did not vote. Why did 30 000 get 'please explain' notices while the other 29 000 were not asked to explain? I may be able to obtain that answer later as people may have lodged statements saying that they were religious objectors or whatever. In the 1979 election 29 000 'please explain' notices were sent and in 1982 there were 32 000 sent. That takes up the time of staff at the department to check the rolls and write the letters, along with the added cost of posting the letters. It also involves electors writing back to say that they had a flat tyre and left home at 5 to 6, thus arriving late at the polling booth. The big percentage say that they did not make it because the car broke down between home and the polling booth. That was the case with the shopping hours referendum.

The number of expiation notices sent out in 1979 was 6 000, in 1982 it was 8 000 and in 1985 it was 10 000. We are now sending out 10 000 expiation notices advising people that they must either pay a fee or be summonsed and before the court because they were not able to get to the polling booth and could not give a satisfactory reason. You may not have liked a particular candidate in the election or been able to find anyone suitable from your viewpoint to vote for and thus decided not to vote. So, you are then a criminal. You may have just decided it is better to go fishing than worry about who is elected to Parliament, because your vote does not achieve anything and you are wasting your time. Whatever the reason, people have not voted. At the last election 10 000 received a notice saying that they would have to appear before the court if they did not pay $10.

In 1979, 1 100 were summonsed, so 1 100 people in the State were brought to court because they did not think any candidate was worth voting for or thought that the system was not worth supporting. In 1982, nobody was summonsed, even though 8 000 expiation notices were sent out. That situation occurred because an electoral redistribution was going on and the department was too busy to send out

the summonses. Six months expired, which was the limit within which summonses could be issued, so none were sent out and those people were lucky; they were not found to be criminals, they were just forgotten.

In 1985, 1 500 people were summonsed to court, not all of whom have yet appeared. Some cases might run through to later this year. They have been told that charges have been laid against them, but by the time they all get before the court it could be December this year—which is 12 months since the last election—and people are still suffering the mental trauma of having to appear in court because they did not vote. It is a pretty rough world when we get to the stage when people who did not like any candidate or Party or did not vote for some other reason have 12 months trauma waiting to get to court.

The maximum fine in the court is $50. Think of the clerks, any officers who are involved, and a lawyer, who may handle the charge in the court. I have not asked the courts how much it costs to handle any particular charge, but I think we would all agree that each charge heard in the court would cost at least $100 just for the staff involved and the time of the magistrate. If a justice of the peace is used, that person gives his time voluntarily. Fancy clogging up the court system with 1 500 cases of people failing to vote for a particular person who wants to be a politician. Really, that is what we are doing. What sort of system is it?

I then come to the question of how much it costs the department. The Electoral Commissioner, in his letter to me, made the point that his figures relating to these matters were conservative. He said that expenditure for the 1985 election in checking who did not vote was as follows: the compilation of the check roll, $60 000; postage, $20 000; temporary staff, $30 000; permanent staff, $40 000; and bailiffs, $32 000. Thus, $182 000 is spent on checking the rolls and trying to collect the money for expiation fees, and eventually to sue and raise the sum of money from fines in the court.

The Electoral Commissioner has not included all the legal costs involved. He then estimates approximate receipts. For expiation fees, he expects to receive $30 000. So, we send out 10 000 expiation notices, the expiation fee is $10, and we get back $30 000, so that 7 000 cases are left. We end up summonsing 1 500, so that 5 500 are lost somewhere. This happened after the first 'Please explain' notices to 30 000. Where are the 5 500? They do not get penalised at all, yet they failed to answer the 'Please explain' notices.

Some of them have been exempted because they went to their local MP and said that their child was ill or swallowed a pill just before it was time to go to vote; they missed out attending at the booth, and forgot to tell the Electoral Commissioner. We know that happens, but surely cases raised with members of Parliament do not total 5 500, because if that is the case some members get far more of them than I do. I only had about six, and each of those had in fact voted and been wrongly challenged about not voting. So, we have $60 000 receipts as a maximum and $182 000 as an expense, accepting that both of those figures, in the Commissioner's terms, may be conservative.

However, when they go to court, the court does not even fine such people $50. The average fine is $15, so the court system is cluttered up with 1 500 poor, unfortunate individuals who did not like any of us and who are charged $15 and lose half a day from work. What sort of system is that? Those figures do not include the informal vote. People who attend the polling booth to meet their legal obligation, but who either screw up their paper or write a rude message on it and place it in the ballot box, just to conform with the law, have used their car, fuel and time, and there has been an infringement upon their private life. They may have wanted to go fishing or to a football match or cricket match, but the law states that they must attend a polling booth. Do we always get an informal vote from those people?

It has been said that political Parties see compulsory voting as a device which assists them. I take it further than political Parties and say that that applies to politicians. I have an article here which states:

> . . . It is evident that our representatives in Parliament, whether they belong to the Government Party or not, are impressed by the usefulness of these laws in getting in the vote with a relatively small expenditure of energy and Party funds; they are persuaded that it suits their more sinister interests not to remove this morbid appendix from the body politic.

That is true. I have heard the discussions on both sides of politics that, if there is voluntary voting, members would have to work a lot harder out in their electorates. They will have to go out and mix with the people, because the people cannot be forced to go to the polls. I know that the member for Albert Park would have no bother with voluntary voting because he does work his electorate. However, others would have a problem.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: I am looking for his support. I know that there is a time limit, and the Whip has just reminded me that I said I would finish before this. Surveys that have been taken show that 20 per cent of the people say that they would not possibly vote in some elections. Why do we force them to do it? I know the sorts of argument that will be used against me, but I will answer them at a future date. The Electoral Commissioner also said that if the Government provided the Electoral Commissioner with a scanner which became fully operational by the next election, that would allow him to cut significantly the cost of compiling this check roll. The machine costs only $60 000, but would improve efficiency, to what degree I do not know. I believe that the right to vote should be a legally entrenched one by way of enrolment. However, it should be up to the individual to use that privilege—as a moral responsibility if they wish—and it should not be up to the State to force people to vote.

The short title of the Bill is, of course, a formal matter. I cannot give a commencement date, as I must leave that matter to the Government when it proclaims the Bill after it is passed. In clause 3 I am seeking to amend section 61 of the principal Act by striking out subsection (2), which provides:

> (1) Subject to this Act, ballot papers shall be on a form prescribed by regulation.
>
> (2) The following statement must be included on each ballot paper at or near the top of the ballot paper in clearly, legible print—
>
> 'You are not legally obliged to mark the ballot paper.'

In other words, that informs electors that they have met their legal obligation by turning up to vote, but that they do not have to mark the ballot paper. Clause 4 relates to the repeal of Division VI of Part IX of the principal Act, which is the compulsory voting section of the Electoral Act. I do not need to read it all, but it states, in part:

> . . . it is the duty of every elector to record his vote at each election in a district for which he is enrolled.

That is hogwash, because we cannot force people to cast their vote—that cannot be done at all. All we can do is ask people to turn up at the polling booth and take a ballot paper. This part of the Act is telling people that it is their duty—and I hope it is not suggesting it is their legal duty, because it is not—to vote. The Act states later:

. . . but the Electoral Commissioner, if satisfied that the elector is dead or had a valid and sufficient reason for not voting, need not send such a notice.

What are we getting to when the Electoral Commissioner is required to check to ascertain whether people have died since an election commenced, and whether or not he should send out notices? We would have electoral officers not only checking for valid votes but also checking the *Advertiser*, or with the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages, to ascertain who has died. Therefore, the compulsory section of the Act is of no benefit at all. I ask the House to support the proposition that we have voluntary voting in this State, and that we abolish compulsory voting.

Mr DUIGAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

TERTIARY EDUCATION FEES

Mr KLUNDER (Todd): I move:

That this House condemns the Federal Liberal Council for its support of the reintroduction of tertiary education fees.

I have moved this motion, because—

Members interjecting:

Mr KLUNDER: If members opposite are patient, when their turn to speak arrives they will be able to make a reasoned comment on my speech rather than just parading their prejudices, which they are doing at the moment. I want to make perfectly clear why I have moved this motion and why I am speaking to it.

The first reason is that every time the Liberal Party moves a strange and silly motion because of its ideological blinkers, someone somewhere ought to get up and make comment on it. The second reason why I am moving this motion is that I have been there; when I was a youngster I was not able to go to university and take the course that I would have liked to take, because my parents quite simply could not afford to pay the university fees applying at that time.

I will indicate to the House just what the background of that was. My parents and I had been in Australia for about five years. My father was a tradesman who was earning the single wage in the household, which comprised himself, his wife and three children, and he was earning about £20 a week. The family had just bought a new house and had a large mortgage. In those circumstances the £500 per year which at that stage was the cost of a university education was simply impossible for them to pay. In fact, it was a requirement in such a household that when a child became old enough to earn an income that child went out, earnt money and helped out the family in its payments for the house and various other things. It was one of the great credits to my family that it was willing to forgo that amount of money from me and allowed me to go to the next choice—teachers college—where I eventually trained to become a teacher on the princely pay of £5 a week, a sum on which I managed to eke out a survival by supplementing it with considerable vacation work picking fruit along the Murray and undertaking various other jobs.

In my case it was a fortunate choice that I went to teachers college, because it turned out that I enjoyed teaching and for 15 years I taught before I first came into this place. The House can imagine that it was with more than the usual degree of enthusiasm that I greeted the abolition of tertiary fees. It was more than just greeting it with enthusiasm—I believed it would then be possible for youngsters coming through the system to go for the degree of their choice and not have to make decisions based partly on economics and partly on choice.

It also meant that many more people who would normally not be able to afford to go to university would be able to attend, and that that would benefit the State because the better brains would then be at university being trained for the various professions. I was very irritated when I read late last month of the Liberal Party's Federal Council meeting in Adelaide voting overwhelmingly to reintroduce tertiary fees.

Mr Meier interjecting:

Mr KLUNDER: The honourable member shows his ignorance of arithmetic as well as ideology. The fees were $250, and the average cost of educating a tertiary student at the moment is $8 200 a year.

Mr Meier interjecting:

Mr KLUNDER: At the time I was going through college I could have obtained the equivalent of $250 from the work I did fruit picking along the Murray. Indeed, I had to pay a double statutory fee: one for the teachers college and one for the university that I attended. In any case, I want to make some points about this motion and the vote by the Liberal Party last month. First, the Liberal Council is far more representative of the Liberal Party than are Liberal MPs in this or any other House. Members of the Liberal Party in this House are frequently nothing more than an aberration thrown up by their local electorate college. Secondly, the vote was 26 to 19 which in political terms is a pretty clear sort of majority; in fact, a clearer majority than on the other motion that took place concerning the status of women, about which my colleague the member for Mawson had something to say in this House last week, and on which, as my colleague says, she did very well.

Further, a 26 to 19 vote is not a clear representation of how the Liberal Party thinks. If it voted according to its ideology, the vote would have been much higher. I indicate to the House the reasons for that, and I will quote some of the Liberal Party members who actually spoke at that meeting. First, I will quote the Tasmanian delegate, Mr Eric Abetz, as reported in the *Advertiser* of 29 July:

Tasmanian delegate, Mr Eric Abetz, also criticised the motion as being too vague, and too open to interpretation by 'Left-wing operatives on campuses'. He said the whole issue had been considered in an *ad hoc* manner. If the Party wanted to win the nine or 10 seats it needed to take Government the motion should be defeated. The stark political reality of introducing fees would be a large loss of votes among the youth of the nation.

He was not the only person who spoke against the motion. The President of the Australian Liberal Students Federation, Mr Cliff Smith (quoted again from the *Advertiser*):

. . . strongly attacked the motion, which he said was inadequately worded. 'I couldn't think of anything more dangerous to give a Left-wing student or a Labor Federal politician than the wording that says that fees should be introduced at initially a low level,' he said.

Neither of those individuals opposed the introduction of tertiary fees on ideological grounds; they made their comments on the pragmatic ground that it would damage their Party. Therefore, one assumes that they were ideologically in favour, but modified their vote on the basis of pragmatism. As I have agreed with the Opposition Whip that I would speak for only five minutes—as distinct from the last speaker, who was going to speak for 10 minutes but spoke for 25 minutes—I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

COUNTRY FIRES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr BLACKER (Flinders) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Country Fires Act 1976. Read a first time.

Mr BLACKER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In bringing this matter to the attention of the House, I believe that all I am doing is placing on the Statute Book the correct interpretation of the Country Fires Act as was intended when it was originally debated in this Chamber. The specific matter that I draw to the attention of the House is an anomaly which has cropped up in the payment of compensation for a firefighter who was killed in the course of fighting a fire. Briefly, the legislation provides that, if a person is injured while fighting a fire, he is fully covered under the workers compensation aspect. However, in the event of a person being killed, it then becomes a matter of interpretation as to whether or not that person's spouse is a dependant, depending on the individual's vocation, partnership or the company set-up.

A solicitor has brought to my attention a situation on behalf of a client whereby a farmer who was a member of a family partnership was killed while fighting a fire. However, his wife, because she was a member of the partnership, was considered not to be a dependant. Therefore, any claim to workers compensation or the lump sum payout normally available to any other individual was unavailable to the spouse of the deceased under those circumstances. That was not the intent of Parliament when the legislation went through this House. I venture to say that, if that rule was carried through to its ultimate end, probably 90 per cent or more of farmers would not be covered under the workers compensation provision in the event of their being killed in the course of fighting a fire.

There is the problem of the different interpretations as to how real is that problem. In the case that was brought to my attention, I believe that the insurance company and the client of the solicitor did agree to a partial settlement, rather than taking the matter to court. It was put to me that, if the matter went to court, the insurance company could deny responsibility on the basis that it could not be proved that the spouse of the deceased was in fact a dependant, yet, on the other hand, we all know that when the legislation was passed, that was not the intention of the legislation. It was generally accepted without question by everyone, on both sides of the House, that the normal provisions of workers compensation should apply to farmers who, after all, make up the largest percentage of volunteer firefighters in the Country Fire Services.

All this amendment does is to clarify the law as we believe it should be interpreted and, as such, I call on the House to support the Bill. The Bill consists of three clauses, the first being the short title and the second being the commencement. Clause 3 deals with compensation and provides:

Section 27 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after subsection (2b) the following subsection:

(2c) Where—

(a) a person to whom this section applies dies;

(b) a claim for compensation is made under the Workers Compensation Act 1971 by a person claiming to be a dependant of the deceased;

and

(c) the deceased and the claimant were both members of a partnership or proprietary company and the predominant work of the deceased before the date of death was in the business of that partnership or company, then, for the purpose of determining whether the claimant was a dependant of the deceased and, if so, the extent of the dependency, any income derived by the claimant from the partnership or company shall be deemed to be an allowance made by the deceased, out of the deceased's own income, for the maintenance of that person.

Clause 3 clarifies the interpretation of a dependant as far as the Country Fires Act is concerned and, in accordance with the Parliamentary Counsel, clarifies that clause to ensure that the spouse of a deceased person who was killed in the course of fighting a fire would meet with the requirements and, therefore, would be eligible for the compensation that any other person who was similarly affected in the fighting of a fire would attract. I commend the Bill to the House and would be grateful for the continuing support from both sides of the House.

Mr FERGUSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

EDUCATION FUNDING

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I move:

That this House deplores the threats made by the Government to reduce substantially its funding for education despite election guarantees made by the Premier that there would be no funding cuts to schools.

Prior to the last election the Premier wrote to my wife a very personal note in which he solicited her vote for the ALP candidate in Mount Gambier. As members of the House would realise, the request failed quite dismally, but in the letter the Premier highlighted a number of facts, one of which was the importance to his Government of education. The letter to Mrs Allison states:

We all remember how bad things were just three or four years ago. Our economy was in tatters. School leavers just didn't have a chance. Our education system had been hit by Liberal cuts and more Liberal cuts. Pre-school and child-care were just not regarded as a Liberal priority . . . South Australia is now up and running.

On the second page the Premier returns to education and states:

Labor has made health and education priority areas. In community welfare we have returned to concern. But we are not resting on our laurels. I hope that education will be a key issue in this campaign. It is true that South Australia now has the best standard of education of any State in Australia.

By way of aside, I agree with the Premier, but I add that South Australia has had the best standard of education of any Australian State for many a long year. The Premier further stated:

The Liberals cut back education. It was not regarded as a priority area. We now spend $800 million each year on education. As a result, class sizes are now smaller. Standards have improved. The curriculum has been upgraded so that schooling can be more relevant to children's future needs. But we can and must do better. We want to make sure that our education system is more finely tuned so that our children have the best chance in life.

The Premier also said:

But I can assure you, Mrs Allison, that our priority will be to upgrade teaching standards.

The letter contains quite a lot of information in that tone. The Premier was also kind enough on 28 November 1985 to advertise in the *Advertiser* as follows:

A child born today will leave school in the twenty-first century. We have a vision for our children's education which extends beyond the year 2000.

- We guarantee there will be no funding cuts to schools.
- There will be no reduction in teacher numbers.
- We will employee 100 new ancillary staff a year for four years.

He gives four or five other firm commitments, which are quite unequivocal. The Institute of Teachers, the Primary Principals Association and the South Australian Parents and Friends Association including the South Australian Association of School Parents Clubs (and that association wrote to me only this morning) all express concern that there may be substantial reductions to education funding.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: If the honourable member bides his time, I think I can allay any fears, misgivings and wrong beliefs that he might have.

Mr Rann: Why were you dropped from the portfolio by your colleagues?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: We will question that later. We might look at the statistics and ask that. Perhaps the honourable member will examine the statistics closely, directing his mathematical mind to them. The fact is that parent, teacher and student organisations and other organisations in South Australia are vitally concerned that the next State budget should not follow the pattern that has been set by the last two State budgets. I have gone to the trouble of extracting from the State Auditor-General's Reports over the past 10 years, from 1976-77 to 1985-86, the forward budget estimates for the Education Department. To ensure that we are dealing with like terms in each case over the past 10 years, I have taken out the Education Department line that included administration, primary and secondary allocations, the TAFE line and the miscellaneous line (as the miscellaneous line includes the Childhood Services allocation, which has now been listed separately in 1985-86). This information has been added as a footnote. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* this purely statistical document.

The SPEAKER: Can the honourable member assure the Chair and the House that the material is entirely statistical?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Yes, Mr Speaker.

Leave granted.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT BUDGET ESTIMATES (RECURRENT), 1976-86

Year	State Budget Total Est.	†Ed. Dept (APS)	TAFE	Misc.	Total Ed.	Ed. (APS) as % of State Budget	Total Ed. Dept as % of State Budget
	$,000	$,000	$,000	$,000	$,000		
1976-77 ...	1 117 000	243 539	29 505	22 778	295 822	21.80	26.48
1977-78 ...	1 141 418	285 978	36 721	23 488	346 187	25.05	30.32
1978-79 ...	1 235 072	308 005	40 698	26 857	375 060	24.94	30.37
1979-80 ...	1 316 799	324 750	43 252	29 227	397 229	24.66	30.16
1980-81 ...	1 423 744	371 980	48 303	35 372	455 655	26.13	32.00
1981-82 ...	1 722 412	411 450	54 108	41 724	507 282	23.89	29.45
1982-83 ...	1 925 889	465 373	65 300	42 181	572 854	24.16	29.74
1983-84 ...	2 182 471	507 446	73 369	51 593	632 408	23.25	28.98
1984-85 ...	2 623 840	577 811	85 118	62 357	725 286	22.02	27.64
1985-86 ...	2 967 538	638 065	97 750	43 118 (CS) 34 131 *	813 064	21.50	27.39

†Ed. Department (APS) includes administration, Primary and Secondary funding.
*Children's Services now a separate association and includes funds formerly in 'Misc.' and other portfolios. (Now Minister of Education's responsibility in total).

The Hon. H. ALLISON: In this document I have also extended the percentage bases of allocation. I have totalled the department plus TAFE plus miscellaneous and calculated it as a percentage of the total State budget estimate for each year. I have also taken the Education Department line, which includes administration, primary and secondary, and extended that as a percentage of the State budget for each year. Interestingly enough, if members look at a few of the lines (and they will see the whole picture before them) they will see a definite pattern.

In 1976-77 the line for the Education Department, administration, primary and secondary was 21.8 per cent of the State budget. It improved steadily until in 1980-81 it was 26.13 per cent, in 1981-82 (those maligned Liberal years) it was 23.89 per cent, and in 1982-83 (when I was again personally responsible for that budget) it was 24.16 per cent. In 1983-84, 1984-85 and 1985-86, there was a steady decline in the line Education Department, administration, primary and secondary to 23.25 per cent in 1983-84; it was 22.08 per cent in 1984-85; and 21.5 per cent of the State budget in 1985-86. That 21.5 per cent is, in fact, worse than the previous worst allocation of 1976-77.

If we have a look at the broader figures—that is, the total Education Department allocation—in 1976-77, the department scored 26.48 per cent of the total budget, which rose in 1977-78 to 30.32 per cent—a figure that was increased to the peak of any year in the past 10 years in 1980-81 to 32 per cent of the State budget—almost a third. Was that in Labor years? No, Sir! That was under the Tonkin Liberal Administration. However, in the past three years 1983-84 to 1985-86 the total allocation of education funds as a proportion of the State budget comes down from that 32 per cent to 28.98 per cent in 1983-84, 27.64 per cent in 1984-85 and 27.39 per cent in 1985-86.

As I said, members can check the figures by going to the documents which are in the State Parliamentary Library—they are readily available. These figures are purely the Auditor-General's figures and, in case honourable members believe the estimates will give a worse picture than the actual expenditure, I have also gone to the trouble of compiling a separate document showing the actual expenditure. I do not seek the inclusion of those figures in *Hansard*—

An honourable member: Why not?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Simply because the 1985-86 actual expenditure is not yet available; the Auditor-General's Report will be out in a few days. I will seek leave to continue my remarks and by the time the debate is resumed I assume that the 10 year actual expenditures will also be available. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted: debate adjourned.

COMMONWEALTH-STATE RELATIONS

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I move:

That this House expresses its strong concern and disquiet at the increasing use by the Commonwealth Government of its privileged position under the Australian Constitution to avoid the application of relevant State laws in Commonwealth places even where those laws do not conflict with or impinge upon the dominant purpose for which the Commonwealth place is used or for which it was established and, in particular, this House condemns the decision to allow the erection of the advertising hoardings at Parafield Airport adjacent to the Main North Road without the consent of the relevant State or local authorities which would otherwise have been required.

I move this motion because of my concern at the way in which the Commonwealth Government has continued to use the provisions of sections 52 and 109 of the Australian Constitution to override relevant State and local authorities in matters which are exclusively their jurisdiction. Of course, there are a number of reasons why the Commonwealth Government should have the exclusive jurisdiction over Commonwealth places such as airports, Commonwealth railway stations, RAAF and army bases, and so on—those matters are beyond dispute.

Where the Commonwealth uses its legislative power under section 52 of the Australian Constitution to provide relevant laws for the management and government of those places which relate to the purposes for which they were established, then I have no objection and I am sure that this Parliament would endorse that position. Unfortunately, of late the Commonwealth Government has sought to intrude into areas which are very much a State concern.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr M.J. EVANS: For the benefit of the member for Murray-Mallee, my concern in this matter relates particularly to Commonwealth places and a refined area of constitutional law. In particular, I draw the attention of the House to the Commonwealth's power. It has allowed the erection of some massive advertising hoardings at Parafield Airport in order solely to gain additional revenue for the Commonwealth. I understand that the Commonwealth receives some $10 000 per year from that source and that the sole purpose of the advertising hoardings is to gain that additional revenue. There is no other purpose in mind. Certainly, the use of the Commonwealth power to approve those advertising hoardings in no way adds to the use of Parafield Airport in relation to its purposes as an airport. That is my argument in this instance.

Of course, other areas, such as liquor licensing, are also relevant. The use, for example, of the Commonwealth power to permit poker machines or gambling on airport property or on Commonwealth trains is, I believe, equally wrong, where that is contrary to State law. If the States choose to authorise a purpose such as that within the State, I accept that that is appropriate. Where the Commonwealth uses its power, for example, to authorise the use of poker machines in airport lounges or on Commonwealth trains, I believe that is quite a wrong use of that power because it does not relate to the use of the property of the Commonwealth for the purpose for which it was established. Because of the complexity of this matter and some other arguments I would like to bring before the House, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

CONSTITUTION REVIEW

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should establish a commission of distinguished South Australians to review the Constitution of the State and to make recommendations to Parliament for such reform of the Constitution Act as the commission may think just, proper and desirable following extensive consultation with the community.

I move this motion because it is now just over 50 years since the Constitution Act of South Australia in the form in which we now know it was first enacted by this Parliament, and it has been amended many times over the years, often in an *ad hoc* way, to deal with problems as they arise in a constitutional debate in South Australia. As this is now our Jubilee year—150 years of statehood in South Australia—I believe it would not be an inappropriate time to review the Constitution and the mechanisms of our Government.

Many reforms or alternative methods, depending on one's point of view, are possible and could certainly be taken into account by a commission which would review our State Constitution in much the same way as the Commonwealth Government is now reviewing its Constitution. I believe that it would be appropriate for the Government to move to establish such a group. I believe that could be done without significant cost, based as it is solely in South Australia, and with just the need to consult with South Australians, both rural and metropolitan. I believe that a group of South Australian citizens distinguished both in community service and specialised areas, such as the law, could report over some months to this Parliament about any improvements or changes they believe should occur in the State Constitution.

I can think of relevant matters such as the frequency and duration of Parliamentary sittings, the powers of the Governor, the powers of the Executive, whether or not Ministers should sit in the Legislative Council or even the House of Assembly, the independence of the Judiciary, the abolition or retention of the Legislative Council, proportional representation, voluntary voting or compulsory voting (as my colleague discussed), balanced budget initiatives that have occurred in the United States, and so on. A whole range of issues could be considered and my comments are not meant to be exhaustive or indicative of matters I would prefer to see considered. I simply canvass the matters that could be raised and suggest some alternatives that might be looked at by such a commission. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

MOTOR VEHICLE INSURANCE

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should investigate the desirability and feasibility of replacing the present system of motor vehicle registration fees, drivers' licence fees and third party insurance for both bodily injury and property damage, with a levy on the sale of all petroleum products.

In my view, while it is not competent for a private member to obtain the necessary resources or background information to determine the validity of a policy such as this, it certainly is within the competence and responsibility of the Government of the day to undertake such research. I have made this suggestion because of the increasing complexity and bureaucratic intensive nature of the administration of the motor vehicle system.

Although the Government has recently taken some initiatives to reduce the administrative burden and the paperwork costs associated with the system, I believe that, given the massive cost these days of registration fees, drivers' licence fees and third party insurance, it would be much simpler to arrange for a system whereby the cost of those fees and insurance policies was met through a levy on petroleum products. Such a levy is already collected by the State Government to the extent of 2c a litre on petrol as business franchise tax, and very little administrative cost would be involved in extending that to equate with the cost of these other fees. If the balance was then made free of charge, of course the Government would make substantial savings on its administration costs. Also, the public would have the benefit of being able to pay as they go and to pay as they use, principles that I believe all members of this House would consider to be reasonable in this context.

It would also mean that we could relate registration and insurance more directly to usage. Over the past few years the State Government has made significant attempts to translate the direct cost of registration and insurance and to relate that to the power and consumption of petrol by a motor vehicle, given that the registration cost now relates directly to the number of cylinders and the mass of a motor vehicle. I believe that it would be quite appropriate for administrative and efficiency reasons to further investigate this matter and to eliminate the possibility of people driving unregistered and uninsured vehicles which, although the numbers are relatively small given the large number of vehicles driven on the roads in this State, can have a significant impact. People who have accidents with unregistered or uninsured vehicles soon find that many of what they believed to be existing rights evaporate rather quickly and in fact they are left in a very much unprotected state. Therefore, I believe that the House should request the Government to investigate this matter so that the full impact of it can be assessed and the costs projected. I want to bring before the House some further statistical information in relation to this matter. As it has not yet been prepared, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ELECTION BUDGET

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

That this House condemns the cynical way in which the Government expended the State's reserve funds to inflate the 1985-86 election year budget—

(a) knowing that South Australia would receive a decreasing share of the Commonwealth-State revenue sharing grants in 1986-87;

(b) knowing that any significant reduction in finance during 1986-87 would have a serious impact on services; and

(c) relying on public apathy to dissipate electorate anger over the period until the next election.

This motion is straightforward. It relates to comments that I made last year. I refer members to the debate recorded at page 788 in *Hansard* of 10 September 1985. I signalled then that the Government was embarking on a very dangerous course. I raised this concern principally because I knew that in 1986-87 the budgetary difficulties that we would naturally face would be exacerbated by the actions of the Bannon Government in the 1985-86 election year.

No doubt exists in my mind that the finances were manipulated for electoral purposes and the major losers will indeed be the populace of South Australia. The people will have to bear greater charges and imposts as a result of the actions taken at that time. Specifically, during that debate almost a year ago I pointed to the areas in which the Government had managed to salt away funds to boost the 1985-86 budget.

If members need reminding, or cannot read previous debates, I point out that $7.7 million should have been transferred from the Highways Fund during 1984-85, but it was not transferred: it was put back into general revenue to assist the election budget. A further $18.6 million of housing moneys held in trust should have been repaid in 1984-85. However, that sum was not repaid but was deferred until 1985-86. A further item was, by way of overdraft from the South Australian Government Financing Authority, the salting away with Treasury of some $6.7 million.

The $5.9 million payment to the State Government by the State Bank was for profit earned by that bank. Of course, there was the transfer of some $20 million from the South Australian Government Financing Authority representing a surplus on account, namely, profit. Another item related to the defeasance, which also earned in excess of $20 million. My additions on those items amounted to $58.9 million. I did say at the time that the proper course for any responsible Premier or Treasurer to take was to ensure that these revenue or capital items were used to decrease the accumulated deficit.

Members may recall that at that time the accumulated deficit at the end of 1984-85 was of the order of $51 million. Had indeed the Treasurer carried out proper financial control, we could have seen the accumulated deficit decrease virtually to zero. He chose not to do this but instead used the revenue to boost the State budget. That has a number of implications and impacts on which I will be speaking shortly. In my speech on the adjournment debate the other night I mentioned that it was important that governments, like businesses, budget properly for the future. When forward estimates clearly show that there is going to be a downturn in revenue for the forthcoming year, businesses have to work out ways in which they can either increase revenue or decrease costs and, if possible, do both. There seems to be no acceptance of that simple proposition by this State Government.

The Labor Government over a period has seen fit to tax this State at extraordinarily high levels. Its increased revenue for its three years in office up to the last election amounted to some 55 per cent, far in advance of increases in the CPI. Indeed, our levels of increase in the consumer price index were higher than in other States because of the extraordinary taxing efforts of this Government. Given that it did embark on these taxing measures to raise the level of services and increase the number of public servants, it nevertheless had the capacity to decrease the underlying deficit.

It is important for members to note that there is a cost to an underlying deficit that is financed by borrowings, and that cost is the interest on the borrowings. It is estimated that the cost of running this deficit was in the order of $6 million per year. I am unaware of what the budget strategy with be for this forthcoming year: we will hear about that shortly. However, it is unlikely that, given the financial restraints placed on the Government of the day, that $51 million underlying deficit can be reduced. The Government, therefore, has committed itself to a continuing impost on Treasury revenue of $6 million from that source year after year, rather than in 1984-85 and 1985-86 using the extraordinary revenue items which I outlined earlier to decrease the underlying deficit.

Members opposite clearly do not understand that, if services are boosted, the taxation levels in any one year are increased to allow that to happen. There is an underlying requirement, if those services are to be maintained, that the taxation levels also be maintained or increased. During years of difficulty, of course, it means that taxation levels have to be increased, and we have already seen 400-odd charges in this State having to be increased. Despite this, the Treasury coffers will still have to produce additional forms of revenue, because of the shortfalls in various items. I draw the attention of members to the fact that the State Government was well aware that the Federal Government intended to decrease the extraordinary grant that it gave the State Government to assist in the budget smoothing process. In 1985-86 the sum of $34.2 million was paid to the State Government above what was agreed to at the Premiers Conference in the cost sharing arrangement. This sum represented two-thirds of the revenue advantage which would have accrued under the health arrangements, so, in net terms, the cost sharing arrangements decreased our relative share, although there was some offset by the Federal Government.

The Premier was well aware of and agreed to the fact that, of this $34.2 million in 1985-86, only $17.1 million would be given for 1986-87. Again, we have seen a revenue decrease which was known to the Premier well before the event, with some $17 million less to be made available from this source. Irrespective of the state of the economy, there was likely to be a significant decrease in moneys made available by the Commonwealth. The Premier would also have been aware that the state of the economy was particularly fragile at that time, as I mentioned on a number of occasions. It took no particular genius in the Treasury or within the economic policy areas of the Government to work out that there was a high probability of decreased revenue coming from some of the sources which had contributed to the 55.2 per cent increase in taxation in the three year period.

Mr Duigan interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: The member for Adelaide mentions OPEC. If he wishes to look at the record, he will see that the revenue from the oil received over that three years was minimal. There was a projection, of course, that during this forthcoming term the revenue would increase considerably, but it has not done so. Indeed, I went to a budget breakfast last year when a person who is probably well known to members on the other side of the House projected that the price of oil would fall, placing at risk the ability to sell our Moomba productions. There has been information on this available for everyone to see. It means either that the Government has indulged in manipulation to an extraordinary extent to enable itself to succeed at the 1985 election or, alternatively, it is getting fundamentally bad advice.

Mr Rann interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: The member for Briggs says that it did not need to. All I can say to him is that I wish it had not, because the Government would be in a much sounder financial situation today if it had not indulged in this manipulation of reserves. I wish to further develop this argument when time allows, and I seek to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

MINISTERS' REPLIES

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I move:

That in the opinion of this House the rulings of successive Speakers in allowing Ministers when answering questions to use debate in that answer, and also to raise subject matter not directly related to the question, is not in accordance with this House's Standing Orders or its accepted authority, Blackmore.

Standing Orders 124 and 125 cover the point I wish to make. Standing Order 124 states that in putting a question 'no argument or opinion shall be offered', and Standing Order 125 states that 'in answering any such questions, a member shall not debate the matter to which the same refers'. A 'member' refers to every member of parliament, Minister or otherwise. I believe that the Speaker has made a definite and quite considerable success of attempting to get members to abide by those two Standing Orders within the last couple of weeks, since I gave notice of the motion, and I think that some members have been successful in trying to abide by those two provisions.

For that reason, I am not going to proceed any further with the motion today, because I believe there has been a great improvement. I wish Mr Speaker well in endeavouring to further improve it, and I trust that in the future I will not have to further debate the resolution. With those comments, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ELECTRONIC GAMING DEVICES

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I move:

That a select committee be appointed to inquire into the likely social and economic impact of electronic gaming devices (including Club Keno and poker machines) on the community.

In so doing, I must say how disappointed I am that I did not have the opportunity to move this motion on the first Thursday of the sittings of this Parliament; I was led to believe that that was when I was to be given the time to do so. I consider this a very important issue that has raised much debate in the community—some of it informed, some ill informed. I am endeavouring to bring to the attention of the community and the House an issue that I think should be considered.

In doing that, I want to refer to some extracts from the report on my parliamentary study tour that I undertook between 28 April and 25 May 1984. During my study tour, I visited the Nevada Gaming Commission and looked at the management, operation and security from a Government standpoint of casino operations. I did not support in this House the legislation for a casino, as I did not believe that such a venture would be economically viable. When I look at the current situation of the Adelaide Casino, I see that I was wrong—and I admit that. However, that is only at this stage. Let us look at the casino in two or three years time and see what the situation is then. In my report, I stated:

I was also advised by Nevada Gaming Commission staff that poker machines are the bread and butter of a casino. Perhaps this is an area Parliament may not have been courageous enough in tackling. It has been said certain organisations are involved in controlling the poker machine industry in Australia.

I have always believed if this is so, then those people can be eliminated. A Government can own and control the poker machines. It is quite easy to set the percentage the machines pay out by sealing the machines and regularly having them audited by Government auditors. Regular inspections should be a requirement and costs should be borne by the licensee. In other words, if the casino operator wants a casino license then they pay for all costs of monitoring that licence. If they want poker machines, then they pay for the monitoring and auditing of those poker machines. Poker machines could well be manufactured in South Australia by our Government workshops, thus eliminating any outside ownership or control whatsoever.

In actual fact, we have been advised in the last few days that, through the success and development of Technology Park and various organisations there, a new type of computerised poker machine could be made and programmed in South Australia, and that Technology Park is very keen to become involved in this aspect. I can see that we could well be exporting technology programs. I went on to say:

Poker machine payouts in Las Vegas vary greatly, from an advertised 98 per cent return, supposedly, to 50 per cent return. I believe poker machine percentage payouts could be restricted in line with the percentage of return obtained through the TAB win and place dividends. Once the percentage is set, the machines are scaled and a strict accounting system established for each machine. As with all gambling games standard percentage returns are known. These are:

	Percent
Blackjack	.5-15
Craps	.7-16.7
Baccarat	1.27
Roulette	5.26
Slot machines (poker machines)	2-50
Wheel of fortune	11-25
Keno	18-35

The other two games involved were Racetrack, which we do not have here and which returns 18 per cent—about the same odds as win and place on the totalizator—and Neighbourhood Bookie, 28 per cent. Those figures give some idea of the percentage on turnover that the house obtains.

I spoke yesterday to management staff of the Adelaide Casino. Inevitably, no matter what one hears or reads, the well run and well managed casino will return those percentage figures on turnover—there will be highs and lows, but over a given period those percentages, if the establishment is operating on them, are consistent. In Las Vegas the casino poker machines are used to attract people: that is why they have a very high payout. In my experience that was not so. Every time I put $20 into a poker machine it went so quickly it did not matter.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: You're lucky to have $20 to put in a machine.

Mr BECKER: It took a long time to save. However, in Australia when we talk of poker machines we relate to the New South Wales club experience. I happened to be in Sydney, as an employee of the Bank of Adelaide, when poker machines were legalised. It was an incredible situation because the Government merely legalised what was already going on in many areas under cover, anyway; but, it was totally undisciplined, totally uncontrolled, and totally irrational behaviour by those who wanted to try that new form of entertainment, or gambling. So, we have seen in New South Wales a significant growth of clubs, club facilities and benefits to members.

People who were contributing $4 annually for membership could participate in a wide range of facilities and low cost meals provided by the sporting organisations. It helped to boost the financial return to those sporting clubs, and many league clubs that I came to know did well by providing facilities and encouraging junior players. The benefits flowing from training programs and the assistance given brought people into the sport. The benefits that attracted people included holiday cabins, low cost holidays on the New South Wales coast, magnificent bowling greens as well as other organisations within the structure of that club. This structure allowed the average worker for a very nominal membership fee to enjoy first class benefits—there is no doubt about that. The facilities were top class.

If one was a resident of a Sydney suburb (say, Manly) and wanted to join the Manly Bowling Club, it would cost a fee that was far beyond the means of the average worker. Instead, one could join the local leagues club for $4 and many facilities were available within the structure of the club. So, the lifestyle of the average person in New South Wales did improve remarkably. On the other hand, allegations were made in the early days that many people were involved in uncontrolled and undisciplined behaviour. They believed they could make much money from poker machines and they spent small fortunes. Some people were totally irresponsible in their behaviour because there were just so many machines available in clubs.

Stories circulated that one could manipulate machines by wiggling the handle or by putting something down the machine. There were stories about how one could make money very quickly. When it all came out in the wash it was clear that many of these beliefs were absolutely false. At the same time the management of various clubs was extremely loose. I well remember one leagues club that finally went bankrupt. Every night the coins in the machines were emptied out into metal buckets on a trolley and taken to a supposed strong room where once a week the buckets of coins were picked up by utility and taken for deposit in a vault in the local bank for another week until the money was counted and the proceeds credited to the club. Many people handled those buckets and obviously took a bit here and a bit there until finally the club, which had a colossal turnover, went bankrupt. That situation got totally out of hand.

What we are looking at and proposing in South Australia is that doubtless the casino would like to have poker machines, but the impact of that change on licensed clubs and the hotel industry and other fund-raising activities is something about which we are not sure. Unofficially, the casino management, I believe, is willing to develop the southern side of the Adelaide railway station. We have seen what it is capable of doing on the northern side. I understand it intends to spend about $20 million, although I do not know how much it would actually cost. I cannot confirm that figure. Also, I want to scotch the rumours that the basement of the casino is full of poker machines—that is just not true. The casino does not have any poker machines because no-one knows what type of machines would be permitted.

Members interjecting:

Mr BECKER: The member for Morphett says the wiring is there. That is not so. The poker machines would be on an entirely different side of the building. If permitted, poker machines would not go into the casino side.

Members interjecting:

Mr BECKER: I suggest that members ask the management what it has in mind. The whole thing is a big 'if'—if poker machines were approved. Members should ask the casino what plans it has in that regard. That is the type of story that is being spread and people then tend to place some credence on the issue. It is not so. It is totally false. Having looked at the issue and considering whether they should go into the casino, I was approached by the Licensed Clubs Association of South Australia, which felt that it was missing out badly. I supported Sunday trading. I believed that hotel trading hours should be extended on Sundays, simply because of the experience we had at Glenelg and advice I received from senior legal persons in this State. However, I did not realise at the time Sunday trading was extended the impact it would have on licensed clubs.

I think that each and every member of this State and Parliament should realise that licensed clubs in South Australia have a very important role and make a considerable contribution to providing organised training facilities and an outlet for the young people of this State to participate at various levels of sport. Therefore, the licensed clubs have a very difficult job, as do other organisations which operate on a voluntary basis, to raise money to provide the funds necessary to run these organisations.

I can well see the point that, if we are to support licensed clubs and relieve the State Government of the financial impact of having to heavily support through funding our various sporting associations, perhaps we should look at some way of providing means to finance licensed clubs. I believe that licensed clubs should be given an opportunity to install poker machines. Following my visit to Europe, particularly West Germany, I was surprised to see poker machines as we know them located in restaurants and hotels, and we also saw some in hotels in London.

Mr S.G. Evans: They are not the same.

Mr BECKER: The member for Davenport says that they are not the same. What I expect and desire for licensed clubs in South Australia is a type of machine that makes a payout of about $49.50 for a 10c or 20c investment. If the bettor accumulates more than $49.50, he loses the lot. In West Germany there is a machine where the bettor can accumulate winnings up to a certain amount—$49.50.

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

Mr BECKER: No, you did not; you took the cash, and that was it. However if you went past that, the machine took all the money. In Singapore, licensed clubs are allowed to have three poker machines, which are quite sophisticated,

multiline and multicoin machines. I was not very impressed with them. Although they are very popular, I did not see any queues and there was no great rush to use the machines in Singapore. It was the same in West Germany and in the hotels of London: no-one queued up to use the fruit machines, the poker machines or whatever they are called. It all comes down to the number of machines that we will accept.

I believe that the small licensed clubs will have only one or two machines, and the larger clubs, such as major football clubs, will have a maximum of 25 machines. That is one proposal that has been put to me. Whether or not that is correct or whether it is acceptable or economically feasible, I do not know. That is why I think a select committee of Parliament should look into the whole range of options that could be involved in this issue. However, it goes further than that. I am surprised at the amount of money that is invested daily and each year through instant cash tickets. The Lotteries Commission instant money game has grown from a turnover of $18 million in 1982-83 to $25 million in 1983-84 and $28 million in 1984-85.

In his report for 1985 to Parliament, the former Minister of Recreation and Sport advised on page 36 that the gross turnover of fundraising lotteries conducted pursuant to the Lotteries and Gaming Act for 1983-84 was $67.7 million and in 1984-85 it was $66.6 million. The net turnover was $20.4 million in 1983-84 and $20.8 million in 1984-85. Although I can obtain only an estimate, I believe that, of the gross turnover in the past 12 months of some $66 million, $45 million was attributed to the instant money cash tickets which cost 20c or 25c. For a long time I have been concerned about accountability with that type of fundraising and those tickets.

Mr S.G. Evans: The Mickey Mouse clubs in the pubs.

Mr BECKER: As the honourable member would know, between 1979 and 1982 the former Liberal Government conducted an inquiry into the operation of this type of gambling in hotels, sport and social clubs, and we found that several of those sports and social clubs were of very doubtful origin. Although it was difficult to prove, we believe that not all those sports and social clubs were genuine. After making representations to the hotel industry, we believe that there has been some tightening up in this area. The Department of Recreation and Sport (Gaming Division) has also clamped down on the licensing of those clubs. The question still remains today if one buys these instant money tickets, whether the proceeds go to the rightful owner of that licence and whether the licensee then allocates that money for the purpose that is claimed. If it is a sport and social club, is the money then allocated to various sporting activities or charitable organisations? My experience in the field of charities is that the bulk (over 90 per cent) of moneys raised in this way finds its way through to charities, sporting clubs and deserving organisations.

Some of the hotels, particularly some in the western suburbs, have a very high reputation and credibility as well as accountability to their patrons as to where the proceeds go. That is also the case with some sports and social clubs and the members. Unfortunately, with a few organisations, it has been very difficult to find exactly where the money goes, so there has been quite a large rip-off, if I can use that word, in the use of instant cash tickets. In those cases, the money has gone probably into the hands or pockets of the proprietor or very few people.

The member for Davenport also mentioned earlier the prizes not being put into the boxes. That question was also raised some years ago when similar allegations were made. I have since had those allegations verified by a very close friend of mine, who had a delicatessen. He said he paid his weekly rent in this way. Originally, he conducted instant cash tickets for the local soccer club. He was then approached on several occasions to act as an agent for these instant cash tickets for a different sporting club and he was offered $40 per week. He knew that that was illegal and he was not interested. Later, he was approached by another organisation which was handling these instant cash tickets and which said, 'Look, here is a box. We will give you $25 to handle it for this particular club. There are the four $50 winning tickets. Feed them in every day so that you spread the winnings.' That is the idea, but sometimes the staff would forget, so he would do quite well from it. It helped him pay the rent. He is no longer in that business, but he has always had a guilty conscience about that.

He, like me, believes that we should perhaps be looking at an automated system. As the former Minister would know, the trouble is that a large number of people are involved in this field of handling instant cash tickets. They are not licensed, but I think we should license them so that it can be controlled. I know that there are Government regulations and so on, but I believe that the stage has come when we should license people so that we can control the willy-nilly issuing and dealing that goes on. The cost of a set of 2 000 instant cash tickets is about $30, but I am told that one can bargain and get the set for $20 or less. Many booths are also being set up in major shopping centres. Under the licence, people are not allowed to employ anyone to sell instant cash tickets, but I believe that some of these people might be employed part-time or might be receiving a commission for selling the tickets—I do not know. I believe that the inquiry should consider this aspect. If people are employed, perhaps that would create jobs. It is a social issue, which the select committee should consider.

There is no doubt in my mind that at present because of the lack of staff (not because of the lack of ability by officers of the Department of Recreation and Sport), as 9 300 licences to handle small lotteries and instant cash tickets have been issued, it is very difficult to check on accountability, thus very unsavoury practices are occurring. They are the people who are complaining about the threats of automation. I want to say a lot more about what the select committee should consider, and I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ECONOMIC POLICIES

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I move:

That this House condemns the Federal Labor Government for its economic policies which have tended to bankrupt Australia and have led to such a loss of confidence overseas that the Australian dollar has sunk to its lowest value ever; and condemns the Premier for his public support of these policies.

My original motion referred to the economic policies of the Federal Labor Government 'bankrupting' not 'tending to bankrupt' Australia. This debate allows me to continue some of the remarks I made yesterday when we moved a motion in this place condemning some of the new imposts under the budget that was announced recently.

Mr Hamilton: Your contribution was terrible.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Beauty is in the eye of the beholder, of course: likewise, the judgment of merit relating to contributions in this House is no doubt in the ears of the hearer. I would be worried if the honourable member was ever to praise any of my efforts in this place. I would think that that would be the absolute kiss of death: I would lie down and throw my legs in the air, and throw

off this mortal coil (in the words of Shakespeare). I am flattered that the honourable member, by inference, has said that I did a very good job yesterday.

The fact is that the country is, to all intents and purposes, bankrupt. As I said yesterday (and I repeat today, because I hope it might sink in), the situation hails back to the electoral tactics of the ALP whenever it is seeking government. We have seen it in this State. We have seen it in Victoria, when Premier Cain promised his way into office and immediately proceeded to break his promises—he kept some, which were inflationary. We saw it happen here in 1982 when the Bannon Government promised its way into office and then proceeded to break promises (although it could not break them all). We saw it federally with the Hawke Labor Government, which promised the world. The ALP said, 'You name it, we will give it.' The Party gathered to its bosom every fringe group, such as the environmentalists—you name it, they promised it! They would give them the world.

But the Hawke Government welched on a few of those promises. Members of that Government broke their promises not to introduce a wine tax and to build a railway line to the Northern Territory to provide a trade outlet for the produce of South Australia. They broke promises that were very damaging to us. Because we are electorally expendable, because South Australia is a small State, they chose to break those promises.

The Labor Government interfered with Tasmania—they kept their promise to environmentalists there but that managed to keep them out of office in Tasmania. The Labor Party must regret that—certainly Tasmanians must regret that interference. The fact is, they promised the world, and in some areas they sought to deliver it. The end result was an enormous expansionary budget in the initial years of the present Labor Federal Government. As I said, Whitlam revisited: history repeating itself.

Anyone with an interest in politics will remember the Whitlam years. We could not spend the money as fast as it poured out of Canberra. The electorally popular issues of education and health are the issues the Labor Party have always seized—they were a big deal then as they were during the Dunstan years here. We are now in one hell of a mess with our health system, and education is about to suffer too. The flood gates opened on these electorally popular issues; we could not get programs under way quickly enough. But that is what Hawke did—promised his way into Government. Hawke deliberately planned an expansionary budget, and he said, 'In this country we cannot afford the tragedy of the levels of unemployment we have.' That was the big catchcry, and that was also the Bannon/Wright catchcry in 1982. The Labor Government then pumped a lot of money into the economy (a lot of it borrowed overseas) to create temporary jobs. I think we spent something like $1 billion on temporary work schemes. *An honourable member interjecting:*

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: They are going to halve it this year, the honourable member who is interjecting might note. The fact is that there was an enormous expansionary budget. As I said yesterday, and I repeat today, at that stage reputable economists were all saying that this was a very chancey, dangerous course to follow. We know that the Secretary to the Treasury, John Stone—a highly respected economist/adviser and one of the top men—left at that stage because he quite obviously disagreed entirely with this big splash of public funds meant to artificially prop up the employment program. It also increased our public debt enormously and, more importantly at the moment, our overseas indebtedness.

That is the background to the economic strategy the Labor Party is now seeking to put into reverse gear. So that is one side of the equation. The mess we are in lies squarely at the feet of the Federal Labor Government. I understand that Bill Hayden had a severe disagreement about that original economic strategy; if that is correct, it is to his credit. I understand that there was some disagreement within Federal Labor circles as to that initial economic strategy which led to the demise of John Stone and to the present economic difficulties and our record level of overseas indebtedness.

Mr Rann: Record employment growth in the private sector since the Second World War.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We talk about record employment growth but there is a problem with this sort of economic planning—proceed in one direction, find out it has not worked and then back-pedal as fast as you can. The end result is worse than it would have been if a steady course had been followed during the whole of that period. We now have the spectacle of Hawke publicly saying—and I think I heard it this morning—that inevitably unemployment will rise. Let the member for Briggs chew on that.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is not true either. The fact is that the nation is in a worse situation now, and the medicine will have to be more bitter and less palatable as a result of Labor Party policies. The other part of this equation, which makes it very difficult for governments to do what they should do in a democracy, is the fact that the Labor Party does not govern: the ACTU does. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

LEADERSHIP OF LIBERAL MEMBERS

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I move:

That this House highly commends all Liberal members of Parliaments in Australia for the outstanding leadership displayed by them in promoting equal opportunities for all people, regardless of sex, race, physical ability, appearance, economic means and family background.

I am fairly relaxed about this whole proposition, because it has been very much a part of the tradition of the Liberal Party for many years. Since 1921 the Liberal Party has had women in Parliament as members. Indeed, in Western Australia a Mrs Edith Cowan was a member of the Party that was a forerunner to the Liberal Party. As members here would know, over 40 years ago the Liberal Party of Australia, as it is now known, became a reality as a consequence of the amalgamation of six or seven similarly motivated groups of people in the political arena which came under the national leadership of the then Mr Menzies (the late Sir Robert Menzies). However, we have no hangups about our roots. We recognise those people who have always felt the same way about life and who have had a philosophy of political decision-making similar to ours.

The first ALP woman member of Parliament was Senator Tangney, also from Western Australia. The same sorts of things apply to all those other groups of people I have mentioned in the motion. I guess as much as anything I rise to put this proposition before the House for the sake of ensuring that members are not mistaken or misled by the kinds of remarks that were made by the member for Mawson last week. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

GOODS SECURITIES BILL

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

PETITION: ELECTRONIC GAMING DEVICES

A petition signed by 47 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to permit the use of electronic gaming devices was presented by Ms Gayler.

Petition received.

PETITION: PROSTITUTION

A petition signed by 150 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose any measures to decriminalise prostitution and uphold present laws against the exploitation of women by prostitution was presented by Mr Ingerson.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the Leader of the Opposition, I point out that questions that would normally be directed to the Minister of Mines and Energy shall today be directed to the Deputy Premier.

URANIUM SALES

Mr OLSEN: In view of the potential economic significance to South Australia of the Federal Government's decision to lift the ban on the sale of uranium to France, will the Premier reconsider his statement, in the *Advertiser* of 5 August, that he is opposed to sales of uranium to France? Since the Federal Government's announcement, representatives of the joint venturers have said that it will assist their efforts to find markets for Roxby Downs uranium. In my talks in London last year with one of the joint venturers, it was made clear to me that, rather than the present scaled-down project, the viability of Roxby Downs would be enhanced by their ability to negotiate sales with France. As the Federal Government has said that sales to France will be made on exactly the same basis as sales to Japan (that is, under strict bilateral safeguards ensuring that the uranium is used for peaceful purposes only), it is difficult to see what objection the Premier can continue to have, given that he was prepared to travel to Japan last year in a bid to encourage uranium sales to that country.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The objection is quite clear. I am surprised that the honourable member ignores it. I do not believe that the French can be trusted in this area, quite frankly. It may well be that the same bilateral arrangements can be negotiated, but they would be negotiated with a country which is not a signatory to the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty and which is testing nuclear weapons still in the Pacific against all international agreements and treaties, and that is certainly adversely affecting us in this part of the world. So, basically, that has been the position that I have taken on the matter. I do not agree with the Federal Government's decision. I understand the basis of that decision, but I have said on a number of occasions that I do not agree with it.

The question is then put to me, 'Well, by saying that, are you not in fact condemning the Roxby Downs mining operation?' I am not doing that, and the point must be made again and again: the decisions that have been taken in relation to Roxby Downs, with its start-up in 1988, which this Government has supported as we undertook to do with the electorate in honouring the indenture, have been taken against a background of no possibility of sales to France. Whether there will be sales to France in the late 1990s or beyond, I cannot say. Circumstances may well have changed in that time, but the Federal Government's decision is not directed to Roxby Downs. It is to deal with a particular problem that it has, namely, that at the moment it is paying a large amount of compensation, while the French Government is rather delighted with that situation because it does not have to take at prices above the spot price that it is currently able to get on the world market uranium for which it has already contracted.

What the Federal Government is saying is that at the moment our policy is not hurting France—in fact, it is financially advantaging the French; that is not changing the attitudes of the French, because they do not really care about it and, further, it is costing the Australian taxpayer a considerable amount of money because the compensation has had to be paid. On that basis the Federal Government then says that in all economic logic Australia should open up that contract to France. That is its decision.

My position on that is that, while there may well be economic logic in it, I really believe that, while France continues to behave as it does in the international forums on this issue, even despite the economic implications of that, we ought to hold off and we should not be opening the gates to France buying our uranium. Having said that, I repeat that the Commonwealth has to determine the policy. It controls the export licences, and this State Government is not in a position to influence that. As to a detrimental effect on Roxby Downs, at this stage that is not an issue. I am speaking, as I am sure many other citizens do, about our attitude to France and nuclear energy.

ANNUAL YOUTH PARLIAMENT

Mr TYLER: My question is directed to you, Mr Speaker. Will you, Sir, consider investigating the introduction of an Annual Youth Parliament in South Australia? When visiting Canada recently, I had drawn to my attention the existence of the British Columbia Youth Parliament. While I am aware of individual instances of young people being involved in our parliamentary process, I know of no permanent youth Parliament having ever existed in South Australia. The British Columbia Youth Parliament bears the motto 'Youth Serving Youth', and aims to promote the mental, physical, spiritual and social well-being of the youth of British Columbia.

The Parliament consists of 85 people, aged between 16 and 25 years, each representing a youth club. The Parliament meets annually to debate issues of public interest and importance and to decide a program of activities for the year. The members of the Youth Parliament and the organisations they represent participate throughout the year in various activities involving young people. These are educational, recreational and charitable, and include visiting children's hospitals and presenting educational programs in schools about British Columbia's election procedures and political structure. They also conduct a pre-teen program on recreational courses at a neighbourhood house.

Mr Speaker, it has been put to me that this youth Parliament concept could be equally valuable for South Australia as it has been for British Columbia. The experience gained by the participants in the areas of organisation, finance and debate would be extremely valuable in nurturing the talents of our young people as well as a fitting recognition of the contribution that they give to our society.

The SPEAKER: It is probably appropriate that this question be asked by the youngest member in the House. The Chair is of the view that this proposition may have substantial merit. In the past, my predecessors have hosted a type of Youth Parliament organised by the Guide Dogs Association, and there have been other similar events arranged to be held in the House of Assembly Chamber, organised by groups such as Rostrum and the political Parties. A lack of adequate parliamentary staff resources would prevent the House itself undertaking the detailed year-round organisation that would be involved, although I am sure that an organisation such as the Education Department, the Department of Youth Affairs or an outside group, as is done in British Columbia, might be willing to do all the necessary preparation. If this is feasible, I would be very happy to host such an event here in the Chamber, and I will consult with the Minister of Education and the Minister of Youth Affairs to see if the necessary resources can be found.

ROXBY DOWNS INDENTURE

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: In view of the Premier's opposition to the sale of uranium to France, does the Government intend to amend the Roxby Downs indenture?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will be very interested to hear the answer, as will be, no doubt, the Minister of Transport. The joint venturers have made it clear that the Federal Government's decision would assist them. On ABC television last night, the South Australian representative, Mr Tony Palmer, said that it made one of the world's largest markets for uranium available to them and that 'obviously, it must make it easier for us to peddle our wares'. Clause 34 of the indenture imposes on the State Government specific obligations not to do anything prejudicial to the efforts of the joint venturers to sell uranium. However, the Premier's attitude to sales to France appears to be inconsistent with his obligation under this indenture and more in line with the statement in the *Australian* this morning by that noted South Australian left winger, Mr John Scott, who, in referring to the Prime Minister, said, 'He can go to hell.' Can the Premier, therefore, clarify whether the Government will honour its indenture obligations not to stand in the way of the joint venturers in seeking sales to France, or whether he intends to amend the indenture?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We do not intend to amend the indenture. I said in my response to the Leader of the Opposition that this Government gave an undertaking to the people of South Australia that we would honour and implement that indenture, and that is exactly what we have done. We have done it at some political cost. We have done it certainly in the face of opposition, both within the community and, perhaps even more importantly, at the national level. I have taken on this fight in a succession of national conferences of our Party to ensure that the policy allowed us to honour that promise on Roxby Downs, but that is where it stops.

The Deputy Leader can quote the joint venturers' attitude; of course he would do that, and of course they would like to sell anywhere and under any circumstances that they could. That is because it is in their commercial interests, and I do not criticise them for that. That is what they are on about; they want to mine and they want to sell their product, and that is good. But the Government surely has some larger responsibilities. The very fact that the Federal Government has the power to issue or not issue export licences, irrespective of the terms of the indenture in South Australia, indicates that there can be conditions in the public interest imposed on them.

Until the budget this week, one of the conditions in the public interest imposed by the Federal Government was that they would not give an export licence for sales to France. They have now said that they will in the future, subject to certain requirements which would, of course, have to be negotiated and dealt with. I do not believe that France is an appropriate country to receive our uranium. Considering France's attitude to nuclear testing and international agreements, and the appalling *Rainbow Warrior* incident, and so on, I do not believe it is a fit country to receive product from Australia. However, I also recognise the constraints as—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat for a moment. The Chair has endeavoured to protect members, when they are asking questions, from being harassed by a barrage of interjections. The Chair intends that Ministers will receive the same protection, and calls on the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to cease interjecting. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I also recognised the constraints that are imposed upon us in terms of making that a directive or policy. As far as the joint venturers are concerned I have expressed my wish there, but we do not have the power under the terms of the indenture; nor do we have a mandate to change the indenture to gain that power.

AUSTRALIAN INTERNATIONAL INSURANCE EXCHANGE

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Premier inform the House whether Treasury has studied the move by the Western Australian Government to introduce an Australian international insurance exchange, and whether there would be any benefit to South Australia to do the same? On 28 July 1986 the Department of the Premier and Cabinet of the Western Australian State Government and the Western Australian Development Corporation announced the establishment of the Australian International Insurance Exchange, which intends to commence operations in Perth next year. One of the aims of the exchange is to retain in Australia some of the substantial funds which leave the country each year in the form of insurance and reinsurance premiums.

Estimates by the Western Australian Development Corporation suggest that, in its first year, the exchange could attract capital investment of up to $50 million and premium income of $25 million: premium income is estimated to approach $200 million after five years. The exchange is to operate on a basis similar to Lloyd's, with insurance and reinsurance facilities being provided by professional syndicate underwriters, the syndicate membership being drawn from insurance companies, financial institutions, corporations and individuals. It is hoped that the exchange will provide new capacity to the corporate sector at a time when

overall capacity has been shrinking, particularly in broad form property and liability insurances.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank the honourable member for his question, to which the short answer is 'Yes'. The development to which he refers, the establishment of an international insurance exchange, is being monitored very closely to identify whether advantages that could accrue from setting up such an exchange could apply to South Australia. The honourable member would be aware that over the past few years we have embarked on a massive shake-up of our State's financial system. We have improved the competitive ability and flexibility of our financial institutions and have created some new ones—I instance the Government Financing Authority, Local Government Finance Authority, Enterprise Investment, a number of other instruments, and the amalgamation of the State Bank.

All of this has been done in the past three or four years and has certainly proved of enormous benefit to the State. When we hear of any new instrument or financial initiative such as this, obviously we look at it to ascertain whether or not it can be appropriately applied in South Australia. Certainly, some fairly ambitious claims have been made from the Western Australian Government and Development Corporation proposal. Whether those claims, in fact, can be matched over the first year of its operation is a bit hard to tell; but, certainly, if there is an indication not only that it can work as set up in Western Australia, but that it can work here, we will be into it immediately, because the more that we can ensure the making of money in this way the less we have to rely on taxes and other forms of revenue to maintain our State services.

URANIUM SALES

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: In view of the Premier's opposition to the sale of uranium to France, will he be asking the Roxby Downs joint venturers not to initiate any sales negotiations with potential French customers for uranium?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This is the third question on this matter, and it is really covering exactly the same ground. I will not indulge in any vain repetition. The joint venturers are quite clear about my attitude in relation to uranium sales to France.

DANGEROUS WEAPONS

Ms GAYLER: Will the Minister of Emergency Services take urgent steps to stop sporting goods and toyshops from selling offensive weapons, such as slingshots, to schoolchildren? I have received serious complaints from constituents concerned that certain Adelaide shops are selling a very sturdy version of a slingshot to schoolchildren in school uniforms. Today I was able to buy such a slingshot for $21.50. Members may like to inspect it later. It is made of metal, leather and surgical type rubber and has metal ball-bearings.

Mothers are very concerned that their children may accidentally hurt their younger brothers and sisters and are especially concerned about injuries to eyes. Members will be aware of reports whereby O-Bahn buses are suspected of having been damaged by missiles, and shops on Prospect Road and elsewhere in the north-eastern suburbs may well have been damaged by similar weapons. In another incident reported to me a mother was horrified at her young son shooting at a neighbour's car and, again, the child was dressed in a school uniform.

I am advised that a slingshot of similar style has been used in West Germany and Japan by people demonstrating against the police, and in those cases the ball-bearings seemed to be armour piercing. The Department of Public and Consumer Affairs advises me that, because the slingshot is an offensive weapon under the Police Offences Act, it is for the police to determine what action can be taken. Will the Minister take urgent action in relation to slingshots, flick-knives and crossbows?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I thank the member for Newland for drawing the House's attention to this matter. I have had an opportunity to inspect the weapon referred to. It is extremely impressive and also very expensive. One is continually amazed at the amount of money people are prepared to spend on such things. It appears to me to be an offensive weapon—in fact, it appears to me to be potentially a lethal weapon. I will immediately draw it to the attention of the Police Commissioner and appropriate advice will be given to sales outlets.

LIQUOR LICENCE TAX

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: In view of the fact that the Opposition's estimate that the 20 per cent wine sales tax will add $4.2 million to the State's revenue from the liquor licence tax during the next three financial years is based on official Treasury figures, will the Premier withdraw the statement he made this morning that this figure is a furphy and now say whether he will use this extra revenue to offset the impact of the doubling of the sales tax?

Yesterday, the Premier specifically rejected the Opposition's proposal to apply this windfall to offset the doubling of the sales tax, and on radio this morning he said this was all a furphy. However, Treasury figures provided to the Legislative Council in November 1984 show that between 1985-86 and 1987-88 the Government expected that extra State revenue to be generated by a 10 per cent wine sales tax would be, in 1984 dollars, $1.5 million. On this basis, our estimate that the 20 per cent tax will generate additional revenue of $4.2 million between 1987-88 and 1989-90 is, if anything, conservative.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Those estimates, which were based on both the rate of growth in the wine industry and the expected effect of the tax, proved to be quite wrong. Indeed, in the net effect, particularly bearing in mind that we took action to exempt vigneron sales from licence fees, we probably recouped far less than before. That is the simple situation.

I do not think members understand the basis of our liquor franchise fee, and they are certainly unable to calculate figures. The figures they have produced are nonsense. In fact, it is virtually impossible to make any precise estimates. However, I would like to put this information before the House: it depends on the level of sales and whether or not the tax is passed on as to whether the State Government indirectly, and some 12 months later, can collect anything.

Looking at the experience since 1984, when the 10 per cent wine sales tax was applied, the rate of increase in wine prices from June 1984 until the March quarter 1986 was 7.4 per cent. That figure was significantly less than the average rise of the goods component of the CPI, which rose by 13.9 per cent. In other words, in real terms there was a drop in the price of wine, and that is why I say there would have been a negative effect on State Government revenue. They are the facts as produced by the Bureau of Statistics. So in real terms, taking into account the sales tax, the real

price return to wine makers probably fell by about 14.3 per cent. As I said yesterday, that represented a real squeeze on their profits and on their margins.

In addition, for the month of May 1986 (and these are the latest figures I have) total wine sales showed a 0.2 per cent decrease over the five months. In other words, there is a double effect here—the total wine sales are going down, and that is another cause for concern about the wine tax applied in this week's budget. If in fact sales go down, it is obviously bad for the wine industry, but I point out that in that instance there is absolutely no windfall—on the alternative, it is a shortfall.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order and remind him that it is highly disorderly for him to be commenting on that matter when he has already, collectively, as part of the House, been called to order.

OVERSEAS WHEAT SALES

Mr RANN: Will the Minister of Agriculture ask the State Opposition to join this Government and South Australia's rural community in condemning a Western Australian Liberal MP who has asked the United States to keep selling subsidised agricultural products to China and the USSR because this would assist in defeating the Australian and New Zealand Labor Governments?

It has been reported in the Federal Parliament that Mr Lightfoot asked US Secretary of State George Schultz to 'Stand fast on the proposed wheat sales to China and Russia' because (and I quote) 'Your actions will have a detrimental trade effect on the two socialist governments of my country and New Zealand that those respective administrations would have difficulty recovering from.' This morning, the Secretary of the United Farmers and Stockowners, Mr Grant Andrews, told me that he condemned Mr Lightfoot's actions in the strongest terms because he had shown a callous disregard for our embattled wheatgrowers in seeking to politicise this important issue.

Members interjecting:

Mr RANN: I do not know why the Leader of the Opposition is getting so nervous: I said 'Lightfoot', not 'lightweight'. It has been put to me by others that the State Opposition has been strangely reticent in dissociating itself from Mr Lightfoot's quisling actions.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I have no hesitation in taking up the honourable member's question to the Opposition. I am sure the shadow Minister would join with me in that call, but his members and his colleagues have been remarkably silent. I think Mr Lightfoot's call is the most cynical and depraved act that I have seen a member of Parliament commit, particularly given the stress that we have faced with our wheat farmers in this country. It is one of those situations where such actions can only damn the situation our wheatgrowers face in terms of the international market.

We have just seen the bipartisan exercise, led by the Federal Minister for Primary Industry, attempting to indicate to both Senate and House of Representative members in the United States that the impact of their decision in supporting, both through the export support scheme and the farm subsidy program, the wheat deals with the United States and with some of our traditional markets in the Middle East, and now with China, will totally undermine the international pricing mechanism, and the marketing structure, and lead to nothing but disaster for the whole of the wheat and grain producing areas of the world.

Mr Lightfoot's actions have severely undermined a serious campaign by the Federal Minister, the shadow Federal Minister and those other members who joined him, as well as other members of the industry who have lobbied in the United States. Much lobbying remains to be done. The President of the National Farmers Federation is to visit the United States, either just before or just after the elections in that country, in order to add further weight to the lobbying. Mr Lightfoot's comments can only add to the detrimental impact that we face in trying to market our wheat on the world scene.

By encouraging Mr Schultz to withdraw his obvious concern, which he expressed both to the United States Government and publicly, about the position taken by the United States, those comments have been seen to undermine not only Mr Schultz's attitude but the actions of Mr Kerin, who went on the bipartisan delegation. To say (as the member for Bragg has indicated), 'May I urge you to stand fast on the proposed wheat sales to China and Russia' can be seen only as an act of treachery, as the Prime Minister, the Foreign Minister and Mr Kerin have indicated. So, I call on all members to denounce and condemn, in the strongest possible terms, Mr Lightfoot, who obviously is a part of the extreme mad right wing lunatic fringe of the Liberal Party in Western Australia.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: No, he's right in the mainstream.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Well, one would hope that his comments do not reflect the feeling of Western Australian members or any other members of the Liberal Party, because to protect our markets we must present a unified front.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Murray-Mallee pipes up at an appropriate time, but I do not know whether or not he speaks for all that group. However, I know that the shadow Minister in this House has shared public platforms with me and expressed his concern about the position in the international wheat market, and I expect that he would be open in his condemnation. I call on all other members of this House in condemning Mr Lightfoot who, in my opinion, should be called Mr Foot-in-Mouth.

PETROL TRADING HOURS

Mr S.J. BAKER: Will the Minister of Labour confirm that the Government has now received the report of the *ad hoc* committee on petrol retailing which was appointed during last year's election campaign, chaired by Geoff Virgo, and originally scheduled to report in March? Will he also confirm that an announcement is imminent concerning the Government's decision to allow all service stations to trade 24 hours a day?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I cannot confirm that the Government has received a report.

Mr S.J. Baker: Why not?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will tell you why if you just hold on.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister should resist the temptation to respond to interjections in the House of Assembly.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I cannot confirm it because the committee was not to report to me: it was to report to the Attorney-General. I understand that Geoff Virgo will give that report to the Attorney-General some time today.

I look forward, probably on Monday in Cabinet, to seeing what the Hon. Geoff Virgo and his committee have come up with, and I am sure that at next Monday's Cabinet meeting or at a subsequent meeting the matter of hours for petrol stations will be reviewed and that an announcement will be made at an appropriate time.

HILLS FACE ZONE

Mr ROBERTSON: Is the Minister for Environment and Planning aware of a recent upsurge of off-road vehicle traffic in the hills face zone between Darlington and Marino, and will he outline any steps that he intends to take to curb the incidence of trespass on public land? It has been drawn to my attention by a number of residents abutting the hills face zone between Darlington and Marino that there has recently been a dramatic increase in the number of off-road vehicles illegally using the hills face. In recent weeks, several constituents have reported seeing many trail bikes, some registered and some not, being ridden by riders ranging in age from five to 50 years. In some cases, I am told, cars towing trailers with as many as five or six trail bikes park along the edge of the hills face zone. More recently, several constituents have reported that a new form of four-wheel all-terrain vehicle has made an appearance on the hills face, and I am told that such vehicles can now be hired in an unregistered state specifically for off-road use. I therefore ask the Minister what action he proposes to take to combat the illegal use of off-road vehicles on public land.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I understand that discussions on this matter have been held by the National Parks and Wildlife Service, the Police Department (especially officers from Darlington) and the Highways Deptment. The Highways Department has determined that it will place large barriers at specific points of access to the land that it owns in the area in order to try to prevent access in that way. The police will continue to monitor the situation, as will officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service who believe that, if an area or part thereof were to be reserved under the Act, it would not add to the burden in administering the Act in that area, but in fact make their job easier: they are expected to control these activities but, so long as no reservation is available, the legal force of the National Parks and Wildlife Act cannot be brought to bear on it. The possible reservation under the Act of the more sensitive parts of that area is being seriously considered. In the meantime, the measures that I have outlined will continue to apply.

NORTH ADELAIDE HOMES

Mr BECKER: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning say how the State Government intends to pay for its compulsory acquisition of two privately owned properties at North Adelaide (Kingsmead and Belmont) at a cost of $1.6 million and their restoration at a further cost of at least $1 million? Once this sum of over $2.5 million of taxpayers' money has been spent, what does the Government intend to do with the properties?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Resell them and recoup our investment.

AGE DISCRIMINATION

Mrs APPLEBY: Can the Minister of Employment and Further Education indicate what priority is being given to lessening the practice of age discrimination of the adult unemployed? There is an increase in the number of complaints relating to age discrimination in employment, and unemployment, being received by my office, and the recent figures that I have obtained from the Commissioner of Equal Opportunity's office indicate that 3½ per cent of complaints received by that office relate to age discrimination. As adult unemployed have the greater lead time in unemployment, a percentage of these people are individually pursuing new or upgraded skills, and as their frustration has been related to me, the reasons being given why they are not acceptable in employment would appear to be in line with unreasonable discrimination based on age.

A recent report showed that these people were being asked their age prior to being asked to outline their skills and ability. It also appears that a lack of importance was placed on new skills that these people had pursued in the interests of becoming employable. I therefore draw the Minister's attention to this practice and I ask that consideration be given to providing guidelines to ensure that such practices and discrimination do not further disadvantage adult unemployed people in our community.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I can certainly state to the House that the Government does believe in the priority of this issue. It is an important issue that needs addressing, and I can indicate that the priorities recognised have resulted in quite significant action being taken. I am pleased to note that in the recent Federal budget the Federal Government has indicated some greater priority to this area as well. I agree with the comments made by the member for Hayward that it is quite intolerable that there should be discrimination on the basis of age in respect of employment opportunities. My personal viewpoint is that that discrimination should not in fact be allowable. Indeed, I note that under the South Australian Industrial and Commercial Training Act there is capacity for statements with respect to discrimination on the basis of age to be overruled, because that Act provides that that should not apply as a discriminatory factor.

The facts are that adult unemployed people very often face longer term unemployment, and amongst that group there is often a greater rate of unemployment than in relation to other people in the community. That situation applies firstly to the category of people over 25 years of age, but quite particularly to those who are 40 years and over. People in that category share a disproportionate burden of the unemployment facing this country at the moment. Worse still, the situation with respect to mature age unemployed is more serious now in the 1980s than it was in the mid-1970s—proportionately, not just in terms of the total number of employed.

In that context, recognising the seriousness of the problem, in 1985-86 the South Australian Government introduced the adult unemployed support program as an initiative to start addressing the needs that existed. I might say that 25 projects have been funded under that program. As a result of that, a number of very interesting things have taken place. I noted with interest the figures quoted about the number of people that DOME (Don't Overlook Mature Expertise) has been able to assist to obtain employment as a result of its having received financial support from, among others, the State Government. The South Australian Government was the first in Australia to agree on a discrete program of support to operate in conjunction with community bodies, particularly those dealing with the mature unemployed. So, not only did we identify the priority but we put some action behind it.

In addition, both myself as the present Minister of Employment and Further Education and my predecessor, the Hon. Jack Wright, who worked in many of the areas that I now cover, have taken up this issue with the Federal Government on a number of occasions, putting the point of view that it, too, should recognise the priority of assisting adult unemployed people. I was pleased to note in the recent budget a large injection of funds into adult training areas. The adult training programs, in the Federal budget, comprising the national skills shortage, the labour adjustment training arrangements and the general training assistance program have increased by 47.5 per cent, or 39.5 per cent in real terms, from $18.9 million to $27.9 million. In that context it is worth noting that South Australia's share in the coming year will be $2.5 million, or some 650 places.

I have instructed the Director of the Office of Employment and Training to continue to recognise the priority in this area and also to investigate, in conjunction with employers and unions, what further work can be done to upgrade the State effort even further so that this very important issue of mature age unemployment can be addressed as equitably as possible.

CHILD RESTRAINTS

Mr INGERSON: Does the Minister of Transport intend to announce next week details of the State Government's scheme for rental of child restraints, a system to operate in conjunction with Red Cross from 1 September, at a cost of $40 per unit, half of which will be refundable? Further, will the public be able to place their names on the rental register prior to the Minister's announcement?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The announcement will be made next week. Is that right, June? It is in June's electorate and I have invited her, so she has a copy of the invitation.

Mrs Appleby: Next Thursday.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will be announcing the new child restraint scheme next Thursday. The price will not be as high as the honourable member has suggested. The Red Cross will participate in the scheme. Of course, all details of the scheme will be made available when I launch it next Thursday, and if the honourable member wants to follow up the matter in Parliament later I will give him all the details he so anxiously wants to give to the press today.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the next question, I remind the Minister of Transport that he should refer to members by the name of their electorate.

RECREATION AND SPORT CONSULTANT

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport tell the House whether the position of women's consultant to the Department of Recreation and Sport is soon to be filled and, further, will he undertake to review the upgrading of this position from its present level of CO5?

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: It is interesting that once again the member for Murray-Mallee has to interject when it comes to looking at the matter of equality of opportunities for women. The position of women's consultant to the Department of Recreation and Sport was created by the Bannon Government in its first term of office in response to clearly identified needs in the area of women's participation and involvement in recreation and sport. It has been put to me that the first incumbent of the position, Monica Redden, in fact undertook her duties in a most diligent and excellent way. It has been further put to me that the position and the role and responsibilities involved in it are of such significance that the status of the position should be upgraded from its current CO5 level. Will the Minister undertake to review the classification of that position and will he tell the House whether an appointment to replace Ms Redden is about to be announced?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for her question and her interest in this matter. She is well known for her interest in women's affairs, particularly in the recreation and sport area. The position is currently vacant. The previous appointee, Monica Redden, who was the women's adviser to the department has moved to another position in the Public Service. Currently it is classified as a CO5 position. I shall ask the department to undertake a review of the position and its responsibilities and role and I will subsequently consider what classification is appropriate and whether an upgrading is needed.

I think that, given the emphasis of Government policies on encouraging greater participation of women in sport and recreation in this State, it is important that both the position and the person who holds it have a status that is recognised within both the department and the community as being commensurate with the status that the Government gives to the role of women in sport and recreational pursuits in this State. I am more than happy to ask the department to undertake that review. I hope that, notwithstanding financial restraints, a reclassification for the position can be upgraded and both role and responsibility can be considered. The position will be filled in accordance with the Government's employment legislation as quickly as possible. I know that the department is anxious to fill the position. The women's advisory committee, which reports to me as Minister, has been upgraded from a committee advising the department to that of advising me direct. Given that emphasis, I think that it is appropriate that the position be upgraded in line with appropriate community status.

I thank the honourable member for her question. I know there is a good deal of anxiety within the community about this position and the filling of it. I can assure the honourable member, her constituents and others in the community who are concerned, that the matter will be dealt with expeditiously. I hope we can make some public announcement shortly in regard to all the questions raised.

SOUTH-EASTERN FREEWAY

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister of Transport now say whether he is prepared to accept my invitation, extended in writing some weeks ago, to attend a public meeting on a date of his choice, thus providing the opportunity for members of the public to have their say regarding the need for immediate action to be taken to improve the condition of the Mount Barker Road between Cross Road and the start of the South-Eastern Freeway and, if not, why not? I have extended to the Minister an invitation to attend a public meeting on a night of his choice in relation to current problems associated with the Mount Barker Road. It is intended that that meeting will deal not with future projects that may arise from studies being carried out, but rather with immediate work that needs to be carried out as a matter of extreme urgency prior to the commencement of any major work on alternative routes, etc.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member invited me to attend a public meeting I had not intended to attend, and I explained my reason to him. He has sub-

sequently spoken to me, and I said I would reconsider that decision, and I am in the process of reconsidering it. What the Government has done in relation to the Mount Barker Road is very much on the public record. It is the first Government that has been prepared to face up to doing something about that stretch of road, which has been a problem for commuters for many years.

It has not suddenly happened. The problems were there. The member for Davenport has expressed his concern about the actions of the Government of which he was a supporter over a number of years. The Government in which the member for Heysen was a Minister—and I think he was the member whose electorate included that stretch of road—did absolutely nothing. This Government has commissioned Maunsell & Partners to do a comprehensive study including environmental impact statements, and report to the Government early next year on the preferred alignment, so that a decision can be made next year to recommend to the Federal Government action that should be taken to bring up to national standard the road between Mount Barker and Adelaide.

It may or may not be on the current alignment; it may be on a new alignment. That recommendation will be made to me by the consultants who have been commissioned, working with the Highways Department. In the meantime, as the honourable member knows, because he brought to me a deputation which submitted a whole number of recommendations, the Highways Department and the Government are in the process of investigating what could be done in the short-term on that stretch of road.

Some decisions have been made—decisions that were discussed, I understand, when the honourable member was a Minister of the Tonkin Government, although nothing happened—such as the barriers that will be put in place. We will be putting down a non-slip road surface to make—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: It will be in the areas with a bad accident record. That will make the road safer for wet weather. We will be looking at the median strips to ensure there are no unnecessary openings.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The member for Bragg says 'What about policing?' It is a very difficult area to police, as he would know. Pulling over drivers on that stretch of road can create traffic problems. So, there are hazards and it is not an easy matter. We put up signs, I think last week, to inform commuters that that is a dangerous stretch of road. All the evidence available to us (and I think the honourable member would agree) is that the major problem is not the road but the way in which drivers treat it. It is absolutely certain that people drive on that stretch of road at a speed that has no regard for safety. The camber problems and the problems at the Devil's Elbow are part of the overall study being undertaken by Maunsell and Partners.

The honourable member tells me there will be a public meeting in his electorate, they want to talk about existing problems. All of the information which the honourable member has at his fingertips and which could be presented to the Government and to me as Minister, has been presented in a deputation that he brought to visit me, and a reply has been sent to the honourable member on matters he raised on that occasion. I saw no purpose in going to a meeting to be told exactly what the honourable member has already told me, but I told him I would consider his proposal and I am in the process of doing that. I do not think that it helps for the honourable member to believe that, by asking questions in this House and making it a public issue, he can put pressure on me to attend the meeting. It is a matter I am still considering, and when I have made my decision, I will advise him—privately, and not through the medium of this House.

NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH PROGRAM

Mr De LAINE: Is the Minister of Emergency Services able to inform the House whether, and if so when, the Neighbourhood Watch scheme will be further expanded into other areas of metropolitan Adelaide? Because of the increasing number of burglaries taking place, especially in areas such as Woodville North, Cheltenham, Pennington and Rosewater, there is an urgent need for every possible means to be implemented to assist our excellent Police Force to combat this very serious problem.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have some information here for the honourable member, because he raised the matter with me a little while ago. There is a quite ambitious scheme for the expansion of the program to various parts of the metropolitan area. Precising what I have, because of the time constraints on us, I indicate that on 5 May this year the first of 30 new Neighbourhood Watch areas was established at Salisbury North. Since that date, nine areas have been launched, the last being Brooklyn Park on 11 August this year. Henley Beach is to receive its program on 2 September next.

The Crime Prevention Section of the Police Department, which is responsible for implementing these programs, is confident of reaching its target of having 30 new Neighbourhood Watch areas in operation by May 1987. The selection of the first 30 programs was made on the basis of higher crime figures and on the demography of those areas. Implementation has been structured so that each of the metropolitan police subdivisions received two programs during the first 12 months of expansion. This was done to ensure that the additional workload was distributed evenly. Commercial Union Insurance has sole sponsorship rights in return for funding at the rate of $50 000 a year for three years. It is estimated that each new 600-home area will cost about $2 000 to establish and maintain.

During the second year of the development, the process of area selection will be changed. Rather than select areas themselves, the police will invite citizens groups interested in establishing Neighbourhood Watch in particular areas to make applications for implementation of programs. The police will endeavour to comply with these requests within the scope of available funds. I have with me the list referred to and, as it is purely statistical, I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

Proposed	File Number	Suburb	Subdivision	Inspector
1	001	Flinders Park	Henley Beach	Marshman
2	007	Norwood	Norwood	Maggs
3	002	Salisbury North	Para Hills	Attwood
4	003	Prospect	Holden Hill	Green
5	005	Plympton	Glenelg	Zuvich
6	006	Elizabeth Downs	Elizabeth	C/I Peacock

Proposed	File Number	Suburb	Subdivision	Inspector
7	004	Morphett Vale	Christies Beach	O'Malley
8	008	Goodwood	Unley	Biggins
9	009	Brooklyn Park	Plympton	Aberle
10	010	Henley Beach	Henley Beach	Marshman
11	011	Magill	Payneham	McRae
12	023	Milburn	Holden Hill	Green
13	043	Holden Hill	Tea Tree Gully	Woollacott
14	053	Marion	Darlington	Lord
15	062	Semaphore	Semaphore	Rieniets
16	029	Elizabeth North	Elizabeth	Peacock
17	028	Ingle Farm	Para Hills	Attwood
18	027	Mile End	Plympton	Aberle
19	013	St. Peters	Payneham	McRae
20	014	Blair Athol	Holden Hill	Green
21	016	Findon	Henley Beach	Marshman
22	017	Edwardstown	Unley	Biggins
23	018	Glenelg North	Glenelg	Zuvich
24	035	Hackham	Christies Beach	O'Malley
25	048	St. Agnes	Tea Tree Gully	Woollacott
26	031	Salisbury East	Para Hills	Attwood
27	026	Elizabeth East	Elizabeth	Peacock
28	020	Parkside	Unley	Biggins
29	038	Croydon Park	Regency Park	Faeth
30	025	Torrensville	Plympton	Aberle
31	032	Adelaide	Adelaide	Barrett
32	024	West Croydon	Regency Park	Faeth

SAMCOR

Mr GUNN: Is the Minister of Agriculture prepared to assure the House that he and the Government will support strongly the board of Samcor in implementing the recommendations of the review of that organisation which has recently taken place; in particular, will he free the Samcor board of the requirement to continue to implement Public Service Board requirements; and will he not give in to the representations of the Public Service Association?

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: One question at a time. I do not need the assistance of the Minister of Transport. We know his views on agriculture: he was a maize grower. I point out to the Minister of Agriculture that the recommendations contained in that review, if implemented, would give the board a sound basis on which to become financially viable. However, it cannot implement those recommendations unless it has the strong support of the Minister and the Government.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the shadow Minister for his question, and I understand his concern on behalf of the rural community.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Privatise?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: That is one alternative. It is important to note that discussions will be held with representatives of bodies, including the unions and the UF&S, I hope next week. Details are being finalised for a meeting to consider the report with the review committee. Those discussions will, of course, canvass all issues raised in the triennial report. I reinforce what I have said already, that the salvation of Samcor obviously rests with adopting some harsh and what might be unpalatable recommendations about its future management. This harshness and severity will apply right across the board and affect all levels of Samcor's operations.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Murray-Mallee interrupts again. I will not bother to invite him to the disucssions, because we would end up with a disaster on our hands if he were involved in negotiations. This is a delicate situation involving the future of people's livelihood and the future of this operation. If the member for Murray-Mallee wants to interfere and add his two-penny worth, I suggest he takes a long trip. I appreciate the sympathy shown by the shadow Minister, who is obviously far more concerned about this matter than is his colleague on the back bench. I have already indicated to the board my views in relation to the report. I have not yet indicated my position publicly because I have not taken final recommendations to Cabinet.

I want to hear the reactions of the parties concerned before I make a final recommendation to Cabinet. I think that this is appropriate, given the severity and nature of the report, but I assure the honourable member that I considered the very severe nature of the report and the overriding and important ramifications contained in it. Some severe medicine must be handed out in terms of Samcor's future operations and we have to adopt these recommendations in a general sense, but before we make positive and specific recommendations I would like to canvass all those views with the parties concerned.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

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

By Command—

Background Paper on the Law Relating to Prostitution, prepared by the Attorney-General's Department.

CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

NORTH HAVEN (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ROADS (OPENING AND CLOSING) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STATE SUPPLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the State Supply Act 1986. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The State Supply Act, 1985, and Regulations came into effect on the 30th September, 1985. The main aim of this legislation is to achieve the best value from funds available to public authorities for the purchase of goods and to ensure that local industry has the maximum opportunity to compete for the supply of goods to the Government.

Section 5 of the Act excludes the following bodies from the operation of the Act:

the Pipelines Authority of South Australia;
the State Bank of South Australia;
the State Government Insurance Commission;
or
a local government body.

This action was taken on the basis that it was desirable for these bodies to be as free as possible from Government control.

The Electricity Trust of South Australia, the South Australian Housing Trust and the State Transport Authority are declared by regulation to be prescribed public authorities. These bodies are not subject to the direct control of the State Supply Board, but the State Supply Board may make recommendations to the Minister responsible for a prescribed public authority on any matter relating to the authority.

This action was taken on the basis that each of these bodies have a well established efficient supply operation, they operate as commercial enterprises and generate a substantial proportion of their revenue from non-government sources.

Now it is proposed to exclude the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories (AMDEL) and the South Australian Tertiary Institutions from the provisions of the State Supply Act 1985, and to correct an anomaly in respect to the State Supply Board's function to dispose of goods.

Exclusion of bodies from the Act:

Section 21 of the Australian Mineral Development Act 1959, excludes AMDEL from the provisions of the repealed Public Supply and Tender Act 1914, but AMDEL was not included in the list of bodies excluded from the State Supply Act 1985. To exclude AMDEL it is necessary for section 5 of the State Supply Act 1985, to be amended.

The reasons for excluding Tertiary Institutions from the operation of the State Supply Act 1985, are that special status and independence of institutions of higher learning is well established and recognised in the community; that a large proportion of their funds is provided by the Commonwealth Government; and that the universities do not relate closely to the State Government in their major area of expenditure and on matters of operating policy.

Involvement of the State Government in matters of supply in this context is inappropriate.

The proposed amendment will exclude the following Tertiary Institutions from the provisions of the Act:

University of Adelaide
Flinders University
Roseworthy Agricultural College
South Australian Institute of Technology
South Australian College of Advanced Education.

Functions of Board:

Section 16 of the Act provides that 'the Board may, if it thinks fit—*(a)* with the approval of the Minister, undertake or provide for the acquisition of goods for a body other than a public aurhority or a prescribed public authority'.

The Act makes no provision for the Board to dispose of goods for a body other than a public authority or a prescribed public authority, e.g. a local government body, philanthropic organisation, Commonwealth Department or a Department of another State Government.

It is proposed that the Act be amended to permit the Board, with the approval of the Minister, to dispose of goods for a body other than a public authority or prescribed public authority.

Since the State Supply Board was established it has developed and issued general instructions to provide a flexible, efficient and cost effective framework for supply operations in Government Departments, Hospitals and Health Centres and Statutory Authorities. In addition the supply function of the Education Department has been reviewed and operational arrangements established for the enhancement of that function.

The State Supply Board has been appointed to monitor the South Australian public sector's compliance with the National Preference Agreement.

The State Supply Board is operating efficiently and making a significant contribution to the cost effectiveness of the supply function in the South Australian public sector. The minor changes proposed in this Bill will clarify the jurisdiction and functions of the Board.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 amends section 5 of the principal Act by providing that the following bodies are excluded from the operation of the Act:

the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories;
the University of Adelaide;
the Flinders University;
the Roseworthy Agricultural College;
the South Australian Institute of Technology;
the South Australian College of Advanced Education.

Clause 3 amends section 16 of the Act to provide that the Board may, with the approval of the Minister, dispose of goods for a body other than a public authority or prescribed public authority.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Education Act 1972. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It contains a mixture of amendments most of which have arisen from departmental officers' consideration of legisla-

tive changes needed to enable more effective administration of the Education Act. The remaining amendments are intended to remedy deficiencies in the Act which were identified during reviews of departmental operations by groups such as the Committee of Inquiry on Rights of Persons with Handicaps (the Bright Report). I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 redefines kindergartens previously administered by the former Kindergarten Union of South Australia. It acknowledges their new legal status under the Children's Services Act.

Clause 4 provides for delegations from the Minister to apply to officers for the time being holding particular positions. Currently, the wording of this section requires that delegations be made to officers by name. This hinders efficiency.

Clause 5 is consequential on language arising from that used in the new Government Management and Employment Act.

Clause 6 provides for the payment of allowances to Ministerial Advisory Committees to be effected upon determination by the Minister. Currently section 10 requires that the actual dollar amounts be prescribed with the result that on each occasion that allowances are varied by Government for other Boards and Committees in the public sector, payment to Ministerial Advisory Committees is delayed pending an amendment to the Education Regulations.

Clause 7 is consequential upon terms used in the new Government Management and Employment Act.

Clause 8 is intended to achieve similar results to clause 4 except that in this case the amendment refers to the Director- General's power to delegate.

Clause 9 amends section 17 of the principal Act so that future employment options currently available to officers suffering from invalidity or incapacity of a permanent nature are extended to officers with temporary disabilities. It also provides for transfer to a position of different status rather than a position of reduced status.

Clause 10 is consequential on language arising from that used in the Government Management and Employment Act.

Clause 11 arises from the repeal of subsection (la) of section 25 in 1984. The definition of the school year will appear, wherever necessary, in relevant Education Regulations. The definition will accommodate variations in starting and finishing times arising from the effects of the four term school year which commences in 1987.

Clause 12 amends section 31 so that should the occasion so require, a member of the Teachers Classification Board may be removed from office for mental or physical incapacity if that incapacity results in the person being unable to carry out his/her duties. The qualification to removal from office was proposed by the Bright Report.

Clause 13 is a similar amendment to that sought in clause 12 except that it relates to members of the Teachers Salaries Board.

Clause 14 is consequential on language arising from the implementation of the Government Management and Employment Act.

Clause 15 is a similar amendment to that sought in clauses 12 and 13 except that it relates to members of the Teachers Appeal Board.

Clause 16 provides the right for the relatively new Association of Teachers in Independent Schools to nominate a member for appointment to the Teachers Registration Board. It also contains a consequential amendment arising from the abolition of the Kindergarten Union of South Australia.

Clause 17 is a similar amendment to that sought in clauses 12, 13 and 15 except that it relates to members of the Teachers Registration Board.

Clause 18 arises as a result of the abolition of the Kindergarten Union of South Australia. In the context of section 60(2) no substitute is required.

Clause 19 deletes reference to the former Public Service Act and provides for the Registrar to be a person employed in the public service.

Clause 20 is a similar amendment to that sought in clauses 12, 13, 15 and 17 except that it refers to members of the Non-Government Schools Registration Board.

Clause 21 is a similar amendment to that sought in clause 19 except that it relates to the Registrar, Non-Government Schools Registration Board.

Clause 22 provides for a severer penalty in the event that a governing authority operates an unregistered school.

Clause 23 provides that authorized panels may enter and inspect any premises which the Non-Government Schools Registration Board reasonably suspects are being used as a Non- Government school. This provision is aimed at tightening scrutiny of persons and organizations who seek to circumvent their legal obligations.

Clause 24 deletes the reference to school districts so that the amendments incorporated in clause 25 can operate more effectively.

Clause 25 provides children with the right to enrol at any school with the proviso that the Director-General of Education may determine conditions under which enrolment applications may not be accepted by schools, e.g. to alleviate accommodation difficulties compounded by enrolment applications originating from students living outside the school's catchment area. It also clarifies the student's inalienable right to attend his/her nearest school, according to his/her education level. An increased penalty for non-compliance with the compulsory attendance provisions is also provided.

Clause 26 introduces statutory consultative and appeal provisions for a parent whose child is the subject of a direction that requires the child to be enrolled at a particular school because of a disability or learning difficulty. It also provides for a child of compulsory school age, with an extreme behaviour problem, to be enrolled in a learning programme outside the traditional classroom setting. Here again statutory consultative and appeal rights for parents are provided.

Clause 27 amends the penalty for breaches of the compulsory attendance provision so that it restores its deterrent effect.

Clause 28 amends the penalty for breaches of the Act pertaining to the employment of children of compulsory school age.

Clause 29 assists with the identification of a child and his/her parents where suspected breaches of the compulsory attendance provisions are involved. The penalty amount is also increased.

Clause 30 is consequential on language arising from the implementation of the Government Management and Employment Act.

Clause 31 amends the Act to widen the money lending sources available to school councils. Apart from banks, credit unions, etc., it is known that parents and other persons within school communities are prepared to offer loans

at token interest rates. This represents a cheap and virtually untapped source of funds which, through savings in interest payments, could allow councils to increase their borrowing level or, alternatively, allow them to divert the funds saved into other school improvements. Ministerial and Treasury controls will still apply.

Clause 32 provides for School Loans Advisory Committees to be established in each of the five areas established under the restructured Education Department.

Clause 33 provides for a more flexible approach to the utilisation of assets. In terms of existing legislation, the Crown Solicitor has advised that the Minister's property may not be used for purposes which are not part of the educational process. It also provides for the Minister to contribute towards the cost of facilities which are not owned by the Crown in return for access to those facilities on a joint use basis.

Clauses 34, 35 and 36 provide for increased penalties for breaches of various sections of the Act so that their deterrent effect is restored.

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

RACING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Recreation and Sport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Racing Act 1976. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill proposes amendments to the Racing Act, 1976, in relation to totalizator sports betting.

In 1985, the Racing Act was amended to permit the Totalizator Agency Board (T.A.B.) to conduct totalizator betting on football matches. It was envisaged at the time of introduction of this amendment in 1985, that the opportunity to wager on the outcome of football matches would create a new source of betting turnover and would not operate in competition with totalizator betting on the races. The latest figures available indicate this assumption has been proven to be correct. Since the introduction of Footypunt there has been an increase in TAB turnover associated with the racing industry exceeding 9%. Footypunt betting has shown a marked increase during the first year of its operations, demonstrating community acceptance of this form of betting.

The operation of the Casino however, has affected the TAB's budgeted turnover. While it is too soon at this stage to quantify this, the TAB is experiencing some difficulties in achieving its targeted growth. Measures such as totalizator betting on major sporting events could serve to counter marketing edges gained by alternative forms of gambling.

Additionally, the public interest generated by the inaugural Adelaide Grand Prix, the success of the America's Cup Challenge and the large following attracted by cricket played at the national and international levels, are indicators that the opportunity to bet legally on the outcomes of such events would be well received by the community.

This bill is designed to enable the TAB to conduct betting on such major sporting events. However, the approval of the Minister will be required in each case to enable betting on a particular sporting event or combination of events. I envisage that betting on the Adelaide Grand Prix, to be held during October, will be the first opportunity for the community to bet legally on a sporting event, other than a race or a fotball match with the TAB.

It has been estimated that betting on the 1986 Grand Prix will generate between $160 000 and $240 000 turnover. A total deduction of 20% would apply to each bet type. Of this 20%, 1% would be allocated to the TAB capital fund, as is the case with footypunt. After the administrative and operating expenses of the TAB are met (this is expected to be in the order of 10% in the first year, due to first-up ticketing costs and promotional expenses), the residual profit will be allocated at the Minister's discretion, between the body by which the event or events were conducted or to some other related sporting body, and the Recreation and Sport Fund. The profit from the Grand Prix betting is estimated to be in the order of $16 000 to $30 000.

Officers of the TAB in consultation with employees of the Department of Recreation and Sport, have formed the view that the community would be most receptive to the following forms of betting on the Grand Prix:

(a) Win and Place;

(b) Quinella;

and

(c) Trifecta.

If the demand for this facility becomes evident, the Racing Act will enable it to be extended to facilitate betting on Grand Prix events and other sporting events held outside of Australia.

In summary, I consider that this Bill, by permitting the community to bet legally with the TAB on the outcomes of major sporting events will cater for and generate extended community interest in major sporting events.

I commend this Bill to Honourable members. The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 amends the long title of the principal Act, to extend the scope of the Act to include betting on other sporting events (other than a race or a football match).

Clause 3 provides for the repeal of section 3 which is a machinery provision detailing the arrangement of the Act.

Clause 4 broadens the scope of several definitions of terms used in the principal Act relating to totalizator betting on races and football matches, so as to apply to totalizator betting on other sporting events.

Clause 5 amends the heading to Part III of the principal Act.

Clause 6 amends section 51 of the principal Act to provide that it will be a function of the Board to conduct, with the approval of the Minister, totalizator betting on major sporting events (other than a race or football match). Further, clause 6 extends the powers of the Board in two respects. Firstly, to enter into contracts or arrangements with other bodies with respect to the conduct of totalizator betting and the exchange of information in relation to the events on which such betting is conducted, to encompass other events apart from races or football matches. And secondly, to accept totalizator bets made with it by members of the public and to pay dividends on those bets, to encompass other events apart from races or football matches.

Clause 7 makes consequential amendments to section 62 of the principal Act, which provides for the payment or accreditation by the Board of dividends on totalizator bets as soon as practicable after the completion of the race or match in relation to which the bet was made. The scope of

section 62 is widened to apply to events other than races or football matches.

Clause 8 provides for the repeal of sections 84i and 84j, which prohibit the conduct of totalizator betting on football results, except by the Board, and make it lawful, notwithstanding any other law, for the Board or its servants or agents to accept totalizator bets on football results from persons of not less than 18 years. These sections have been widened to encompass all forms of totalizator betting authorized by the Act, and have been inserted as new Division V of Part III of the Act, headed 'Miscellaneous'.

Clause 8 also inserts new Division IV into Part III of the Act. Proposed new section 84i empowers the Board, with the approval of the Minister, to conduct totalizator betting on any major sporting event or combination of events, other than a race or football match, such betting to be governed by rules approved by the Minister. Proposed new section 84j provides for the application of the totalizator pool in relation to an event or combination of events in respect of which the Board conducts totalizator betting under Division IV of Part III. Twenty per cent of the totalizator pool is to be set aside, to be applied as soon as practicable after the end of every 6 months period, in payment of the capital, administrative and operating expenses of the Board, and the balance (if any) to be split between the body conducting the event or events, or some other related body and the Recreation and Sport Fund, as the Minister may determine. The remaining eighty per cent of the totalizator pool shall be applied in the payment of dividends in accordance with rules approved by the Minister.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

OIL REFINERY (HUNDRED OF NOARLUNGA) INDENTURE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the report of the select committee be noted.

The select committee has reviewed the arrangements proposed under these amendments and has endorsed the approach. The Acts relate to the collection of wharfage at Port Stanvac, in regard to the operation of the State's only oil refinery and lubrication oil refinery. Under the wharfage arrangements developed in 1958, inward wharfage is payable on refinery feedstock calculated on the basis of the volume of product sold within the State from the refinery. Thus, finished products from the refinery which are sold interstate or overseas do not pay wharfage: this acts as an incentive for the operators to process more feedstock through the refinery for export to other regions. It also recognises that the State was previously receiving wharfage on petroleum products imported into Port Adelaide marine installations, and the Stanvac wharfage is in lieu of this revenue foregone.

However, whereas the State owns and is responsible for marine facilities at Port Adelaide and other petroleum terminals at Port Pirie and Port Lincoln, the Port Stanvac facilities are owned and operated by the refinery operators, Mobil and Esso. The State incurs no costs (capital, operating or maintenance) in the operation of Port Stanvac. All wharfage received is net revenue to the State. At other ports such as Port Pirie, Port Lincoln and Port Bonython, the State does incur operating costs and wharfage received is reduced by these amounts. In the 12 months ending January 1986, the State received approximately $680 000 in wharfage from Mobil and $908 000 from Esso at Port Stanvac, a total of $1.59 million.

Under the revised arrangements, it is estimated that total revenue will be $1.75 million for the year ending January 1987, growing to $2.75 million by the year ending January 1991 (in dollars of the day). These figures are calculated on the assumption of a 7 per cent per annum average CPI. Thus, the revenue to the State will increase significantly over the period. Nevertheless, the main achievement of the new arrangements is to strengthen the viability of the Adelaide refinery. The refinery is an important part of the South Australian energy sector, and produces about 75 per cent of the State's petroleum requirements. With an employment of over 300 people, and an annual expenditure on local purchases of over $40 million, it is important that the refinery continue to be a viable operation.

The new arrangements will assist the refinery to remain competitive, and will provide an incentive to the refinery operators to process more feedstock through the Port Stanvac refinery. At the same time, it will give the State an increase in wharfage receipts in line with changes in standard wharfage rates. In commending the motion to the House, I make it clear that I was not a member of the select committee. It is because of a family bereavement that my colleague the Minister of Mines and Energy is not here today to move the motion and seek the passage of the two Bills. I will not seek to make general remarks in relation to the two Bills; I feel they are sufficiently close so that what I am saying in support of this motion is sufficient to cover both measures. Suffice to say that I chaired the select committee for the 1976 Bill and the changes that occurred at that time.

Until the recent change in boundaries, the refinery was an important industrial establishment in my own local electorate. I also accept what has been given in evidence before the select committee, that some of the perceptions of the industry and the way that the refinery will operate, which were valid in 1958, are no longer valid: first, the production of condensate and naphtha from Port Stanvac was not necessarily envisaged in 1958, if one looks at the verbiage of the legislation of that time; and, secondly, in 1958 there was no onshore (if I can use that term) production of crude oil in South Australia. What was envisaged at the time was the processing of products which came from beyond our shores. That situation has changed considerably over the years, particularly with Bass Strait crude but also in relation to the light crudes discovered at Tirrawarra and other parts of the Cooper Basin. So it is necessary that the legislation is brought into line with those modern realities. Without any sense of embarrassment because I was not directly involved, I commend the work of the select committee to the House.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I support the report of the select committee and in due course will formally support the two Bills. The select committee was a fairly felicitous experience, as I guess most select committees tend to be. There was no area of controversy. Standing Orders required that the Bill be sent to a select committee, which had the advantage of hearing from a series of witnesses who had some interest in the matter. The proprietors from the refinery appeared before the committee, and an officer from the Department of Mines and Energy and an officer from the Department of Marine and Harbors also gave evidence. All in all, the Opposition is quite happy with the arrangements that have been made for the payment of wharfage at the refinery.

I was slightly perturbed—perhaps that is too strong a word, and perhaps I should say surprised—at part of the evidence which I thought tried to compare apples with

oranges: the arrangements entered into for Port Stanvac compared to the arrangements entered into by the Government of which I was a member in relation to Port Bonython. It was my privilege to negotiate for the then Liberal Government the Port Bonython indenture which allowed the flow of oil from the Cooper Basin to Stony Point and thence over the Port Bonython wharf and onto the tankers. That has meant a great deal in terms of revenue to the State. So I was surprised that there was an attempt (I thought) to compare the arrangements at Port Stanvac with the arrangements for Port Bonython to show that the Port Stanvac arrangements were indeed quite outstanding. In fact, as I have indicated, I thought that exercise amounted to comparing apples with oranges.

To get the record straight in relation to the arrangements at Port Bonython, Keith Ronald Freeman, the Director of Administration and Finance for the Department of Marine and Harbors, appeared before the committee, and he proved to be an excellent witness. I am not pointing the finger at any officer or at anyone else who gave the evidence which led to my inquiry, but I want to get the record straight, because there was a deliberate attempt on a talk-back show to misrepresent the details of the Port Bonython indenture and to give the impression somehow or other that the State got a bad deal in relation to what was happening up there. A posh fellow with an Oxford accent, probably a member of the left wing of a political organisation, was on an ABC talk-back radio show. He was obviously a stooge. These shows tend to attract some of these ultraculture voices. The only time I received an abusive telephone call was when I was attacking a communist fringe group and some fellow with an Oxford accent ticked me off one Saturday morning. He was obviously a member of a communist left wing group. He told me that he was not paying for the telephone call and I told him that I did not have to listen to him and I hung up. However, on Phillip Satchel's talk-back show on the ABC, this cultured voice completely misrepresented the terms of the indenture arrangements for the Port Stanvac wharf. So I suppose I am a bit ultrasensitive on that point.

Mr Freeman certainly clarified the position in relation to the arrangements at Port Bonython. As to the attitude of the Department of Marine and Harbors in relation to the various arrangements it has made around the State for wharfage, I thought that Keith Freeman, who was examined by the committee on Tuesday 7 May, put the position rather well indeed. I refer to the transcript, as follows:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: As a matter of policy the department is not keen on private wharves?—(Mr Freeman) No, that is right.

Indeed, it is a private wharf at Port Stanvac; it is owned by the companies. I thought the point was being made that there was some advantage to the State in this arrangement because it did not have to pay upkeep on the wharf. It is certainly not Government policy to have private wharves. The transcript continues with a question I asked, as follows:

I have just read the latest information that has come to the committee with some interest, and without saying too much about that there is a fair bit of stuff about what it costs the State to maintain the wharf at Port Bonython—

I may have been exaggerating somewhat there—there was not a lot, but there was some material—

for instance, I well recall discussions with the department when an indenture was being written, at which time the department fought tooth and nail to own that facility and to control it, and as a matter of departmental policy that is the way they want it.

This Stanvac thing was quoted at the time as not being the most desirable arrangement, whereby it was a privately owned wharf. I just wanted to check that out?—(Mr Freeman) Certainly, the policy of the department has aimed at there not being private wharves, but there are a number of examples of where there are—such as Whyalla, which is a prime example, and the wharves at Ardrossan and at Ballast Head on Kangaroo Island. But there are wharves that are under licence from the department, and the department still collects some wharfage revenue from the operation of those private facilities.

In relation particularly to the Port Bonython wharf, the concern of the department there about having private wharf facilities or Government owned wharf facilities was really that in that area there is a limited opportunity to have port facilities, because of the depth of the water, etc. At that time the department was particularly concerned that if the facility was a privately owned one it could be detrimental to the State's interests if somewhere down the track there were other people who wanted to ship out of that area but could not do so because of its being a private facility. So, the idea there was to have the ability for other people to use that facility if the demand arose.

I might interpose there that the proponents of the Stony Point development fought that pretty hard and they wanted to have that exclusively there for their own use. However, we stuck out and insisted on the possibility of joint use because, of course, at that stage we had envisaged the Roxby Downs development and we thought that in due course there might need to be exported over that wharf some of the production from Roxby Downs. So that was the reason for our insistence that it be a facility which had the possibility of use by a third party. Then the Chairman, who is the Minister (and who was on that select committee), interposed:

I think that was put to us at the select committee at the time as being one of the reasons.

Then the evidence continues, beginning with a question I asked:

That is part of the deal . . . I am not critical for a moment of what happens there [at Port Stanvac]. I just wanted to get on the record my view in seeking to explain the arrangements there that the argument is a bit specious by talking about the . . . savings to the department by the department not owning and running it [the wharf]. The whole idea of Port Bonython was to accommodate what was departmental policy, and there was no disagreement with that?—(Mr Freeman) What has happened in practice with Port Bonython—the arrangement is an excellent one:

that is right from the horse's mouth—

Certainly . . . now it has been working, it has worked out excellently from our point of view and I think from the producer's point of view.

I then said:

I was of that view, of course, and I am glad that you put it on the record. I just read this argument to justify what happened to Port Stanvac. It has done it at the expense of Port Bonython. I think it is nonsense. Both deals are all right in their own way?

The response from Mr Freeman was:

You have to look at the circumstances at the time and what you are trying to achieve. I would agree with you. I think both of them are working extremely well, certainly from DMH's point of view. We have no problem with either of them, even though they are quite different.

I wanted to put that on the record just as much for the benefit of the unknown man with the Oxford accent who I heard on the Satchel radio program misrepresenting the position entirely. He had the indenture for Stony Point completely muddled up. In fact, I think it was deliberate misrepresentation in his case—certainly not in this case. I do not want anyone in this House to have any misunderstanding at all that the deal which we hammered out for the port arrangements for Port Bonython were anything but entirely satisfactory for the State. Having said that, I think the arrangements for Port Stanvac are also entirely satisfactory for the State. As I said, the select committee met on a number of occasions; we had expert witnesses in people who knew what they were talking about, from interested parties, including the Mines and Energy and Marine and Harbors Departments, and the proprietors of the refinery themselves. We came to the unanimous conclusion that both Bills to ratify the new arrangements at Port Stanvac should be passed unamended.

Motion carried.
Bill read a third time and passed.

MOBIL LUBRICATING OIL REFINERY (INDENTURE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:
That the report of the select committee be noted.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Both this Bill and the previous Bill dealt with went together, as far as I am concerned, so what I have just said about the other measure applies equally to this one.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I can only echo the Deputy Leader's statement, from my own point of view.
Motion carried.
Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:
That the House do now adjourn.

Mr De LAINE (Price): First, I wish to speak about a young person who means a lot to all members of this place. This important person is Tatia Schmerl, a young lady who, as members are aware, is the apprentice chef here in Parliament House. Tatia has consistently topped classes throughout her years of apprenticeship in this exacting occupation, and last year in the third year of her apprenticeship she passed with very high honours: in fact, she topped the State.

Tatia began her interest in cooking while studying year 11 at high school and, having had her work experience here in the House kitchen, she decided to enter this profession. Tatia commenced here three years ago and rapidly showed signs of outstanding ability in the art of cooking. In addition to Tatia's college achievements (and she has always gained credits and distinctions in this area), she has won virtually every State-wide cooking and culinary competition she has entered—an extremely impressive record.

This year Tatia has completed an elective course in Chinese II Cooking. Last Tuesday week she graduated, together with 10 other students, in this very complex and demanding course, as usual with top honours. Tatia is due to complete her apprenticeship in August next year and would like to do the chef's certificate elective in pastry next year, if the House catering budget will allow (attention the Joint House Committee!).

I was very honoured to attend the graduation ceremony last Tuesday evening which was in the form of a Chinese banquet. I attended this important function on behalf of and representing the parliamentary Labor Caucus. This banquet was held at the Regency College Food Catering School, which is, of course, located in the electorate of Price.

As I said in my Address in Reply speech, the Food and Catering Section at Regency College is world class—a world class teaching establishment in a world class electorate. I had the pleasure on that evening of dining with Tatia's family and successfully negotiated a 10-course Chinese meal. Tatia's mother, Wendy, will be well known to members, because she has been employed on the catering staff of this House for the past 13 years.

This was my first experience of Chinese food, and I doubt whether I will ever acquire a real liking for it. I must admit to being a connoisseur of good plain Australian food. However, the food on that occasion was beautifully prepared and presented and was a credit to Tatia and her 10 fellow graduates. The complete banquet was organised and conducted by students of the college and I was tremendously impressed by the efforts of all of them. Not only did chefs graduate on that occasion: waiters and waitresses also graduated. All those students were a credit to themselves and to the college in the way that they presented themselves and the way in which they served the food. Their appearance, skills and manners were top class. It was an enjoyable evening and all the graduates are to be heartily congratulated, with special congratulations going to Tatia Schmerl, on a fine performance.

The second item to which I wish to refer is a matter of grave concern to my district. Although obviously not confined to Price, it is reaching plague proportions in that area. I refer to burglaries, especially in my district. The days when burglaries happened at night while people were away from home have given way to these days when burglaries happen at any time of the day or night—whether or not the residents are home. This dangerous situation is causing me grave concern. Recently, I received the following letter on this dangerous pattern of crime from one of my constituents, who referred to the plight of her mother in the following terms:

> This letter is being written to express grave concern about the safety and well-being of the residents in the Woodville area. This letter is being written after much worry, deliberation and discussion with other people who reside in the Woodville North area. My mother has been residing in the Woodville North area for 30 years now and up until one year ago did not have any worry about being burgled. She is a pensioner and is widowed, as are many other residents of that street. As you are aware it is an older established area and only to be expected that the majority of residents would be over 50 years of age. The fact that the majority of these people live on their own is a very worrying factor. Approximately one year ago she was burgled for the first time, whilst she was out visiting. As a result of this burglary we installed a burglar alarm and ensured that windows such as the bathroom and laundry were secure and even went so far as to nailing them on the outside so that it was nearly impossible to open. I say nearly impossible because on 31 July with the aid of a screwdriver and hammer and heaven knows what else the wood surrounding the glass was removed and the lock tampered with so that the window could be opened—

this elderly lady had had a burglar alarm fitted to the house and it was capable of being zoned from one zone to another—the resident was watching television in one room while the burglar alarm had been armed in the rest of the house—

> the burglar alarm found and switched off, the back door opened and whilst my mother was watching television in a room with the door closed she was systematically burgled and lost a great number of her possessions. It is quite needless for me to say that upon hearing a noise and trying to open the door and finding it was being held on the other side before managing to yank it open after screaming, that she was petrified upon seeing a person with a flashlight running past her and going out of the house. Naturally being afraid and on her own she did not give chase.

Some people live on their own because they have lived in the area for many years and they are reluctant to leave the house. Indeed, many of them made the bricks for their home and built it brick by brick, so their home has a great sentimental value. The letter from my constituent continues:

> Surely it does not need a major accident or death before the law can step in and take some action to try and make it safer for residents to live in their own home. These people should be entitled to some protection. Steps should be taken to try and make it safer for the residents of this area to live in their own home.

I thoroughly agree with that. As well as the case referred to in the letter, I have had several other cases reported to me, but I have not the time available to go into details today.

However, I have several suspicions. Possibly I am a suspicious type of person, but it seems to me that people, whether living in new or old homes, may have their homes broken into soon after they buy a new video or stereo, and I am suspicious about that. Recently, two families living in separate areas went on an overseas trip together and both their homes were burgled at the same time. This situation needs looking into, especially concerning the people or organisations who may know when householders are going away. In this regard I refer especially to travel agents, insurance companies, finance companies, and the like. The fact that these crimes have developed to the extent that they have is serious.

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

Mr TYLER (Fisher): Earlier today I asked the Speaker whether South Australia's young people could have their own Parliament.

Mr Robertson: A good question.

Mr TYLER: I thank the honourable member. I was especially pleased with the Speaker's reply. I completely understand his concern about the lack of adequate parliamentary staff resources, but I was delighted to hear him undertake in this House that he would take up with the Minister of Education and the Minister of Youth Affairs the concept of a Youth Parliament. I believe that an annual Youth Parliament would allow young people to contribute their ideas on important issues facing our State. A Youth Parliament would also encourage young people to approach issues in a responsible way. It would be a positive way of channelling young energies and ideas, for the good of the community. I believe that it would be appropriate if South Australia's Parliament House could be used as the venue. The Youth Parliament concept would then be a high status forum for issues of special concern to young people. It would also foster a commitment by young people to citizenship and democracy.

When I was visiting Canada recently, the existence of the Youth Parliament of British Columbia was drawn to my attention. British Columbia is a Province of Canada and each December 85 young people aged between 16 and 21 years attend a session at the Parliament buildings in Victoria.

Six other provinces in Canada now also hold Youth Parliaments on an annual basis. At the annual December session in British Columbia, young parliamentarians debate issues of public interest and importance and plan the upcoming year's program of activities. At each session a premier is elected to oversee the next session's activities. He or she is responsible for appointing a cabinet which in turn presents Government legislation. This legislation enables the Youth Parliament to implement social service activities which further the aims of this concept. I mentioned earlier today that the Youth Parliament bears the motto 'Youth Serving Youth' and aims to promote the mental, physical, spiritual and social, well-being of the young in each province so it is not just a 'talk shop' or 'whinge session'.

Members of this Youth Parliament and the organisations they represent participate throughout the year in various activities involving young people that are educational, recreational and charitable. As I mentioned earlier today in my question, these include visiting children's hospitals and presenting educational programs in schools about British Columbia's election procedures and political structure, and there is also a pre-teen program of recreational courses at a neighbourhood house. The Youth Parliament concept would be very beneficial for South Australia. The experience gained by the participants would be extremely valuable because it would, I believe, nurture the talents of our young people. I would therefore welcome the views of young people, parents, youth leaders and teachers concerning this suggestion.

At this point I would like to turn to some matters that are of concern in my electorate. First of all, on a positive and delightful note, it was a great pleasure for my wife Judy and myself to attend two school productions last week. The first was on Thursday night at the Matthew Flinders Theatre in Flinders University where we witnessed the Flagstaff Hill Primary School Production of *Tin Pan Alley*. On Saturday night we attended the Aberfoyle Park High School production of *Riff Raff*. Both productions were musicals, and it was obvious that a tremendous amount of work was put into them, as they were of the highest standard possible. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate both schools publicly on their splendid achievements. The two schools concerned, the Education Department and the communities of Flagstaff Hill and Aberfoyle Park have reason to be very proud of the casts and crews involved. We certainly look forward to their next contributions.

The schools in my electorate are producing some outstanding enterprising young people. In recent weeks I have been approached by two groups: the first comprised some students from the Braeview Primary School concerning recreation needs in the O'Halloran Hill/Happy Valley area. Their concern is that currently they ride their BMX bikes on the road or on the footpath which causes a traffic hazard to pedestrians, other road users and it also causes a major traffic hazard to themselves. Of course, it is illegal to ride on the footpath. They were looking for some assistance in setting up a BMX bike track in that area so that the young people, of whom there are plenty, could participate in this popular sport in an area and environment which is safe.

A group of students from the Aberfoyle Park High School who participate in the very popular sport of skateboard riding also came to see me, and, like the group from O'Halloran Hill/Happy Valley, this group would like a skateboard facility in the Aberfoyle Park/Flagstaff Hill area which would suit the needs of young people. Currently, I am working through the various channels with these groups of young people and I hope that eventually we might be able to facilitate their very reasonable and practical requests.

The issue of recreation facilities for young people in my electorate is enormous. It is a problem that exercises the minds of all of us involved in government, whether Federal, State or local. In 1984, the councils in the area initiated a youth needs study, which identified transport, information, recreation and employment as the target areas for action. The Happy Valley council has been very active in promoting its short and long-term planning for the city as well as working with other Government and community bodies to make its action effective. The Happy Valley council's track record in youth support is in sponsoring cooperation and planning aimed at anticipating the problems of the future and seeing that preventive action is taken now. That is something for which I congratulate the council. As a youngish sort of person I can see that sort of major problem looming. We need to anticipate future problems and take preventive action now.

In my Address in Reply speech, I referred to the marvellous achievement of the local community at Aberfoyle Park in establishing a neighbourhood house, a facility that all the community will enjoy for many years to come. Next door to the neighbourhood house we hope to develop a youth facility, a drop-in centre to be known as 'The Shed'. The group of young people actively involved in this project come

from the Aberfoyle Park, Flagstaff Hill and Happy Valley areas and call themselves 'Youth Action Unlimited'. This group of young people is particularly energetic and active and, under the guidance of Liz Williamson from the Happy Valley council, has developed some tremendous organisational and lobbying skills. I have certainly experienced some of those talents.

The Southern Region of Councils is also interested in providing facilities for young people. For instance, there is a proposal to establish a mobile youth centre using a converted bus to reach youth in a variety of locations in the southern metropolitan area. This proposal follows the success of the Buzz-Bus, which has operated at various times in the Happy Valley area. The concept is for a bus to operate on a circuit basis over the southern region to cover Marion, Noarlunga, Willunga and Happy Valley. It would locate in areas where youth are known to gather—such as Willunga, Port Noarlunga South, Flagstaff Hill, Trott Park, Sheidow Park, and Hallett Cove. The operating hours I imagine would be between approximately 6 p.m. and 10 p.m.

As well as providing a meeting place for youth, the bus would provide access, referral and information on a range of health, welfare, housing and legal matters. In this, the bus would act as a catalyst in assisting youth who may not always know of or use the various services. Word of mouth and simple publicity would ensure promotion of the bus amongst potential users. The numbers of young people using the bus would be easily monitored, as would referrals to agencies. The bus would be managed under the sponsorship of the Southern Region of Councils and would have a support committee of youth, youth workers, council representatives, police, health and welfare staff.

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

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I wonder how many members, in their visits to the Library in recent weeks or months, have taken the time to go through some of the older volumes that are held there, to examine them and to see really just what we are holding down there. I think that, if the Government does not take early steps to preserve some of the Library's priceless and historic literature, which is slowly decaying on the shelves down there through inadequate storage, in years to come we will regret that no move was made at this time to provide controlled storage conditions for that work. Some masterpieces, going back to the turn of the century, have found their way onto the shelves in the basement by one means or another, having been either donated to the Library or bought in years gone by.

We have down there millions of dollars worth of books and when you examine them you find that the leather bindings are starting to decay, and ultimately that decay will spread throughout all of the books. If they remain in their present storage conditions those books will deteriorate so that the generations following us will not have access to them. Some eight years ago, I believe, a proposition was put up by a former Chief Librarian that we have someone come in and value those books. At the time some $7 000 was required to undertake that exercise and, as the funds were not available, the exercise did not take place.

Since that time, we have had some CEP money made available and an effort was made to move and clean some of the books. It is a limited achievement, I suppose, in getting our collection set up for the future. If you go down to the mezzanine floor you will find some extraordinary volumes which are now part of our State's heritage. Down there you will find, for example, a volume of early engravings and engravers of England from the British Museum. I am not suggesting for a moment that anyone would want to take out a page, but it has been put to me that, if a page of that volume were taken out and taken to Sothebys and if you had the right buyer at auction, you may get $8 000 per page—and there are 76 engravings in that book.

Down there we also have seven volumes of Piranesi's *Ancient Rome*, an asset of the State. We have *Sketchings of the Alhambra Palace* by Jones, once again, an asset of the State. There are four volumes of the Domesday Book which members one day, when they get leisure time in this House, could peruse if their families come from England. They could perhaps go through that book and have a look at some of the old entries that go back to the old families of Britain.

There are four volumes of facsimiles of the National Manuscripts of Ireland and two volumes of the National Manuscripts of Scotland. There is quite an interesting volume on military antiques of the Romans in Britain. All of these are of immense value and all, with time, decaying. First, I think the department has to acknowledge that we have a priceless collection of manuscripts and volumes in the cellars of Parliament House—a collection running into millions of dollars.

Having acknowledged that we have this collection, we then have to decide what we are going to do with it. There are two or three options available. First, I guess we could have them assessed, take them to auction and sell them, and the money could then revert to the library for improvements to the library. I would think that if that happened the money would end up back in general revenue and would certainly be lost to the library. I believe that is quite an impractical proposition, anyway.

To my mind, we first have to ensure that those books are preserved so that they will be available for many years for future generations. Because of their immense value to the history of the State, to the country and, perhaps, to Britain and Europe (where they originate), they should be made available for display. This means that any moves made by the Library Committee and staff to ask for display cases should be totally supported by the Parliament.

That would enable visitors to Parliament House to not only come and see the Chamber and the library but also examine some of these valuable volumes which would be on display. Clearly, we have many of them and it would be up to the library staff to assess those which should be put on display. I am sure that the staff would be very happy to rotate them on display from time to time. Their storage conditions have to be very exact. They require controlled humid conditions; otherwise, the rot will continue. Experts have to be brought in to assess that aspect. Never let it be forgotten by this Parliament that heritage is many times stored in the form of books. This has been the situation since man was able to read and write. In this way the history of countries is recorded.

There are people in the community who like to go to libraries and pull out antique books that are part of our heritage. We are very fortunate in this Parliament to have a library of such a standard, and particularly fortunate over the last hundred years or so in some of the volumes which have been placed here. I believe that what has happened is that the books have been placed down in the basement and many members do not realise that we have millions of dollars worth of books down there rotting away.

I bring it to the attention of members and let them ponder on that aspect. I have been advised by those who should know about these things that, unless correct storage conditions can be provided, we have a problem on our hands, because these books will continue to deteriorate. If that

happens and we do not provide the correct storage and glass cases, and if we do not do the right thing by the public and put the books on view, they will eventually be lost—perhaps not in my lifetime but in the lifetime of those coming behind us. Bearing in mind the millions of dollars worth of books that are stored away down there, if we lose them it will be a national loss and a national scandal.

Motion carried.

At 3.57 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 26 August at 2 p.m.