HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, February 5, 1976

The SPEAKER (Hon. E. Connelly) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

WATER RESOURCES BILL

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

GOVERNORS' PENSIONS BILL

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

POLICE PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

PETITIONS: SUCCESSION DUTIES

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN presented a petition signed by 201 residents of South Australia praying that the House would amend the Succession Duties Act to abolish succession duties on that part of an estate passing to a widow.

Mr. MILLHOUSE presented a petition signed by 171 residents of South Australia praying that the House would amend the Succession Duties Act to abolish succession duties on that part of an estate passing to a surviving spouse.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS

GOVERNMENT APPOINTMENTS

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Deputy Premier say what appointments, if any, of persons formerly employed by the Whitlam Administration have been made to South Australian Government departments since December 13, 1975? Further, will he say to what positions they have been appointed, at what salaries, and whom they have replaced? A report in the *Financial Review* recently stated:

One of the by-products flowing from the change of Government is a flow of talent from Canberra to one of the few remaining Labor strongholds, Adelaide. A number of officials who came to prominence during the Labor years in Canberra, particularly in the urban policy area, are hoping to find renewed scope for their energies in South Australia. The former Prime Minister's Private Secretary (Mr. J. H. Mant) is to work as a consultant to the Minister responsible for planning (Mr. Hugh Hudson). In July last year, an adviser to Mr. Tom Uren (Mr. R. Dempsey) joined the staff of the Premier (Mr. Dunstan). Former Labor Government press secretaries have also been flocking to the State in increasing volume. Late last year the Public Service Board Chairman (Mr. G. J. Inns) announced that employment quotas for 1975-1976 had been fixed, and that jobs in the Public Service would be very hard to get. The suggestion implied by the *Financial Review* report of "jobs for the boys" in South Australia should be clarified as soon as possible.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Listening to the Leader of the Opposition, one would be led to believe that the people to whom he has referred have no ability or competence. One would think that they were appointed just because of a name or a position they had previously held. That is not the case. The only appointment that has been made since December 13 (and I think that that was the subject of the Leader's question) to a position in the South Australian Government is that of Mr. John Mant, who was a former Principal Private Secretary to the Prime Minister (Mr. Whitlam) during part of the latter's term in office. That appointment was made in the planning field (I think in the State Planning Office). Mr. Mant is consultant to the Minister for Planning. The Leader mentioned Mr. Rob Dempsey, but he was appointed prior to December 13, to the best of my knowledge, although I will check this matter. They are the only two people who have been involved in appointments to the State Public Service, and certainly I make no apologies to anyone for those appointments having been made.

PORT MISERY

Mr. OLSON: Will the Minister of Marine investigate the possibility of establishing a historical marker at Port Misery? The National Trust of South Australia, West Lakes Limited, Port Adelaide Historical Society, Lutheran Church and Woodville council have met over a number of months to consider a historical marker for Port Misery situated on the west lake, west of the junction of Old Port Road and the causeway. West Lakes Limited has constructed a replica of the early wharf at a cost of about $3 000, and in due course the area at Port Misery will be vested in the Woodville council, which will then maintain the area. Port Misery was the commonly-known name of the original Port Adelaide and through it over 16 000 British settlers and others first set foot on the shores of the new colony. It had an active life of nearly four years, after which Port Adelaide was established farther down the river.

In addition, the great significance of Port Misery was that the first immigration into Australia of continental Europeans on an organised and substantial basis occurred when 200 Evangelical Lutheran refugees from Northern Germany landed in November, 1838. It is intended that the historical marker will take the form of a symbolic roof tree used in architecture of Lutheran historical significance, and it also symbolises the emblem of the city of Woodville which is a gum tree native to the area. To mark the centenary of Woodville, the council resolved that a commemorative plaque be established at Port Misery and, therefore, it is anxious that this historical marker be established during the centenary year celebrations.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be delighted to have the honourable member's request examined by the Marine and Harbors Department. From the supporting remarks he has made it seems that sympathetic consideration can be given to this matter. I was wondering why the name of Port Misery was used in the first place: someone suggested that it might have been the headquarters of the Liberal Party, but I am not sure.

PANELEX

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister in charge of housing say what long-term benefits will flow to South Australia as a result of the joint South Australia and Penang operation involving Panelex? A letter written by the Premier to the *Advertiser* on December 27, 1975, states, in part:

The significance of this plant is that, as the houses are completed, South Australian componentry such as stoves will be installed in them so that the South Australian appliance industry will be guaranteed long-term markets.

The inquiries I have made indicate that South Australian appliance manufacturers would be lucky to break into this market, because the Japanese have a duty-free entrée to

the Malaysian market. In those circumstances, local manufacturers doubt whether there is much veracity in that statement. If other long-term benefits are obvious from this joint venture with Penang, I think the House should know about them. It is known that Panelex is a company set up in South Australia of which D.P.F. (S.A.) in which I think Mr. Liberman is involved, is the owner. If the benefits that the Premier says will accrue will not accrue to this State, we should like to know what benefits will, in fact, accrue.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I thank the Deputy Leader for his question: it is considerate of him. In answering it, I think I should give a bit of background. One of the basic problems that has always faced South Australian industry has been its heavy reliance on the motor car and domestic appliance industries. As a consequence of that heavy reliance, the normal situation has been that, whenever there has been any slackening off in demand in the Eastern States, the relative rise in unemployment in South Australia has been greater than elsewhere in Australia. That situation can be offset in two main ways. One is through a general diversification of industry in South Australia so that we are less vulnerable in an aggregate sense to changes in demand in the Eastern States for motor cars and domestic appliances generally. The second way is by broadening the market as much as possible for the products in which we are already specialising.

In normal circumstances, if there is a reduced demand in the Eastern States for domestic appliances, that may be offset by an increased demand from export markets. Therefore, the Government's policy has been directed towards a diversification of industry in South Australia and, secondly, towards endeavouring to develop export markets from the products of South Australia as an alternative to the Eastern States markets. If we are able to do this, it is likely that the fluctuations in demand in the Eastern States will be different from fluctuations in demand overseas, and we will have a more stable employment situation in South Australia as a consequence. The Deputy Leader knows of the efforts the Premier has made for a considerable time that have been directed towards that end, and I should have thought he would support any attempts to secure export markets for goods produced in South Australia.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I do.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am glad of that. I therefore take it that the Deputy Leader is a supporter of the arrangements—

Mr. Goldsworthy: Now answer the question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Deputy Leader is a weird kind of supporter. I suppose he has been affected a little by the knocker tendencies of his Leader—Ocker and Knocker! If the Deputy Leader, by further interjection, wishes to encourage me to develop this theme a little further, I am quite willing to be encouraged.

Mr. Gunn: Why don't you answer the question?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am answering the question. The trouble with the member for Eyre is that even when a question is answered he wouldn't know—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to answer the question, and I ask the Opposition to cease these interjections which encourage rebuttal and use up Question Time in a way in which it was never designed to be used. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I appreciate your intervention. The Panelex proposal can lead to a stimulation in employment in South Australia, and endeavours have been made to secure as part of the production of houses for Malaysia the inclusion of the equipment for those houses. There is no doubt that, because of the arrangement that has been made, if South Australian domestic appliance manufacturers are willing to produce components for these houses they can be included as part of the overall package, no matter what arrangements may exist as between Malaysia and Japan. As I am not familiar with the latest situation regarding details concerning domestic appliances, I will get a report for the honourable member. I hope that, as he is a supporter of the stimulation of export from South Australia to Asian countries, the next time he makes statements about this type of matter he will appear as a supporter and not as a knocker.

MURRAY RIVER WORKING PARTY

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Can the Minister of Works say what impact is likely to occur following the cessation by the Federal Government of the committee that was set up as a Murray River working party? Although I was not surprised, I was dismayed to see a report two or three days ago referring to several inquiries that had been stopped by the Federal Liberal Government, one of which was the special committee set up to examine the problems of the wine and brandy industry in Australia. This disturbed me, but I was more disturbed to read that the Federal Government had completely terminated the inquiry being undertaken by the Murray River working party. In view of the importance of the Murray River to this State, and knowing the work that this committee was chartered to do, I ask the Minister what he believes will be the impact of the cessation of this work and the problems this is likely to cause for the people of South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The impact of the cessation of the work of this committee will be negligible, because the working party had completed its work and had reported to the steering committee (comprising the relevant Ministers from New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia and the Australian Government). The recommendations of the working party had been agreed to by the steering committee and had been referred back to the various Governments. We are waiting for some confirmation of the present position from Mr. Anthony, I sent him a telex the other day when I learned that this committee had been disbanded, urging him to give me a reply whether or not he was willing to support the recommendations of the working party that had been supported by the former Australian Government Minister, Mr. Berinson. It is most important that the functions of the River Murray Commission are broadened to include the control of quality as well as quantity of the water in the Murray River. This was one of the major impacts of the recommendations made by this working party. The offensive part of the disbanding of this committee was that it was set up by the Premiers of the States of Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia, and the Prime Minister of Australia at that time, Mr. Whitlam, and yet it was disbanded without any consultation with the States. There was no regard paid to whether they considered the working party should continue or not. We set it up and that Government knocked it off.

Dr. Eastick: Who was financing it?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In fact, there was a contribution by all the States because officers from the various States were involved in the working party, so the answer to that question is not as the honourable member

thought: it was not entirely financed by the Australian Government, it was financed by the various States and the Australian Government.

Dr. Eastick: What was the pro rata payment?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Incidentally, as the officers concerned were all public servants, if they had not been doing that work they would have been doing something else. I have had no reply from Mr. Anthony whether or not the present Government is willing to accept those recommendations, which are most vital to South Australia. It is essential that the working party committee's recommendations be put into effect as soon as possible because all members in this House know just how important that is to this State—the sooner the better. I hope the present Australian Government will not be so short-sighted as to disregard the recommendations of that working party. Concerning the money purported to have been saved by disbanding the committee—nothing.

PORT LINCOLN WORKS

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Minister of Works obtain from the Minister of Agriculture a report on upgrading the freezing capacity at the Government Produce Department-Samcor-works at Port Lincoln? The throughput capacity of the works is being severely restricted because of its inability to kill more than 55 head of beef a day, and I understand that the capacity of the chain could be almost doubled if more freezing capacity was available that would meet specifications of the Department of Primary Industry. The problem has been accentuated this year because of large contract orders and because of fishing problems and the agreement that the department has with fish factories to provide freezing space for tuna. Regrettably, we are finding a large part of the tuna catch being transhipped to Melbourne without being treated at Port Lincoln, thus causing a loss of work to Port Lincoln people. Last year it was indicated to me that the freezers would be upgraded by early 1976, but there appears to have been a considerable delay in upgrading them. I should be grateful if the Minister could obtain a report in order to expedite matters.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The administration of the abattoirs at Port Lincoln is now, in fact, under the control of the Director of the State Supply Department, although a small amendment is still required to give legislative effect to the change. Only in the last week or so the Director made several recommendations to me regarding the upgrading of the abattoirs so that more beef and sheep could be handled. I cannot remember offhand the details of those recommendations (and, because of the many matters with which I have to deal, I am not certain whether the matter has been approved or whether I have sent it to Cabinet), but I shall be pleased to get a report for the honourable member and let him know the position as soon as possible.

DIABETIC ASSOCIATION

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, say whether the Government intends to increase its contribution to the Diabetic Association of South Australia? Members will be aware that the activities of that association are threatened with curtailment because of a shortage of funds. The Minister of Health has been reported as saying that if a request were made to the Government by the association it would receive sympathetic attention. I therefore ask the Minister to ascertain whether such a request has been made and, if it has, what the Government's response to the request has been.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will refer the question to my colleague. However, I can give a short reply. Pending such an application, the honourable member will be pleased to hear that I discussed this very matter with the Minister of Health on, I think, Monday or Tuesday. Therefore, I can inform the honourable member that an immediate grant of $1 000 will be made to enable the association to continue its activities at least until the end of the financial year. This sum is in addition to the usual sum of $1 000 a year the association has been receiving. Also, I understand the association intends to make a submission for a larger grant for the next financial year. I will pass on the honourable member's request to my colleague and ensure that I have not omitted any detail.

STATE PLANNING

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister for Planning say whether the Government, through its big brother policies of planning and development, is determined to deny people living in country areas the right to determine their way of life? Over the past 12 months, it has become apparent that the Government has either lost sight of, or has never really known, the reason why people live in country areas. To those people, in the past, the open space and freedom of living in the country has been far more important to them than the public facilities provided for people living in metropolitan areas. As matters have developed under the Planning and Development Act and the operations of the State Planning Authority, greater restrictions have been placed on the rights of people, especially those living in country areas. Numerous applications are being made to the Government for the transfer and subdivision of land. In the main, local councils have supported many of the applications, and local Lands Department district officers have also supported them, as have Government service departments. However, when the applications have finally reached the State Planning Authority they have been rejected on the basis that they are not in the interests of good planning. It is unfortunate that many of the recommendations of senior officers of the Lands Department (most of whom have served their time as district officers in country areas) are seeing their recommendations totally overlooked. Is the Government therefore determined to continue in this vein, or will it adopt a more practical approach and accept the recommendations of senior officers of the Lands Department who have had experience in this field and who, in many cases, have had their views and experience totally overlooked?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have a question for the member for Chaffey. For how long will he continue the tactic of misrepresentation that is involved in the question that he has asked?

Dr. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I thought the Minister was expected to answer questions, not ask them.

The SPEAKER: I think it is a matter of the way in which the Minister chose to answer it. His latter words indicated that he was using an unusual method of answering it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Thank you for your assistance, Mr. Speaker. Apparently, Opposition members, especially the Leader, have not heard of the term "rhetorical question". Perhaps they might care to look it up in the dictionary.

The Hon. G. R. Bromhill: They're a bit dull.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: They are, and that is unfortunate. It is interesting that there has been some attempt to misrepresent the overall situation regarding the

Planning and Development Act. Basically, the Government's policy is that, wherever practicable, interim development control prior to the promulgation of zoning regulations will be placed under the control of local government, and there are several recent instances of district councils in country areas being granted the powers of interim development control prior to the promulgation of their own zoning regulations, which are determined locally. Once the regulations are promulgated (and these are the product of the local situation), the general categorisation of the zones is laid down in general terms by the State Planning Authority, but what becomes a zone almost invariably is a matter for the local people to determine. Once that occurs, further development of the area under the Planning and Development Act becomes entirely a matter of local control, and I should have thought the honourable member would appreciate that point.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is difficult to put up with the display of ignorance in this House all the time. The Riverland development plan has been displayed recently. It is subject to objections, and the objections and local opinions are wanted. There is no suggestion that the draft proposals will be imposed on local people in the Riverland area. Once the objections have been received and considered, the final matter, after full consultation with local government in the area, can be determined, and then it is a matter of local people being in control of their own destiny. The honourable member has talked about the freedom of people in country areas. What he is talking about is the freedom of people in country areas in many cases to trample on the rights of other people living in those areas.

Mr. MATHWIN: I rise on a point or order, Mr. Speaker. I direct to your attention the fact that I believe that the Minister is debating the issue, not answering the question as is supposed to happen in Question Time.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Chaffey, in asking the question, talked specifically about the freedom of people in country areas. Matters of how land is to be developed in extending a township or in new developments in country areas invariably involve conflicts of interest, and the Planning and Development Act is designed to provide a means whereby local people can sort out that conflict of interest. The whole purpose of zoning regulations and procedures is to formalise a means whereby people in the local area can determine what will happen and, where there are conflicts of interest, that can be properly considered.

Mr. Arnold: Why are the recommendations coming from councils that—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I ask the honourable member to give me specific instances of what he is complaining about. He has mentioned the Lands Department and certain recommendations made by it. What are those recommendations? Will he give me the instances? If he does, I will have them investigated.

Mr. Arnold: The support of applications.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I want information in support of applications. If the honourable member gives me chapter and verse, I shall be pleased to have the matters investigated and bring down a full report, which I also will make public and ask the press in the local area to publish so that everyone will know the true facts. I ask the honourable member to please give me the full and specific details.

RESERVOIR HOLDINGS

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Works tell the House the present position regarding our State reservoirs? As we have had an extremely dry summer and as it seems that fine weather will continue, people with excellent lawns and vegetable gardens, which have been watered well, are concerned whether our supplies will be adequate.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is most fortunate that I happen to have with me a full report on the present situation regarding our water supplies, and I am certain the member for Unley would be quite pleased if I gave only the total figures now. The total capacity is 187 620 megalitres and the present storage is 124 630 M*l*. The storage at the same time last year was 136 107 M*l*. The honourable member will see that we are not quite as well off as we were at this time last year, but I assure him that we will have no worries about water during the present summer period. We will be quite safe in that regard. I have the detailed figures and other information in statistical form, and I ask leave to have that inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

WATER STORAGES

Reservoir	Capacity Megalitres	Present Storage January 30, 1976 Megalitres	Storage at Same Time Last Year Megalitres
Mount Bold ..	47 300	25 858	29 985
Happy Valley .	12 700	12 003	12 075
Myponga	26 800	20 465	20 955
Millbrook	16 500	12 316	13 948
Kangaroo Creek	24 400	11 234	9 470
Hope Valley ..	3 470	3 198	2 897
Thorndon Park	640	531	583
Barossa	4 510	4 099	4 070
South Para .. .	51 300	34 926	42 124
Total	187 620	124 630	136 107

The present total storage in the metropolitan reservoirs is about 66 per cent of the total storage capacity and is 11 477 megalitres less than at the same time last year. It is expected that about 43 100 megalitres will need to be pumped into the metropolitan system from the Murray River to meet the total demand for 1975-76. This quantity is about 20 000 megalitres more than was pumped into the system last year but still represents a low pumping year and no problems are anticipated in meeting the remaining summer demands.

BOLIVAR EFFLUENT

Mr. BOUNDY: Will the Minister of Works say what progress the Government has made in preparing its submission to the Australian Government regarding the two schemes it proposed for the use of Bolivar effluent? Has the submission been made and, if not, when will it be made? As reported in *Hansard* of March 26, 1975, at page 3206, the Minister of Works then made a Ministerial statement regarding the use of Bolivar effluent. It is unnecessary to read the whole statement, but two schemes were proposed, one being general and one specific. Later in the statement the Minister said:

The Government then intends to make a detailed submission to the Australian Government for financial assistance to implement the project. This could be expected to be favourably received in the light of the national water policy adopted by the Australian and State Governments, which provides for "the development of waste water treatment facilities in conjunction with water supply systems and the encouragement of recycling and re-use where appropriate". These steps are expected to take about 12 months.

The member for Torrens interjected, stating:

When will the report be tabled?

The Minister then stated:

I said that within 12 months these things should be completed and placed before the Australian Government.

All members realise the great need for this project to proceed, and growers are anxious to know what commitments this State Government will make towards this necessary project.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The 12 months is not up.

Mr. Boundy: You said within 12 months.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I am not certain of the stage the inquiry has reached, I will ask the Director and Engineer-in-Chief and let the honourable member know the current position as soon as I can.

WATER FILTRATION

Mr. WELLS: Does the Minister of Works have any knowledge of the reported change to the South Australian Government scheme to filter Adelaide's water supply? My question arises from a report by the Premier in today's *News*, and I want to know what is likely to happen in this matter. The South Australian community has been informed of the Government's intention regarding water filtration, and now it seems that Mr. Lynch is about to reject and dishonour a promise and pledge made by the former Federal Labor Party Government to provide funds to filter our water. If this is so, I ask the Minister whether this means that South Australia is to continue to be condemned to have a poor water supply, which we inherited over more than three decades of insipid and useless L.C.L. Governments, and whether anything can be done to rectify the situation which, no doubt, will be applauded by the Leader of the Opposition, as he has said in the House that South Australia already gets too much money. Can the Minister inform me of the current situation?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I certainly have no knowledge that the Commonwealth Government has indicated that it will not continue with this scheme. I contacted Senator Carrick by telex about a fortnight ago and asked him for an assurance that the money that had been promised by the previous Australian Government would be forthcoming this financial year, and I have had that assurance for this financial year. Naturally, I and every member would be concerned to see that the 70 per cent long-term loan and the 30 per cent grant that was made by the Whitlam Government to this State to filter Adelaide's water supply will continue to be forthcoming. As members would be aware, this was intended to be spent over a 10-year period and, therefore, there is about another eight years before the programme is likely to be completed, at a cost of about $100 000 000. One plant will be on stream late this year or early next year, and tenders have been called for the construction of another plant. It is imperative that the programme continue, because it would be ludicrous if filtered water were to be supplied to part of the metropolitan area and not to other parts.

Certainly, if the State Government was to fund the scheme, it would have to be spread over 20 years or 30 years, and that is not acceptable, because it is essential that Adelaide's water supply be filtered. Everyone knows that the appearance and quality of Adelaide's water are not up to the standards that normally apply, certainly in other cities. However, I am confident that the present Commonwealth Government will see fit to continue this programme. Members will be aware that, when the national sewerage scheme was introduced by the Whitlam Government, South Australia made the case to the Australian Government that, because not only of this Government but also Governments in the past in South Australia, the reticulation of sewerage was well in hand here, and we did not have the tremendous backlog of sewerage that existed in Sydney, Brisbane, Melbourne and Perth (particularly Brisbane and Perth). Because of that, we asked that consideration be given to another problem in the area of filtering Adelaide's water. It was on that basis that we were given the financial assistance to which I have referred, and I hope that that will continue. A good case could and will be made out by this State to the Commonwealth Government for a continuation of this programme. There has not to my knowledge been a direct refusal. From my reading of the newspaper, Mr. Lynch has merely asked the Premier to set out a case why financial aid for this project should continue, and that certainly will be done.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Dr. TONKIN: I think it only right that I should correct a misunderstanding that Government members seem to have arrived at, such as has just been expressed by the member for Florey. This misunderstanding seems to have arisen from the taking out of context a remark which I made previously but which was not reported in full at the time. I repeat again for the benefit of Government members that, in my opinion, South Australia has received too much money by way of tied grants and not enough money by way of general revenue: there is considerable difference in the meanings. I should also like to say that, if my reputation (which the Government is now developing for me) as a knocker of this State refers to what the Government is doing to this State, I am proud to have that reputation as a knocker of what it is doing to South Australia.

GLENELG INTERSECTION

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Transport say what priority has been set for the installation of traffic lights at the intersection of Brighton Road, Jetty Road, Maxwell Terrace and Dunbar Terrace, Glenelg, when it is expected that work will commence, and when the installation will be completed? The Minister will know that the installation of these lights has dragged on for many years, and the blame has been shifted from the Commonwealth Government to shortages of materials. These lights will give much needed protection to the many aged people who use this intersection and who now find it impossible to cross it, particularly in the evening. This urgency puts the lights in a high priority category.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Going from memory now (and I will check it), I think that it will be in about two months or three months time. I think the member for Hanson would be able to provide more detailed information, as he sought this information. I gave him the information and, if I remember correctly, it was published in the *Guardian* under his name, together with the relevant dates.

Mr. Mathwin: You can smile if you want to. It was June, you said, and I'm asking whether it still applies.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It seems that the honourable member has asked me a question the answer to which he knew all the time. I will try to sort out this little domestic problem between him and the member for Hanson and come up with something that hopefully might satisfy them both.

SECONDHAND VEHICLES

Mr. EVANS: Will the Attorney-General say whether he intends to amend the Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act to give insurance companies the opportunity to sell the many hundreds of damaged motor vehicles in their possession? Under the Act, no person can sell more than one secondhand motor vehicle unless he is licensed. When cars are written off, the insurance companies become the owners of those vehicles. Insurance companies hold hundreds of motor vehicles that cannot be sold legally, and only a small amendment to the Act is needed to cover this situation. Only a fortnight of sittings remains, and if we wait until the middle of the year many hundreds more vehicles will be held. This matter affects employment, ties up much capital and also clutters up many yards in which the insurance companies need to store vehicles on a continuing basis. I am sure the Attorney-General is aware of this problem, and I ask him whether he intends to introduce a Bill to amend the Act, because a private member will not be able to do that until next August or September.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I could make about 15 points in answering, but in deference to the Opposition I will make my comments as brief as possible. I am well aware of the problem raised by the honourable member, and I am pleased to be able to inform him that this problem has been looked at and I have approved some proclamations and regulations that will largely overcome the problem. It is not possible completely to eliminate by subordinate legislation the difficulties he has raised, and legislation will need to be introduced. In doing so, I will look at many areas of the Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act which for various reasons need amendment, and we will bring in a comprehensive Bill to take care of those matters. This is a serious matter. The Government recognises it as such, and we will be looking at it again. I cannot, however, let pass this opportunity to bring to the notice of the House that again the honourable member seems to be using his office in this House to promote the interests of himself or his family, because I understand from the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs that he raised this matter in relation to his own or his family's business interests, and I think it is disappointing to see he is continuing with this practice.

Mr. EVANS: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. EVANS: What the Attorney-General has just said is a lie. I have—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must withdraw that remark.

Mr. EVANS: I withdraw it. It is an untruth. I have never raised the matter with the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs. If someone has done so, he has used my name. I have no interest in the business, and I can tell the Attorney whence the query came. It came from the Parafield area, and through an insurance company. My brother does have a wrecking yard but he has no interest in any insurance company. If the Attorney-General takes that approach to my questions, I will not be able to speak at all because of the large size of my family and their business interests. At no time have I raised the matter of my brother's business with the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs. That statement was a deliberate untruth so far as I am concerned.

HIRE-PURCHASE AGREEMENTS

Mr. MAX BROWN: Is the Attorney-General aware that some electrical retailers in Adelaide seem to be using an undesirable form of hire-purchase in connection with colour television receiver sales? I think the Attorney-General knows I have grave doubts about some of the hire-purchase schemes we have in South Australia. I understand that the old form of hire-purchase was abolished a few years ago and replaced by new forms of transaction, which are supposed to be more simple and under which the true rate of interest is supposed to be disclosed to the consumer so that he can shop around for the best credit deal. The advent of colour television seems to have brought with it some new rental-purchase schemes, some of which are said to be interest free but which seem to involve hidden charges which are not disclosed to the consumer as a rate of interest. In fact, no interest rate is disclosed under these schemes. Can the Minister say whether these schemes comply with the law and, if they do, whether it is intended to amend the law to prohibit them?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am aware that some companies are hiring colour television receivers and other electrical appliances to consumers under a form of agreement which provides for a possible later purchase of goods but which does not confer legally enforceable options and is therefore not a hire-purchase agreement. I compliment the honourable member for raising this matter because it shows a continuing interest by him in protecting the rights and interests of consumers in South Australia. The policy of this Government is that contracts for the sale of goods to consumers on credit terms should all be required to disclose all the charges payable by the consumer, including any difference between the cash discount price and the terms price, and that all those charges should be included in the annual rate of interest to be disclosed on the documents. It seems that these new schemes involve selling of goods on credit by means of a contract that is disguised as a simple hiring agreement, and it may well be necessary to amend the legislation in this State so we can eradicate these undesirable practices. We will be looking into this matter, and I will bring down a comprehensive report for the honourable member.

LAND TAX

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Deputy Premier say what progress has been made in relation to the setting up of State Taxes Department criteria designed to allow landholders to apply for relief of part or the whole of their land tax burden where cases of hardship can be demonstrated? Many calls have been made on the Premier to provide relief to certain sections of the community which are financially embarrassed by the burden of land tax, and included in that wide range of organisations and members of Parliament who have provided evidence on behalf of landholders was a deputation from the United Farmers and Graziers and Stockowners associations, which was, I understand, officially assured some time ago that something would be done. That has been confirmed today by a senior officer of the State Taxes Department. I should like a report on the situation, as it is sought desperately by landholders. I am sure the Minister will appreciate that many landholders are anxious to get some indication of how and when they will be able to apply for this new system of remission.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not able to report to the honourable member offhand, but I will get a report and bring it down for him, hopefully on Tuesday.

MOUNT BARKER INTERSECTION

Mr. WOTTON: Will the Minister of Transport consider further the reopening of Childs Road, Mount Barker, as an alternative entry and exit road to and from Mount Barker? Would he also consider at least a three-month trial period for Childs Road to be left open to enable comparative counts to be used between vehicles using Childs Road and Adelaide Road? Further, would the Minister seek a report on the suitability of the intersection of the South-Eastern Freeway exit at Mount Barker and the Adelaide Road leading into the town of Mount Barker? At a recent meeting of residents at Mount Barker, which was addressed by an Assistant Commissioner of the Highways Department, a resolution asking for Childs Road to be reopened was supported unanimously. It was believed that the wishes and needs of the community in Mount Barker in general had been completely disregarded in the closing of Childs Road. The last traffic count to compare the two roads was taken in 1963, and at the time a preference was shown for Childs Road. The intersection of the freeway exit and Adelaide Road is causing concern following many serious accidents in the short time since its opening.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I know this has been a touchy topic for some time. Many investigations have been made and many reports provided. I am not sure what further reports can be provided to the honourable member.

Mr. Wotton: I just want you to give it another look, that's all.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am prepared to provide the honourable member with the information that has been available until now, if he has not seen that.

Mr. Wotton: We'd like you to act as well.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will act on the advice of people who are experts in that area, namely, the Road Traffic Board, and it is on their advice that the action has been taken up to this stage. I doubt very much whether the honourable member, or I, or anybody else would have the gall to claim the expertise that these people have. I will ask the Chairman of the board to look at the points the honourable member has raised and see if I can bring down the information that has previously been available so that he can peruse it to see whether there is any area in which we can move.

MONARTO

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Minister for Planning provide me with a list of all tenders showing the successful tenderers and prices in the matter of leasing farmlands within and outside the designated site of Monarto? Tenders that have been called recently have now closed, and very few local tenderers seem to have been successful. That is why I would like the Minister to provide me with this information.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is not normal practice that information supplied by way of tender is released as public information, because the tenderer making the bid will always regard it as confidential. I will discuss with the Monarto Commission the matter raised by the honourable member and see what kind of summary information I can provide. Perhaps he might care to discuss the matter with me afterwards and, if I can assist him further on a confidential basis, perhaps that can be done.

WIRRABARA BRIDGE

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Transport have investigated the possibility of having a by-pass constructed around the damaged road bridge on Highway No. 32 and over the Rocky River about two kilometres south of Wirrabara? Members will recall the weekend when throughout the State great damage was done by excessive falls of rain. As a result of that rain, this bridge and other bridges have been out of commission since that time. A by-pass road that goes to Wirrabara Forest is being used, and traffic is directed around it. The distance on this road to Wirrabara is not much greater, but it is an unsealed road and quite dangerous. I believe a sum of money was made available to maintain this unsealed road, and I have also been told that this has almost been expended. As it could be some time before this bridge is rebuilt, I ask whether consideration could be given to building a short by-pass around the bridge.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: When that bridge was washed away (on October 24, I think: it was the day the Crystal Brook bridge was also washed away), there was much damage to other roads, council roads and highways alike. Arrangements were made for the detour and funds were provided so that traffic would be able to detour for the period required, because it was necessary to redesign and rebuild that bridge completely. The situation has not changed; the funds were provided to upgrade the detour road and, as far as I am aware, that is still continuing. If the honourable member's question means that the funds provided for the maintenance are now almost depleted, I will ask the Highways Department to consider this matter to see whether additional funds can be provided to maintain the road in a trafficable condition until the new bridge can be built.

Mr. Venning: How long will that be?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: About 12 months.

JOINT HOUSE COMMITTEE

The Legislative Council intimated that it had appointed the Hon. J. A. Carnie to fill the vacancy on the Joint House Committee caused by the resignation of the Hon. Jessie Cooper.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Superannuation Act, 1974. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This Bill, which makes a number of amendments to the principal Act, the Superannuation Act, 1974, arises from recommendations of the South Australian Superannuation Board. The disparate nature of the amendments suggests that they may most conveniently be dealt with *seriatim*. I will now deal with the Bill in some detail. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 5 of the principal Act, the section that provides for the definitions used in that measure. The amendment proposed to the definition of "contribution months" is of a drafting nature, the words proposed to be struck out being otiose and possibly slightly confusing. The two amendments proposed to the definition of "contribution salary" are of considerably more substance. They arise from a decision of the Superannuation Tribunal, established under the principal Act, which makes it clear that the salary payable to a contributor must take into account any variation of salary, having retrospective effect to the day in relation to which the salary is to be ascertained.

The effect of these amendments will, in relation to contributions, ensure that for that purpose no regard need be paid to such variations. If the amendment is agreed to, the board will be relieved of the necessity of making a large number of retrospective adjustments to contribution amounts, adjustments that cannot be justified in terms of cost benefits. The amendment to the definition of "employee" presages the introduction of a provision that will enable former contributors to declared schemes to be accepted as contributors to the fund. Honourable members will recall that "declared schemes" are other superannuation schemes to which the Government is liable to contribute. Under the amendments proposed, contributors to such schemes will be afforded the opportunity of entering the general scheme under the principal Act.

The amendment to the defintion of "full unit entitlement" again reflects the decision of the tribunal referred to, and is intended to ensure that those persons whose pensions were adjusted under section 98 of the principal Act will not be retrospectively disadvantaged. The amendment to the definition of "prescribed deduction" is intended to relieve the Public Actuary of the necessity of engaging in a somewhat unproductive actuarial calculation. The insertion of a definition of "supplementation amount" will be explained in relation to the amendments to section 75 and section 84 of the principal Act.

Clause 4 inserts a new section 6a in the principal Act and attempts to clarify the legal effect of the expression "whole time" when used in the definition of "employer". From its inception, the scheme of superannuation proposed in this State was one to provide retirement benefits for those servants of the State who were employed in a permanent capacity and who were required to give their "whole time" to their duties. However, as the concept of Public Service employment has developed, there are now many people whose employment has an air of permanency but cannot by any stretch of the imagination be regarded as "whole time" employment.

When one appreciates that the contributions and benefits provided under the principal Act are entirely related to the salary from time to time payable to an employee, it is easy to see that there can be no place in the scheme for those whose hours of duty may be varied at will by their employing authority. Quite inequitable advantages can be obtained where an employee spends the majority of his "contribution life" in, say, a 20-hour-a-week employment situation, and then changes to full-time employment shortly before his benefits accrue. To deal with this situation, the proposed new section 6a provides (*a*) that, in future, only "full-time" employees will be admitted to the scheme; and (*b*)except in special cases, those "part-time" employees who are at the moment in the scheme, or who are entitled to join the scheme, will be restricted in both contributions and benefits to the "equivalent salary" based on the hours they are working on the commencement of this amending measure.

Clause 5 makes certain machinery amendments to the provisions of section 13 of the principal Act which deals with the application of moneys in the fund. These amendments are self explanatory and have been requested by the trustees of the fund. Clause 6 amends section 45 of the principal Act which deals with entry of contributors into the scheme. The amendment proposed by paragraph (*b*) is to guard against the possibility that a person may obtain double benefits from the scheme. The amendment proposed by paragraph (*c*) is to cover a situation that may arise where a contributor gains entry to the fund on the strength of a false statement as to his state of health.

Clause 7 amends section 45 of the principal Act which provides for the purchase of service, by limiting the times at which this purchase may take place to two occasions, when a contributor joins the fund and when he is about to go on pension. This restriction has been recommended by the board to guard against the possibility of contributors "electing against the fund", a practice that, if widespread, can throw the fund out of balance. The amendments proposed by paragraph (*b*) of this clause at proposed subclause (4) permit the Public Actuary to take into account retrospective increases in salary in calculating lump sums payable and at proposed subclause (5) state expressly what is implied in the scheme of periodical contributions for purchased "contribution months".

The amendments to section 46 of the principal Act made by clause 8 are consequential on the amendments made to section 45 by clause 7. Clause 9 amends section 54 of the principal Act, which dealt with the situation of a contributor to the fund who was at the same time a contributor to a declared scheme. This section in effect "froze" that contributor's contributions and benefits at the rate applicable when this situation was first dealt with. If the amendments to this clause are agreed to, such a contributor will be permitted to contribute to the present scheme on a basis that will accord with arrangements he may enter into with the Minister. Such arrangements will necessitate him passing to the fund the benefit he would otherwise accrue from the declared scheme.

Clause 10 will enable the board to recover any outstanding contributions payable by a contributor from moneys standing to the credit of the contributor in the Retirement Benefits Account. Clause 11 is a machinery amendment to section 62 of the prescribed Act requested by the board. Its acceptance will remove the possibility of an anomaly being created in the application of this section. Clause 12 inserts a new section 65a in the principal Act, and is commended to members' particular attention. It is quite self-explanatory and is intended to limit the right of withdrawal from the fund by contributors once they have been accepted as contributors. Clause 13 makes some small but significant amendments to section 67 of the principal Act, this being the provision on which the right to a pension is granted. The main thrust of the amendment is to ensure consistency in the grants of various pensions and to ensure that an appropriate pension is awarded in every case.

The amendment proposed by paragraph (*a*) will ensure that an invalid pension will not be available to a person who may obtain a pension by retirement. The amendment proposed by paragraph (*b*) should ensure that common grounds for retirement on invalidity must be established by each employing authority. The amendment proposed by paragraph (*c*) should ensure that common policy for retirement under the retrenchment provisions is also established. The amendment proposed by paragraph (*d*) will ensure that a person shall not be retrenched if he can be retired. The amendment proposed by paragraph (*e*) ensures that the proper test is five years contributions, not five years service in the case of a retrenchment pension.

The amendments proposed by paragraph (*f*) establish a fixed commencing day for pensions and also give a right to suspend the pension where a "retired" employee is still in receipt of remuneration for his service. Clause 14 is a machinery amendment to avoid an anomaly apparent in the application of the formula set out in section 71 of the principal Act. Clause 15 amends section 75 of the principal Act which deals with commutation of pensions. The amendment proposed by paragraph (*a*)

is purely a machinery one but the amendment proposed by paragraph (*b*) is significant in that it makes it clear that any amount by which a pension has been increased by supplementation (as to which see the definition of "supplementation amount" inserted by clause 5) will not be taken into account in determining the proportion of the pension that can be commuted for a lump sum.

Clause 16 amends section 76 of the principal Act which deals with invalid pensions and makes a significant change. In effect, it makes the continuation of such a pension dependent on the pensioner seeking appropriate treatment, thus emphasising the rehabilitation aspect of this pension. Clause 17 amends section 78 of the principal Act which deals with remunerative activity of an invalid or retrenched pensioner by somewhat enlarging the area of employment he may accept. Clause 18 merely clarifies the intention of section 81 of the principal Act which is to facilitate the disposition of any residue where benefits paid under the Act do not exceed contributions.

Clause 19 makes amendments to section 84 of the principal Act which deals with commutation of a spouse's pension which are similar in effect to those made to section 75 by clause 15. Clause 20 has been inserted as an amendment to section 93 of the principal Act, from an abundance of caution, to ensure that no present pensioner who obtained an adjustment of pension under this section is disadvantaged by the application of amendments proposed in this measure. Clause 21 is a drafting amendment. Clause 22 amends section 102 of the principal Act and is of considerable significance to persons who contribute to the Provident Account. On attaining the age of retirement such persons will now automatically become full contributors to the fund with its attendant advantages.

Clause 23 repeals and re-enacts section 121 of the principal Act in consequence of the passage of the Family Relationships Act, 1975. No change in principal is proposed here. Clause 24 provides for the making of returns by employing authorities, and clause 25 enacts in the principal Act a provision that appeared in the previous legislation but which was omitted from the principal Act. The provision prohibits the assignment of benefits under the Act. Clause 26 inserts two new heads of regulation-making power which are self-explanatory.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

JURIES ACT

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Juries Act, 1927-1974. Read a first time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: 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.

Mr. Mathwin: No!

The SPEAKER: Leave is refused.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The principal object of this Bill is to correct an anomaly that has become evident since the new system of jury pools came into operation late last year. The section of the principal Act that provides for jury pools has been interpreted to mean that the Sheriff must call in all the jurors summoned for a month even when only one trial is to commence on a particular day of that month. In practice, this has meant that the Sheriff has had, on occasions, to call in many more jurors than could possibly be required to constitute a panel. On at least one occasion about 40 more persons were in attendance than were required. Apart from the extra burden of work placed upon the Sheriff, the cost factor is significant.

Also, there is inconvenience to the jurors themselves. A further object of the Bill is to correct some anomalies in relation to the persons who are exempt from jury service, and to achieve equality between men and women as regards jury service. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act on a day to be proclaimed. Clause 3 repeals section 14a of the Act which enables a woman to cancel at any time her liability to serve as a juror. Thus a woman will now only be able to be excused under sections 13, 16, 17, or 19 of the Act. Clause 4 provides for the service of jury summonses by ordinary pre-paid post. Registered mail is now very costly and does not always provide the most effective mode of service. Clause 5 empowers the Sheriff to divide a jury pool into sections, by ballott. Only one section need be called in to render jury service if only one jury panel is required. The ballot for division of a jury pool into sections may be conducted before or after the first day on which the jurors are required to attend. All ballots under section 32 must be conducted in public.

Clause 6 repeals section 60b of the Act which provides that a woman may be excused from serving as a juror on the trial of any issue that she considers would be, for example, unduly offensive to her. Clause 7 deals with persons exempt from serving as jurors. The item dealing with colleges of advanced education is placed in proper alphabetical order. All references to "wives" are removed. The word "spouse" covers the situation where a judge, etc., is a woman. The amendments to the items relating to the Electricity Trust and the State Transport Authority provide that only officers of those authorities are exempt. Other employees of these authorities will now serve as jurors, as is the case with State Government employees. Finally, it is provided that both male and female members of a religious order are to be exempt—the Act at the moment only exempts women.

Mr. MATHWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

WATER RESOURCES BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 3. Page 2026.)

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I am pleased that this long-awaited Bill is now before the House so that we may have the opportunity to consider the work that has been undertaken and the manner in which the legislation has been presented. Generally, it is a consolidation of the Control of Waters Act and Underground Waters Preservation Act, but it also introduces two or three other important factors that will be increasingly important to the management and quality of water in South Australia. For some time we have been asking for the establishment of a South Australian Water Resources Council and the inclusion of regional water resources advisory committees.

In including these organisations the Government has taken advantage of being able to use local knowledge, and I believe the Minister will readily accept that this has been useful previously, particularly in advising the department concerning decisions that have been made. I remind the Minister that a deputation visited him about 12 months ago when the Murray River in this State was in a difficult situation with extremely high salinity. The persons in that deputation had knowledge of local conditions, and suggested to the Minister a procedure that should be adopted. The advice was accepted, put into effect, and

helped the situation considerably in South Australia concerning water quality immediately following the high river level in 1975.

In his second reading explanation the Minister pointed out that, of the total water resources of Australia, South Australia has only 2 per cent. Obviously, we have to make more effort in this State than is necessary in other States to conserve and manage our resources for the utmost benefit of all people concerned. The Minister also pointed out that of the total land mass South Australia occupies about 12½ per cent and has a population of 9 per cent of the Australian population. It is therefore crucial that we in South Australia make every effort to use the water resources that are available to us to the best advantage. We have an increasing need to expand industry and urban development as our population increases, and we will have increasing problems of waste disposal. The Bill effectively provides the manner in which waste will be controlled and what penalties will be imposed for breaches of the legislation.

Although extemely high, these penalties are necessary, In one instance the penalty for an offence is $10 000, but no doubt courts will use their discretion in deciding when this sort of penalty is imposed. We know of examples from overseas following the contamination of bays and inland waters when much higher penalties have been imposed, but if a large company causes water pollution a small penalty of up to, say, $5 000 will not deter it from continuing in that way. It may be willing to pay a fine and continue polluting the waters. The provisions for waste disposal and maintenance of water quality are extemely important parts of this Bill.

The fact that the Government has seen fit to bind the Crown will make the legislation more acceptable to the public. Any modern legislation that does not bind the Crown is archaic and a step backward. Today, there is no reason why the Crown should not be bound in the same manner as are members of the community. The Minister has said that the provisions of this Bill are in keeping with the objectives of a policy statement which was made last year and which was released by the three States and the Australian Government together. That statement is very much in line with the policy expounded by the Liberal Party during the recent State election. Generally, we do not oppose the objectives of this Bill, and the consolidation of the two Acts will make this a more simple document that can be more readily understood by people who divert underground or surface water. In the past we have had three or four pieces of legislation controlling surface and underground waters, and water quality was also dealt with in the Health Act.

Provisions relating to the recreational use of surface water and the preservation of flora and fauna have been considered and the appropriate sections of the Control of Waters Act (which were recently included in that legislation) have also been included in the Bill. In 1973 we moved a motion in relation to the preservation of wetlands and, as a result, the Government introduced amendments to the Control of Waters Act to preserve existing wetlands and flora and fauna. These important environmental provisions have been included in this Bill, and they will safeguard the river and waterways and water resources, whether they are wetlands on the river or in the South-East, from excessive draining that has denied the wild life of this State access to the limited areas they can occupy. Establishing the Water Resources Council is a most important advance and I believe that this legislation will prove to be the most advanced of its kind, especially as the Government has recognised that there could be much expertise available in the community to be used in an advisory capacity to the Minister.

The Bill allows the Minister to appoint regional water resources advisory committees, and I strongly recommend that interested persons in the Murray River valley, the South-East, the Adelaide Hills and plains, and an area of Eyre Peninsula should, after the Bill has been proclaimed as an Act, make representation to the Minister to establish an advisory committee in each of those suggested areas. Local knowledge available on almost every aspect of underground and surface water and salinity problems could be used by the Minister. A point raised by that deputation to the Minister about 12 months ago proved the value of using local knowledge and advice. I assume the advisory committees will operate through the advisory council, which, in turn, will pass on information to the Minister. This approach gives people who are vitally concerned in these areas (people whose livelihood depends completely on the preservation of underground water and the protection of surface water) the opportunity to make representations to the Minister. The committees will be recognised through legislation that will give them a sound basis on which approaches can be made, and this will take this vital area somewhat out of the political arena.

It is far better that people whose livelihoods are vitally concerned with water resources in South Australia can make representations to the Minister through advisory committees and the Water Resources Advisory Council in preference to matters being argued on a political basis, because this subject is far too important in the interests of all South Australians to be used as a political football in the Parliament of this State. That the other States concerned and the Australian Government have agreed in principle to the policy statement that was released (and the Bill incorporates all the points contained in that statement) indicates that the other two States are willing to enact similar legislation. If that is so, we may be making headway in relation to water quality. The total water allocation available to South Australia is somewhat limited but, as has been stated on many occasions in recent years, the quality of that water is just as important to us as is the quantity we receive, especially when it is water diverted for irrigation purposes.

It is useless to divert water that has been polluted or contains a high salinity level, as investments made for irrigation can be destroyed overnight. The critical use to which this water is put is domestic use, so pollution must be kept to an absolute minimum. Another important aspect of the Bill that will remove arguments arising from time to time relates to the allocation of water and whether or not a person has received a fair go from the department. That the Bill provides for the establishment of a tribunal to hear and determine problems independently will again take this vital question out of the political arena.

Obviously, the department has its own point of view, but an individual arguing against a strong department headed by a Minister and controlled by an Act does not leave the divertee or water user in a strong position. The establishment of the tribunal will put South Australians in a position where they are no longer arguing with Government departments, and I believe this is a major step forward in the interests of modern legislation. When people must argue with Government departments, they are at a complete disadvantage from the start. The part of the Bill dealing with well drillers imposes substantial restrictions, but I support the need for those restrictions.

I assume that the object of this measure is to ensure that we make the greatest use possible of water. If we are depleting underground water at three times the recharge rate, obviously the Government must have substantial control over its use. Unfortunately, in past legislation (and I do not see the situation altering) people who have been completely honest with their figures have been the most severely penalised in the allocation of water and water licences. This relates largely to the original establishment of the permit system where the person who was completely honest was far worse off than was the unscrupulous person who claimed that he was using or diverting twice the volume of water that he was actually using. I do not know how one overcomes the problem. I always prefer to see the honest person benefit, but that has not always been the case in the past. There are other instances of this practice related to the diverting of water from the Murray River and also to the use of underground water on the Adelaide Plains and in the South-East.

With the establishment of the Water Resources Advisory Council and regional advisory committees, people in regional areas will have an opportunity to clearly indicate to the Minister their concern for the action taken in the past by the South-Eastern Drainage Board, which has carried out what was required of it under its charter. Perhaps it has been too efficient at its job, and is partly responsible for the depletion of underground water in the South-East, where it must be re-charged from permanent surface water. Whether this is a correct assessment I am not sure, but I believe it has a bearing on the situation. If a regional advisory committee is established in the South-East, it could do much independent work in this field and make recommendations to the Water Resources Advisory Council relating to improvements that could be made in the management of underground water in the area. In the main, I support the Bill. It is much in keeping with Liberal Party policy on the matter and having the matter in one consolidated Act will make it easier for most people to understand and for the Government to administer effectively and to make the greatest possible use of the water resources available to South Australia.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I am pleased to support the Bill, which probably is one of the most important pieces of legislation that this State has considered. The Minister has referred in his second reading explanation to this State's being the driest State in the driest continent, and he gave the reasons why we should give a speedy passage to the measure. The member for Chaffey, the Opposition shadow Minister on water resources, has dealt with the Bill, and I endorse what he has said.

I want to refer to water generally and particularly to the water position in the South-East. The appointment of the South Australian Water Resources Council is a forward step, and the 12 persons appointed to the council will have the sacred duty of seeing that South Australia has the component that it needs most to ensure and promote development. The Minister has set out the criteria and has explained what is embodied in the Bill. Clause 14 (2) provides:

The council, in advising the Minister, shall have regard to any factors affecting or likely to affect—

(*a*) the quality of any waters;
(*b*) the equitable distribution of any waters;
(*c*) the loss or wastage of any waters;
(*d*) the preservation and conservation of any waters;
(*e*) the health and welfare of the people;
(*f*) the conservation and propagation of flora and fauna;
(*g*) the preservation and improvement of structures, relics or sites of historic or anthropological interest;

and

(*h*) the preservation of the amenity, nature, features and general character of a locality.

I refer to the run-off that occurs in the high rainfall areas, and I hope that, when this legislation is in operation, that matter will be considered with a view to storing water where we can. I should like to see use of the turkeys nest type of storage in areas in the South-East where it can be used. Graziers have complained to me about not being able to get water entitlements under the Underground Waters Preservation Act. This has caused dissatisfaction in some areas, and the suggestion I have made could be considered.

The member for Chaffey has spoken of recharging the underground water resources, and he has referred to the South-East. I hope that the council, amongst its duties, will consider the effect of drainage on the South-East. In some areas where drains are used, they have got rid of surplus water and promoted some development.

Mr. Venning: Do you think they overdid it?

Mr. RODDA: I think that in some cases it has been overdone. I should like to see action taken to put weirs on some of these drains. When high rainfall occurs in some seasons, the water must be got away. Much water seems to be moving down those drains in summer that could well be contained in them. I remember the late Harry Kemp saying, when he was a member of this Parliament, that many people were pleased to have these drains dug but that they would be equally pleased when they were filled in. I am not saying, from the top of my head, that that would be so, but there should be some control.

I should also like the Minister and the council to closely consider water use. The Padthaway area has been referred to many times, and people there have purchased properties recently but, because no water rights were sold with the properties (and that was because of the Underground Waters Preservation Act), those people have not been able to take advantage of the water supply that is there. I think the decision made was the correct one, but at present water, under flood irrigation, runs down roads, and a better type of water use must be considered quickly and in a practical way.

The easy type of irrigation is provided by putting in a big pump. In the Padthaway area, large pumps can put out much water quickly. That is easy irrigation, but I am not sure that some of the more conservative methods of irrigation should not be encouraged, because if they were perhaps we would get better use from irrigation. I have mentioned some things that I should like the council to consider closely and thereby spread our form of irrigation. The council will have wide powers. In all cities there is a health hazard in drinking rainwater that is polluted with industrial waste, but I am not sure, having regard to the Minister's statement that South Australia is the driest State in the driest continent, that we should not encourage people in built-up areas to save roof water.

The development of Monarto and other cities has been spoken about, and we are encouraging people to come here. We have had a downturn in our population growth, but the position will improve and, if we are to bring people to this State, we must have a supply of potable water. This legislation will provide that, and ultimately desalination will have to be considered. I know that the Minister wants to get this legislation through, and I am pleased to support it. I should be pleased if discussion could take place with the council and its officers on the issues that I have raised.

Mr. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

BUILDING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 3. Page 2022.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): The Opposition has no real objection to this Bill. The Government has given as the reason for its introduction fire safety in buildings throughout the State. The Minister, in his second reading explanation, stated that, following a disastrous fire in Sydney recently and an earlier fire at the People's Palace here in Adelaide, there was a need to update fire precautions and fire safety in many of our city buildings. Perhaps I should raise the objections I have to the Bill initially so that the Minister could before next week, when we continue the debate, examine the areas of concern, and he may be able to accept amendments at that time. The Bill allows for a committee of three members to be formed who will be responsible for deciding what upgrading should take place to any building in any local council area. Such committees will comprise a person nominated by the Minister, a person nominated by the Chief Officer (by that I take it the Minister means the chief fire officer for the area or his nominee), and the local building surveyor. The Bill provides that any two committee members shall form a quorum. The Bill goes even further and provides that the Chairman shall have a deliberative vote as well as a deciding vote. This means that it will be a one-man committee if only two members attend, because, if the Chairman (I take it that he will be the person probably nominated by the Minister) is present and the building surveyor and the person nominated by the chief fire officer or the chief officer (if he is the third person) is not present and if the first two disagree, the Chairman can override. So, it will be a one-man committee, and I object to that.

We should either increase the size of the committee to four or take away the Chairman's deciding vote. If only two members attend and if they do not agree, they would have to wait for a third member to be present at a subsequent meeting and agree, or argue the matter out until they agreed. We cannot justify putting this kind of power into one man's hands. No one man should have the power to go to the owner of a building and say, "We believe that you should upgrade your building," involving a large sum. One member will be able to decide that, even though the Bill provides for a three-member committee.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The local government body makes the decision.

Mr. EVANS: The three members in the initial stages make the recommendations, but it is still the one person who goes to the local council. As much as the Minister might say that that is all right, I disagree. It should be more than one member who decides. The other area of concern is that any one member can make the inspection at any time, and the Bill does not stipulate that that member shall give reasonable or even any notice to the property owner. I believe that the member should at least give reasonable notice to the property owner and that more than one member should inspect. I know that, in the main, more than one member would inspect, but we should ensure that at least two members make the inspection. There is no way any politician can attack a proposal that is likely to save lives, but there is no guarantee that the Bill will save lives. There is no guarantee that, regarding past fires, if all the precautions had been taken in the building the same number of deaths would not have occurred. Human nature is strange when people are under pressure.

Mr. Keneally: Are you against fire protection in buildings?

Mr. EVANS: There is no clear indication in the coroner's report that, if all the fire precautions had been taken in the building, there would have been a lower loss of life.

Mr. Keneally: Are you saying that no buiding could be regarded as a fire trap?

Mr. EVANS: No.

Mr. Keneally: That's what you are saying.

Mr. Mathwin: No building can be made completely safe.

Mr. EVANS: What I am saying is that, in giving this power to a committee and to local councils, we must be conscious of how difficult it will be to upgrade some of the old buildings to the standards we expect in new buildings. If we attempt to implement that kind of standard in a short time, I believe that the financial burden would be so high that many buildings would be condemned. I know the argument is that if it will save lives it should be condemned but, if we take that approach, we may find that we will be short of accommodation in some areas. If the honourable member wants to take the same attitude in the case of drunken driving and other areas and save lives by being as ruthless, he might save more lives than he would by means of the Bill.

The Opposition strongly supports the principle that we need to examine those buildings that constitute a fire trap. The most serious of the buildings in this field should be rectified as soon as possible, but we hope that some moderation will be used in putting this legislation into practice. Although many buildings are old, people have survived within them, although that might have been more by good luck than by good management. I believe that real panic could be caused in the city and in some suburbs to property owners. We might have a problem on our hands of a shortage of accommodation, owners having said, "We are sorry. We cannot afford to meet the commitment at the moment." I am not putting money before lives, as much as I know that argument might be used against me, but there are many areas in our society where we tend to back off from our responsibilities and do things piecemeal. I have made the point that, in the drunken driving area, we, as a Parliament, have tended to back off, but we are gradually overcoming this defect.

I hope that in this field the necessary upgrading will be done moderately in the initial stages. There is no real complaint about the Bill, except that I believe the Chairman should not have two votes, that when an inspection is made all reasonable care must be taken in giving the tenants or property owner reasonable notice of when it will take place, and that more than one committee member of three (or more) should carry out the inspection. In fairness, I think the Minister would agree that some building surveyors employed in local government might not have enough expertise in this field, and for that reason I hope that they and at least the fire officer make the inspection. I believe they are both experts in their own fields. They could go along together so that a more balanced decision could be made. There is no opposition apart from those two matters: one in relation to the making of decisions and the other is the amount of power the Chairman will have. The latter matter can be dealt with simply, without giving the Chairman the deciding vote. The Opposition supports the Bill through the second reading.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support this Bill, which includes certain provisions that are long overdue. I say this as an engineer and as one who has served in local government. I have looked at many buildings around

Australia, the fire safety aspects of which I believe were dubious, and I would regard some of them as real fire traps. However, let us not get carried away. My research into this Bill indicates there is a real need for upgrading the legislation. I read with interest the Coroner's report on the fire in the Salvation Army building in Pirie Street, a tragic affair. However, fires have occurred in buildings in South Australia where fire precautions have been taken, and fires will undoubtedly occur in the future, no matter what legislation is passed. I hope we never have a "towering inferno" in South Australia. I was in Sydney when a fire occurred in a hotel at Kings Cross. I was interested in the publicity in the press and media at that time, and I understand the New South Wales Government is now updating its legislation in this respect. I looked at the Kings Cross hotel in which the fire had occurred and I could understand how the people were injured when they had to jump out of the windows.

New multi-storey buildings should not cause concern, because they are generally designed by architects and engineers with a high degree of fire protection, but they still have the problem of updraughts caused by lift wells. That aspect does not worry me much. I am more worried about the older buildings which are used for residential or work purposes. Many of the old buildings contain much timber. The old Government Printing Office that was at the back of this building could have been a fire trap because it had all-timber floors supporting machinery that used flammable materials.

We will also have to be careful about the way in which the property owners are treated when the provisions of the Bill are carried out. There will have to be a system of checks and balances and much common sense will have to be used, otherwise, even though referees could be referred to, some hardships could occur. This legislation will have to be administered with much common sense because the powers are sweeping, although of course human life and safety come first. The Chairman, the chief officer and the building surveyor should know what they are talking about in their respective fields. If anyone wishes to appeal against certain judgments he should be able to go to a referee. Of course, that course exists under the present Act. I assume the referees, who are normally architects and engineers, would be competent to hear such appeals. I repeat that this measure must be administered in a common-sense way, and the worst thing that could happen would be a clean sweep approach with buildings being pulled apart unnecessarily. I support the Bill unreservedly, but hope that it is administered sympathetically.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill. The member for Fisher has already said that he believes the size of the committee is too small and he is worried about one member being able to control it. I do not believe that is a good thing. There is no doubt that there will always be fire traps, particularly in old buildings. However, I am concerned about the provisions of this Bill being carried out in a clean sweep because much damage could be done in a short time. The powers of entry and inspection of a building and the powers of a member of the committee are great. New section 39e (1) provides:

A member of the committee for an area may at any reasonable time enter into or upon and inspect any building or structure in the area, and, as far as may be reasonably necessary, cause any part of such building or structure to be cut into or laid open, for the purpose of determining whether the fire-safety of the building or structure is adequate.

I suppose occasions could arise when that power would be necessary but it seems to be a lot of power to give a member of a committee. A decision could be made by that one member of the committee. Last year I asked the then Minister in charge of housing (Dr. Hopgood) what was the Government's policy in relation to high-rise flats for pensioners, and he replied that the intention of the Government was to continue with this type of building for aged people. Does the Government really believe that there is any high-rise building in South Australia that is not a fire risk, and is there any fire escape that could be called safe? The alternatives to a fire escape in a high-rise development are very few. The first thing that goes in a raging inferno is the lift-well, because it creates a vacuum drawing the fire up into the lift-well and preventing any chance of escape in a lift. The fire escape around the lift-well is just as bad. What has been said in the past about the effectiveness of such means of escape has been proved wrong.

The other alternative is the exterior fire escape. Does the Government expect, when building high-rise developments, to place the fire escape on the outside of the building? If it does, how does it expect old people of 70 and 80 years of age to be able to come down 10 or 15 floors on a fire escape, a difficult feat for a young person. Heights cause dizziness to people of all ages. The only other type of exterior fire escape would be a chute, and we can imagine these people trying to escape from the tenth or fifteenth storey down a chute. It would be impossible for them and would cause most aged people to receive serious injuries. I was surprised that, with all this evidence available, the Government still contains in its programme a reference to building high-rise flats for aged people. That is an absolute disgrace.

The Government is now presenting a Bill that it says will improve the situation relating to fires in high density living areas, yet the same Government condones the building of high-rise flats for aged people. If people wish to live in this type of accommodation that is their business, but pensioners who are looking for low rental accommodation, when offered this type of accommodation, have no alternative but to take it or wait for five or six years for a ground floor unit. These people go to the Housing Trust and say, when offered accommodation on the fifteenth floor of a high-rise unit, "I can't go in the lift, and I don't want to live in this compact, high density unit because it is a lonely life, even though there are many people around." The Housing Trust's answer would be to put the person's name down for a ground floor unit, which would take five years or so to find.

Mr. Keneally: They can go to private enterprise and pay $45 to $60 a week.

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable member's answer would be to go to private enterprise and pay $45 a week rent.

Mr. Keneally: That's the Liberal policy; that's your answer.

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable member knows very well that is not the answer. We are dealing with the problem of housing aged people, and we are dealing with high-rise development and the problem of fire. Although the Government has introduced this Bill, which I believe is needed, it has also given its blessing (and it still has this in its policy) to the housing of aged people in this State in high-rise development, low-rental accommodation. There is a great fire problem in high density buildings and there is no solution because there is no safe fire escape, particularly for aged people. I support the Bill, and hope the Minister will have some explanation, particularly of clause 13.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government): Let me put the minds of the member for Torrens and the member for Fisher at rest. I do not envisage (and I would be very disturbed if I thought this) a clean sweep approach as a result of this legislation, as that would be impracticable. If the committee to be established under this legislation attempted to do that, I am sure that the provision for an appeal to a referee would be exercised often and quickly, and the committee would have to rethink its attitude. I do not see that as a problem.

The honourable member for Glenelg was talking about the core of the whole problem, and that is that there is no complete solution to the problem of fire safety. Everyone accepts that. Equally, it is acknowledged throughout Australia that the Building Act of South Australia includes the best fire precautions of any Act and is probably as good as is reasonable to have in any legislation of that type. In that case, many of the criticisms the honourable member raised about the high-rise flats for pensioners disappear. Such buildings have not been built, as far as I am aware. I do not know of any 15-storey or 16-storey blocks of flats built for pensioners.

Mr. Mathwin: They were going to be built at Elizabeth, and the Minister said you were still going to build them.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: "Going to build"—that is the key. The present Building Act came into operation on January 1, 1974, I think.

Mr. Coumbe: April 8, 1971.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Thank you. This legislation sets out provisions that must be abided by for all buildings erected after that date. The legislation before us is not to deal with buildings erected under the present legislation, because fire precautions are adequate. It deals with fire precautions in buildings erected under the old Building Act, in which it is considered by the Fire Brigades Board and the union of fire fighters (who have a ringside seat at every fire) that fire precautions are not adequate. This Bill provides a vehicle for a committee to determine what is reasonable to do in a building such as the People's Palace, or the old Government Printing Office, or the Foy and Gibson building.

Mr. Mathwin: Parliament House!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No, I do not include that building because there seems to be no real fire trap here, although I do not say there are no fire traps in the building. Generally, the floors and walls of Parliament House are of masonry, but in many other buildings money could be spent first to reduce fire hazards. In reply to the member for Fisher's query about a member of the committee entering premises at any time, I think the word "reasonable" safeguards the owner. I am sure that power, which also exists in other cases, will not be abused, and I should like the committee to retain this power of entry. I expect that the committee member will say, "We are going to come around." However, I would not like him to have to give that notice. For instance, in one of our older city hotels it could be found that furniture was being stacked on a stairway which could then not be used as a form of exit. In such a case, I would not want notice to have to be given. I am sure these provisions will be administered properly.

The Chairman of the committee will have a casting vote when only two members are present, otherwise there could not be a meeting without three persons being present unless unanimity was achieved. Obviously, a report would have to go to the committee, and the Chairman would have to have a strong reason for taking his action, and I should think he would want to make sure that details of his reason and attitude were supported by at least the member of the committee who was not present when the decision was made. I am sure that these are reasonable provisions and if the fears of Opposition members materialise the Government would not hesitate to remedy an ill that the honourable member rightly says may develop.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

GOVERNORS' PENSIONS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 3. Page 2022.)

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I believe I speak for all Opposition members, certainly for Liberal Party members, in supporting this Bill, which provides for pensions to the present Governor and those who may succeed him in that office. The Bill also provides for payment to spouses of Governors who die in office or after retiring. I am satisfied that all members agree that it is necessary to introduce the provisions. I am sure that almost all of our previous Governors have been able to provide themselves with service superannuation, but this legislation will make payable to the Governor on retirement a sum that will be at the rate of the maximum of half his salary throughout the preceeding year as Governor of this State. Also, there will be payable to the spouse of the Governor the sum of three-quarters of that half salary that would have been paid to him. On behalf of members of my Party, I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I, too, support the Bill, but there are a couple of things I want to say about it. The most important question is that of retrospectivity. The Bill is framed not to apply to any incumbent or to the widow of any incumbent of the office appointed before December 1, 1971. I can think of only three or four people who could possibly be affected by the measure, and they are probably covered by way of pension, anyway. The Bill, if the member for Murray had looked at it (and I do not know whether he did), takes into account other pensions when fixing a pension under the Bill.

I cannot for the life of me see why the cut-off date of December 1, 1971, has been included. It may mean nothing. I refer to the people concerned with some deference. Lady George is still alive, but Sir Robert is dead. She would receive a pension from the Royal Air Force. Sir Edric and Lady Bastyan are still alive and Sir Edric is living in South Australia. He would be receiving a pension from the British Army. The widow of our first Australian born Governor, Lady Harrison, is, I believe, living in Sydney and is or was employed as the public relations officer for the Girl Guides Association. I hope that all those people are properly cared for financially. It would have been a gracious act not to have included the cut-off period just in case something goes wrong with their financial arrangements. That could happen. South Australia owes a debt to all of them for the way in which they carried out in their different ways their duties when in office. A private member could not introduce legislation of this nature, because conceivably it would mean the expenditure of money. I suggest to

the Government, therefore, that it consider removing this provision just in case at some time in the future, or even now, there may be a reason why one of the people to whom I have referred should have a claim on the State.

That is the only practical matter I raise, and I raise it with respect and deference to those whom I have mentioned. My only overall comment is that the Bill shows the changing of the times because, until recently, the question of pensions for Governors, former Governors and Governors-General did not arise; they usually came from England, served here, and went away again, so that someone else had the responsibility of looking after them. Invariably the practice now (and I do not know whether it will always be the practice) is for Australians to fill the positions. Therefore, South Australia has a responsibility to those people. Nationalism, of which this is a slight but not necessarily bad example, costs us money.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I support the views expressed by the member for Mitcham. It is not as though there is or necessarily will be the need for a flood of Government money to supply pensions to people who have fulfilled the role of Governor and his lady. I believe that Lord Norrie was still alive (or at least was until recently) and attending on special occasions at the House of Lords. The Government has previously shown compassion in this area, and we, too, on this side have revealed that we believe in compassion of this nature. To fortify my statement, I refer to the Budget debate when I asked the Treasurer to consider the position of the Lieutenant-Governor and stated that he provided a service to the community and put in a considerable amount of his time and effort and that the sum appropriated for him was small. The Treasurer has since indicated by letter that the original appropriation has been doubled. I commend that action, because the Parliament should uphold the office of Governor, Governor's lady, and the Lieutenant-Governor. Because certain amendments will have to be drafted, I ask the Minister whether I should seek leave to continue my remarks or whether he will report progress in the Committee stage because this is a financial measure and it may not be possible to amend it in another place. I believe my point has been well made, so I look forward to the unanimous support to the amendments that we believe should be made.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I do not disagree with the suggestion put forward by the member for Mitcham and supported by the member for Light. Although I do not wish off the top of my head to say that I will amend the measure, I shall be pleased to speak to the Treasurer and other members of Cabinet about it, because I hold some sympathy with the point expressed. The matter was considered by the Treasurer when a submission was made to Cabinet about it. It was believed that, because the people concerned would receive military pensions, they would probably not desire or require such a pension. The value of money has changed tremendously, so it could be that some of these people who filled this high office with great distinction might be finding it a little difficult to make ends meet and to maintain the way of life to which they were accustomed for several years. For that reason I shall be pleased to put the Bill into Committee and to report progress. I can assure members that if we can amend the Bill to take into account what has been raised we will do so.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

PUBLIC AUTHORITIES (INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 3. Page 2022.)

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): The Liberal Party will support this Bill through the second reading stage, and amendments will be moved in Committee. The Bill is a simple one, although I think the principle involved should be discussed. The purpose is merely to facilitate the appointment of employees to the boards of public authorities in the State as board members or directors. I think it important that I clearly explain the Liberal Party policy regarding the appointment of directors to the boards of public authorities; in other words, appointment of employees to boards in the public sector.

The Liberal Party is opposed to the election of representatives of employees to the boards of public authorities. However, it is not opposed (and I draw the distinction here) to capable people who understand the problems within the authority serving on the boards. That policy could well mean that there was an employee on the board. The principle is not that we oppose having employees on the boards, but we oppose having on the board representatives of employees, they having formally been elected by some scheme, already clearly stated by the Government, to represent them on the board.

I have made it clear that we have no objection to employees being on the board provided they have expertise and something worth while to contribute to the management of the authority. They would be selected by the appropriate people who select other board members. I now will relate to the House the recommendations made in a Government report. These are the recommendations of a committee established by the Dunstan Government in 1972. The committee was asked to report on worker participation in management in the public sector, and some recommendations regarding so-called worker directors in chapter 7 are worth considering. I understand the report has not been made known publicly. I understand that for various reasons the Government decided not to release the report to the press. I may be incorrect in saying that, but certainly, from a letter that I saw, it had not been made available. The people on the committee were representing the Labor Government in the State, and part of the recommendation states:

Public sector managers were substantially opposed to the appointment of worker directors. They obviously resented any erosion of their management prerogative and were quick to point out that, in any event, worker directors would not possess the requisite managerial skills. Their objections even extended to an expression of sympathy for workers appointed to these positions, on the grounds that they would be subject to an intolerable conflict of interests. Union representatives, although not as forthright in their views, reacted quite coolly to the concept. They clearly saw dangers of a union becoming compromised if one of its members was so appointed. The only argument supporting the principle came from the Public Service Association, whose representative sought the reintroduction of the association's right to nominate a member of the Public Service Board, although in discussions it was conceded that difficulties were inherent in such an appointment. This suggestion was not emphasised as part of the association's submission.

I understand that the Government has not adopted, as in one of the recommendations, that there should be a representative of the Public Service Association on the Public Service Board. In other words, when it comes close to home and to administering the very centre of the public authority, when it comes to determining in some ways how the Government's policy will be implemented, the Government is not prepared to have the employees on the board.

However, the Government is prepared to have them there when it comes to some semi-government or public authority not directly concerned within the administration of the Government at the central point of the Public Service Board. It is interesting to note that the Government adopts one policy for outside authorities but does not adopt that policy when it comes close to home. Paragraph 7.10 of the report states:

In our reading of the relevant literature (relating mainly to overseas experience), we also noted that the weight of opinion was against the appointment of worker directors. In recommending against such appointments, the Royal Commission on Trade Unions and Employers' Associations (the Donovan Commission) had analysed the implications of the experiences in many European countries. In essence, the report indicated that where the traditional "adversary" system prevailed, there were great difficulties involved in unions attempting to fulfil both the oppositional and co-ordinating role with management. Within Australia, litigation in a New South Wales Supreme Court case in 1967 (Bennets v. The Board of Fire Commissioners of New South Wales) drew comments from the presiding judge, Mr. Justice Street, on the difficulties inherent in serving in the dual capacity of employee representative, and in the overriding and predominant duty to serve the interests of the board.

I will now mention a name that has been widely quoted, as you know, Mr. Speaker, by the Premier as the name of an authority in this area and the name of one from whom, I understand, the Government used to seek advice on worker participation. The recommendation continues:

Yet another authority, Dr. F. E. Emery, Senior Research Fellow, Australian National University, advised us that he saw no real advantage in appointing employee representatives to boards of management. Indeed, he envisaged the overriding danger of the worker director either "going management" or isolating himself by an employee-orientated stand.

I will skip, because of the time factor, some of the aspects that are discussed. I will go on, because the disadvantages of putting employee representatives on the boards of public authorities are listed. The report, which relates purely to the public sector, and not to the private sector, continues:

However, given the current lack of knowledge of this more advanced form of participation, the opposition of management to it, and the lack of interest of unions (and, presumably, the work force in general), the committee believes that any advantages likely to evolve from the appointment of worker directors would be outweighed by the disadvantages which may be summarised as follows:

(*a*) the difficulties involved in conflicting loyalties to the employees on the one hand and the board of management on the other;

(*b*) the compromising position likely to be suffered by unions, where members are participants in and are bound by decisions of the board;

(*c*) the trust and credibility problem where the worker director may either desert his worker background for the management position, or isolate himself by aligning himself with worker interests;

(*d*) the problem of selecting worker directors in a situation where various unions are involved, and the likely ensuing bickering between unions, following the appointment; and

(*e*) the problem of ensuring that worker directors have a sufficient range of skills and background to make a contribution to the efficient management of the organisation.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that you would agree that all five disadvantages are real and have not been considered by the Government in putting forward its industrial democracy policy, about which it has openly boasted. I come now to the final main recommendation concerning worker directors, put forward by the committee as follows:

Recommendation: The committee recommends that, in the light of current thinking and experience, appointments to public boards, trusts and corporations should not include representation (by nomination or election) of employees. The committee does, however, support the appointment of persons who have experience and understanding in employee problems and affairs.

That is the policy which the Labor Party upholds; that is, we believe that people who have a knowledge of employee problems and affairs should be appointed to boards. Occasionally, that might be an employee of a public authority, but he would need to possess exceptional qualities to overcome the difficulties. It is on that basis that the responsibility must lie with the Minister for the appointment in making the recommendation to the Government. It should not at any stage be up to the employees, no matter how democratic their election, to try to nominate or elect a representative to serve them on the board of a public authority. I think that clearly illustrates exactly what is the Liberal Party's policy, and I think it is relevant that we see the recommendations of this report of a committee established by the Dunstan Government supporting our policy. It is ironic that the Dunstan Government has thrown those recommendations aside and gone for what it calls an industrial democracy policy.

We know what that is: a policy in the private sector that attempts to nationalise all South Australian companies, with more than 50 employees, through the boardroom, and we know how the private sector has reacted to that problem. It has already told the Premier, who has partly backed down, but let us not be fooled by the way in which he has backed down. He has simply said that, regarding the private sector, legislation will not now be introduced until after the next election.

Mr. Keneally: Is he the Premier who has the highest rating in Australia?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If one goes out and asks people what they think of the Premier and his industrial democracy policy, they will not waste any words whatever: they will not have a bar of it. The important point is that the Premier, in Cabinet, has altered his policy, but the Labor Party conference has not altered its policy. Who dictates the policy in this State? It is the Labor conference, not the Premier and the Cabinet. Therefore, one should not be fooled by this superficial whitewashing the Premier has tried to achieve. He has done it, I think, on the most dishonest grounds, because he has maintained his objectionable policy and he is trying to silence some of his major critics at this stage, knowing full well that he will implement that policy as quickly as he can. The most objectionable part of the policy remains, namely, one-third of the board members will represent employees and one-third will be appointed by the Government (and we are told that they are to report back to the Treasury). I smile when I see the expression in the Labor Party policy that "we" (the Australian Labor Party) shall appoint the directors.

Mr. Whitten: That's not correct.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It is in the policy and, as "we" is used (and it being an A.L.P. document), it refers to the A.L.P. I know that Government members do not like it. Max Harris dealt scathingly with this matter in the *Sunday Mail* and, as a result, the Premier tried to placate him.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: You should have come better prepared.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I did not expect to run into a Government back-bench that did not know its own policy, although its members approved of it. I did not expect to find such ignorance. Even though I found that, I did not expect them to admit it here, so I must clarify the point for the Government. The other two aspects of the policy that are objectionable are that, first, representation on the joint management council and on the board can be taken only by

members of the trade union movement. The whole concept of worker participation is an attempt to improve relationships for all employees but, unfortunately, the Labor Party comprises two classes of employee—those who have to be members of the trade union movement and those who do not have to be members. "Democracy" applies only to those who happen to be members of the trade union movement. If they are not members of a trade association, they are not eligible to represent anyone on a board or consultative council. That is a sad reflection on the Labor Party, which is really a Party of discrimination, as it discriminates between members and non-members of trade unions.

The final aspect, particularly about the objectionable policy, is that the Government is setting up a joint management council that will apparently have a major area of co-determination. This joint management council will be elected by the employees nominating half of the people, the other half being nominated by management with the approval of the board. If one works out the percentage over which the employees have final say, one will see that 66 per cent of the representation on the joint management council must have the approval of the employees at some stage. The Premier has said that that is a lot of rubbish, but if he worked out the figures he would see that very quickly. They do not like to admit the fact that they are going to have more than a majority of the people on the joint management council only with the approval of the employees, and that shows the extent to which the Labor Party is trying to nationalise South Australian industry through the board room. I have a copy of the industrial democracy policy of the Australian Labor Party passed at its 1975 Annual State Convention. I will read the relevant portion for the back-benchers of the Labor Party, as they have obviously not read the document. Paragraph 6.5 (*c*) states:

> We will train and appoint publicly experts in company management who will be public officers and who will have equal numbers with the first two groups mentioned on boards with the duty of maintaining community interests and of reporting to the Treasury, the Companies Office and the public.

That "we" obviously refers to the authors of the document, the people who possess the document—the Australian Labor Party. In correct English we can read this as saying, "The Australian Labor Party will train and appoint publicly experts in company management."

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I understand that under the Standing Orders of this House the honourable member, having quoted from a document, can be required to table it. I request that he table the document.

The SPEAKER: It is not an official Parliamentary document, and therefore it cannot be tabled.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I must compliment you, Mr. Speaker, on the consistency of your ruling on that matter, because I remember being rejected on a similar point of order last year, and I am surprised the Minister did not remember that case. I could easily give the Minister a copy if he has not read it. I have not the slightest—

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the honourable member to continue the debate. I have made a ruling. I will not accept it if it is tabled.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I was going to offer to table it, but the Minister will not accept it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to continue the debate.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I have made my point that the Labor Party, the "we" in the document, intends to try to take over private companies in this State. What members opposite do not like is that the truth has come out about their real intentions, and that was what the Premier was trying to hide in his statements. In the long and short titles to the Bill is an attempt to try to get this House to approve such a policy, and I will not approve it. That is why certain amendments will be moved to alter the titles. The Bill does not indicate how these people will be appointed to the board: it simply says they may be appointed. Certain public authorities have employees already serving on their boards, and that system is working extremely well. South Australian Meat Corporation is one case in point, and I know from discussions that the employee on that board has been extremely effective. That is why in no way do I oppose the principle. I can think of other cases where employees have served on boards, and in most of those cases the arrangement has been extremely successful. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I take the opportunity to do what the member for Stuart has asked: that is, talk about the second electorate office being opened in Port Lincoln. I do this with a great deal of reservation, because I believe the whole thing has been unnecessary and that it has indicated to the public a certain degree of impropriety or undesirable practice on behalf of a number of people and a number of organisations. My previous intention on this matter was to ignore it, hoping that in doing that and setting my sights on where I wished to go would be sufficient to uphold me through this crisis. Such has not been the case, however, because now propaganda is being used against me that "Blacker agrees with this, because he is not saying anything." Therefore, I must bring the matter before the House and explain exactly what has happened.

In November of last year I was told by the member for Eyre that he intended to set up an electorate office in Port Lincoln. I gave no indication on that occasion whether I was pleased or disappointed: I just did not know. I knew it was something I would not do, and I believe it is something most other members would not do. I put the question to the member for Eyre on that occasion, saying, "Graham, since I have been in Parliament you have used the philosophy to me 'keep out of my electorate and I'll keep out of yours'." I accepted that philosophy and on the three occasions I have been into the electorate of Eyre I have informed the honourable member. On one occasion I took him from Whyalla to Ceduna in my own car. I believe I have been forthright in upholding that philosophy.

I said to him, "What happens with that philosophy you have presented to me and preached to me ever since I have been in Parliament?" His words were, "Peter, let's face it, it is you or me." I believe that to be an act of confrontation—one of certain admission that he intends to proceed against me regardless. Let us not get involved in the rights and wrongs of the various philosophies, because I believe members of the public will make up their minds on whether they believe this to be a fair and proper practice. I considered the matter and thought that, if the member for Eyre intended to do this, perhaps

he was doing it at his own expense. Consequently, I could not do anything about it. However, I thought the Liberal Party, his own Party, would stop him from doing that, because, ever since I have been involved in politics, there has been a campaign of "Don't split the vote", and this campaign has been used by almost every member throughout the State at a number of elections. Now we have a member of that Party proving just how wrong that philosophy was. It is the old story that if you stretch a certain argument too far and get out of the true perspective in which it is supposed to lie, ultimately the chickens come home to roost. This is exactly what has happened.

Let us assume that the member for Eyre intends to proceed and that the Liberal Party intends to allow him to proceed. We then get down to the crux of the matter, and the matter I wish to raise in my grievance, namely, that the State Government has financed or intends to finance this electorate office. When electorate offices were being established in 1973, every member was sent a circular setting out the criteria regarding the establishment of these offices, and one was that the office must be within the member's electorate, although there were other criteria.

Mr. Keneally: Port Lincoln will never be in his district.

Mr. BLACKER: Consequently, the electorate office in Port Lincoln was established, but it does not have my name on it, never has, and I hope there will never be any need for that. However, that need may be forced on us.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: It's well located.

Mr. BLACKER: It is, for the purpose for which it was designed, and is a valuable asset to the people of the District of Flinders. It allows most people to be able to contact their member readily by means of a local telephone call. Although it has been of valuable service, it is a Flinders electorate office and not a Peter Blacker office. The member for Eyre has tried to soften the blow of that exercise by saying that there are personal reasons for the move, and I appreciate the difficulties in servicing a large district. However, that is vastly different from the ultimatum that the honourable member issued to me, and he subsequently said that he would visit all schools on Eyre Peninsula. That is a vastly different philosophy from what he has told me and other members, and clearly we are not getting the true facts.

The stark fact is that it will be used as a campaign office and, regrettably, it is being financed by the State Government, which has bent the rules to assist him to create a dogfight against me. I can appreciate the Government's point of view, because a good dogfight would not hurt it. The question arises of how far it should go and whether the taxpayers of this State should be called on to finance what is only a campaign office situated in a town about 120 kilometres outside the electoral district, particularly when the Government knows that one of the electorate offices will survive only until the next State election. It seems that the money being spent is a short-term investment to promote a dogfight, and I believe it is improper for the Government to go about it in this way.

Another question that comes to mind is why a member has been allowed to do this. Should his own Party have stopped him? Obviously, it is not concerned with what happens, because it will be either Blacker or Gunn, and what the heck! That Party will accept what is left, and no doubt it is willing to let the dogfight continue. I completely exonerate any officer of the Public Buildings Department in Port Lincoln from any suggestion of being involved in deciding to place the office in that town. Two top officers of the department have spoken apologetically to me and pleaded for my forgiveness, stating that they had nothing to do with it. I accept their statements, because no officer has had anything to do with it.

I believe some people in my district will try to play "silly fellows", but that is more of a reflection on them than it is on me. It is a good thing that I have a keen sense of humour, because I have just found out that the member for Eyre intends to reside in Port Lincoln in the house alongside where I live.

Mr. WELLS (Florey): I state my objections to and disgust about several matters, the first and probably the most important being my contempt and disgust at the action of the Leader of the Opposition in leading an attack on Mr. Liberman of the South Australian Housing Trust.

Dr. Tonkin: No, it was on Mr. Dunstan, the Premier.

Mr. WELLS: This attack was made purely and simply to smear the character of a man who has done much for South Australia and will continue to do so. It was completely unfounded, and I was amazed to hear the Leader say that he had documentary proof that would substantiate his statements. I was willing to hear what the Leader had to say and was also interested in hearing the Premier's rebuttal. It must be acknowledged that the Premier exploded every argument, accusation, smear, and allegation against Mr. Liberman that had been made by the Leader. It was contemptible in this Chamber (or in any Chamber that enjoys privilege) to make statements that are not made outside in order to allow the person spoken about the chance to rebut the charges and take any action he may deem fit in defence of his character. Mr. Liberman cannot come out openly and join a dogfight with the Leader or any other member of Parliament, because of the position he occupies in this State. I was surprised and hurt to hear the Leader make such allegations and attempt to smear the reputation of this man. Before this attempt I did not think the Leader would stoop to such low action, but it is now on the record and nothing can expunge it.

I now refer to the press and media reporting that has occurred and relate it to the statements made by the Leader. Before the House rose, the second edition of the evening daily newspaper came out with banner headlines carrying the story the Leader had given in this House less than one hour before. Therefore, it seems to me that the story was given to the press before the statements were made here. I suppose that is permissible, if a person is willing to do it.

Every word the Leader said about this matter was published verbatim, but the Premier's rebuttal statement was never printed in the newspaper. The newspaper had banner headlines, a report on the front page and about three quarters of page 18 covered the Leader's remarks, with the report finishing "Proceeding". However, there was no full report of the Premier's rebuttal of those statements in his defence of Mr. Liberman. Many people (and the Leader should be included in that group) are willing to make statements to get the publicity, even if they are wrong. They abide by the edict that any publicity is good publicity. I believe in a fair go for everyone. The media was at fault in not publishing the full story as it unfolded in the House. I refer also to the biased media reporting during the recent Commonwealth election. Generally, the media acted in a despicable manner, which perhaps we could expect it to adopt because of its political leanings and hatred of a socialist Labor Government. Every branch of the media, wherever I read, heard, or viewed it, was violently anti-Labor and exhibited one-sided reporting.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the *Herald*?

Dr. Tonkin: Did you talk to Ernie about it?

Mr. WELLS: As a matter of fact, I did, but unfortunately our circulation is not as great as the circulation of the Murdoch press, but it should be, because every worker in this State should read the *Herald*.

Mr. Mathwin: Whether they like it or not!

Mr. WELLS: It is not a matter of liking it; they would read it just as I bloody well read the *Advertiser* or the *News*.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must call the honourable member for Florey to order, because that last statement was most unparliamentary.

Mr. WELLS: I accept your ruling and apologise for making the statement, and will jolly well not say it again. However, it remains that the media of this country can no longer (if it ever could) be called impartial. That relates not only to its editorials (because they reflect the policy of the paper) but also to the style of reporting. It was interesting and encouraging to Government members to see that members of the Australian Journalists' Association took industrial action in defence of their right to have their articles published as they were written. Their articles were distorted by additions and deletions. I therefore admire their action in protesting against the attitude of the media. It is no good trying to disguise the fact that the media was biased.

Mr. Venning: What about on previous occasions? I've seen them on your side, too.

Mr. WELLS: I do not know when the honourable member has seen a press or media statement that has favoured the A.L.P., unless it is the "Bunyip Daily" or something like that. Finally, I express my contempt for the Premier of Queensland for his action in assisting the Liberal Party to win the Commonwealth election through a Senate miscarriage of justice.

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

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): It is interesting to note that members on the Government benches are trying unskilfully to turn the public's attention away from the Premier, against whom my Leader's attack was expressed, and towards Mr. Liberman whose background was incidental to the attack on the Premier. I therefore hope that my point will be made clear to everyone. However, that is not the point at issue in my grievance. I am really concerned about a telephone call I received today which followed two or three I received on Sunday and Monday. I was told that the Minister of Agriculture had released news in Adelaide about the Modulock Woods and Forests Department expansion in the South-East. The implication from the news media in the South-East was that it believed it should have been informed much earlier about the development. Neither the Premier nor the Minister had the common decency to inform the media in the South-East at the outset, despite my raising questions seven or eight months ago in the House and having shown considerable interest in the venture.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Do you support it?

Mr. ALLISON: Today I am again asked what is my reaction to a message from Adelaide from the Premier. Because the Premier is in Canberra, I assume it must have been his press secretary acting on his behalf. Apparently the Premier wanted to know what the local member thought about the new project. "Tonkin is a knocker", the Premier says, "and knocks everything in the State". That is a reiteration of what he says in the House. I should like to set the picture straight, because there are various anomalies in the various press releases by the Minister, none of them seemingly official, some of them verbatim and some of them hearsay reports.

What does the Minister really intend the people to know about this venture? We do not know whether the joint venture is profit-making or non-profit-making. We do not know whether it will manufacture housing or housing components, because they have both been referred to. We do not know whether the South Australian-New Zealand venture will involve a considerable cash flow from New Zealand, or whether it is the licence that is put in as the New Zealand share of the venture. There are so many aspects of the venture about which we do not know that I believe the Minister would have been well advised to straighten out those matters before he issued his rather hasty release on Sunday evening.

One anomaly relates to the use of surplus production of timber. I have been told by Woods and Forests Department representatives that there is not a surplus production, but in the past three months there has been a shortage of South-East timber on the market. It seems that timber is being diverted from one sector of the market to another sector. If we are to use timber in South Australia for South Australians, I say more power to the Minister—good for him, because I like to see that sort of approach. However, this is a South Australian-New Zealand venture. South Australian designers are out of work. We have been told very quietly by the Minister that South Australia will produce only 300 houses in the first year of operation—only a drop in the ocean. I have been informed that 300 houses will make the Woods and Forests Department and the Government one of the prime producers of this type of housing in South Australia and that they will be a major competitor against 12 other South Australian companies employing good union labour. It seems that that good union labour is not being considered.

Mr. Keneally: But the market is there.

Mr. ALLISON: I have been told by house producers that the market is difficult because producers are having trouble placing the houses they are making. I should like the Minister to take up the honourable member's point and to reassure South Australian private enterprise that the Woods and Forests Department expansion is not being made at the expense of good, existing South Australian industry. The Minister did not make that clear, but, to set the rest of the State's mind at rest, he should have done. Let us make no mistake about it. I am parochial enough to welcome this sort of development for Mount Gambier because I like to see decentralisation, which is exactly what this is.

If we must have a joint venture, let us consider South Australian industry, too. Is there no South Australian company that would not have availed itself of Government aid for decentralisation, the very aid that was promised to us from the Minister's corner only a few weeks before we broke up for the recess? Is there not a company that would not have availed itself of the Commonwealth Government's aid and could they not have gone into a joint venture with the Government in the South-East if private enterprise is to be involved in this venture? I am strongly in favour of South Australians being given the chance to use South Australian resources for South Australia. This is a question to which the Minister has not replied. Let us not forget that this matter has been under negotiation for more than a year now, so there has been every chance to look around.

Mr. Whitten: Are you saying this is a full South Australian Government venture?

Mr. ALLISON: No. Let us not forget that the Labor Party platform states, "Nationalisation of industry generally". I will not debate that now, because it is in black and white. If the Government is going to nationalise and include some joint venture, let us think of South Australians first. If the Premier is a South Australian, as he told my press in the South-East he is, he should put his venture where his mouth is.

Dr. Tonkin: Many companies in South Australia would be delighted to do it.

Mr. ALLISON: Yes, and I am assured that the finance would be available, too. Regarding the absorption of over-production, there is little chance that there will be any over-production in the South-East. The Deputy Premier assured me during the Budget debate that little additional money was available for land purchase. In fact, I pointed out that the amount was reduced from $450 000 last year to $300 000 this year. In reply to a question, he said, "No, the chances are that the land will not be available in the South-East, less suitable land is available, the price of land is increasing, and probably land will be bought elsewhere in the State." Plantings in the South-East are fairly stable now. They look like having plateaued and staffing seems to have plateaued, so over-production is an unlikely reason. It is a diversion of existing production into another line. I do not mind if money is used in South Australia; I have no criticism there. The main point is that the Government has engaged in a Government and private enterprise venture outside South Australia, and due consideration does not seem to have been given to giving South Australians the opportunity to participate.

Mr. Keneally: Hasn't the Minister talked to you about it?

Mr. ALLISON: The Minister has told me nothing whatever on which I could check. We on this side are most under-informed. People have been inquiring, but there has been no common decency, as there has been no release to the people inquiring or to the press in the South-East. There has been only an off-the-cuff remark made in Adelaide. I think this is bad manners. I am bringing up the matter here, in the proper place, in public, where it should have been aired previously.

Mr. Keneally: Have you spoken to the Minister?

Mr. ALLISON: No. On the last occasion on which I did, he made promises about the abalone divers, and he has not kept those promises. I will speak about that in another grievance debate. In his press release in the South-East the Premier says that Tonkin is a knocker. However, the Leader already has pointed out his reasoning. He is knocking the socialistic approach by the Premier in running this State. The South-East knows all about socialism. Before December 13, many people were scared to commit themselves, and they are commiting themselves now. They are still scared of doing things in this State, because private enterprise has been knocked severely in the past three years and it will continue to be knocked, as we can see from the number of commissions and so on being appointed, with powers to enforce. No-one in the Liberal Party is knocking South Australia. We are knocking the socialist serve that we are getting in South Australia, the socialist version of government.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What do you mean by socialism?

Mr. ALLISON: Karl Marx, when deciding whether to call it the communist manifesto or the socialist manifesto, tossed a coin and decided on the former because socialism was a midle-class belief in 1848. Further, Engels, in his preface to the 1888 edition (and I have obtained a copy from the Parliamentary Library), explained that it was just a toss-up whether it was called the communist manifesto or socialist manifesto, but there is another good story in that, and Government members will get that served up in a later grievance debate.

Motion carried.

At 5.25 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 10, at 2 p.m.