HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 18 November 1986

The SPEAKER (Hon. J.P. Trainer) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Appropriation,
Controlled Substances Act Amendment,
Family Relationships Act Amendment,
Hawkers Act Repeal,
Land Tax Act Amendment,
Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act Amendment,
Pay-roll Tax Act Amendment.

PETITION: BREAD

A petition signed by 14 330 residents of South Australia praying that the House pass legislation to allow the baking of bread in the metropolitan area on weekends was presented by Hon. Frank Blevins.

Petition received.

PETITION: POKER MACHINES

A petition signed by 911 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose any measures to legalise the use of poker machines in South Australia was presented by Hon. P.B. Arnold.

Petition received.

PETITION: PROSPECT KINDERGARTEN

A petition signed by 197 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to appoint a full-time teachers aide to the Prospect Kindergarten was presented by Hon J.C. Bannon.

Petition received.

PETITION: SCHUBERT'S FARM

A petition signed by 2 809 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to reopen Schubert's Farm to the public was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

PETITION: MILK

A petition signed by 2 635 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to allow the sale of bulk raw milk was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

PETITION: ELECTRONIC GAMING DEVICES

A petition signed by 91 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to permit the use of electronic gaming devices was presented by Mr Tyler.

Petition received.

PETITION: PROSTITUTION

A petition signed by 55 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose any measures to decriminalise prostitution was presented by Hon. D.C. Wotton.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: all questions except Nos 65 to 77, 101, 120, 161, 176, 179, 182, 185, 188, 193, 194, 202, 216, 224 to 226, 228, and 230; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE

In reply to **Hon. P.B. ARNOLD** (21 October).

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

The Engineering and Water Supply Department is organising the 5th Australian Biennial Hydrographic Workshop which is to be held at the South Park Motor Inn on 8-12 December 1986. There are to be 35 full-time delegates from 20 water authorities throughout Australia, with additional delegates attending on a part-time basis.

As on previous occasions, the workshop has been organised on a live-in basis and as such the three Adelaide-based officers involved will be required to be in attendance for approximately 12 hours per day. The normal rule will apply, however, that centrally based officers will not be accommodated overnight.

On 7 and 8 August 1986 working lunches were held at an inner city restaurant and at a North Adelaide hotel involving Traffic Branch personnel and their counterparts from the Urban Transit Authority, Sydney, who were in Adelaide to discuss the State Transport Authority's computerised scheduling and rostering systems.

Nine people attended each luncheon and the cost for both amounted to $311.45.

HUMAN SERVICES TASK FORCE

In reply to **Mr LEWIS** (17 September).

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: My colleague the Minister of Local Government has advised me that, in May of this year, she announced the formation of the Human Services and Local Government Task Force. Its members are as follows:

Department of Local Government (Chair), Ms Anne Dunn
Department of Local Government, Mr Bernie Coates
South Australian Health Commission, Ms Liz Furler
Department for Community Welfare, Mr Andrew Hall
Department of Education, Ms Ann Gorey
Department of Recreation and Sport, Mr Jim Daly
Children's Services Office, Ms Colleen Johnson
Department of the Arts, Mr Reye Wright
Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Mr Tony Lawson
Office of Employment and Training, Mr Charles Connelly

Office of the Commission on the Ageing, Dr Adam Graycar

Ethnic Affairs Commission, Mr Alessandro Gardini

Women's Adviser to the Premier, Ms Jill Whitehorn

Youth Bureau, Mr Patrick Bayly

Disability Adviser, Mr Richard Llewellyn

Local Government Association of South Australia, Mr Des Ross

Treasury Department, Mr Mike Keily

The report will be released for comment from local government and other interested organisations.

ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATIONS

In reply to **Hon. P.B. ARNOLD** (23 September).

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I refer to your question concerning the height of a mechanical grape harvester on a low loader and advise that, following the second weighing of the vehicle and load where the height was checked, the driver was advised to seek an appropriate permit from the Highways Department in Adelaide. When he did so, he was advised that a 12-monthly permit would only be available if application was made in writing. This is because any period permit requires more detailed assessment than a short-term or single-trip permit. Because the permit application was made by phone, the permit was issued for nine days as requested by the applicant. Upon request the applicant will be issued with a permit to operate for up to 12 months at a time on roads in the Riverland area at a height of up to 4.5 metres. Application forms are available from the Permits Section on (08) 343 2276 or 343 2700.

Dr G. DUNCAN

In reply to **Mr S.J. BAKER** (18 September).

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have been advised by the Attorney-General that it is inappropriate to answer the question until the court proceedings in this matter have been finalised.

GRAND PRIX

In reply to **Mr INGERSON** (5 November).

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No company formed by Dr Hemmerling and Mr Barnard was contracted to run the 1986 Australian Formula One Grand Prix.

MARIJUANA

In reply to **Mr D.S. BAKER** (22 October).

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I refer the honourable member to the answer given by the Attorney-General to the Hon. K.T. Griffin which appears in *Hansard*, 30 October 1986, page 1673.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: BEVERAGE CONTAINERS

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: In March, Parliament passed amendments to the Beverage Container Act. The amendments were aimed at strengthening the anti-litter provisions of the Act and included raising the deposit for non-refillable beer bottles from five to 15 cents. The deposit lift was sparked by the entry into the South Australian market of packaged beers manufactured by Bond Brewing. Bond beers are sold in non-refillable bottles.

For years, South Australia's unique deposit return system has been based on refillable beer bottles. Successive Governments have maintained that refillable bottles made good sense in terms of litter control and the savings in natural resources and energy. Local brewers have played their part by promoting the use and return of refillable bottles.

The entry of Bond Brewing into the South Australian market with non-refillable bottles threatened the basis and intent of the South Australian system. Parliament responded by legislating to raise the deposit on non-refillable beer bottles from five to 15 cents both as a disincentive to brewers to market undesirable containers and to restore the relativity in South Australia between refillable and non-refillable bottles that existed in 1976.

In essence, Government was demonstrating its commitment, in no uncertain terms, to refillable beer containers. Bond Brewing responded by indicating that it intended to change to refillable containers. It asked that the amendments relating to the deposit rise and labelling requirements not be brought into force until 1 October, thus giving the company the time necessary to make the changes. This was agreed and other brewers informed of the decision.

However, Bond Brewing changed its mind about introducing a refillable container and initiated a High Court action claiming that the new 15 cent deposit unfairly restricted trade between States and was discriminatory, contrary to section 92 of the Constitution. Since 28 April, Government undertook all the necessary legal steps to defend this action. The only evidence that could be led in the High Court had to be objective evidence of the environmental advantages of refillable bottles. Evidence such as Government's demonstrated preference for refillable bottles, historical tradition, or the effects of any decision on local industry would be of limited, if any, relevance before the High Court.

It was clear to Government's legal advisers that the evidence available to the Government was insufficient to support the maintenance of a deposit differential of four to 15 cents between refillable and non-refillable bottles. For example, breakage tests, carried out for the Government by the independent research laboratory Amdel, showed that non-refillable bottles had the same or greater strength than refillable bottles commonly in use. Given the lack of objective evidence and the substantial cost of continuing an action before the High Court, Government chose to settle out of court to secure the South Australian beer bottle deposit system which requires every beer bottle to carry a deposit. I hope members opposite, who do not seem to be listening, will recall the way in which they voted on this legislation in this Chamber.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order. The Deputy Premier.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Government chose to settle out of court to secure the South Australian beer bottle deposit system which requires every beer bottle to carry a deposit and retain a deposit differential between refillable and non-refillable bottles. The four to six cents differential is one which can be sustained before any High Court action, on the evidence available. Since Government announced the settlement a good deal of misinformation has been generated about its impact on South Australia's litter control

system. I am not sure whether members opposite are agreeing to accept some blame in this matter, as they seem to be by their—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order, and ask the Deputy Premier to stick to his explanation.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: All beer bottles in South Australia will continue to carry a substantial deposit. Non-refillable bottles are not throw-away containers. They will carry a six cents deposit returnable through marine store dealers. There is in fact two cents more incentive for their return than for refillable bottles which carry a four cents deposit.

Government will further regulate to bring wine coolers and beer cans under the same deposit arrangements as for beer bottles. Government has made it abundantly clear that it would have preferred to retain the four cent to 15 cent deposit differential and the emphasis in South Australia on refillable beer containers. However, the fact remains that South Australians including Government and industry are bound by the Australian Constitution and cannot legislate or act in a way which is contrary to section 92 of the Constitution.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. D.J. Hopgood):

Planning Act 1982—Crown Development Reports by the South Australian Planning Commission on proposed—Intensive Animal Feedlot, Aberfoyle Park High School.

Beverage Container Act 1975—Regulation—Deposit Levels (Amendment).

Botanic Gardens Board—Report, 1985-86.

Department of Environment and Planning—Report, 1984-85.

Planning Appeal Tribunal—Report, 1985-86.

By the Minister of Emergency Services (Hon. D.J. Hopgood):

Country Fire Services—Report 1985-86.

By the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. D.J. Hopgood):

Engineering and Water Supply Department—Report, 1985-86.

By the Minister of Lands (Hon. R.K. Abbott):

Advances to Settlers Act 1930—Balance Sheet and Report, 1985-86.

By the Minister of Forests (Hon. R.K. Abbott):

Woods and Forests Department—Report, 1985-86.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. G.F. Keneally):

Office of the Commissioner for the Ageing—Report, 1985-86.

Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board—Report, 1985-86.

Outback Areas Community Development Trust—Report, 1985-86.

Parks Community Centre—Report, 1985-86.

South Australian Psychological Board—Report, 1985-86.

State Clothing Corporation—Report, 1985-86.

Corporation of Henley and Grange—By-law No. 23—Parklands.

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

Building Societies Act 1975—Regulations—Prescribed Securities and Loans.

Commercial Tribunal Act 1982—Regulations—Formal Inquiries.

Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act 1973—Regulations—

Contracts for Sale of Small Businesses.

General Regulations, 1986 (Amendment).

Trade Standards Act 1979—Regulations—Safety Standards for Pedal Cycles.

Supreme Court Act 1935—Rules of Court—Supreme Court—Solicitor Profit Costs.

Children's Court Advisory Committee—Report, 1985-86.

Department for Community Welfare—Report, 1985-86.

By the Minister of Correctional Services (Hon. Frank Blevins):

Correctional Services Advisory Council—Report, 1985-86.

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. M.K. Mayes):

South Australian Meat Corporation—Report, 1985-86.

By the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. M.K. Mayes):

Fisheries Act 1982—Regulations—

Restricted Marine Scale Fishery—Number of Licences.

River Fishery—Number of Licences.

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. M.K. Mayes):

Racing Act 1976—Rules of Trotting—Administration of Drugs and Penalties.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr KLUNDER brought up the forty-sixth report of the Public Accounts Committee on electricity supply assets replacement.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

MARIJUANA

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier order an immediate and independent inquiry into how cannabis plants worth $8 million can be grown on Government owned property and whether this crop was intended for the South Australian drug trade? Cannabis plantations with a street value of $13 million have been discovered in South Australia during the past four days. I refer to Saturday's discovery near Loxton and to another today at Tailem Bend, indicating that the 'Mr Big' financiers of the drug trade are making further inroads in South Australia, anticipating that there will be a larger market with the introduction of on-the-spot fines.

The plantation discovered near Loxton was growing on land owned by the State Government in the Katarapko Game Reserve, which is under the control of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. Reports indicate that the crop had been growing for possibly 12 weeks in an area which should be regularly patrolled by the National Parks and Wildlife Service. In the circumstances, I call on the Premier to immediately appoint an independent person to inquire into why the crop was planted and cultivated without detection for so long, who financed it, and whether it was intended for sale only in South Australia.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: No investigation is required—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: —into this matter. First, I congratulate the Police Department on an excellent piece of detection. The police have always had and will continue to get full support from the Government in their efforts—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Coles to order.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: —to eradicate any attempt to grow marijuana in any area of South Australia, be it on public or on private lands. I believe that this operation was a fairly sophisticated one. Pending the prosecution on this matter, I do not think that I should canvass the details, a good deal of which will come out in the court.

The national parks system covers something like 6 per cent of the land area of the State, a good deal of it involving reasonably rugged country and very heavy and dense vegetation. The rangers cannot be expected to be in a position to always know what is being grown where. I reiterate that obviously rangers, in the course of their duties with the National Parks, will do all that they possibly can to ensure that, where reports come to their attention of strange plants being grown anywhere, they will immediately make those reports available to the Police Department, but I think it is ridiculous to suggest that any independent investigation is required in this matter.

PRESCHOOL EDUCATION

Mr TYLER: Can the Minister of Children's Services assure the House that the quality of preschool education will not be adversely affected by recent changes to the provisions for entry? Also, can the Minister advise the House whether it is expected that the new provisions will improve the staff/student ratio? Further, can he say whether these provisions will mean that more four year olds are able to obtain the optimum level of preschool education; that is, four sessions per week for one full year before they enter junior primary school?

I have been approached by several constituents who are concerned about these changes. While acknowledging the necessity of sharing available resources throughout the preschool community, they are concerned that the desired effect will not be achieved and that there may indeed be some adverse effects. They are particularly concerned that the changes imply that parents must make decisions about when their children will start school much earlier than was previously the case. They feel that this will affect the ability of preschools to be flexible to the individual needs of children.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER; I thank the honourable member for his question. Indeed, the member for Newland also has raised this matter with me. I understand that there has been some discussion in local communities—

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I have spoken also to the member for Davenport on the telephone about a similar matter, I think a few days ago. The Children's Services Office preschool enrolment policy which has been recently circulated to preschool centres attempts to meet the demands for sessional preschool for four year olds, which continue to increase. In the 1985-86 financial year three new preschool centres were opened at Flagstaff Hill, Para Hills West and Modbury. The new preschool facility at Wynn Vale will be completed later this month and a new centre will be opening at Olympic Dam around August 1987.

However, during the past 12 months, 90 centres were unable to offer the usual number of sessions for four year olds and waiting lists were necessary. The Children's Services Office therefore took the responsible management step of formalising preschool enrolment policy which will allow centre staff and management committees to monitor more clearly their ability to provide all children with a year of preschool prior to starting school. This does not represent any major change in direction in preschool services, but reinforces a longstanding commitment. The policy will be implemented as children commence preschool in 1987.

This policy reflects the Government policy and commitment to the provision of preschool programs—the preschool programs for which the Children's Services Office is funded. Although planning for programs such as pre-entry are encouraged within the preschool week, the aim of the CSO enrolment policy is to ensure that these programs do not exclude the enrolment or attendance of any child who is legitimately entitled to four terms of a preschool program.

With respect to liaison with primary schools, including non-government schools, I can advise the House that the policy is based on active cooperation between preschool directors and primary school principals in a local area. Such cooperation is already an important part of ensuring the satisfactory transition of each child from preschool to primary school.

If a director identifies a school with uncertain enrolment dates, regional directors or advisers from the Children's Services Office will arrange to visit the principal of such a school and work out a satisfactory set of procedures. A child will not be disadvantaged under this enrolment policy because he or she is attending either an Education Department school or a private school.

Regarding casual preschool vacancies, should a preschool have a vacancy mid-term due to unexpected transfer, the Preschool Director in consultation with the Regional Director of the Children's Services Office, will be able to offer this position to another child.

With respect to the flexibility of a child's development, whilst this policy is designed to ensure an equitable provision of preschool services, the policy is not inflexible. Preschool enrolments of children before the age of four or after five years of age may be permitted if this is in the best interests of the child. This will happen with the approval of the Regional Manager after full consultation with the respective centre. Parents have the right to withdraw their children before they have completed four terms at preschool. Children who are disadvantaged by long distance travel to rural kindergartens may extend their preschool year across two calendar years. I trust that this information will allay the fears that have been raised with me by honourable members.

KATARAPKO GAME RESERVE

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning, as a matter of urgency, report to the House on how frequently the Katarapko Game Reserve has been patrolled during the last three months by officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, and will he ascertain whether the resources available to that service are sufficient to ensure that illegal drugs are not cultivated in national parks and reserves?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I can certainly indicate to the honourable member that rangers visit Katarapko Game Reserve quite regularly as part of their patrols. I am certainly not in a position to indicate that, in fact, they are able to patrol every square inch of the territory; nor am I in a position, nor will I ever be in a position (and nor would any other Minister be in a position), to be able to give any guarantee that the parks will not at any stage be subject to further activities such as this. Again, I make the point that the parks cover 6 per cent of the land surface of this State. Not all those parks are in the climatic areas that would admit of this form of cultivation, as far as I understand what this cultivation is all about. However, certainly

millions of hectares could be subject to this activity. No matter what the provision of resources to the parks system might be, we would never be in a position to give that sort of guarantee.

PORTABLE TRAFFIC SIGNALS

Mr PLUNKETT: Will the Minister of Transport consider the use of portable traffic signals at the site of roadworks and other disruptions to traffic? Prior to entering Parliament, as an organiser of the Australian Workers Union I knew of a case where a highway and council worker was killed after being knocked down by traffic that failed to honour the red flag. That system is used in this State to slow down traffic, but on this occasion the red flag was completely ignored. From inquiries I found that there was no legal obligation on the driver to slow down: it was only a matter of courtesy. I am very concerned, and I always have been concerned, about the safety of workers, so recently I took the opportunity to look at the system that is used in the United Kingom. I found that portable battery operated traffic lights that completely stopped traffic were used and that there was no danger to workers on the road. I know that some members opposite are not interested in the protection of workers, but I certainly am.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Peake will have to restrict himself to the facts of the matter.

Mr PLUNKETT: Thank you, Sir. I took it upon myself to speak to the foreman and workers on the road and asked them how hard it was to erect these portable lights. They explained to me that they could be erected in five minutes. I asked them about the arrangement with the traffic police, and they said that they had the necessary permission for, say, two or three weeks or for the estimated duration of the work, perhaps even three months. That was very interesting, because we have problems in implementing the same system in South Australia. Would the Minister take the matter to his advisers and get as much information as possible so that portable traffic lights can be introduced in South Australia, if possible?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. As I recall, it was due to the honourable member's efforts that the 25 km/h speed limit was imposed on motorists going past highway gangs on major arterial roads and also in local government areas. So, I am very well aware of his concern for the safety of workers.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Yes, E&WS and council gangs. The speed limit is 25 km/h, and anybody who exceeds that is, of course, in breach of the law. As Minister, I have been concerned about the safety of these workers, and we have had meetings with the AWU, the Highways Department and the Police Department, in an effort to devise a system that assures the greatest possible safety for workers. Over the past 12 months or so we have had police blitzes, particularly in the South-East and the mid North, and we are also looking at the possibility of introducing a system of cameras that could result in encouraging people to reduce speeds.

Unfortunately, we seem to have some of the most irresponsible drivers here in South Australia, and any of us who have worked on road gangs would agree with that. If a motorist is travelling at 110 km/h he has to make a conscious effort to slow down to 25 km/h. People who felt that they had done so would, if they looked at their speedo, find that they were doing something like 60 km/h, at great risk to the workers. The honourable member suggests that this system apparently works overseas in Europe and the United Kingdom. I imagine that my advisers should be aware of this. In any event, I will bring the matter to their attention, because I will give every consideration to any suggestion that might result in greater safety for people working on our roads. I will bring down a report for the honourable member.

DRUGS IN SCHOOLS

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Will the Premier order the Minister of Education to undertake an immediate review of how school principals apply departmental guidelines relating to the discovery of drugs in schools? Following the recent discovery of marijuana at the Port Lincoln High School and the suspension of eight students, the Director-General of Education made a public statement in which he said, in part:

> Within the school grounds misuse of any drug will not be tolerated at all and, if the substance is illegal, police are called in to investigate as a matter of course.

However, this is not a rule that is being followed by the principal of a high school in the electorate represented by the member for Henley Beach, whose vote will give South Australia softer marijuana laws.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is getting very close to commenting.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I have been informed that the Principal of Henley Beach High School, as a matter of deliberate policy, has not called in the police. This occurred in one particular instance earlier this year when a group of students were found to be smoking marijuana on the school oval during the lunchtime recess. The parents of the students, but not the police, were informed. As such action may deny the police an opportunity to identify the source of supply of drugs in schools, and as parents need to have confidence that departmental guidelines are applied consistently, I ask the Premier to order an immediate review of the application of these guidelines.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for her question. I will be pleased to obtain a report from the Director-General of Education with respect to the specific example that the honourable member quoted. If the honourable member gives me further details, such as the time, date or whatever else may be relevant in the collection of information on the serious allegations raised by her today, that will help us in resolving the circumstances and appropriate action that can be taken in accordance with those circumstances. I can only repeat what the Director-General said at the time of the incident referred to by the honourable member: that this is a matter of great importance in our education system. I assure the honourable member that the department will be vigilant in these matters.

ROAD TRAINS

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Transport outline the situation regarding A class trains running through Port Augusta and also B class trains running to Mount Gambier? I point out that this is not a railway question. On Saturday 8 November, I represented the Minister at the 41st conference of the Country Carriers of South Australia. At that meeting Mr Ian Curran sought information on A and B class trains operating to Port Augusta and Mount Gambier,

respectively. Therefore, I would appreciate the Minister's advice on this subject so that I might advise the Country Carriers of South Australia.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member not only for raising this matter but also for representing me at the 41st annual meeting of the Country Carriers of South Australia. I would have liked to be present, but one cannot be everywhere at once. I am well aware of the concern of country carriers about the use of B class trains, especially from the South-East. There has been a restriction on bringing these trains into Adelaide because of fears concerning the Mount Barker highway and the public reaction to a B class train being on that stretch of road.

It is usually agreed that a B class train with compatible connection is a stable configuration, more so than the ordinary trailer. We have B class trains coming from the north, on Highway 1, into the industrial areas of Regency Park, Port Adelaide, etc. That does not involve the type of road extending through Mount Barker, for example. I have had representations from the Commercial Transport Association, and at present I am considering whether or not we could allow a trial for selected carriers on that section of the highway. There is no other reason but the nature of the road for our not allowing these vehicles to come in. It is probably in the best interests of the organisation (that is, the carriers themselves) for them to be involved in an educational program because I can imagine the reaction to a B class train coming to Adelaide from Mount Barker: there would be considerable concern about that, and the carriers could perhaps through an education system convince other road users that the B class trains are stable. Therefore, at present I am considering whether or not we can agree on a trial for selected carriers over a certain period, in order to determine the reaction.

A class road trains stop at Port Augusta and at the moment the Government does not intend to allow these trains to come farther south. There are a number of reasons for that decision. First, the City Council of Port Augusta is totally opposed to bringing road trains over the bridge and through that city. Secondly, the road trains cause deterioration of road surfaces and we have a regard for that factor. That matter is also under active consideration.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I would not say that. My record speaks for itself: my ministerial responsibility is paramount over my responsibilities as the local member. If the honourable member wants to disagree with that statement, he should talk to people in my district. There is not any intention in the near future to change the policy on this matter but, if there is evidence that we should, I would be happy to do so.

MARIJUANA LAWS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Did any Government Minister or any officer acting on the Government's behalf have discussions with the Drug and Alcohol Services Council before the council's decision to mount an advertising campaign to justify the Government's policy on marijuana laws, and was the Government involved in deciding the content of this advertising?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would imagine that the Minister of Health had some discussions with the Drug and Alcohol Board, in that it reports to him. Indeed, the campaign being waged is, of course, one that is coming from the general promotional budget of the Health Commission. Surrounding Operation NOAH and the Government's drug offensive, it was always clearly contemplated that we would be spending money in this area. Instead of attacking this action, members ought to welcome the fact that we are doing something in this area. I can only say, in relation to the particular advertisements that are being run, thank goodness they are, because there are many young people in this community who are under the illusion—because of the nonsense from those members opposite—that marijuana is legal: it is not. The legislation does not achieve that.

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Murray-Mallee and the member for Victoria both to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I believe that, if the Drug and Alcohol Board was not doing it, the Government would certainly have to take up the cudgels. It is not political advertising, and it certainly is not the scurrilous nonsense that members opposite put in the press—and by so doing, I suspect, wanted somehow to entrap some young people into believing that what was illegal was in fact legal. That is not appropriate. The Government, the Drug and Alcohol Board and everyone else—including the Opposition—have a responsibility to tell the truth, and that is what is being done.

STATE BANK

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Premier inform the House of the State Bank's current performance in providing funds for the economic development of South Australia? In the recent annual report for 1985-86 the Chairman of the State Bank, Mr Barrett, expressed confidence that its increase in assets during the past 12 months would help the bank maintain its position as a leading financial institution in South Australia. The past 12 months has seen the Australian economy enter a very difficult period, and I seek information about the performance of the State Bank during that period.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member's question is a particularly timely one in that it draws attention to the almost spectacular performance of the State Bank in its amalgamated form. Without the presence of such a successful and powerful financial institution, much financial activity in this State would simply not have occurred. In that, I am referring not just to the direct contribution of the State Bank but to the competitive environment which it has created to the benefit of all South Australians.

The honourable member referred to the report of the State Bank and the success that was recorded there. I would also like to draw the attention of the House and the honourable member to the latest survey published in the *Business Review Weekly* which, in fact, records the growth of the State Bank: it was ranked 112th out of the top 1 000 Australasian companies. Its previous ranking was 123rd.

Even more important in terms of the bank's performance was a report published in *Australian Ratings* in October. In fact, the bank received a glowing report of its performance since the merger in July 1984. It received a rating of triple A and A1-plus, and in assessing the capital structure of the State Bank, *Australian Ratings* said:

> In *Australian Ratings* opinion the South Australian State Government has shown far greater awareness of the need for satisfactory and adequate capital structuring of its guaranteed utilities than other State Governments.

Australian Ratings further wrote:

Following the merger of the two banks and subsequent capital reconstruction the new SBSA is well capitalised by World Bank standards.

I think it is this strong structure and performance which have enabled the State Bank to retain its leading role in important areas in our State economy, such as housing. During the past 12 months, for instance, the State Bank froze home loan interest rates for four months and it lent $385 million for housing at a time when funds for home buyers were severely reduced. It has also picked up a considerable amount of corporate business in the course of its operations over the past 12 months. It makes a very direct contribution to State revenue. It pays the normal rates of State taxation—payroll tax, land tax and financial institutions duty—and by so doing also creates a healthy return for what is a community owned asset. So, I am pleased to acknowledge the performance of the State Bank, not in my words but those of the ratings assessors to which I have drawn attention.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN EGG BOARD

Mr GUNN: Will the Minister of Agriculture immediately withdraw an instruction that he has issued to members of the South Australian Egg Board not to attend Parliament House during the debate on the Bill to abolish the Egg Board? I have been informed that a member of the Minister's staff telephoned the office of the Egg Board during a meeting of the board on 6 November.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: The Premier should laugh! The purpose of that telephone call was to relay an instruction from the Minister that the members of the board were not to speak to any member of the Liberal Party or even to be present at Parliament House during debate on the legislation. Such an instruction is unprecedented and a denial of the democratic rights of board members—

The SPEAKER: Order! That part of the honourable member's explanation is clearly comment, and I ask him to restrict himself to statements of fact—not of opinion.

Mr GUNN: Certainly, Mr Speaker; I would not in any way want to contravene Standing Orders or your rulings. I wish to go on to explain my question, because it is important. I want to quote the following statement by one board member, recorded in the minutes of the meeting on 6 November:

On several occasions I have rung the Minister's office to arrange a suitable time to meet with the Minister to discuss his proposals for the industry. However, I have been unable to get a reply. I feel it is unjust of the Minister to accuse me or any other member of this board of lobbying the Opposition, as I feel it is my right and privilege to offer information to any person, regardless of political leanings, if requested to do so.

As the Minister's instruction is an outrageous attempt to deny members of Parliament information about this matter, I request that the Minister immediately withdraw his instruction.

The SPEAKER: Order! The last part of the explanation was clearly comment. The honourable Minister of Agriculture.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Again, we hear the voices of the rural rump being echoed in this Chamber, and we can see the reaction of a few people protecting a few of their mates—and this is another example of that situation. I think that the consumers of South Australia know exactly what this Liberal Party has done in relation to this Bill and what price they will have to face in terms of eggs because of the reaction of the rural rump of the Liberal Party. I note again that not one metropolitan member stood up and spoke during the debate on the egg Bill in the Lower House. That is a quite significant factor: not one of them did so.

Members interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: On a point of order, the statement by the Minister—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has not yet called on the honourable member for Davenport. The Chair was awaiting a reasonable degree of decorum before proceeding to do so. The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr S.G. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I claim that the Minister has told an untruth. I did speak in the debate—

Mr Tyler: You're an Independent.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Fisher to order. The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr S.G. EVANS: —on the third reading, because the Government limits the time that members can speak on subjects. I chose the third reading to make the point that I did not support it.

The SPEAKER: This is not a point of order: there is absolutely no point of order whatsoever in what has been raised by the honourable member for Davenport. It is clear that he is trying to signal that it is his intention to give a personal explanation at a later stage. If that were the case, he did not need to signal his intention: he could have merely approached the Chair at a later stage and he could have indicated that that was what he intended to do at the conclusion of Question Time.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Murray-Mallee.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I think that this Bill about to come before the other place is of such importance to the community of South Australia that everyone ought to know what the consumers in this State have been paying for eggs and the impact on the economy as a whole. That is a very significant and important fact which the Opposition is trying to evade and about which it attempts again to put up a smokescreen.

In relation to the point raised, I have not instructed members of the Egg Board not to attend Parliament, or anything of that sort. I told my staff that I was surprised about—and noted—the positions adopted by some members of the Egg Board, which is a statutory body advising the Minister in relation to this legislation. It was not an instruction but, rather, an inquiry from my office about their roles. In regard to the points raised by the member for Eyre, as have other Ministers, I have dealt with the Chairman of the board on a constant and continual basis. The Chairman is appointed to that position and he is the person with whom to liaise.

There has been constant and continual contact not only from my office, but also from the department in relation to all matters. Any matters that the board members have wanted to raise have been able to be communicated through the Chairman. That has been done. I do not believe that it is my position to constantly meet individuals every minute of the day in relation to these issues. The views of the board were very clearly expressed and made available through the Chairman. I have no doubt as to where certain members of the board stand in relation to each issue. The position of the Egg Board has been made very clear to me, both verbally and in written communication, by its Chairman.

In order to make the position clear, I regard people who are on statutory bodies as having a responsibility to the Minister and the Government in relation to their appointment, and I have just pointed that out to those people

through my office, as they may not have been aware of their responsibility and accountability.

SAMCOR

Mr GREGORY: Can the Minister of Agriculture advise the House on the current trading position of Samcor and whether there has been an improvement since the end of the 1985-86 financial year? I ask this question in view of the significant loss identified in the annual report of Samcor for 1985-86, which is addressed by the triennial review of Samcor tabled in this House by the Minister in August.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am delighted that the honourable member has raised this question about Samcor, because it has been of great interest not only to the metropolitan community but also to the rural community. The matter of Samcor also has been of interest to this Parliament because of the difficult decisions that have had to be made over the years in relation to the operation of Samcor. Of course, my predecessors have had the recurrent problem of dealing with the losses that have been recorded, and they have been constant.

I am pleased to report that, for the first quarter of operation for 1986-87, Samcor has recorded a net profit of $219 000. Of course, that can be accounted for by the good trading position and flow of stock through Samcor. It is not expected that, unless there is an exceptional season, that situation will continue for the remainder of 1986-87. However, it compares with the trading position of last year of a loss of $249 000, which shows that the measures that have been adopted by the board of Samcor have already shown some positive impact, albeit it is probably disguised within the stock trading which Samcor has shown over the past three or four months.

The Chairman has kept in contact with me in relation to the implementation of the triennial review, and he is pleased to say that all parties are going in the same direction. There has been cooperation between the board, the unions, all interested consumer groups, and the UF&S in relation to the application of the triennial review. It is important to note that to date the board has implemented some of the recommendations. There has already been an improvement in terms of the operating position. There has been a reduction in some of the maintenance allocations. Some of the staff, through natural attrition or relocation, have been removed from the area, and that is an additional factor in favour of Samcor.

There will be discussion this week in relation to the appointment of a financial adviser to assist Samcor in its deliberations, and I think that overall we can see that steps are being taken in the right direction towards assisting Samcor and turning it around. I hope that its operation situation by the end of 1987 will be such that we can announce that Samcor has a healthy future. I want to qualify that by saying that no-one can expect Samcor, given its brief and its commitment, to ever be a financial bonanza. Hopefully, we can see instituted some of these measures which will assist not only the continuation of Samcor and the staff involved but also the community that it services.

OLYMPIC SPORTS FIELD

Mr INGERSON: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport confirm that the Government is now liable for a pay-out of about $400 000 as compensation for the cancellation of a contract to resurface the Olympic Sports Field track, and will he explain the reasons? On 6 November the Minister was forced to correct earlier statements he has made about this matter and admit that the Government had already paid out $100 000 to Superturf Holdings Pty Ltd in compensation for the cancellation of this contract, with the further possibility that the Government's liability might be even greater. I am now informed that the Government faces a total pay-out of about $400 000. If this is the case, it points to serious mismanagement of this contract, and I ask the Minister to explain the reasons.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It seems as though this is the same informer who informed the honourable member about the Grand Prix tickets. There is no such information at my fingertips at present. I indicated to the House quite clearly that—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Has he apologised?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: No, he has not apologised yet. As I indicated quite clearly to the House a week or so ago, there was to be a review by Crown Law, the Auditor-General and the Department of Recreation and Sport as to the Government's liability in regard to cancellation of the contract. I have not yet received the formal report from those three departments, but I hope to have it as soon as possible. Of course, we will be more than open in our discussions with the principals of Superturf, as a consequence of any inconvenience that they have suffered. Certainly, in relation to the planning of a future athletics track, I have made sure that it does not interfere with the facility, as we need to plan for the future.

ORNAMENTAL ANIMALS

Mr ROBERTSON: Will the Minister of Emergency Services assure the House that ornamental chickens and ducklings that are currently on sale at a store at the Brickworks market have not been illegally imported into Australia? Can he further assure the House that the chickens and ducklings concerned were not subjected to undue cruelty before they were stuffed and mounted as ornaments? My attention was recently drawn to a stall in the Brickworks market where a number of stuffed animals and birds are on display for sale. I subsequently visited the market and was able to confirm that stuffed specimens of young ducklings and chickens mounted on a bamboo base are on sale as ornaments. It has been put to me by a concerned resident that innocent creatures such as chickens and ducklings should not be subjected to such cruelty and that the sale of such ornaments is grotesque in the extreme.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Quite candidly, I cannot give the House that assurance because, until the honourable member raised the matter, I knew nothing about it. I will take up the issue and obtain proper advice for the honourable member and the House, which may involve having to speak to the Commonwealth authorities in view of the fact that they have control over the movement of goods in and out of the country.

FROST DAMAGE

Mr BLACKER: Can the Minister of Agriculture explain to the House the current assessment of the frost damage on central Eyre Peninsula, and can he also explain whether there is any possibility of financial assistance being given to those affected through the Federal Government's Natural Disaster Relief Program? This frost damage has been assessed

to be more extensive than many people first envisaged, and many farmers believe that such damage has not been experienced for some 30 or 40 years. As the damage is similar to that of a bushfire, many constituents believe that the area should be considered as a natural disaster area and therefore be eligible for assistance.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question. I know that he was concerned to ask this question, certainly in the last week of sitting, and of course it is of concern particularly to those people on the West Coast and people in his electorate. This morning I received a report from the department in relation to their estimate of damage. As a consequence of that report, there are still some farms to be investigated by officers. I can give the member the rough figures at the moment: 93 farms have reported damage to 13 November but we still have some 13 farms to inspect in relation to the quantity of damage that has occurred to the crops.

That figure represents something like 14 486 tonnes of wheat and about 10 000 tonnes of barley. I suppose we will not know the accurate figure until the end of the season, but the estimate of damage at this point in time is around $2 million. As the member would appreciate, that does not qualify us under the Federal Government Disaster Relief Program, so it will be a matter, from the point of view of that assessment, of State Cabinet making a decision in relation to that point.

With regard to the magnitude of the impact of the frost, I have asked for a couple of points to be further clarified by the department, and I hope to have those in a day or so. I will certainly be informing the honourable member, and the Parliament, of the assessment from the department in relation to those two points. I reiterate that I have just received a report this morning in relation to the first estimate of the damage. Some farms have yet to be inspected, and I have a couple of points that I want clarified in relation to the assessment from the department and its analysis of the impact of the matter before I can make any recommendation and bring the matter before Cabinet.

CLOTHING INDUSTRY OUTWORKERS

Ms LENEHAN: Can the Minister of Labour tell the House whether he has seen reports in the *Southern Times Messenger* newspaper and other media outlets detailing the exploitation of outworkers in the clothing industry? Further, will the Minister tell the House whether the Department of Labour can afford any protection to these workers? I ask this question as a follow-up to the campaign recently launched by the clothing and allied trades unions to improve conditions for outworkers who are women who make up garments in their own homes on a piecework system for clothing manufacturers.

A community health worker from the Southern Women's Health and Community Centre has identified a long list of examples of the exploitation of these outworkers. I refer, for example, to the payment to workers of $1.75 per item for sewing up a dress which retails at $22 and, secondly, the payment of 60c per dress, requiring the completion of 80 items for the worker to earn a total of $50 a week. As well as the financial exploitation of these outworkers, concern is also held for their health and welfare.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes, I have had my attention drawn to the article in the *Southern Times* and I commend the newspaper for publishing it and the member for Mawson for taking it up with me. It is an area that gives me, as Minister of Labour, and the Department of Labour, which has the responsibility for enforcing standards, a great deal of concern indeed. Some of the examples given by the member for Mawson indicate that everybody in the House, regardless of the political Party to which they belong, would be disturbed by some of the gross exploitation that is taking place in this area. It really is disgusting. This is a very difficult area to police. There are some statutory requirements on people who undertake outwork under the Industrial Code, but they are very difficult to enforce.

It is extremely difficult to get people to register as outworkers and for the Department of Labour to find out precisely who has taken on this activity. Concerns have also been expressed to me, quite properly, by reputable employers in the clothing trade who are having great difficulty in meeting competition from firms employing what can only be described as sweated labour, and this situation applies also in the footwear industry and small metal industries. Reputable manufacturers both in this State and throughout Australia are having this difficulty. The practice is especially offensive because it is mainly women in poor economic conditions who are exploited in this way. Indeed, many of them are migrant women, and it causes us greater concern that there is further exploitation and that the people being exploited are in a weak industrial and economic position.

On 31 October, the Ministers of Labour, at their most recent meeting, in Adelaide, decided to set up a small working party to investigate as much as possible the extent of outwork throughout Australia. We have also taken other action by intervening in a case that the Federated Clothing Trades Union has before the Arbitration Commission in an attempt to bring these practices under an award. In this regard, the South Australian, New South Wales and Victorian Governments have intervened in support of the union, and I believe that every member would agree that that was a perfectly proper thing to do. This is an increasing problem given the difficult economic circumstances that enable employers to take advantage of people, particularly migrant women, and I believe that that is an especially deplorable situation. I am pleased that I may assume from the lack of interjection from the other side that all political Parties in this State and throughout Australia agree that the position must be redressed to a great extent, not necessarily by stopping outwork (that is not the Government's intention) but to see that as far as possible people are not exploited and that reputable firms not engaging in this activity are protected from the very low rates that are paid in the industry. I again commend the honourable member for drawing the article in the *Southern Times* to my attention.

CATTLE TRANSPORT

Mr D.S. BAKER: Will the Minister of Agriculture take steps to ensure that the Department of Agriculture does not put unnecessary restrictions on the transport of cattle to Adelaide from other States when such cattle are to be slaughtered at Samcor? The State Brucellosis and Tuberculosis Committee recently decided to allow restricted cattle (that is, cattle for slaughter only) to travel to Samcor from Alice Springs only by train. No road transport of cattle into South Australia will be allowed in the future. However, similar cattle from the Birdsville Track and south-west Queensland that are road transported to Samcor for killing will be excluded. This ridiculous action will exclude an estimated 8 000 cattle from being killed at Samcor each year and will seriously affect the annual losses at Samcor which now total $3.9 million. Will the Minister step in to stop this petty bureaucratic action from further adding to Samcor's losses?

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave is withdrawn for the honourable member to continue with his question. The honourable Minister of Agriculture.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question and will have the matter investigated. I am not sure what he thinks that I should do by way of intervening in such an outrageous step. Recently, through the board we declared that the area north of the dog fence should be free from brucellosis and tuberculosis, although that statement must be qualified as cattle are always coming in and out of those areas and a new infectious outbreak could occur. However, the inspection processes carried out on those transfers are fairly rigorous. It is a matter of great concern to members of the industry, given the funds they have contributed, to see that brucellosis and tuberculosis prevention programs are maintained. I will ask for an urgent report from the department and get back to the honourable member when I have it.

HOUSING

Mr DUIGAN: Has the Minister of Housing and Construction seen the letter to the Editor of the *Advertiser*, dated 12 November, from the Secretary of the Landlords Association about the Minister's record in office? Further, does the Minister accept the argument that the Government is directly responsible, by requiring rental properties to be reasonably habitable, for a reduction in the number of large houses that are available for rental? Earlier this month I asked the Minister a question about the International Year of Homeless Youth, which will be celebrated next year, and sought advice from him as to how the Government would participate in that international year. I referred to widespread concern about the lack of availability of housing for youth and the problem faced by community and welfare organisations in this area. In particular, I alluded to the estimate from a youth shelter as to the number of young people who could not satisfy their housing requirements.

In the *Advertiser* of 12 November the Secretary of the Landlords Association claimed that Government policy had removed from the market old large houses that could otherwise have housed up to 20 tenants, which would have been able to satisfy many of the needs of these young people. He also argued that Government policy that required rental properties to be reasonably habitable was also to blame for a shortage of affordable housing. I was referred to in that letter, and I have since received many telephone calls from people wishing to make known their disquiet at the claims of the Landlords Association and their support for the Government actions that the association was condemning. I therefore ask the Minister to say whether he accepts any of the arguments put forward in that letter by the Landlords Association.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: It is most appropriate that the member for Adelaide has asked this question because he not only was mentioned in Mr Eddie's pathetic letter but he also has become known as someone especially concerned with the issue of homelessness, particularly in his own electorate which includes the Adelaide city centre. Mr Eddie's letter is probably the silliest thing that I have ever read concerning homelessness and the issue of accommodation. It was an all too obvious attempt to portray the Landlords Association as a benevolent group whose primary concern is the welfare of its tenants. Unfortunately for the association, Mr Eddie's letter achieved the exact opposite, convicting himself and his members of the very things that Governments all around the world have been struggling to eliminate for years; that is, slum housing and the exploitation of tenants, especially poor people. Mr Eddie says that in the past many houses that were intended for demolition were often let to students or those on social security and that Government policy had (would you believe it?) prevented this from continuing!

Mr Eddie named two pieces of legislation that he claimed were responsible for the housing shortage: the Residential Tenancies Act and the Housing Improvement Act. However, I believe that those two Acts are the two greatest pieces of legislation ever passed by this State Parliament for the protection of people facing the problem of getting housing and being exploited by landlords. Those two pieces of legislation have worked very well with the exception of three years when the Tonkin Government eliminated the Housing Improvement Act in this State by transferring its administration to the Local Government Department rather than the South Australian Housing Trust. I have often wondered why Mr Murray Hill took that step and what inducement he was offered by the Landlords Association, in effect to—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the Minister has cast an intolerable aspersion on the integrity of a member in another place, and I ask that he withdraw.

The SPEAKER: The Minister will have to withdraw that remark.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: If it is the term 'inducement' I would have thought—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister will have to withdraw the remark.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I withdraw the remark, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair does not need the assistance of the member for Mount Gambier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I was going to go on and say that when I became the Minister responsible for housing I was also Minister of Local Government at that time, and my first action was to set in train the regulation transferring the Housing Improvement Act back from local government to the South Australian Housing Trust; and, in doing so, I said to my departmental officers, 'Will you please give me all the dockets containing the original pathetic Administration's reasons why they sent it over from the South Australian Housing Trust to local government.' However, my officers could not find any documentation whatsoever. It seems that, on the night Mr Tonkin conceded defeat, the shredder was going full blast in the Minister's office. Therefore, I thought it was rather fair for me to use the term 'inducement', assuming that, perhaps because the Hon. Murray Hill himself is a landlord, he was sympathetic to the views of the South Australian Landlords Association.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I rise again on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The point of order is the same as the one I previously raised: the Minister is casting intolerable aspersions on the character, integrity and probity of a member in another place, and I ask that he withdraw.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is of the view that the remarks made by the Minister on this occasion were not as serious as those a moment or two ago.

An honourable member: What?

The SPEAKER: Order! Nevertheless, the Minister is in effect repeating the same imputation, although in a more moderate form and in other words.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the honourable member for Mount Gambier. I ask the Minister to withdraw the remark.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I would have thought that—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I withdraw the comment. I am proud of both the Residential Tenancies Act and the Housing Improvement Act: they are progressive measures, and they are there for the protection of tenants. Perhaps I have baited members opposite, but one thing comes through loud and clear: people on our side are concerned about tenants who are being exploited, whereas people on the other side are not so much worried about tenants as about the standing of their members in the community. I think there is a distinct difference, and I am sure that members on my side will pick up that difference.

I suggest that Mr Eddie stop whingeing about the Residential Tenancies Act and the Housing Improvement Act, and accept that they are two worthwhile pieces of legislation which have been passed by this Parliament. If he is concerned about the problem of homelessness, let him and his association forget about fat profits and exploitation for a while, and put forward a submission to my youth housing inquiry, which will consider what they have to say.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has no wish to delay the proceedings of the House unduly, but I draw the attention of members on both sides of the House to the ruling given by the Chair on page 178 of *Hansard* on 7 August, in relation to the amount of comment that can be introduced in questions and the amount of comment that ought to be introduced in reply to those questions.

TRAVEL AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Act proposes minor amendments to the Travel Agents Act 1986, which was passed on 4 March 1986, and assented to on 20 March 1986. The Travel Agents Act 1986 is designed to be part of a uniform scheme for the regulation of travel agents adopted by New South Wales, Victoria, Western Australia and South Australia.

Further amendment to the Act was contemplated before the Act was passed. During the parliamentary debate on 19 February 1986 the Minister of Consumer Affairs stated:

I also indicate to the Council the passage of the Bill will not mean that the scheme will be established within a week or two after that. There is still a lot of work to be done, and I anticipate that negotiations will continue for another six months or so, given that we must rely on three other States to get the scheme up and running. The sooner the Bill is passed, so that everyone knows that the Parliament approves the principles of the Bill, the sooner the scheme can come into operation.

It is necessary to make that point so that honourable members realise that a considerable amount of work is yet to be done before a proposal is fully in place. It may be that, as the scheme is developed further by consultation over the next few months, there will be a need for the matter to be again put before the Parliament, if there is some minor tidying up to be done. We really had no choice but to introduce the Bill, get the principles accepted and have the Bill passed by Parliament and to then deal with any outstanding matters in consultation with the other States. Similar legislation was subsequently passed in New South Wales and Victoria. As a result, it is now possible to identify certain 'core' provisions which need to be similar in each of the State Acts. Those 'core' provisions are contained in a schedule to a participation agreement signed by the respective Consumer Affairs Ministers from New South Wales, Victoria, Western Australia, and South Australia on 19 September 1986. Most of the matters set out in the schedule are already covered by the South Australian Act.

However, the schedule calls for the enactment of a provision to allow for forfeiture to the Travel Compensation Fund of profits from trading as a travel agent without a licence. Section 7 of the Travel Agents Act 1986 has been amended to include such a provision.

Section 8 of the principal Act has also been amended by including a further matter of which the tribunal must be satisfied before granting a licence.

It was also thought to be appropriate to include a provision which made it an offence for a licensee to fail to ensure that the business was managed and supervised by a person with prescribed qualifications. This provision had been included under grounds for disciplinary proceedings, and, because of the wording in the disciplinary provisions, it will remain so.

A further ground for disciplinary proceedings has also been included in subsection (8) of section 13. A person who is carrying on business as a travel agent may now be disciplined where he/she has been found guilty of an offence involving fraud or dishonesty punishable by imprisonment for a period of not less than three months.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 7 of the principal Act, which deals with the requirement for a travel agent to be licensed. Provision is made for a court, in convicting a person for carrying on business without a licence, to order the person, or any associate, to pay to the Crown the estimated profits arising from the commission of the offence. Any amount so received by the Crown is to be paid into the Compensation Fund.

Clause 4 amends section 8 of the principal Act. The effect of the amendment is that the tribunal must be satisfied before granting a licence, that the applicant is not disqualified from holding a licence under a corresponding law. In addition, the requirement that the tribunal be satisfied that the applicant is financially sound is to be removed in order to facilitate South Australia's participation in the compensation scheme.

Clause 5 inserts into the principal Act new section 10a. The new section requires that each place from which a licensee carries on business must be managed and supervised by a person with qualifications approved by the tribunal.

Clause 6 inserts into section 13 of the principal Act a new ground for disciplinary action: that the respondent has been found guilty of an offence convicting fraud or dishonesty punishable by imprisonment for three months or more.

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

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time allotted for—

(a) All stages of the following Bills:

Crown Lands Act Amendment Bill,
Irrigation Act Amendment Bill (No. 2),
Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 2),
Standard Time Bill,
Fruit and Plant Protection Act Amendment Bill,
Futures Industry (Application of Laws) Bill,

Residential Tenancies Act Amendment Bill,
Trustee Act Amendment Bill,
Administration and Probate Act Amendment Bill,
Sale of Goods (Vienna Convention) Bill,
Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment Bill,
Steamtown Peterborough (Vesting of Property) Bill (No. 2),
Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment Bill (No. 2),
Road Traffic Act Amendment Bill (No. 3); and

(b) Consideration of the amendments of the Legislative Council in the following Bills:

Education Act Amendment Bill,
Animal and Plant Control (Agricultural Protection and Other Purposes) Bill,

be until 6 p.m. on Thursday.

Motion carried.

CITY OF ADELAIDE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the City of Adelaide Development Control Act 1976. Read a first time.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill seeks to clarify the operational arrangements for appeals to the City of Adelaide Planning Appeal Tribunal established under the City of Adelaide Development Control Act. In April 1985, Parliament passed amendments to the Act which, amongst other things, created two additional appeal rights against decisions under the Act (see sections 4a and 39e). Prior to the amendments, the Act provided for appeals only against decisions on development applications. The amendments made in 1985 introduced provisions enabling the Adelaide City Council and/or the City of Adelaide Planning Commission to declare an existing use to be abandoned after the activity has ceased for at least six months (see section 4a). The amendments also introduced a provision allowing the council to require the removal of outdoor advertisements it considered unsightly (see section 39e). In both cases, the amendments also create a right of appeal for the owner or occupier of the land against such decisions.

Sections 32 to 39 of the Act prescribe procedures relating to appeals to the tribunal, and govern matters such as the conduct of hearings, the power to award costs, procedures relating to witnesses, and so on. While it is clear that these operational provisions apply in appeals relating to development applications, it is not explicit in the Act that the same operational provisions apply in the two new types of appeal introduced in 1985. This Bill therefore seeks to ensure that all appeals to the tribunal are subject to the same operational provisions by amending the appeal clauses to refer to all appeals under the Act.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 30 of the principal Act. Section 30 provides for the commencement of appeals under section 28. The proposed change will extend its operation to appeals under sections 4a and 39e.

Clause 3 amends section 32 of the principal Act. Paragraphs *(a)* and *(b)* transfer the requirement that the tribunal have regard to certain specified provisions of the Act when considering an appeal to a new subsection (1a). This enables the operation of existing subsection (1) to be confined to appeals under section 28. Provisions similar to subsection (1) are already included in sections 4a and 39e. New subsection (1a) is in the same form as section 54 (2) of the Planning Act 1982. Paragraph *(c)* makes an amendment that makes it clear that subsection (2) of section 32 will apply to all appeals under the Act.

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

COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Commercial Arbitration Bill is the product of many years of work by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General to achieve uniform law for the settlement of disputes by arbitrators throughout Australia.

The need for reform and restatement of this area of law has been recognised in a number of Australian jurisdictions. The South Australian Law Reform Committee examined the subject in a report of 1969. Victoria's Chief Justice's Law Reform Committee considered the matter twice—in 1974 and again in 1977. The Queensland Law Reform Commission reported on the subject in 1970, the ACT Law Reform Commission in 1974 and the NSW Law Reform Commission in 1976.

The Standing Committee of Attorneys-General agreed in 1974 to the preparation of a model Bill to form the basis of uniform legislation.

The model Bill that was finally agreed to was the culmination of more than 10 years work. It is an important example of cooperation between Commonwealth, State and Territory Governments. When it is enacted in all jurisdictions, Australia will have a substantially uniform system of arbitration for the settlement of disputes arising from commercial agreements.

Legislation based on the model Bill was enacted in New South Wales and Victoria in 1984, the Northern Territory and Western Australia in 1985, a Bill has been introduced in the Tasmanian Parliament in 1986 and the Queensland Attorney-General has announced his intention of introducing legislation in the near future.

The scheme of the legislation is generally to give the parties to an arbitration agreement freedom to regulate the arbitration agreement as they wish; where the parties have not made provision for a particular contingency the legislation steps in and provides what is to happen.

Many of the provisions of the Bill relate to purely procedural matters. I shall proceed to draw honourable members' attention to some of the more important provisions of the legislation. The notes on clauses are substantial and should be referred to for assistance.

The Bill makes provision for the court to appoint an arbitrator or arbitrators, when an arbitration agreement is silent as to who should arbitrate, or where a person appointed dies or otherwise ceases or fails to act. Apart from this role, the possibility of court intervention is kept to a minimum.

The arbitrator will have a wide discretion as to the manner in which arbitrations are conducted. He must act accord-

ing to the law, but may otherwise conduct proceedings as he thinks fit.

If the parties confer upon the arbitrator the further authority, he may even act as *amiable compositeur* or *ex aequo et bono*. These words appear in the marginal role to clause 22. Their meaning is explained in clause 22 (2)—the arbitrator may determine questions by reference to considerations of general justice and fairness. The result is not that the arbitrator is authorised to act as a libertine. He must always act according to the rules of natural justice and the provisions of the arbitration agreement.

On application to the court, a party to an arbitration can obtain a writ requiring any person to appear or to produce documents. An arbitrator will have power to make interim awards. This is frequently necessary to preserve the *status quo*, to safeguard property or to protect the interests of a party pending a full hearing. An arbitrator will have the power to order specific performance of an agreement in circumstances in which such a remedy would be available in the Supreme Court. Awards made in arbitration proceedings will be final and binding.

Unless the arbitration agreement makes specific provision as to costs, the arbitrator will have a discretion as to awarding the costs of the arbitration. There is also provision for an interest component to be included in the award, and for interest to be paid on any sum ordered to be paid by a party, so that the aggrieved party can receive interest on any sum owed from the date on which the dispute arose until payment is made. This provision takes account of commercial interests and recognises the need for the law in this area to operate in a commercially realistic fashion.

There will be no jurisdiction in the court to set aside an arbitrator's award on the ground of error of fact or law on the face of the award. Consent of the parties or leave of the court is a prerequisite to an appeal from an arbitrator's award. The court will however have power to set aside an award where there has been misconduct on the part of the arbitrator or the arbitrator has misconducted the proceedings.

Of particular concern to the standing committee was the question of whether a party should be legally represented. Submissions were received supporting every view from representation without restraint to strictly controlling the right to representation.

The provision which eventually appeared in the model Bill was defective in several respects, notably in that a body corporate had an unqualified right to legal representation at an arbitration while a natural person had not. The model provision ignores the fact that a natural person may have much greater need of legal representation before an arbitrator than before a judge or magistrate. Moreover, the model provision purported to limit rights to legal representation in large commercial claims.

The model provision has been redrafted and the provision in this Bill allows a party to be represented by a legal practitioner where a party to the proceedings is a legal practitioner, where all parties agree, where the amount of the claim exceeds the prescribed amount, or where the arbitrator or umpire gives leave for such representation.

Another departure from the model Bill is found in clause 53 of the Bill. Clause 55 prevents the use of *Scott v. Avery* clauses to oust the jurisdiction of the courts. This means that a claimant who is a party to an arbitration agreement can choose to proceed either by arbitration or in court. If the latter choice is made, the court has a discretion to stay the proceedings (and hence compel the complainant to go to arbitration) but only if the defendant satisfies the court that there is 'no sufficient reason why the matter should not be referred to arbitration in accordance with the agreement'. The model provision thus makes available to the plaintiff a choice of forum which is not open to the defendant. In order to redress this imbalance, a further provision has been included under which a defendant can have arbitration proceedings removed into court where there is good reason why the matter should be dealt with by a court rather than an arbitrator.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. Clause 3 contains repeal, transitional and application provisions. Subclause (1) provides for the repeal or amendment of the legislative provisions contained in the schedule. Subclause (2) provides that the Act shall apply to any arbitration agreement, whether made before or after the commencement of the Act, but, by virtue of subclause (3), if an arbitration is commenced before the commencement of the Act then the arbitration is to continue as if the Act had not been enacted. Subclause (4) provides that the Act shall apply to arbitrations provided for in any other Act. Subclause (5) states the circumstances in which an arbitration is to be deemed to have commenced. Subclause (6) removes from the operation of the Act arbitrations under the Supreme Court Act, the Local and District Criminal Courts Act and the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act and arbitrations prescribed by the regulations.

Clause 4 contains various definitions required for the purposes of the Act. Clause 5 provides that the Act binds the Crown. Clause 6 provides that, unless the parties agree to the contrary, where an arbitration agreement does not specify the number of arbitrators to be appointed, then it shall be deemed to provide for the appointment of a single arbitrator.

Clause 7 provides that, unless the parties otherwise agree, an arbitrator shall be appointed jointly by the parties to the agreement.

Clause 8 sets forth the procedure that can be adopted if a person who has power to appoint an arbitrator defaults in the exercise of that power.

Clause 9 provides for the appointment of a new arbitrator or umpire in place of an arbitrator or umpire who dies or ceases to hold office.

Clause 10 empowers the court to fill a vacancy in the office of an arbitrator or umpire.

Clause 11 provides that where an arbitrator or umpire is removed by the court, the court may appoint a replacement or, unless agreement is a prescribed arbitration agreement, order that the arbitration agreement will cease to have effect.

Clause 12 provides for the appointment of an umpire by the arbitrator if there is an even number of arbitrators.

Clause 13 deems an arbitrator or umpire appointed pursuant to Part II of the Act to have been appointed pursuant to the provisions of the arbitration agreement.

Clause 14 provides that subject to the Act and the agreement, an arbitrator or umpire may conduct the arbitration proceedings in such manner as he or she thinks fit.

Clause 15 provides, where the agreement provides for three or more arbitrators, for the appointment of a presiding arbitrator and the manner in which decisions are to be made.

Clause 16 establishes the circumstances in which an umpire may enter on the arbitration in place of the arbitrators as if the umpire were the sole arbitrator.

Clause 17 provides for the summonsing of witnesses and the production of documents.

Clause 18 provides that, unless the agreement expresses a contrary intention, on application to the court by a party or an arbitrator or umpire, the court may order a person in

default to comply with a summons to attend or with a requirement of the arbitrator or umpire and may make consequential orders as to the transmission of evidence or documents to the arbitrator or umpire. By virtue of subclause (3), an arbitration may proceed in default of appearance or compliance with the requirement of an arbitrator or umpire if, in similar proceedings before the Supreme Court, the court could also proceed.

Clause 19 relates to the giving of evidence before an arbitrator or umpire. An arbitrator or umpire will be able to administer an oath or affirmation and take an affidavit. The arbitrator or umpire is not, subject to the agreement providing otherwise, to be bound by the rules of evidence.

Clause 20 specifies the circumstances where a party may be represented in arbitration proceedings. Under subclause (1), legal representation is to be allowed if a party is a legal practitioner, all the parties agree, the amount or value of the claim exceeds a prescribed amount, or the arbitrator or umpire gives leave. Under subclause (2), other forms of representation are to be allowed where the representative is an officer, employee or agent of a body that is a party to the proceedings or where the arbitrator or umpire gives leave.

Clause 21 provides that, unless the parties agree to the contrary, there shall be continuity of proceedings when an umpire enters on the arbitration or where a new arbitrator or umpire is appointed.

Clause 22 provides that, unless the parties agree to the contrary, any question arising for determination in the course of proceedings shall be determined according to law.

Clause 23 provides for the making of interim awards.

Clause 24 allows for the making of an award ordering specific performance of a contract if the Supreme Court would have power to order specific performance of the contract.

Clause 25 provides that arbitration proceedings may be extended to include a further dispute between the same parties arising under the same agreement.

Clause 26 provides for the consolidation of arbitration proceedings.

Clause 27 vests an arbitrator or umpire with the power to order the parties to take action with a view to settling the dispute without proceeding to arbitration or to complete the arbitration.

Clause 28 provides that the award of an arbitrator or umpire is final and binding on the parties, unless the agreement expresses a contrary intention.

Clause 29 provides for awards to be made in writing and to include a statement of reasons for the making of the award.

Clause 30 allows the correction of an award in cases of error.

Clause 31 allows for an interest component to be included in an award. The rate of interest is to be determined by the arbitrator or umpire but cannot exceed the rate at which interest is payable on a judgment debt in the Supreme Court.

Clause 32 allows the arbitrator or umpire to direct that interest at the rate payable on a judgment debt in the Supreme Court be paid on any sum to be paid under the award.

Clause 33 provides for the enforcement of an award, by leave of the court, in the same manner as a judgment or order of the court.

Clause 34 provides that the costs of the arbitration are to be in the discretion of the arbitrator or umpire, unless the agreement expresses a contrary intention, and may be taxed or settled by the arbitrator or umpire, or taxed by the court. Subclause (3) declares certain provisions in relation to costs to be void.

Clause 35 provides for the taxation of the arbitrator's or umpire's fees and expenses.

Clause 36 relates to costs where an arbitration fails.

Clause 37 imposes a duty on the parties not to cause any delay or to act to prevent an award being made.

Clause 38 relates to the judicial review of awards. An appeal is to lie to the Supreme Court on any question of law arising out of an award but a court shall not otherwise have jurisdiction to set aside or remit an award on the ground of error of fact or law on the face of the award.

Clause 39 empowers the Supreme Court, in certain circumstances, to determine any question of law arising in the course of the arbitration.

Clause 40 restricts the right of appeal where the parties have entered into an agreement restricting the right of appeal (an 'exclusion agreement').

Clause 41 restricts the circumstances when an exclusion agreement can be entered into.

Clause 42 empowers the court to set aside an award where there has been misconduct on the part of the arbitrator or umpire or the award has been improperly procured.

Clause 43 provides for the remission of certain matters by the court.

Clause 44 enables the court to remove the arbitrator or umpire where it is satisfied that there has been misconduct or undue influence or where the arbitrator or umpire is incompetent or unsuitable to deal with the particular dispute.

Clause 45 provides that a party is not prevented from challenging the impartiality, suitability or competency of an arbitrator where the party appointed the arbitrator.

Clause 46 relates to delays in prosecuting claims.

Clause 47 empowers a court to make interlocutory orders in relation to arbitration proceedings.

Clause 48 relates to the extension of time for doing any act or taking any proceeding in or in relation to an arbitration.

Clause 49 allows a court to make an order or give a direction on such terms and conditions as the court thinks just.

Clause 50 provides that, subject to the Act and any agreement to the contrary, the authority or an arbitrator or umpire is irrevocable.

Clause 51 protects an arbitrator or umpire from actions in negligence in respect of anything done or omitted to be done in the capacity of arbitrator or umpire.

Clause 52 provides that after the death of a party the agreement may be enforced by or against the personal representative of the deceased.

Clause 53 relates to the relationship between judicial and arbitral powers and provides for the stay of court proceedings in certain cases and the removal of arbitration proceedings into court in certain cases.

Clause 54 empowers a court to refer a matter to arbitration where relief is sought by way of interpleader and it appears to the court that the claims in question are claims to which an arbitration agreement applies.

Clause 55 relates to contractual provisions which provide that arbitration or the happening of an event in or in relation to arbitration is a condition precedent to the bringing or maintenance of legal proceedings or the establishing of a defence in legal proceedings. Such provisions are to be construed as agreements to refer the matter to arbitration.

Clause 56 specifies the methods that may be used to serve notices under the Act.

Clause 57 is a regulation-making provision.

The schedule provides for the repeal of the Arbitration Act 1891 and for consequential amendments to the Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1924 and the Supreme Court Act 1935.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE STEAMTOWN PETERBOROUGH (VESTING OF PROPERTY) BILL (No.2)

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

That the time for bringing up the select committee's report be extended until Thursday 20 November 1986.

Motion carried.

CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 November. Page 1862.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): The three Bills currently to be considered by the House (the Crown Lands Act Amendment Bill, the Irrigation Act Amendment Bill (No. 2) and the Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)) are all related, and the Opposition supports these three measures. However, the Opposition requires from the Minister of Lands an undertaking that existing rights of landholders will not in any way be affected, because in putting before Parliament what appears to be minor legislation in the name of simplifying and streamlining the operation of departments or the administration of transfer of land it is very important to ensure that people's rights are in no way diminished. My colleague the member for Light will refer to a case where a constituent of his has had certain problems.

The Opposition is quite happy to support the proposal, which allows for a more simple method of placing information on a new series of public maps. I entirely endorse the principle that when people go to examine the public map of South Australia they be fully aware of all the information that they may obtain and that they can get that information from one source. Therefore, I see no problem with that. As most people would be aware, a person can go to the office of the Department of Lands, in what I think is known as Light Building, and pay $2 to obtain a printout of the land holdings of any person in South Australia. One can obtain the details of the price that was paid for land and when it was actually purchased, and so this measure is really not giving the public access to information that is not currently available.

In relation to the Local Government Act Amendment Bill—and I will deal with the three Bills together—the simplified method of creating roads appears to be commonsense. I sincerely hope that, when this course of action is taken and the notice is placed in the *Government Gazette*, both the owner and the council concerned are fully aware of their obligations and that these courses of action will not be taken unless there is agreement of all persons concerned. I know of some of the problems that councils have had in the past in obtaining very limited amounts of land to improve the alignment of roads, and I entirely endorse a simplification of that process, but I am also aware that the rights of landholders must be protected, and so it is really a matter where commonsense must apply.

In relation to the Irrigation Act Amendment Bill, I can see no problem there so long as the rights of existing lessees are not in any way interfered with, so that, when leases or boundaries are altered, everyone concerned is advised and full consultation takes place. The Opposition will monitor very closely the operation of these measures, to ensure not only that the interests of the department are met (because we are really not in the business of just simplifying legislation for the departments concerned so that it is easier for them to administer) but that when we simplify legislation it is in the interests of all citizens of the State, that their rights are protected, and that their businesses, home allotments, farms or other commercial properties are in no way endangered.

I appreciate the opportunity that I have had to have extensive discussions with departmental officers in relation to these three related matters. I believe it is important that members of the Opposition be properly informed on matters to be debated in Parliament. I do not intend to speak on the other two Bills. I believe that information provided so far to the Opposition has allowed us to conclude that these are minor amendments which should be supported. As I said earlier, my colleague the member for Light will seek from the Minister certain information in relation to a problem that he has had in his electorate. At this stage I therefore inform the House that I support the three measures.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I support the measure. I take this opportunity to raise with the Minister a subject in relation to land that is held by the Crown under trust. I take it that the usual practice will apply, whereby one can refer to some sections of the Act to a degree when speaking to a Bill in general terms during the second reading debate. The land to which I refer is that part of the Peter Waite Trust land on which the Urrbrae Agricultural High School and the Unley High School are situated. I believe that the Government has asked private valuers to value the land, although I am unsure of the reason for putting a value on it. It appears that it could be for the same reason as has occurred with other Government owned land, particularly land owned by the Education Department, namely, that the Government might intend selling part of the Peter Waite Trust to developers, the Housing Trust, or someone else to develop for housing. Can the Minister of Lands or the Minister of Education—whichever of them has appointed private valuers to value what I call Crown land under the Act because it is held by trust on behalf of the people, having been donated by Peter Waite many years ago—tell us exactly the reason for valuation? The Minister might not be able to do that now, but he should be able to do that during the Committee stage, if not at the end of the second reading debate.

I also refer to the point about roads under the Local Government Act to which the member for Eyre referred briefly. I have always been concerned about this matter, and I put to the Minister that there must be some merit in eventually giving more direct control to local government in relation to opening and closing of roads, thus saving some of the humbug. The point that we are referring to at the moment is not so much in relation to opening and closing of roads as to the transfer of land for road purposes, but I include in my comments the need to speed up the process of opening and closing roads. After writing to local government seeking opinions on this matter the main theme that came through to me was that the process could be speeded up by having some Government supervision but with most of the decision making processes handed over to

local government, instead of it being tied up in the public sector, which at times seems to get bogged down, with councils blaming surveyors and surveyors blaming the Government, with often too many bodies involved to really stop passing the buck and to find out who is responsible. So, I make the point to the Minister that this area needs to be looked at, and I hope his department will take the opportunity to do that in conjunction with the Lands Titles people.

An important point at this stage concerns the Government's intention perhaps to sell part of the Peter Waite Trust land. Is the land being valued so that a housing estate may be developed? People in that part of my electorate (and I believe also the member for Mitcham's residents) would be quite concerned if the Government intended to bring before both Houses of Parliament some motion to diminish or demolish the trust—which I believe is what would have to occur, under the trust, to do that. Peter Waite created that trust to try to give the people of this State a bit of open space land for agricultural studies and research. I am referring not to that part of the land on the eastern side of Fullarton Road, as that land is under the CSIRO and the University of Adelaide, but to the part on the southern side. This matter is of deep concern to people in that area, as it appears that the Government intends to do something with the land. So, in supporting the Bill, I raise those points.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I take this opportunity to speak on the first Bill, although there is a general indirect involvement of that Bill with another. Already my colleague the member for Davenport has raised the question of opening and closing of roads, itself the subject of another Bill that has previously been before the House. Because of the very nature of the measure currently being considered, which is to make it easier for the transfer of roads, I want from the Minister an indication of the degree to which this will interfere with the provisions of the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act, or whether that will be the subject of subsequent legislation that the House will be expected to consider. I do so on the basis that, whilst it is laborious and sometimes takes months of endeavour by the parties involved, be they private individuals, councils or other statutory bodies, the actions that are undertaken are pitched at guaranteeing that there will be no loss of benefit to a person who has a legitimate interest in the land concerned.

I think that earlier I related to the House an occasion when I was involved in an arrangement with the local council (at its request) to make available to it a parcel of land on a property which I owned at Willaston, subject to it passing over to my interest a road which it wished to close on the opposite side of the property. It was a mutual arrangement and it had been discussed locally with the people who were in close proximity. No difficulties were foreseen and the necessary public meeting was held by the council.

The material was forwarded to the appropriate department in Adelaide and, after a period of time, I was told, 'We will be quite happy to undertake this exchange of land involving the closure of the parcel of land (being a roadway) after the road is first opened.' Although the road had been in existence for over 80 years, it had never been officially accepted by the council so, in terminology associated with roads, it was deemed to be a closed road which could not be closed until it had been opened, so another 12 months or more of endeavour was undertaken. That became quite a hassle and tended to delay an otherwise acceptable and mutually agreeable transaction.

That situation highlighted the fact that one cannot take lightly the law as it has been—and probably as it should remain—to ensure that on every occasion the rights of individuals, whether corporate bodies (in the sense of a local governing body), or a statutory body, or private individuals should at all times be maintained. I am aware also of the endeavours of the Saddleworth-Auburn district council to undertake the closure of a number of roads which have not been in any sense open roads for very many years. They have been cropped or grazed for a long period of time by a number of adjacent owners who are prepared to pay a remuneration to the council for the benefit of the community, but in recent weeks they have been stifled by the attitude of a member of the public who seems to be adopting a course of vindictiveness towards the council as a result of a previous experience that he had with that council. It is his right to raise these questions, so the matter continues.

I think that I have highlighted that it takes time—and will continue to do so—to achieve these results but, at the end of all the investigations, it was quite clear as to who was the true owner of the land and, if the land was to be transferred, even at no cost or at peppercorn cost, then that matter had been correctly researched and no legal or other action could be taken at a subsequent time. However, one instance about which I have had discussion with the Minister over recent times relates to a parcel of land adjacent to the Light River which for many years was used by the community for recreational purposes. In fact, there were two parcels of land, one in the District Council of Light and the other in the District Council of Riverton. Without the knowledge of the local community or local councils, the ownership of that land suddenly changed from the Crown to a local farmer. Investigations revealed that the local farmer obtained deed to the land because he made personal representations to somebody within the Lands Department that it was really an abandoned piece of land; it may have been titled 'reserve No. 11 and reserve No. 13', but it had no import to the community. Although the district councils had made available rubbish receptacles and from time to time had mowed the area so that it could be used for community purposes, particularly for picnics, the land suddenly went out of what one might call the public ownership into the ownership of an adjacent landowner.

At this stage I have no idea of what consideration, if any, was made in granting that person those small reserves of land. Suffice to say that, subsequent to the event, the owner erected a fence around the property and has since offered it for sale. The price of the land was $25 000, which price was accepted by a purchaser but, during the cooling-off period, the purchaser decided that he would not proceed with the transaction, so the land has not changed ownership from the person who (it might be suggested) had a windfall gain and who is likely to gain an even greater windfall if and when he sells the property. That is a case of the community losing a benefit. The 'community' can include the council, the adjacent landholders, the people in the community who have made use of this area for recreational purposes, or the Crown or the State, which has had actual physical ownership of those parcels of land until the negotiation which I have just described.

I ask the Minister to indicate whether the actions referred to will be satisfactorily monitored and whether people will be protected by the passing of these measures. I do not question the thrust of the Bill, but I question the effect that it might have in the long term on the community.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Lands): I thank the Opposition for its support of the Bill. It is necessary to

deal with the three Bills separately, but I will comment on a few of the matters raised. First, I point out that the current situation is that the Crown Lands Act and the Irrigation Act include requirements that town lands be described as allotments in townships and that other lands be numbered as sections or blocks. The removal of the limitations that apply in relation to the current situation and with these provisions that we propose from the Statutes will allow any new land parcel created by subdivision of Crown lands to be numbered as allotments in a particular survey plan. This action will lead to greater efficiency in the sequencing of land parcel mutations and related survey records, and it will present a unified approach to land subdivision for the benefit of the Government and the public generally.

Regarding the specific questions that the member for Davenport and the member for Light raised about the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act, I point out that this measure does not have any relevance to that Act. That is a separate issue. However, following discussions between the member for Davenport and me and my discussions with the Director of the department, we will conduct a review of the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act, but that has not yet commenced. We advertised two weeks ago for a project officer and, as soon as that officer is appointed, we will commence the review of that Act. That Act has no relationship to this measure. If the member for Davenport or the member for Light have specific concerns that they would like me to consider, I would appreciate their raising those matters with me, and I would certainly take them up.

There was correspondence between the department and the member for Light about the parcel of land to which the honourable member referred adjacent to the river in his district. Again, that has nothing to do with this legislation. This measure will not take away any of the existing rights that have been created by an action on the public map, whether an authority of a lease, a boundary or a public road. There will be no loss of enjoyment at all by the public as a consequence of this measure. The protections will remain, and this Bill will have no effect on those matters that have been raised. If there are any other concerns, we can deal with them later.

Mr S.G. Evans: What about the Urrbrae land?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: That is a separate matter. As I said, if the honourable member has a concern about that, I would be happy to consider it.

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

IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 5 November. Page 1862.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I support the Bill.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 5 November. Page 1863.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): The Opposition supports this measure, which makes one or two minor improvements to the existing arrangements. We hope that it will benefit local government and the community in general. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages

STANDARD TIME BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 30 October. Page 1710.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I oppose this Bill. My Party opposes this Bill. Liberal members will vote against it. The majority of South Australians oppose this Bill and, because they do, the Government hopes the Bill will be defeated in another place. Why, after all, has the Government been running dead on this issue for more than two months? The answer is simple. The Government has introduced this Bill to appease those business interests who have agitated for it but who, at the same time, oppose what the Government has been doing on workers compensation and industrial safety.

The Government wants to offset the damage done by its kowtowing to union officials over workers compensation and industrial safety. It wants to drive a wedge between the Liberal Party and those business groups supporting the move to EST. It also wants the other place to throw out the measure so it gets the best of all worlds—praise from some sectors of business for introducing the measure while, at the same time, escaping the electoral backlash that would inevitably occur if a transfer to EST was ever proceeded with.

I have news for the Government. The Liberal Party will not oblige. Some have said we should let the measure through so the Government cops the blame. But the Liberal Party is not prepared to expose South Australia to the disadvantages of this measure, even for a short period. South Australia is envied around the nation for our lifestyle. We must do nothing to tamper with it.

If the Government disagrees with the scenario that I have just outlined about its tactics on this Bill, I remind the House that this measure was foreshadowed, with much fanfare, at the beginning of September—almost three months ago. The Government actively encouraged journalists to comment that it was being decisive—for a change, I might add—and that it was prepared to make some major decisions—for a change. Here was a Government, so the propaganda went, ready to act, ready to put South Australia ahead, in touch with most of the rest of Australia.

However, the Government now knows, from the response to this legislation by the normally silent majority of South Australians, just how far out of touch it is. That is why the Premier and other Government Ministers have refused, repeatedly, to publicly debate the measure with me. That is why the Government has done nothing for two months to justify the measure. That is why we had such a limp and inadequate second reading explanation by the Deputy Premier.

Before showing why this Bill must be defeated, let me put it in an historical context. Debate about two time zones goes back 102 years to a world conference held in Washington D.C. in 1884. That conference adopted standard time, setting at 24 the number of time zones in the world, each zone extending over 15 degrees of longitude. Universal time, or Greenwich Mean Time, was centred on the zero meridian through Greenwich, with each of the other time zones being a whole number of hours ahead or behind universal time to a total of 12 hours.

In Australia, prior to 1895, the official time adopted in the several colonies was for most purposes the mean solar time of the colonial capital. This created widespread anomalies and confusion. For example, before the direct Adelaide to Melbourne rail link was established all train communications between Adelaide, Melbourne and Sydney were through Broken Hill. It was often the case that people arriving in Broken Hill at precisely the same moment had three different times on their watches depending on whether they had come from Adelaide, Sydney or Melbourne, all of which were then on different times. However, there was no unanimity of view about what should be done to remove as many of the anomalies as possible. At a postal and telegraph conference held in Brisbane in 1893, the following resolution was passed:

> That it is desirable in the public interests that the hour zone system should be adopted in a modified form so that there should be one time throughout Australia, namely, that of the 135th meridian, or nine hours fast of Greenwich.

It is a pity, for South Australia's sake, that all the colonies, as they then were, did not adopt this proposal. Instead, what first occurred was the adoption of proposals discussed at a November 1892 conference of surveyors in Melbourne. These divided Australia into three time zones, the standard times for which were to be the mean solar times of the meridians of 120 degrees, 135 degrees and 150 degrees east longitude. This gave standard times eight, nine and 10 hours respectively ahead of Greenwich Mean Time.

The 120 degree zone comprised Western Australia, South Australia and the Northern Territory were in the 135 degree zone, and the Eastern States comprised the 150 degree zone. The necessary legislation was adopted without debate or opposition in the South Australian Parliament in 1894. It was not long, however, before business interests in Adelaide began lobbying against this. The Chamber of Commerce was particularly prominent. Its views were subsequently summarised in this Parliament as follows:

> I have the honour to call your attention to the fact that commercial cablegrams are generally delivered in the morning and, in consequence of the present arbitrary law by which the Adelaide time is made one hour later than that of Melbourne and Sydney, South Australian merchants are placed at a great disadvantage, their competitors having one hour to act on the cablegrams before the local commercial men are in receipt of theirs. And it is therefore considered necessary by the committee of this chamber, in the interests of the commercial community and the public generally, to move for some alteration so that the colonial times might be as nearly as possible assimilated.

This was a communication from the Secretary of the Chamber of Commerce, read to this Parliament on 19 October 1898—just over 88 years ago. Another view was, however, put on behalf of other interests. Mr William Archibald told this House on 25 October 1898:

> The question was of vital moment to workers, to whom it was important that the working day should be completed in daylight in winter, and if they tinkered with the present system it could not be done.

The House finally agreed to move the clock forward so that South Australia was only 30 minutes, rather than an hour, behind Sydney and Melbourne. The sentiments in support of that move expressed on behalf of business interests were understandable at the time.

However, with every tick of the clock since, those disadvantages have been disappearing with the advent of the telex, STD, telephone recording systems, facsimile machines, a host of other electronic paging and communications equipment, and more flexible working hours which all bridge the time gap. But what have not disappeared are the disadvantages to workers and to families in fiddling with our time again. The business lobby was successful in 1898. Central Standard Time was fixed at the meridian of 142.5 degrees east of Greenwich—9.5 hours ahead of Greenwich Mean Time.

However, I believe the Government, in wanting to go that step further, to put South Australia on the same time zone as the Eastern States, needs to do much more than simply repeat the arguments advanced almost 90 years ago. I find it surprising today—in this age of instant and mass communication—that the arguments have not advanced on those put in the horse and buggy era. To me, the arguments of the Government and those in business who support this measure have not been convincing. They are not sufficient reasons to turn the clock further forward—to make it midday in Adelaide when the sun is directly overhead in Honiara. Granted, there are some attractions, but they become more superficial the more one examines this question.

Let me admit that I am one of many who did not, until this change became a real possibility, look much beyond the superficial arguments. I will now deal with some of them. The views of some business people are probably best summarised by the report entitled 'South Australia, a Strategy for the Future', published in September 1982 by the State Development Council. It had this to say:

> The half hour time difference between South Australia and the Eastern States places South Australians at a considerable disadvantage in their business and trading relations. When different lunch breaks are taken into account, daily communication time is cut by up to 90 minutes. This presents problems for local businesses with Eastern States markets and is a difficulty which has to be considered by firms intending to locate or have sections of their operations based in Adelaide. There seems to be considerable advantages in a switch to Eastern Standard Time for South Australia. The council realises this would present some problems for centres in the Far West of the State and feels that they should have an option to remain on Central Standard Time.

This recommendation is now embodied in the legislation before the House. Members would note that, while it referred to 'considerable advantages' arising from a move to Eastern Standard Time, it did not quantify them in terms of savings in costs or jobs and investments. While the council did, without quantification, refer to increased investment potential, one businessman has gone even further during the current debate to say that South Australia will get no more new investment if this move is not supported.

This is an argument the House cannot and should not accept. It quite simply defies history, ignores the investment in South Australia which has taken place over the past 90 years, and defies the fact that the multi-billion dollar investment in recent years in the Cooper Basin and at Roxby Downs has taken place without any regard whatsoever for the time difference. It is, in fact, one of the most superficial reasons I have ever heard for any measure ever put before this House. It is patent nonsense.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: I have noticed that the economy of Western Australia is expanding quite well, thank you very much, with a significant time lapse on the Eastern States of Australia. Let us consider further the argument that it places obstacles in the way of contact with Eastern States markets. I am surprised that the State Government would join this argument given its endorsement of the flexitime system. Under that system, public servants are required to be at their desks only within the core hours of 10 a.m. to noon and 2 p.m. to 4 p.m.

If the State Government really believes that being half an hour out of step with the Eastern States poses major difficulties for business, what does this say for dealings between the public and private sectors in South Australia, or for dealings between the South Australian public sector and those in other States under flexitime arrangements? Flexitime means that communications can be inconvenienced

for more than 90 minutes each day. In discussing this matter with business people, I have found the source of greatest irritation to be the half hour difference. It seems they would not mind so much if it was a full hour, but half an hour is neither here nor there. There is something in this.

I understand that there are 253 standard times adopted around the world. All but 14 of these are based on hourly meridians of longitude. The exceptions are Afghanistan, Burma, Newfoundland, the Cocos Islands, the Cook Islands, India, Iran, Lord Howe Island, Nauru, Norfolk Island, Nepal, and Sri Lanka as well as South Australia and the Northern Territory.

Members will see from that list that South Australia is keeping some strange company, I would suggest, however, against this must be weighed the fact that a number of countries have more time zones than Australia without suffering disadvantages. Canada, for instance, has six time zones. The United States has four on normal time. If the New York and Chicago stock exchanges, the largest in the world, can operate efficiently on an hour's time difference, why is half an hour an impediment to South Australia's financial dealings with the other States? Mexico also has four time zones. Russia, of which the honourable member would know a little, has 11. Indonesia, like Australia, has three time zones, and surely, if this was such a disadvantage, Indonesia, with all the economic problems it has, would also be doing something about it.

Any fair, objective conclusion from an analysis of these facts is that the problems which different times zones are said to cause to business are more imaginary than real. Certainly, the Deputy Premier's second reading explanation suffered from the same disadvantage as most of the representations supporting this move.

It lacks specifics. It fails to quantify any specific benefits to South Austalians, while it simply glosses over the disadvantages to the lifestyle of the average family in South Australia as in metropolitan Adelaide. The Deputy Premier referred to a Chamber of Commerce and Industry survey about this proposal. He mentioned the results, but what he did not talk about was the number of chamber members who respond to the survey. It was only 6 percent of the chamber's membership. In any survey, by any standard, that is a very poor response. The first thing, the fundamental thing it shows, is that the issue being surveyed is not one of major importance to those being asked the questions. This was confirmed by a statement in the *Advertiser* on 13 October by the President of the chamber (Mr Maslen), who said:

> It's not a big issue with us. It was going to be convenient for those who had contact with the Eastern States. So far as gaining or losing jobs is concerned, it's not going to make any difference.

The House should see this survey and the chamber's official view in their full context—not the narrow one the Deputy Premier presented to the House. In relation to supposed advantages to business, where is the Government's consistency when we have the Premier talking about the importance of the Northern Territory as a market for South Australia and the need for closer trade ties, when his Deputy wants to put us out of kilter with Territory time on the grounds that CST disadvantages South Australian business? There is no consistency of view.

The Deputy Premier also referred in his second reading explanation to a statement that I made when this latest proposal of the Government was first announced in September. He quoted two words from what was a full statement: he quoted me as saying the proposal has 'considerable merit'. It does have merit, looked at superficially, as I admit was the case until I investigated this matter more fully. Again, however, the Deputy Premier is guilty of giving only some of the story, because that was not all I said. Let me quote further from that statement:

> It is most important that we give adequate thought to the people of Eyre Peninsula and on the Far West Coast, as the time change would complicate life for them. Problems obviously would arise in the communications area and with television and radio programming if two time zones were established, and travelling from one zone to another could create difficulty. The Liberal Party has been developing a policy on the whole question of time zones and daylight saving, and this has been done in conjunction with organisations and people affected by change. The pros and cons of any proposal must be considered in depth, but a decision must be made once and for all so that we can put an end to years of argument and speculation.

That statement carried with it the very clear message that the measure needed to be considered in depth and that all those affected by it—those disadvantaged as well as those advantaged—needed to be considered. Here we are talking about a move to EST, not an alteration to daylight saving. They are separate issues. Just as in April the Government announced a proposal for a permanent division of the State into two time zones (presumably because it believed such a move would have considerable merit) but then refined its attitude, so have I.

However, I have done so in full consultation with a wide range of people—in full consideration of the wide community interest and family units in Adelaide as well as those in other parts of South Australia. The Government has not and, speaking of a change of mind, the Dunstan Government in 1971 specifically rejected any move to EST Of course, the Deputy Premier did not mention that.

In his second reading explanation he talked about 'the impression of South Australia's remoteness', 'the opportunity to maximise the benefits of South Australia's unique summer climate', 'time or cost disadvantage' of the Adelaide money market. These are vague terms. While the Deputy Premier had little more to offer in support of the Bill, he glossed over, with gross understatement, the disadvantages to South Australia. He referred to 'some minor inconvenience to some people'. I suggest, rather, that there will be more than minor inconvenience if this Bill goes through, and the greatest inconvenience will be caused to this Government, because there would be uproar amongst the general community if this was inflicted on them.

Let me put forward some of the specific reasons why this measure, on full reflection, must be opposed. Had South Australia been on Eastern Standard Time this year, the sun would not have risen in Adelaide before 7.45 a.m. on 58 consecutive days during winter—during all of June and for 27 days of July. Taking this further, on 156 days of the year, between 3 April and 5 September, the sun would not have risen before 7 a.m. In other words, virtually all of the community would have been forced to rise in the dark for five months of this year. This has serious implications for lifestyles and families. What about the family in which both parents work? All members must be aware that often this means children are sent off to school before 8 a.m. In one specific case of which I know, a metropolitan school principal has sent out a circular about problems associated with children needing to be dropped off at school at an early hour. The principal is most concerned about these children being left in unsupervised schoolgrounds now. Under EST, that problem would be compounded—such children would be dropped at school in the dark on many school days during the year.

It is also now common practice for many schoolchildren to have to catch more than one bus to school, meaning that they need to leave home well before 8 a.m. Here again, I am talking about metropolitan area experience—not problems isolated to small communities on the Far West Coast,

as members opposite like to tell the story. Such people would be extremely disadvantaged by this move. In these regions the problems are, of course, magnified. Under EST it would be common during winter for people to be still driving with their car headlights on at 9 a.m. Yet often schoolchildren in country regions have to leave for school as early as 7 a.m. because of the distance they need to travel. By this measure, the House would be condemning them to standing on the roadside in the dark for much of the year waiting for the school bus.

The Deputy Premier says, glibly, that flexible school hours can be adopted to meet such circumstances, but this will only cause further problems in those situations where both parents work and have to leave home at an early hour, because of work commitments. Belatedly, the Minister of Recreation and Sport has come into this argument today to talk about a transfer to EST, providing greater safety for schoolchildren involved in after hours sports. This is nonsense. The earliest the sun set in Adelaide this year was 5.11 p.m. allowing almost two hours daylight at the end of the day for school sport and practice. Against this must be weighed the problems that I have mentioned (faced by all schoolchildren, not just those who play sport) of being forced to travel to school in the dark. As a parent I do not want my children leaving home by pushbike or catching a bus or train in the dark, as they would, under this legislation, be required to do for a large part of the year.

Turning to the workplace, the problems are not, as the Government suggests, confined to rural South Australia and more particularly the West Coast. Industries with early starts would be affected in metropolitan Adelaide as well. For example, the building and construction industry has a traditional 7 a.m. start. Is it the intention of the Government to add to the safety problems of those who work in high rise developments by forcing them to work for prolonged periods in the dark? The same applies to road gangs, to power workers, to E&WS workers. The alternative is to change working hours, but this would only lead to claims which would increase labour costs. Looking at another key sector of our work force, in manufacturing industry, our single largest employer, production usually commences at 7.30 a.m. This means that workers involved would be forced to travel to work in the dark for much of the year, with all the implications that has for road safety, as well as having to contend with the added nuisance and inconvenience of getting up in the dark for much longer.

I also wonder whether the State Government has considered what further inefficiencies two time zones would impose on its own operations. There are 17 State Government Departments with offices in the proposed western zone which would lose three hours a day in communication time with the eastern zone. In addition, seven Commonwealth offices are in the same position. The Government obviously has listened intently to the representations of metropolitan television stations on this matter, but it has ignored the problems to be forced on country media under a two zone system, and the ABC, I might add, from its Collinswood address. It has ignored, for example, the problems the ABC will face with AO programmes which begin at 8.30 in the eastern zone during summer. Because it broadcasts all its programs through the Aussat satellite, television programming cannot be split for time zones. As a result, AO programs would come on at 7.30 and the main news from that channel at 6 p.m.

Referring to the media generally, I am aware that many journalists are concerned that a transfer to EST will result in more networking of programs from Melbourne and Sydney, putting at risk jobs and local content of programs like news and current affairs. I suspect, as well, that the move would result in declining adult television audiences because of more daylight at the end of the day.

In Adelaide under EST, the sun would not have set before 8.45 p.m. on 72 days during December, January and February. The latest sunset would have been 9.4 p.m. on nine consecutive days during January. Twilight, of course, lasts for much longer. It is not when the sun sets—it is that twilight period. In this respect, it is interesting to note that astronomical twilight will continue until almost 11 p.m. during that period to which I am referring.

All of this does, of course, have major implications for families with younger children. Anyone with younger children, who has experienced the problems at home, can well identify with what I am saying. Even with daylight saving, these implications are apparent in the heavier workload which crisis care centres, women's shelters and crisis accommodation houses are forced to take on during summer. Calls to them increase by up to one-third in the summer months because of factors associated with family tensions, difficulty with children, and alcohol. It is the experience of people who work in these centres that, the more leisure time people have as a result of daylight saving, the more this causes the sort of problems they must deal with. This situation will get worse under EST.

I suggest in fact that, rather than pose some minor inconvenience for some people, as the Deputy Premier suggests, a move to EST would cause quite massive inconvenience to very many people throughout the State—not just on the West Coast—in Adelaide as well as country towns. It would be disruptive to family life. It would be disruptive to communities and it would be disruptive to many businesses here in Adelaide.

We know this Government has never cared about country people. That is clearly identified by its policy decisions. It appears it is also uncaring of families, of children. It has gone to pot in more ways than one. Mr Deputy Speaker, the proponents of the Bill have failed the test of justification. I have had no more than a handful of letters from individual business people and business organisations in favour of this proposal. I have had well over 200 letters against it from people throughout South Australia and in metropolitan Adelaide. The business representatives have disappointed me, to say the least. I have respected the right to do so of those organisations that decided to advertise their point of view on television and in the press, but I do not believe that their arguments were persuasive.

They have suggested there may be little community resistance to this move and that it ought to be given at least a trial. They do, however, labour under a misapprehension. I doubt whether they are in touch with the wider community view. If they are, then they are being quite selfish for commercial reasons: self-interest.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Self-interest. This is one of these things which have to be experienced to be fully appreciated, and I am confident that, if the South Australian community is ever exposed to the full impact of this measure, it will rebel: and we can do without that.

Some correspondence to me, from some business people, has amounted to lecturing of the Liberal Party on its obligations to recognise private enterprise concerns. I take this opportunity to say that it appears to me that some in business in South Australia need to look at their real priorities. I have found it incredible that some should attach such importance to this measure when they have remained silent on other proposals of far more importance in the long term to them and to the State economy—and here I refer

to proposals involving workers compensation, industrial safety, wages policy and tax policy. South Australia will have an investment drought if we do not get these issues right here in South Australia—not superficial measures such as that brought before the House.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: In response to the Deputy Premier's interjection, 'Nobody loves you', I can tell the Deputy Premier that the majority of South Australians, people with young families, who will have to persevere if this measure gets through well understand that the Liberal Party at least is prepared to stand up and be counted, to express in this Parliament the view that they will be inconvenienced and disadvantaged. We are prepared to weigh up the pros and the cons, the advantages and disadvantages, and on any fair, reasonable and balanced assessment the disadvantages far outweigh the advantages. For that reason we will be opposing this Bill.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I welcome the opportunity to speak on this Bill. The gyrations of the Leader of the Opposition are rather interesting, because, as most of us on this side would be aware, he has been thrashing around now for nigh on 12 months to try to find an issue, and suddenly he has been pressured by the rural rump again, that the minority of people out in the country . . .

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will take his seat, please. I call the House to order and, unless this debate is conducted properly, I will start warning people and then naming them. I am determined that this House will behave in the way in which the rest of the people of South Australia would like it to behave. The honourable member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: Thank you for your protection, Sir. It is rather interesting to see how very quickly a man draws blood in this place when he hits the nail on the head. That lot over there are like Paddy's dogs: they can dish it out, but they cannot take it. I sat here and listened—like the gentleman I am—to what was being put forward by the so-called Leader of the Opposition: not very bright, indeed. He did not even address—

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Go back and shear your sheep! The member for Victoria has not been in this place very long, but he has made his mark as one of those jackboot people to whom we have become accustomed, with his kicking of the trade union movement. It is well known in trade union circles how he likes to kick the hell out of the trade union movement.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: That is a rather interesting comment. He said, 'There is no question about that,' that he likes to kick the hell out of the trade union movement, so his contribution will not be worth a cold pie, in my opinion. They talk about minority pressure—the Leader of the Opposition particularly spoke about minority pressure and how the trade union movement was pressuring the Government. I would suggest that the reverse is the case, given the stance of the Liberal Party: some time ago it supported this measure but then suddenly, for some unknown reason (or maybe it was pressure from the rural rump), the Liberal Party decided to change its attitude to this measure, in an effort to embarrass the Government. As I have said, members opposite have been thrashing around looking for an issue but have not yet come up with a real issue.

It really is the most pathetic performance that I have seen in my time in this place. They are an absolutely hopeless bunch. I will not say more; it would be unkind. I would think that had this been such an issue I would have received telephone calls from people from all walks of life, from schools, child-care centres, the elderly, business people and local people in the community operating hotels, pubs and clubs, as members opposite know only too well (and indeed the member for Bragg could attest to this) that I am well known in my electorate. However, I have received no such response from my local community and I certainly have not had the response that is perceived by the Leader of the Opposition. The calls that I have received in my office have been rather interesting—

Mr Olsen: They didn't contact you because—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON: The Leader of the Opposition is either a fool or a knave, or both, as he has a very short memory in relation to the lighting of Football Park, so let him get back into his box. He knows damn well that I am not one to be pressured by him or anyone else, so let us not hear that drivel from him. We do get a bit sick of that. The number of representations made to me have been rather interesting and they have all been kept on file. One is from a constituent from Frome Crescent, West Lakes. A second is from West Lakes Limited, from a Mr Howell, who put forward some of the views expressed by the Leader of the Opposition—and quite clearly I respect his views, but I certainly do not agree with them. Further, I have received responses from the Rural Youth Movement of South Australia, the Elder Conservatorium of Music, Adelaide University, the Astronomical Society of South Australia, one from Kadina, from the Mayor of Port Lincoln, and from the District Council of Elliston. Then we can get to the positive ones, Sir. So, overall, taking into account the 20 000-odd—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Indeed they do count—

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I say to the member for Chaffey that I am here to represent not only the interests in my electorate. I have referred to the two representations that I have received from people within my electorate; what about all those other people with whom I have canvassed the issue and who have said, 'It is not a real issue, Kevin, I couldn't care less, it doesn't worry me, there are only 24 hours in a day, so what'? So, the real point, as I said before, is that members opposite are thrashing around for an issue. I suggest that, if the issue was so strong, people in my electorate would do as they have done in the past seven years that I have been in this place representing my electorate well: that is, they would ring me and make representations to me, be it at my electorate office, at my home, in the street, or in the pub, the clubs or wherever. But that has not occurred, so let us not be snowed by what members opposite are saying. It is not a fact.

The other question is the matter of industrial safety. God forbid that these hypocrites opposite stand here and talk about industrial health and welfare in the workplace: what they would know would fit on the back of a postage stamp. The only time that they talk about the working class in this country is when it is to support an argument of their own. I ask and challenge them to say what representations have been made to them from the trade union movement or any individual union in respect of this change of hours. Not one representation from a trade union has been made to me. I have not had one representation made to me from any of the unions in South Australia—not one.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Albert Park to resume his seat. I have asked members to cease interjecting and to behave as members of Parliament should behave. I notice that the member for Victoria is on the speaking list, but I assure him that, if he continues to act as he has been acting, he will not be speaking in this debate.

Mr D.S. Baker: Is that a threat?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is a threat. I have now drawn this to the attention of the House, and I promise the House that I will take action. If members want to persist and test me out, let them keep going. The honourable member for Albert Park.

Mr MEIER: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, under which Standing Order did you make that threat to the member for Victoria?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Under the Standing Order of continuously disobeying the Chair. I will produce that Standing Order. I can assure the honourable member that this House will behave itself.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no doubt about it, as the Deputy Leader interjects. I will not have this continuous barrage that is going on. This is the third time that I have had to interrupt. The honourable member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: Thank you very much, Sir. Some of the tactics employed by the Opposition to try to stifle debate in this place are rather interesting.

An honourable member: We are interested in what you have to say.

Mr HAMILTON: No you are not; you are a hypocrite and you know it. You sit there with a smug look on your face and mouth platitudes, but really you do not care for the working class people of this State. The honourable member was quite clearly rejected down my way, and it is only because he stood for a safe Labor seat that he got—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON: It was only because of his standing for a seat that he could not win that he got theGWseat that he now holds.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: If members interject they have got to expect a response.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr HAMILTON: Thank you, Sir, I will. I find it very hard sometimes to contain myself, but I certainly agree with your rulings. The Government's proposal as suggested would bring 97 per cent of the State's population into line with 90 per cent of this country. Members opposite do not like it, and I will be most interested to hear the remainder of their response. But I would ask them to put forward evidence as to the overwhelming rejection by the community of this Bill. If the community is so anti this measure, I am at a loss to understand why members like myself, and other Government members for that matter, have not received very strong and vigorous representations to that effect. I have already explained to the House that I have not received such representations. My own union is in fact quite vocal when it comes to matters that affect the railway industry. Hours worked by members of the ARU cover 24 hours a day and I would have thought that, if it had been such an issue in the trade union movement and in particular my own union, members of that union would have made representations to me. However, not one word, not one scintilla of evidence have I had from the trade union in representations made to my office opposing this measure.

An honourable member: What about safety?

Mr HAMILTON: Indeed, in terms of safety, I have raised the question before, although the member for Mitcham interjects. If it was such an issue, I believe that my union would have been one of the first to make representations, and as I am still a member of that organisation I would have expected representations to have been made to me along the lines of, 'Kevin, we are opposed to this measure and have reservations about it for the following reasons.' No-one on this side of the House, or indeed the whole House, is more concerned than I am about the question of safety in the railway industry. I worked there for 25 years and, from the contributions that I made in this House, members would know that I am concerned about one of the most dangerous industries. When members opposite raise that argument, it is just a furphy. I support the Bill and I look forward to its speedy passage through this House.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): We have just witnessed a demonstration of the lack of quality of debate and argument coming from the Government. Continually we have in Parliament this deficiency that, when the Government puts forward a proposition, it is not adequately debated by Government members. If the Government believes in its legislation, all members of the Government should speak to it. The member for Albert Park has just indulged for some 10 or 15 minutes in a diatribe in which he said nothing. In fact, during that whole period, the only thing that he demonstrated was that none of his residents think very much of him.

Mr Lewis: Nor the trade union movement.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Nor the trade union movement, because they are not talking to him, either. If one analyses the member for Albert Park's speech (and it probably justifies only two minutes reference), one will find that he has had no contact with his residents. It is a somewhat different situation in Mitcham. I have received at least 30 letters from constituents in my electorate and beyond.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: Mr Deputy Speaker, you would understand that people are not prone to write; very few people correspond with their local member of Parliament unless they have a grave difficulty. The honourable member opposite, as well as every member of this House, understands that. To receive 30 letters on a topic of current interest indicates a considerable degree of feeling. Besides those 30 letters, I have received numerous phone calls and visitations to my office from various people. The overwhelming opinion has been against the move to Eastern Standard Time. It is not simply a matter of saying that it is the rural rump, because I know that there is feeling against this move by members of the general community.

For the benefit of members opposite who do not bother to keep in touch with their electorates, I inform the House that difficulties caused by daylight saving will be exacerbated by moving to Eastern Standard Time. The Opposition specifically referred to the fact that it did not want to change the daylight saving legislation, because it believed that that legislation was to the general benefit of the community. However, people have expressed concerns about issues associated with daylight saving which will be further exacerbated by the passing of this Bill. If members opposite had been in touch with their electorates, they would understand that many elderly people in their areas—

Mrs Appleby interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: If the member for Hayward thinks that she does not have any elderly people in her electorate, she should do some doorknocking and she would discover that that is not the case. She would find also that many elderly people resent the fact that they have to eat their evening meal during the very hot part of the day. If they are fortunate enough to have air-conditioning, then their costs increase quite substantially because, as everybody understands, under this regime electricity charges have increased quite considerably. A large number of elderly people have contacted my office, either by letter, by telephone or personally, to say that they do not want a further extension of the daylight saving hours.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: If members opposite wish to say that they have no regard for the elderly people of this State, let them stand up and say so. If that is their contribution to Parliament, at least let the electorate know that the elderly people of this State are disfranchised. Also, I have received a number of representations from young families. I hope that members opposite would have also received such representations. Members know that parents with young families have great difficulty in putting their children to bed, not only when it is hot, but also when the sun streams through the windows.

A good parent (and I hope that most members have some feelings for their children) will find that, if the children are very young, they have to go to bed at 7.30 or, if they are a little older, perhaps 8.30, 9.30 or 10 o'clock. Of course, during midsummer it is still daylight during those hours. Parents of young families also have said that they have problems with air-conditioning. With daylight saving the hottest part of the day is around 3.30 or 4.30 and, if we adopt EST, that time is extended further and will occur around tea time. Not only do those parents have to cope with the problems of the heat at tea time, but also they have to cope with the problem of putting their children to bed. I have received a number of representations from that quarter; in fact, I have received more representations on this topic than almost any other issue.

I was rather interested to hear the comments of the Premier in his second reading explanation in relation to the business interests in this State. Before I formed an opinion on this matter I canvassed a number of people who I knew had interstate links, because they either did business with interstate companies or had interstate offices. Everyone said that the existing time difference caused no difficulty whatsoever. Further, half of those contacted said that they believed the half hour difference was an advantage. Of course, I was a little nonplussed to hear that comment, because I understood that business people wanted to link in with interstate times. They told me that it allowed them the opportunity to deal with their interstate counterparts early in the day and to get on with the domestic business when the doors opened at 9 a.m.

After canvassing a large number of people in the business community, I discovered that their attitude towards the impact of EST was either neutral or negative. I do not know where the Premier obtained his information that there was a widespread demand in the business community for EST, because that is at variance with my survey. It is also somewhat at variance with the experiences of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the Employers Federation. No doubt, there are certain groups within South Australia who would benefit from it, such as the finance industry, which has said for a number of years that it would like to see changes made in the time zone so that it could link in with interstate, but the point has been made already very adequately by the Leader that those States which do not line up with Eastern Standard Time do not seem to have been overly disadvantaged by the difference. Despite its current economic difficulties, Queensland, along with Western Australia, has the strongest growth profile of all States, yet it has a time difference, particularly during summer. If one follows the Premier's logic, one could suggest that we should reject this proposition out of hand for that very reason. If time suddenly made a difference, one would find the economies of Western Australia and Queensland suddenly disappearing because they could not adequately attune their communications systems owing to the time difference.

As members would realise, the situation is somewhat different. If the time difference is used properly, it can be of advantage to South Australia. Most businesses in South Australia use it properly and they find it an advantage. They start work a little earlier and perhaps they leave work a little earlier. They take advantage of the difference because it means that they can address domestic and State needs during the business day.

I resent the proposition that we divide the State. The Leader referred to this suggestion. It is interesting to note that the Minister has drawn lines on maps on, I think, at least three occasions trying to work out where the boundary—the magic line—should be. If one steps over that line suddenly they are an hour behind. The difficulty that the Minister has experienced in designating that part of the State that shall remain in a different time zone indicates the difficulty that the Government has had with this proposition. Each time a line has been drawn on the map, someone has said, 'That will not assist our cause.' The Minister has finally come up with a dog leg that somehow represents what he believes to be an adequate boundary that will lessen the disadvantages experienced by people in the western part of the State.

I refer briefly to the energy consequences. I have already referred to the problems experienced by elderly people and young families during the heat of the day. Members would realise that temperatures at five or six o'clock during daylight saving are far higher than they are at the same time prior to daylight saving. I telephoned the Electricity Trust and asked whether it could supply a measure of increased electricity consumption. While the trust can give no measure, it agrees that the change would have a significant effect on electricity consumption. The reasons are many. One is that that is the time when people come home from their air-conditioned offices and crave more air-conditioning. The second reason is that our lifestyle is such that more and more people are now using air-conditioning as a form of relief.

The first reason is probably the most relevant: the fact is that people have become used to air-conditioning as a way of life to provide relief in their workplace, and they expect the same when they get home if the temperature is too high. On many occasions during the summer—probably for 50 per cent of the summer—people use their air-conditioners. The half hour difference will mean in some cases another half hour consumption of what is quite often a very expensive mode of cooling, particularly if people use refrigerated cooling. So, there are energy consequences in the change to EST.

The member for Albert Park threw away industrial safety and said that he had had no representations from the union movement. I have received no representations from the union movement on anything. They do not seem to be willing to talk to the member for Albert Park too much unless they want an occupational safety Bill or a workers

compensation Bill that will provide them with increased benefits or greater power. I do not necessarily think that they are too interested in Eastern Standard Time. I even question the validity of the honourable member's remarks about industrial safety. The Leader outlined the problems that would occur in the building and construction industry, particularly during the winter months, as a result of the change. Members would appreciate that that is not the only industry that would be affected.

We saw some nefarious examples from the Minister of Recreation and Sport in the newspaper about children coming home from school during daylight hours, but I ask, 'What about the other end of the scale—children going to school in darkness?' That is the situation in many rural communities in the depths of winter, and members should understand that people and their children in metropolitan areas will be in that position because often daylight does not occur until 7.30 a.m. Many people in the metropolitan area leave home at 7 o'clock, 7.30 or 7.45 to catch buses to go to the school of their choice. Is the Minister of Recreation and Sport suggesting that somehow the number of people at one end of the scale are not offset by the number of people at the other end of the scale? I contend that the number of people who would be disadvantaged at the beginning of the day would far outweigh those who would be disadvantaged at the end of the day. If one considers the hours of daylight in the winter, that is proven.

My objective in speaking was to put clearly on the record that many people in the metropolitan area reject this proposition. Many people who suffer some element of disadvantage due to daylight saving and who know they will suffer further disadvantage under EST reject it. It is important that the concerns and interests of the business community be canvassed in this House. I have found from my survey of people in industry that either they were neutral or that they believed that the change to EST would have not particularly damaging consequences but would be a negative component in the system.

I congratulate the Leader of the Opposition for what I believe was an exceptionally good and excellent presentation to this House on all the factors impacting on the question of EST. My position prior to this debate, until I had actually canvassed the issue amongst my constituents and the wider business community, was that I was vaguely in favour of the change. It is good that this issue has been raised in the House, because at least we can encourage community response on the issues that are affecting people. It made me appreciate a little more that daylight saving has been a great bonus to metropolitan dwellers and, indeed, to many rural dwellers, but that it has also been a disadvantage to some. That has been brought home clearly. We are talking about the net benefit and the interests of the State. We are talking about a great State, which has a lot going for it. We do not need EST. I really do not know why we have to join with the Eastern States. We will be joining with New South Wales and Victoria—

Mr Blacker: Selling our soul.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes, indeed. Why can we not be different from the other States? Why should we embrace New South Wales and Victoria with all their problems? I join with the Leader of the Opposition in rejecting the Bill.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): The subject of an EST conversion for South Australia has not really caused a great ripple, in my district anyway. The lady at the Meals on Wheels kitchen said that she was not too interested in it, and I have received a letter from an astronomer, who is also not too interested in it. So, I believe that the public in general are fairly apathetic about the proposition and are probably prepared to give it a go. On the other side, I have received letters from industry, and the points made regarding the connection between South Australia and the Eastern States are valid, but even then I have some doubts about just how it will end up when there is a variation, for instance, between Western Australia, South Australia and the Eastern States. Of course, the Northern Territory and Queensland will be in different time zones again at different times of the year. So it continues throughout the world.

I am not totally convinced about the proposition. I was interested to hear the percentage of the members of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry who were surveyed: I understand that only 6 per cent—a small percentage—of the membership was surveyed. I am also very interested to note the position of the media. They are certainly very strong on this issue, and I am not quite sure whether that is purely a pecuniary interest in the rationalisation of their services—

Mr Blacker interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: As the member for Flinders says, it will certainly be the tail, which will give them common times for shows. There will be no recording or replaying. I believe that their interest is certainly totally motivated by the dollar. I can understand the concern of the people in the west of South Australia. There are certainly problems.

I do not believe that it is the Eastern Standard Time conversion that really causes the problems: it is daylight saving. The principle of splitting the State worries me. A State should be a State, united and working together. We are going to have a diversion within the State, east and west, and to me that is not a good thing. In his second reading explanation the Minister said that steps were under way to fix that. To be candid, I am confused about the effect of it. I am prepared to give it a go, perhaps with a sunset clause in the legislation, just to see what happens.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: There could be a sunset clause on the Eastern Standard Time section, because I am not sure how it will affect us. I know that there are industries, apart from the media barons who wish to utilise the system, and there may be some advantages with a common time. What really worries me is the concern and effort that has been put into this issue, which I really do not think is a world breaking issue, by the people who can affect public opinion. I refer to the media and the Chamber of Commerce. There are, impinging on our State, much more serious things such as tariff changes to the textile industry, problems with the citrus and wine industries, and index problems with the customs variations.

I refer also to such problems as the intended changes to the sugar industry and, as announced last week, the changes to the tariff of ICI at Port Adelaide where thousands of jobs are at risk. I have not heard the Chamber of Commerce or the media say anything about that. Not one word has been said about the jobs that are to go down the tube, but they are very interested and put a lot of time, effort and editorial space into rationalising their own industry. From what I can see, they do not give a damn about the working people in this State. The change may rationalise the Stock Exchanges of this country, and there may be some benefits. I heard a financial expert in an interview on the radio today saying that he did not really think the change would do us much good. He said that there might be some job-sharing in the financial area but he really did not think we would leap ahead.

As I said earlier, I am concerned about that aspect also, and with the proviso that we can adjust it at some future

date if it does not work, I will give it a go. The promotion and support of the media, which has forgotten all the other areas of distress in the State, concerns me. If we are going to do something to really get the State moving, we must look after the jobs in the State and not just worry about a half hour in time.

I have not seen one serious editorial in the paper about the tariffs, for instance. Only the other day Tony Baker put a whole page out about the submarine project, which is a great project that has really been promoted magnificently by our State. Full credit must go to Jim Duncan, the man in charge, who has done a magnificent job. Tony Baker put out a page on that, and there were other columns about the rationalisation of Eastern Standard Time. However, there was not one word about the other matter, and that concerns me.

In conclusion, I refer to the Minister's second reading explanation, in which the Minister said that he believed that all the groups and individuals who had been involved in the debate in the community thought that the State should at least give it a go, and I agree with that. I will give it a go, but I would like to see the sunset clause brought in.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): As the member for Mitcham rebutted the remarks made by the member for Albert Park, I do likewise. The honourable member pointed out to the House that he had no representations from his constituents or from the trade union movement. We will give him the benefit of the doubt and presume that he has received representations on other matters—in which case, he would have received a great number of representations on the question of the decriminalisation of marijuana. He did not say a damn thing about that. He chose to sit back and say nothing whatsoever about the opinions that had been expressed to him. So, the public, of course, have perceived that he is irrelevant. There is no point in contacting the man if he does not represent their interests when they do so. Why bother to take the trouble of pursuing him over the next issue on which they feel strongly?

Let us consider the Government's tactics in bringing this measure before the House at this time. To my mind it is clearly for no other reason than that the Government wants to push the proposition to legalise prostitution and the decriminalisation of marijuana, which matters have been in the public mind, away from public attention, and instead to put this matter before public attention. That is the real reason for it.

It took 10 minutes for the member for Albert Park to say one word about this measure. The rest of his time was taken up abusing me and my colleagues and reflecting on the reasons why we have chosen, as individuals, to oppose this proposition. Of course, that did the honourable member no credit, and to his dismay, in due course I am sure, he will discover that his speech, along with those other speeches that have been made on this question, will be read very widely throughout this State.

I speak with some confidence about the matter that the honourable member says he has regarded as irrelevant because of the other matters on which he suggested that he would have received representations. I also question the integrity of that remark, because a number of railways employees in the town in which I live, namely, Tailem Bend, have spoken to me and expressed their dismay and opposition to this proposition. He now comes to this place from the Railways Union, along the ladder of the usual trade union promotion arrangement, ultimately into the Parliament (that is, if you can wangle the numbers with your mates and say, 'This one is for me and that one is for you'). I know that those members of the Railways Union and my constituents feel very strongly about this matter. They have told me that they have contacted members of the Labor Party. I have no doubt that either they are or he is telling fibs. I will leave them to judge the position.

Notwithstanding the extent to which the member for Albert Park regrettably drew attention to the indifference with which he is treated by his constituents on this issue and other issues, he went on to say how he had received submissions supporting the proposition from business leaders, and I think trade union leaders were included in that group. If that is so, all I can say, as I have said before, is that this is an illustration of the extent to which big business and big unions get into bed with big government to make sleazy deals, because that is what this is. There is no doubt that it suits some big employers. The regrettable thing about it all is that they could have solved the problems by communicating with their head offices—those poor fools who occupy the management positions of big business corporations who have written to me and, I am sure, other members in this place. They could have solved that problem simply by starting work a half hour earlier every day, and the 80 or so people in this city so affected represent something less than the interests of the other more than one million people who live in this State. I do not see any reason why we should not deregulate the labour market prior to the introduction of this proposition.

It is important to recognise that the costs of certain business operations in this State will rise consequent upon the passing of this measure. It is argued by the networking large electronic media groups that the Bill will reduce their costs. Other businesses with head offices in other States (because this political Party now in government has made sure over the past 15 years that few head offices remain in this State, so it is branch offices that are here) say the same thing. Surely, they together could have simply asked the Government to deregulate the labour market so that the incidence of costs did not fall on country people and on small business people. Now, if one works in a business where sunlight is used as the means of lighting the operation, servicing it when things go wrong and equipment breaks down will have to be done outside working hours far more often than it is at present. Accordingly, penalty rates will have to be paid to the repairmen who fix broken-down equipment or restore the power supply. This kind of service is provided by trade unionists who work under awards that are related not to sun time but to clock time, the artificial expression of time. The activities of the repairman are not related to the relevance of sun time and to the kind of activity in which people engage properly and necessarily as a consequence of it.

This morning, while driving to town, I heard the Minister of Recreation and Sport say over the radio that he believed that the Bill would be of considerable advantage to parents because it would allay their fear of their children returning home after sports practice in the dark, especially in the winter months. That is not all the schoolchildren by any means. There has never been any stated correlation between child molestation and travelling home after school sports practice in darkness during the winter months. Certainly, it has never been suggested as a reason for changing our time, but now the Minister trots it out as a reason for this legislation. Yet he produces no figures, so his argument has no integrity: it is spurious and illogical because at the other end of the day, as has been pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition, all children will have to rise and travel to school in the dark.

At any rate, such arguments only illustrate that we are comfortably off geographically—in relation to the equator and the South Pole because, the year round, most of our day is bathed in daylight, whereas in most of Europe and North America huge populations live in a situation where it is dark at 4 p.m. or shortly thereafter and still dark at 10 a.m. Indeed, in some cases the position is even more extreme. Yet they still fix their time as nearly as possible according to the sun time that is prevalent and, on a nation by nation basis, they select the median closest to the meridian on which the conventional one-hour interval is established.

The Leader of the Opposition referred to the other 13 places around the world which stick to that general convention, but we are not in that group. We are half an hour behind what would be the normal time zone or we are half an hour ahead of it, whereas we should be on a meridian that runs through not a point east of Broken Hill but a point in Spencer Gulf in terms of the way in which we fix our time an hour behind the Eastern States. There is no good reason for transferring our time to EST. Indeed, there is good reason why, having established CST where it is, at a point just east of Broken Hill and east of Hamilton in Victoria, if there is to be a standard time zone, all the Eastern States, South Australia and the Northern Territory should adopt Central Standard Time. If we believe that it will enhance the efficiency of our industrial operations, that is the meridian on which we should base our time and leave Lord Howe Island and Norfolk Island in their own time zone.

I have made the point (and perhaps it needs to be understood more clearly) that primary producers are probably the largest group of people affected by this legislation: they must work by sun time, not clock time. Their crops are not ready to reap merely because the hour hand of the clock has moved on. They are ready to reap only because there has been sufficient sunlight to reduce moisture levels to enable threshing to occur. The same thing applies to horticulturists and market gardeners, at the other end of the day, when they might like to finish their work and be off home towards dusk, they must stay in the field (if they are, say, irrigation farmers) or they must return there if they have electric motors that have to be switched on so that in the process of pumping their water they do not incur the wrath of the Electricity Trust and have to pay a higher tariff than they would otherwise pay. Whether the trust will change its time clocks with a switch to EST at no cost to consumers, I do not know, but I doubt it.

This Bill will adversely affect the capacity of the primary producer to make a suitable time when he can order on the telephone from the major commercial centres during the course of his day's work. People, who live on Eyre Peninsula and in the north-west of the State, will shift their buying preferences from Adelaide to Perth: the people in the Mallee will act similarly. Indeed, they have already said they should do so. At present, the tradition is to order spare parts and other goods required quickly from the nearest capital city or major trading centre through the local distributor, but that will not happen any more if this Bill passes, because those people will on many days not start reaping until after midday and, if the header or some other piece of equipment breaks down later in the day, they will come in, eat their lunch after doing a fair stint of work, and make the call.

They would know very well that by the time they got their order accepted in the Adelaide office and had it transferred to the Melbourne office that day, the time being the same, it would be too late for it to be packaged and despatched; so it is not likely to be despatched until the next day. If they telephone Perth—and I will continue telling them to do that, because I refuse to be pushed around in this way by head office operations based in the Eastern States—they will be miles in front—two and a half hours, in fact—and Perth people will still not have begun lunch. They will package the goods, put them on transport and have them here—not only on the West Coast but in the Mallee—late the following day, ready for fitting on the morning of the day after.

To depend on the unreliable sources of supply and the large warehouses of Melbourne and Sydney would be unrealistic, in my experience, because they often take two and sometimes three days to get stuff there, so the sensible thing is to go where one can get the service. Branch offices in Adelaide which have their head offices and inventory (stocks of parts, and the like) in the Eastern States will lose business—and for good reason.

I do not understand the argument advanced by the Stock Exchange. It does not now open at 9 o'clock, half an hour later than the Eastern States stock exchanges, nor does it close merely for one hour at lunch time. It takes quite a break, and it does not hang on until after the Eastern States stock exchanges have closed down and normal business hours have concluded. It is a nonsensical argument to suggest that it will stop the drift of trading away from the Adelaide Stock Exchange: it will not affect the drift of trading to or from the Adelaide Stock Exchange. If those people engaged in trading stocks and shares want to fall into line with the Eastern States, they can ruddy well start trading half an hour earlier, and it will not affect the rest of the world one iota. It certainly would not upset the lifestyles of stockbrokers very much anyway, in my judgment.

I see no advantage to the broader community in enhancing those already controlled environments of work where they have air-conditioning and controlled light intensities. We simply pander to their whims for the sake of the additional profits they believe they will make, without considering the risk and the inconvenience to the remaining work force and the large numbers of schoolchildren who will be inconvenienced at the commencement of the day. Of course, there are tangible illustrations of the increases in costs that will be incurred by people living in rural areas who will have to outlay, as has been pointed out in the most graphic example I can think of, something of the order of $2 000 to $3 000 on the average farm to hold additional grain in storage, having then to reload it and take it to the silo the next day.

I want to give credit to the very sensible public spirited proposition which has been put by Spencer Gulf Telecasters Ltd in opposition to the kind of stupid propaganda put out by the rest of the media in this State.

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

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): Every member will probably know which way I will vote on this occasion. I rise to express my bitter disappointment at the lack of interest in this matter within this Chamber. Just a while ago there were only eight members here, and I would like that on the record: that a debate of such magnitude and such significance to a wide section of this community attracts so little attention and, more particularly, so little participation, particularly by Government members.

I would like to make it patently clear that if the Government proceeds with this measure it is doing so directly against the will of the people in my electorate. A few weeks ago I presented a petition of 11 182 signatures to this Chamber, and I am given to understand that that is the largest petition ever presented to this Parliament from within a single electorate. I have not been able to double check that,

but I understand that is the case. That shows the depth of feeling of the people in my electorate concerning this matter, so if the Government proceeds it is not doing so on the basis that it involves a vote one way or the other: it is proceeding in direct opposition to the opinion of people in my area.

I would like to go through the Minister's second reading explanation and point out some of the absolute mockery the Minister has presented in this case. I do not know who wrote the speech for him, but it is so full of loopholes that one would find it very hard to regard as any sort of rational debate. The Minister starts off with his explanation, then starts talking about a line with which to divide the State. The line then gets doglegged and starts to wiggle round, because there is a little pressure group somewhere along the line which the Minister has to accommodate, so the line develops a series of wiggles and cannot come to a conclusion.

Somewhere along the line there is a necessity for the Government to bend the rules to help itself. The Minister then talks about the support the Government has for this proposal and about the Green Triangle Committee. I was able to get the Minister to accept that the Green Triangle Committee is predominantly made up of Victorian business people—not South Australians. Why should Victorians be influencing this debate—influencing the will of this Government against that of our own business people—and trying to monopolise that particular area?

The matter was put to the joint Victorian/South Australian Border Anomalies Committee. We all know that where there is a time schedule there will be an anomaly. Obviously, that committee would like to shift an anomaly. What they do is divide the State down the middle, instead of having the time zone on the border where it should be—and would be in almost every other place in the world. It has shifted the anomaly from there to another part of the State and referred it to the State Government.

What does the State Government do? It goes along cap in hand and says, 'Yes, jolly fine fellows.' I will give the Minister credit for two things I believe are accurate in his explanation, and I quote from part of it which makes reference to the Daylight Saving Act Amendment Bill considered earlier this year, as follows:

> These amendments and the extension of the period by two weeks in March this year rekindled long standing sectional opposition to daylight saving, particularly from the western region of the State.

That is an admission that it was the Government which highlighted and rekindled this proposal for Eastern Standard Time and daylight saving: it was the Government—and I wish to stress that quite strongly, because the Minister of Labour was canvassing the matter all around my electorate, within his electorate and all around the top of Spencer Gulf, saying that it was the farmers on the west coast who did it; then, in my presence, the Minister said, 'No, it wasn't; it was the farmers further over.' I take exception to that, because it was not the farmers further over who started it at all; it was the Government which, by extending daylight saving by two weeks, 'rekindled' the matter, in the Minister's own words, and set this whole chain of events in motion. So, the Minister of Labour has been proven wrong by the Deputy Premier, and I am glad that that is on record.

When the Government accepted the Hon. Mike Elliott's amendment (that is, the amendment put forward by the Democrats, in February or March this year), the Minister said that the Government would not make use of that power without prior examination of the implications of such a move. I venture to say that the Government has failed in that. It has not examined the implications of that move, and neither has the Minister acted in accordance with undertakings given in this Chamber that he would consult with the affected parties. He has not done that. The only consultation of which I am aware in relation to my area (and no doubt that of the member for Eyre) was a deputation brought to him on the day he gave notice of the legislation being introduced. If that is consultation, then the Minister must be condemned. The Minister condemns himself by this very statement in the second reading explanation:

> In my discussions with these groups and with individuals I have received very strong support. The attitude which I believe is common to all these groups and individuals is that the State should at the very least 'give it a go'.

The Minister goes on and talks about the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, and organisations such as the Metropolitan Television Broadcasters, the Advertiser Ltd, the State Bank, Softwood Holdings, and regional organisations. The Minister said that he had been personally involved in discussions with those people, but he has not been personally involved in discussions with those people who are seriously affected by the legislation. Why not? The Minister is obviously canvassing only a one-sided argument, and we all know that if one wants to win an argument one simply asks the right questions at the right time.

The Chamber of Commerce has been referred to as an organisation that adds weight to the Government's proposal: the second reading explanation states that the Government has given weight to the evidence provided by the Chamber of Commerce and refers to a poll of Chamber of Commerce members which indicated that 57 per cent supported the introduction of EST. Might I point out that the poll was conducted amongst 6 per cent of the members of the Chamber of Commerce and, of that 6 per cent, 57 per cent supported EST. So, the net effect is that a total of only 4 per cent of the members of the Chamber of Commerce have come out and supported EST. To that end that is a pretty meagre amount upon which the Government has placed its entire justification of the legislation.

The Minister then goes on to talk about deviations around Roxby Downs, and so forth, and this is where we start to see all the cynicism of the Government emerging. The second reading explanation refers to Adelaide money market operators and the Stock Exchange. However, any money market worth a pinch of salt operates 24 hours a day. If we have to rely on that half an hour, what is wrong with South Australia? Every other nation in the world adopts time zones relevant to hours of daylight from sunrise to sunset. The Minister went on to say that there are benefits to be derived from the recreation and tourism aspect, but the Minister has not consulted the recreation and tourism people in my electorate—because they are totally opposed to it.

Obviously, the Government proposes to split the State, and the tourism people are totally opposed to that. I attended a meeting of the Eyre Peninsula Tourist Association only last Tuesday, and members of that association were strongly opposed to the proposal. So, again the Minister is flying in the face of some of his own arguments. The Minister goes on to refer to Cooperative Bulk Handling Ltd, and said that the General Manager had advised that silo operations are sufficiently flexible to cope with daylight saving. That is true, but at whose cost? It is not at the cost of the taxpayer but of the grain growers, the producers. They are the ones who must pay the extra time and a half and double time, and pay for the extra storage capacity that must be held on their farms when the silos are not open.

I understand that in the vicinity of 46 000 tonnes of grain is harvested in one hour during the harvest period of the

year, 46 000 tonnes of storage area that must be provided by someone. Obviously, in this case the Government is saying that it will not provide it; Cooperative Bulk Handing will not provide it; and so the farmer must provide those storage areas. So, that is another fallacy. The Minister goes on to say (and I hope that the Minister will consult with one of his colleagues on this):

The effect on shearing times has also been exaggerated. Most shearing takes place in the summer months when there will be sufficient natural early morning light to commence shearing.

The Minister has had the wool pulled over his eyes good and proper on that one, because there is no way in the world that one can conduct shearing operations smack in the middle of summer and in the grass seed season. The Minister has been taken for a ride; he is totally wrong. In our area the bulk of the season starts in mid-June or early June and goes through to mid-November—it is just coming to an end now—and it will recommence in mid-February for autumn shearing and then break off and start again in June. That is the normal run of shearing that occurs in the farming areas. In the pastoral country shearing is undertaken for 12 months of the year, depending on the season, and basically that is from State to State and is not 12 months of the year within the State. So, in relation to that issue the Minister is totally wrong.

The Minister then refers to school hours. I was interested in his comment that most school buses commence their run at about 7.45 a.m. I think it is about time the Minister got out into the country or recalled his days as Minister of Education, as he would find that some bus runs, although not many, start before 7 o'clock and many start at 7.10 a.m. The Minister is giving times that to the general public might perhaps seem reasonable but they are false to the extent of perhaps half an hour or more. Yet, the Minister goes on and talks about that. He said then that he is consulting with the Minister of Education to see whether school hours can be altered. However, that does not work. It has been tried. In single parent families or families where both parents work, with Mum, say, starting work at 9 o'clock, the children, if they are not going to school until 10, would be unattended for an hour.

The Government supposedly acts in the interests of smaller groups, and in relation to women's issues and things like that, but this proposal creates one of the biggest problems for children that is known. We have already tried the idea of starting school later. It has failed. It was attempted at Ceduna school, and I hope that the member for Eyre refers to this. Agreement was reached between the parents, the school teachers, the school council and the general community that they would start school later, but then the school bus drivers would not have a bar of it, as the drivers all worked in the town after they had completed their bus run, starting work at 9 o'clock at their place of employment, and obviously if they did not get in until 10 o'clock their work opportunities would be lost. So, all this has been tried and it has failed and yet the Government still puts it up as being some sort of panacea.

The Minister goes on to talk about the allegation that children have to come home from buses in the heat of the day: he quotes times between midday and 4 o'clock and says that between those times there is a variation in temperature of only 0.5 degrees C in the average temperature. Why did the Minister not say 5 o'clock? That is the time that we are talking about. The children are hardly on the bus by 4 o'clock, and most of them have another hour to go. Why is the Minister not talking about the period when the children are on the bus for the longest time? Quite obviously, the Minister chose the figures deliberately to suit his argument. Why could he not be factual and honest and say exactly what the time was when the children are on the bus? The Minister has put up a smokescreen here. In this case we all know that it is no good comparing conditions at 1 o'clock, 2 o'clock or 3 o'clock, because the children are at school anyway. But with the children being on the bus between 4 o'clock and 5 o'clock there is a wide variation of time.

Reference has been made already to the effects of daylight saving on electricity consumption. We all know that a factor involved in the introduction of daylight saving was the saving of power, but we are now finding that daylight saving is in fact creating an increased usage of power. What has not been explained is what is to happen for outside workers in local government and other Government instrumentalities with a 7 a.m. or 7.30 a.m. start. We all know that at present under Central Standard Time at 7.30 on 21 June it is relatively dark. There are shearing sheds that cannot start at that time. We all know that at 7 o'clock on Eastern Standard Time it would be totally dark, and therefore problems with the unions are immediately created. A member said here a while ago that the unions had not been consulted. I know that John Lesses did a tour of Eyre Peninsula, I know that he expressed concern to the people over there, and I have also been told that he was gagged when he got back to Adelaide and that he was not allowed to go public.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: By whom?

Mr BLACKER: I do not know: I said that I had been told—I wish I did know, and I wish that he would repeat publicly what he has previously told people over there publicly. I would dearly like him to come out—

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: Because he cannot back his shearer colleagues in commencing work in the dark. Further, there is the matter of local government authorities having to put their road graders and rollers on to the roads in the early hours of the morning with their lights on. There has to be a massive change somewhere.

I am concerned particularly about the Government's attitude to this whole issue. It has been hell bent on, if you like, jumping on a section of the community about which it could not care less. It does not realise that its interference with natural time is so great that I do not think such a thing occurs anywhere else in the world. I understand that, if Eastern Standard Time is adopted along with daylight saving, the natural time meridian or the time of the day when the sun would be directly overhead would be parallel to the meridian which is 100 kilometres from New Zealand. That is how far out South Australia would be. Members opposite could not care less about this issue and that is the thing that concerns me. This Government is hell bent on assisting to destroy the lives of many people, but it does not care about this issue. I seek leave to have a table inserted into *Hansard*. It is of a purely statistical nature.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member give an assurance that it is entirely statistical?

Mr BLACKER: Yes.

Leave granted.

DETAILS OF SUNRISE AND SUNSET ON LONGEST AND SHORTEST DAYS

	Ceduna	Adelaide	Mount Gambier
1. Shortest Day (21.6.86)			
Sunrise			
*Central Standard time with daylight saving	8.43	8.23	8.15
Central Standard time no daylight saving	7.43	7.23	7.15
*Eastern Standard time with daylight saving	9.13	8.53	8.45

DETAILS OF SUNRISE AND SUNSET ON LONGEST AND SHORTEST DAYS

	Ceduna	Adelaide	Mount Gambier
Eastern Standard time no daylight saving	8.13	7.53	7.45
2. Shortest Day (21.6.86) Sunset			
*Central Standard time with daylight saving	6.31	6.11	6.03
Central Standard time no daylight saving	5.31	5.11	5.03
*Eastern Standard time with daylight saving	7.01	6.41	6.33
Eastern Standard time no daylight saving	6.01	5.41	5.33
3. Longest Day (21.12.86) Sunrise			
Central Standard time with daylight saving	6.18	5.58	5.50
Central Standard time no daylight saving	5.18	4.58	4.50
Eastern Standard time with daylight saving	6.48	6.28	6.20
Eastern Standard time no daylight saving	5.48	5.28	5.20
4. Longest Day (21.12.86) Sunset			
Central Standard time with daylight saving	8.49	8.29	8.21
Central Standard time no daylight saving	7.49	7.29	7.21
Eastern Standard time with daylight saving	9.19	8.59	8.51
Eastern Standard time no daylight saving	8.19	7.59	7.51

Source: Calculated from data from the Highways Department Surveys Office (2600217)
* These might never apply.

Mr BLACKER: The table is a record prepared by the Parliamentary Library and relates to the shortest day and the longest day of the year. It gives the time of sunrise and sunset at Mount Gambier, Adelaide and Ceduna. Under Eastern Standard Time, with no daylight saving, on the shortest day of the year sunrise at Ceduna would be at 8.13; at Adelaide, 7.53; and at Mount Gambier, 7.45. On that day sunset at Ceduna would be at 6.1; at Adelaide, 5.41; and at Mount Gambier, 5.33. On the longest day, under Eastern Standard Time, and with daylight saving, sunrise at Ceduna would be at 6.48; at Adelaide 6.28; and at Mount Gambier, 6.20. On the longest day under Eastern Standard Time with daylight saving (and I refer to Yorke Peninsula and daylight saving operating there) the effect would be that Mount Gambier would have sunset at 8.51; Adelaide, 8.59; and Ceduna, 9.19. Under the compromise as proposed by the Government, with Eastern Standard Time and no daylight saving to the western part of the State, Ceduna would still have sunset at 8.19 p.m. on 21 December. I think that, if the Government has not seriously considered this matter, that fact should be noted.

I have received many letters, including a letter from the State Bank (which I think makes a mockery of the writer of that letter), suggesting that South Australians have to put up with snide remarks of being half an hour behind. I do not think that the general manager of any organisation should make a comment such as that. I have received very few letters in support of this Bill. On the other hand, I have received petitions signed by 11 182 people who are strongly opposed to it. Also, I have received letters from people living in Bordertown, Kadina, the Mid North and of course many places on Eyre Peninsula who have been strongly opposed to this legislation.

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

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): It is perhaps fortuitous that I follow the member for Flinders because, in modern times, the third move towards daylight saving in South Australia was commenced in 1968 by people living in Port Lincoln, when the Bank Officials Association supported the introduction of daylight saving. That was the beginning of the campaign which was responsible for introducing the daylight saving proposals in this House in 1971. Of course, the introduction of daylight saving had occurred on two previous occasions. The first occurred in 1916, during the First World War when daylight saving was enforced by the Commonwealth Government and all States, including Tasmania, followed that legislation. The second occasion was during the Second World War, when the Commonwealth Government again introduced legislation which forced all States to adopt daylight saving. South Australia's first attempt to introduce daylight saving occurred in 1971 following the launching of the campaign by the people in Port Lincoln—and that is quite a twist.

I support this Bill. Ever since I became the member for Henley Beach, I have called for an extension of daylight saving. The fact that the change in the time zones fits into that slot of increasing daylight saving is fortuitous. Some very eminent people support this proposal. Probably for the first time I find myself on the side of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry SA Inc. The only other time that I have been on the side of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry followed the settlement of one of the many disputes in the printing industry when its advocate agreed with me in the Arbitration Commission. During the rest of my career we have usually been on opposite sides of the fence.

I am surprised that the Leader of the Opposition was not prepared to support the Chamber of Commerce and Industry in its endeavours, but under the signature of the General Manager (Mr Lindsay Thompson), I have received correspondence which very strongly supports the proposition that is now before the House. The chamber lists five major reasons for its support of this legislation and all would provide millions of dollars in savings to this State. In its letter the chamber states:

> There is a substantial volume of daily communication between the South Australian business community and the Eastern States. The half hour time discrepancy creates two hours of lost business contact time, a major inefficiency when communications are not possible for half an hour at the beginning of the day, at each side of lunchtime and at the end of the day.

Of course, that is a very sensible proposition.

Mr Blacker: Are you talking about flexitime? After allowing for flexitime—

Mr FERGUSON: Members opposite have from time to time talked about flexitime. One can understand that they do not fully understand the principles of flexitime. Flexitime does not mean that there will be no communications over the span of hours suggested by the Chamber of Commerce. Any good businessman who is running his business properly would ensure that his office was manned from opening to closing, irrespective of flexitime. The arguments about flexitime are absolute nonsense. If that business person did not ensure that his office was manned, he ought not to be in business. The argument that flexitime has some correlation with the loss of communications is nonsense. The Chamber of Commerce further stated:

> With the economic development of the State in mind, the more imaginative and constructive South Australians have seen the opportunity for Adelaide and South Australia to develop as the computer and administration centre for Australia. We do not believe that major companies will move their facilities to Adelaide when business times are not common with the population and market centres of Australia.

That makes absolutely good sense. There is no reason why, with the introduction of new technology, computer centres cannot operate from Adelaide. Adelaide can be a central office for a whole host of computerised industries but, unless they can keep up a communication with the Eastern States, where the markets are—

Members interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I am only agreeing with the Chamber of Commerce, with which the honourable member agrees in relation to most of the debates in this House. This must be the first time that the Leader of the Opposition does not agree with the Chamber of Commerce and Industry. The chamber further states:

> The half hour discrepancy creates difficulties for those involved in financial transactions with the Eastern States on the Stock Exchange, money markets and in the banking industry.

The member for Murray-Mallee said that he could not understand why that was so, because the Stock Exchange closes down for a considerable time. But, the honourable member, and other members opposite, must know that transactions do not take place in the Stock Exchange: they take place in offices outside the Stock Exchange. I have taken the opportunity to canvass stockbrokers on this proposition, and they agree with me that, if the time zones are brought into line with those applying to the Eastern States, there is no doubt that there would be an increase in the number of staff in those offices, because they would be able to catch up with an increase in more transactions. The financial area in South Australia is a service industry that is growing. It creates employment. Indeed, it has created more employment than have other industries in the past few years, and members opposite should support a proposition that will increase employment in South Australia.

The media is also suffering considerable inconvenience and expense in attempting to arrange program scheduling and, in some cases, complying with the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal regulations when South Australia is out of line with the Eastern States. There is no doubt about it—a change to Eastern Standard Time would save South Australian companies hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of dollars. Southern Television Corporation Pty Ltd wrote to me supporting this legislation, and stated:

> I am writing on behalf of the three Adelaide commercial television stations. We have noted the recent statements which refer to the proposed change from central standard time in South Australia. We wholeheartedly support this proposal and can only hope that this positive step will be adopted.
>
> This issue is of particular relevance to the television industry in that each station is obliged to delay telecast a considerable amount of program material each week. Sometimes this is necessary to comply with the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal program classification regulations; for example, 'AO' programs must not be played before 8.30 p.m. It is also necessary to tape-delay programs in order that they can be telecast at the most appropriate time; one example is the Ray Martin Midday Show which we tape at 11.30 a.m. for replay at noon.
>
> The need for tape-delay of program material causes us considerable operational costs. Further to this, all taped program material is subject to a sales tax impost, even though programs are telecast within 30 minutes of their being recorded. It is clear that this cost impost is purely as a direct result of the 30 minute time difference between South Australia and the Eastern States. We therefore totally support this initiative and trust that you will approve the passage of the Bill.

Thus, in the electronic industry alone the savings to South Australian companies would be quite considerable.

Mr Becker: How many jobs?

Mr FERGUSON: I do not know—and I am not sure that any jobs would be lost.

Mr Becker: You're not interested.

Mr FERGUSON: It is not a case of my not being interested. If the member for Hanson produced evidence about how many jobs would be lost, I would be prepared to listen to him. That proposition has not been put to me. In fact, it is quite possible that more jobs would be created as a result of the change. Certainly, that would be true in relation to financial institutions. It may well be that the increased number of jobs in financial institutions would more than make up for any jobs that would be lost in other areas.

I refer very briefly to the daylight saving aspect of the time zone change. I have been considering this proposition for many years. Representing a seaside constituency, I am very surprised to hear the interjections from the member for Hanson, because a continuation of the daylight saving extension would be a definite advantage to small business in his district. He has not considered the additional business that would be created in his seaside district. Certainly, the extension of daylight saving would mean that beach lovers could frequent the beach for longer times than at present, and that would be to the advantage of local business. It would certainly benefit the local hotels, restaurants, delicatessens and other small business in seaside suburbs. I know that, because I have canvassed the traders in Henley Square on this proposition, and they are very strongly in favour of the change because of the additional business that it would bring them.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I am very surprised at the member for Hanson, who represents a metropolitan seaside district and who is opposed to this proposition, because it would certainly assist the beachside businesses in his area. From time to time I have been contacted by sporting clubs that are in favour of additional daylight hours during which they could pursue their interests as a result of this proposition. The tennis clubs in my district are particularly in favour of the proposition. It will give them time to complete some of the tournaments that were started earlier in the year. The change would certainly provide more daylight hours for training. I was surprised at the reference to schoolchildren and how they have an absolute minimum of two hours. School sporting clubs in my district are taking up the challenge, and coaching and playing takes place not on the schoolgrounds but on sporting ovals.

So, with an increase in the period of daylight saving there is the facility to transport children to ovals and back again in daylight hours both for training and playing. It also makes more coaching available and provides more time for individual tuition. Junior players, especially females, are enabled to return to their homes after an evening's sport in daylight and, therefore, in greater safety. More opportunities are provided to conduct twilight meetings, which are an advantage to both players and spectators. Financial benefit also follows because of greater spectator interest in sport. Both from the proposition of supporting business and from the viewpoint of people conducting sporting entertainment, I support the Bill.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I oppose this legislation.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Well, it should not be any surprise to the honourable member. The Leader of the Opposition has explained in very fine detail the various problems associated with the legislation, but what concerns me is that the Government has no mandate to introduce this Bill. The Government has not established the opinions of that very large body of people in the community who are still quite apathetic and indifferent about the legislation. There has been no referendum to the public; there has been no parliamentary select committee; and very little statistical data has been presented by any of the proponents and

supporters of the legislation in the House this afternoon to say what precisely are the advantages of this legislation.

The Bill has not been thought out, and one has merely to look at the proposed dividing line between east and west of South Australia, which looks like the dogleg to end all doglegs, or a zigzag line, to see that the Minister, after introducing the Bill, still had second, third, fourth and fifth thoughts about it in order to accommodate the complaints of a wide variety of South Australians.

The people in the South-East of South Australia, whom I represent, have made representations to me, and on the part of the people who support the legislation I have had brief correspondence from the Mount Gambier City Council, a letter from the Green Triangle Committee, one or two letters from business houses in the South-East and one letter from the Mount Gambier Chamber of Commerce. On the opposite side, I have had strong representation from the 260 or more dairy farmers in the South-East and western districts of Victoria, particularly the south-eastern people, who do not want to be milking later and later into the evening—they already defer milking until the cool of the evening—which would destroy their social and family life.

The UF&S zone 13, which represents the entire South-East, claims to be speaking for all South-East farmers in opposing the legislation. Mothers have complained to me that they do not want their children going to school in the wet, dark, rainy mornings of winter. They already have to get up early in order to catch buses, and it may take as much as an hour to get to school. Mothers have also complained that children would be out of bed later in the evenings, which again spoils their social life. Apart from that, there have been complaints from some shift workers, including those representing the Mount Gambier City Council, who claim they would be going to work in the dark in the morning and would have to wait until it became light before they could start. Alternatively, they would have to change their working hours to be able to work in the daylight hours.

The media in South Australia has been split with the Murdoch Press coming out strongly against the legislation but with others coming out and publicly advertising and really putting the Government's case. Media representatives in the South-East have asked me how they can be expected to report objectively on this legislation when their own industry is being subjective in supporting the Government measures. Apart from that, I believe, justifiably, that a great number in the media in South Australia are concerned that, should Eastern Standard Time apply right across the main body of South Australia, a great number of media positions would be lost with newscasts and other broadcasts coming direct from interstate into South Australia with South Australian journalists and staff having little to do but switch on and switch off appliances to receive the telecasts from interstate.

The radio and television media in the Eyre Peninsula have written, I believe, to all members saying that they certainly do not want to go to Eastern Standard Time because of the problems that it would present to them. Apart from that, I have received extensive correspondence from Rural Youth, the entire local government in South Australia—with the exception of the Mount Gambier City Council, which says that it is opposed to any change from South Australian Central Standard Time to Eastern Standard Time. I believe that very strong representation has been made to the Mount Gambier City Council and to the Green Triangle Committee in the South-East by many other south-eastern South Australians who have expressed the view that South Australia should remain on Central Standard Time and should not transfer to the new time zone covered by Victoria.

Another interesting aspect, which has not yet been pointed out by anyone in the House, is that in New South Wales trouble is brewing because of that State's proposal to divide New South Wales into eastern and western time zones. One wonders why South Australia should be rushing into something when there are problems interstate. I believe that occurred three or four weeks ago, when the popular press brought that matter to the notice of the public in South Australia. There has been a very strong lobby in New South Wales for the east and the west of that State not to be divided, and that is the subject of strong public complaint.

The number of people who have continued to lobby my office have come out almost 90 per cent against the change to Eastern Standard Time, and a very large number of South-East people have taken the time to telephone and write to my office. I have quite a substantial dossier of correspondence before me, which I do not propose to read out to members of the House, all of which indicates that the community of South Australia is far from unanimous on this proposition to change to Eastern Standard Time. Therefore, it begs the question all the more why the Government does not put the whole matter to a referendum, at the very least, in order to ascertain what the mass of South Australian people are thinking. This proposal seems to be a brainchild of the Government and, prior to the Government's announcing that it was going to legislate, I had had absolutely no representation for change from members of the community in the South-East.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: If the honourable member thinks that my office is not a busy one, I suggest that he contact the Premier's Department, because someone there rang my office only two or three weeks ago and asked, 'Is that the busiest electorate office in South Australia?' I would tell the honourable member that we have averaged 70 or 80 calls a week year in, year out over the past 10 years. So, I believe that we have a fair amount of public opinion coming across the counter.

Mr Hamilton: What do you do on the other three days?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: What do you mean by 'the other three days'? Are you on to an eight day week? Are you proposing further Government changes? Are you now legislating for an eight day week? Good heavens! There is an honest man who has every Friday off, or is it mathematics Albert Park style? I am not sure what. As I said, we have a considerable amount of representation from the public through my electorate office, and we have not had any requests for the changes that the Government proposes to make. I strongly recommend to the Minister that he take this legislation back to the drawing board so that he can get his lines straight, if he intends to divide South Australia into east and west, or, even better than that, that he put the matter to the public so that we can have much stronger, firmer and better informed advice before we are asked to put this legislation through both Houses.

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

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I oppose the Bill. The Government has never told us where the great pressure is coming from in the community for this measure. We have been told that some business houses might want it. We have also been told that it would be a great advantage to the community, but the community does not appear to have responded to the suggestion that it will be such a great advantage. In fact, within my district I have not had even

one supporter of the proposition, although I do not say that it has no supporters in my district. I have had letters, both for and against, from various interest groups, including the Chamber of Commerce (in favour) and a group in the electronics industry (also in favour). I have also had communications from community groups that are opposed to the Bill.

One must ask the Government where the pressure came from for this measure. Did it come from some big businesses that have close contacts with the Government, the manufacturers of major products and other ventures which would find that change in time advantageous? Are some of the people in the big investment field and the monetary market in favour of the change? That is the sort of market that is sometimes attacked by members opposite as being an unfair area, one in which it is possible to make money without an effort, as the Hon. Mr Hudson used to say, whereas others have said more recently that it is an unprincipled area in which to make money. Is it because of pressure from that group that the Government now says, 'We want to change the time of the State to bring it into line with that of the Eastern States and to tell west coasters that they can get lost because they don't get involved in big business and aren't that important, because the Government isn't likely to win seats on Eyre Peninsula at any time'?

Government members should bear in mind that sometimes it is reasonably important to win votes in the Upper House. Some people in the community say that it is a good idea to elect a Hawke Government federally and a Bannon Government in South Australia, because such a combination will put many businesses back into the small business category, but that is hardly justification for changing our time to fit in with the Eastern States. What does this Bill do to the person who leaves the Hills during the winter months at 6.30 or 7 a.m. to start a daily job in the city at, say, 7.30 a.m.? Do we push the peak hour traffic back closer to darkness, fog and rain, as is experienced in some European countries? Are we concerned to do this when we have one of the most dangerous roads, Mount Barker Road, coming out of the Hills? After all, the Federal Government and the State Government have admitted that it is dangerous by making more money available so that something can be done to improve it.

Do we change the time so that people have to leave the Hills at an hour when travelling conditions are more dangerous, or do we say that it is not much more dangerous driving in darkness or fog than it is in daylight? I assure members that it is certainly much more dangerous. Did the mothers with young children request the Government to change the time? Was the Government pressured by those who arrange community meetings for 8 p.m., but see people start to roll up at 8.30 p.m. or 9 p.m. merely because they find that they can do gardening at home at a later hour? With daylight saving one starts earlier in the morning but often still finishes just as late at night: that happens in practice. If members opposite have not experienced that, they must attend fewer meetings than I attend or they have a better regimented community, but I doubt that very much.

Did the local delicatessen proprietor ask for the change in time? Does he deal with the Eastern States and talk to them on the telephone? Back in the 1890s did they want to make this change? Why not? We have better communications today. Indeed, without attending the office one can run a business today by means of telecommuncations and word processors with visual display units. A person does not have to be in the office. In fact, some of the better operators have a terminal in their home: they do not even have it in the office. Some may have one in the office, one in the home, and another in their motor vehicle.

So, where is the pressure coming from for this change today? I believe that it was the Chamber of Commerce that said that a businessman could not make contact with the Eastern States during the lunch hour, but I find that the ideal time to make such a call. If I do not got out for lunch, I can easily contact a public servant in the Eastern States while ours are all out to lunch. We have a half hour time slot, to make the communication. Let us be honest: if a business house is not operating by 8 a.m. and communicating with colleagues in other States and in other parts of the world and if it is not still operating at 6 p.m., it is not likely to succeed. If we say that that is not so, we are kidding ourselves. Just go to Germany, Japan and America and see the hours that business people work. So much for the argument that business wants a change of time.

Perhaps some of the bigger operators in the sharebroking field have leant on the Government and said, 'You'll make yourselves good fellows. If you do this, we'll think you're great. We may even contribute to your funds at election time.' I do not know. There must be a reason because, as far as I am aware, no section of the community has asked for the change. Farmers have not asked for it. Have the workers asked for it? Have the trade unions said to their members, 'You normally start by 7 a.m., and now we want you to start half an hour earlier according to the sun'? Have the union members asked for it? Under present conditions union members may start work at 6 or 7 a.m. Do they want to start work half an hour earlier according to the sun?

The electronic media want to change, and I can understand that, because 13 million of the 16 million Australians live on the eastern seaboard. In South Australia we are peanuts. We are too far out of the time zone with Western Australia, and once we adopt EST (and I hope that we never do) the electronic media will say that South Australian news is not worth putting over. Almost all the news that one hears over the radio or sees on television is Eastern States news because the stations do not want to show South Australian news to the 13 million people in the Eastern States. We are not worth considering.

I can understand the electronic media supporting the change of time, because it saves television and radio stations a few thousand dollars a year in time slotting. However, immediately that happens, even less will be said about South Australia than is said now over the broadcast news programs, and very little (especially anything good) is said about South Australia today in those programs. I heard the Chairman of Jubilee 150 make a radio comment about the news media: that they were more negative than positive. I accept that some big businesses and the electronic news media think that the change of time will be great, but how about the rest of the people of South Australia? Would we be better off advocating going half an hour the other way if business houses claim that the half hour slot is a nuisance and that all over the world the differential in time is one hour? Let us make our difference with the Eastern States one hour and be closer to Western Australian time. It would be like the United States of America or Canada; or Russia, if you like, where there are 11 time slots across the country. The Minister says that the half hour does not count for much. We are really half an hour out of time slotting now, according to the sun. We are half an hour too close to the Eastern States already, and it does make a difference.

I rise at the same time each day, regardless of the time slotting, according to the sun. It does not matter what the clock says: that is the time at which I rise. We are now talking about advancing by an hour and a half in the

daylight saving period. One goes to meetings which do not get under way until 8.30 or 9 p.m., and one is still there at 12 midnight or 12.30. Under the old system, at least one was home by 11 or 11.30 p.m., and it does make a difference at the end of the summer period when energy is sapped more than in the winter months. I speak personally there, but I am sure that many people with young children feel the same way. Should we not consider the people in the western part of the State? In Adelaide and suburbs we have our own cosy little spot with the school just around the corner, as well as a police station (except in Blackwood, where the Minister will not give us a police station), and an office of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. Community welfare, social security, kindergartens, child-care, universities, etc., are accessible, but in the country children, five or six years of age will go 100 km, in some cases, to get to school.

Are we concerned? Is that a form of child abuse, to make them get up and leave home in darkness when most of us in the city are still sleeping, and lucky if we are motivated half an hour before the bus leaves to get to work? We then hear the Minister of Recreation and Sport say that it will help people who are playing sport: it will be less dangerous, and they will not get hit with a cricket ball at practice because it gets dark. What a joke!

The argument of the Minister who introduced this measure, the Deputy Premier, is that this is good for the recreation of the community, and that is really all we have talked about. As far as the general community is concerned, the only peg on which the Government can hang its hat is more time for recreation. What the Government should be talking about is more time for re-creation of the work effort.

We are discussing more leisure time, encouraging the community to spend more time on leisure and less time on productivity. Under this proposal, plus daylight saving, people are going to their workplace earlier, and all that many of them are thinking about is what they will do when they finish work, when it is roughly 4 o'clock by the sun. Are they going to the beach, to play golf or tennis, to have a walk, or go down to the local and have a few ales? What benefit is that in the long term to the economy?

Many people end up using that time to get more tired, and by the end of the week many of them are virtually zombies when it comes to effort within the workplace. That might sound harsh, but I ask members to think about it. If any of them have young families—and I think there are more on the other side than this side now—I ask them whether they find that their children get more testy by the end of the day during daylight saving—let alone this extra half hour we are talking about—than they do in the winter months when there is no daylight saving. If it affects children, it also affects adults, although adults may have more control over this situation.

I cannot support the proposal. The Government may have thought that this would be one way of getting a bit of recognition from some of the business houses which might support it financially or might want to build something on top of Mount Lofty; or recognition from operators in the tourist industry who think that it might provide a few benefits through people spending more leisure time, whether drinking or engaged at leisure in some sporting recreation or facility: they might get the people spending their money in that area in lieu of some others.

The Government should be directing its attention more towards the economy of the State. If some of the business houses say that we will suddenly get more headquarters here if we adopt this half hour, we all know that is hogwash, as is the argument that we will keep more of them here and they will not go to the Eastern States. If their main base is in Melbourne, they will shift the headquarters of any business they take over here to Melbourne, and all their insurance policies, etc., will be issued in Victoria.

About the only undertakings that have not done that are Australian National—a Government body—and Australian Bacon. I think they are two of the few where the takeovers did not skip the State and put all the investments elsewhere. Do not tell us the half hour did that, because it did not: it was where the financial base stood for those companies. The only area in which there has been some variation is to the west. There is no doubt that Western Australia now is a powerful financial base which will become even more powerful, and shifting half an hour further from them is not likely to do us much good—although, I will admit, not likely to do much harm.

There is one other area to which I wish to refer, to which the member for Flinders has already referred, and that is outside workers. Think of outside workers in the Hills who are rostered to work now on a building site or on the roads, perhaps for the Engineering and Water Supply Department or for the railways: these people start work when the sun time is 7 o'clock, and we suddenly pull them back to 6.30 a.m. in pretty miserable conditions (in the winter months, anyway). Even if it is not raining it is not the warmest place in South Australia, nor is it the most pleasant place to be working outside, especially if it is on a muddy building site in the middle of winter. Suddenly we require these people to start at 6.30. Or are we saying to those who are union members, 'We'll get your times of starting changed,' so that in the Hills it will be a different time from that on the plains? We know that is hogwash, also.

The Government has tried the ploy. Deep down, I think, many of its backbenchers, with the complaints they would have received would no doubt prefer to see this Bill defeated. The Government then can say to people in the finance industry, in sharebroking and one or two other business areas that want it, 'We did our best, but the rotten Democrats and Liberals chucked it out in the Upper House.' Most of the Australian Labor Party backbenchers will be clapping. The ministerial group will be pleased because it would have gained a point from those two groups and, at the same time, made sure they did not upset the vast majority of the community. That is the truth of the matter because, in the main, small business does not want it. Most of them do not deal outside the State, and there is absolutely no benefit in it for them: there is only disadvantage. I oppose the Bill.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I oppose this Bill—remembering that it is in two basic parts: one concerning the introduction of Eastern Standard Time and the other concerning a second time zone in South Australia for four months of the year. I have been disappointed by the general reaction to the Bill so far from certain Government members who seem to have written it off as a non-issue. They have given the impression that people are not particularly concerned one way or the other—but how wrong they are! Perhaps the people in the metropolitan area are not so much concerned one way or the other, but I would say that the reaction that I have had personally at the office and at functions that I have attended, as well as through letters, has indicated that it is one of the greatest issues since I came into this House four years ago.

It is wise to trace the history of how this legislation came before the House. I believe it goes back to the beginning of this year, when the extension of two weeks was given for daylight saving. As a result of that extension the committee was formed on Eyre Peninsula, known as the Eyre Peninsula

Campaign Against Daylight Saving. That committee received terrific support from the people on Eyre Peninsula, and they proceeded to lobby the Government to exclude them from daylight saving in future. I received quite a few letters from residents of Eyre Peninsula. In relation to this whole debate, what upsets me about the attitude of some Government members is that they seem to think that the Opposition, the Liberal Party, is taking a negative attitude.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr MEIER: The opposition has come from the people, and I will proceed to point that out to the member for Fisher and others who cannot see the light of day. Back in April this year I received a letter from a Mr G.D. Schulze, of Kimba, the first paragraph of which reads:

> I would like to point out to you the plight of us peasants who live on Eyre Peninsula and the west coast of this State in regard to a stupid thing called daylight saving, which is forced upon us without any consideration for our children's health and well being . . . there is only one thing we look forward to in relation to daylight saving each year, and that is, the end of it.

Another letter, from Mrs Trewartha, said:

> Eyre Peninsula Campaign Against Daylight Saving resolution: that we oppose Eastern Standard Time for South Australia and that we propose that South Australia remains on Central Standard Time and that no daylight saving occurs west of 137 degrees east for Eyre Peninsula.

That is where this whole issue came before the Government: Eyre Peninsula did not want to go to daylight saving. If people living there wanted a second time zone I guess it would be for them to canvass the matter and to determine an outcome. I appreciate that the Government had to consider the matter, and I will acknowledge that the present Minister had decided to look into the possibility of two time zones, having mentioned that earlier this year.

However, what a shock it was, not only to the residents of Eyre Peninsula but also to the residents of Yorke Peninsula and the rest of the State, when the Government said, 'Look, we have thought about it; the idea of two time zones makes sense, but we are not going to get you out of daylight saving altogether. We are going to bring the whole State forward an extra half an hour and then during daylight saving the people on Eyre Peninsula will not have to go to daylight saving.' In other words, the people of Eyre Peninsula will still be landed with the extra half an hour during the daylight saving period. However, the worst thing is that they will have the burden of that extra half an hour for the whole of the year, in the winter time as well as the summer time. So, that is the first unbelievable thing.

The second aspect concerns taking the rest of the country areas and the city areas into Eastern Standard Time, involving an extra half an hour. It is in relation to this that the comments and criticisms have come from the people in my electorate. I refer to some of them. Mr and Mrs Rex Kakoschke, of Sandilands, said:

> We wish to protest in the strongest terms regarding the proposed legislation to alter South Australia's time to Eastern Standard Time. We feel that we deserved at least a say in the matter, but we were not given an opportunity to do so. The State Government has simply decided for political and recreational reasons to alter the time without the slightest concern for country people generally, particularly those west of Adelaide. It seems that we are totally ignored.

I suppose that one could argue that their opportunity for representation is being exercised now, but one would think that the courtesy would have been extended to people generally to at least voice an opinion before an announcement was made.

When the Labor Government came to office in 1982 it maintained that from then on it would consult with the people, that it would not just bring in legislation without consultation, that there would be no more of this lack of consultation. That has proved to be the biggest joke of all time, and it is another broken election promise, but we are used to that, so what is the difference there? Consultation did not occur, and that is reinforced in this next letter, from Mr B.R. Fuller, of Moonta, who says in his opening sentence:

> Did Dr Hopgood consult us about time changes to EST? I think not.

And he is correct. I refer to a letter from Mrs Mary Filmer, of Warooka, who said:

> Do you realise that the Corny Point to Yorketown area school bus already leaves before sunrise at two periods during the year? Can you imagine children waiting for the bus in mid-winter, half an hour before sunrise?

That has been brought out by other speakers in this debate, and I think we should consider the children of this State, or are we too greedy? Perhaps we are too greedy for our own sake, and perhaps certain individual people have more clout than others while minority groups are forgotten. I acknowledge that the rural people are in the minority: that was proved at the last referendum on daylight saving which indicated that rural people were overwhelmingly against it, but, because they were in the minority, they lost. We have an example of this in relation to Eastern Standard Time, with the people who have been pushing for shorter working hours. The average working week is fewer than 40 hours for many employees, who are heading towards 35 hours in a working week. Whilst that occurs in the city areas, in rural areas farmers in fact invariably have had to extend their working hours—for two reasons. First, to make a living, they have had to purchase more land and, because they have more land, they have to work a larger area. Secondly, because of the introduction of daylight saving and with the proposal to adopt Eastern Standard Time, they will have to work longer hours, because the harvest normally starts only when the moisture is sufficiently down. That could now be mid afternoon. With our present times, 2 o'clock was not unusual, but they hoped to get under way by midday (on extreme days, 2 p.m.) and they can often continue to work until after dark, when the moisture again rises. If it gets dark at about 10 o'clock, and one adds another hour (if they are lucky, maybe two) that could be nearer to midnight. If Eastern Standard Time is introduced in South Australia, that would be the working day of the farmer.

One could argue that he can sleep in in the morning and therefore adjust his day just as nurses and some other shift workers have to do. In the rural situation that does not work, because the people with whom he deals, such as the stock and station agents and his bank manager would work different hours. The children have to go off to school and, for a variety of other reasons, he has to be up early when the rest of the family rises. He cannot adjust his day as perhaps other people who are in shift work can. I have a letter from Diane Schmidt, of Warooka, who states:

> The reason I am writing is to protest South Australian time being changed the same as the Eastern States. In particular, you are aware of the plight our children have travelling from Marion Bay and Stenhouse Bay on buses to Warooka and Yorketown.

In a letter from Mr and Mrs S.L. Redding, of Minlaton, they state:

> At the moment our children rise at 6.45 a.m. to catch the bus at 7.55 a.m.

This letter is dated 11 September 1986, and it continues:

> If the time is changed to Eastern Standard Time and daylight saving as proposed, it will be 5.15 a.m. and 6.55 a.m. respectively.

That reinforces their concern for their children as well as many other children. Why should this imposition be placed

on them? I received a letter from Mr and Mrs Barry Ritchie, of Kadina, who state:

> We have read of politicians' views on daylight saving and now feel quite strongly that we in the country do not exist and are not considered one iota. It is all for Adelaide people, which is being rather selfish.

I think it is a poor reflection on the State and on our Government when they do not take into account the views of the whole of the State but, rather, jump in before having thought the situation through. Maybe the Government is secretly very happy that it seems that this legislation will be stopped in the other place. Controversial legislation dealing with marijuana and prostitution have been introduced recently and I think that they hope that this daylight saving legislation will not turn into such a controversial matter. That will be the case if it is defeated in the other place.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr MEIER: It is interesting to hear the member for Albert Park interject, because I mentioned earlier that I was disappointed with contributions by members opposite. I think that when people from rural areas read the member for Albert Park's contribution, they will say once again that city politicians could not care less about the people in the country and that is a sad reflection on the member for Albert Park as well as other members.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr MEIER: I think that if the member for Fisher had listened to the member for Albert Park's speech, he would know that it is a lot wider than that.

Mr Hamilton: You ought to read it tomorrow.

Mr MEIER: I do not have to read it tomorrow; unfortunately, I sat here and listened to it. I received representations (mainly verbal) from Mr Neil Bittner, Mr Glen Lamshed, Mr Tom Gordon, Mr Deryck Davey, Mr Steve Redding and many others that time will not permit me to address this evening.

Let us consider the situation from the business point of view. I was amused with some of the letters that I received from certain city-based organisations which sought my support for the legislation. They seem to think that half an hour will make a phenomenal difference to our State. I cannot see how it will change things at all. First, other countries such as America, which seems to be doing a lot better than we are when one compares the valuation of our dollars, has four time zones. Canada, which also is doing a lot better than we are, I believe has six time zones so, if we cut out half an hour, how will our State suddenly perform a lot better? I do not believe it is at all relevant. Certainly, if people are affected by it, why cannot they start half an hour earlier or finish half an hour earlier, depending on the situation?

The argument has been put forward that schools should adjust their times. I would be very interested to hear of any school that has been able to adjust its time for daylight saving or for Eastern Standard Time—I do not think that that occurs. It is a pity that I cannot incorporate into *Hansard* a map (I know that it would have to be purely statistical), because it would clearly show just how ridiculous the situation would become if we adopt Eastern Standard Time.

As has been stated earlier, we are on the 142½ degree east meridian which runs through Victoria and New South Wales, so we have already adjusted our time half an hour towards the Eastern States. If we want to be on a similar time, we should convince those States to take off half an hour because, ideally, the line of longitude could be on the 135 degree meridian, or there could be argument that we might adjust on the 137½ degree meridian, but we do not have to deal with that argument tonight.

Adopting Eastern Standard Time means that we would go to the 150 degree east meridian, which is not far from Sydney, so we would go to Sydney time and then, with daylight saving, we would go to the 165 degree east meridian, which almost touches the South Island of New Zealand. I do not see why we need to run our time so far from our own time zone. It amazes me, particularly since members of Parliament have been criticised for occasionally going overseas, that some members have not learnt that they continue to regularly change their watches and that, in this world, time zones are a fact of life. It does not matter what country one is talking about; time zones change regularly and the rest of the world seems to live quite satisfactorily with various time zones, so why cannot South Australia do the same?

The irony of the business organisations' campaign in favour of Eastern Standard Time was highlighted by the fact that regional television services did not concur with the campaign and in fact they actively campaigned against adopting two time zones in this State. I believe that they saw through some of the arguments in relation to daylight saving. An argument was also raised that a tax was imposed on taping. My counter argument is: why not change the Federal legislation so that recordings that have to be taped for a period of, say, an hour or less are excluded from the tax? South Australia does not need this Bill. We need one time zone and we need to look to our own State as the central State and not to run along behind other States.

Mr Tyler: You're a good ostrich.

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

Mr BECKER (Hanson): The member for Fisher called the member for Goyder an ostrich, but let me remind the member for Fisher that, while we have a responsibility to our individual districts, we also have a responsibility to the whole State. I do not believe that any member on this side or any member opposite is an ostrich. The member for Goyder put the issue very well on behalf of his constituency.

I refer to *Hansard* of 24 August 1982 (page 664) and the debate on the legislation that set up a referendum on daylight saving. At that time I said that as the President of the Bank Officials Association (now the Bank Employees Union) I had in 1968 launched a campaign in Port Lincoln seeking wage and salary increases and improved working conditions, including the introduction of daylight saving. I do not recall hearing any criticism on my stand on daylight saving. We felt that that initiative would be of benefit to the State. I do not recall that Eastern Standard Time was raised as an issue: we did not think it was necessary at that stage.

It is also interesting to note that on 15 September 1971 there was a vote in this Assembly concerning the establishment of daylight saving. I supported the introduction of daylight saving for South Australia and of the 47 members in the House at that time only seven members who voted in favour are still here.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: The survivors.

Mr BECKER: You can say that again. The member for Fisher (now the member for Davenport—an independent Liberal) supported daylight saving; I am the remaining member of the Liberal Party; and the members of the ALP were the member for Stuart (the present Minister of Transport); the member for Playford (the former Speaker); the member for Mitchell (the present Minister of Mines and Energy); the member for Gilles (the former Minister of Recreation and Sport); and the Minister for Environment and Planning was paired.

I have stood by that decision to support daylight saving, and I suggested the extension of daylight saving to accommodate the Australian Grand Prix. But a permanent extension and a change to Eastern Standard Time are different issues altogether. I do not want to reiterate my experiences in banking and during my three years in Sydney, but for the life of me I cannot understand the argument put up by the Chamber of Commerce in relation to financial transactions. In those days, banks worked to fixed hours, from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. Since then, the hours of most banks have been extended: banks remain open until 4 o'clock, 4.30 or 5 p.m. There are no fixed hours in some respects for banks, and so there has been flexibility over the past few years. That is very important because, when I was working in a bank, at five minutes to three we started to tot up our funds to determine whether there was a surplus or a deficit.

A surplus meant that funds were put onto the short-term money market to gain the best interest for the day or, if the balance of payments was short, we would borrow and try to negotiate a rate from those who had surplus funds. Most companies that had headquarters in Adelaide did the same thing. They did not want to be overdrawn at the bank and they did not want to leave surplus deposits in their bank account. Certainly, anything over £50 000 (today probably $50 000) could be placed on the short-term money market overnight. By five past three there was a panic to get money set in whatever way was necessary.

Today, with the flexibility, the electronic transfer system, and the greater adjustment to the financial market, I do not believe that South Australia is missing out or being disadvantaged in any way at all. In Sydney 20 years ago people chased the time zones. If they did not get their money set in Sydney, they looked to South Australia, then to Western Australia, and then off-shore, chasing the London market. From memory, that could be done until 11.30 p.m. or midnight.

Today it is an entirely different ball game. I do not believe that any company that has its headquarters in South Australia would be financially disadvantaged. There is a continual placement of funds on the short-term money market and a continual seeking of deposits to balance any shortfall on that market. Certainly, there is greater flexibility towards the end of the financial day, which rolls on until 6 o'clock or even later. There is a continually revolving situation with transactions on the Stock Exchange, whether on the Sydney Stock Exchange or the Perth Stock Exchange, which has considerable status today because of the number of entrepreneurs from Western Australia. Unfortunately, South Australia has only one well-known entrenpreneur of any note, and he is John Spalvins of Adelaide Steamship Company Ltd. Western Australia has boasted several famous entrepreneurs, such as Holmes a Court, Bond, Parry, and a few others. Who will survive in the next few years will be due more to good luck than to anything else.

The difference in time zones between Perth and Sydney has not made one iota of difference to these people. They deal in hundreds of millions of dollars daily and, in fact, when a Western Australian company (the Bell group) makes a takeover bid for a Melbourne company (BHP) it makes one wonder where the argument comes from that in the middle of the country, in dear old Adelaide, we are worried about time zones. It makes no difference whatsoever.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr BECKER: That is right. John Elliott from Elders-IXL spends more time overseas than anywhere else. That can be good luck for shareholders, but it can be a disadvantage to Australia in some respects, because he does not pay very much taxation. I think we could organise that in future. I know that in one year the Bell group made a profit of $50 million and paid $23 000 in income tax. That is the situation. I fail to understand the problem raised by the Chamber of Commerce. But I do not believe that the Chamber of Commerce is all that serious.

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

Mr BECKER: If the Chamber of Commerce was genuinely concerned about this issue, not only would its representatives be present in the gallery (as the member for Davenport has said) but also it would have called on us and done some real lobbying. I do not know of any organisation, whether trade organisation or union, which when concerned about an issue does not put its case in every way possible. Those organisations send representatives on their behalf. A very weak campaign has been put forward by the chamber and certainly by the media group.

I am very critical of the media group, because I do not believe that the decisions that are made in Adelaide by the various television companies have been made by the boards at their respective levels. Let us consider the three commercial television stations in Adelaide; Channel 9 is owned by a company in New South Wales; Channel 7 is owned by a company in Melbourne; and Channel 10 is owned by a company in Western Australia. Not one of those television companies is a wholly owned South Australian company as far as the shareholders are concerned.

Of course, each television company is affiliated with other larger media groups and organisations. Let us not kid ourselves: if we ask the newsroom staff and some of the staff in those television stations what will happen if they get parity with Eastern Standard Time, we will be told that these television stations will record and produce their programs interstate.

Radio station 5DN has not written or complained to me about this issue. It grasped the nettle and has an Australia-wide, midnight to 5 a.m. talk-back program, which is sometimes centred in Sydney and broadcast from Melbourne. The time zone has not worried the Macquarie Broadcasting Network. The 5DN news service is broadcast at midnight, and there is that half an hour delay where we pick up and come in half an hour after the program starts in Sydney. There are no problems and nobody appears to be disadvantaged by that. If it can be done in radio, it can be done through the medium of television. SBS, the multicultural channel, has programs coming out of Sydney with only the news service produced here in Adelaide. The time difference does not upset their programming, but they do have some staff in Adelaide.

There is no doubt in my mind that if the media group got this Eastern Standard Time they would retain a contract for the news service. They would buy it by way of contract, going out to tender, and we would not retain the news crews that we have at the moment. There would be no point, as everything would come through on relay, as it does on radio at the moment. I think there are disadvantages for South Australia. We can at least retain our own little bit of independence by having our time zone.

I have not heard anybody mention the value of our northern neighbours, the Northern Territory or the northern part of the Pacific. Although the bulk of our population is on the eastern coast, our trading future is in South East Asia, where there are hundreds of millions of people. If one looks at the South Australian export and import situation, one sees that South Australia exports approximately $4.8 billion worth of goods and imports $5.3 billion worth. Our exports to New South Wales total $1.5 billion, Victoria $1.6 billion, Queensland $580 million, Western Australia $473 million, Tasmania $88 million, Northern Territory $256

million and overseas, via interstate ports—and it really annoys me to think that our overseas exports go via interstate ports—$146 million.

We import from New South Wales $1.8 billion worth of goods, which involves a deficiency of $300 million; for Victoria the figure is $2.8 billion, with a deficiency of approximately $1.2 billion; for Queensland it is $193 million, involving a surplus of almost $300 million; and for Western Australia the figure is $168 million, involving a surplus of about $300 million. For Tasmania, the figure is $46 million, resulting in a surplus of $42 million; and from the Northern Territory we import $61 million, with a surplus of approximately $190 million. Of course, imports from overseas total $215 million, involving a deficiency of $70 million.

Those figures may not mean much to the average person, but our very important markets of Western Australia and the Northern Territory total about $720 million, a very important part of our export trade, and both those markets give us quite a huge surplus. Therefore, if we are talking dollars and cents, if we are talking commerce and industry, if we are talking benefits to the State, we cannot write off the Northern Territory, and we certainly cannot forget Western Australia.

The member for Goyder said that America is divided into four zones, the summer and normal time, and Australia in normal time is divided into three zones and during the summer it is divided into four zones. It is best to keep the situation as we have it. It was interesting to note that in the USSR they have 11 time zones running across the continent. Of course, Russia is a huge continent, about three times the size of Australia. If the scheme was no good, I do not think Russia would adopt it. In China, there is only one time zone. I would have thought that if any country needed to have separate time zones it would be China. Be that as it may, that shows members that there are many other countries in the world—Mexico being one of them—that have several times zones. So Australia is not on its own and, as you travel through Europe in the summer period, you can find different time zones there as well.

Whilst I am a supporter of daylight saving and the benefits that it has brought in relation to the recreation of workers and the people of South Australia, it brings a very limited benefit to my electorate because only a few shops at West Beach may benefit. Unfortunately we do not have a major shopping centre that would benefit. We did have a benefit at West Beach years ago with extended shopping hours, but a Labor Government wiped that out; that cost 110 jobs, about 80 of them being part-time jobs for university or college students. When one looks at a change in the law that affects workers, one must consider the jobs, the minuses and the plusses, if there are any.

That is why I always keep coming back to the need for an economic impact statement. That is the whole tragedy of this legislation, as it has been with other legislation: we have not had an economic impact statement on which we can make a further judgment on this issue. It is no good saying that there is going to be a bit of this and a bit of that. We really want to know in dollars and cents terms. I do not think that anybody has seriously got down to doing those sums. While it cannot be done, it is always best to err on the side of caution. That is what I do, and I recommend that members reject the Bill.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): In speaking against altering the eastern portion of South Australia to Eastern Standard Time and leaving the western portion of the State on the current time of 9½ hours ahead of Greenwich Mean Time, I would like to start with a history of how time zones were fixed in the world and refer to the history of time zones in South Australia. It is a pity that this debate has become political, because there is a lot of history that should be put down. It is a pity that such a parochial narrow-minded attitude has been taken by a lot of people who have some illusion of South Australia catching up with the Eastern States.

This debate about changing our time is about an international agreement which is honoured by most people in the world except very few countries. I will touch briefly on the debate that occurred in 1898, when the same minority groups hoodwinked some Parliamentarians into putting us out of kilter with most of the rest of the world. I am sure that, if this research had been done by the Government before this ill-researched plan to change some of South Australia to Eastern Standard Time, this Bill would not be before us today. I refer, first, to some of the history of time zones. Standard time was adopted at a world conference held in Washington DC in 1884. The number of time zones was set at that conference at 24. Each zone extended over 15 degrees in longitude and universal time was based on the zero meridian through Greenwich. Each of the other time zones is a whole number of hours ahead or behind universal time to a total of 12 hours.

Time zones are most often referred to by their central meridian and, in South Australia's case, this should have been 135 degrees longitude, which runs through Elliston. That is, of course, if we had adhered to the international agreement of 1884. Prior to 1895, in Australia the official time adopted in most States, or Colonies as they then were, was the mean solar time of the capital city in that State. This meant that the central meridian running through Adelaide put South Australia 9 hours 14 minutes ahead of Greenwich Mean Time. However, in November 1892 a conference in Melbourne suggested that Australia should be divided into three time zones and adhere to the world and international agreement which resulted from the 1884 Washington meeting. The standard time for each zone in Australia would then be the mean solar time of the meridians of 120 degrees, 135 degrees and 150 degrees east longitude, giving three time zones in Australia of eight, nine and 10 hours respectively ahead of universal time. It was proposed that the 120 degrees east zone should comprise Western Australia, the 135 degrees east zone, South Australia and Northern Territory, and the 150 degrees east zone the Eastern States.

In 1894, legislation was passed by each Colony and became law in 1895. It should be pointed out that this put South Australia in its correct zone and in line with the rest of the world, with few exceptions. The boundaries of South Australia and the Northern Territory continued to be the easterly and westerly extremities of CST as it was then known. In 1898, the South Australian Parliament amended the Standard Time Act of 1894 and moved the central meridian from 135 degrees east, running through Elliston, to 142 degrees east, which ran not through South Australia but through Warrnambool in Victoria.

Elliston, the correct centre by world Standard Central Time, was now on the extreme left of the territory, and west of Elliston was in another time zone. This change in 1898 put South Australia and the Northern Territory not only out of kilter with the rest of the world under the international agreement, but meant that Australia was one of six major countries that did not conform. The other countries, mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, included Burma, India, Afghanistan and Iran. All the other countries have their time zones one hour apart.

In reading the 1898 *Hansard* and following that debate through both Houses, it is interesting to note some of the reasons given for the need to change. Many reasons given on that occasion were the same as the reasons that are being given now and I believe that they were ill founded and have been proved to be so. However, the then Chief Secretary introduced the Standard Time Bill in the Legislative Council on 3 August 1898, and the reason given by him for this strange change was that commercial men who received cable advice from Great Britain were put at a great disadvantage because they were out of kilter with the Eastern Colonies.

Even in 1898 this reason appears strange (in fact, just as strange as the reasons being given today for change). Indeed, this argument is still just as invalid as the arguments being used today. Even in the old fashioned cable service of 90 years ago we were not as disadvantaged as those commercial men said. Poor Western Australia would not have had a hope of competing then if the argument was true. It would not have had a chance to keep up with the rest of Australia as the member for Hanson pointed out, but, Western Australia has done a good job over the past 90 years and its being two hours behind the Eastern States has not made one iota of difference to its development as a State or to the high regard in which it has been held throughout Australia.

If we follow this Government's argument today and the argument of 1898, New Zealand should be much better off because it could receive its cables two hours ahead of the Eastern States. That may be a reason why New Zealand refused to become part of the Commonwealth: it would probably be forced to adopt Eastern Standard Time, which would diminish Auckland's advantage over Sydney if we accept the argument being put forward today. If we accept that argument and if South Australia moves to EST in 1986, how can the other States be protected from being so disadvantaged with South Australia coming on stream with their time? When the Eastern States suddenly realise that little old South Australia has moved over to get an alleged competitive advantage, they must consider changing their time zones to keep in front of us.

If one takes this argument to its logical conclusion, we will all be on the International Date Line and today will become yesterday, which is just as ludicrous a suggestion as changing our time in 1898 and in 1986 when we are contemplating another change. Returning to the dramatic arguments put forward in Parliament in 1898, the cable argument has been well canvassed in this Parliament earlier today, but it carries little weight. However, one of the main arguments in 1898 was that London was the business centre of all our trade, but I remind members that much has happened to change our circumstances since 1898. There has been a tremendous change in communications, and today we have telex, telephone, television and direct dialling for international calls. So that argument no longer applies.

The next argument is that Great Britain is no longer our major trading partner and we should not be worried about altering our time to fit in with that of the Eastern States if we are worried about London. Indeed, following that argument today, there is good reason, as was well stated by the member for Hanson, why we should change our time to suit our other trading partners, South Korea and Japan, which both use their correct world times. In fact, if we were using ours we would be in the same time zone as Japan, which is our major trading partner. If any change is warranted, we should be going back half an hour and not forward half an hour. That would place South Australia in a better competitive position if the argument of the Government were to be followed, because we would then be in kilter with our major trading partner (Japan) and not competing with our sister States in the east.

On 18 October 1898, the Bill was introduced in the House of Assembly, and next day the second reading was carried. Opposition to the Bill was expressed in Committee. Mr Coply said that he opposed the third reading and he put an argument that had been stated by the *Advertiser* that morning, as follows:

> All that the Bill proposes to accomplish could be readily effected by the simple procedure of opening and closing businesses half an hour earlier by the clock than at present, but this requires, it is thought, so mighty a revolution in the manner and customs of the people that it is dismissed as an impracticable solution. Instead of moving on with the time, we have to get the time moved for us, or everything is permitted to drift into confusion.

That is pretty strong stuff from the *Advertiser*, and I notice that it has not come out with the same sort of strong stuff on this current issue. I would refer it back to its editorial of that day. It is just as well they did not have television advertising in 1898, otherwise we would have seen a very costly advertising program being put to air by the *Advertiser* to retain the world zone time for South Australia. An *Advertiser* campaign probably would have been more effective in those days than now. At least it would have been based on logical realities and an interest in the welfare of all South Australians, not splitting South Australia—and the community—into two time zones. So South Australia joined Afghanistan, Burma, India and other unimportant financial areas of the world by moving half an hour away from world zone time and half an hour closer to Eastern Standard Time.

When I hear some of the arguments put forward, not only in this Chamber but in the media, I must admit that I wince. The Minister of Agriculture went on ABC radio today and talked at length of the effect on children playing afternoon sport. After all, he is the Minister of Agriculture, and agriculture is this State's greatest money earner. He often gloats of mirages of huge pots of gold in overseas markets—none of which has come to fruition. But, of course, talk is cheap for the Minister, who is supposed to be our Minister in charge of agriculture, and his entire business experience has come out of a book and not from running a business of his own. Here we now have him trying to split our State into two time zones to put us further out of kilter with the rest of the world and not to put us on the same track as our trading partners.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: That is what I keep wondering, because at no stage during this debate has he taken into consideration the people who are trying to produce the export income for this State. Surely we can look at the world as a whole and note that all major financial capitals and all our major trading partners do not feel the need to chase rainbows and change their time zones. We have already done that once in this State, and I hope it will not happen again.

We should not delude ourselves that we can retain credibility with a further time change. Surely, common sense would dictate that we should not have changed in 1898 and we should not change in 1986. The argument today is just as shallow and even more confusing by splitting this State and dividing the population into two time zones.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I want to speak only briefly on this subject, which nevertheless is one on which I feel very strongly. I have received a considerable amount of representation on this matter. It has been pointed out by my colleagues on this side of the House that many contacts have been made through their constituents who have wished to put a view on the subject. I commend the Leader, John

Olsen, for the way in which he has led this debate and the representations he has made. Obviously, the Liberal Party feels very strongly about this matter, but it is not one merely of Party loyalty. I, for one, support the view the Leader has expressed, because it makes common sense. The argument he has advanced, together with that of many of my colleagues on this side is a very practical one.

I have been rather surprised at some of the comments made by those few on the other side who have spoken. Obviously, they are not very convinced. They are not very sure about the point they are making. I was interested in the second reading explanation with which the Minister introduced the Bill in this House. He indicated, for example:

> Following release of the proposal in April, letters were received from interested parties. A diversity of views were expressed in the responses, and not all views expressed regarding the proposal were easy to categorise.

I find that rather interesting, and perhaps some questions might be asked of the Minister in Committee. He went on to say:

> However, it is significant and worth noting that those most opposed to the proposal were also strongly opposed to the *status quo*.

I do not know how that works out. Certainly, the people who have contacted me were almost totally in favour of retaining the *status quo* and opposed to the changes that would be brought about by the implementation of this legislation. The Minister goes on to say:

> The alternatives suggested by those persons were unrealistic and undesirable involving, in some cases, the complete abolition of daylight saving and moving the State a full hour behind the Eastern States.

He then went on to talk about presenting a more balanced view. I would suggest that many of the points made by my colleagues on this side, and particularly by the Leader, do just that: they bring a very balanced view to this debate. There are, certainly among those people to whom I have spoken, very few who have been able to bring forward convincing arguments to support the need for the change to Eastern Standard Time. We have heard much about the role of the Chamber of Commerce in this debate. In fact, the Minister goes on to say in his second reading explanation:

> The Chamber of Commerce and Industry kindly provided the results of a poll of their members which indicated 57 per cent supported the introduction of EST . . . and 43 per cent supported the *status quo*. The chamber therefore advocated EST for the State. The Government has given weight to that evidence.

I have had the opportunity to speak to members of the Chamber of Commerce, both at a State and local level, and have been rather surprised by the comments that have been made by some of those people. In fact, I would suggest that the majority of those to whom I have spoken see this legislation as a non-issue.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I do not think they do understand it. They certainly are not in a position to be able to argue strongly in favour of it. When one looks at a support of 57 per cent, I find that rather staggering.

Certainly, among members of the chamber in my own district in the Hills—which certainly cannot be regarded as being in the heart of the rural district; it is more urban than rural—the debate that took place very recently at one of the meetings suggested that a large percentage of those people present favoured the *status quo*. So, I am not convinced that it is such a major issue as far as the Chamber of Commerce and Industry in this State is concerned. When we look at the electronic communication devices we have it is not really difficult to take into account the time differential with other States. It is not an impossible situation for people to make contact through telexes and the types of communications now available, so many of those arguments are removed. The Minister goes on to say:

> I acknowledge that the proposal will pose some minor inconvenience to some people.

I want to refer to a couple of letters that indicate just how major the problems are and how important the concerns are to many people in this State. The Minister continued:

> However, such inconvenience has been wildly exaggerated by the detractors of the proposal.

I do not believe that that is the case. The organisations from which I have received many of the letters are made up of very genuine people, and they are taking the opportunity to express views that they hold very strongly, and I support those views. Let us look at some of them. Most members, at least on this side of the House, have received a letter from the Rural Youth Movement of South Australia. I think this letter has been very well put together. It states:

> The Rural Youth Movement of South Australia is an organisation with member representation in all areas of our State, including Adelaide. We wish to express our concern over the recent proposal to change South Australia's time zones. The issue was considered and discussed at our last State executive meeting, held on 7 September 1986. Representatives at the meeting expressed strong opposition to the State changing to Eastern Standard Time. A motion was passed at the meeting that this letter be written to you expressing our concern with this issue. Indicated below are some of the reasons for our concern.

I think that the reasons are very concise and very much to the point. They are:

> Business operates effectively on an international scale passing through many time zones, therefore the argument that South Australian business would prosper is invalid.

I certainly support that. The letter goes on to say:

> The changes proposed would especially disadvantage country people living west of Adelaide, because of the long distances that school children have to travel to and from school. For example, many children who now catch a school bus at 6.55 a.m. will be catching it at 6.25 a.m., in the dark. This will further increase the problems of lack of sleep at night, loss of concentration during afternoon school lessons for all children, along with the current problem of travelling home in the hottest part of the day.
>
> Another disadvantage to country people, particularly farmers, is at shearing time where shearers start work at 7.30 a.m. Even now it is often dark in winter time and at either end of the daylight saving period. Many pastoral shearing sheds have no facility for lighting, therefore reducing efficient productivity through lost time. Shearers work by standards set by the Australian Workers Union and work by the clock, not by the sun.

That is generally recognised. The letter continues:

> Neither do they work overtime to make up for time lost in delayed starting time.
>
> Due to grain moisture content controls, the start of harvesting each day is controlled by the sun and weather, not the clock. If moisture levels are too high (common in the early morning), the grain is unacceptable to the South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling Ltd. With 8 000 farming families involved in the harvesting of South Australia's most important cereal crop, wheat, a further offsetting of delivery time of grain to silos, would result in the need for temporary paddock storage of 48 000 tonnes of grain every night, throughout the State. With the proposed time changes the silos will in effect be open for a shorter period during the ideal time of day for harvesting. This once again reduces optimum productivity of a very important industry.

The Rural Youth Movement of South Australia goes on to list in the letter other reasons why it is opposed to the move to Eastern Standard Time. For the Minister to say that it is causing very little concern to a few people is very much understating the problems that will be experienced if this legislation is to pass through Parliament. I certainly hope that it will not pass in the other place and that the Bill overall is defeated. I think that is the feeling of the majority of people in this State, and that is what they want to see. In fact I am rather surprised that this issue has not gone to a referendum. I would like that to have happened.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Minister is showing some surprise at that suggestion. I cannot remember the exact year, but it was while the Tonkin Government was in office—

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: It was 1982.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It was in 1982 that we had a referendum on daylight saving, as that was seen to be the appropriate way to handle the matter at that time. I would have thought that the measures in this legislation are far more significant than just those relating to daylight saving, and for that reason I would have thought it appropriate to have a referendum. I am extremely disappointed that that has not occurred, but obviously the Government has decided not to follow that course. I would suggest that with a Federal election not that far away it would have been an ideal opportunity in this State to have drawn up a referendum and to have asked—

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood interjecting.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am not too sure about that, but it seemed to me to be a very fair way of providing the opportunity for all people in South Australia to have their say in this regard. I refer to one other letter that has been received. It is from the Women's Agricultural Bureau of South Australia. I do not want it to appear that I am referring only to representations from agricultural organisations, and I might say that I have a number of very close friends employed in business in the city who feel as strongly as I do about this subject. So, it is not one that is just one-sided. I refer to some of the issues that have been raised by members of the Women's Agricultural Bureau of South Australia. They state:

> Members on Eyre Peninsula in particular do not wish to have a separate time zone from the rest of the State. It was felt that this would further add to the isolation they already experience in relation to the rest of the State. Members do not wish to have South Australia's time zone changed to that of the Eastern States. The argument that South Australian business would benefit is not valid because business operates effectively on an international scale in spite of many changes in time zones.

That is the case, considering the situation in the United States of America, for example. The Women's Agricultural Bureau also states:

> Members wish to make known their protest at the extension of daylight saving by two weeks in March 1986 and the proposed extension in October 1986 without consultation with the public.

That is something that the public has felt very strongly indeed, namely, the lack of consultation required. Again, a referendum would have provided an opportunity for all South Australians to have their say in such an important matter. The Women's Agricultural Bureau goes on to urge that consideration be given to South Australia's time zone being pegged to the meridian nearest to the centre of the State, which would give a one hour time difference from the Eastern States: in other words, to come back rather than to go forward an hour. The letter further states:

> It would also mean that clock and sun time would be more closely related throughout the year.

Certainly a lot of people to whom I have spoken suggest that that would be the appropriate move. The letter continues:

> Daylight saving should cease on the Sunday prior to children returning to school for the commencement of the first term. This would alleviate the problem faced by families with school children who have to travel long distances by school bus (up to 50 km each way) in the hottest time of the day, 4 to 5 p.m. in February, the acknowledged hottest month of the year. In these difficult times of rural crisis this problem further compounds the stress being experienced by all members of the rural community. In the interest of all people of South Australia we would like to see a meeting of all interested groups convened by the Government to discuss this subject before a decision is made.

That request was made by that organisation. Other organisations have made similar requests, but really that has not happened. The opportunity has not been provided for the type of debate that I believe would be appropriate for such a move. The matters referred to in these letters have not been taken lightly. They have been debated at length at meetings of these organisations, and I could refer to many other forms of representation by various people which have all come about as a result of consideration of and debate on this subject.

I refer again to the so-called support of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry SA Inc. I am not in a position to speak for all members of the chamber, but I have spoken to enough people who belong to that organisation to realise that many of them do not support that move. I reiterate my thoughts in regard to a referendum. It would have been most appropriate for a referendum to have been held. In fact, the Minister earlier interjected and said that he did not believe that it would be appropriate for the State to look at a referendum at the time of a Federal election. I would be interested to determine whether that was the case and whether the Minister has been able to seek information and would be able to provide that advice when he has the opportunity to reply in the second reading debate. It is a practical way of involving all people in the State. I recognise the expense involved, but I would like to see referendums used a lot more in this State on many more issues. I believe that, in relation to an issue that will have such differing effects on different people in different areas of the State, it would be most appropriate for a referendum to be held.

I oppose the legislation. I sincerely hope that this House does not allow this Bill to pass and, even if it does because of the numbers situation in this House, I sincerely hope that the legislation will be blocked when it reaches another place.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): A slogan of this State is: It's our State, Mate. This Bill ought to be described as: Divide our State, Mate. Unfortunately, South Australia has operated on a meridian of 142.5 for the past 88 years and an Act relating to Standard Time was assented to on 23 December 1898. I refer to the *Hansard* record of 3 August 1898 of that unfortunate debate, and the second reading explanation of the then Chief Secretary, which states:

> The Act of 1891 adopted the zone time, which was in force throughout the civilised world, and the effect was to make the time in Adelaide an hour different to that of the eastern colonies, which had another zone, and an hour different to Western Australia, which had another zone. The original meridian adopted here was 133.35 Greenwich. That was altered in 1894 to 135—

may I say that it should never have been altered—

> and it was now proposed to adopted the 142½ meridian . . . The reason for the alteration was that commercial men who received cable advices from Great Britain were put to great disadvantage under the present system as compared with business men in the other colonies . . . There was a proposal some years ago to make the 135th meridian the meridian for Australia, which would have suited us admirably, but unfortunately the other colonies would not agree to it.

More is the pity! He further stated:

> The Bill was practically a copy of the Bill of 1894, save that a different meridian was substituted.

It would appear that, for the past 88 years, South Australians have been working around an Act that was based at the time on a necessity, but in today's society it is very antiquated. We no longer receive cable advice from Great Britain that makes our commercial businessmen less efficient. In fact, with today's technology, information is accessible within minutes. For example, we have facsimile machines, telexes, videos, vocadexes and, of course, ISD telephones.

Needless to say, in recent times, we have operated on a quaint business requirement based on the late 1880s. On a more serious note, the effect of Eastern Standard Time on my electorate and the rest of the State is not satisfactory. Our rural industry and isolated communities, which in normal conditions have enough hardships and limitations, have had their fair share already over the last 18 months, without the added confusion and restrictions EST will place upon them.

The rural sector provides more than 40 per cent of the State's export income. The greater part of Eyre Peninsula would be separated and inconvenienced from its centralised health and education services. Our country schoolchildren have long distances to travel for their education. Many will be catching a bus in the dark and travelling home in the hottest part of the day.

Shearers start work at 7.30 a.m. and work by standards set by the Australian Workers Union in the Arbitration Commission and work by the clock and not by the sun. Many pastoral shearing sheds have no facilities for lighting, thereby reducing the efficiency of productivity. It is often dark in the winter time in the mornings and in the evenings, when they start work and when they complete the shearing operation.

When it comes to harvesting (something about which I have some knowledge), due to grain moisture controls the start of harvesting every day is based on the sun and weather, not the clock. The grain is often unacceptable and is reaped too early in the day. Unfortunately, often one cannot start reaping until about 12 o'clock so one has a very short day in which to operate. There are 8 000 farming families involved in harvesting South Australia's wheat. A further offsetting of delivery time of grain to silos would result in more paddock storage, and that is more expense.

Television will be disrupted on the West Coast, which relies on the ABC, and the proposed change will disrupt the news services. If the proposed daylight saving changes take place, viewers west of the 137 longitude line will receive the 6.30 p.m. news at 5.30 p.m., which is much earlier than business people, let along farmers, can be at home. It will affect GTS BKN 4's commercials for alcohol, which would be shown legally at 8.30 p.m. in Port Pirie, but illegally (at the same time) at 7.30 p.m. west of 137 longitude. It would also affect 'Adults Only' rating programs from stations east of the new time zone, when it would be prime children's television viewing in the western zone. As stated by GTS BKN themselves, this would contravene the programming standards as set by the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal and possibly the conditions of their licence.

GTS BKN has sent a submission, which all Parliamentarians have received, voicing its doubts and concerns on the Government's proposal to split South Australia into two time zones during daylight saving. Their coverage area will be divided by the proposed 137 degrees line and, as they stated, it will affect television programming, commercial placement and, ultimately, revenue. This proposal will throw their whole programming, advertising and development into havoc, and the ultimate consequences are as yet not fully appreciated. Their concern at clients withdrawing advertising from prime programs that are in unpopular time zones is only the start of a loss of revenue which would have a spiral effect with employment and development.

If EST is adopted, how much local media input would South Australians receive? Since we would no doubt be heavily influenced by Eastern States news services and current affairs programs, that is another concern which, as yet, is not fully appreciated or answered by the Government. The airlines and their schedules will be in similar disarray. The backing of the Chamber of commerce and Industry for this proposal astounds me. Why is it that Western Australia is operating efficiently when our only access to that State in business hours during daylight saving is only two hours? Surely we can handle half an hour. The argument that South Australian business would benefit is not valid, because business operates efficiently on international scales in spite of many time changes right across the world.

If anything, the two time zones in South Australia could easily affect local businesses with branches across the State, for example, from Ceduna to Mount Gambier. The chamber's own economist was quoted in the *Advertiser* of 20 October 1986 as saying there was not any economic evidence to support the move to EST.

I could continue with many more examples and reasons why the Government's proposal should not be adopted. It has not been researched adequately. The average person on the street, quite frankly, does not care one way or the other. There has been no mandate from the people for such a change. There was a referendum on daylight saving, but there has been no referendum in this case, and the proposed change to EST has not been discussed adequately in the community.

This exercise will only serve to split this State. We also recognise that Australia is one of only six countries in the world to have a half-hour zoning. Before the current meridian was adopted, we were on the 135 meridian, which allows for the sun to be practically overhead at noon. If we continue with the Government's proposals, during daylight saving our midday sun will be over the North Island of New Zealand at 12 noon here. That is a ridiculous proposal.

I firmly believe that daylight saving should cease on the weekend prior to children returning to school for the commencement of the first term. This would alleviate problems faced by families in the country whose children are the ones who suffer in the hottest part of the day when they travel home in February, which has been acknowledged as the hottest month of the year.

My proposal in relation to EST is to adopt the 135 degree meridian once again. This would bring some order and relativity to South Australia. It would be a more sensible approach, which would incorporate 98 per cent of the State's population in the same time zone and also keep the major centres united. And it goes without saying that it would keep South Australia and South Australians united and not divided.

In the brief time during which this debate has been raging across South Australia, I have received hundreds of letters from my constituents who expressed not only concern but also complete annoyance and anger at these proposals. I will cite some of the letters. A letter of 21 October 1986 from the District Council of Elliston states:

> This council is concerned as to the proposed introduction of legislation to alter the State's time zone to eastern standard time, as well as two time zones within South Australia.
>
> The following points are made with regard to the proposals as publicised to date . . .The media campaign by radio, television and newspaper interests should be viewed with concern. What will be the effects of employment in the media industry in South Australia if there are direct transmissions from the Eastern States? Will South Australia become a victim of 'networking' from the Eastern States, resulting in loss of local input with regard to programs? What are the ethical considerations in the media using their resources to promote their own point of view to a passive public? . . .
>
> Currently there is not daylight saving in Queensland. However, there has not been any indication that this creates undue problems in trade with New South Wales and Victoria during the summer months.
>
> The State Government's promotion of South Australia as the best location for the proposed submarine project has clearly indicated the attractiveness of this State for industrial development.

These factors in themselves far outweigh any need to change the time to eastern standard time to secure industrial development.

The proposal for two time zones as outlined by the Deputy Premier in his news release dated 22 April 1986 will contribute to a sense of division within the South Australian community. A reference to time zones and eastern standard time was not a factor in the original referendum on daylight saving. They are separate issues to the original debate. Where is proof of widespread community support for the proposals as outlined by the Government? This council would urge you to vote against any legislative proposals to change South Australian time to eastern standard time and divide the State into two time zones.

Let me assure the council that I have no intention of supporting either of those propositions. As someone—the only member of this House—who would have to live in the new time zone that would be created, I take strong exception to this proposal being foisted on the citizens in that part of the State. This change will be inflicted on those people without any consultation whatsoever. I put to the House the problems that will be created when people are communicating within their own State. There will be split cricket and football associations and people will be confused.

This proposal is an absolute nonsense. Obviously, it has been dreamt up by the backroom boys within the Labor Party who have not given a great deal of thought to the long-term problems. The member for Heysen clearly indicated the views of the Rural Youth movement, so I will not refer to the letter that I received from that body. However, the views were well put and I support them. I received a letter from the Town Clerk of the City of Port Augusta, Mr McSporran, which stated:

I have been asked by Her Worship the Mayor, Mrs N. J. Baluch, and members of the Port Augusta city council to convey to you their views on the proposal by the State Government to alter the South Australian time zone to provide for eastern standard time in the area east of the 137 degree line of longitude.

At meetings held on 30 June and 20 October, members unanimously agreed to oppose any alterations to the current time zones operating in South Australia. Members do not believe that the arguments provided by the Government justify a change in the time zones. Furthermore, it is their opinion that businesses within South Australia do not suffer to the extent the Government indicates because of a 30-minute time difference between South Australia and the Eastern States.

The other arguments provided by the Government in terms of simplification of airline timetables and other travel arrangements, etc., are considered by members to be of so little significance as to be superfluous. In addition, council believes that the extension of daylight saving hours during March of this year by a period of two weeks had no significant advantages for the community whatsoever and in fact exacerbated the problems of 'daylight saving for the rural areas'.

Accordingly, members feel that their objections to the Government's proposals should be expresed and that the announced decision should not be supported when the relevant legislation is introduced into State Parliament.

I sincerely hope that that council has made its views very clear to the local member, the member for Stuart and Minister of Transport, so that he can support the stand taken by the Opposition. I received a letter from the District Council of Streaky Bay which stated:

Council is of the opinion that moving to eastern standard time and/or the creation of two time zones does not have the support of the majority of people in South Australia. Any move to effectively lose our identity and individuality in this the Jubilee 150 Year of South Australia is an insult to the people . . . The existing central standard time, because of man's tampering with nature, gives the people of South Australia 30 minutes of permanent daylight saving for the whole year. There seems to be no justifiable or rational reason for imposing an additional 60 minutes of daylight on the people of South Australia. If there are good and sound reasons for eastern standard time/daylight saving/two time zones, then it would seem appropriate to have the issue properly debated and put before all South Australians—not just a selected few.

I share the concerns of the district council, and I sincerely hope that the House will support my views. I have also received a letter from a Mrs Woolford on behalf of the Central Eyre Peninsula School Parents Association. Mrs Woolford also contacted the member for Flinders. In her letter to me, she states:

With the imminent introduction of the Standard Time Bill to Parliament by the Deputy Premier, we earnestly seek your support in opposing this Bill for the following reasons:

1. We are one State—not to be divided by time zones. 'A Divided State, Mate' would then need to replace 'A Great State, Mate'.
2. Throughout the world time zones are one hour apart. What right has South Australia to create an inconsistency? The U.S.A. has six time zones and businesses appear to interrelate and function well.
3. The western area would have permanent 'daylight saving' a concept not favoured by the majority of Eyre Peninsula residents with schoolchildren being particularly disadvantaged.
4. Why sacrifice a large area of the State for the convenience of a few people adjacent to the State's eastern border?
5. Flexitime and technological developments should allow businesses to proceed without disruption.
6. Two time zones would disrupt appropriate family television viewing. Cheaper STD rate times would be inconsistent and confusing. The greater area of Eyre Peninsula would be separated from its centralised health and educational services.

The South Australian population has had little time to consider all aspects of the proposed Bill. It is imperative to maintain the status quo in order to allow opportunity for further deliberation in a more democratic manner.

We therefore implore you to cast your vote against the Bill.

I can assure Mrs Woolford that I certainly shall be doing that. In conclusion, I believe that proper consideration should be given to altering the time zone to 135 degrees. Then, we ought to debate that matter in a cool and rational way. Proposals such as this should not be inflicted on the people at the whim of a Government Minister. It is not only unfortunate but also a quite unnecessary course of action to adopt. There is no public clamour for this particular proposal. It is not something about which the people have approached members. I do not think I have ever been approached in Adelaide by anyone wanting this. We are lobbied on many issues at length but this is one issue on which I have never been lobbied by people in favour.

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

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): I quote:

Fifteen years ago a remarkable combination of forces gave Adelaide city—the city inside the parklands—a new sense of direction. An imaginative Premier, the best Lord Mayor in Adelaide's history, an intelligent consultant planner, tough residents' associations and some business reformers joined to support a more original, humane, 'people-oriented' city plan than could possibly have prevailed in Sydney or Melbourne at that time. Fifteen years later those forces seem to be present again: strong Premier, reformist Lord Mayor, imaginative planners and concerned residents.

Thus began an extremely important, provocative in many respects, and insightful analysis of planning in the city of Adelaide over the last 15 or so years. As many members on both sides of this House would know from special editions of the *City News* which have been made available to them, as well as through other documents that have been made available by the Adelaide City Council, the city of Adelaide plan is undergoing a major review—its first 10 year review and its second review since it was formulated some 15 years ago.

Amendments will be made to the City of Adelaide Development Control Act incorporating the changed and extended controls over a variety of developments in the city and they are expected to come before this House some time early in the new year. My purpose tonight is to direct the attention of the House to some of the issues that are raised in the objectives and policies for the city, which are currently on display at the old Methodist Church hall behind the Colonel Light Building in Pirie Street.

The display and the process of public consultation has gone on now for some time in various forms at a variety of levels and is now nearing the end of its time of public debate and consultation. If I may, I will paraphrase Hugh Stretton: the current City of Adelaide development plan, based on the work of George Clarke in 1974 and given statutory effect in 1976, has been able to promote and enhance some of the best and most loved features of Adelaide yet at the same time has been incapable of preventing some of its worst excesses and some of the least loved features of our city.

The history, by and large, of the city of Adelaide development plan over the past 12 or 15 years has been positive although not necessarily uniform in either quality or in attracting support right across the board. I suppose the key features of the current planning process and the way in which the various protagonists have approached the plan review is with a sense of pride or a sense of ownership of the city. However, the city does not belong to any one group, be it the Adelaide City Council, the State Government, the planners, the architects, the historians, the bureaucrats, the politicians, the residents or anyone else. But, it does attract and beguile all those people and others, and it does provide them with a whole range of opportunities. It is this sense of ownership—of a desire to improve, enhance, develop and protect a vision of Adelaide—that has characterised the nearly year long debate about what should be the future for the city for the next 10 or so years.

The public launch of the final review stage of the plan jointly by the Premier and the Lord Mayor was marked by a unanimity of approach on many aspects of the plan; on the need to enhance and restore the Victorian and Edwardian character of central Adelaide while at the same time finding new development opportunities for major private and public developments; to give legislative protection to the parklands, while ensuring that they can be used by people from right across metropolitan Adelaide; to respect the rights and amenity of existing residents while recognising that the city and its infrastructure can, in fact, support many more people than live here at the moment in an increasingly wide variety of housing types; to enable people to get into the city by car and by bus, but at the same time being able to use it and get around in it on foot; to provide services to local residents while recognising that many people focus their community and social activities on the city; to protect and enhance the key design features and the unique layout and character which has emerged over 150 years of settlement, yet acknowledging that the city will go on for more than 150 more years and that our debt to the past must be as significant as our legacy should be to the future.

These are some of the dichotomies of city planning, of city living and of city government. The pendulum moves between often competing ends, and planning, like government, is about finding the right balance for the times between these often competing objectives in the same policy area. However, there are one or two features that I would quickly like to mention here while I have the opportunity. The first is housing, and I would like quickly to refer to the following extract from the special edition of the *City News*, which concentrates on the new plan for Adelaide:

> Housing is one of the major land uses in Adelaide. Since 1976, the council has acted to reverse a trend towards a declining population and has been successful in establishing a dynamic housing market.

Recently, announcements have been made by the City Council about its preparedness to enter into joint schemes with both public and private housing developers, as well as undertaking individual developmental initiatives of its own. A number were referred to by me earlier this month in a question to the Minister of Housing and Construction, as a result of an announcement made by the Adelaide City Council and the Housing Trust that 25 units would be built in Gilbert Street for homeless people.

In commenting on the increased involvement of the City Council in the provision of housing in the city, the Minister said that it was encouraging that the current Lord Mayor (Jim Jarvis) had picked up the problem of housing development and the problem of homelessness, and that he was addressing the problem and wanted to get involved. The Minister said that this would not just reverse the trend of people moving out of the city but would in fact address the specific social problems of those people who could not find appropriate accommodation for themselves in the city. Other examples are currently being discussed and negotiated between the trust and the council for further development of walk-up flats and family units for the aged and for single people, and I believe that many more opportunities can be found, if there is a preparedness (and I believe that there is) on the part of both the trust and the council to use their imagination and to try to use the land resources that are currently available.

Adelaide once housed about 40 000 people and, although I would not necessarily want to return to that situation because many of those people were housed under unsuitable and unhygienic conditions, the physical infrastructure is there and is capable of sustaining more people. Indeed, I believe that the city of Adelaide plan sets a framework within which such opportunities can be created. The important thing is that we must be careful not to impose impediments to new forms of housing development. It is already expensive to buy and to build and we do not want to make it more prohibitive by the regulations that we impose. The support given to housing development in the City of Adelaide Development Plan is a fine example of the way in which we can develop those opportunities.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I wish to raise a matter that is of grave concern to the many investors who are using land brokers in South Australia. Over the weekend one of my constituents informed me that she had lost $138 000 and that her daughter had invested $60 000 which will also be lost. Those two people stand to lose $198 000 because of the action of a landbroker by the name of Ross D. Hodby and Associates. My constituent says that Ross D. Hodby and Associates, of 24 Divett Place, Adelaide, has gone into receivership, that the first meeting of creditors will be held tomorrow (19 November), and that Mr Hodby will be the subject of a public examination on 22 January 1987.

The tragedy of the activities of this person is that over 200 clients are believed to have been defrauded of about $2 million. At this stage, the Fraud Squad and others who are investigating this person's affairs have no idea how many people are involved and what the final sum will be. I point out that two other people with similar names are operating as landbrokers: Barry P. Hodby and Associate of 178 Gray Street, Adelaide and Dean Hodby of Black Top Road, One Tree Hill. Under no circumstances are they

involved with Ross D. Hodby and Associates, and it is unfortunate that those two businesses bear a similar name.

When discussing this matter with my constituent, I learned that for many years she, like many others, handed over large sums to be invested on first mortgage. Sometimes she would take a receipt and at other times considered that handing over her cheque was good enough, leaving the broker to place the money on a registered first mortgage. Some months ago she did not receive her regular monthly interest cheque and, rather than worry the broker, she rang direct the person with whom she had the mortgage, only to be advised that the mortgage had been repaid 15 months previously.

This lady had received interest cheques from the landbroker, but the person who she thought had the mortgage had paid it out. So, no doubt the landbroker, in this case Hodby, was dovetailing the system and creating a false impression. My constituent has since found out that one person telephoned her a few days ago and wanted to know how the mortgage on her house was going. This person thought that she had a mortgage for $80 000 over my constituent's house, but my constituent said, 'That's impossible because I have the certificate of title in my possession, so no one could register a first mortgage.' On the other hand, my constituent thought that she had mortgages on various properties, but she has since found, by using her solicitor to make a search of various properties, that those mortgages do not exist. It is a clear case of fraud and a tragedy that this person who thought her money was well invested now stands to lose $138 000. She also enticed her daughter to place $60 000 in the same manner.

Many people do not understand the method and system of investing this type of money. There are not enough rules and regulations. Certainly, there is not enough education in the community to warn those people who place money with anyone, especially on first mortgage, that, when they hand over the money, they should receive a trust fund receipt. More importantly, they should receive a registered mortgage and a title so that they can have these documents registered and thus protect their investment.

Certainly, trust must be placed in the ability of the person to proceed with those documents, but it is most important to obtain independent advice on all investments. That is an area where there is a large questionmark as to the ability of some people to give advice to would-be investors. This is a tricky and dangerous field. Today, when many people want to place money in a safe and secure long term investment, so many people are offering advice, yet there is very little recourse on those people if their advice proves false, misleading or incorrect.

Mr Groom: There might be a conflict of interest.

Mr BECKER: I agree. Although I do not always recommend the use of the legal profession because that can be expensive, it is sometimes well worth spending $100 or so to obtain sound legal advice, because in that respect there is recourse. Under the heading 'Land and Business Agents Act—Consolidated Interest Fund', the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1986 (at page 268) shows that at that date the balance of the fund was $3 938 000. One large claim is already outstanding against that fund. I believe that it concerns the Swan group of companies which caused investors to lose about $4 million.

Now we have Hodby for some $2 million plus—we really do not know until the public come forward to the liquidators and advise them just how much money is outstanding or missing. I believe that there may be one or two other instances as well. For the financial year ended 30 June 1986 there was $1 million worth of income into this fund. There was $354 000 worth of claims paid out, $3 000 for accounting and legal fees, and the increase in the fund was $662 000, so that now gives the fund an overall total of $3 938 000.

Under the regulations concerning this fund, the fund is to be applied for compensating persons who suffer pecuniary loss from the fiduciary default of an agent. The amount that may be applied by the board towards the satisfaction of all claims relating to an agent or broker is limited to 10 per cent of the balance of the consolidated interest fund as disclosed in the last audited account, or such higher proportion as may be approved by the Minister.

So, under those regulations only $390 000 could be available for the 200 persons who have lost this $2 million. It could well mean that if the Minister or the Government so decides, certainly a greater proportion of that money could be made available but, unfortunately, they have the Swan group of companies' claims outstanding—a huge amount that could swallow up the bulk of the money in this fund. I feel for these people who have invested their money. I feel for these people who take upon the trust of another to invest their money, but there can only be this continual warning that when one hands over money one must receive a properly registered document, and one has that document registered with the Lands Titles Office, particularly in the case of registered first mortgages.

The other problem, of course, in talking to my constituent was that she had very little idea of just how much the person was investing for her on certain mortgages. Sometimes three persons could be involved in the one mortgage. A mortgage may be for $80 000; one person has $50 000, another has $20 000 and a third has $10 000. The person with the largest amount, the $50 000, is the one who holds the title. So, it is extremely difficult for people investing their money to know exactly what is going on. Therefore, there must be a warning and, at the same time, I think the Government should look at the system. It is one of the best and safest methods of investment, but when multiple names are placed on mortgages and on the title, there must be some means of ensuring that everyone gets the correct notation that their investment is safe. On the other hand, there is insufficient money in this fund.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): One of the easiest things to do in this place or out in the community is to stand up and say, 'I told you so,' and it is easy to be wise in hindsight. I do not intend to do that tonight, but one matter that I have raised on a number of occasions in this place is the design of West Lakes Boulevard. Quite frankly, my view is that the design of that roadway in some areas is appalling, to say the least. Members in this place could be aware of the question I asked a few weeks ago in relation to an elderly citizen, very well known to me, who lost her life outside the Shell service station on West Lakes Boulevard between Brebner and Turner Drives.

I raise this issue tonight because, since that unfortunate accident, I have received numerous representations from senior citizens clubs, from the hotelier at the Lakes Resort Hotel, from Delfin Management Services, the Mayor of Woodville, and a number of others whose names escape me for the moment. Between Frederick Road and Military Road there is no break in the traffic flow for pedestrians to cross this very busy road.

I have watched this over many years, and people take their lives in their hands when they cross this boulevard, because of the design of the boulevard itself, particularly in proximity to Brebner and Turner Drives. It is designed in such a way that there are bends, it is a speedway along which young and old alike travel at high speed and, to

compound that problem, there is the question of the trees in the plantation as well as the continual erection of buildings on the northern side of West Lakes Boulevard. This will increase traffic flow out of the new Woodbridge development onto the northern side of the boulevard, involving an two additional exits onto this very busy thoroughfare which comes off a bend in the road.

I predict that there will be a considerable number of accidents in the vicinity of these two exits on the boulevard. Constituents who have approached me—including some constituents who work in Parliament House and who reside close to that area—have informed me that, many years ago, they were given an undertaking that no additional exits would be provided onto West Lakes Boulevard. Quite clearly, there is a need for traffic lights either on the Turner Drive or Brebner Drive intersection on the boulevard.

One only has to go there on a Thursday night, a Friday, or a Saturday morning to see the problems in terms of traffic control. To compound this, STA buses enter and leave Brebner Drive, and it is very difficult to get out onto West Lakes Boulevard from either Turner or Brebner Drive. To do a left hand turn, in some instances, causes rear end collisions. Although I do not have the traffic figures with me tonight, I know that rear end collisions are prevalent in that area. I am informed by the Corporation of the City of Woodville that, going back to 1974, undertakings were given that traffic lights would be installed at the intersection of Turner Drive and West Lakes Boulevard. Some 12 years down the track, that has yet to be achieved.

The West Lakes development forms a large part of my electorate, as members would know. It is also a very popular part of the western suburbs and many people from the metropolitan area use the facilities there. Over 100 aquatic events are held on the West Lakes waterway. Marathons, triathlons, rowing and aquatic events are held in this area. In addition to that, about 100 000 children go through an aquatic program held each year by the Education Department at the West Lakes Aquatic Centre. I predict that that attendance will increase in future, and that will further compound the traffic flow problems in that part of my electorate. Further, Football Park is becoming increasingly popular as a venue for holding events. I understand that shortly Elton John will give a concert at Football Park, and I believe that this will further highlight the problems of traffic control in the area.

Mr Becker: What about Kenny Rogers and Dolly Parton?

Mr HAMILTON: Indeed, that would be a large boost to the tourism and entertainment industry—there is no question about that, and one would certainly be delighted to see Dolly Parton demonstrate her ability in that area! Seriously, I intend to pursue the matter of traffic problems in the area. I know that the Minister is aware of my concerns. I hope that the pedestrian crossing is erected, as in my view it is important to provide a break in the traffic so that the elderly, young children, young mothers and students can traverse West Lakes Boulevard in safety. I know that the many influential people in my electorate who have approached me on this matter, such as the Mayor, the Town Engineer, representatives from companies and local residents, are on the right track. I look forward to the day that a deputation to the Minister results in the resolution of this matter.

Motion carried.

At 9.53 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 19 November at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 18 November 1986

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

156. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. To which department or agency does fawn coloured Holden station wagon registered UQG-443 belong?

2. What Government business was the male driver with an adult female passenger and two young children conducting on Saturday 23 August 1986 at approximately 6.00 p.m. whilst travelling south on Brighton Road through Glenelg?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The vehicle UQG-443, which belongs to the Department of Tourism, was being used in accordance with the approval issued.

157. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: To which departments or agencies do the motor vehicles registered UQF-262 and UQF-723 belong and what Government business was being conducted at approximately 4.30-4.45 p.m. whilst travelling along Morphett Road on 12 August by the male driver with female adult passenger in the first vehicle and the female driver with a child passenger in the back seat and also carrying sports gear thought to be a hockey stick in the second vehicle?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Registered vehicle UQF-262 was being used by two officers of the Department of Environment and Planning to collect camera equipment which had been used the previous day and stored overnight for safety at one officer's home, and which was required by the other officer for a field trip involving an early start the next day.

The other vehicle, UQF-723, is allocated to the Engineering and Water Supply Department and is an Isuzu single-cabin traytop truck which has been located in Mount Gambier since 25 June 1986. On the day in question the vehicle was secured in the operations depot as it was not required for scheduled work.

URBAN ABORIGINAL SCHOOL

178. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal children, respectively, are enrolled at the Urban Aboriginal School at Elizabeth?

2. What is the expected number of such enrolments when the school is fully operational in its permanent building?

3. What is the anticipated annual recurrent cost of staffing and running the school for 1986-87?

4. In what year is it anticipated that study at year 8 level will be undertaken at the school?

5. Will a school council be established for the school and, if so, what form will it take and pursuant to which provisions of the Education Act 1972, will it be constituted?

6. What curriculum materials have been prepared for the school which are at variance with those established for general use, in what way do they vary from the standard materials and by whom were the materials prepared?

7. Are there any plans or proposals for further buildings associated with the school or to be constructed on the site or adjacent land and, if so, what are they?

8. What criteria have been established against which the success of the school as an alternative education mechanism will be evaluated?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. There are 39 children enrolled, one of whom is non-Aboriginal.

2. The enrolment projection for 1987 is 60 students.

3. Estimated recurrent cost of staffing and running the school for 1986-87 is $245 500.

4. The nine students who are presently enrolled in Year 8 take some of their subjects at Kaurna Plains and are integrated into classes at Elizabeth High School for others.

5. An interim School Council was established in September 1985, to plan for the opening of the school. It was subsequently replaced by the elected School Council, which had it inaugural meeting on 26 March 1986. This Council was established as a Primary School Council under Regulation 201 of the Education Act. It is anticipated that in 1987 additional members will be nominated, as defined under Regulation 201 for Area Schools.

6. The school uses the current curriculum materials used by all schools as a basis for the program offered. Methodology differs because there is a strong focus on Aboriginal learning styles. Aboriginal Studies units were produced by the Aboriginal Studies Section at Wattle Park Teachers Centre, featuring the Kaurna, Narunga Narrindjerri people.

7. The Northern Area Education Office, through the National Aboriginal Consultative Council, has registered with the Commonwealth Schools Commission a Statement of Intent for a Stage 2 Development to cater for year levels 8-12 inclusive.

8. The Aboriginal Education Section of the Education Department's Studies Directorate is establishing a data base to provide an on-going comparison.

REWARDS

180. **The Hon. B.C. EASTICK** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services: On how many crimes have offers of reward been announced in each of the report periods from 1980, how many such rewards have been claimed or awarded and have any been withdrawn following public announcement and, if so, for what reasons?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The schedule below provides the information requested.

CRIMES HAVING OFFERS OF REWARD

Report period	*No. of rewards offered	Rewards claimed or awarded	Rewards withdrawn
1979-80	4	1	1—offer terminated by insurance group.
1981-82	7	nil	2—offers withdrawn by an insurance co. & private citizen.
1982-83	9	nil	4—3 offers terminated by insurance co's & 1 withdrawn due to *ex gratia* payment.
1983-84	2	nil	nil
1984-85	2	1	1—1 offer terminated by private citizens.
1985-86	4	nil	1— offer terminated by insurance co.

*Includes reward offers by non-government sources.

In addition to the number of rewards listed above, all banking institutions, through the Bankers' Association, have a standard 'General Reward' system of up to $10 000 for information leading to the apprehension and conviction of

any person who commits an armed hold-up on a bank. These rewards are payable by the banks at the discretion and on the recommendation of the Commissioner of Police. Some other institutions also have a similar reward system in relation to offences committed against them. These include the Totalizator Agency Board—$5 000, the S.A. Chamber of Commerce Inc.—$5 000, and the Reserve Bank of Australia—up to $25 000 for offences relating to counterfeit and stolen Australian bank notes. None of these rewards are announced publicly during the currency of any applicable investigation. In this sense, they differ from the normal reward announcements made in the case of, for example, murder investigations.

TRAIN DERAILMENT

184. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What was the cause of the derailment and capsize of seven trucks and the brake van of the ballast train on the Victor Harbor railway line on 9 September?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Since the derailment occurred on a section of track that is owned and maintained by Australian National, advice has been sought from the General manager of A.N.

CONVENTION CENTRE

186. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: How many conferences have had to be cancelled or rescheduled because the ASER convention centre will not be completed on schedule and what is the estimated value of lost conventions to the State?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There have been eight conventions/exhibitions that were tentatively booked to the Adelaide Convention Centre within the ASER complex that have been rescheduled to other venues within South Australia. No conventions have been lost to the State due to the delayed opening of the Adelaide Convention Centre.

ASER PROJECT

187. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Is the Premier aware of cost run-overs, inefficiencies and documentation difficulties associated with the 'fast track method' of building being used for the ASER project?

2. What now is the estimated completion date and cost of each phase of the project?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. There is no evidence to suggest that the fast track method of building is, *per se*, less efficient and subject to cost overruns than the design prior to construction method. In the case of the ASER project, while there have been cost overruns, there is no evidence to suggest that the total cost of the project would have been any less had the traditional method of design been used. The traditional method of design would however have produced more accurate estimates and thorough preparation procedures which would have avoided errors and omissions resulting in estimated costs more accurately reflecting actual costs.

2. The hotel, office tower and common areas are components for which the joint venturer (ASER Property Trust) has a complete or substantial responsibility and it would not be proper for me to be making public details of their commercial and financial operations. Of those components in which the Government has an operational interest, the estimated completion date for the car park and the Convention Centre is April 1987. The net rolled up cost of the car park is currently estimated at $16.5 million and for the Convention Centre $31.1 million. These figures are expressed in August 1986 terms.

PUMP HOUSE COVER

188. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: When will the Minister reply to correspondence from the member for Hanson of 5 February concerning the pump house cover located in the laneway between Lowry Street and Portland Court, Fulham, and what has been the reason for the delay in responding further to the Minister's acknowledgment of 11 March?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The reply is as follows:

Dear Mr Becker,

Sewage Pump Station Vent in Laneway Between Lowry Street and Portland Court, Fulham

I refer to your letter of 5 February 1986, concerning a sewage pump station vent at Fulham.

The 15 metre vent which is the subject of concern by local residents is unfortunately located where there are no nearby trees or suitable structures to camouflage or mask its presence. A photograph of the vent is attached.

The vent in question is necessary to provide adequate dispersion of sewage odours (which are normally generated at pump stations) and to prevent corrosion of equipment by reducing corrosive vapour levels in the pump station atmosphere. Pump station vents also have value in minimising health hazards for sewer maintenance workers by removal of toxic gases. Gases emitted from the vent are dispersed well above ground level and would present no health risk or odour nuisance.

Without the vent there would no doubt be complaints about odours.

The new pumping station has replaced an operationally less efficient ejector station which had been built in 1958 at the same location. The original station did not require a vent because it functioned differently, using a sealed transfer system. This type of pumping station has now become obsolete because of difficulty in obtaining spare parts.

The sewage handled by the pump station originates from a relatively small area and the station is fed by three 150 mm sewer main systems, none of which lends itself (because of the small sewer diameters) for relocation of the vent to any nearby area where it may be less obtrusive and still provide effective pump station venting.

It is unfortunate that the modernisation of the pumping station has meant the installation of an environmentally intrusive structure. The most practical solution to this problem could be the growing of one or more suitable trees near the vent to mask its presence. A moderate size tree would suffice (not necessarily growing as high as the vent) and would fit in well with the general area which is one where there are quite a number of relatively large trees of different species.

However, in view of the lack of available space on Crown land it would be necessary for any trees to be planted by neighbouring property owners on their land.

A good example of the use and value of suitable trees to mask the effects of stark obtrusive structures is the trees along Anzac Highway between the numerous very large Stobie poles lining that motorway.

As certain tree root systems can penetrate and damage sewers, careful selection of suitable species is necessary. A brochure on this matter, issued by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, is attached. Advice in selecting the most suitable trees for the particular location can be obtained from those contacts listed on the back page of the brochure.

Yours sincerely,
(Signed)
D.J. HOPGOOD
Deputy Premier and
Minister for Environment and Planning

LIQUOR LICENCE FEES

195. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Attorney-General:

1. How many hotels, clubs, restaurants and other liquor licence holders did not pay their licence fees on the due dates of 1 January, 1 April, 1 July and 1 October in each category and how many were subject to the 10 per cent fine after 14 days from due date and are all outstanding fines now paid and, if not, why not?

2. How many licensees in each category have had their licences revoked for non-payment of fees in each of the past two financial years and how many such actions are pending?

3. How many fines have been remitted, wholly or in part, under section 90 (3) of the Liquor Licensing Act 1985 during the past four quarters, why were they remitted and how do these figures compare with the previous four quarters?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. No record is kept of those licensees who did not pay licence fees by the due date. The first record is made 15 days after that date when the 10 per cent statutory penalty is incurred. The number of licensees which had not paid their licence fees within 15 days of the due dates in 1986 were:

	15 January	15 April	15 July	15 October
hotels	33	33	31	29
clubs	131	46	43	81
restaurants	83	93	68	80
other licensees	41	29	38	44

2. In the 1984-85 financial year, 22 licences were forfeited under the repealed Licensing Act 1967. The Liquor Licensing Act 1985 does not allow for forfeiture or revocation of licences for non-payment of fees, only their suspension. In the 1985-86 financial year, 14 licences were suspended under the current Act. No such actions are pending.

3. Thirty-six applications for remission of late payment fines have been granted over the past 4 quarters. In most cases, the reason was that accounts had been sent to incorrect addresses or not sent at all. There are no figures for remissions under the repealed Act.

NGERIN ALTERATIONS

196. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Fisheries:

1. What alterations and additions have been made to the vessel *Ngerin*?

2. Have the windows, which were steel, been changed to aluminium and, if so, why?

3. Is the vessel unstable and, if so, why cannot the water level be altered and does this interfere with the correct steering of the vessel?

4. Is the bottom of the vessel rusted out and being replaced?

5. What is the estimated cost of all repairs?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows.

1. In August 1986 the marine research vessel *Ngerin* underwent its annual maintenance refit. This work involved two components:

(1) Required annual maintenance:
Hull, super structure and decks sand blasted, rust treated and painted.
Hull below water line cleaned and re-antifouled. Sea chest cleaned and antifouled and all sacrificial anodes renewed.
Anchor check plate extended to prevent anchor wear.
Anchor winch reposition to ease wear on anchor chain and hawspipe. New trawl blocks, stabilisers and springers fitted.
Storm boards on bunks raised 50 mm.

(2) Additional facilities not provided at the time of construction due to costs limitations
Area known as 'dry lab' divided into three separate cabins:
computer room;
dry laboratory;
two berth accommodation;
additional storage facility.
Trawl booms fitted to enable comparison with commercial vessels. Trawl winches repositioned to suit new booms
Water line raised 50 mm to allow for increased draft due to dry lab conversion mentioned above.

2. No.

3. No, the vessel has full survey certification from the South Australian Department of Marine and Harbors and this involved stability tests.

4. No.

5. (1) Repairs—Nil.
(2) Annual maintenance and refit—$66 000.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE

197. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: In each department and authority, how many employees have unused long service leave credits of six months or more?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Extraction of the information from individual files will be very time consuming and the effort to obtain the information is not justified.

The Government and individual chief executive officers are aware of the need to manage long service leave as part of the budgetary process. This is being done on a financial year basis taking into account both the needs of individuals requesting long service leave and the needs of organisations to meet approved objectives.

SCHUBERT'S FARM

198. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Premier: Is it intended that Schubert's Farm be closed to the public and, if so, when, why and is it intended that it be closed permanently and what is to happen to the various artifacts that are currently housed at the farm, including those on loan?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. Schubert's Farm was closed to the public from 1 November 1986, but existing bookings until the end of December 1986 will be honoured.

2. The closure at this point is not permanent. The History Trust has established a working party to report to it by March 1987 to examine whether Schubert's Farm can be reopened as a viable historical museum and to identify the resources needed to do so. The working party will report on all aspects of the farm's closure including proposals for the care, return or disposal of the collections.

METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE

199. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. What has the introduction of the 38-hour week meant in regard to the recall of manpower and associated costs within the Metropolitan Fire Service?

2. What effect has the amalgamation of the two industrial associations had on the industrial relations of the Metropolitan Fire Service?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. Additional recalls for sickness, during the period November 1985 to October 1986, applicable to the 38-hour week, is estimated at 62 recall shifts. Costs totalled $14 517.

2. To date the relationship between the Metropolitan Fire Service and the newly-formed United Firefighters Union of South Australia is considered positive and effective.

200. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services:

1. What specific plans does the Metropolitan Fire Service have regarding the location of fire stations as a result of the Cox Report?

2. Where will new stations be located, at what cost and what is the estimated completion date in each case?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government has approved the program for relocation of stations that, when completed, will assure a response time frame of within six minutes for the first appliance and nine minutes for the second appliance on the scene of a fire/emergency incident within the metropolitan area.

Following the above approval, the S.A. Metropolitan Fire Service developed and incorporated into its five year capital works program, a scheme to implement the relocation of fire stations in a reasonable and practicable time frame (refer to 2.1 and 2.2 below).

2.1 Work has commenced on acquisition of sites for the new stations and the following locations are programmed for the current financial year:

Station	Site	Estimated Cost $
Port Adelaide	to Grand Junction Road, Port Adelaide	750 000
Rosewater	to Angle Park	830 000
Gepps Cross	to Grand Junction Road, Northfield	780 000

2.2 Other stations to be resited, proposed locations, projected costs and completion dates are:

Station	Site	Year	Estimated Cost $
Semaphore	to Taperoo	1987-88	790 000
Thebarton	to Brooklyn Park	1988-89	990 000
North Adelaide	to Nailsworth	1989-90	1 130 000
Woodville	to Glengowrie	1990-91	1 210 000
Glenelg	to Morphettville	1990-91	1 220 000

201. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Emergency Services: What is the purpose and function of the Metropolitan Fire Service's central exercise writing team and how does the work of this team impact upon emergency services efficiency?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The aim of the Central Exercise Writing Team is to prepare, manage and debrief significant joint Emergency Services exercises. As a result of these exercises, the Emergency Services have had the opportunity to initiate emergency procedures for scenarios up to State Disaster level, throughout many areas of the State. The problems which are identified during these incidents can be examined and remedial action taken to improve coordination and efficiency. The demand for services and advice from many sources, including private industry is an indication of the success of the Writing Team.

203. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is the Road Safety Council carrying out an investigation into the need for a reduction of speed limits on roads in sections of the Adelaide Hills and, if so, which areas are being considered, when is it likely that the report will be completed and who is to be given the responsibility of implementing any recommendations?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: As a consequence of the abolition of the Road Traffic Board and amendments to the Road Traffic Act, the Highways Department is now the responsible authority for the determination of speed zoning on roads under the care, control and management of both the local government authorities and the department. The department is not proceeding with an examination of all roads within the Adelaide Hills. However, it is proceeding with such an examination on all roads within the area under the jurisdiction of the District Council of Stirling. The examination will be completed late in 1986. Should there be justification for a change in the speed zoning on a particular road, the authority responsible for that road will install the necessary signs.

COROMANDEL CORRIDOR

204. **Mr S.G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: When will the Government announce its preferred route for the Coromandel transport corridor and when will construction begin?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Highways Department is awaiting formal advice from the City of Mitcham before finalising its report on the Coromandel Valley Roads Study for consideration by me. The purpose of the study is to clarify land requirements and construction of any works has not been scheduled to be undertaken in the forseeable future.

POTATO BOARD

205. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture: How much has the Government realised on the assets of the former South Australian Potato Board, how is that money being used and how much of it has been put back into benefiting the potato industry?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Net realised assets of the South Australian Potato Board as at 28 October 1986 are $1 028 964.33. The realised assets of the board have been used only in satisfying the liabilities of the board.

Under the Potato Marketing Act Amendment Act 1986, claims can be made against board's assets until 14 March 1987. After the redeployment costs of former board employees have been met, and all board liabilities satisfied, all remaining assests will constitute a potato industry trust fund which will be administered by a Potato Industry Trust Fund Committee and be used for the enhancement of the potato industry.

RANDOM BREATH TESTING

206. **Mr INGERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Does the Government support the recommendations that all police officers engaged in normal traffic patrol duties, wherever possible, be required to devote an appropriate number of hours per week to random breath testing duties to ensure that the number of drivers tested annually should be at least doubled and, if so, when will it be implemented, what are the number of hours to be devoted to this task and how many police are to be involved?

2. Is there any requirement that traffic police officers conduct random breath tests and, if so, has there been any

increase in random breath testing by police officers engaged in normal traffic duties?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. The Police Department and Department of Transport are currently assessing the resources required to implement an expanded random breath testing program. The expanded program will include the use of traffic patrols to perform 'unscheduled' breath testing operations.

2. There is no current requirement for traffic patrols to perform this function other than designated random breath testing units.

207. **Mr INGERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: When will the Government implement the recommendation that all drivers breath tested should receive a card giving relevant information on the effects of the problems associated with drink driving, with the level of their blood alcohol reading recorded on the card by the officer conducting the test?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: This procedure takes place for drivers who are tested at a breath analysis (evidentiary) machine. It is considered undesirable to provide BA readings to all drivers tested with the screening devices.

208. **Mr INGERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Government support the recommendation that sufficient random breath testing equipment be made available in country areas with police officers trained in its use and, where practicable, local police officers be assigned to random breath testing operations as part of their normal duties?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Police officers in certain country areas are already assigned to random breath testing operations as part of their normal duties. This applies in those areas where breath analysis facilities are available and when other taskings and work-load commitments allow. Resource requirements to expand these activities in country areas are currently being assessed.

209. **Mr INGERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Government support the recommendation that section 47 *(f)* of the Road Traffic Act 1961 be amended to provide that a driver requiring a blood test shall take such a test at the nearest available authorised facility, that adequate resources should be provided to ensure drivers/riders involved in accidents resulting in death or bodily injury are tested where facilities for such testing are available and that sufficient equipment should be provided to enable at least 90 per cent of such drivers to be tested?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Road Traffic Act was amended in July 1985 to require this. Work is in progress to assess the necessary resources.

210. **Mr INGERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Government support the recommendation that section 47 *(a)* (1), (2), (3) and (4) of the Road Traffic Act 1961 be amended by deleting reference to breath tests and substituting alcotests?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Road Traffic Act was amended in this way in July 1985.

ROAD ACCIDENTS

211. **Mr INGERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Government intend to provide funds for a further study of the joint involvement and the potentiation effects of alcohol and other drugs in accidents to establish any need for additional action in this area and, if not, what does the Government intent to do about this matter?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: An officer has been appointed in the Road Safety Division with responsibilities including this work.

BREATH TEST IGNITION DEVICES

212. **Mr INGERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is a review being carried out on breath test ignition devices for motor vehicles and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: This work is being carried out by an officer in the Road Safety Division.

ROAD SAFETY

213. **Mr INGERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is it the intention of the Government to put all matters relating to random breath testing and other road safety programs, road safety research, the collection and coordination of statistical data and the future planning and development of road safety programs under the control of the Minister of Transport?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: A Road Safety Division and a Road Safety Advisory Council have been created and both are responsible to the Minister of Transport. It would be undesirable and impractical to place all matters related to RBT and other road safety programs under the control of the Minister of Transport. As an example, the Police Commissioner will continue to be responsible for the day to day management of the on-road RBT program.

RANDOM BREATH TESTING

214. **Mr INGERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Government support the recommendation that a driver, if stopped at a random breath testing station, be required to produce his/her driver's licence immediately or, if unable to do so, within 48 hours by reporting to a designated police station and, if so, when will it be implemented and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Although section 96 (1) of the Motor Vehicles Act provides authority for a member of the Police Force to request production of drivers licences within the time frames specified in the member's question, this power is not exercised in the course of random breath testing operations. Section 47da (4) of the Road Traffic Act requires police to conduct tests so as to avoid undue delay or inconvenience to drivers. In the spirit of this legislation, therefore, it is the practice of police to refrain from asking for drivers licences unless the circumstances of an individual indicate otherwise. Any change to this practice is likely to impinge upon the effectiveness of random breath testing operations.

POLICE VEHICLES

215. **Mr INGERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Government support the recommendation that vehicles used by police be equipped with appropriate traffic control equipment and signs to enable them to be readily converted for use as random breath testing stations and, if so, when will it be implemented, how many vehicles would be involved, what is the nature of the equip-

ment involved, what is the estimated cost and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Funds have been set aside in the 1986-87 budget for an expanded Random Breath Testing Program. The Police Department and Department of Transport are currently assessing requirements to enable the specific allocation of resources. Resources will be provided for the equipping of additional police vehicles with traffic control and breath testing equipment.

ROAD SAFETY

217. **Mr INGERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Government support the establishment of a permanent Parliamentary Standing Committee on Road Safety similar to that which exists in New South Wales to monitor, review and initiate various road safety proposals and programs on an ongoing basis and, if so, when will it implement this recommendtion and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Government does not intend to establish such a committee and it believes that other initiatives, including establishing a Cabinet Subcommittee on Road Safety, a Road Safety Division, a Road Safety Advisory Council and a Road Trauma Task Force will provide the Government with sufficient research, investigation, advice and coordination to allow an integrated strategy to be developed and implemented.

DRINK DRIVING

218. **Mr INGERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Government support the recommendation that a driver convicted of any drink driving offence in addition to prescribed penalties be required to return to a system of 'P' plates for such a period as determined by the courts and, if so, when will it be implemented and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: This was implemented in July 1985 by amendments to the Road Traffic Act and the Motor Vehicles Act.

219. **Mr INGERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Government support the recommendation to extend to the courts the power to allow a driver convicted of a random breath testing drink driving charge to hold a probationary licence for work purposes only where the court considers that loss of employment could result from a loss of licence, with other penalties still applying and, if so, when will it be implemented and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Government does not intend to implement this as it would be extremely difficult to administer and be contary to the thrust of other initiatives which emphasise tougher penalties for drink driving.

220. **Mr INGERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Government support the recommendation that courts be provided with a discretionary power to reduce the penalties for second offenders appropriately if the driver agrees to a referral to the Drug and Alcohol Services Council driver assessment clinic and, if so, when will it be implemented and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Government does not intend to implement this. Professional advice indicates that referrals under such conditions are unlikely to be successful.

221. **Mr INGERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: How much money has been made available by the Government specifically to ensure adequate publicity about random breath testing and the dangers of drinking and driving in each of the years 1983-84 to 1985-86 and how much has been set aside for this purpose in 1986-87?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The following amounts were made available by the Government:

1983-84—$72 000
1984-85—$166 000
1985-86—$172 000

In 1986-87 an initial allocation of $85 000 has been made but it is expected this will be increased when decisions have been finalised on the timing and size of the RBT program.

222. **Mr INGERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Government support the recommendation that an ongoing education program for schools and the community about the dangers of drink driving be instituted and adequately funded and, if so—

(a) when will such a program (as distinct from *ad hoc* inclusion of drink driving references in health education lessons) be developed;

(b) what would be its estimated cost if it was to be implemented in all secondary schools;

(c) what kind of program would be used in community education on this matter; and

(d) what has been done to develop such a program?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Government supports this recommendation. To assist in implementing it, the Ministers of Education and Transport have established a working party.

(a) Such a program will be developed in stages and will consist of many elements which may change as further experience is gained. In 1984-85 a drink driving education kit was circulated to all high schools. Pamphlets and films produced by the Federal Office of Road Safety are used by the Education Department.

(b) The cost would be substantial, but no detailed estimates have been prepared.

(c) A suitable program would combine school based education programs, media publicity, involvement of community groups, increased involvement of local government and on-road police presence and legislative change.

(d) Work is proceeding in all these areas.

223. **Mr INGERSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What monitoring and/or assessment of self-testing breath testing units is carried out on behalf of the Government and what is the cost and, if none has been carried out, is it the Government's intention to ensure that such monitoring and assessment is undertaken?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Developments in this area are being monitored by staff of the Road Safety Division and an assessment is planned during 1987. This will be done using existing staff and budget allocations.

227. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: How much was spent by the Government or any Government authority on anti-drink driving advertising or education campaigns in the year 1985-86?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The Road Safety Division of the Department of Transport spent $170 000 during 1985-86 on anti-drink driving advertising campaigns. This figure

does not include other substantial costs, which have not been estimated, incurred by—

- staff of the Road Safety Centre in conducting programs at the centre or in attempting public meetings;
- the S.A. Police Department in anti-drink driving enforcement and education program;
- the Education Department in developing and implementing drink driving curriculum materials and programs;
- the Drug and Alcohol Services Council in providing drink driving assessment programs and education programs;
- the Federal Government through the Federal Office of Road Safety programs and/or the Drug Offensive.

DE FACTO RELATIONSHIPS

229. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Attorney-General: Does the Minister intend to reform the laws of equality governing the determination of property proceedings between persons who live in a *de facto* relationship and, if not, why not and, if so, what action is proposed and when?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The Australian Law Reform Commission is examining the law relating to the division of matrimonial property following divorce. Their report is due in mid-1987. When that report is available consideration will be given to what, if any, changes should be made to State laws governing the distribution of property following the breakdown of a *de facto* relationship.