HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 18 August 1988

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

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Controlled Substances Act 1984. Read a first time.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It seeks to bring the penalties under the principal Act for trafficking in cannabis and related products into line with current experience of the drug trade. In particular, the Bill addresses a very narrow problem: the production of cannabis through large scale plantations of the plant within South Australia.

The Bill is not proposed as a solution to the drug problem, and I hold no unrealistic ideals that it will be anything but a small element in the overall approach to the problem. However, I believe that it will be a useful improvement to the law as it stands and is, therefore, an appropriate topic for a private member to address in this House.

The present law provides a three stage approach to the provision of penalties for possession and trading in cannabis, and they may be categorised as follows: personal use of small quantities—expiation fee or small fine; small scale dealer—$50 000 or 10 years imprisonment; large scale trafficking—$500 000 and 25 years imprisonment. This is a reasonable way to proceed but, unfortunately, the way in which individual offences are categorised has not proven to be appropriate in the real world.

The transition between small-scale dealing and large-scale trafficking is set at 1 000 growing plants, 100 kilograms of cannabis, or 25 kilograms of cannabis resin. The Minister of Health has advised me that these amounts were fixed on a purely arbitrary basis when the regulations were first drafted in 1985, and I fully accept that there was no way in which a 'correct' figure could have been arrived at, at that time and, indeed, there is no scientific demarcation line between large-scale and small-scale drug dealing; it is all a matter of experience and perspective.

However, it is essential that we keep these matters under review to ensure that the Act is refined from time to time in the light of experience and community perception of the relative seriousness of the crime. Accordingly, I propose that the limits fixed in 1985 are absurdly high in the context of 1988.

The minimum of 1 000 growing plants is a veritable forest of plants which would yield between $1 million and $2 million dollars on the street at today's prices. Quite clearly, most people interested in trading in cannabis would plant a crop of less than 1 000 plants since any more would be impractical to manage, would involve too great a loss if it was discovered, and the differential penalty is too great with the cultivation of 999 plants involving a massive reduction in penalty.

This theory is borne out by the facts. Since the Act was first proclaimed, no-one has been convicted of an offence which would attract the most serious penalty, but some 31 people have been convicted of the lesser charge. It should be borne in mind though that many of those convicted of the lesser offence have been found in charge of plantations of hundreds of plants with a potential street value of up to, say, $1 million.

These criminals are not innocent young people seeking to experiment with a recreational drug for their own pleasure. That group is well provided for—some would say too well provided for—under the expiation fee system. Rather, they must be enterprising criminals who are seeking to exploit the addiction of others for personal profit. No-one could grow hundreds of plants and claim any other motive but enrichment through drug trafficking. Therefore, the Bill sets a much smaller limit for the transition point in order to better distinguish between those who have set out on a misguided but small-scale operation and those who are operating a large-scale, continuing drug business.

Like the limits devised by the Minister when the first regulations were proclaimed, these new limits are entirely arbitrary and I make no apology for that. However, the proposed minimum number of 100 growing plants which will attract the higher scale of penalties under this Bill still represents a potential street value of $100 000 worth of cannabis—hardly a minor undertaking.

The law must evolve and adapt to the changing times, and the evidence makes it abundantly clear that the original limits were too high and that those who trade in drugs of addiction are able to escape the more serious penalties which this Parliament intended for them. I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr BLACKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

COORONG FISHERY

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I move:

That the regulation under the Fisheries Act 1982 relating to Coorong and Mulloway fisheries, made on 7 April and laid on the table of this House on 12 April 1988, be disallowed.

The Opposition regrets that it is necessary once again to move for the disallowance of another regulation brought into this House by the Minister of Fisheries. It indicates clearly that the Minister puts forward to Cabinet and Executive Council regulations that he has virtually not considered and which have been placed before him by the Department of Fisheries. It also indicates very clearly a lack of consultation and discussion with the recreational and professional fishing fraternity in this State. I suggest to the Minister that he tries to overcome these problems by establishing a Government backbench committee to examine some of these regulations. It is to be hoped that some of the problems will be eliminated, and there will be no need for the Opposition to move for the disallowance of regulations that are totally inadequate and quite impossible to put into effect.

There is no way that the regulation I have moved to disallow can be implemented. It indicates to members of the Opposition that the Government's intention is not to control recreational net fishing in the Coorong. It is a straight-out attempt to ban recreational netting because there is no way that an amateur can comply with the regulation that has been brought down by the Minister of Fisheries. I refer to a letter that I received from the Secretary of the South Australian Amateur Fishermen's Association Incorporated (Mr Natt) following the gazetting of the regulation. Mr Natt states:

Unfortunately, the association is forced occasionally to dispute some Government decisions, when these decisions are considered to be:

1. over regulated,
2. difficult to enforce, or
3. complicated, impractical and dangerous to perform.

One such decision occurs in the specifications for the setting of a recreational set mesh net to be used in the Coorong. We read from the Department of Fisheries handout 'Recreational Fishing Guide to the Regulations' that:

> 'a mesh net used in the Coorong may only be set from the waters edge, and must float when set.'

The persons responsible for compiling this particular specification certainly appear to have little, if any, knowledge of the physical conditions existing on the Coorong shorelines at normal pool level. We ask you to consider the following points:

(a) During the (very seldom) fresh water Murray River discharge, the pool level may rise up to 600 mm, for a short time. At the normal pool level, the Coorong consists of a variable-width, meandering channel, with an average depth of approximately 2 metres. The bottom is of silt-covered soft mud flats, strewn with rock reef and clinging blanket weed.

(b) For some years, the association has been aware that unlicensed commercial operators, under cover of darkness, work several small-mesh set nets in the Coorong fishery. This illegal practice proves that enforcement is difficult, and the recent changes will not have any restriction on such practice.

(c) Consider the physical characteristics of this area:

On the mainland side, the edge of the waters consist of shallow, silt-covered mud flats, with submerged rock. These flats extend up to 300 metres from the channel, but there are also limestone cliff peninsulas and bays, from which extend coral formations, currently infested with crabs.

The edge of waters on the coastal hummocks side has extensive sand spits some 200 metres long, between shallow muddy bays. The immediate edge of the water is made up of extremely soft, deep, unsupporting (virtually liquid) mud, with some clinging blanket weed. To set a mesh net from the waters edge in this particular environment is extremely difficult, and dangerous to the point that loss of life could easily result for the inexperienced.

(d) No doubt the Minister of Fisheries would not agree that recreational netting has been removed from the Coorong fishery—but the conditions outlined above make the setting of a legal mesh net from the waters edge impossible in practice.

(e) The South Australian Amateur Fishermen's Association (Inc.) suggests that the Minister authorise a Department of Fisheries officer to demonstrate, in several areas, off both shorelines, the legal setting of a mesh net, to recreational specifications, in the presence of association executive members at normal pool level. (Both parties to be responsible for their own expenses, etc.)

(f) Because of the mesh sizes allowed for the recreational netter (50-64 mm) the capture of legal-sized mulloway, bream and flounder is denied. The only scale fish species available would be yellow-eyed mullet and occasional salmon trout; both, as it happens, being of low commercial value.

In his letter Mr Natt has set out quite clearly that there is no way on earth that the amateur fisherman in the Coorong can comply with the regulations that have been placed before this House. In response to a letter that was written by Mr Len Potts to the Director of Fisheries, the Director stated:

> The mulloway is an important recreational and commercial fish species in South Australia, and the new management arrangements have been implemented to provide greater protection for stock maintenance. The arrangements are aimed at specifically preventing the capture of undersized mulloway.

I think that we should take careful note of what the Director of Fisheries has said, that is, that the regulations are aimed specifically at preventing the capture of undersized mulloway. I think that spells out the intent of the regulations. Then we have only to look at Mr Potts' response to the letter that he received from the Director of Fisheries. In part, he states:

> This regulation is self-defeating in the interest of preserving mulloway stocks as I discovered a few days ago when I visited the Coorong to comply with the new regulations and set a net of one metre drop from the waters edge. In six hours of daylight I did not catch one mullet, although this can be expected at this time of the year as mullet do not come into the clear shallow water near the waters edge in daylight hours, when it is free of marine grasses for fear of predation by pelicans and cormorants. In expectation of fish moving into the littoral waters after sunset, I remained with my net until midnight, during which time I captured 15 mullet, 42 juvenile mulloway and numerous mottled crabs.

He further states:

> If the regulations permitted the setting of a net of one metre drop in water of one and a half metres or more in depth, the taking of juvenile mulloway would be avoided at all times as they are bottom feeders and rarely catch in a floating net as they move under the net.

If the Minister had had detailed and in-depth discussions with not only the professional fishermen in the Coorong but also the amateurs, he would have found a wealth of knowledge as they have been fishing the waters of the Coorong for most of their lives. They know exactly what occurs. Under these regulations the fish that we are trying to protect—the juvenile mulloway—will be caught every time. We on this side have a responsibility to ensure that the resources of this State, particularly our fishing spots, are protected, but the regulations that the Minister has placed before the House do exactly the opposite. The regulations are destroying juvenile mulloway in their thousands.

It is high time that the Minister established a backbench committee to look at the problem of ill thought through regulations being brought into the House when they are not in the interests of this State. For that reason we find it necessary to move for the disallowance and withdrawal of these regulations in the hope that the Minister and his department will bring back effective regulations that can be managed and put into effect in the interest of preserving fish stocks in this State and in the interests of recreational and professional fishermen.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SALISBURY NORTH RENT OFFICE

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I move:

> That this House condemns the Government and in particular the Minister of Housing and Construction for allowing the South Australian Housing Trust to close the Salisbury North Rent Office from Friday 29 July 1988.

I know that the member for Gilles is not happy with my motion, which condemns the Government's treatment of Housing Trust tenants in this State.

The Hon. H. Allison: Make them walk.

Mr BECKER: As the member for Mount Gambier says, 'Make them walk.' It is worse than that. The siting of a Housing Trust branch office at Salisbury North enabled the tenants in that area and surrounding areas to pay their rent on a regular basis. Whilst the office was open on only a couple of days a week but was not open on Saturday or at lunchtime, it provided some facility and benefit for the Housing Trust tenants. In the past two years we have seen the Housing Trust slowly withdrawing any assistance to its tenants or any facility that made it easy for the tenants to pay their rent.

The Port Adelaide office, which covers most of my electorate, is closed on Saturday morning, as are all other offices. So, we find that, little by little, the benefits that were established by the Playford and other Liberal Governments to help those in Government housing through the South Australian Housing Trust are being severely curtailed. There is no excuse for that whatsoever. It is poor management by the Government regarding the affairs of the South Australian Housing Trust. The situation at the Salisbury North

office is totally unfair. I have been advised that many pensioners are very upset at the closure of the rental collection office.

The Hon. H. Allison: Where is the nearest office?

Mr BECKER: The nearest office is at Salisbury and, therefore, people have to make special arrangements to attend that office, purchase a money order or make arrangements to forward their rent by cheque.

The Hon. H. Allison: It will be 39c for a stamp after 1 October.

Mr BECKER: Yes, it will be 39c for a stamp, as the member for Mount Gambier reminds me, and, in addition, there is a fee for a bank cheque. Banks are not frightened to charge; I know they charge like wounded bulls—

Mrs APPLEBY: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr BECKER: It is just another way of—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Gunn): The member for Hanson will resume his seat.

Mrs APPLEBY: Will the Chair advise the House who is actually moving the motion?

The ACTING SPEAKER: It is not for the Chair to determine the content of the contribution by the honourable member for Hanson. Therefore, I cannot uphold the point of order. I point out to the honourable member for Hanson that he must confine his remarks to the motion before the Chair.

Mr BECKER: Well, that is okay.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable member for Hanson is not reflecting on the Chair.

Mr BECKER: No, not quite, Mr Acting Speaker. I would not do a thing like that, not with you in the Chair. But lately I find that, whenever I get close to the bone, I am always interrupted by someone from the Government benches.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr BECKER: As the member for Mount Gambier has advised me, the Housing Trust tenants in his district are experiencing problems and are disadvantaged because of the poor management and direction of the Government regarding the affairs of the South Australian Housing Trust. When someone contacted the Housing Trust public relations officer—God only knows who that is—that person was advised that nothing could be done about the situation and, anyway, they did not even know there was a branch office at Salisbury North. I find that very difficult to understand, and I will raise that matter with the General Manager of the Housing Trust next Friday when I have my regular meeting with him. It is most unfair that these tenants are being disadvantaged in this way.

The rental officer for the Housing Trust also argued that the facility was not used all that much and, because it was not open at lunchtime, it was of no great benefit to the tenants. The fact is that the facility had been made available, and until now the Housing Trust had been able to afford to provide that service for the tenants at Salisbury North. The other reasons for the closure were that it was a small branch office (and most of them have now been closed) and that there was a security problem in one person handling all that money. That really riles me because, for the 20 years I was working in a bank, there were one-man agencies. There are many organisations that run one-man offices, be they dry cleaning shops, chemists or post offices—they are there for the benefit of the public, to offer a service and a facility to the public.

I have received a copy of a petition which I understand has been given to the Minister, if not the Manager of the Housing Trust. It is signed by 327 people who reside in the Salisbury North/Burton area. These people have passed the following message through to the trust:

> We the undersigned are very upset with the closing of the rent office at Salisbury North. We request that you appoint a sub-agent to collect rent at Trinity Crescent Shopping Centre, Salisbury North.

I understand that the Housing Trust has not appointed anybody as agent and that it does not appoint agents to collect rent on its behalf. The Electricity Trust of South Australia established this system many years ago and found that it was a most beneficial way of assisting their customers to pay their accounts. I cannot see why the South Australian Housing Trust, as a compromise, could not appoint somebody at that shopping centre as an agent. A small service fee could be paid. Certainly, it would be a great benefit to people who are disadvantaged, such as the frail, the aged, and those on limited fixed incomes. I believe that the South Australian Housing Trust is not looking after its tenants in the way that it should be.

On the latest figures available, for the year ended 30 June 1987, the South Australian Housing Trust received $113.4 million in rent paid by tenants. I understand that that rent does not cover anywhere near the cost of the operations of the trust. But it is interesting to note that almost 25 per cent of the rent covers management expenses. So, the management operations of the trust are expensive. I understand that, I accept it, and I appreciate that the Housing Trust must continuously look at its finances so that its income can meet its outgoings. Even so, last financial year there was an operating deficit of $10 million. However, that is not the fault of Housing Trust tenants.

The South Australian Housing Trust has borrowings of $1.25 billion. The interest last financial year on those borrowings was $44.3 million. If the Government is fair dinkum in assisting Housing Trust tenants or in assisting disadvantaged people to obtain affordable rental accommodation, I believe that some of those borrowings should be capitalised; it should be capital of the Housing Trust and thus save those tenants that huge interest bill of $44 million, considering that the trust collects only $113 million in rent. It is a very high impost, and the position in which the Housing Trust finds itself is very awkward indeed.

Of course, one can understand why the Housing Trust and the Government now have a total reversal in selling off rental accommodation from the property stock and offering the properties to tenants, in order to reduce those debts and to ease the maintenance burden. All in all, it is a very disappointing attitude to take, with the trust closing down a sub-branch which was of clear benefit to Housing Trust tenants. The member for Bragg, who knows the Trinity Crescent Shopping Centre quite well, has promised to provide me with additional information that will assist us in this debate. As of this morning he had not received it and because of that delay I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURALISM

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): I move:

That this House:

(a) affirms the principles of non-discrimination and integration embodied in the politically bipartisan approach to immigration and multiculturalism which has existed in Australia since the Whitlam Government and has been supported by successive Liberal and Labor Governments; and

(b) calls upon the Federal Parliamentary Liberal and National Parties to reaffirm their previous commitment to these policies,

and further, that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition in the Federal Parliament.

For the past 15 years at least there has been a bipartisan approach to immigration and ethnic affairs in this country. South Australian Governments, both Labor and Liberal, have been able to benefit from the bipartisan approach that has been taken by successive Governments nationally.

Irrespective of whether those national Governments have been conservative coalitions or Labor Governments, by and large they have pursued the same sorts of policies. This has been of considerable benefit in the implementation and administration of ethnic affairs policies within the States, because the State policies in respect of multiculturalism, ethnic affairs, and immigration have, by and large, mirrored Federal policies. That has also been done irrespective of whether the Governments in the States have been conservative or Labor. It has benefited Australia on the world scene, more particularly, in the Asian and Pacific region, in that we are seen as a people with a single, consistent view about what we are trying to do in this country, that is, to bring together a socially cohesive, non-discriminatory, non-racist community with freedom and opportunity for all.

That means both freedom and opportunity internally for people to partake of the benefits of our community as well as a fair and non-discriminatory, non-racist policy of access to this country. When the policy was adopted some 15 years ago with the support of both major Parties, the removal of the White Australia policy lifted a considerable weight off the shoulders of those people who had been in Australia for up to 40 years previously. They felt that they were being welcomed formally and positively into the community of Australia. That was a considerable benefit to the Australian community as a whole. The changes that both national Parties made increased our standing within our region and within the international community. The policy has served us very well.

Mr Groom: Where does John Howard stand?

Mr DUIGAN: We will get to John Howard in a moment. At the Federal election in the middle of 1987 a summary was issued of the policies of the two major Parties and the Democrats. I would like to read those summaries to the House and, as I read them, I would like members to see whether they can determine which policy belongs to which Party. The first summary reads as follows:

> Support for refugee and family reunion programs; support for immigration of skilled people; education and information; counselling and interpreting services to help Australians of ethnic origin.

The second summary reads:

> Increased immigration of younger skilled and employable people; continuation of family reunion, humanitarian and refugee programs; priority to English language training; and specific strategies for aged migrants.

The third summary states:

> Continued priority to family reunion immigration; implementation of a national policy on languages; production of a paper on immigration; and cutting of delays and backlogs in the immigration appeals system.

I think that members would agree that it would be very hard to distinguish any of those policies from each other. Any of those policy statements issued by the three Parties could be replaced by any one of the others. For the record, the first was the policy of the Democrats, the second that of the Liberals and the third that of the Labor Party.

There is no distinction in any substantial element about what it is that we are doing in the immigration area or the ethnic affairs area or in the provision of services to a variety of people of ethnic minority background within Australia: no distinction whatsoever. It was not an issue at the 1987 Federal election: that is not surprising if one refers to the platforms of those Parties at the national level. The policy position (or the platform I should say) of the ALP states:

> Australia is a multicultural society which has been immeasurably enriched by the contribution of migrants to our national life. One of our nation's greatest achievements has been its acceptance of people from a wide and diverse range of backgrounds regardless of race, religion or ethnicity.

A very similar statement can be read (and I wish to read it to the House) from the national platform of the Liberal Party:

> Recognising the contribution migrants have made individually and collectively to the economic, cultural, and social development of Australia and to the enrichment and diversity of our way of life, Liberals believe that migration programs should continue to be valuable to Australia's development and security.

That policy goes on to identify a number of ways in which that broad, overall objective can be implemented, including the following:

> Ensuring the development of a society free of avoidable tensions.

Those sentiments are being reflected in the State policies, the State programs, and the State objectives of the Liberal Party and of the Labor Party. The policy issued by the Liberal Party at the last State election in 1985 stated:

> The Liberal Party recognises migrants as part of the overall society within which enterprise, self-reliance, and a will to succeed is to be applauded and rewarded.

The policy identifies the importance in a multicultural society of tolerance, of diversity, of freedom, and of understanding, and states:

> In our cultural and political democracy, a lasting and stable multiculturalism is our aim.

These are sentiments that would be equally at home in the policy or platform of either the Labor Party or the other major Party, the Democrats. We have, in the past few weeks, seen a moving away from that essentially agreed bipartisan attitude on immigration and ethnic affairs. The Federal Leader of the Opposition has proposed a 'one Australia' policy: as if we do not have a 'one Australia' policy at present. He has proposed a 'one Australia' policy which I believe is discriminatory, divisive, disruptive and inflammatory.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Gilles will come to order.

Mr DUIGAN: I believe that in issuing the policy and in making statements surrounding the policy, we have moved away from what I have described earlier, namely, the essential bipartisan attitude. I begin an examination of what has happened in the past few weeks by referring to a statement that was made in this House last week by the member for Briggs in reply to the Governor's address. He said (page 72 of *Hansard*):

> No amount of hedging and twisting by Mr Howard can obscure the simple truth that he wants to tug on the responsive chord of racism. In doing so he not only diminishes himself but he also diminishes his Party and damages Australia's vital new markets and its reputation in the eyes of nations to which racism is repugnant. At home he risks breaking social cohesion as he attempts to focus the hostility of ignorance on small groups within our community.

I do not believe that that is an exaggerated statement. There have been a number of statements made in response to the issuing of the policy in recent weeks following the announcement of the 'one Australia' policy, and some of them have unfortunately been made by people within the coalition. There has been an attack on multiculturalism, and on people who are involved in the multicultural area and in the administration of ethnic affairs programs.

In the *Advertiser* a fortnight ago Senator Puplick, who I understand is a Liberal Senator, said of the people involved in the ethnic affairs area, in the administration of programs, be they social, education or health programs directed to a variety of people of different ethnic backgrounds:

> They are the political limpet fish of the ALP and ought to be brushed off like any other parasite.

Parasites! The people who are involved in the administration of programs that derive from the previously agreed concept of multiculturalism are being described as parasites—parasites on the Australian community. I do not believe that the sort of society that we have had as a result of our policy deserves condemnation like that; they are people who are genuinely attempting to bring social justice programs to people who have come from other countries.

The Government's position in this debate is not terribly dissimilar to that which has been adopted, and I give due credit for that to the Liberal Opposition in this State. On 9 August *Hansard*, page 39, in the Legislative Council, the Minister of Ethnic Affairs said the following (and I think this summarises the general position which we have followed in South Australia for many, many years):

> In the final analysis we are a multicultural society whether we like it or not. You cannot have mass immigration for over 40 years from virtually every country of the world without creating a reality which is a multicultural community. While we have a non-discriminatory immigration policy and annual numbers of 150 000 or so, we will continue to have a culturally and linguistically diverse population. The challenge here is to ensure smooth integration into the Australian community without rancour, bitterness or racial division.

That is the essence of the multiculturalism policy adopted by both Parties. Unfortunately, it now seems that that policy is being adopted by only one of the major Parties at the national level.

I do not wish to be partisan; I do not think that this is a partisan issue. There have been good people, people fired with notions of fairness, social justice and liberty; who have spoken up against this policy right across the community. I believe it really is a question of morality and of social justice. The new 'one Australia' policy has been condemned by a variety of people right across the board. The repudiation of multiculturalism and the rejection of the current basis of immigration selection will not do Australia's standing any good. It will not do the policy of social cohesion, which we need in this country, any good, and it does not in any way, derive from the Fitzgerald report.

The Fitzgerald report into immigration, subtitled 'A Commitment to Australia', endorses the concept of multiculturalism, examines the process of migration to the country and seeks to pursue the same objectives, albeit in a slightly modified administrative way. Allow me to quote from the Executive Summary of the Fitzgerald Report on Immigration, as follows:

> A coherent philosophy of immigration is needed. Such a philosophy should emphasise the Australian context of immigration and the commitment required of all Australians to Australia and its future, and allow Australians to understand how immigration affects them now and in the future, how it can contribute to a positive harmony of economic and social benefits, to a culturally enriched Australia, to openness, tolerance and sophistication, to economic independence, to creativity, and to a racially diverse, harmonious community.

Those words in the Executive Summary of the Fitzgerald Report on Immigration could well have been the melding together of the policies of the three major Parties that I summarised at the beginning of my address. They are not now compatible with the views that have unfortunately been espoused by the Federal Leader of the Liberal Party. The selection process that the national Government has used over the past 15 years consists of five categories: family migration and reunion; skilled and business migration; independent and concessional migration; refugee and humanitarian migration; and a special category for those with special skills that are identified in terms of Australia's overall economic goals.

Each of those five areas has been governed by a series of quotas, queues and tests. The proposal is to add three more tests to those existing five categories: a test of colour, a test of race and a test of nation. I reject those tests as being incompatible with the concepts of Australian freedom and democracy that I—and I believe everyone in this House—hold so dearly. I am sure that nearly every member of this House has spoken at citizenship ceremonies, welcoming new citizens to Australia—to the family of Australia and the nation of Australia. And so they should. Australia is a migrant nation. There is probably no other nation on earth that has accepted people from so many countries over such a long period of time without the racial disharmony and conflict that is so evident in so many other places.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr DUIGAN: The member for Mount Gambier says that in the first 10 years that he was here there was not acceptance, tolerance and understanding of his arrival in Australia and of his attempts to become part of Australia. He is right; the policy, which treated people like the member for Mount Gambier in a discriminatory way, using vituperative language to describe his desire to become part of the Australian community, has been rejected by both Parties as a result of the acceptance of what was, until two weeks ago, a bipartisan policy on immigration and ethnic affairs.

The member for Mount Gambier benefited from those new policies adopted by both Parties at the national level. He recognises it; he has benefited from it; he can see the gains that have come about as a result of it; and so should everyone else who comes to this country. But, if the current policy being pursued by the Federal Leader of the Opposition continues, the sort of response that the member for Mount Gambier had to put up with in his first 10 years in this country will be heaped on everyone else on the basis simply of race, nation and background—and we should reject it.

Multiculturalism brings all Australians together with a shared commitment to the nation as one people drawn from many different cultures. In the spirit of the Australian ethos of live and let live, multiculturalism allowed and encouraged immigrants to maintain the culture of their country of origin. As the member for Mount Gambier told us, any attempt to curtail cultural expression will have the effect of alienating migrants in their new home and lessen their commitment to Australia.

Multiculturalism is a democratic reality that has now been described in a variety of conceptual ways. A variety of programs which have been accepted by Australians across the board have flowed from that. We now have a country in which four out of every 10 Australians were born overseas or are the sons and daughters of immigrants. We must never forget that. It is an extremely important fact and it will continue to be important as this country goes into the twenty-first century, into a world that is very, very different from the world that we have been used to in the twentieth century. Our markets are changing, as is our economic orientation. Our reliance on Europe and the political, constitutional and trade ties with Europe are weakening and we are developing very strong ties in our own region because it is becoming a very strong economic region on its own.

Let me reflect on what is happening in the European community with which traditionally we have had so many ties. It is becoming one multicultural community itself.

Already the trade and travel barriers are breaking down. The European community that we have considered to be so much a part of our history is becoming one integrated, multicultural community. Even if we did maintain our links with western Europe, we would be dealing with a multicultural and racially and linguistically diverse community and those people would expect to be able to deal with Australia as equal partners, not just in trade but in the way we conduct our society.

Quite apart from that, we are moving into the Asian and Pacific region where we must develop strong links and where people want to see that we are not throwing up artificial barriers of trade, race, nation or religion.

I must acknowledge that these general sentiments have been espoused by the Leader of the Opposition and I welcome his contribution to this debate. The sentiments that he expressed in welcoming the Hon. Mr Julian Stefani to the Parliament of South Australia underline the way in which the State Liberal Party is addressing this issue. I remind members of what the Leader said on that occasion:

> It is a mark of a caring, concerned, civilised and cohesive society than it can and will tolerate diversity and it will insist that, in the selection of migrants, there will be no discrimination whatsoever on the basis of race or colour of skin. Such a non-discriminatory policy not only must be maintained, it must be seen to be maintained.

Similar sentiments have been expressed by the Leader of the Liberal Party in Government in New South Wales. He, too, has repudiated the Federal Leader's policy, his attacks on multiculturalism, and the concept of having a racially based discriminatory method of immigration to this country. He, too, wants to ensure that the fair policy that we have had in this country is maintained and that there continues to be a bipartisan approach. My motion will achieve that.

I hope that we, as a House, will be able to deliver, in a non-partisan way, that message to a Leader of a national Party. We can ask him to return to the sentiments that are being expressed by his Party's Leaders in South Australia and New South Wales.

What have Mr Howard, Senator Stone and Ian Sinclair said? What have Mr Fraser and Senator Teague said? A perusal of newspaper headlines over the past three or four weeks would indicate that there is nothing but confusion and chaos about this policy. There have been such headlines as 'Howard slams Fraser's criticisms', 'Howard raps Nationals', 'Sinclair fuels immigration row', and 'You're just so weak!' said Senator Teague about Mr Sinclair and Senator Stone.

There is confusion, division and a difference of opinion about this policy that I think can be overcome. I do not think that the policy is set in stone. I think that we can return to the very sensible basis that we had previously. On 2 August John Howard stated:

> It would be in our immediate term interests and supportive of social cohesion—

supportive of social cohesion—

> if it (Asian immigration) was slowed down a little so that the capacity of the community to absorb [it] were greater.

He suggests that it will benefit social cohesion if we slow down Asian immigration a little. He is saying, 'I am not saying that I want to end Asian immigration; it is just that there is too much of it. I am not against Asians or Asian immigration.'

Ms Gayler: How many is 'too many'?

Mr DUIGAN: How many, indeed! On 12 August the Federal Leader clarified exactly what he meant by this 'one Australia' concept and he stated:

> The program will, however, be subject to the undeniable right of the Australian Government, in the name of the Australian people, to alter the level and composition of the program to ensure the maintenance of social harmony and cohesion.

We already have social cohesion and social unity as a result of our multicultural and migration policies, but we are now told that it is a policy that is socially divisive and disruptive. We already have it. It is Mr Howard's policy which would promote social division, confusion and dissent about something that is essential to a liberal, free and democratic society.

On 16 August there were some disputes between Mr Howard on the one hand and Mr Stone and Mr Ian Sinclair on the other, because what they had been saying was that we should bring Australia's immigration stream back into balance. Mr Sinclair and Senator Stone thought that there was an excessively high proportion of immigrants from Asia in the stream and that it had to be rebalanced; that is, introducing race and ethnicity to the criteria in each of those five immigration streams that I mentioned previously.

What do the Australian editorial writers say about this 'one Australia' policy? They have said that it is wrong, wrong, wrong. The Australian *Financial Review* on 11 August stated, 'Mr Howard, you are wrong.' The *News* on 12 August stated, 'Mr Howard, you are wrong'. The *Advertiser* on 13 August stated, 'Mr Howard, you are wrong.' As a community in South Australia we should benefit from these policies. As democratically elected representatives from a racially tolerant community, we should also say the same thing: 'Mr Howard, you are wrong, please think again'. Mr Howard cannot get one voice on one policy in one Party, so it is going to be very difficult to get single agreement in one nation about one policy. The editorial in the *Financial Review* of 11 August was very interesting, indeed. On the policy it stated:

> There is much that is obscure or ambiguous about the proposed immigration policy, but it is as least crystal clear that with all its implications it is the responsibility of one man.

The editorial stated that there were two ways to go in respect of the immigration policy, and that Mr Howard did have a choice into how he tackled this policy issue, and stated:

> Strengthened by his leadership position, bolstered by his own self-proclaimed image of being a non-racist, reasonable man—

a concept and a view many people had of him previously. He could have emphasised that part of his personality, policy and tradition of his Party. Instead, said the editorial, he carefully and deliberately chose to emphasise the other side, and concluded that as a consequence the wrong decision had been made.

For the past 40 years we have been subjected to large scale immigration, and this has had a major benefit in transforming the Australian population, its cultural attitudes, and its views of the rest of the world. No doubt exists about the overwhelming commitment our population has to Australia—the 'one Australia'. That commitment is already there. We recognise it when we welcome people to the nation of Australia at citizenship ceremonies. A 'one Australia' policy in the way it has been described now implies that there is division, diversity, ghettos, and also racial, language and ethnic tensions and that it can only be brought back together by having one nation.

It implies at its worst, disloyalty. It implies no commitment to Australia and implies that there is no acceptance of the democratic institutions of our community as well as no sharing of cultures, that the Australian culture we have has not benefited by these people coming from all over the world to be part of our community. Everyone in this House would accept that that is patently false. The present policies are not about separate nations, separate developments, or ghettos. All the evidence is to the contrary. We cannot turn our backs on the success of the programs we have been

pursuing until now. We cannot turn our backs on the success of the policies pursued by both our major Parties. We cannot turn our backs on the success of the immigration programs we have pursued over the past 15 years, and we cannot turn our backs on the success of the integrated community with which we are working.

In conclusion, I will outline what multiculturalism is and means. It does not mean giving advantages to migrants or people of ethnic minority origins over and above advantages, benefits and opportunities given to any other Australians. We are talking about equal opportunity for all.

Multiculturalism is a social policy that embraces all Australians, regardless of colour, ethnic background, sex, or religion. Secondly, it does not only ensure that all Australians enjoy social, political, and cultural freedom but also that they accept their equal share of responsibility for the country's well-being. Thirdly, it does not support or encourage cultural divisions but advocates an acceptance of differences. Multiculturalism encourages all Australians to learn from each other by an acceptance of cultural diversity.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: But we are all migrants. We all came here from other countries.

Mr DUIGAN: Exactly. The member for Chaffey indicates that we are all migrants and that we all came here from other countries. I agree. That is exactly the point, but the policy now being pursued by the Federal Leader of the Opposition wishes to make distinctions on a racial basis of who can come here, and it wishes to repudiate multiculturalism. It is as well that members know exactly that these are the two key elements of the policy: a racial element in the immigration selection program and a repudiation of multiculturalism.

I was outlining the benefits of multiculturalism, and I will go on. Multiculturalism should encourage people to make a commitment to Australia and to being Australian. This is easier—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber. The honourable member for Adelaide.

Mr DUIGAN: This is easier in an environment where migrants of different backgrounds feel fully accepted. Multiculturalism is not about positively discriminating in favour of migrants at the expense of other Australians. Finally, it is an economic asset which holds the key and should assist in Australia's economic development and prosperity.

I conclude by looking at some of the external consequences if this suggested policy is pursued. I will do it very briefly as I know other members wish to speak on other matters. In the *Advertiser* of 6 August, a former Director of the World Bank, when commenting on this policy, said that the policy was already costing Australia billions of dollars. He went on to enumerate what they were, in terms of the consequences of members' perceptions of the way in which judgments would be made about Australia in other nations and about how we operated in the world. In the *News* of 8 August, an article was headed, 'Asian trade in jeopardy'. In the *Australian* of 13 August, under a heading, 'Beware! Asia is watching', Bill Guy made a very key point when he said:

> If Australia chooses to reject Asia now, the chances are that in the future it will be rejected by Asia.

Rejected by Asia; rejected by the very part of the world with which we wish to become far more closely aligned. Yesterday, the Minister of State Development and Technology gave us some examples of how major economic development managers in the South East Asian region were looking at Australia now. We must be very careful. Our national future is at stake.

The logic of no Asians is the logic of no immigration. We are an integrated world. We are part of a Pacific region, and we must ensure that we are seen to be part of it and that we are prepared to welcome people into our community. Mr Howard's position at the moment is new.

In 1984 Mr Howard espoused a different view, and I would like him to return to that view. In 1984 he stated in Federal Parliament:

> I supported the policies of the former coalition Government which were humanitarian and 'liberal' in the true sense of the word. We were prepared to take the Labor Party's generous support for people from war-torn parts of South-East Asia. We were prepared to preach tolerance and liberalism.

I ask Mr Howard to return to that policy—for his sake, for Australia's sake and for the sake of the community. I ask the House to endorse a bipartisan, multicultural and racially non-discriminatory policy for Australia.

The Hon. H. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

COORONG CARAVAN PARK

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I move:

> That this House condemns the Government for its failure to secure the interests of taxpayers in relation to the sale of the Coorong Caravan Park by the Storemen and Packers Union and calls upon the Treasurer to refer the sale of the park to the Auditor-General for investigation and report to Parliament.

The saga of the Coorong Caravan Park goes back several years and represents a very sorry chapter in the tale of Government grants to non-government bodies. It is, I believe, an indictment of the political relationship between the State Labor Government and the Storemen and Packers Union. It represents in its worst form a misuse of public funds for political purposes. It represents a betrayal of the trust that taxpayers place in Governments, when they assume that Governments will use taxpayers' funds for public purposes and for the good of the community. In short, the matter of the public funding of the Storemen and Packers Coorong Caravan Park for a purpose which has resulted or which will result in private union profit and gain is one which I believe the Parliament ought to refer to the Auditor-General for investigation and report to Parliament.

The background to this story is as follows. In 1984, the Storemen and Packers Union applied for and received a Commonwealth Employment Program grant of $180 000. I mention the sum of $180 000 because that is the amount that was publicly credited to the union—although I believe that in the end the amount was considerably greater than $180 000 and, indeed, could have exceeded $190 000. The Storemen and Packers Union had previously paid $80 000 for the Coorong Caravan Park early in 1984. On 4 May 1988 the union advertised in the *Advertiser* the sale of Policeman's Point Coorong Caravan Park for $165 000. The advertisement read:

> Opportunity to buy 4.9 hectares abutting the Coorong. There are 48 powered sites, with plenty of room for expansion.
>
> A feature of the property is the large, fully carpeted recreation hall; modern ablution block with six men's and six ladies' toilets plus showers. Six fully furnished cabins and two on-site vans are also included. Special features of the property are the large in-ground pool, sauna and tennis court. Great potential for catering to church and school groups. The asking price is well below cost of development.

A Nuriootpa phone number is provided. It is not a bad sort of profit if one buys a park for $80 000 and, four years later, tries to sell it for $165 000. If the union were to obtain that price for the park, it has doubled the value of its investment in four years using money that did not belong to it in the first place. The long and the short of it is that the taxpayer has poured a minimum of $180 000 (and, very

likely, substantially more than that), into a union investment which is now being flogged off at what are regarded in the industry as cut-price rates, considering the investment of taxpayers' money which has gone into it.

The taxpayers have financed the fully carpeted recreation hall, the in-ground pool, sauna and tennis court, the modern ablution block with six men's and six ladies' toilets plus showers, and the six fully furnished cabins and two on-site vans. This is a very serious matter. I originally raised the matter in 1984 on the basis that the union had jumped a queue of more than a score of local government bodies which were applying for that same grant and had been in the queue for years. When I raised that issue, the Minister of Housing and Construction dismissed the matter and said, 'No,' there had been no jumping of queues; there was nothing really to worry about; everything was perfectly all right. In the House of Assembly in 1984, I asked a question on notice as follows:

From which local government areas has the Department of Tourism received applications for subsidies for development of tourist resorts since November 1982? What were the projects and the value of each? What was the sponsoring organisation for which subsidies had been sought? What applications have been approved, and over what period would the total funds for each project be made available?

The answer comprised a long list of local government bodies which occupied more than a full page of *Hansard*. Of course, not all of those tourism bodies had sought CEP grants but, in answer to questions during the Estimates Committee that year, the then Minister of Tourism (Hon. G.F. Keneally) indicated that the Department of Tourism was seeking Community Employment Program grants in order to support those local government bodies which had applied for tourism subsidy grants.

In any event, it was clear that a large number of public bodies—not private bodies, and for these purposes we must consider the union to be a private body—had applied for grants. They had been in a queue for at least two years. The Storemen and Packers Union suddenly jumped that queue of scores of local government bodies, and the first question to be asked is this: how did the Storemen and Packers Union get to the head of that queue ahead of a whole range of local government authorities?

Mr Oswald: Political patronage.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Political patronage can be the only answer unless the Government can come up with a better one, and it never has. In the four years that I have been asking questions on this issue, no Minister has come up with a satisfactory reason as to why the Storemen and Packers Union obtained this substantial grant in the first place.

Mr Oswald: They don't like the truth.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The truth is that the political patronage must have contained some substantial payola in terms of either votes for candidates at preselections—

Mr Hamilton: No way!

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: That is interesting. The member for Albert Park appears to know some answers. If he is willing to tell us, let him stand up and speak in this debate.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Do you think that George will come back from overseas and blow his top.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: That is a very good question. I wonder whether the General Secretary of the Storemen and Packers Union, Mr George Apap, in his intense disappointment at being discarded for the position of President of the ALP, might return from Malta and decide, 'Well this lot are not really worth dealing with; I will tell a few home truths about them.' We will see what happens when Mr Apap returns from Malta. He may well feel that it is time to speak out about his relationship with the ALP.

Let us go on to the next chapter in the saga. When I raised the issue of the sale of the park on Sunday 8 May, the Secretary of the union, Mr Apap, responded in an *Advertiser* article of Monday 9 May 1988, as follows:

It's true we have advertised it (that is, the park). It's true we are selling it for money reasons, but the reasons will remain with the union.

Is the Storemen and Packers Union down on its uppers? What are the money reasons? We are entitled to know, because the union is using public money—taxpayers' money—in order to get out of the financial hole that it is apparently in. The article continues:

'I'm not going to say if we are going to break even, lose money, or make money. It's true we bought it for $85 000, but we have spent a lot of money on it.'

He said the appliction for a CEP grant had met all the necessary criteria.

'We did receive a grant. We had to employ at least 13 people for six months and on top of that had to employ two others we had to pay for,' he said.

'We upgraded the park so we could give 13 people in the area, where unemployment is enormous, work for six months.'

If that is the case, why is it that only three locals were employed on that project?

Mr Lewis: And not for six months.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: And not for six months, as the member for Murray-Mallee says.

Mr Lewis: They brought in their friends.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: They brought in their friends. Three locals and 10 people from Mount Gambier and Adelaide were put on that project, despite what Mr Apap described as the enormous unemployment in the area. That is question No. 2 of the very many questions that need to be asked. We are adding up the questions. First, why did the union get the money in the first place? Secondly, why were local people not employed in accordance with the criteria on which the grant was approved? That also is a scandal which ought to be investigated. We will come shortly to the reasons why the Government is not proposing to investigate it.

Mr Apap said that the union had used a lot of its own money on improvements including architects' drawings, the sauna, pool and carpets. How much of its own money did it use? The taxpayer is entitled to know. This is a taxpayers' asset because the taxpayer has poured infinitely more money into it than the Storemen and Packers Union. The article continues:

Most of the CEP money went on wages. Workers were involved in painting, helping set up the swimming pool and the sauna.

Of course, those are labour intensive projects; naturally their capital value is costed on the cost of the labour, and the cost of the labour was given to the Storemen and Packers Union by the taxpayers via a CEP grant.

On the following day, Tuesday 10 May, the Minister of Employment and Further Education (Hon. Lynn Arnold), who is responsible for administering the CEP money in South Australia, said that the union was acting perfectly legally in selling the park. How can a Minister defend an action which disposes of public assets when absolutely none of the value of that asset goes back to the taxpayer? The Minister cooly stood up and said that the union was acting legally. In other words, the Bannon Government firmly defends this move which the Opposition maintains is not only illegal but immoral.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Quite similar; after all, it is only taxpayers' money! It is there to be used as the Labor Party thinks fit for its own benefit, and never mind the public good. Mr Arnold said that the union, as sponsor for the plan, had contributed a substantial sum of its own money. It was now looking to quit the park below the union's cash input. Mr Arnold said that the decision to sell was a commercial decision made by the union, that Federal money had employed about 14 people for eight months and had done the job it set out to do. Well, if the criteria are correct, it had set out to relieve local unemployment at Policeman's Point and in the Coorong area. It had failed demonstrably to do that by ensuring that less than one-third of the people employed on the project were local people. As one union member who rang me to complain about all this said, 'The more you look into this the dirtier it gets'.

When I raised the question of the sale publicly in May, it became even more interesting. Philip Satchell of ABC radio decided that this was worth pursuing, so he got Mr Apap on the telephone and asked a few questions. One of the questions was: 'You have certainly stuffed it up, haven't you George?' Mr Apap replied, 'It has been such a disaster for many reasons.' Now, what are the reasons?

An honourable member: Was this the caravan park or the loss of the presidency?

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I think it was the caravan park, but Mr Apap has had many disasters. In fact, life has been one long disaster for Mr Apap. When you look at it—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Gunn): Order!

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: If one accumulated a list of George Apap's disasters, there would hardly be a speech long enough to contain them. I realise that I have ample time.

Mrs APPLEBY: On a point of order. I just wish to query whether the comments that various members are making are relevant to the motion.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a point of order? I was distracted.

Mrs APPLEBY: Well, I presumed that the Acting Speaker was listening. I was asking whether comments being made are relevant to the motion.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The Chair is of the view that members moving motions are given considerable room to manoeuvre. Therefore I cannot uphold the point of order. I suggest to the honourable member for Coles that she ensures that her remarks relate to the motion before the Chair.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Mr Acting Speaker, I assure you that the remarks relate very strongly to the motion before the Chair. I was referring to the career of Mr George Apap, the Secretary of the Storemen and Packers Union. That union purchased the caravan park; it has allegedly invested some of its own money in the park in addition to in excess of $100 000 of taxpayers' money; and it stands to benefit as a result of the sale of this asset. Mr Apap and his general attitudes and career are very relevant to the motion. It is interesting that the Government Whip chooses to defend Mr Apap, and perhaps she voted for him in the ballot for the ALP presidency.

Mrs APPLEBY: On a point of order, I wish to ask, Mr Acting Speaker, whether hypothetical comments made as part of a motion are acceptable?

The ACTING SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order, but I suggest that the member for Coles relates her comments to the motion. As I was about to indicate, the motion does not refer to the ALP Presidency. The honourable member for Coles.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: That is very true, it does not, but I wish to point out—and I will link up these remarks very closely—that the Secretary of the Storemen and Packers Union was a candidate for the position of President of the political Party which is at present in Government. That is central to this whole argument of political payola and to this debate. Every member opposite knows it, which is why we have a lot of shamefaced Government members sitting on the bench, holding up their hands and not looking at all happy about the way this motion is going. The reason is that the debate is uncovering a lot of things which the Labor Party would like to hide.

The point of this motion is the link between the Storemen and Packers Union, the Labor Party and the Government; the fact that this union has received vast sums of taxpayers' money and that it is going to sell an asset which has been financed by the taxpayer. That money will then go into union funds, which will then be shared with the political Party in Government which has helped to finance the asset. It is a horrible, circular movement of money from the taxpayers through the Government into the union and back to the political Party. That is undeniable; that is what is smelly about this whole grant and why it should be referred to the Auditor-General for report to Parliament.

In all this the Premier has said absolutely nothing. Mr Apap's statements do not in any way justify the fact that the union will make a profit at the expense of the public. The Premier has not said whether he condones this scandal. The Minister of State Development and Technology has said that he condones it. Some time earlier, in 1984, the Minister of Housing and Construction said that he condoned it. We must, therefore, assume that the Premier condones it, even though he was not too happy at the prospect of Mr Apap becoming President of his Party—and he actively worked to ensure that that did not happen.

The Premier should make public all the documents which relate to the union getting this money in the first place. I believe the only way that this can happen is if the matter is referred to the Auditor-General. Under the Public Finance and Audit Act 1987, section 34, the Auditor-General is given powers to obtain information. Section 34 (1) *(a)* enables him, by summons, to require the appearance of any persons or the production of any relevant accounts, records, or other documents. Subsection (1) *(b)* enables him to inspect any such accounts, records, or other documents, and retain them for such reasonable period as he or she thinks fit, and make copies of them or any of their contents. Subsection (1) *(c)* requires a person who has access to information which is, in the opinion of the Auditor-General, relevant, to provide that information to the Auditor-General in writing. Under that section the Auditor-General also has powers to inspect or enter buildings, which would enable him to get to the bottom of this very dirty pool.

The only way that this can happen, since the Premier refuses to act, is for the Parliament to act. If members opposite refuse to enable this motion to proceed to allow the Auditor-General to act, they will have complicity in what the taxpayer believes is a thoroughly dirty scandal. Why would members opposite not want this matter to be investigated if it is all above board? If Ministers have defended it, why would members opposite not believe that the details should be made public? If it is all okay, as the Minister of State Development and Technology states, why will members opposite not support this motion? At this stage we do not know whether or not they will support the

motion. I urge members opposite to support it but, if they do not, they too will be involved—each one of them by virtue of his or her vote—in a cover-up which should be exposed.

Another question which needs to be asked is: what happened to the money and why was it not properly managed in the employment stage? A potential buyer of the park contacted my office when it was advertised and, following his inspection, described the park as derelict. He claimed that it was not worth $60 000 in its present state and that it would require at least $50 000 worth of expenditure to bring it up to a habitable level.

That looks very strange alongside Mr Apap's acknowledgement on Philip Satchell's ABC program that the money spent on the project amounted to $380 000. The Storemen and Packers Union spent $85 000 in the first place and the project was granted $185 000 of taxpayers' money, making $270 000. After allowing for inflation, a sum of over $300 000 is arrived at. Yet, a potential buyer said that it was not worth $60 000. Where on earth did all that money go? What kind of management was involved? Why was the project not properly supervised? Why has it been allowed to become derelict? On and on the questions go, and they must be answered. The Government's silence on this question, except when forced out into the open by the media, has been deplorable. It confirms the public's worst fears, that is, why is the Government unwilling to open this up to examination?

The next chapter in the saga involves the actual sale of the park. It took a long, long time to be sold from the time of its advertisement to the time of its actual sale. I understand that a number of buyers inspected the property but found it in such a disgusting state that they were repelled by it and decided that it was not worth acquiring. My most recent information is that the park was sold about a month ago for a discounted price. The final figure has not been disclosed. However, it is said to be equal to the value of the games rooms on the property. I do not know what that is.

Mr Lewis: I wouldn't give you $40 000 for it.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The member for Murray-Mallee, in whose electorate the Coorong Caravan Park is situated, says that he would not pay $40 000 for it. That brings the scandal full circle. It started with an $85 000 investment by the union and $180 000 plus of taxpayers' money was poured into it, using labour that did not fit the criteria of the guidelines under which the grant was approved. Finally, this public asset, having had all this money spent on it, was flogged off for less than the value for which it was purchased. The only way that this question can be resolved is through the Auditor-General.

Mr Oswald: It sounds like the yabbie farm.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Yes, indeed, but it looks pale by comparison. At least the yabbie farm did not involve union funds and political payola, or not as far as we know. It was certainly an appalling waste of public funds but it did not have quite the smell about it that this project has. It is a tale of political payola, of incompetence, of cover-up by the Government, and of a total unwillingness to face up to the responsibility of accountability to the taxpayer when taxpayers' money is being spent. The Auditor-General is the only person who can ensure that this occurs and who can answer the many questions that I have asked and many more besides. This whole matter should be examined under the provisions of the Public Finance and Audit Act, particularly sections 34 and 36, under which the Auditor-General can report to Parliament, and section 37, under which he can make recommendations to Parliament.

In moving the motion, I condemn the Government for its failure to act so far, but I say to Government members that it is not too late for them to try to restore some public confidence in the probity of the CEP program and the Government itself (and indeed the Parliament) because, if members opposite oppose this motion, they will be saying that it is okay to throw $180 000 in the direction of a union which is affiliated with its own political Party; to cast all that money aside; to let the public asset be squandered; and to let the return from that asset be banked by the union which was the beneficiary of the payola.

It is simply not good enough to allow this to occur. I urge all members to support this motion and to ensure that the interests of all taxpayers in relation to the Coorong Caravan Park are secured by referring the whole question of the sale of that park to the Auditor-General for an investigation and a report to Parliament.

Mrs APPLEBY (Hayward): I move an amendment to the motion, as follows:

Leave out all words after 'House' and insert 'notes the referral to the Auditor-General by the Minister of Employment and Further Education of documentation relating to the CEP project at Policeman's Point (known as the Coorong Caravan Park) and requests that the report of the Auditor-General on this matter be tabled by the Minister'.

Having heard the arguments put forward by the member for Coles, and with the approval of the Minister and in his absence, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Adelaide is completely out of order.

Mr Oswald: As usual.

The SPEAKER: Order! As also is the member for Morphett.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[*Sitting suspended from 12.43 to 2 p.m.*]

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: RANDOM BREATH TESTING

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: In December, 1986, the Government provided funds to double the intensity of the police effort in random breath testing, and to provide extra publicity against drink driving. Extensive publicity was directed at drivers, particularly males aged between 18 and 50. A report on the effectiveness of the increased police effort and the publicity campaign has now been completed by the Road Safety Division of my department. I am therefore able to report to the House some pleasing results:

- A survey has confirmed that drivers received the publicity message.
- Fear of apprehension has been the major factor in deterring people from driving when they have had over the legal limit of alcohol—over .08.
- A Road Accident Research Unit report shows that the proportion of drivers in metropolitan Adelaide with a blood alcohol count exceeding .08 decreased by 42 per cent.
- The increased police effort began in May last year: in the 12 months from that month fatalities decreased by 18 per cent.

The overall conclusion of the report, which I now table, is that the increase in the random breath testing plus the publicity drive have succeeded in its aims of reducing drink driving and accidents.

QUESTION TIME

ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

Mr OLSEN: As domestic power costs in South Australia are the second highest in Australia, will the Minister of Mines and Energy order a major review of the operations and efficiency of the Electricity Trust? A comparison of electricity costs in all States, following the latest tariff adjustments, reveals that only Western Australians pay more for domestic power than do South Australians. The typical South Australian consumer pays $664.40 a year—$111.68 more than in Sydney, and $71.56 more than in Melbourne, when for many years South Australians paid much lower tariffs than other States.

The Opposition has consulted power industry experts who say that one reason for higher tariffs in this State is the declining efficiency of the Electricity Trust. During the past five years, the trust has increased its tariff by about 600 people at a time when the growth in demand for power has been going up at less than 1 per cent.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The Leader has a considerable amount of cheek in asking this question. He has on several occasions raised this item in the House, and on a number of those occasions he has been answered from this side. In case he has not been able to understand the answer, I will give it again. In the three years during which his Government was in power electricity costs in this State rose by over 50 per cent. In the three years immediately following we were tied to having to increase prices by 12 per cent per annum because of an agreement that the Leader's deputy made at the time he was Minister.

Since then, the price of electricity has not risen by as much as the consumer price index, and in one year it went down not only in real terms but in money terms—and that ought to be answer enough for the honourable member.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

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

COSMOS 1900

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Will the Premier tell the House what plans have been made to deal with the re-entry into the earth's atmosphere of a Soviet satellite, *Cosmos 1900*? There have been several reports recently of the impending crash of the satellite, which is carrying a nuclear reactor. A number of my constituents have expressed concern to me about the consequences of such an occurrence in South Australia.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank the honourable member for his question because I, too, have noticed that there has been a series of reports on this subject, and obviously there can be some public disquiet about it. First, let me say that the satellite, although it has been reported as such, is not carrying a nuclear reactor. It is carrying some form of nuclear powered electric plant, which obviously is in some form of protected covering. I do not think that details of the exact danger of that actually impacting on the earth have been fully ascertained. The use of the term 'nuclear reactor' suggests that some kind of nuclear explosion, and so on, could follow, but that is certainly not the case at all, although there may be some radioactivity present. I guess that is an example of the sort of sensationalising to which some of these things can be subject.

About a month ago the Prime Minister wrote to all State Premiers advising of the possible re-entry into the earth's atmosphere of this satellite, *Cosmos 1900*, and he sought cooperation in finalising contingency planning for that occurrence. Effectively, it was simply an early warning suggesting to the States that our disaster plan services be mobilised in anticipation of the need to do something more comprehensive when more information was to hand. The Commonwealth, in turn, has a national emergency operations centre as part of the Natural Disasters Organisation, and that is on standby.

The latest information is that the satellite is in a decaying orbit. It will probably re-enter the earth's atmosphere in mid September—exactly where is still unknown and cannot be properly tracked. However, I understand that we would have at least five to seven days warning of any re-entry and possible impact, so, there is certainly a considerable time in which people can be warned. Certainly, the impact could be quite considerable, in that debris from the satellite could be scattered over a wide area, estimated to measure about 40 by 1 000 kilometres.

The Soviet Space Agency has advised that components of the satellite will automtically separate on re-entry into the earth's atmosphere, making it much easier to handle. The Commonwealth Government has strict procedures, through its Natural Disasters Organisation in Canberra, to track the satellite, establish its impact area, and deploy a search team to locate, assess and deal with any debris, including possible radioactive debris.

The Commonwealth procedure will be supported by State authorities, under the State disaster plan—and that has already been activated. Our job will be to inform the public what to do, to cordon off any contaminated areas and, if necessary, to provide for safe evacuation from such areas. State and Commonwealth officials are in continuous contact. There should not be any reason for people to change plans or panic or in any other way react to this possibility. There will be plenty of warning and therefore there is no point in anticipating a disaster of any kind. I give that reassurance, and I add to it that the contingency plans are in place and will be readily activated if need be.

POWER GENERATION

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: My question is to the Minister of Mines and Energy.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order. I call the Minister of Transport to order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader to order: he has leave to ask a question, not to respond to interjections.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I just want to put him right, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will he review the timetable for construction of the third unit at the Port Augusta power station, because South Australia's power demand is growing much more slowly than earlier forecasts, and the State's generating capacity is to be supplemented by the three State interconnection from 1990? Since 1983,

because of slow economic growth, overall demand for electricity has been rising at less than 1 per cent. Peak demand forecasts made in 1983, on which decisions to build the third unit at Port Augusta were based, are now shown to have been overestimated by as much as 20 per cent. In addition, the three State interconnection will come on stream in 1990.

Expert opinion in the power industry now is that these factors will allow South Australia to delay the commissioning of the third unit at Port Augusta by at least four years, with significant savings to power consumers. About the power tariff question that the honourable Minister mentioned, the increases were due to an 80 per cent increase in the price of gas due to an agreement entered into—

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave is withdrawn. The last part of that question is out of order. The honourable Deputy Leader was clearly putting forward a case for particular actions, not simply providing sufficient facts to explain the context of the question. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for his question. Clearly, anything that is as far in the future as the actual construction of NPS3 is under continuous review. Quite clearly, if it is built too early there is a waste of interest on the capital expended which is not required at that stage, and if it is too late there is a risk to the continuity of supply. So yes, the situation will be monitored continuously and the power station brought on stream when it is needed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister interjecting is out of order. The member for Henley Beach.

ORGAN TRANSPLANTS

Mr FERGUSON: I direct my question to the Minister of Health. Following the announcement by the Federal Minister for Health that the States may have to consider legislation to increase the number of organs being donated by people for surgery, will the Minister of Health say whether the Department of Health has considered the ethical questions involved in the use of animal organs? Mr Bernard Levin, in an article in the London *Times* on 4 August, stated that it is now quite possible for pig kidneys to be used in the human body.

Mr Levin suggested that further advances in medical technology will allow the kidneys of pigs, the hearts of chimpanzees, the lungs of wart-hogs, the windpipes of rats, and the stomachs of cows to be used in human transplants. Mr Levin's article has created considerable interest in the United Kingdom, with readers of the *Times* taking sides for and against—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting at this stage. I call on the Minister to reply.

Mr Ferguson: I am never able to get a question out. Why pick on me?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair does not need to reply to flippant questions of that nature. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the honourable member—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! For the second time I call the Deputy Leader to order. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the honourable member for his question which, I suppose, is in two parts. The honourable member raised the issue of organ transplants and whether animal organs would be of use. Also, I suppose, a further question concerns the ethics involved. I have been advised that an extensive review of the use of animals and experimentation with animals, for example mice, was undertaken in this State some time ago. That report was implemented, so there is an extensive ethics procedure in this area. As to whether animal organs can be used at this stage, I am advised that much more work must be done before this procedure can be considered useful.

I suppose that the fundamental question would be why we must consider using animal organs. This raises the question of the shortage of organs from donors in this State and other States. That is a serious question and I am pleased that the honourable member has raised it today and that the Federal Minister for Health (Dr Blewett) raised it a few days ago. This is something with which I was involved 10 years ago while the natural death legislation was going through Parliament. The select committee on that legislation had to ensure that there was nothing in the Act that prevented or inhibited in any way people from donating organs, so we had evidence before the select committee on that matter.

I have stated clearly in the media that I have always tended to the view that we should have an opt-out system rather than the present opt-in system.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Coles is out of order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: This is a serious question and I was trying to deal with it seriously.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call to order the honourable member for Coles and the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: This is a serious question and one that does not require such interjections during an answer. I normally welcome interjections, but in this case interjections are inappropriate. I have always adopted the view that we should have an opt-out rather than an opt-in system. The present system requires a positive comment from a person giving permission for his or her organs to be used after death. The very consequence of the present system is that many people who die have perfectly useful organs that are buried when they die, and that many people die for the want of organs. I guess that the overwhelming majority of people would be only too happy to have their organs used after they died—

Mr S.J. Baker: Why can't they say so?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —provided that someone organised it for them. After all, apathy is the main reason why we have this shortage of organs for transplant purposes. The member for Coles, quite inappropriately, interjected that that would mean that one's body belonged to the State, but that is absolute nonsense.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is absolute rubbish. It seems to me that, if a system of opting out was run efficiently and effectively, it would be easy for people to opt out and, if people chose not to do so—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I think that the honourable Minister has addressed himself to the question sufficiently. I ask him to wind up his remarks.

Ms Gayler interjecting:

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As Minister of Health, I am not here to legislate for my own personal point of view: I am here to implement Government policy and in the main to reflect the views of the community. I have welcomed Dr Blewett's raising this matter in the community and I have done several radio and television interviews on this topic, asking members of the community to give thought to it and, if possible, to let me know how they feel about it.

I understand that the question is on the agenda for the next meeting of Health Ministers early next year and I hope to be able to take some of the views of the community of South Australia to that meeting. I also hope that it is possible to work out a much more efficient system where people are not dying for the want of, for example, kidney transplants, or putting up with most uncomfortable lives because of having to have their blood cleansed two or three times a week. I hope that everyone in the Chamber agrees with me and treats this question seriously, not using it, in the way that members have, as a political point-scoring exercise.

COORONG CARAVAN PARK

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I address my question to the Minister representing the Minister of Employment and Further Education.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has no advice on this matter; however, I am sure that the appropriate Minister will rise at the appropriate moment. The honourable member for Coles.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: When did the Minister ask the Auditor-General to investigate the sale of the Coorong Caravan Park by the Storemen and Packers Union? Why did he not take this action immediately the park was put up for sale, and will the Government require the union to repay the taxpayers' money invested in the park?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The Storemen and Packers Union, of which Mr George Apap, the former Senior Vice President of the ALP, is State Secretary, received a CEP grant of $180 000 in 1984 to develop this park for the use of union members. In May this year, the union advertised the property for sale at $165 000, with the proceeds of the sale to be retained by the union. Immediately the union advertised the park's sale, the Opposition called on the Government to ask the Auditor-General to investigate the matter and to require the union to refund the taxpayers' money invested in the project. However, the Minister refused to take any action.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is of the view that the honourable member is canvassing matters which are the subject of a motion before the House moved by the honourable member for Coles herself.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The explanation is related to the question and will, I believe, assist the Minister replying to the question to understand the nature of what happened.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair cannot accept that. The matter has already been canvassed before the House by way of debate on the motion moved by the honourable member for Coles.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave is withdrawn. I call on the Premier to reply.

Mr S.J. BAKER: A point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Sir, the substantive motion standing in the name of the member for Coles and the amendment that was put before this House are not in the same vein as the question that is being asked today. The question relates to why—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not raising a relevant point of order. The Chair withdrew leave for the explanation which is canvassing matters that are already the subject of debate before the House. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I know that the Opposition is a little disappointed that the Government is not defensive or secretive about this matter. I am sure that it is most disappointed that we are only too happy to have the Auditor-General—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not know about other members of the House, but the Chair would like to be able to hear the reply. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Government is only too happy to have the Auditor-General investigate this matter, as in relation to any matter of accounts that come into the public domain. As to the specifics of the question, I will refer the matter to my colleague.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the Deputy Leader to order.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I again call the Deputy Leader to order. The honourable member for Bright.

AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS

Mr ROBERTSON: Can the Minister of Agriculture confirm that the agricultural chemicals collected from South Australian farms during last year's recall program have been safely removed from South Australia? During the past year the Minister informed the House on a number of occasions that the chemicals, since recall, have been temporarily stored at Gladstone. Since that time there has been a degree of speculation about their disposal. At that time I understand that the Minister gave an undertaking that they would not remain in South Australia.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question. I know that a number of people in the community are very interested in this issue. I can assure the honourable member and the South Australian community that the organochlorins have been safely disposed of from our shores. Because of the terms of the contract with the private contractor, we are not able to disclose the route or method of disposal at this stage, but I can assure members that the department has negotiated a very safe arrangement with the contractor to ensure the safe destruction of the chemicals. As to the amounts, 52 tonnes of DDT, both in liquid form and in solid form, was collected, along with 4 tonnes of dieldrin and lindane and the remainder, making up 64 tonnes in total, comprised other organochlorins, such as heptachlor, aldrin and chlordane.

In terms of disposal, I should also put on record my thanks to the authorities involved, including the Department of Agriculture officers, and the rural community at large, because I think that the process of collection, storage and handling has been performed in an exemplary fashion.

The efficiency and safety with which it was handled is an example for the rest of Australia. Throughout South Australia about 70 collection points stored and handled these chemicals in a very safe way. We are now able to say that the chemicals have left South Australian shores and are on their way for safe disposal.

POLICE TRANSFERS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: My question is directed to the Minister of Emergency Services. Will he investigate claims by a senior detective that the transfer of officers from the Major Crime Squad will prevent police completing investigations into the Marafiote murders? This claim was made in an interview published yesterday in the *News*. The senior detective quoted said that officers already transferred out of the major crime squad each had key roles in the Marafiote investigations. He said that, while their work had unveiled a large network of crime in South Australia and that they had, for the first time, built up a great deal of intelligence in relation to the Mafia in this State, he understood that their investigations had not been completed at the time of their transfers.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I do not have to investigate it, because I have already done so. The allegations were made known to me over a week ago and I immediately took up the matter with the Deputy Commissioner of Police (the Commissioner being in the north of the State at that time). I have received a full report from the Deputy Commissioner of Police on the matter. It is clear that the unit of the Police Department to which we are referring will be far more effective as a result of the change. The Police Association significantly fully supports this change in administrative procedure and there certainly will be no loss of data, information or intelligence available to us. I would be only too happy for the honourable member to discuss the matter with the Commissioner if he so chooses.

RURAL ASSESSOR

Mr De LAINE: Can the Minister of Agriculture advise whether the proposal to appoint the rural assessor for the Far West Coast has been implemented and, if so, what results have been achieved? On 29 July the Minister announced that, in response to the poor season of the Far West Coast and the fact that there had been some changes to the Rural Assistance Scheme, the Department of Agriculture would temporarily move a rural assessor to the West Coast to give information and advice to farmers who were experiencing financial difficulties.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question. I know that not only members on this side but also members on the other side of the House, particularly the members for Flinders and Eyre, are very interested in this issue. As we know, the area west of Ceduna is suffering again because of lack of rainfall. At the moment the seasonal situation is quite frightening for some of the people involved.

It is a situation we responded to by placing in Murat Bay a regional economist who will work with the regional assessor and regional office in order to assess members of the farming community involved in this very distressing situation. The program was announced on 29 July and was due to commence on 15 August. We have had a successful series of interviews with some 26 farmers who made appointments to see the rural assessor, and that represents something like 25 per cent of the farmers in the immediate area. Of those 26, many are in a desperate situation with regard to their viability.

However, we have already assessed through the officers that farm build-up or restructuring is an adequate way in which we can address the financial situation of a significant number of them. Overall, from advice I have received from our regional director, Dr Swincer, it would appear that the exercise has been very successful and useful for the community, allowing us to establish a much broader base of information and also providing a better decision making base for the area in future.

We are looking at a program, and I hope that, when I visit later next month, I can discuss with those farming communities schemes that I hope will address the long-term problems in these areas. I hope that we can in the next few weeks release to the people some information on those schemes. The assessment program, involving a financial assessor and our regional economist, through our regional office, has worked successfully and the exercise has proved to be valuable, not only giving us information but also assisting the community, which is the most important aspect of such an exercise.

COORONG CARAVAN PARK

Mr MEIER: Will the Premier instruct the Storemen and Packers Union to repay the proceeds from the sale of the Coorong Caravan Park to the taxpayers of South Australia?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is a very odd question as to the source—the member who is asking it—the Minister to whom it is directed, and the nature of the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: What I think was an identical question was asked a minute ago by the member for Coles. I can only refer the member for Goyder to that answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Premier and the member for Goyder to order for continuing a dialogue across the Chamber after the House has been called to order. The honourarable member for Spence.

DREDGING VESSELS

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Will the Minister of Marine inform the House whether the sale by the Department of Marine and Harbors of the dredge AD *Victoria* and the two hopper barges has yet been settled and what savings are likely to be made as a result of disposing of those dredging vessels?

Mr Gunn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: It is about time the member for Eyre—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Spence not to respond to out of order interjections from the member for Eyre.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: They did not make me the politician of the year for nothing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The matter of disposing of the dredging equipment was close to being finalised while I was Minister, and I would be interested to learn of the settlement. As the average capital expenditure on dredging was

in excess of $2 million per annum, I am interested in knowing the actual savings, taking into account the frequency of maintenance dredging required to be done by the remaining bucket dredge, the *Andrew Wilson.*

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the honourable member for his question and I can appreciate his reasons for asking. Whilst I am sure that the honourable member is aware that the exact sale prices of the AD *Victoria* and the two hopper barges are a matter of commercial confidence between the Government and the buyers, I can inform the House that when final settlement for the AD *Victoria* is made in November this year the combined sale price for the three items will be in excess of $800 000. With regard to the second part of the honourable member's question, I can provide the following information. Over the past 10 years the bucket dredge has been virtually exclusively used for capital dredging. This work included general deepening and widening improvements to the Port River, extensions to the Outer Harbor swinging basin, deepening No. 6 berth, Outer Harbor, from 12 metres to 13½ metres, completing the 12 metre channel from Fairway Beacon to the container berth and deepening and widening the Port Pirie channel.

The dredge has also been involved in assignments such as the Porter Bay marina, ICI dredging, Pipelines Authority of South Australia pipe trench dredging and the entrance channel to North Haven. The Department of Marine and Harbors projects have accounted for capital expenditure averaging approximately $2.6 million per year in previous years. However, given that the Port Adelaide channel and berths are now dredged to an extent sufficient to meet present needs, the requirement for a capital works dredging operation no longer exists. In the past 'maintenance dredging' has accounted for about $100 000 per annum, and this is the order of cost expected in the future. The estimate of average total savings as a result of disposing of dredging vessels will be in the order of $2.6 million per annum.

POLICE TRANSFERS

Mr S.J. BAKER: Will the Minister of Emergency Services say whether the current major restructuring of the Major Crime Armed Hold-up and Special Crime Squads will make the police more vulnerable to corruption? There is serious concern within the Police Force about major changes now being made to these squads which will result in many senior officers with long experience in crime fighting being transferred to other duties. Yesterday the *News* published an extensive interview with a senior detective who said that the transfers were being implemented without consultation with those officers directly affected and in a way that will jeopardise the ability of the police to effectively combat crime. The senior detective also said that because 'less experienced officers would be put into a major crime fighting role they would be less able to recognise or stand up to and oppose the insidious corruptive influence police are continually subjected to'.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: One of the mechanisms that was identified in the National Crime Authority report—in the chapter 12 that has been made available to the people of South Australia—for combating corruption and ensuring that corruption is seen to be being combated is the regular movement of officers between areas of sensitivity. However, in any event, I would have thought that no police officer or anyone else would need a great deal of experience to determine whether or not they are being offered a bribe. It seems to me that that is something that a person with only a minimum of intelligence or experience can judge straight away. So, as to the suggestion from a certain source—and a disgruntled source, if I can say that—why on earth people who might move into areas in which they have less experience should indeed lead to any suggestion that that officer would be more open to corruption, I am blowed if I know. It seems to me that the honourable member has attempted to rephrase a question that was asked by one of his colleagues and that the only way he could do it was by tacking onto it the magic word 'corruption'.

OLYMPIC DAM PROJECT

Mr DUIGAN: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy provide the House with any up-to-date information on the value of contracts which have flowed to South Australia from the Olympic Dam project in any of the six years since the election of a Labor Government?

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable Deputy Leader for repeatedly interjecting.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am very pleased to be able to advise the House that the high level of South Australian participation which has been evident right from the start of this project has been maintained, and from the time that the joint venturers committed to the project in May 1986 until 30 June this year contracts totalling $377.4 million have been let. The South Australian content of these contracts has been 80 per cent. In terms of dollars actually paid out by the joint venturers until the end of June this year, amounting to $351.6 million, I again indicate that the South Australian content was 80 per cent.

One can draw two conclusions from this: first, that the joint venturers have obviously honoured the Indenture provisions which, broadly speaking, required them to give South Australian suppliers, manufacturers and contractors reasonable opportunities to tender and, where possible, to give preference to local tenderers, all other things being equal. Secondly, it is also clear from the figures that South Australian contractors, manufacturers and suppliers have in fact performed very well.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I do not want to listen to the honourable member's interjection because I am telling this Parliament how well South Australians have been performing.

An honourable member interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: They have been performing very well indeed to be able to win that high percentage of the available contract.

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

Mr BECKER: Following the Premier's ministerial statement last night to correct information he gave during Question Time yesterday, and so that the public can get some perspective about alleged corruption in South Australia, will he say how many people are named in the NCA report who are not police officers; are there more non-police persons than police officers named in the report; are any of them present or former employees of the Government or holders of public office; and, if the Premier will not provide this information, will he explain how it would affect ongoing investigations by simply nominating the number of people

named in the report and whether they are Government or non-government employees?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There are a lot of questions there, Mr Speaker, but I am afraid I cannot answer them. As I said in my explanation yesterday evening, the numbers, details, and so on, simply cannot be put before the House. Indeed, that fact has been recognised in questions put by the Opposition. The member for Coles in the preface to her question acknowledged that where we have ongoing investigations it is in no-one's interest for them to be put into the public domain. It is as simple as that. It is nothing to do with undue secrecy. On the contrary: if successful prosecutions are launched in any cases, they immediately become the subject of public note, although then, of course, we have the argument before the courts on the suppression of names, and so on.

The very care that the courts take in those instances, I think, makes it incumbent on us in Parliament to be even more careful at a stage when purely allegations are involved and, therefore, their substance or otherwise has not been tested in any possible way. For those reasons and for no other, I am afraid that we cannot put numbers and names before the House.

TENANCY LEGISLATION

Mr GROOM: My question is directed to the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General in another place. Will the Minister report to the House on whether any reforms are contemplated to the commercial tenancies legislation to provide further protection for small businesses? Considerable progress was made towards protecting small businesses as a consequence of the passage of the commercial tenancies legislation several years ago. I understand that the Attorney-General intends to review the workings of the Landlord and Tenant Act relating to commercial tenancies.

My question today is prompted by a number of recent situations that have been drawn to my attention. Briefly, an increasing number of lessors have adopted the practice of granting short-term leases and refusing to include rights of renewal. Combined with this is a lease requirement for the lessee annually, monthly or weekly (as the case may be) to provide sales figures. At the expiration of the short-term lease and armed with these gross sales figures, irrespective of net profits, these lessors are demanding rent increases at exorbitant and exploitative levels, in some cases drawn to my attention—

The SPEAKER: Order! The last part—

Mr GROOM: I shall leave that out.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will not leave it out. He will sit down because leave has been withdrawn. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question and for his ongoing interest in this important area. I will obtain from my colleague in another place the status report that the honourable member seeks.

SOIL AND WATER SALINITY

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Following the announcement in Adelaide last Friday by the Federal Minister for the Environment (Senator Richardson) of 'the latest most important plan to combat soil and water salinity in the world', can the Minister of Water Resources say what is the South Australian Government's financial commitment to the plan this year and in succeeding financial years, and what commitments have been given by the Governments of Victoria, New South Wales and the Commonwealth to fund the essential works program incorporated in the plan?

The Hon. SUSAN LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question and for his interest in this extremely important and vital area of concern, not only to South Australians but to all Australians, especially those in New South Wales and Victoria. I cannot give the figures off the top of my head for the South Australian commitment to this major project, but I will certainly get for the honourable member the figures that he requires, including the commitments of the other three Governments. However, I should like to add that it was recently my first opportunity as the newly appointed Minister of Water Rescources to attend the Joint Ministerial Council on the Murray-Darling Basin, and this is an appropriate time to pay a tribute to the contributions of all the Ministers who attended that conference, particularly the lead Minister from South Australia, the Deputy Premier, who has for some years attended the conference.

Further, in a spirit of bipartisanship I would pay tribute to the newly elected New South Wales Minister (Mr Ian Causley) for his contribution. It was pleasing to be part of a council where people sat down and genuinely tried to solve some serious problems, particularly salinity problems, and to consider those longer term planning issues that relate to the prevention of the kind of problem that we have seen developing over the years on the Murray River. I will get the figures required and let the honourable member have them as soon as possible.

GOLDEN GROVE RECREATION FACILITIES

Ms GAYLER: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport ask his department to liaise with the Golden Grove developers (Delfin Property Group) and the Tea Tree Gully council concerning their plans for sporting and recreation facilities in the area and the timetable for those facilities in and near the development area? Sporting clubs in the north-eastern suburbs are all experiencing a heavy demand because of the fast growing population. Indeed, some cannot take in new members, including young players, because club facilities have simply not kept pace with the population. Planned expansion, extra facilities and funds are needed if north-eastern residents are to avoid the 'Norm' syndrome and instead be part of the 'Life. Be in it' generation.

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave is withdrawn. The honourable member clearly began debating the matter. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for her question and I appreciate her real interest in this area. Obviously, we have devoted considerable energy to considering major sporting requirements, especially facility requirements for sport in this State. In this regard, we must also consider the recreation side of the ledger, because that is an important outlet for many members of the South Australian community.

The opportunity presented itself when the Cabinet met at Tea Tree Gully about one month ago to consider the issues confronting the north-eastern suburbs. The honourable member and I looked at several sporting facilities and had discussions with some of the sports community leaders during the day and in the evening at Modbury. Obviously, there is a great need for resources in that area, and it is of very keen interest to the department.

I assure the honourable member that the department will liaise with the authorities with regard to the development

of Golden Grove. It is important that we continue to take into account the demographic changes occurring in that region when considering future sporting facilities to be developed there. The hockey-lacrosse facility is within the immediate geographic area of the north-eastern suburbs, and will provide an important recreational outlet for many of the honourable member's constituents. The high regard in which that facility is held throughout Australia and, indeed, internationally, is very important.

In relation to the question of the department's liaison, I give the honourable member that assurance and, as part of our continued facilities development review, it will continue to liaise with all those authorities, both in the north-east and, of course, in the south where there is a major population growth. I thank the honourable member for her question and interest, and I know that her constituents are well represented in these matters.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

Mr OSWALD: Will the Minister of Health order an urgent independent report into the reception and treatment of patients at the casualty receiving department of the Flinders Medical Centre to include the serious allegations made in this week's Messenger *Guardian*? The hospital has refused to discuss the matter publicly on the grounds of patient confidentiality and that it is inappropriate for the hospital to publicly discuss the allegations as, the hospital claims, they bear little resemblance to the real situation.

In that paper, under the headline 'Pensioners blast lack of urgent care at hospital—woman with broken knee told to come back in two day's time', there are three reports as follows:

A Christie Downs woman, who did not want her name published because she was receiving medical care, said she was forced to wait six days before her fractured knee was treated.

The woman, 69, broke her knee at a dance on Saturday 6 August, and was taken to Flinders Medical Centre in an ambulance.

At the centre her knee was bandaged and she was told to return on Monday 8 August, to consult a specialist.

She makes the point:

'It was not their (the doctors') fault. They were very busy,' she said.

The woman remained in bed, suffering severe pain, until her husband telephoned the hospital on Monday morning. But he was told an appointment could not be arranged until Friday 12 August.

That is another six days later. The article further states:

Another womam from Christies Beach had a similar experience when she suffered bleeding from the bowel.

The woman, aged 54, had earlier been admitted to Flinders because of kidney trouble.

'After five days at home, I found I was bleeding from the bowel,' she said.

'My daughter took me immediatey to Flinders. There was only one doctor who was seeing everyone. He did a blood and other tests. He said there was a lot of blood in the bowel.'

She was sent home at 1.20 a.m. and told to make an appointment for further testing later in the week.

The final report states:

In May, a Christie Downs resident was taken to Flinders because he had a trapped sciatic nerve in his spine.

The report continues:

He consulted a doctor, who told him there were no beds available, and he was sent home.

'I had no public hospital treatment while I was in pain.'

'I had to seek private hospital treatment.'

He had an operation at a private hospital, costing about $3 000—his life savings.

The three residents are members of an over 50s club. The club president said he feared many elderly residents in the south were not receiving adequate health care.

'I've got no gripe against the medical centre,' he said.

He was referring to the doctors. He continued:

'I'm disgusted with the bureaucratic mucking around by governments.'

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes, Mr Speaker.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is the question that he asked.

ROAD MARKINGS

Mr ROBERTSON: Will the Minister of Transport instruct the Highways Department to investigate the use of non-slip paint in future line marking operations? I am informed by members of the Motor Cycle Riders Assocation that the use of enamel paints on highways has been a worry to motor cyclists for a number of years. I am also informed that enamel paints tend to become slippery when they have a coating of oil, particularly in wet weather. I am further informed that a range of decking paints also exist that are used in marine applications and on concrete surfaces. I am told that any such paint suitable for use on highways might also find an application marking tennis courts and outdoor netball courts.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Minister resume his seat for a moment. The honourable member for Bright is supposed merely to explain the context of the question and not to expand on anything. He should not start presenting the pros and cons of a particular argument, because that would constitute debate. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am not sure about the use of such paint on tennis courts and I will refer that matter to my colleague, the Minister of Recreation and Sport. However, it is true that paint on the road has caused difficulties for motor cyclists. As the honourable member has pointed out, the Motor Cycle Riders Association of South Australia has made a number of representations to me, as Minister, and to the Highways Department to see whether a non-slip or non-skid paint can be developed.

The Highways Department has carried out investigations to develop materials to improve the skid resistance of pavement markings. The latest trials have been successful, and equipment is now being developed to apply the new material. It is anticipated that this equipment will be in service within the next six months. However, I point out that the paint used in South Australia is obtained from the same manufacturer as that used by road authorities in the Eastern States, and the Highways Department constantly monitors new paint technology. There is no evidence of superior products being available, either interstate or overseas. When new pavement marking products or techniques become available and are practical, they will be introduced. The products that we use are the best available.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am not sure whether they are manufactured in South Australia or interstate. I hope that it is South Australian. We seem to have the best technology in a number of areas and it would not surprise me if that was the case in this area. If that is the case, we would sell the product to the Eastern States. The material is commonly used by all departments. The pavement marking practices in all States are in accordance with Australian Standard 1742. In problem areas, and to combat adverse weather conditions, the line work is supplemented by installing raised pavement markers. These provide additional reflectivity to emphasise delineation of the painted lines and an audible warning to motorists deviating across sep-

aration and lane lines. This topic has been taken seriously by the Highways Department and other road authorities throughout Australia and the world.

It is known that, particularly in wet weather, motor cyclists can slip on the paint that is now used. We are quite certain that research will show that better properties can be developed within this paint and, the sooner, the better. I thank the honourable member for his question.

COUNTRY HOSPITALS

Mr BLACKER: Can the Minister of Health reassure this House and my constituents that the Government has no intention of closing any hospital on Eyre Peninsula or any intention of changing the role of any hospital on Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Flinders for his question. The member for Flinders, the member for Eyre and I live on Eyre Peninsula so, of course, hospital and medical facilities on the Eyre Peninsula will receive a high level of attention. I can assure the member for Flinders that, during its life, this Government does not intend to close any hospitals on Eyre Peninsula or to alter their role significantly.

STATE OPERA COMPANY

Mr DUIGAN: Will the Minister for the Arts outline to the House the current financial situation of the State Opera Company of South Australia following the ministerial statement that he made on 23 March in which he indicated a number of difficulties that the Opera Company faced and that drastic action would be needed to turn around the company's fortunes.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am pleased to say that while the financial situation has still not recovered—and under the plans being drawn up it will be sometime before that is the situation—a number of steps have already been put into operation which are working very satisfactorily indeed. I will outline them briefly to the House and in so doing point out that one thing that has happened since March has been the appointment of a new General Manager, Mr William Gillespie, who arrived only a couple of weeks ago to take up his duties. With his background and experience with the Pittsburg Opera Company (his most recent appointment), I am confident that he will bring a new perspective to the management of the company. In the nuts and bolts of achieving control of the financial situation, a number of measures have been introduced, for example, the workshop of the company is to close as from the end of 1988 and other arrangements will be made for those employees currently in the workshop. The wardrobe staff will be reduced by attrition. The administration has reduced its staffing levels by four and from 1 July the Opera Theatre was transferred to the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust for operation. All of these factors will remove management and financial burdens, thus resulting in savings to the Opera Company.

In the program area the State Opera has ensured that in its two productions during the 1989 calendar year budgets have been reduced by the order of 20 per cent. Again, that provides immediate savings in the 1988-89 budget outlook. In addition, negotiations are continuing for a season of the Australian Opera.

Finally, the financial affairs of the company are being closely monitored by the Arts Finance Advisory Committee. It appears that cash flow payments will be released only upon receipt of monthly budget performance indicators. Financial control will be tight and already the action is showing dividends.

POINT PEARCE COMMUNITY COUNCIL

Mr MEIER: Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs advise the current position of the Point Pearce Community Council? Is the official Point Pearce Council in control of the Aboriginal settlement or has a *de facto* council taken over? Nearly three months ago on 20 May a group of Point Pearce residents gave notice in writing that they could no longer support the local council and that they would be taking over. The monthly Central Yorke Peninsula liaison meetings between blacks and whites have been suspended until the situation is resolved. As a result, important projects are in limbo. These are questions on financial transactions and uncertainty as to the future of Point Pearce.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Minister of Health to order. Members cannot conduct conversations across the barrier with persons in the Speaker's gallery. The Minister of Aboriginal Affairs.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I understand that a vote is to be taken within the community this week to resolve the question of the formation and constitution of a committee of management for that community.

OMBUDSMAN 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 inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This short Bill seeks to amend the Ombudsman Act 1972 to upgrade existing penalties under the Act and to provide for new offences of preventing persons from making complaints to the Ombudsman, and of hindering or obstructing such persons. These new offences are considered desirable, not only because the Ombudsman himself has sought their inclusion, but also because similar provisions exist in the Police (Complaints and Disciplinary Proceedings) Act 1985 (section 49 (2)). I commend this Bill to honourable members.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 amends section 15 of the principal Act which is the provision dealing with the making of complaints. The maximum penalty in subsection (4) for refusing or failing to take all steps necessary to facilitate any communication by a complainant necessary for or incidental to a complaint under the Act and for failing to ensure the privacy of that communication is increased from $500 to $2 000.

Clause 3 inserts a new provision, section 15a, which makes it an offence to prevent a person from making a complaint or to hinder or obstruct a person in making a complaint. The maximum penalty is $2 000.

Clause 4 amends section 22 of the principal Act which prohibits the disclosure of information obtained by or on behalf of the Ombudsman in the course or for the purpose of an investigation. The maximum penalty is increased from $500 to $2 000.

Clause 5 amends section 24 of the principal Act. This section provides that a person must not obstruct or hinder the Ombudsman, fail to comply with lawful requirements of the Ombudsman or make false statements to the Ombudsman. The maximum penalty is increased from $500 to $2 000.

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

ACTS INTERPRETATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

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 inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this short Bill is to insert into the Acts Interpretation Act 1915 a provision of general application that will apply to cases where an Act is to be bought into operation on a day (or days) to be fixed by proclamation.

Experience has shown that when detailed consideration is given to the timing of the implementation of an Act, it may be the case that considerable flexibility is required, especially if transitional problems come to light during consultation on specific issues relating to the commencement of the measure. Such consultation may not have been practicable, or appropriate, before the passage of the legislation. The amendment would assist in many of these cases by giving the Governor-General power to bring the particular measure into operation in several stages. This degree of flexibility might also assist a government, in appropriate cases, to make savings when staff and facilities must be reorganised on account of legislative change, and enable a government to bring measures in gradually when members of the public or businesses must reorganise themselves on account of legislative change.

Obviously, the proposed provision would not prevent the Parliament from making more specific provision for the commencement of a particular measure, if it so desired. A similar provision has been included in the Interpretation of Legislation Act 1984 of Victoria. Finally, the amendment would result in the simplification of the standard commencement provision (usually clause 2 of a Bill).

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 amends section 7 of the principal Act to provide that, when an Act is to come into operation by proclamation, then, unless the contrary intention appears, the proclamation may fix a day for the commencement of the Act, fix different days for the commencement of different provisions of the Act, or suspend the operation of specified provisions of the Act until a day or days to be fixed by further proclamation. The amendment will allow for the 'staggered' commencement of complete provisions, parts of provisions, or provisions that are to be inserted into another Act.

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

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the State Transport Authority Act 1974. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Since major amendments were made to the State Transport Authority Act in 1981, it has become apparent in the light of day-to-day experience that further amendments are required particularly in the areas of property, transit infringement notices and obstruction of vehicles.

During negotiations concerning the construction of the new headquarters building for the authority, several deficiencies came to light in matters involving the authority's powers to acquire land, purchase shares or establish a company, establish and operate car parks and apply its regulations to areas not its property such as the North Terrace underpath under North Terrace. Following advice received from the Crown Solicitor, the provisions of this Bill will rectify these problems.

With regard to fare avoidance, the current wording of the Act places the onus of proof on the prosecution which in certain instances seriously impedes successful prosecution. For instance, in the case of a passenger overriding the value of a ticket, the onus of proof is on the prosecution to prove the passenger knew what the correct fare was and deliberately paid a lesser amount. Under strict liability for fare offences the onus of proof is on the passenger to prove that it was a genuine mistake. Strict liability for failure to pay fares is enforced in Victoria, New South Wales and Western Australia.

There is no provision under the current Act to prohibit the placing of dangerous objects on rail tracks. On occasions track electrical circuits have been short-circuited causing abnormal operation of signals and level crossing devices. Inclusion of provisions in this Bill relating to obstructions to the public transport system will further improve the safety level on public transport.

The Bill also provides for flexibility with regard to the issue of expiation notices. It will empower the authority to cover late expiations, double expiations and permit the setting of a lower expiation fee.

The provisions of this Bill also empower the making of regulations prohibiting disorderly and offensive behaviour of persons whilst on any authority premises, not just on vehicles as at present. The regulations may extend to property that is associated with a public transport system but does not belong to the authority.

As it is intended that the principal Act will be reprinted as soon as these amendments come into operation, a list of statute law revision amendments is attached in the schedule to the Bill.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for commencement on a date to be fixed by proclamation, with the usual power to suspend provisions.

Clause 3 increases a penalty for non-disclosure of interests from $500 to a division 8 fine ($1 000).

Clause 4 amends section 17 of the principal Act which deals with the general functions of the State Transport Authority. The amendments expand the powers of the authority. In particular it empowers the Authority to set up companies to carry out functions on its behalf or related functions and to acquire and dispose of shares, securities and other interests in bodies corporate with the approval of the Governor. The Governor's approval is not required for acquisition of interests in a strata unit or strata corporation.

Section 17 is also amended in view of the Government Management and Employment Act 1985 to make it clear that authority employees are not public servants.

Clause 5 repeals section 18 of the principal Act and substitutes a new provision. The new section gives the authority power to acquire land for the establishment, extension or alteration of a public transport system or for any incidental or related purpose.

Clause 6 substitutes the heading immediately preceding section 23 and inserts section 22a. This provision permits the authority to set up and operate car parks for the convenience of public transport users.

Clause 7 increases the penalty for hindering STA employees from $500 to a division 8 fine ($1 000).

Clause 8 repeals sections 25 to 29 of the principal Act and substitutes three sections. New section 25 deals with the payment of fares and charges for services provided by the authority. Subsection (1) provides that where a service is provided to a person and he or she fails to pay the appropriate fare or charge fixed under the Act that person commits an offence and is liable to a division 9 fine ($500). Subsection (2) creates an evidentiary aid by providing that, in the absence of proof to the contrary, an allegation that a particular service was provided to the defendant will be accepted as proved.

Subsection (3) provides two defences. First, that the failure to pay was attributable to an honest and reasonable mistake on the part of the defendant; second, that the defendant did not have a reasonable opportunity to pay. New section 26 makes it an offence to obstruct the public transport system. The maximum penalty fixed is a division 5 fine ($8 000). New section 27 provides that a person may expiate an offence against the Act by payment of an expiation fee. The Authority is granted a discretion with respect to extending the time for payment and reducing the amount of the fee payable in particular cases where appropriate.

Clause 9 amends section 31 of the principal Act by making incidental changes to the regulation-making power. Regulations may be made dealing with the behaviour of persons while on the authority's vehicles or premises, or while on premises that do not belong to the authority but are associated with one of the authority's public transport systems. Regulations may be made relating to liquor licences for the authority's premises. Regulations may be made fixing, and providing for the manner of payment of, fares and charges. Regulations may also be made in relation to the carriage of luggage and dealing with abandoned goods. The maximum penalty that may be prescribed for a breach of regulations is a division 9 fine ($500).

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE FIREARMS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

That the time for bringing up the report of the select committee be extended until Tuesday 23 August 1988.

Motion carried.

RADIATION PROTECTION AND CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 August. Page 167.)

Mr BECKER (Hanson): This single piece of legislation, I am informed, is simply a housekeeping matter and relates to the licence fee for operations in which radioactive ore is mined and milled. At the outset I must complain: I felt that the Minister's explanation was unsatisfactory as there is a lot more to the Bill than simply the extension of the licence arrangements. The legislation relates to the Roxby Downs joint venture and the importance of radiation protection measures included in the Indenture. Those arrangements were arrived at after considerable amount of negotiation between the Government and the joint venture partners. The joint venture partners hold a special mining licence that was granted in 1986, initially for 50 years. That licence can be extended.

At present, under the codes of practice and the effect of clause 10 of the schedule to the Radiation Protection and Control Act, it is considered appropriate to issue a licence under the Act for the period of the special mining lease. If a special licence was granted, it would apply for 50 years. The legislation currently requires payment of the full licence fee prior to the granting of the licence. That would mean that the joint venture partners would be liable for a fee that was payable 50 years in advance. At this stage I am not able to ascertain the cost of the annual licence fee or the amount being sought by the Government. If one has to pay for 50 years in advance, the Government today will receive a huge sum of money and a fee would not be payable for another 50 years. At the same time that sum of money could be used in such a way that it could have some economic impact on the mine and disadvantage the joint venture partners in the early stages. I understand that it is a considerable sum.

We are concerned for the safety, health and welfare of those working on the joint project—always have been and always will be. The legislation, in essence, simplifies the housekeeping aspect of it and I understand that the joint venture partners totally support the proposal. We will certainly seek from the Minister information regarding this licence fee as we want to know whether it is a tax, a simple fee or a form of reimbursing the Government under the terms of this Act for supervising this aspect of the Act.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I support the Bill. In speaking to it I raise the matter of what I regard as double standards. I know that the Government is very proud of what is happening at Roxby Downs, and a lot of its members would like to go further. Of course, this Bill is regulating or putting some control into the protection that is needed in relation to the operation, whether in the mining aspect or, eventually, in the milling operation. Earlier today we saw a further illustration of double standards in relation to the piece of junk from the USSR that is floating around out there in space. There seems to be very little concern

about that, because there is some sympathy with that country. However, if this related to a Yankee satellite there would be a great highlighting of the matter in the print media and other places, causing some concern in the community.

I just raise that as a type of double standard that is experienced in this place over the years. Many members of the present Government opposed Roxby Downs while now they say it is a great thing and that the State is getting benefits from it. However, previously according to them, it was going to be a great danger to the State and we should not go on with it. They maintained that it must be stopped, and that was because Liberal forces happened to be in Government at the time. Now the Government is quite happy to work with the venturers—and I give it credit for that. I agree with the Government's bringing in legislation providing some protection for workers, but at no time in the past did members of the Government ever have the intestinal fortitude to stand up and say that it had used its stand as a political ploy, originally to win points from the extreme 'greenie' movement, but that it was now quite happy to go along with it.

I give the Government credit for bringing in this legislation, although I would like to know how much the licence fee will be and when it is to be paid. I do not believe that there is any confidentiality in that, and there should not be any confidentiality at all. If the joint venturers are saying that there should be, I believe they are wrong also. This Parliament is supposed to be ensuring that the Government governs in the best interests of the people. We should be told what the fee will be, and whether it is to be a set fee per year or a lump sum, or whether it will increase every year, as suggested, by indexation. I support the proposition. I hope the Minister can tell us what the fee will be and how it is to be paid, and what sort of time-slotting is involved.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I support the legislation with a great deal of pleasure. This is the last hurdle in relation to Roxby Downs being given the full go-ahead for its future development and production, with all Government licence procedures and requirements being met. So, in a sense this is the culmination of a great deal of effort by a great number of people. On this occasion of meeting the last legal requirement for the mine to go ahead, I again indicate to the House that a series of major obstacles had to be overcome for this mine to proceed and for the benefits of the mine to become apparent to the public of South Australia. In response to a question today I was interested to hear the Minister of Mines and Energy suggest that 80 per cent of all the contracts that have been let in relation to this project have gone to South Australian companies, under the terms that were required in the Indenture.

Every member of the Labor Party then in this House voted against that Indenture. Not to put too fine a point on it, I find it ironic that every member of the Labor Party then sitting on this side of the House voted against that Indenture, while today we have a Minister standing up proudly and referring to the terms of that Indenture, which I for one fought desperately and long and hard to get through this Parliament, with no help whatsoever. The biggest hurdle with the Indenture was to get it through Parliament. As I have said, that was the enormous hurdle and, had the Indenture not been passed, this Bill before us today would not have been introduced. The Indenture was vigorously opposed, particularly by the now Minister of Health, who has the passage of this Bill. As we know, he is on the left wing of the Labor Party, and even to this day the left wing of the Labor Party is not happy with the prospect of uranium mining.

However, we now have this farce of the Premier's seeking to claim some credit for this vast mine when he and his Opposition did everything they could to prevent us surmounting that first hurdle—and it was an enormous one. I pay tribute to all those people who assisted the Government at that time in our desperate attempts to get the project off the ground for the benefit of the South Australian public—against all the misrepresentation, all the opposition and all the efforts of the Labor Party to thwart those attempts. That went on for more than 2½ years. I want to pay a tribute to all those public servants who assisted, with an enormous amount of effort, the then Government's attempts to put together the Indenture ready to put before Parliament. An enormous amount of work went into the preparation of the Indenture. I believe that at that time it was the most detailed document ever prepared for any large venture in Australia. That view was put to me by interstate commentators.

There were obstacles to be overcome in the preparation of that Indenture. We had the carping criticism of the then Leader of the Opposition, John Bannon, about the slowness of reaching an agreement in relation to electricity. There was the carping criticism about there not being a necessity for the Indenture. However, I refer again—and I put this on record last night in this House—to comments made by the then Leader of the Opposition in trying to put a torpedo straight through the middle of the project. The project would have collapsed if the Indenture, which the Labor Party, to a man, opposed in this House, had not passed the Parliament. BP was very nervous about the investment. BP officials told me that they could well withdraw, even if the Indenture passed: they were having second thoughts. Had the Indenture not passed, there would be no Bill before Parliament today to overcome the last hurdle for the project to proceed. The absolute hypocrisy of the Premier in claiming some credit for this venture is just beyond belief.

I want to pay tribute to those public servants who were involved. I do not think that a public tribute has been given to them as the negotiating team who assisted and who worked tirelessly on the Indenture. The team was headed by Peter Hill, the Director of Mines. He worked tirelessly day and night on many occasions to overcome the difficulties associated with the project. We had a big input from Treasury, headed by Ron Barnes, and there was Peter Emery and Kathy Moore. Keith Lewis was involved when the water sections were being negotiated. We had some help from the Health Commission. We had a bit of a problem with the Health Commission. This has not previously been put on record, but I will refer to it now. I do not refer in any detracting way to Jill Fitch who was attached to the Mines Department, on and off periodically. However, a report was commissioned by the Health Commission in relation to this project, to be presented to a select committee of the Parliament.

I had a phone call from someone who was looking for a stir about a year ago and who said that their conscience was worrying them and they would like to put on record my attempts to intimidate the Health Commission. I said 'Go your hardest. I've just won a suit against the ABC, and I would be only too happy—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I got some money out of the ABC. I got an addition to my holiday house.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It was not a slip. The ABC broadcast a segment on the *7.30 Report*, or whatever it was called then, suggesting that Western Mining and

Goldsworthy had conspired to countermand the environmental requirements of the law. In other words, the ABC was alleging that Goldsworthy and Western Mining were in cahoots and, in fact, broke the law. Western Mining took the ABC to the cleaners and it cost the taxpayers about $300 000—a bit more than Blevins has cost us recently. I think that that is what they got out of the ABC.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: No, I didn't get anything like that: mine was quite modest.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Cornwall I meant, not Blevins—that was a slip. Cornwall has cost the South Australian public about $150 000. The Australian public coughed up about $300 000 for the ABC libel, but mine was about 100th of that. I settled out of court: I just wanted the apology.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Even at that stage. But I put on record the fact that at that stage we had a problem with the Health Commission. A report was to be put before the select committee. This matter has not been in the public arena, but I throw it in to show one of the difficulties we had to confront. There was a report talking about the increased number of cancer cases which would occur if this mine went ahead. I confess, quite honestly I was very suspicious, because Dr Richie Gunn, the failed Labor candidate for Kingston, was a member of that unit. I called Dr Keith Wilson (who was then in charge of the unit) into my office and said that I wanted it changed. I said that I did not believe it was a fair representation. This was only one of the minor obstacles, I might say, but it is the sort of obstacle we were up against. I said 'I don't believe this is a fair representation of the radiation controls which the Health Commission helped us negotiate and I don't believe these hazards outlined in this report can be justified in terms of current medical knowledge.'

Dr Keith Wilson adamantly refused to change the report because, he said, it would reflect poorly on his officers. Good luck to him! I was very worried, and I made no bones about it. I honestly believed that this was another attempt, in cahoots with the Labor Party, to sabotage this project. This matter has not seen the light of day, but I remember the details perfectly well. I then rang Dr Brenton Kearney who was the Acting Head of the Health Commission and said, 'I don't believe this is a fair and honest report: would you look at it?' As a result of Dr Kearney's knowledge of the scene, the report was modified.

I guess I was in the gun with the section which prepared the report but that was then put to the select committee and it was backed up by expert evidence from Sir Keith Pochin from the United Kingdom and one of the leading professors from Flinders University. So I highlight the difficulties we faced. We had this every inch of the way. At every step we took to negotiate that Indenture, we had problems, and I pay tribute to the group of public servants headed by Peter Hill and including Ron Barnes, Peter Emery and Cathy Moore from Treasury. Michael Bowering (now Judge Bowering) did an enormous amount of work with the legal aspects of the Bill. Jill Fitch made an enormous contribution to the indenture.

Many people worked very hard over a long period of time to get that indenture drafted and into Parliament, but the political battle was more wearing. And we see the poor old Premier at the first bit of opposition backing off from major projects like Jubilee Point—he would not know what a political fight was! We were against majority public opinion when we started that Indenture process but there was 2½ years of solid effort against every obstacle put up by the Campaign Against Nuclear Energy, the John Scotts of this world, and the Left wing of the Labor Party of which the now Minister of Health is a member. It really is ironic that he is presiding over this last piece of legislation which will allow the project to proceed. It really has come full circle.

I am quite sure that his colleague Peter Duncan (with whom at a personal level I get on famously) would not mind me recounting this anecdote. I said, 'Here it is, Peter.' He said, 'Yes, Roger. I think the plain fact is that we are caught and can't get out of it.' That was the official view of the Left then: they realised the inevitable. So did Premier Bannon when, because of the courage of Norm Foster—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: They crucified him. That Indenture got through—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is not entertaining: it is true.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is very interesting material that the Deputy Leader is putting before the House, but I ask him to try to link his comments to the Bill.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I thought I did initially when I said that this is the last hurdle—and those hurdles were many and various, most of them erected by the Labor Party. This is the last hurdle that this project has to jump for it to become a legal entity in South Australia with no inhibitions at all on its further progress. I want to put on record a few of the experiences which are still fresh in my memory, although not too fresh in the memory of the Premier and other detractors. I refer to not only the enormous amount of effort put in by a very dedicated group of public servants but also the enormous and very wearing political battle that we had to fight to get the Indenture before Parliament and to get it through.

Mr Groom interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Let me put this on record: in my discussions with Normie Foster in the latter days when we knew that Norm was thinking of changing his mind—and Norm will remember this—he said, 'Why don't you have an election, Roger? You'll win it hands down'—and we would have. My reply was, 'Norm, if this does not get through in three weeks time, by 30 June, we have no project.' I have enough faith in Norm's integrity to believe that he will recall that conversation. If this did not get through by 30 June 1982—which was the date stipulated in the indenture, on which the joint venturers insisted—I do not believe we would have had a project.

An honourable member: He will go down in history as a greater South Australian than anyone sitting over there.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course he will. The greatest man the Labor Party has thrown up in this century, and I say that genuinely. I believe that at the end of this century it will be seen that the man who has done more for the development of this State and shown a bit of real courage is none other than Norm Foster. I have a lot of respect for a lot of Labor men—

An honourable member: What about the women?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: They are just coming into their own. The Labor women have only just come onto the scene. I am talking about the Labor men who have been in a position to influence events in South Australia. The Labor women are just coming onto the scene. I have a lot of respect for—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I like Molly, but her contribution to the State was not in that field. Of all the Labor men I have known, the one I admire as much as

anyone and who, if justice is done, made the biggest contribution to the development of this State is Norm Foster. So I pay tribute to him because of his courage and his conviction.

I pay tribute to the public servants. I pay tribute to the Government of which I was a part for the tenacity with which it pursued this issue so that we are now at the stage where the Labor Party is clamouring to get some credit for this enormous project. I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Health): I thank members opposite for their various contributions. The contribution from the member for Hanson was direct, to the point, accurate and a model that all later speakers should have followed. The honourable member told us what the Bill was about and said he supported it. He then asked me whether the fee for the licence represented cost recovery. The short answer to that question is 'No', it is not for cost recovery, although an element of cost recovery is involved. Obviously, it will cost the State something to police the joint venturers, but the fee does not come anywhere near that figure.

The member for Davenport asked, 'How much?' I do not have that figure in front of me, but it will be in the regulations that come before Parliament, so it will be on the public record. I shall not go through the interesting contribution made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I know that from time to time in Parliament we are involved in interesting things, and the time in question was one of great interest and excitement that made the long nights of boredom worth while because we were all involved in significant events. In fact, we all got a charge out of it, and none more so than the Deputy Leader. I give him full credit for the work that he did. I have been involved in such issues myself, and there is enormous satisfaction—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: I think you've got a bit of guts, Frank, but I've—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader is very much out of order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: As I said, I congratulate the Deputy Leader on the way in which he applied himself to his task and on the way in which he was victorious, but a fat lot of thanks he got. The Liberal Government was tossed out soon afterwards and those of us who voted against the legislation have been in power ever since, so there is no justice! I hope that the Deputy Leader enjoyed it all: I certainly did, but a fat lot of thanks the Deputy Leader and his colleagues got. I thank the Opposition for its support of this measure.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Licence to mine or mill radioactive ores.'

Mr BECKER: Can the Minister say what is the estimated cost of supervising these provisions in relation to the Roxby Downs joint venture partners?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am advised that the total figure for the Government, not just the Health Commission but the Department of Mines and Energy, is about $400 000.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—'Term of licences and registration and their renewal.'

Mr BECKER: In his second reading explanation the Minister said that Parliament would be advised of the annual fee. Will that fee be indexed to the consumer price index?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: No, it is not to be indexed to the CPI. The formula, which will be set out in the regulations that will go to Parliament, is the gross non-farm product implicit price deflator index.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

RACING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 August. Page 168).

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I support the Bill, which increases significantly the fine for SP bookmaking from $8 000 to $15 000 for the first offence, and from $15 000 to $40 000 for a second or subsequent offence. The penalty for a second or subsequent offence of $4 000 or imprisonment for one year is inserted for a person who makes a bet with an unlicensed bookmaker or who makes a bet in which its acceptance by the bookmaker would constitute an offence against the Act.

In supporting the Bill, I should like to comment on SP bookmaking generally, to suggest directions that the Government should be taking in this area, and to comment on expansions that have already taken place in respect of the Totalizator Agency Board. First, we must ask ourselves what is SP bookmaking and why is it occurring. It is a situation where a person has a bet with another person who is not a licensed bookmaker, often in a hotel, frequently by telephone, occasionally in the street, the bet usually being recorded, starting price odds being given, credit almost certainly granted, and settlement one way or the other being made later.

Whether a transaction is legal or illegal depends purely and simply on whether the bet is taken by a licensed bookmaker. Indeed, there is not much difference between the transaction in question and the transaction that occurs at the racecourse or under the current legalised TAB system every day.

It seems to me that the Government has two problems with this sort of transaction: first, it is illegal but has public support; and, secondly, the Government and the codes get no benefit at all because no tax is paid. As I said, betting by the public with an SP bookmaker is little different from those two legal transactions. It has often been said that the SP bookmaker is a parasite in the racing industry, and as the industry is currently structured, that is so. I support that comment because there is no benefit to the racing industry or the Government, but the public use SPs.

The Minister of Recreation and Sport said in his second reading explanation that in South Australia estimates of illegal betting turnover range from $50 million to $200 million in any one year. The last full investigation into the racing industry (the Hancock inquiry) set the figures at between $100 million and $200 million a year. So, it seems that in that period of seven or eight years there has been no change in the estimate. However, no-one really knows what the figure is. What is certain is that a very significant sum of money is transacted on betting with SP bookmakers every year and that the racing industry and the Government suffer a significant loss because of it.

The Royal Commissioner, Mr Costigan, QC, when reporting on the activities of the Federated Ship Painters and Dockers Union, made a significant and detailed report on SP bookmaking, including in his report evidence from Mr Connor, QC, who had reported on SP bookmaking in Victoria. He suggested a turnover of some $1 000 million in Victoria in 1979-80.

A recent paper produced by the Queensland Government, and placed before the Fitzgerald inquiry, estimated Queensland SP bookmakers' turnover in the order of $200 million annually. Unfortunately, I was not able to get a copy of that report, but I understand from a conversation with the Queensland shadow Minister that it is the result of one of the most comprehensive studies of SP bookmaking in this country. As the Minister is nodding his head, perhaps he will send me a copy. It is hoped that some good will come out of that study which will benefit the racing industry in all States.

It was estimated in that report that avoiding payment of the turnover tax cost Queensland some $2.8 million a year. If we relate that to South Australia on the figures used by the Minister in his second reading explanation—and the comments made by the Hancock committee—this State also is probably losing in the order of $2.8 million in any one year through illegal betting. Conservatively, one could say that in South Australia a figure of somewhere between $2.8 million and $5 million has been lost to governments annually over the many years that this sort of betting has been going on.

Is SP bookmaking merely a grubby act, or is it a fact that people in the community from the year dot have wanted to be able to bet with a bookmaker at a convenient place, or by telephone, being granted credit as an option? Is it possible that the community knows what it wants but that governments and racing codes have never recognised this fact in the past? How can governments all around Australia over the years have allowed thousands of millions of dollars to go untaxed when all that is needed is legalisation, a simple stroke of the pen, a simple recognition of the fact that, when governments prohibit something that is desired by the public in large numbers and not allowed, then the activity flourishes illegally?

We can make a simple and significant comparison between SP bookmaking and the prohibition of alcohol in the 1920s. Because such a substantial sum of money is involved, it attracts the attention of crooked unions, as the Costigan royal commission has clearly shown, and encourages other illegal activities such as those of the drug trade. It is important that we encourage people to bet legally; however at the same time we must provide certain services which they do not currently have.

I congratulate the Government on its significant extension of TAB services into hotels, and I applaud the very significant upgrading of the Teletext system, which has been a tremendous advantage and encouragement to the off-course punter, the significant work that the TAB has done in upgrading its presentation of racing fields in the *Advertiser*; and, of course, in recent times the significant involvement of Sky Channel in this system. One of the problems with this rapid expansion of Sky Channel is that fewer and fewer people want to go to the racecourse. Whilst it is picking up some of the SP money in hotels, it is significantly taking away large numbers of people from the racetrack. That is affecting a very important part of the racing industry through a continual reduction in bookmakers' turnover. I believe that the Government and the community need to make a decision whether we want bookmakers in this State—and in Australia—to continue in their very significant and important role as part of the racing industry.

In last year's annual report of the Betting Control Board we see that in 1983-84 bookmakers' turnover was $208 million; in 1984-85 it was $217 million; and in 1985-86 it was $228 million. So, there has been a significant increase for three consecutive years. In 1986-87, with the introduction of Sky Channel and the extension of TAB into hotels and the casino, there was a significant drop to $194 million. On current figures, which I understand will soon be available, there is a further drop to $185 million for the year 1987-88. In the past two years we have had a significant drop in bookmakers' turnover but a significant increase in TAB turnover.

It is my belief that, as well as increasing penalties, which is supported by the Opposition, the Government must quickly introduce telephone betting with bookmakers on course, because, unless we take up the option of encouraging those people who bet SP by telephone, and who have the option of credit we will see in the next 10 years the demise of bookmakers as we know them today. I believe that that would be a tragedy for South Australian racing. I encourage this Government to do something about it quickly.

Unfortunately, a national committee has been set up to look at the introduction of telephone betting across Australia. I am disappointed about that, because I believe that the best way to gain the advantage for South Australia is for us to be the first cab off the rank. It seems that we have missed an opportunity and I urge the Minister to step in as quickly as possible to prevent the demise of the bookmaker in this State. I recommend that we introduce telephone betting as soon as possible. I support the Bill.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Gilles): I support the Bill. This is about the fourth time that I can recall providing increased penalties for SP bookmaking. Even though I support the Bill, I do not think it is the ultimate solution. My solution would be to introduce a mandatory gaol sentence for SP bookmakers who offend for the second time. As Minister of Recreation and Sport I advocated that course of action for quite some time. However, I could not convince my colleagues in Cabinet of the wisdom of that move, and there was a lot of opposition to it.

If we look at other legislation, in particular, the Road Traffic Act, there is a mandatory gaol sentence for the second offence of driving under the influence of liquor. I recall very clearly a meeting in Hobart some four or five years ago which was convened as a result of the Costigan report and at which all Ministers of Recreation and Sport and Ministers in charge of the police met in an attempt to introduce common penalties throughout Australia for SP bookmaking. That was a bit of a lost cause, because at that time I recall that Queensland had the highest penalty of any State—some $20 000 for the first offence. I further recall asking the Queensland Minister of Racing at the meeting how many people had been prosecuted in Queensland and the answer was 'None', so there were no prosecutions at all.

The sort of penalty does not matter: there must be a sufficient deterrent to minimise (and I say 'minimise', because I do not think that one can really eliminate SP bookmaking) illegal bookmaking. The penalty must be a sufficient deterrent to enable the police to enforce the law, to enable the courts to provide a sufficient penalty, and to ensure that that deterrent sticks. I think the best deterrent for anyone who offends for the second time is a mandatory gaol sentence. As Minister, I increased the penalties on two occasions and I recall that my predecessor (Michael Wilson) also increased the penalties. As we are back again attempting to amend the Act to increase penalties, it would appear that whatever we have done in the past has not been sufficient deterrent to discourage SP bookmaking.

The TAB has subagencies in hotels, and I am pleased that the member for Bragg now supports that principle. I recall that, when I introduced the first two subagencies in the

Belair Hotel and the Windsor Hotel (which happened to be in my electorate), I was accused of—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: It was a great Windsorgate scandal at the time! I was accused by the member for Bragg and his colleagues of all sorts of impropriety. The concept has been a great success, because now there are about 169 such sub-agencies in operation and that provides the public with ample opportunity to bet legally. The point was made by the member for Bragg also that Sky Channel has come into operation since that time. That has been a wonderful success. I do not believe that it has affected attendance at racecourses. I do not know whether or not the honourable member attended the Victoria Park races last weekend, but there was a good crowd in attendance, and the weather was kind to the South Australian Jockey Club. In winter, attendances tend to decline, but overall, despite the influence of TAB agencies and subagencies, people still attend race meetings and the industry is in a fairly healthy condition.

We can make it even healthier by minimising, as much as possible, the opportunities for people to bet with SP bookmakers. My ultimate solution is to have a sufficient deterrent to stop people betting with SP bookmakers. It is not the situation of many years ago involving a two bob exercise in the corner of a hotel: it is a rather large business. The SP bookmaking business has been emphasised by the Costigan report and we do not know exactly how much money changes hands, because, of course it is an illegal activity. We know that they pay no income tax.

Mr S.G. Evans: You don't know that for sure.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: They do not pay income tax on the revenue that they acquire.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: They might, in an indirect way, but they do not pay all the taxes that they should pay and, as a consequence, that has a deleterious effect on the racing industry in general. I support the Bill, and I hope that it passes this House.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I am not keen to support the Bill, because I have grave doubts about imposing such penalties on people who we think are cheating. They are cheating the Government. I have an old saying in my office, 'Don't steal, the Government doesn't like competition.' That is really the truth of the matter, because these penalties are quite high. If one looked at some Acts of Parliament—

The Hon. J.W. Slater: It's a maximum penalty.

Mr S.G. EVANS: Of course it is the maximum penalty—I agree with the honourable member—but this legislation gives the court the opportunity to impose that type of penalty.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Has it ever been done yet?

Mr S.G. EVANS: No, and the reason why there has been no success is that no Government has ever had the courage to chase the SP bookies and to put them out of business. They virtually have to give themselves up.

The Hon. M.K. Mayes interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: You can give me the facts. When the TAB was introduced into one hotel, the ABC interviewed the local SP bookmaker and asked, 'Do you think that this will affect your business?' The ABC interviewer did not know that this person was the local SP bookmaker and he laughed and said that he would still be right. There was a joke about that throughout the pub, because the interviewer thought that the person concerned was an ordinary pub client, when he was the SP bookie.

The racing industry knows my views on this matter. I am not anti the racing industry, but originally I called it a sport and was told that that was wrong, so now I refer to it as a sporting industry. If Government money is around in the sports area, the racing industry wants support from the Department of Recreation and Sport; or, if Government money is around in the industry area, it wants support from the industry area. In other words, this group claims it employs more people than just about any other section of industry in the State but, when it comes to any hand-outs, it asks for help. It gets cross with me because I say that racing is not an industry; racing is a sport.

The industry is gambling and this Parliament gives that group of society the privilege to have gambling. Pushbike riders do not have it, nor do those in pigeon racing, or many other sections of society. For many years thoroughbreds were the only ones with that privilege. If you had a mongrel bred horse you were not allowed to put it on the track against the thoroughbreds, regardless of whether it would beat them or get thrashed. It was there to protect a particular class—let anyone deny it. The dogs were then given the privilege. Bookmakers came to me when I was acting as a parliamentary secretary to a Premier and said, 'If you will support gambling on the dogs, we will give you funds towards the election.' I said I would pass it on and ask the boss, but I am not interested. They said that the other group had accepted—a miserable $350.As I have stated here before, the answer from my Leader came back, 'Tell them to get lost'. It was the day that a letter came through from the Federal Sports Minister on the Chowilla Dartmouth Dam issue. They were told to get lost. The other group won the election and payment was made. It was the 1970 election on 30 May. That is when betting on the dogs was introduced. When I read in the Minister's statement the following:

> It should be realised that SP betting is no longer a 50 cent each way operation but a large national network handling millions of dollars. None of this money goes back to the industry, which has enabled this turnover to be generated.

The industry did not enable that at all: this Parliament enabled that money to be generated by giving the privilege of gambling to that section of society. I do not say that it should be stopped or changed, but let us state the facts and the real position. The Minister went on to state:

> The Costigan Royal Commission confirmed this concern and stated further that SP betting is a significant social evil which has connections with organised crime.

I have no doubt about that, but the same thing has happened within the racing industry with the dogs, horses, gallopers or trotters. Organised crime exists within it, and only at odd times is anyone caught out, as it is difficult to eradicate. We know that SP betting goes on in the community. If we employ enough police to seek out and find these people, the penalties are high enough to get rid of them. We know how often they are caught. It is not because the penalties are not high enough but because we do not employ the personnel to catch those who offend. SP betting is a form of well organised crime as is the rigging of races, whether through doping or other means.

When Pistol Lad lost in 1938 by about four ounces the owners said, 'You might be able to beat the jockey at times or beat the trainer, but you cannot always beat the clerk of scales'. I do not say that that happens these days, as the protection of punters' money is a lot stronger. We can increase the penalties to whatever we like and introduce gaol sentences as suggested by the member for Gilles, but it will mean absolutely nothing in getting rid of SP betting or other organised crime which everyone in this Parliament knows exists in the racing industry. It does not involve huge

numbers of people, but the rewards for those involved are high.

It is worth us employing more police to tackle the problem. If we make the penalties high the police are automatically placed at greater risk of being bribed, as happened in the drug scene. In this State we thought we we were free from all of these things in our Police Force, but suddenly week by week the faith that many of us had is being destroyed, to the detriment of the vast majority of dedicated officers who exist within the force. That is brought about because governments of the day in recent times have not been prepared to employ the necessary personnel as they cannot afford it. They are saying that they cannot afford to employ personnel to get rid of organised crime, but can afford that type of crime to go on.

I do not have any great support for the Bill, and do not think that supporting it in whatever form will affect the end result. It will pass, and in the community it will pass. The Police Force is understaffed and there is a destruction of morale because one or two foolish get rich people got into the force and made it difficult also for the Minister in charge of the police. It probably makes it difficult also for the Minister handling the Bill. It is a desperate move and will not achieve the goal. Bookmakers may have suffered a little. No doubt that the Casino did not help the TAB, and probably did not help SP bookies.

I am not keen to expand betting in this State, but to get away from SP bookies the telephone system is one way of doing it. I hope we will take the same approach in this State as in the United Kingdom, where it distinguishes gambling from betting. Gambling involves no skill as in the Casino and therefore no advertising is allowed. However, some skill is involved with cards and dog or horse racing and therefore comes under the category of betting. I wish the Minister luck in getting his Bill through but it will make no difference to SP bookies. If the Government wants the personnel to get rid of them the penalties that apply are high enough for people to be caught and taken to gaol. If they are found guilty I do not think we need to worry about gaoling them as they will soon get out of it. I wish the Minister luck.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I support the Bill. I have a different point of view from that held by the member for Davenport. I think he painted a quite inaccurate picture of the racing industry. I do not think that his view would be shared by many people in this State. My main area of concern relates to the declining turnover of bookmakers. Many bookmakers are now at only the break-even point, and some are now pulling out of the industry. Many factors are causing this, not the least of which is the impact of the new Sky television receivers now in most of the TAB sub-agencies in hotels, and there is the matter of the very large SP turnover that is going on in the public arena. Of course, this Bill is addressed at this turnover.

The remedy suggested by the Government is an increase in penalties. In relation to this, can the Minister in his summing up give us an indication of how the prosecutions are going? We are being asked to agree to doubling the fines. My experience over the years, as a very regular racegoer, and probably one of the most regular racegoers in the Chamber at the moment, has been that, although the police are aware of the existence of many SP bookmakers, they do nothing about them. I am also acutely aware of very large SP operators who are operating from private homes. On one occasion I was witness to a person making a telephone call to the Gaming Division of the Police Department and reporting a very large operator. I was asked to witness the telephone call, just out of interest. However, a month later that man is still operating, as large as life, both off-course and also we see him from time to time down at Morphetville.

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: I am not going to make a move, because I am just interested in standing back and seeing how long it takes before the police decide to move on this gentleman. He has been in operation for years. He is a very big operator. The police know who he is but they have not made any move—

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: The honourable member is saying 'Who is he?'

The Hon. R.G. Payne: No, I am asking who dialled the number of the police—you or the other person?

Mr OSWALD: No, the person who came to tell me about the story subsequently dialled the police. I listened to the telephone conversation while he reported the matter to the police. I was well aware of the operator, anyway, because I had seen him at the Oakbank races, and I had seen operations elsewhere. I am not going to go to the police; everyone in the racing industry knows who the man is, and we are just waiting to see how long it takes before the police decide to do something about him. I am just wondering whether, with the increase in penalties provided for in this Bill, the resolve will still be there in the Police Force to do anything about SP bookmakers.

In relation to the new penalties, for a first offence there is an increase from $8 000 to $15 000 for a person who acts as a bookmaker. That can be someone who takes a bet for $500 and acts as an SP bookmaker. Thus, he is fined $15 000 but that man might have a monthly turnover of $50 000. However, he has accepted a bet for $500 and he is then liable to a $15 000 fine. By the same token, the person who places the bet of $500 is potentially subject to a penalty of imprisonment. I think that that balance of penalties is a bit out of kilter. Imprisonment applies to a person laying a bet while the person receiving the bet is subject to only a monetary penalty.

One would think that the application of a penalty of imprisonment in relation to the person accepting a bet would provide some deterrent. I look forward to the Minister's comments in this regard. However, as it stands the bookmaker himself might have a turnover of hundreds of thousands of dollars. He may be fined $15 000 for a first offence and even for a second offence a fine of only $40 000 applies. Thus, the threat of something happening to him is not as great as would be the case if a gaol sentence were applicable to a bookmaker, as against just the person who lays out the money, the punter.

What can we do if these fines are not effective and bookmakers continue to operate in the public arena, with the police turning a blind eye to them with a lack of resolve to prosecute? The member for Bragg floated the idea of telephone betting. I believe that the Betting Control Board also supports that proposal. There are difficulties I suppose from the Government's revenue point of view in relation to telephone betting. If money goes through a bookmaker I think payment back to the State amounts to 2 per cent, while 10 per cent of money paid to the TAB comes back to the State. My view is that we should take the opportunity of obtaining part of these millions of dollars that are circulating in the SP bookmaking market and of injecting some of it back on-course.

If telephone betting would create a situation where just some of these millions of dollars that are circulating illegally in the SP market could be returned to on-course bookmak-

ers, thus helping to make those on-course bookmakers more viable, then that would result in two things: it would help on-course bookmakers, who are a vital part of the racing industry, and it would also take out of circulation some of the tens of thousands of dollars that are circulating illegally and which the racing codes do not see. They do not get their percentage and nor does the State Government.

I might have been wrong earlier when I referred to the amounts of 2 per cent and 10 per cent, so perhaps the Minister can clarify this in his summing up. If we can get this money out of circulation and onto the racecourse, then the bookmakers would benefit. It would help their turnover and would encourage them to stay in business. The punters would benefit because this would help maintain the racing atmosphere, with on-course bookmakers. We do not want the situation that exists in the United States where all they have is TAB machines behind windows. Also, a percentage of the money that goes through a bookmaker goes back to the clubs and can be used by the clubs for the betterment of the racing industry. Thus, it is not lost.

It is a step in the right direction to look at this whole question of telephone betting. It will help achieve this aim of trying to stamp out SP bookmaking. In conclusion, I just remind the Minister that I would like him to clarify the matter of penalties and perhaps he can say why the gaol penalty does not apply as well to SP bookmakers. If it is considered appropriate to impose that on the man or woman actually making the bet, why not on SP bookmakers as well? With those comments, I support the Bill.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): I want to make a very brief contribution to the debate. I commend to members of the House the article written by Des Colquhoun in the Messenger Press which circulates throughout the State, wherein he talks about gambling and the Government winning, and he makes reference to the extension of TAB subagencies and Sky channel. He also talks about the matter of how to beat those 'wicked SP bookmakers'. I do not think Mr Colquhoun had actually read the Bill before he wrote those comments, otherwise his statement might have been a bit more harsh. My concern with the Bill is not that it is not heading in the right direction but that it may well be just a piece of window-dressing that prevents the Government from taking actions that I believe are important to the racing industry.

No-one in this House would deny the importance of the bookmaking fraternity to racing in this country. Therefore the large fall-off in turnover is of concern, I think, to everyone in the racing industry. Some people in this House may believe that it should be full tote betting so that the Government is the major winner, because the percentages extracted from the TAB are far larger than the turnover applied to bookmakers. I think that if the Government does a little lateral thinking on this subject there may well be a solution to this dilemma, rather than using this Bill which, I believe, is just a sop to the bookmakers, with the Government saying, 'Look: we will stamp out those naughty SP bookmakers by increasing the penalties.'

In this day and age I do not believe that is sufficient, and I doubt whether the bookmakers themselves feel that they are receiving any form of justice from the system. The question really is: how do we get rid of SP bookmakers? Do we legalise them or do we somehow change the parameters of the game they are playing? Obviously, if there is no starting price there is no SP bookmaker. If the Government wished to reduce the number of SP bookmakers, why not make it illegal, for example, for newspapers and radio stations to broadcast the starting price? Without the starting price, the SP bookmakers cannot operate. It is just a thought.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: We had that situation in the past, but it didn't work.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The interesting thing is that with the expansion of Sky Channel the observation made to me is that the SP bookmakers work quite comfortably in the Sky Channel environment, because they have two things going for them. They know that when there is a move it is normally reflected through the Sky Channel and they can see the drop in odds, so they can make the appropriate arrangements to lay off. The other thing, of course, is that they work very well in that environment because the agents of Sky Channel can only take limited-size bets, because it is impossible for Sky Channel to take some of the bets that SP bookmakers are taking.

Most Sky Channel agencies probably would not hold more than $3 000 or $4 000 on a Saturday, whereas some of the SP bookmakers would be getting that amount of nod betting from perhaps one individual. There are a number of advantages that SP bookies have in the Sky Channel environment, of which we should not lose sight. The alternative of making the profession legal does have some currency, and we should think along those lines. There are probably a number of other avenues which can be pursued.

I am not sure whether the amount of SP bookmaking has actually increased over the past ten years. No-one has presented any evidence to me to show that it has. It could well be that with the vast increases in TAB turnover there has already been a sucking up of a lot of small money which was going to the friendly SP bookmaker and is now going to the TAB, because there is a very quick turnaround in the payment of money. No-one seems to know just how important the SP section is.

We hear a lot of anecdotal evidence, and until we can actually put figures on these things in a somewhat more professional fashion than we have today (realising that trying to estimate anything illegal is very difficult), we will not be too sure whether the measures we are taking are the right ones or actually exacerbate the problem. This House obviously will agree to the increase in penalty for SP bookmakers. I understand that the Crimes (Confiscation of Profits) Act would also apply. If we catch a very wealthy SP bookmaker and can prove that he has profited from his SP efforts, his assets can be confiscated. There is plenty of room to penalise the SP bookmaker.

We are increasing the penalties here, but to me there are other ways of looking at the problem. If we believe (as I do) that bookmakers are important to the industry—and the decline at the moment is really very worrying—we really have to look at the ways in which we can generate that traffic back to the racecourse. If we lose the flavour of bookmakers on the course, we will only have perhaps 10 days a year when we would generate large crowds of people at the races. Even then, those numbers will drop off because of a lack of bookmakers available at the time.

If the whole bookmaking industry goes down, I believe the racing industry will suffer. One of the good things at the moment is that the TAB is doing an outstanding job and there is competition in the system. I am a great believer in competition. There must be better ways of looking at this problem, and if the only thing the Government is doing is increasing the penalties, I believe it has been selling the bookmakers short.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I will be brief. First, I would like to thank the Opposition for its support of this Bill, and the subsequent Bill I anticipate, and would like to thank the shadow spokesman on recreation and sport for his support. I think that

he probably has a better appreciation than some of his colleagues of the situation in the industry. I do not want to reflect on the number of times the member for Morphett attends the races, I am sure he does so frequently. I am not sure about the member for Davenport, and I think that some of his comments were unfortunate and unnecessary in terms of this industry.

I fear that, when people get up not knowing the industry and start painting a picture of graft and corruption being widespread and extended throughout the industry, it gives a very misleading impression of an industry with very genuine people who enjoy both the sport and the industry aspect of racing, and I cover all codes in that aspect in this State. I think it is very unfortunate for the member for Davenport to return from wherever he has been and quickly reflect on the people involved in a very large and important sporting industry in this State. To compare us with Queensland is very unfortunate. I do not believe that we have anything like the level of corruption in any aspects of our social activity or sporting authorities in this State as compared with Queensland.

We have seen the revelations of the Fitzgerald Inquiry as they pursue those people involved in crime and corruption in that State. We certainly devote adequate resources to our policing of the industry, and I am happy to share with the House the recent report from the Police Department. Of course, it is no names, no pack drill, but the level of prosecution has been pursued. With regard to what we as a Government are doing, this is one string to our bow in an attempt to reduce the activities of illegal bookmaking and to provide funds to the industry as well as to the Government.

One thing the Opposition has overlooked in addressing this issue and the Bill is the funds which come back into the industry and represent half of what is about 10 per cent of the turnover the TAB takes. If we look at that figure for this year, it is well into the $325 million bracket. That is a significant amount, and I hope in the next few days we make some very positive announcements about what has happened in the industry with regard to funding. I think a large part of that is to do with the TAB and the way in which it has been marketing its services to the community, to the investor, and that has helped to place the racing industry in this State on a very sound footing.

I am pleased to have been able to announce what I think is a package after the Hon. Jack Wright (the former Deputy Premier) gave a working paper report to me on subagencies. We had some difficulties there. I think we have now resolved those and the process will move fairly smoothly in the future so that we can see those subagencies, for those people who genuinely believe they can extend a service on a commercial basis to the investing public, able to operate.

I look forward to playing a small part in that process with the TAB board. Regarding our policing facilities, we have six detectives in the Gaming Squad who police these rules and regulations. There are also detectives who are part of the industry and who have a policing role on-course. So, the adequacy is significant.

True, we face ongoing changes in technology and one must consider them, in the words of the member for Mitcham, in a lateral sense, because the picture is rapidly changing and we must counter those methods. We are considering this legislation as part of the overall approach that the Government is making. Several other actions are at present in the pipeline and I hope to announce them soon. They will form a composite package that will eliminate SP bookmakers and allow us to counter their influence in the industry.

It is not just a matter of caring for Government revenue. About 5 per cent of the total TAB turnover goes back into the industry. Then we have the fractions, unclaimed dividends, and the multiple bet turnover that goes into facility development as well. That is a significant figure. In the past five years of the Bannon Government, $7 million or $8 million has been poured directly into facilities growth, and we have seen the results of that in the industry.

If yesterday can be taken as an indication, the Balaklava Cup meeting was a splendidly presented program on an enjoyable day, and I congratulate the Chairman and the committee on their efforts. The Cup field was of an excellent standard and the overall presentation of the program was a credit to the club and significant for racing generally. A record crowd attended and there was probably a record turnover on the TAB. Such a happening augurs well for the industry and is indicative of the present situation in racing and of the economy generally.

I shall quote a passage from the report of the inquiry conducted by Ms Nelson, QC, into the racing industry. This passage clearly indicates why the Government is involved in regulating racing. In her introduction on page 1, Ms Nelson states:

> It is interesting to reflect on the characteristics of the racing industry and to identify the features of its activities which lend them to Government influence and external inquiry. What distinguishes the galloping, harness racing, and greyhound racing from rowing, cycling, and most athletic and car racing sports is the element of licensed betting. It is this element that attracts Government interest and scrutiny because of the need to regulate it for reasons of public order, and because of public revenue implications.

That is an apt explanation of why the Government is involved. Reasons of public order are important. Having grown up in a Methodist household, as many of my colleagues probably have, I know that betting and gambling were frowned on by my parents (and are probably still frowned on by my mother). However, this Parliament is responsible for the regulation of the racing industry and the sporting aspect that is associated with betting, and that is the reason for the regulation in the Government interest.

It is important to note that we are involved in this issue not only as to matters pertaining to Government revenue but in the interests of the industry itself. It is important that the industry get its share. In this regard, the SP bookmaker does not contribute to the industry as the registered legal bookmaker does. That is an important aspect and that is why my predecessors, whether Liberal or Labor, have been enthusiastic in their interest in this matter. The Hon. Michael Wilson shared the same enthusiasm to stamp out illegal betting as was shown by my predecessor, the Hon. Jack Slater.

The more we reduce the operations of the SP bookmaker and provide legitimate betting outlets that convenience the public, the more we shall be putting back into the industry. Over the past five months, 18 prosecutions have been launched by the Gaming Squad against people operating as illegal SP bookmakers, and over the same period 11 prosecutions have been successful, one involving a fine of $10 000. That indicates that the Police Force has been active in trying, with reasonable success, to stamp out illegal gambling.

We must also bear in mind the massive increase of $60 million in legalised betting turnover in the past year, including the TAB subagencies and the other activities of TAB agencies. So, we are starting to make inroads into the activities of the illegal SP bookmaker, albeit operating in the corner bar of the local hotel. In this regard we are having some success and that must mean something to the Government and to the Parliament.

Regarding clarification of certain points, the member for Morphett raised the issue of prison sentences. In this respect, it is important to note that the existing prison sentences are written into both Bills, so that we are not delineating between those persons who bet with an SP bookmaker and are prosecuted. We are putting in a new provision for subsequent offences where there is a penalty of up to one year's imprisonment. The previous penalties of imprisonment for two years and four years remain unchanged, so we are increasing the financial penalty for those unlawful bookmaking activities.

Regarding the publishing of odds, I am not sure how often the member for Mitcham attends race meetings in this State, but there is a popular theory that, if we stopped the publication of odds, we would eliminate SP bookmaking. However, I can assure the honourable member that such an action would have no impact whatever and that SP bookmakers would be able to operate with the information coming off the course and from the tote. The member for Light, by his gesticulations, is trying to show how the operation could be carried out other than by the publication of odds in the local press, and experts in the industry tell me that stopping the publication of odds would have little impact.

So, we must approach the problem at this level and place a barrier between the SP bookmaker and the ordinary investing member of the public. Many people have heard stories about the operations of SP bookmakers in isolated country towns over the years. Indeed, the West Coast has been a favourite area for such rumours and anecdotal tales of SP betting and these stories have lingered over the years.

Mr Blacker: Never!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Flinders denies that absolutely, but I recall tales that my father told me of how SP bookmakers operated in various hotels on the West Coast. In many ways the extension of the subagencies will attack that problem and, with some of the moves that we have planned for the racing industry, we should make further inroads into SP bookmaking. I have answered most of the inquiries from members opposite and I thank them for their support of this Bill. Although I do not believe that it is the final or ultimate solution of the problem, I see it as an important step.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Unlawful bookmaking.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: In discussions with the police has the Minister ascertained their attitude towards SP bookmakers? It was commonly believed that, in order to catch criminals, it was necessary to watch three things: SP bookmakers, whom the police knew about; prostitutes; and pawnbrokers. Perhaps the Casino should be added to that list. I understand that there has been a reluctance on the part of the police in the past to try to put SP bookmakers out of business because they have formed a useful part of the process of catching criminals. Has the Minister ascertained whether or not that feeling still exists? I note that the Minister said that some successful prosecutions have been launched. Those successful prosecutions have come after a long drought period. Does this represent a new attitude on the part of the police, given the linkages that have been well and truly documented regarding SP bookmaking and organised crime?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The relationship between officers of the department and the police is very good. There is constant exchange of information about this area of illegal activity.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I missed the member for Bragg's comment. It is an ongoing situation; we have not suddenly decided to prosecute in that area with great enthusiasm. There has been a reasonably successful level of prosecution over the years. We can all read the Costigan report, and the Fitzgerald inquiry has been covered in the newspapers. If any honourable member has information about SP operators, they should inform the authorities. I am sure that the police will deal with it. I have a high regard for the officer who is responsible for some of these areas of operation. I am darned sure that in his daily operations he and his officers prosecute these offenders with great enthusiasm. He has no reluctance in going forth to try to seal these prosecutions.

As we all appreciate, the difficulty is to get evidence together in relation to alleged operators. That is a very difficult task for the police. I think that the level of prosecutions over the past five or six months indicates that they are working very efficiently in that area and, I would say, very successfully. I have no criticisms whatsoever of the way in which the police operate; the departmental officers certainly have none and have a close liaison with them.

Mr INGERSON: Earlier the Minister mentioned penalties, not actual prosecutions. A figure of 18 was mentioned. What is the range of prosecutions and what penalties have been dealt out? That information can be tabled if the list is too big, but I want to know generally what is happening in this area.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The docket is available via the Police Department. There are various pieces of information on that docket which are confidential. From my reference to that information I know that there has been a range of fines from around $400 to $10 000. Of the 18 prosecutions, 11 have been successful; the remainder are pending prosecution. I will have to check with the Police Department, through the Minister, the confidentiality of the information requested. If it is okay with the Minister and the Police Department, I am happy to share that information with the shadow spokesman on sport. I do not think that it would be fair to publish it in *Hansard*; it would not be appropriate in relation to those facing prosecution.

Mr INGERSON: I am concerned with the penalties, not the names so much. Under the confiscation of assets legislation, have assets been confiscated as a result of these prosecutions?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I think that there has been no confiscation of assets in relation to these prosecutions. I will clarify that situation and come back to the honourable member.

Mr INGERSON: The Minister has said—and a lot of comment has been put to me—that in country areas where TABs are separate from hotels that now have Sky Channel, SP bookmaking is beginning to thrive again. Does the Minister envisage anything being done in that area and is it a problem?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I appreciate the honourable member's comments; it is something that has become obvious to all of us. If Sky Channel is operating from a country hotel and there is no subagency, there is an obvious opportunity for people, who might be tempted, to operate an SP agency. I think that the TAB is fully aware of that situation and I am sure that, in those areas which it feels might be attacked in terms of SP operations, it will recommend that the licensee or owner of the establishment apply for a subagency licence. In due course, I imagine that the matter would come before me for approval.

I will give the honourable member some indication of the turnover. I refer to the annual report. The 1987 turnover for the TAB in country areas was $11 739 268. The figure for 1988 is $23 177 179. So, I think we might be making some inroads into the number of people attempting to operate as SP bookmakers.

Mr S.J. BAKER: There has been some discussion in this House about the Costigan report and the National Crime Authority recommendations. Can the Minister confirm whether he has been provided with detail from either document relating to SP bookmaking and whether they contain recommendations that must be taken up?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The Minister responsible for the police and the relevant Cabinet officers responsible for the NCA have taken that responsibility. I have not been briefed in any way on the operations of SP bookmakers in relation to the proposed investigations by the NCA or briefs that the NCA has been given.

I am aware of the information that is floating around the community about interstate operations and various allegations, but I am sure that my colleagues, the Minister responsible for the police and the Attorney-General, should they see anything or have any information passed to them, as the responsible officers will immediately brief me. The Commissioner of Police is involved in terms of his role with the NCA. I am sure that the police would brief me in regard to any areas that they thought were relevant to my ministerial responsibilities. If any member of the community has any information which they think would be relevant, they can approach the appropriate authority—which is, of course, the Police Department—to take up the matter.

Mr PETERSON: Regarding the question of convenience raised in the previous question involving a TAB agency and a hotel that has access to Sky Channel, resulting in a conflict of interest, a situation has now arisen where people do not want to go into hotels and bet. There are more and more outlets in hotels. What is the present policy on the establishment of TAB outlets in hotels and the continuation of public offices where people, who do not want to go into hotels and bet, will have access to betting facilities?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Basically, it is a TAB policy. The reason why I get involved is that the Act requires me to approve subagency extensions. We have particularly concentrated on subagencies in hotels. Subagencies have been established in other areas, such as the Norwood Football Clubrooms and I am sure that other clubs in particular areas will apply for subagencies.

I think it is important to note that the Government has adopted the policy of continuing to offer TAB agency services to the public. I appreciate that some of the honourable member's constituents may not want to go into a hotel to place a bet. The Government has adopted the policy that agencies should continue to offer that service to the community. A situation may arise where perhaps an agency is situated on the eastern side of a busy main road and on the western side there is situated a hotel where there is a demand for a subagency. In my humble view, those two can operate in harmony and offer that service to the public, so the person who may say, 'I don't want to go to the hotel to place a bet' may go across the road to that agency where the commission staff are employed by the TAB. My policy in relation to the TAB has been that we should continue to operate commission agencies where TAB staff are employed, so the honourable member's constituents can be assured that they do not necessarily have to go to a hotel to have an opportunity to invest in the TAB at that agency.

Mr BECKER: I am a little concerned about the way in which the local TAB agency is developing. Last Saturday I went to Jetty Road, Glenelg, and wanted to have a Footypunt, because I thought my team, Glenelg, would win. I was very concerned about what I saw. The agency was full of people, who were milling around and watching the television screens. One had to cut one's way through the haze of smoke. It seems that, as a result of the provision of television screens and the direct broadcasting of races in TAB agencies, we are now almost getting back to the old betting shop system. In the past, the betting shops were terrible, dull places, but I hope that we are not re-establishing the wheel in the form of modern TAB agencies. Is it TAB policy to encourage patrons to remain in the agency all day? It seemed that some of the patrons had been in the Glenelg agency for quite some time.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I think that the TAB policy has been to encourage the investor to go to the agency.

Mr Becker: In and out.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am sure that it encourages them to place maximum bets. Obviously, that is its charter. I imagine that, if we consider the new underground betting auditorium in the STA underpass, that could be an example where people are being encouraged to have lunch and stay on to enjoy the social atmosphere. That licence operates as part of the hotel and I suppose that it is a much more conducive social atmosphere. I would think that, in the normal TAB agency, that is not the case; the investors are encouraged to come in and place a bet. Obviously, in order to turn over the bets, the more people who come through, the better. That means that those who come to bet should at least exit fairly quickly so that others can get in there. It can be quite crowded on Saturday afternoon.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 August. Page 167.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): This Bill is consequential on the previous Bill and we support it.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I thank the Opposition for its support.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Mitchell): I remind members that it is well over six years since I last had the opportunity to participate in an adjournment debate; I have a hell of a lot to say and I will need a lot of such opportunities to catch up. So be ready! The first area to which I refer relates to the way in which the Leader of the Opposition chose yesterday, as is often the case from the other side, to use statistics selectively to present a case which is not the one being put forward. I refer to the argument presented by the Leader of the Opposition about the so-called declining performance of ETSA and the statistics that he then chose to

put forward selectively to bolster that very weak and quite incorrect case.

For example, reference was made to the fact that during the period I was Minister between 1982 and 1987 the work force had increased by about 600 people. That is probably the only accurate statement that was made by the Leader of the Opposition in putting forward the case. He argued that that was a retrograde step, that there was no support for it and that it therefore showed that, economically, the trust was not functioning as well as it could. Nothing could be further from the truth.

I warn members opposite that, if they intend to embark on such a selective statistical exercise in the future, I always look very carefully at not only what has been said but also at the rest of the statistics that have not been presented. If we looked at the statistics which were quoted, we would find that, in the three years when the Liberal Government was in office, there was also an increase in employment in ETSA, but that fact did not seem to get much of an airing yesterday. In the three year period concerned, from 1979 to 1982, the time when the Liberal Party was in office, there was an increase of 176 people, which is quite a substantial increase. It occurred on an annual basis. That is the first sin of omission, if you like, which was committed yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition with respect to the statistics.

Another important aspect which I draw to the attention of the House (because I am proud to do so) is that, of the 600 new ETSA employees over the five year period that was attributed to the time when I was the Minister, 183 were females. Let us look at the three years of Liberal Government. Once again, this statistic was not referred to by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday. What was the increase in female employment in ETSA during that time? The increase was six females, or two per year. That is hardly something to be proud of and I suppose that that explains why it was not mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition when he played the statistical game.

I saw the Deputy Premier alongside him looking somewhat sheepish and shamefaced. I believe he was thinking, 'Oops, I hope John won't go on with this, because it won't come out too well.' However, the Leader went on with it and, continuing to refer to statistics, said that in sales of megawatt hours per employee there was a decline last year and, therefore, ETSA was no longer being efficient and something should be done about it.

Between the years 1986 and 1987 there was a small decline. The Leader again did not tell us that in each of three years out of the five years of Labor Administration up to 1987 there were more sales of megawatt hours per employee than in the best year of the three years of Liberal Administration, with ETSA utilising the same yardstick or comparison basis, that is, megawatt hours sold per employee.

He then went on to talk about customers per employee as another measure of efficiency—of ranking, of standard—of ETSA, and used disparaging remarks in so doing. Again, in three out of the five years the performance of customers per employee during the time of the Labor Administration was better than the best figure achieved during the three years of Liberal Administration. I chose this line to refer to especially because it shows the falsity and stupidity—in fact, the calculated misrepresentation—of statistics, because we are talking about a change between 105 and 108 customers per employee—a difference of three customers per employee if one accepts the argument put forward by the Leader of the Opposition—as a proper way to judge and evaluate the performance of a utility such as ETSA. Really, that is a quite incorrect approach. I could reel off those statistics all day.

On another page of the 1987 annual report we see a reference to annual kilowatt hours per customer average. That is a fine yardstick using the sort of tactics applied by the other side. I can show that the figure in 1987 under the Labor Administration, namely, 10 590, was always higher than the performance in any year of a Liberal Administration. Therefore, if we are going to use that sort of shallow approach to the matter, clearly when Labor is in power it is a much better performer than Liberal when in power. That is the kind of false basis and misrepresentative approach adopted in this place by the Leader of the Opposition.

If we want to look at the average price of electricity sold we can see that, in the three years 1980, 1981 and 1982 of Liberal Administration (I do not start with 1979 because most of that year was under Labor Administration), the equivalent prices (in 1987 terms) per kilowatt hours sold were 6.57c for 1980, 6.89c for 1981, and 7.45c for 1982—a continuous rise followed by a further three years of rises under the Labor Administration. They were the infamous Goldsworthy agreement years about which the House has heard *ad nauseam*. We cannot get the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to take the responsibility for such a situation, even though he is always up front saying that he is the one who got Roxby started and if it had not been for him it would not be the massive project that it is today. If he is happy to take that responsibility, why does he not shoulder his other responsibilities?

He was the Minister for ETSA at the time. When he is so proud to say what he was doing about Roxby and 'Thank God I was here otherwise we would not have this wonderful project,' why does he not get up and say, 'I was Minister when we had the two highest tariff increases in ETSA's history'? These two occasions—in July 1981 and May 1982, involving 19.8 cent and 16 per cent respectively—were the two highest increases ever. I look forward, hopefully (which proves I am still an optimist after 18 years in this place), to seeing the Deputy Leader take that responsibility.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duigan): Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Hanson.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): The issue I wish to bring to the attention of the House is the recent study to rationalise schools in the western suburbs, more particularly schools in my electorate. It is easy to say that there should be rationalisation of schools within the education system and that we should reduce the cost of education, but it will not be done in my electorate. One must be forgiven for being paranoid, but I was Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee from 1979 to 1982 when we brought down a report on the financial management of the Education Department. It was not a good report for the department, which deserved a rap over the knuckles, and the administration had much to answer for. Another report before the Public Accounts Committee would have been released but for the fact that two members of that committee have been appointed Ministers. It is good luck for them but unfortunate for us that the report has not seen the light of day. That report will help the Government understand the situation and help the parents and friends of all our schools know exactly what is going on.

No-one will convince me that we close schools for the sake of rationalisation when we have displaced teachers and nowhere to put them. We had 77 displaced teachers running around the Education Department and we will have more with rationalisation and will be paying their salaries. If we are paying their salaries, let us employ them for the benefit of the students. I understand that this inquiry into the

schools in my electorate relates to the Fulham and Henley Primary Schools. The recommendation before the Minister of Education is to close both schools and merge them on a recommended site—the Henley Beach Primary School located at Henley Beach South. That is confusing in itself and will no doubt confuse the bureaucrats in the Education Department because those responsible for making the decisions, particularly senior management, have yet to visit either or both sites.

Today I dispatched a telegram to the Minister inviting him to visit both those schools before he makes a decision. If the Minister makes a decision before visiting those schools he is a coward. Any administrator who makes a decision without an on-the-spot inspection is very foolish, and it does not make sense in any shape or form to select the Henley Beach Primary School site at Henley Beach South, because the western boundary is the gulf. There is no room for expansion and, if we merge the two schools, regrettably they will not reach the attendance number of 200 students and there is no guarantee that after five years the Henley Beach Primary School will not be closed.

So, in one respect the Minister has a very difficult decision to make, although a very simple decision in another respect. The Fulham Primary School site could serve the general area, because at least it has a buffer zone around it. That could provide for students as the population changes over a given period. Certainly, within five years I believe that student numbers may improve, if the school council was given the opportunity, as has been suggested on occasions, to be a little more entrepreneurial in promoting the local school. That has not really been encouraged by the Education Department. I found during the inquiry that two of the main departmental employees involved in the decision-making sent their children to non-government schools.

It is difficult to try to convince the public to support our local government schools when the bureaucrats in the Education Department send their children to independent schools. It makes it very hard for parents of students who go to Government schools to accept the decision made by some bureaucrats who are isolated on the other side of the city. I make a passionate plea to the Minister and more so to the Premier and the Cabinet that the decision to recommend the Henley Beach Primary School site at Henley South will cost the Government several hundred thousand dollars because those premises need renovating and upgrading to provide accommodation for 200 students.

The Fulham Primary School proposal would not cost a cent. It is a well developed and well maintained school. It is exceptionally well equipped and it has a considerable surplus in school funds. Students could be brought into that school, even if they were brought in by minibus from Henley Beach South—as there is no direct public transport to either site. This would be more beneficial than spending money on a school site which may not be maintained after five years. There is no guarantee that the Henley Beach Primary School will be in existence in five years time, and there is no guarantee that several other schools in my area will be maintained because of declining enrolment numbers.

I believe that this is only a phase that we are going through. At Public Accounts Committee level we were told when I was Chairman that there would be this decline and that in the 1990s the numbers would increase. Thus, we are looking at a period of only two or three years. The South Australian Institutute of Teachers supports the theory that there should be a moratorium on schools so that the school councils are given an opportunity to promote their schools.

The Hindmarsh Primary School has had about 45 students, I believe, for several years. No decision has ever been made as to what should happen to that school. Why is there a sudden rush to do something in the electorate of Hanson? The decision is political. It is grossly political, as we found out the other afternoon when I asked the Minister a question in relation to school staffing in general.

As to the history of the Fulham Primary School, it goes back to 1859, when the school was first developed as the Reedbed School. It lasted for two years until 1861, when it was renamed the Fulham Primary School, and it remained open until 1915, for some 54 years. The Fulham Primary School is part and parcel of the heritage of the district of Fulham. How can the Government just wipe that out? The school closed in 1915 and for the 1916 school year the students went to the Lockleys Primary School, because the accommodation at the Fulham school was not sufficient; the number of students had outgrown the school. So at that time the school was closed and the students were transferred to Lockleys Primary School. As a matter of fact, in 1959 the enrolment of the Lockleys Primary School peaked, with some 591 students.

In 1960, when the South Australian Housing Trust developed the White Park, Fulham and Henley Beach South areas, the Fulham Primary School was established. It was completed in 1960, and enrolments peaked at 868 students in 1968. Today, it has 64—and that is because there has been rumour and innuendo for the past 12 months in the district, deliberately spread, I believe, by certain people who have vested interests in destroying that school. Yet, the school council was not given the opportunity until a few months ago to look at the situation. It is an absolute disgrace that this has been allowed to occur in an attempt to destroy this beautiful school.

The Henley Beach Primary School's student enrolment increased to 699 in 1967, as Henley Beach South was fully developed by the South Australian Housing Trust. Both schools were affected by the opening of the Fulham North Primary School and the West Beach Primary School. We have seen the strong development of those two schools and then we have seen the decline. The other telling point (and this has now been made to the Minister by Jean Murphy, the Chairperson of the Fulham Primary School Council) is that the Henley Beach Primary School at Henley South is located beneath the flight path of the airport.

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

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Gilles): The matter that I want to raise concerns the matter of consumer credit, or perhaps, more appropriately, consumer debt. It is estimated that at present Australians owe more than $23 billion, and that figure does not include housing loans. The statistics show that increasingly Australians are living on credit. I believe that the economic system and the way that consumer goods are marketed is leading to a spending addiction. That can destroy people's lives and threaten to create pockets of social ruin. In May this year, South Australians borrowed more than $131.4 million. That was less than for people in New South Wales, Victoria or Queensland, but more than for those in the other States and Territories. Most of the borrowing in South Australia for that month was done from banks, which provided $84.8 million. Finance companies provided $23.4 million, credit cooperatives $20.2 million, while $3 million came from other sources.

Australians generally took up mostly fixed loans from banks, which provided them with revolving credit. Most of the fixed loans were for unspecified purposes, followed by those for used cars. South Australians borrowed $283.5 million for used cars, compared with $114.7 million for

new cars. I think that the figures show conclusively that people are relying on credit facilities. At times, that credit is too easily obtainable. This is so much so that the Legal Services Commission was prompted to undertake a campaign. A recent press article stated that the Legal Services Commission wants to see a 'Christmas without credit'.

As to its campaign on 'How to finance the festive season without getting into trouble with credit', a report warns that Christmas is a wealth hazard and it says that the best way is to start now rather than finance December's spending with a loan to be paid off during the rest of the year. The report examines ways in which consumers can prepare themselves for spending at Christmas, either by saving now or by placing goods on lay-by. The Director of the Legal Services Commission, Ms Lindy Powell, said:

> The report could help people avoid over-committing themselves by showing them how to spread their purchases over the year.

I also want to bring to the attention of the House the fact that consumer groups have been calling for credit law reform. An Australia-wide reform of credit laws is clearly needed to stop people blindly entering into debilitating commitments, according to the Australian Consumers Association.

In the quarterly journal *Consuming Interest* the ACA says that household debt has risen by more than 500 per cent in the past decade, while credit card debt in the year to April 1988 has risen by 42 per cent. Personal bankruptcies have now overtaken business bankruptcies and are running at approximately 4 800 a year. It claims that credit companies have been entering into contracts with people who are clearly unable to honour them. One case involved a loan negotiated with a manic depressive who was clearly unable to perceive the implications of the contract.

While I agree with the comments of both the Legal Services Commission and the Australian Consumers Association, I believe that credit itself is not a bad thing. I think that all of us at some time in our lives have resorted to obtaining what we used to call hire purchase in years gone by but, with the advent of the credit card and other forms of personal loans, many people in our society—and not only young people—use credit to provide themselves with some of the things they believe are essential. As I said, the use of credit is not a new phenomenon. It has been with us for a long time, but it has been gathering momentum with the introduction of the credit card, and I think that it needs to be seriously addressed.

I believe that we need an education program, not only for young people but for the community as a whole. Despite the fact that we have consumer groups, consumer protection laws and so on, people still get themselves into financial difficulties by overcommitment and not understanding the financial system. There are recommendations for changes to the credit system, and the greatest concern is, primarily, the willingness of banks, building societies, credit unions and other financial institutions to provide loans or credit cards irrespective of the consumer's capacity to pay.

Let me give an example of the competitiveness that exists amongst those organisations in regard to obtaining business and offering credit. In the local paper about a week ago I came across an insert which referred to 'Bigger and better than a bankcard, with lower monthly payments'. This is issued by Citibank.

Mr Groom: Where did you get it from?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: It came in the local paper. I read it, not that I wanted a loan, but it said to everyone:

> Imagine having up to $100 000 at your disposal for any purpose at any time simply by writing a cheque.

However, if we read the fine print it is based on a 24 per cent annual interest payment, and this of course is subject to meeting Citibank's credit criteria. I am not criticising Citibank in itself, but it is an example of financial institutions trying to promote loans without any consideration for the individual in respect of overcommitting himself in this way. Undoubtedly, there is a snowballing household indebtedness and personal debt as instanced by the increase in bankruptcy rates.

We have debt counsellors who try to correct the situation through community welfare after the event, and we have consumer groups which warn about all the dangers of overcommitment, but I believe that, with the intense competitiveness which exists in the financial environment, people are entering into contracts with little knowledge of the full implications of these contracts. It is important that Governments, banks and financial institutions ensure that the snowballing indebtedness does not become an avalanche. It can become a great social problem, not only for those directly involved, but in relation to the impact it can have on all sorts of situations. I believe it is one of the reasons why we have matrimonial difficulties in young families, and that avalanche could engulf us all, if we are not aware that the internal economy can collapse.

Motion carried.

At 5.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 23 August at 2 p.m.