

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 11 June 1981

The **SPEAKER (Hon. B. C. Eastick)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: COWELL-ELLISTON MAIN ROAD

A petition signed by 131 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide the necessary funding for the sealing of the Lock-Elliston section of the Cowell-Elliston main road was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

PETITION: SEWER AND STORMWATER DRAINAGE

A petition signed by 164 residents of the Porter Bay sewerage proposal area praying that the House urge the Government to initiate immediate action to install sewer and stormwater drainage to the Porter Bay area of Port Lincoln was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

QUESTION

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the written answer to a question which I now table be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

SPEECH THERAPISTS

1157. Mr **HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many speech therapists are employed by the Government and how many are employed in each department?

2. Has there been an increase or decline in each department during 1980 and, if so, what was the respective percentage?

3. What funding was allocated to each department during the 1980-1981 financial year and what was the percentage increase or decrease on the 1979-1980 financial year?

The **Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON**: The replies are as follows:

1. South Australian Health Commission 20.5 (full-time equivalent) and Education Department 19.

2. South Australian Health Commission: During 1980 there was a slight increase in the numbers employed following the creation of a new position of 0.2 full-time equivalent (or two sessions). This represents an increase of some 1 per cent on staffing levels at the beginning of 1980.

Education Department: During 1980 the number of speech therapists employed by the Education Department increased from 14 at 1 January 1980 to 19 at 31 December 1980, a 35 per cent increase.

3. Funds for speech pathology are not specifically identified by the Education Department or the South Australian Health Commission in their budgets.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: RAILWAYS AGREEMENT

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: There has been considerable publicity following release of the Grants Commission Report on State Tax-sharing Entitlements regarding the moneys paid, and to be paid, to South Australia as consideration for transfer of South Australia's non-metropolitan rail services to the Commonwealth. In view of conflicting statements from different sources it is necessary that certain facts, indisputable facts, be placed on the record.

The first point is that the Labor Governments of the Commonwealth and South Australia agreed, in 1975, that several distinct components should constitute the aggregate of moneys to be paid to the State. One of these components was the amount of \$10 000 000, which was the price paid for certain assets and minerals on railway land. This amount of \$10 000 000, which was a once-only payment, is the same amount and the only amount specified in the schedule to the Railways (Transfer Agreement) Act, 1975.

The most important component, however, was a sum of \$25 000 000, which was to be built into the 'base' used to calculate financial assistance grants in 1975-1976 and in future years. This sum, adjusted annually to accord with current value, has been included in South Australia's annual taxation reimbursements in each year since the transfer. At present, the base adjustment stands at almost \$60 000 000.

I must inform the House, however, that the South Australian Government of the day did not sign a formal agreement with the Commonwealth to ensure that its receipt of \$25 000 000, adjusted annually, would be guaranteed in perpetuity, or even for a specified term of years. It is a fact that the then Prime Minister advised against incorporation of this guarantee in the formal agreement signed by the Governments. That advice is contained in a letter to the Premier of South Australia, dated 21 May 1975, wherein the Prime Minister states:

We have taken the view that it would be neither necessary nor appropriate for the other details of the financial adjustments to be included in the agreement.

Mr **McRae**: Because the State was to rely—

The **Hon. J. D. Corcoran**: It was not necessary—

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: Events indicate the necessity for drawing up enforceable contracts. It is also a fact that the South Australian—

The **Hon. J. D. Wright**: It's your own fault, and you know it.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The House has given leave to the Deputy Premier. Assistance from either side of the House is not required.

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: It is also a fact that the South Australian Government of the day acceded to this advice, for it proceeded to dispose of the railways without insisting upon a formal agreement detailing the Commonwealth's complete financial obligations.

The **Hon. H. Allison**: Unbelievable!

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: It is unbelievable. Let me be plain. The Dunstan Government sold the country railways without any legal protection for the taxpayers of the State. According to the terms of the agreement signed by Premier Dunstan, the Commonwealth was obliged to pay no more than \$10 000 000 for the entire non-metropolitan rail system. Instead, the State

Government of the day left it entirely to the Commonwealth to honour, by passing appropriate legislation, what was nothing more than a gentleman's agreement.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If members opposite make any contract in the business world, and do not get it signed, sealed and delivered, they would be judged fools. It is now common knowledge that the Commonwealth's undertaking in this matter was not honoured by the Whitlam Government in the terms agreed privately between the two Leaders. That is, the Commonwealth's appropriation legislation did not specify the perpetual nature of the obligation, and neither was the full financial arrangement placed before the Commonwealth Parliament for ratification. The factual situation, in short, is that the State Labor Government committed an extraordinary financial blunder which left South Australia without its country railways and without guaranteed compensation of the amounts promised by the then Premier, reminiscent of the gas contracts.

I remind the House that it was Mr Dunstan who assured this House on 6 August 1975 that payments to South Australia would amount to \$600 000 000 over 10 years. Indeed, he went further. He said (at page 77 of *Hansard*):

There is the sum of \$600 000 000 over the next 10 years alone, and it will escalate constantly thereafter.

Well, the fact is that payments to date have amounted to \$260 000 000, and if the recommendation of the Grants Commission is accepted, then further payments to South Australia will be terminated. The Grants Commission has come to that conclusion, one senses reluctantly from a reading of the report, for the simple reason that there is no formal and binding agreement between the Commonwealth and the State which makes reference to the State's continuing entitlements. The Commission's Report states in paragraph 7.19 that:

The Commission considered that it would have been proper for it to calculate relativities so as to give South Australia and Tasmania these continuing benefits only if there had been a decision to that effect of the Commonwealth and State Governments clearly conveyed to the Commission either in the States (Personal Income Tax Sharing) Act or in some other way.

Nothing could be clearer. There was no agreement made to embrace all aspects of the financial deal and therefore no long-term protection was given to South Australia's interests by the former Government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Obviously, members opposite do not like it because their naivety and lack of economic expertise are plainly exposed. Finally, let me dispel suggestions which have arisen today that the proposed reduction in South Australia's tax entitlement is not related to the rail agreement, but rather to the State's withdrawal from claimancy before the Grants Commission. Let me point out to the Leader the two fallacies of that claim. First, although Premier Dunstan's private agreement with the Prime Minister made reference to South Australia's withdrawal from claimancy in normal circumstances, that offer was contained in the same document as the details of the transfer agreement.

That was the document, I remind the Leader, which was not included in the agreement to come before this House or the Commonwealth Parliament, and therefore has no force in law. That is the considered legal view of the position. Secondly, there was in any case in that private agreement a caveat which ensures that South Australia could reapply to the Grants Commission as a claimant State. Let me quote again.

If, in the opinion of the State Government, the State's financial position relative to other States justifies a submission.

It is nonsense, therefore, to suggest that the recommendations of the Grants Commission are related in any way to South Australia's status as a claimant State. I must conclude by informing the House that the Premier has today flown to Canberra for urgent talks—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Are members opposite suggesting that the Premier should not go to Canberra to press the claims of the State?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Are members opposite suggesting that the matter is not of such urgency that the Premier should go to Canberra? The Premier has today flown to Canberra for urgent talks with the Prime Minister on this grave issue.

Mr Hamilton: More grandstanding.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the honourable member wants to take the matter lightly, so be it. If members opposite had shown more plain common sense in their economic negotiations, we would not face the major problems that we do in Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier has sought leave and has been granted leave, and I ask honourable members to hear him in silence.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Premier will be putting to Mr Fraser the documentary evidence of the private agreement made between Mr Dunstan and Mr Whitlam. Although we recognise, as does the Commonwealth and the Grants Commission, that this private agreement may not be binding in law, the Premier will be urging the Commonwealth to honour the spirit of the undertaking.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: FORESTRY INDUSTRY

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: In this Chamber last week during the debate on the Appropriation Bill, the member for Peake showed commendable interest in the affairs of the Woods and Forests Department, and in particular the welfare of certain employees.

This gained him some publicity in the country edition of the last issue of the *Sunday Mail*. His interest in the forestry industry is in startling contrast to the lack of interest in either forestry or agriculture shown by the other members opposite. However, the member for Peake let his enthusiasm for a subject virtually untouched by his colleagues run away with him. He and articles appearing in the *Sunday Mail* and the *Border Watch*, which is circulated in the South-East, involving some very wild allegations, showed considerable confusion about the functions of the Woods and Forests Department.

These allegations were:

- (a) That the South Australian Government is letting the forestry industry run down, and State plants would be closed down in a few years despite good profits;
- (b) That the forests, themselves, are being allowed to run down;

- (c) That the Government was not replacing weekly-paid workers in the Woods and Forests Department, and was encouraging workers to resign;
- (d) That the number of skilled tradespersons employed had been allowed to drop to a level which impaired the efficiency of the department's operations.

I therefore make this statement today to clarify the situation, and I do so with some pride. I wish to inform the House of the true position based not on assumptions but on departmental records and fact. First, as to the allegations that the Government is letting the State forestry enterprises run down, the honourable member really does show an amazing lack of knowledge of the situation in that region. The sales of the department show a very healthy growth, hardly indicative of a run-down industry.

For instance, in 1978-1979, the end of which year we came into office, the sale of forest produce was \$12 670 000, but in 1980-1981 it had grown not marginally but by 30 per cent to \$16 100 000.

The sales of the commercial division of the department in the same two periods were \$25 330 000 in 1978-1979 and \$31 630 000 in 1980-1981, an increase in that division of the department of 25 per cent. All this is happening in a State enterprise which the member for Peake alleges the Government is running down. I am sure every company in South Australia would like to be running in the same direction, as indeed is the Woods and Forests Department in this State. The honourable member will be pleased to know that we also expect an improvement on last year's operating profit of \$8 000 000. The predicted result for 1980-1981 is an operating profit of \$9 480 000. These figures reflect a very respectable commercial increase on the operating profit of 1978-1979 which was \$5 700 000. In fact, the figures for 1978-1979, compared with those of 1980-1981, are very revealing when it is appreciated that we are comparing the last full trading year of the department under the previous Government with the first full trading year under this Government.

Similarly the contributions to Consolidated Revenue have substantially increased over this period. In 1978-1979, the department paid \$2 800 000 to the General Revenue fund of the State, compared with \$9 000 000 in 1980-1981.

To set the honourable member's mind further at rest, I can tell him that the department soon expects to be self-funding for capital expenditure, so no longer will it need to draw on Loan funds, as it has done for a long distant past. These figures, plus the continued investment in plant at Mount Gambier, Mount Burr and Nangwarry, and the active replanting of the Caroline Forest, which was devastated by fire, demonstrate that this Government, far from running the industry down, is actively involved in strengthening the ability of the Woods and Forests Department to fulfil its charter and is also contributing substantially to the economy of the whole South-East region, and, indeed, the whole economy of South Australia. In this respect, since the Government took office, work has started on a new plywood factory in the South-East, using logs from the department's forests, and we are proceeding with our negotiations with Australian Paper Manufacturers Limited to establish a thermo-mechanical pulp mill at Snuggery. Indeed, it will not be a contract of the loose nature that we inherited from the previous Government.

Regarding the allegation that this Government is letting the forests themselves run down, let us once again look at facts. The forests are, in fact, producing more. In 1978-

1979, log production was 803 000 cubic metres, while in 1980-1981 it reached 836 000 cubic metres. More is being spent on fertilisers to encourage production. I can give one example to demonstrate our encouragement for greater production in that respect. In 1978-1979, \$358 000 was spent on fertilisers. In 1980-1981, the figure had reached \$640 000. Yet the honourable member would have the House believe, as indeed he set out to do during the debate last week, that this Government is trying to run down its forests. I turn now to the matter of employment levels, a matter on which the member for Peake concentrated at some length.

Mr Langley: When will we get to Question Time?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I can say that there have been no retrenchments whatsoever—

Mr Plunkett: Because of the run-down—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:—within the Woods and Forests Department, nor for that matter within the Department of Agriculture, I hasten to add. Nor is there a policy to reduce numbers in either of those departments below the required effective management levels. The Government has not refused a call from the department to replace any weekly paid staff.

In fact, the approval of every submission involving the replacement of weekly paid staff has been consistent with the applications submitted. These submissions have been attended to expeditiously, in line with our Government's policy, and in line with our Government's recognition of a productive department and the policy that vacancies in the weekly paid force of a department first be offered to other weekly paid employees of the State before engaging people from outside the public sector. In any event, the stipulation concerning the need for prior Cabinet approval (which was another matter raised) to fill vacancies came into effect only on 7 May, and the reports that I am answering on this occasion in this statement were made four weeks after 7 May, so the wild allegation that the problem has existed for eight weeks is demonstrated by that fact.

Mr Plunkett: Why do they have to work seven days a week—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The Government's investment in the Woods and Forests Department, the productivity of forests, and the level of employment all point to the buoyancy of the timber industry in the South East. The honourable member has absolutely no foundation for any of the allegations that he made in this respect during the debate last week. The Woods and Forests Department, under a Liberal Government, I am again proud to say, will continue to play a significant role in the growing and milling of timber from the South-East and from other parts of South Australia.

The honourable member further alleged that the department was in such a parlous state that 19 people had retrenched themselves since Christmas. With his experience, or his claimed experience, of the forestry industry, he must know that this turnover is not excessive and, when one relates that figure to the some 1 300 we employ overall in that department, it is indeed quite minimal. In fact, it is consistent with the industry pattern, particularly as Sapfor, another organisation that he referred to, has recently introduced a second shift which has provided an additional source of employment for mill workers.

The honourable member then talked about a free bus being run from Casterton, in Victoria, to attract workers to the South Australian industry. Rather than being something to be condemned, I suggest to the honourable

member that this surely highlights the buoyancy of employment in this forestry industry, when an employer has to offer such incentives as those cited. On the matter of apprentices, the department currently employs (and I am not sure whether he is with it this time) 50 apprentices, of whom 18 commenced their apprenticeship this year.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Why don't you write the member a letter?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Mathwin: He can't read.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have frequently called for order without drawing to the attention of the House the activities of any honourable member. On this occasion, I point out to the House that the contributions recently made by the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the honourable member for Glenelg were unnecessary and will be tolerated no further.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Finally, regarding the allegations of reductions of tradesmen in the department, the honourable member should have done his homework on this subject also, and not relied on apparently relayed gossip. The reduction in the employment of trades people since 1980 in the Mount Gambier region has been six, including four apprentices who have completed their training—not 20 in just one area, as the honourable member alleged. With his knowledge of the industry, or his professed knowledge of the forestry industry, he should have been well aware that this actual reduction of two adult tradesmen was not unexpected, because the trade force, as is normal in any industry, was built up, and deliberately built up, during the construction phase of the new mill at Mount Gambier. When that \$8 000 000 mill was completed in mid-1980, the normal process of attrition reduced the number of trades people to, as I have indicated earlier, the efficient operating level required by this department if it is to remain healthy, conducive to its employees, and productive, as in fact is its role as far as this Government is concerned.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Education (Hon. H. Allison):

Pursuant to Statute—

1. Salisbury College of Advanced Education—Report, 1979. Ordered to be printed (Paper No. 107).

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. M. M. Wilson):

Pursuant to Statute—

1. Third Party Premiums Committee—Report, 1981. Ordered to be printed (Paper No. 199c).

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: RAILCAR FIRE

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: A fire occurred in the last car of a train travelling from Gawler to Adelaide due to arrive at Adelaide at 8.23 a.m. today. I have ordered a complete inquiry into the incident and my initial information is that no-one was injured. The train was observed to be on fire between North Adelaide and Adelaide stations and the train was brought to a halt by the crew, and passengers were evacuated from the danger area. The crew, with assistance from passengers, attacked the fire with fire extinguishers carried on the train. A total of six large dry powder type extinguishers was exhausted on the flames. Assistance was also sought from the Fire Brigade.

The burning car was separated from the remainder of the train to isolate the fire. Train crew was successful in shutting down the engines of the burning rail car and extinguishing the flames. When considered safe, the damaged railcar was recoupled to its train and the train proceeded to Adelaide railway station. The delay to the train was 34 minutes; six following trains were also delayed, and four departing trains were delayed. Approximately 1 150 passengers would have been affected.

Inspection of the railcar indicates that a mechanical failure occurred in a component underneath the railcar. This permitted sufficient heat build up to cause ignition of fuel or to burn fuel lines. Precise details of the cause of the failure will not be known until components are stripped down and examined in detail. This is expected to take some days.

It is clear that, once the fire was detected, the crew of the train acted promptly to protect passengers in this emergency. As statements are being taken from the crew, they are being commended on their performance in this emergency.

QUESTION TIME

RAILWAYS AGREEMENT

Mr BANNON: How does the Deputy Premier justify the Premier's shabby and misleading claim yesterday and repeated in a Ministerial statement today that South Australia could lose \$60 000 000 under the railways agreement because the \$25 000 000 special grant which was built into the tax formula in 1975, and which is this year worth \$60 000 000, was never the subject of a formal agreement between Governments? The Premier's claim yesterday is totally inconsistent with statements on page 117 of volume 1 of his official February 1980 submission to the Commonwealth Grants Commission for the review of relativities. There, the Premier said that, as escalated, the \$25 000 000 to be paid because South Australia would no longer be a claimant State, 'will as a matter of course be taken into account by the Grants Commission in comparing the extent to which South Australia's needs are being met by its current share of personal income tax collections'. He did not argue to the contrary. Further, on page 289 of volume 1 of the Grants Commission Report on tax-sharing entitlements, it is stated:

Special budgetary assistance received by the two States (South Australia and Tasmania) as part of the railways agreements was recognised by all parties concerned as falling outside the fiscal equalisation guidelines.

Further, from page 289, it is clear, rather, that amounts paid as the result of ending special grants to Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania are in danger. Clearly, only Tasmania, of the three States, tried to defend its position in respect of the buy-out sum for ending receipts of special grants. The report identifies a claim by Tasmania that \$4 000 000 of the \$15 000 000 then granted would be claimed as being outside that agreement. The three States which lose as a result of the Grants Commission's review are those States which formerly received special grants and which were paid various sums to cease applying for special grants. The prospective losses have little to do with the railways agreement, in view of the fact that, for instance, Western Australia could lose a substantial sum but still operates its own railways system. Then there is the evidence of those two other documents, the Premier's statement and the Grants Commission Report.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The reason that the Premier makes the claim that I reiterated today is that it is perfectly true that the former Government did not incorporate legally in documents the agreement which former Premier Dunstan and Prime Minister Whitlam had agreed. When the Premier made his submission, there was no contemplation of the removal of those financial arrangements for South Australia. It is a cardinal and elementary principle of normal sane business practice that, if one wishes to write a contract and have the contract stick, it is made legally binding by way of documentation. I would have thought it would be particularly so when claims were being made before the South Australian public that there was a railways agreement which was going to mean about \$600 000 000 to \$800 000 000 to those people. That was not even sewn up legally.

It is all very well to talk about gentleman's agreements, but that is not the way things operate.

The Hon. Peter Duncan interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I suggest that if the member for Elizabeth was buying a house, for instance, he would not go along and say, 'Okay, we have agreed. We've got a gentleman's agreement. I will pay for the house over 10 years. It will mean \$60 000 to you over that time,' and leave it at that. That is not the way the real world operates, nor is it the way it operates in relation to agreements between States or between States and the Commonwealth.

The plain facts are (and I repeat them for the Leader's benefit; nothing could be clearer) that there was no legal binding agreement made to embrace all aspects of the financial deal. Therefore, no long-term protection was given to South Australian interests by the former Government. If the then Premier wished to see that the South Australian public were to gain \$600 000 000 to \$800 000 000 over 10 years, it would not have been difficult, with the legal advice available, to insist that that be written into documents. No such insistence was made and the Opposition cannot escape that fact.

Mr Bannon: It is irrelevant.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is not irrelevant. I cannot understand what the Leader of the Opposition is talking about. On the one hand, the Labor Government claimed that there was a financial deal which was going to mean about \$600 000 000 to \$800 000 000 over 10 years, and about \$60 000 000 a year continuing to South Australia. That could have been sewn up legally, but it was not, because the then Prime Minister said, 'I do not think it is appropriate to sew it up.'

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Who's breaking the agreement?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Now we are going back to the gentleman's agreement, to the point I made earlier that, even when one buys a house, one does not have a gentleman's agreement, let alone when \$800 000 000 is being negotiated for the State.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Fraser is breaking it, is he?

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Earlier I indicated that the activities of the honourable Deputy Leader and the honourable member for Glenelg were against the best interests of the conduct of the House. I now warn the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the member for Glenelg.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The facts are plain. What happened was, on the word of then Prime Minister Whitlam, that it was not necessary. Any prudent State Treasurer would have believed it was essential that the financial arrangements be set in concrete as best they could by legally binding agreements. I repeat that the Government of the day did not sign a formal agreement

with the Commonwealth to ensure that its receipt of \$25 000 000 adjusted annually would be guaranteed in perpetuity or even for a specified number of years. We have gained \$260 000 000 thus far, and there is no legal agreement that says we should gain more. Let the public judge as to the acumen or lack thereof of economic expertise of the former Premier and the former Government.

PRISON OFFICERS DISPUTE

Mr MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Industrial Affairs give details of the manning levels at Yatala Labour Prison and Adelaide Gaol, a matter that is apparently at the heart of the current industrial dispute?

Mr O'Neill: Why doesn't the Chief Secretary answer?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I would be delighted to give details of the manning aspects of that dispute. Being an industrial dispute, the matter comes under the Public Service Board, which is the employer. The Public Service Board, as members opposite should realise, even though they are rather green behind the ears at times, comes under me as the Minister of Industrial Affairs. I stress to the House that the basis of the current dispute that has now been proceeding for 12 or 13 days is manning levels at Yatala Labour Prison and Adelaide Gaol. It is pertinent that I relate specific details of the present manning levels; what they were prior to the introduction of surveillance equipment; and what they were prior to the escape of Tognolini.

Prior to the escape of Tognolini last year, manning at Yatala Labour Prison on the first watch was 10 correctional officers, and eight correctional officers on the second watch. At Adelaide Gaol, the manning levels were five correctional officers on the first watch and five correctional officers on the second watch. The total, including the two institutions and the first and second watches, was 28 prison officers. After the Tognolini escape, when it was believed that security needed to be stepped up prior to the installation of surveillance equipment, which was a very important part of the increased security, on a temporary basis those manning levels were increased to, at Yatala Labour Prison, 13 correctional officers on the first watch and 13 correctional officers on the second watch; at Adelaide Gaol, there were seven correctional officers on the first watch and seven correctional officers on the second watch, making a total of 40.

The understanding was always that, once the surveillance equipment was introduced, a reassessment of staffing levels would take place. The department purchased about \$1 000 000 worth of surveillance equipment through the tender procedure and installed it at Yatala Labour Prison. After the introduction of that surveillance equipment, based on the recommendations of the Touche Ross Report and our own assessment of manning within prisons, it was obvious that it was necessary to appoint chief supervisors so that there would be permanent supervisors, rather than the previous arrangement of a supervisor rotating among the ordinary prison officers. That recommendation was made by the people who considered the security aspect at the time of the Tognolini escape.

After the introduction of surveillance equipment, the manning levels were, at Yatala Labour Prison, 10 correctional officers and two chiefs on the first watch. We included two chiefs as the permanent supervisors. Prior to that, no chiefs were on duty; one officer was upgraded for the day to the level of supervisor. There were 10 correctional officers and two chiefs on the second watch.

At Adelaide Gaol, on the first watch there were six correctional officers and two grade one chiefs, and on the second watch there were six correctional officers and two grade one chiefs, making a total staff, after the introduction of the surveillance equipment, of 40 people.

I shall now make a comparison of total manning levels prior to Tognolini, immediately after Tognolini, and after the introduction of the surveillance equipment. Before Tognolini there were 28, which was what operated under the previous Labor Government in this State—28 officers on the first and second watches of those two institutions. Immediately post-Tognolini the Government increased the number to 40, and immediately after the introduction of the surveillance equipment, and on the new manning levels which are currently in implementation and which the dispute is about the level was still 40.

So, overall there has been no reduction in manning levels whatsoever. In fact, there has been a significant increase in the manning levels from 28 up to 40. I put those facts to the House because they are very pertinent in understanding or trying to understand what the present dispute is about.

I stress one other point: not only is the manning level now exactly the same as it was before the introduction of the surveillance equipment in terms of total numbers (and a significant increase of some 12, which was almost a 50 per cent increase compared to what it was under the previous Government), but the actual grade or standard of officers involved has been upgraded so that we have two chiefs on every watch at both institutions using the surveillance equipment. There has been a long-standing discussion and negotiation on this dispute with the Public Service Association and the union. I think members should be aware that the chiefs come under the P.S.A., whereas the prison officers come under the Federated Miscellaneous Workers Union, A.G.W.A. Branch.

I hope that the dispute is not about the fact that there has been the chance for a different union to take two of the positions compared to the union involved in the present dispute. I do not think that is the case, and I hope it is not. If it was (and the matter has recently been raised in the Industrial Commission on that basis—it was not the original basis of the dispute, but it has been the recent basis of the argument in the industrial dispute), I believe that is a shabby reflection on the union involved.

Mr Keneally: He knows it is not.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I would hope it was not. I simply mention that because that is the argument currently being used in the Industrial Commission. The honourable member opposite, who has made one or two announcements, obviously without knowing what the facts were, or ignoring the facts, should be aware of that fact, namely, what the argument has been in the Industrial Commission. I have related to the House (and those figures cannot be disputed) that there has been no reduction in overall manning levels and that there has been a significant increase in manning levels compared to the situation just over 12 months ago, and also we have upgraded the classification of officers involved. Therefore, I fail to see what the dispute is all about, especially in view of the fact that the surveillance equipment has been purchased in addition to what was there before.

As I understand it, the original cause of the dispute was that the prison officers involved went to the Industrial Commission because they believed that a safety factor was involved, which is the basis on which any union can quite legitimately take a case to the Industrial Commission. The Industrial Commission under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act has no authority to arbitrate on a manning aspect unless safety is involved, so they took it to

the commission on the safety issue. I ask members of this House and the people involved in that dispute to reason the argument on the following basis: how can the Industrial Commissioner make an assessment of the safety factors unless the men return to work on the proposed manning levels, so that he can make an assessment whether or not a safety factor is involved? It is my plea to the men involved and to the unions involved to stop the senseless dispute and go back on the new manning levels, that is, the manning levels we have proposed with the new surveillance equipment, which are a significant increase on those which applied 12 months ago and which are certainly no reduction on what they were even prior to the surveillance equipment being introduced.

Let the officers go back to work and see whether there is a safety factor involved in the prisons dispute in relation to manning levels. Otherwise—and rightly so—the Industrial Commissioner can make no reasonable judgment of the issues involved and the basis of why this dispute has gone to the Industrial Commission. I should like to read a statement made by the Industrial Commissioner involved. I quote from page 8 of the transcript of 22 May 1981, as follows:

I specifically repeat what I said in the conference—

Mr Keneally: Read what he said last Friday.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: This is the statement:

I will simply repeat what I said in the conference, that I would like the opportunity to see both institutions operating under the new system so that (1) I can see the new system in operation, and (2) that it provides the correctional officers with an opportunity to point to all the faults as they see it in the system.

I simply might add that now that the matter is before the commission any imposition of bans or limitations or industrial action taken will immediately bring the commission hearings to a halt. It will only serve to delay the final resolution of the matter as far as the union members are concerned.

That was the statement of the Commissioner who is hearing the dispute. I reiterate and repeat the request to the men involved to go back to work so that we can, through the Industrial Commission, the normal channels, resolve this dispute. Members opposite frequently say that all industrial disputes should be resolved through the Industrial Commission, using the normal arbitration processes, and that is what the Government wants in this case.

PRISONS SECURITY

Mr KENEALLY: Will the Chief Secretary say how he is able to assure the public of South Australia that the prisons are secure when, due to his Government's incompetence, 350 prison officers have been on strike? On Tuesday, I questioned the Chief Secretary on prison security. I quoted manning figures where less than one-third of the normal staff were on duty maintaining security, supposedly; where surveillance equipment had broken down—and evidence of that is clear; where there had been attempted escapes; and where administrative staff, including a 19-year old man and two Deputy Directors of the Department of Correctional Services, were pressed into service at the prisons, acting as warders, and so on. The Chief Secretary undertook to urgently investigate the charges I made. I now ask the Chief Secretary whether he is able to say what information he can give on the charges that I made on Tuesday.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I am pleased that the honourable member used the term 'charges', because I am

able to inform him that today, as applied yesterday, 54 trained custodial officers are on duty at Yatala Labour Prison.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: At Adelaide Gaol there are 18 staff on duty. I think the honourable member said there were only nine. In reply to the question about the 360 people who are on strike, I point out that the Government has the responsibility to see to it that the prisons are safe and properly manned, and that is what is happening. It is all very well for the honourable member to introduce red herrings, as he did on Tuesday and as he is trying to do today, to say that the public is at risk.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Is that a red herring?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Every step is being taken—the member for Elizabeth is an expert on red herrings and on stinking fish.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: A security problem—that is a red herring?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Let me inform the honourable member that these figures are supplied by the Department of Correctional Services. I have been to both institutions and, despite the claims that have been made, they are running very well. I do not want to repeat the claims made by honourable members, because many problems can be caused by doing so, and it is not in the interests of safety. Let me assure the acting shadow Chief Secretary that every step is being taken to maintain security, and I give full credit to the officers who are working around the clock to see to it that during the dispute referred to by the Minister of Industrial Affairs the security of our prisons is maintained. Despite pressure put on them, some prison officers in country institutions have returned to work. That puts paid to the words the shadow Chief Secretary is trying to put into my mouth.

WATER SUPPLY

Mr SCHMIDT: Can the Minister of Water Resources say what action the Government is currently taking in an endeavour to restrict the issuing of further irrigation diversion licences in New South Wales? It is no secret that the South Australian Government is concerned about the quality and quantity of water this State receives from the Eastern States river systems and the water that flows into our Murray system, from which we draw our water. The quality of water in the metropolitan area is of great concern, and I know that is especially so in my own district.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: Since the Government came into office 18 months ago it has vigorously opposed all further irrigation diversion licence applications in New South Wales.

Mr Keneally: What about in Victoria?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: Let me say quite clearly that the South Australian Government would be just as critical of the Victorian Government if it was issuing further irrigation licences.

Mr Keneally: What about the Shepparton scheme?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: At this stage no further irrigation diversion licences have been issued in Victoria. Consideration is being given to further allocations in Victoria, and if that Government allocates or moves to allocate further irrigation diversion licences this Government will be just as critical of Victoria as it is of New South Wales. It is interesting to note that since the Government has been opposing irrigation diversion licences in New South Wales the number of licences issued has been reduced.

Mr Keneally: Now, that's not true.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Stuart has had the opportunity to ask a question.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: It has been successful to the extent that the New South Wales Government has gone to the extent of legislating to block South Australia from being able to lodge objections to irrigation diversion. This has had two benefits to South Australia. First, it has dramatically reduced the rate of allocation of irrigation diversion licences in New South Wales and, secondly, it has highlighted to the Australian people at large the issue and just how grave that issue is. When I was in the Northern Territory and Western Australia recently, it was a topical subject. Wherever the Director-General and I went in those two States we were asked what progress had been made towards resolving the problems of the Murray River and to control the use of the waters therefrom.

The current action being taken by the South Australian Government is to initiate court action in the Land and Environment Court in Sydney under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, to which very little consideration has been given by New South Wales in the issuing of further irrigation diversion licences. It has been readily stated by persons giving evidence in the Land Board hearings and before the Land and Environment Court in Sydney that New South Wales has not carried out any studies as to the effects on downstream users of the issuing of further irrigation diversion licences. We believe that this is completely in contravention of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, and the Government is currently initiating action in the Land and Environment Court in Sydney to this effect. I am delighted to hear that the Opposition and the member for Stuart are supporting that action.

We believe that it will be fundamental, but ultimately it cannot be resolved between the States. The Federal Government will have to take an initiating role to resolve this overall problem. As I said, I am delighted to see that the member for Stuart supports the South Australian Government in the action taken, unlike his action last week when he quite forcibly supported the contention of New South Wales that it contributes only 8 per cent of the salt load entering South Australia.

During his speech to this House, the member for Stuart indicated that the salt load contribution from the Murrumbidgee and Darling Rivers was not taken into account when considering the total contribution by New South Wales to the salt load in the total river scene. The Darling and Murrumbidgee Rivers are very much part of New South Wales. South Australia is most concerned about the total salinity load entering the State. If the member for Stuart is not concerned about the total salinity load entering the State, for goodness sake let him stand up and say so. When looking at the total salinity load entering South Australia, it is clearly made up of 250 000 tonnes of groundwater inflow from both Victoria and New South Wales, 250 000 tonnes of drainage inflow, and tributary inflows of some 600 000 tonnes, totalling 1 100 000 tonnes, on average, crossing the border into South Australia. Engineers have little argument with those figures, which concern us in South Australia.

The member for Stuart has said that one does not take into account the Darling flow because that comes under the control of the River Murray Commission. If that analogy were applied here, South Australia does not contribute any salt load, because the total river is under the control of and regulated by the River Murray Commission. That is absolutely absurd. I readily accept that South Australia contributes some 500 000 tonnes of salt annually into the stream here. I also recognise, as

should the member for Stuart, that we divert some 300 000 tonnes, leaving a net contribution of 200 000 tonnes in South Australia. The reality is that the total salt load, not net salt load, contributed by the three States is as follows: New South Wales, 33 per cent; Victoria, 28 per cent; and South Australia, 39 per cent. That is what we have to come to grips with.

The only objection South Australia has about New South Wales is that it is not prepared to impose a total moratorium, as has been imposed here all through the previous Government's term of office, recognising the problem with which we are confronted. If New South Wales is prepared to impose the moratorium now until the salinity models have been developed, of which New South Wales admits it has none and does not know the effects of further irrigation development in the tributaries, that is all South Australia asks. We will be just as critical of Victoria if that State proceeds with further irrigation diversions.

STORM WARNING

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I direct a question to the Deputy Premier: obviously, I would have directed my question to the Premier had he not been pulling another stunt.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will come to the point of his question.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Who was responsible for the bungling that occurred during the so-called storm crisis on Monday last week, and what action does the Government intend to take to ensure that those circumstances do not occur again? The Deputy Premier will be aware that last Saturday's *Advertiser* chronicled the confusion that occurred on that Monday. The *Advertiser* reported that the Premier and the State Emergency Service did not even have the silent numbers of the weather bureau, whose public lines were jammed. One can understand why those lines were jammed. Vital, up-to-date information could not be obtained immediately, and the *Advertiser* reported that the Premier's Department had to send a man in a van to find out what was happening.

The Police Department was reported in that paper as saying that it was not prepared to become involved in any in-fighting between Government departments. One can also understand that. I understand that, on Rex Jory's advice (the name of Rex Jory seems to be coming up a lot these days), the Premier invited the media to film him during operations to enhance his image as a man of action. The Government may consider delegating the Premier's State emergency powers to the Chief Secretary so that we can be assured of decisive action in that area in a crisis, because grandstanding and the Premier's public relations were—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader sought leave to explain his question. He is now persistently commenting. I will have to ask the Deputy Leader to come back to the point of his question, or I will withdraw leave.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have finished, Sir.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: In reply to the snide comment that the Premier is pulling a stunt, I can only say that that comment indicates the importance that the Opposition attaches to the monumental mistake that was made by the former Premier in relation to the railways deal. The present Premier has gone to Canberra to try to untangle what will be a disastrous situation for South Australia if it eventuates. So much for the snide comments of the Deputy Leader. The Opposition loves to attribute bungling to people, and it loves things to go wrong. The

Opposition is not terribly worried. Oppositions can have all sorts of approaches to their tasks, but unfortunately the present Opposition has chosen a particularly irresponsible approach. On every issue on which the Opposition comments (and this is a case in point), it takes a negative, knocking, gloomy attitude.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I can illustrate that point. 'No boom Bannon' is a case in point. He says that South Australia will have no resources boom; we do not know where to jump on that; and housing and employment are on the way down. All the indicators are that those comments are nonsense. I am not surprised at the tenor of the Deputy Leader's question, which is knocking someone. In this case, he is trying to knock people who were coping with a situation that was of some importance. The Cabinet was sitting on that Monday, the day on which we normally sit. The Cabinet takes longer to get through its Cabinet work than did its predecessor. I do not know how seriously the previous Cabinet considered its task, but I understand that it managed to get through meetings in an hour or so. That shows the scrutiny given to the affairs of State by that Administration!

The Hon. Peter Duncan: We made decisive decisions.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: We know who made the decisions, and we are now reaping the whirlwind resulting from those decisions. The major problems with which this Government is faced in Cabinet and elsewhere are the bungles of the previous Administration. That is why the Premier is in Canberra today. Cabinet was sitting on that Monday and was well apprised on the situation in relation to the storm. We had the first report about mid-morning, when the situation looked fairly grim. Quite frankly, the reports from the weather bureau indicated that we were in for a very serious storm. Thereafter, Cabinet decided on what it should do as the day proceeded.

Reports were sent in from the Police Commissioner, I would say from memory about every half hour. My Ministerial colleagues could corroborate that. The Cabinet meeting was interrupted while we received reports on what was happening. There was no withholding of information and no real difficulty in obtaining information in relation to the storm. The morning reports indicated that Adelaide could be subject to a very severe battering, and we discussed what should be done about it. As the day progressed, however, the reports became a bit more encouraging, particularly the reports for metropolitan Adelaide. The Deputy Leader is a very good prophet of gloom and doom; he is a good Deputy to 'No boom Bannon'. The Government was well aware of the situation. There was no intermission in the flow of information to the Government, and the people concerned, in particular those who reported to us from the Police Commissioner and the weather bureau, kept us well apprised of the situation.

A.L.P. STATE CONVENTION

Mr GUNN: Is the Minister of Industrial Affairs aware of the resolutions that were passed by the State A.L.P. Convention, first, to support the campaign for a 35-hour week and, secondly, to introduce a 37½-hour week for all Government employees, and will the Minister indicate the effect that implementing such resolutions would have on the economy of South Australia and the future welfare of its citizens?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I thank the honourable member for his question. I hope the Deputy Leader does

not leave the House because he was one of the members who seconded this motion at the A.L.P. Conference. He was irresponsible enough to second the motion in support of the resolutions at the A.L.P. Conference without understanding the effects that those resolutions could have on the South Australian economy. Since the conference, the Public Service Board has taken out detailed estimates of the cost of introducing across-the-board a 37½-hour week for Government employees.

Mr Bannon: Do you mean they wasted their time doing that?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Yes, they did.

Mr Bannon: You mean that your officers did that exercise? That is scandalous. That is an absolute waste of time.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Industrial Affairs has the floor.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I realise that the exercise was a waste of time from the point of view that the A.L.P. will never be in Government and, therefore, that policy will not be implemented. However, I believe it is important that the Government understands the effects of such an industrial claim being made not only by the Opposition but also by the trade union movement. The cost of the 35-hour week across the board for South Australian Government employees would be between \$45 000 000 and \$50 000 000 a year. Those figures do not include any overtime payment or loading that would have to be paid because of problems in regard to fitting in three shifts to a 24-hour day over 37½ hours a week.

The figures are very conservative, and are equal to two new taxes equivalent to the old land tax. If the A.L.P. was ever to regain Government in this State, it would have to impose two new taxes on the South Australian public, on individuals and small business people, to collect between \$45 000 000 and \$50 000 000. There is no other way in which the Government could find that money, especially if the earlier bungle, which has now been brought to light, in which the previous Government did not sign the legal agreement for the railways money, is also imposed upon this State.

The small business people of this state understand what effects would occur if a 35-hour week were imposed just across the Government sector. To make matters even worse, the irresponsible Labor Party of this State has supported the A.C.T.U. policy for a 35-hour week. No other Party in Australia, whether Liberal or Labor, has been that irresponsible, yet the Labor Opposition Party in this State is prepared to shun any possible consequences to the economy, and has expensively tried to buy votes. If we were to have a 35-hour week for South Australian industry and it was not imposed in other States in Australia, it would destroy the manufacturing base in this State, and there is no doubt about that whatsoever. This State enjoys a cost advantage on wages of 7 per cent to 8 per cent, compared to Melbourne and Sydney.

That is the most important factor in making sure that our manufacturing base is viable and continues to grow, as it is doing under the present Government. As I would like to see this State develop and progress and certainly not suffer from the 20 000 job loss that it suffered under the previous Government, I would make sure that this State maintained that wage advantage compared with other States, because without it we are finished as a manufacturing State. I think everyone realises that; even the more sensible trade union officials realise that. They know that their jobs and the jobs for their members depend on this State's keeping a wage advantage, because some 85 per cent to 90 per cent of all metals manufactured in this State are transported interstate and overseas.

Mr Bannon: At the last election, you claimed that that wage advantage had been completely eradicated.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The circumstances now show that it has reached the point where it is 7 per cent to 8 per cent, and that is an advantage we need to maintain. Other motions were passed at the A.L.P. conference that have similar consequences. I will not go into detail, but I urge members of the public to be aware of the nature of the motions passed, and I refer particularly to the small business people. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition on numerous occasions has stood in this place and tried to espouse the cause of small business people, yet the motions passed at the A.L.P. conference, less than a week ago, would have the most damaging and destroying effect on the small business sector of any Government policy.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Rubbish!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The member for Elizabeth interjects 'Rubbish', I can understand that, because he was the instigator behind quite a few of those motions. He has no regard for the private sector or for free enterprise, as we found from his comments reported from that conference.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: I have regard for the people of South Australia; that is what I am concerned about.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The Government is concerned about jobs in this State and will make sure that the small business sector is prosperous and continues to be the major sector where new employment is created. Currently, we estimate that 75 per cent of all new jobs are created in the small business sector. It is for that reason that I highlight that enormous cost of a 35-hour week just for the Government sector in South Australia. Thankfully, the Labor Party in this State will never be elected to government and have a chance to implement that policy.

HOSPITAL PATIENTS

Mr PLUNKETT: Can the Minister of Health say whether it is a practice of all private hospitals in South Australia to make patients sign an agreement upon entering hospital that they will pay interest on any account that is not fully paid within three months? Does the Minister agree with this practice, which is causing hardship, particularly in workers compensation and accident cases? With your permission, Mr Speaker, and that of the House, I seek leave to explain the question.

The SPEAKER: I would indicate to the honourable member that he should be brief, having regard to the time constraints.

Mr PLUNKETT: I will make it very brief. A constituent of mine received an account from the Wakefield Memorial Hospital, the amount incurred being \$86, which was paid out of workers compensation, but, because it was not paid within three months, he has now been asked to pay a little over \$22 in interest. This person is now unemployed and unable to do that.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I understand that the practice does occur. I am not aware how widespread it is or, indeed, what the Government could do to control it. Quite obviously, privately run hospitals have every right to set their own charges and to make their patients aware of those charges when they attend the hospital. However, I will have the matter investigated, and I shall be pleased to provide the honourable member with any relevant details.

MURRAY RIVER

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to allow the immediate consideration of the following motion:

That in view of the serious threat to the quality of water in the Murray River, River Darling systems reaching South Australia, and in view of the continuing lack of co-operation from the other interested States, New South Wales and Victoria, this House:

1. calls for the urgent establishment of a national authority to control the Murray River and its tributaries whether by agreement between the States and Federal Government or by referendum;
2. as an interim measure, calls for an immediate extension of the powers of the River Murray Commission to include controlling water quality;
3. opposes any upstream development in the States of New South Wales and Victoria which affects the quality and quantity of South Australia's water resources, and calls on the Government to institute whatever legal proceedings whether in the High Court or otherwise which can be taken to safeguard this State's water quality and quantity;
4. calls on the Federal Government to make an immediate vote of funds to implement the proposals of the Maunsell Report for the control of salinity in the Murray River;
5. calls on the Premier to lead an all-Party delegation to meet with the Prime Minister and the Premiers of New South Wales and Victoria to express a united South Australian view and seek appropriate action on this resolution; and
6. requests the Premier to take such action as necessary to organise a publicity campaign in New South Wales and Victoria to draw to the attention of the Governments and people of those States the problem of water quality and quantity in the Murray River and its effects on people and the environment.

This motion is being moved in the aftermath of a quite extraordinary sequence of events in relation to this very important matter. In correspondence previously detailed to this House by the shadow Minister of Water Resources, the member for Stuart, the Premier denied the request made by that member to allow Parliamentary time for this matter to be debated, despite the publicity that had been generated in the press on this issue.

Within three days of the signing of that letter, the Premier on a weekend produced an extraordinary stunt, a stunt which involved his threatening New South Wales with the cutting off of gas supplies if in fact New South Wales did not comply with South Australia's demands over Murray River water quality.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader would fully appreciate that, in speaking to this motion, he is required to indicate the reasons for the suspension of Standing Orders, and not to debate the substance of the motion which he will debate should he get such suspension.

Mr BANNON: I am not speaking to the subject matter, and I will try to comply with your direction, as I understand that situation to be so. I will simply try to put this motion and the reasons for moving it in its context. Yesterday, the Premier made a statement to the press which in fact has been published today under the heading 'Unite and fight for river, says Tonkin.' In this statement, the Premier accused the Opposition of defending the Wran Government in New South Wales, rather than fighting the battle for South Australia over this issue. He made other derogatory remarks about the position of the

Opposition—other quite false remarks, which can be dealt with fully in the debate that will follow. However, that press statement and the events leading up to it precipitated a move by the Opposition yesterday to bring on, as a matter of urgency, a debate on this important issue.

As a result of procedural difficulties, and finally as a result of the Government's attitude, we were refused and denied that opportunity. Last night, in another place, a full debate took place, very much along the lines of what we would require in this place, although, of course, many of the arguments to be adduced here would not have been adduced there.

A full debate took place on a motion very similar in content to the one I now wish to move. That was carried by members in another place against the opposition of members of the Government. That extraordinary event occurred last night. This morning, we on this side were informed by the Government that it was going to request a suspension at the beginning of today's sitting in order to debate the issue of the Murray River water. We found this quite extraordinary in view of the Government's attitude yesterday that the matter was, in its view, not urgent enough or did not warrant the serious attention of the House, and the Government used every possible procedural ploy to prevent our debating it. Today, the Government wants a suspension in order to do so. We rather suspected the Government's motives. Clearly, the debate in another place had influenced its thinking, and clearly the financial issue which had erupted in the press, and the Premier's absence from Parliament—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Leader to come back to the point of the suspension.

Mr BANNON: The salient fact is that the Government was going to seek a suspension to debate this issue. Our response was that indeed we would support such a suspension, provided that it did not cut into the Question Time that was expected today. A number of serious and important issues, such as the prisons dispute and the financial problems, had to be raised in Question Time today, and we requested of the Government that the suspension, for whatever motion was intended, should take place after Question Time. That request was initially refused. However, just prior to the House sitting today, the Opposition was given an indication by the Government that it had changed its mind and that it believed that Question Time should take place.

I am sure that, in this, the Government was influenced by the wishes of members, in particular the member for Flinders and one or two others, who had questions to ask or were interested in the Question Time that was to take place. The Government gave the Opposition to understand that, contrary to the earlier advice, it would not seek an immediate suspension, which we would feel obliged to oppose, but would allow Question Time to take place and then the debate could proceed. Now it appears that the Government has no intention of that debate being allowed to proceed. There has been yet a further change of mind on the part of the Government, which appears absolutely incapable of making any sort of decision. We were to have been placed in a position where the debate could not take place, where our views could not be made known to the House. That seems quite extraordinary because, as I have mentioned, we have stressed at all times that we believe that such a debate should take place. We tried unsuccessfully yesterday to have it. We were told that the Government wished to hold it today and, provided we were allowed some questions, we were happy to go along with that governmental request.

There have been three or four changes of heart, but it is very important that members in another place have been

able to express their opinion. They have been able to have a debate on a substantive motion. It is extraordinary that members of the Government in that place opposed the motion that was passed, but that is a matter to be argued in some other venue. It is vital that this House, the popular House, which contains the Minister in charge of the area, should debate the matter fully, whether on a Government motion or on a motion from the Opposition. That is all we seek—full and adequate debate.

The Government cannot argue that the business of the day prevents such a debate. The Notice Paper has virtually nothing on it. There is nothing on the Notice Paper that will needlessly detain the House. The substantive measures shown are not to be proceeded with. There is, as we understand it, no business at all to consider, depending on what happens in another place, so there is ample time for this debate. The Opposition is prepared to sit on to enable it to do so. The matter is far too important to be swept under the carpet.

Those are the reasons. We probably would not have moved this motion if we had not been told that the Government wanted such a debate in this place. We heard that, and we said we would comply. We have had Question Time, and we are ready to embark on that debate, which the Government suggested it would allow, but the Government has changed its mind, simply because the whole issue was a stunt. When Government members thought they could bring it on in order to avoid questioning, they were happy to do it. When they discovered they would have to accept questions and then proceed with the debate, they changed their mind. The other place has expressed its view, and Government members have come out very poorly indeed in that debate.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Leader of the Opposition not to ascribe effects upon members in another place while he is seeking a suspension of Standing Orders.

Mr BANNON: It is imperative that the Minister in this place and his Government colleagues meet the arguments that we wish to adduce on this vital issue. For those reasons, I move for the suspension.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): The Leader of the Opposition still has a great deal to learn about the practices and procedures of the House. I would have thought that he would learn yesterday, but obviously he is a slow learner. It was pointed out by the Premier that the Government would not entertain the granting of a suspension of Standing Orders to the Opposition without prior notice, which is the usual practice, as I will point out.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You gave us—

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, we were courteous, and I will point that out, too, in a moment. The Opposition has not learnt from yesterday that, if it wants the Government to co-operate in a suspension of Standing Orders, it should have the courtesy to let the Government know. The Opposition has not done that. The Leader has not been here long enough to know past practice, let alone matters of courtesy. Let me quote to the House like situations (I cannot recall instances where it was granted) where the Opposition sought a suspension but was denied by the Premier of the day. Mr R. R. Millhouse sought a suspension on 26 March 1974, and that was denied.

Mr Becker: Where is he today?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: In court, probably, earning more money than he gets down here.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader will come to the reasons for the suspension.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr R. R. Millhouse again on 25 July 1974 sought a suspension; he was

unsuccessful. Dr B. C. Eastick sought a suspension on 1 August 1974—unsuccessfully. Mr R. R. Millhouse sought a suspension on 14 August 1974—unsuccessfully. The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe sought a suspension on 15 August 1974, and it was denied. I sought a suspension on 15 August 1974, and that also was denied. Mr R. R. Millhouse unsuccessfully sought suspension on 19 September 1975 and on 11 February 1976. I sought to suspend on 18 February 1976, but that was denied. Mr D. C. Wotton sought a suspension on 29 November, and that was denied, as was Mr D. O. Tonkin's motion on 29 November 1977. So much for the Leader of the Opposition's coming in and seeking a suspension without the courtesy of informing the Government of what he contemplated. Contrast that with the kid glove treatment that I have meted out to the Opposition since I have been Leader of the House. Let me recount today's events.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask no member of the House to react to incitement.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is not incitement, Sir; I am giving the facts. If ever an Opposition has had kid glove treatment from a Leader, this Opposition has had it from me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yesterday, under the ruse of concern for the prisoners, we got an application for suspension to talk about water. The member for Stuart walked out because he wanted to talk about prisons, but the Opposition mounted a motion on water.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have previously requested that the honourable Leader come back to the point regarding the suspension, and I make the same request to the honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is hard to read the minds of Opposition members. We thought they wanted to talk about water, so the Government decided to mount a motion on water. We got to work and had the Minister primed up to move a motion on water. I did have the courtesy to tell the Opposition. The Opposition did not tell us. Out of the blue, we have this matter thrust on the House.

Then there was a general panic in the Opposition ranks: 'What's it all about? We were never told there would be a motion.' In Opposition we were never told by the Government when a motion was to be moved, let alone what it was about.

Then we had a panic about Question Time: would we have it? I said, 'No. You were prepared to give up Question Time yesterday to debate water, so it is reasonable to give up Question Time today, but that was no good: they could not give up precious Question Time. So, the Government decided to delay this motion on water until after Question Time. How does one treat such a group of illogical individuals in these circumstances? We were and still are prepared to have a limited debate on water.

Mr Keneally: 'Still are', you said?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course we still are. The Government is prepared to debate water. The Minister of Water Resources is primed up for such a debate, he has all the facts to—

The SPEAKER: Order! We will not presuppose what the content of any debate will be.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: No, Sir. The Opposition is anxious not to sit tonight, but how can we accommodate it?

The Hon. J. D. Wright: We'll sit tonight.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Oh, good. That is not the message I got from your sub-sub-Whip, the man who does the whipping for you.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Premier will return to his seat.

Mr PETERSON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. Standing Order 154 provides:

No member shall digress from the subject matter of any question under discussion.

As I understand the situation, we are supposed to be discussing the Murray River and water therefrom.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order, for reasons which will be quite obvious to the honourable member when he reads the transcript of the debate.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Opposition has a communications problem—there is no doubt about that. One never knows who to deal with. The unofficial Whip indicated to me that the Opposition was not too keen to sit here tonight. I said that the Government was prepared to have a limited debate on water, and we are still prepared to do that. That will be done by way of a motion, of which I have given courteous notice (kid-glove treatment) to the Opposition. The Opposition agreed to grant a suspension—all sweetness and light! What is it whingeing about? The Opposition has agreed, so in due course this afternoon the Minister of Water Resources will rise and seek suspension. We will receive the ready co-operation of the Opposition, and we will have a limited (in time), debate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, Mr Speaker, it is hard to read the corporate mind over the way, there is no doubt about that. We have bent over backwards in the last 24 hours to accommodate the Opposition. We all have kid gloves on, and in due course, when we have dispatched the other matter which we have to deal with this afternoon, the Opposition will be able to sit down in contentment—it will have its debate. We will be only too happy to talk about the Murray.

In the meantime, it is time the Opposition learnt a bit about the courtesy traditions and precedents of this place. I suggest that Opposition members should read *Hansard* for the last 11 years so that they can learn that the affairs of the House were handled by you with equanimity yesterday.

The SPEAKER: Order! There will be no reflection on votes previously taken in the House.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Suffice it to say that I wish the Leader of the Opposition would learn what makes this place tick, what the precedents are, how to go about learning the fundamental courtesies, and not complain about his more than fair treatment from this side of the House.

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the motion be agreed to. Those of that opinion say 'Aye'; against 'No'. There being a dissentient voice, there must be a division.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (19)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), Blacker, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (20)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Lewis, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Hemming, Millhouse and Payne.

Noes—Messrs Evans, Mathwin, and Tonkin.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (TOBACCO) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

MURRAY RIVER

The Legislative Council transmitted the following resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

That in view of the serious threat to the quality of water in the Murray River/Darling River systems reaching South Australia, and in view of the continuing lack of co-operation from the other interested States—New South Wales and Victoria—this House:

1. calls for the urgent establishment of a national authority to control the Murray River and its tributaries, whether by agreement between the State and Federal Governments, or by referendum;

2. as an interim measure, calls for an immediate extension of the powers of the Murray River Commission to include controlling water quality;

3. opposes any upstream development in the States of New South Wales and Victoria which affects the quality and quantity of South Australia's water resources, and calls on the Government to institute whatever legal proceedings, whether in the High Court or otherwise, which can be taken to safeguard this State's water quality and quantity;

4. calls on the Federal Government to make an immediate vote of funds to implement the proposals of the Maunsell Report for the control of salinity in the Murray River;

5. calls on the Premier to lead an all-Party delegation to meet with the Prime Minister and the Premiers of New South Wales and Victoria to express a united South Australian view and seek appropriate action on this resolution; and

6. requests the Premier to take such action as necessary to organise a publicity campaign in New South Wales and Victoria to draw to the attention of the Governments and people of those States the problem of water quality and quantity in the Murray River and its effect on the people and the environment.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair was given the courtesy of learning that the motion was to be taken on behalf of the honourable member for Mitcham by the honourable member for Semaphore. If that is of any consequence to other honourable members, the Chair at the moment recognises the honourable member for Semaphore. The motion to be taken into consideration—

Mr PETERSON: Forthwith, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I cannot accept the motion. The honourable member will recognise that it is a private member's motion, and that this is not the time of the business of the day for private members' motions.

Mr KENEALLY: I rise on a point of clarification. If it is not appropriate for this matter to be debated now, will the

House have the opportunity before it prorogues to debate the measure that has come down from the Legislative Council?

The SPEAKER: The simple answer is 'No'. Quite obviously those matters which will be debated and which have originated from a private source are those upon which debate has ensued. The message from the Legislative Council be taken into consideration—

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: On motion, Mr Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY: OTHER BUSINESS

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I move:

That Standing and Sessional Orders be so far suspended as to enable those Orders of the Day: Other Business where debate has ensued to be taken into consideration forthwith and each question be put forthwith without further debate. Motion carried.

RAPID TRANSPORT SYSTEM

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Ashenden:

That this House commends the Government on its decision to immediately proceed with the provision of a modern rapid public transport system utilising all the advantages of conventional and guided busways, to serve the people of the north-eastern suburbs of Adelaide, and its associated decision to restore and develop the River Torrens in line with the River Torrens Study Report prepared by Hassell and Partners Pty Ltd.

(Continued from 26 November. Page 2274.)

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden (teller), Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (18)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hopgood (teller), Keneally, Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Gunn and Tonkin. Noes—Messrs Hemmings and Payne.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes. Motion thus carried.

ADELAIDE BY-LAW: PEDESTRIANS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Evans:

That by-law No. 9 of the Corporation of Adelaide, in respect of pedestrians, made on 11 September 1980 and laid on the table of this House on 16 September 1980, be disallowed.

(Continued from 11 February. Page 2742.) Motion carried.

MOORE'S BUILDING

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Millhouse:

That this House is against the proposed use of the Moore's building in Victoria Square for law courts because—

(a) the site should be used for retailing purposes being within what has been a good shopping area but which is already being seriously affected by the proposal;

(b) it is inappropriate to use this site for law courts when the Government already owns other land next to the Supreme Court in Gouger Street bought for the very purpose; and

(c) the building itself is not suitable for renovation for purposes of law courts having been built for use as a shop,

and asks the Government not to go on with this proposal but to arrange for Moore's to be used again for retail purposes and to be returned to private ownership.

which the Hon. D. C. Brown had moved to amend by leaving out all words after 'Victoria Square', and inserting in lieu thereof the words:

for anything other than law courts because—

(a) conversion of the building into courts, together with the completion of the S.G.I.C. and Hilton Hotel buildings, will significantly enhance the potential for retail trading in the established shopping area around the Central Market;

(b) the site is appropriate for court use because of its close proximity to the Supreme Court and other court facilities; and

(c) the building is admirably suited for preservation and conversion to law courts, as an existing part of the Victoria Square architectural scene,

and congratulates the Government for its decision.

(Continued from 11 February. Page 2742.) Motion as amended carried.

BURNSIDE ROAD CLOSURES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Millhouse:

That the regulations under the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1979, relating to Traffic Prohibition—Burnside, made on 29 May 1980 and laid on the table of this House on 3 June 1980, be disallowed.

(Continued from 3 December. Page 2551.) Motion negatived.

INCOME TAX

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr McRae:

That, in the opinion of the House, a Select Committee should be appointed to consider and report on the various methods, either in use or proposed for consideration, of apportioning income tax between the Commonwealth and the States and in particular this State and to advise the Government on the various effects which may be induced by the 'New Federalism'.

(Continued from 19 November. Page 2045.)

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae (teller), O'Neill, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (21)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Evans (teller), Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs M. J. Brown, Hemmings, and Payne. Noes—Messrs Gunn, Randall, and Tonkin.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.
Motion thus negated.

MURRAY RIVER

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Millhouse:

That in order to protect the quality of the water in the Murray River vital to South Australia, this House urges the Government forthwith to take proceedings in the High Court of Australia against the States of New South Wales and Victoria—

(a) for a declaration that this State is entitled to water from the Murray River of sufficiently high quality for use for human consumption and by primary and secondary industry;

and

(b) for an injunction against further diversions by either State of water from the Murray River system which may as a consequence further reduce the quality of water flowing down the Murray River into South Australia.

(Continued from 3 December. Page 2554.)
Motion negated.

PITJANTJATJARA COUNCIL

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Keneally:

That this House takes note of statements by the member for Eyre in this House on 18 September when he made unfair personal references to Mr John Tregenza, an employee of the Pitjantjatjara Council, accusing him *inter alia* of a 'feeble background', of being 'on the extreme left of the political spectrum' and interested in 'supporting political philosophies that are quite contrary to the interests of the Aborigines', and that this House dissociates itself from all these remarks and censures the member for making them and calls on him to apologise to Mr Tregenza and also to the organisation known as Action for World Development, wrongly accused by the member as being 'pro-communist'.

(Continued from 26 November. Page 2270.)
The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hopgood, Keneally (teller), Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (21)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, Chapman, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn (teller), Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs M. J. Brown, Hemmings, and Payne. Noes—Messrs D. C. Brown, Oswald, and Tonkin.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.
Motion thus negated.

I.M.V.S.

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hemmings:

That in the opinion of the House the Government should, in order to restore the credibility and independence of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, establish a public inquiry into the affairs of the institute with particular reference to—

(a) the circumstances surrounding the closure of the environmental mutagen testing unit run by Dr John Coulter and the value of reopening and maintaining such a unit at the institute;

(b) whether, as an independent statutory body, the I.M.V.S. has always facilitated the free and open flow of information on health hazards to its own employees and to the public of South Australia;

(c) whether any undue influence has been brought to bear on the I.M.V.S. by chemical and drug companies to have unfavourable reports on their products suppressed or the names of the companies concerned deleted;

(d) whether reports have been suppressed or names have been withheld by the threat of companies concerned withholding financial assistance to the institute or conversely by providing assistance to prevent unfavourable reports;

(e) whether pressure from outside organisations, including Government departments, has ever produced a restrictive interpretation of regulations by I.M.V.S. senior management which has led to interference with information on actual or potential health hazards to the public of South Australia; and

(f) whether the I.M.V.S. and its senior officers have always served the best health interests of the people of South Australia.

(Continued from 29 October. Page 1597.)

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae (teller), O'Neill, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (21)—Mrs Adamson (teller), Messrs Allison, Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, Chapman, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs M. J. Brown, Hemmings, and Payne. Noes—Messrs D. C. Brown, Oswald, and Tonkin.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.
Motion thus negated.

HOUSING TRUST

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Slater:

That this House strongly disapproves of the actions of the Minister of Housing in limiting the number of houses made available for sale by the South Australian Housing Trust and protests strongly that the trust will no longer be able to provide mortgage finance to assist home buyers through its own resources or other semi-government instrumentalities.

(Continued from 19 November. Page 2036.)

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater (teller), Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (21)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, Evans (teller), Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs M. J. Brown, Hemmings, and Payne. Noes—Messrs D. C. Brown, Chapman, and Tonkin.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.
Motion thus negated.

O'BAHN SYSTEM

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Bannon:

That Government time be made available to debate the Government's decision to proceed with the bus freeway and O'Bahn option for transport to the north-eastern suburbs. (Continued from 19 November. Page 2047.)
Motion negatived.

FIREARMS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr McRae:

That, in the opinion of the House, in view of the increase of firearms in crimes of violence, the Government should urgently implement and enforce the new regulations on obtaining and keeping guns and further that the existing guidelines should be much strengthened.

(Continued from 26 November. Page 2275.)

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae (teller), O'Neill, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (21)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn (teller), Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs M. J. Brown, Hemmings, and Payne. Noes—Messrs D. C. Brown, Chapman, and Tonkin.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.
Motion thus negatived.

VICTIMS OF CRIME

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr McRae:

That in the opinion of the House, victims of crime suffering personal injuries should be compensated by a publicly funded insurance scheme similar to the Workers Compensation Act and should be otherwise assisted and rehabilitated if necessary on the basis that public money expended be recovered where possible from those at fault; and further that a Select Committee be appointed to report on the most efficient manner of achieving that result and also to examine and report on property loss suffered by victims of crime. (Continued from 26 November. Page 2276.)

Motion negatived.

FISHING INDUSTRY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Keneally:

That in the opinion of the House a Select Committee should be appointed to consider and report on the fishing industry in South Australia with a view to—

- (a) assessing the viability of existing fishermen operating in the coastal waters of the State;
- (b) making recommendations on whether legislation should be enacted to improve the management of the State's fisheries;
- (c) making recommendations as to whether—
 - (i) additional licences or authorities should be issued in the various fisheries; or
 - (ii) the numbers of licences or authorities in these fisheries should be reduced; and

(d) determining the adequacy of existing port facilities to service the needs of the State's fishing fleet.

(Continued from 26 November. Page 2278.)

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hopgood, Keneally (teller), Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (21)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen (teller), Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs M. J. Brown, Hemmings, and Payne. Noes—Messrs D. C. Brown, Chapman and Tonkin.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.
Motion thus negatived.

PROROGATION

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday 7 July at 2 p.m.

I wish to pay a tribute to the people who see that this place runs smoothly. I know it is traditional to do this and I think it is fitting that we do, because without the help of all the people associated with this institution of Parliament the place just would not run. I think it is a credit to all the people associated with this institution that it runs so well.

Let me thank personally the messengers. I do not do this in any order of priority, because all of the people who are employed here are indispensable to the institution. I mention the head messenger and his staff. Their work is not unappreciated. When you are dealing with people into the small hours of the morning, sometimes tempers get frayed, but nonetheless staff in this place are never ruffled and I have never seen any of them out of sorts.

I would like to wish Bob Harrison well. As members know, Bob Harrison has been very sick and the reports are that he is recovering well but, nonetheless, Bob Harrison has been associated with this place for many years and I am quite sure that I speak for everyone here when I wish Bob a speedy recovery and hope to see him back on the job before long.

I would like again to pay tribute to the officers at the table, the officers of Parliament who serve in the Chamber. I believe that they leave nothing to be desired in the expert professionalism that they bring to that task. The *Hansard* staff labour under a great deal of difficulty on many occasions. We realise that we do not always make their job easy; in fact, we sometimes make it very difficult. However, we have always had unfailing co-operation, courtesy, help and accuracy from the *Hansard* staff.

Likewise, the library staff have always been all that we would want them to be. The clerical staff, the telephonists, all staff associated with the smooth running of Parliament are thanked. I must say again that the dining-room is run in a most efficient manner by Miss Stengert and the ladies who assist her. I include in these thanks the caretakers. If I have overlooked anyone, then I sincerely want them included. I also thank the policemen on duty who are an essential part of the operations of Parliament. All in all, on behalf of the Government I thank all of these people. I do not want them ever to think we take them for granted; we do not. We acknowledge the excellence of the services which they give, and the Government certainly appreciates that.

In moving this motion I pay that tribute on behalf of the Government to all of those who assist in the smooth functioning of the Parliament. To you, too, Mr Speaker, may I offer the commendation of the Government for the way in which you conduct your duties.

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to second the motion and support the remarks made by the Deputy Premier. Although in terms of actual sitting days this session has not been an intensive one, it has involved a number of late night sittings. As has been pointed out, this puts considerable pressure on the staff and those who support us in carrying out our Parliamentary duties. We certainly owe them some special thanks.

One of the matters under much discussion in the past few months has been security in this place. Obviously, that is bringing some changes. I certainly hope that it will not lead to any tightening up of access by the general public and by those who work and move freely about the premises. The innovations have been shown in the mug shots being worn by people around this place and a close examination of those photographs shows that they do not bear too close a resemblance to those wearing them. We will have to see how that aspect of security works out in practice, I guess.

I join the Deputy Premier in thanking the policemen who often have a tedious job in this place, but it is enlivened every now and again, as it was yesterday by the appearance of their uniformed colleagues in the Correctional Services area, who certainly made their presence felt in a most unparliamentary fashion from the gallery. Nevertheless, I indicate the need both for access and, I suggest, for some care in the way in which the House conducts its business, and the reaction which that has on persons in the gallery.

I also thank those people who cater for us in this Chamber, the messengers. I join the Deputy Premier in his remarks about Bob Harrison, who is familiar and well known to all of us for the sterling work he does. We hope that he is back on deck soon. Thanks to the messengers and their assistants, thanks indeed to the catering staff, who look after some of our basic needs. They have done a sterling job, and we are greatly appreciative of that, as we are of the work of the caretakers. They often have a lonely job, but they are always available and cheerfully willing to assist.

To the *Hansard* staff, too, a special thanks. Their colleagues in the reporting services are under some pressure. There seems to be a move to get rid of persons who are able to take shorthand of *Hansard* standard and to replace them in the Public Service with impersonal tape recordings and people that we do not see or deal with. I think that would be a retrograde step, as I think it is in the courts. The role of *Hansard*, of course, is to record faithfully what occurs in this Chamber, but within that recording many traditions and courtesies are accorded in reporting members' speeches and the proceedings. Unless one has qualified traditional shorthand reporters with their very particular skills, that cannot be done properly.

To others who help us, such as the switchboard operators and the stenographers in the various offices, we thank them for a job very well done. To the Clerk and his assistant and their officers who have helped us through a fairly torrid session at times, we also give our thanks. I hope that I have not omitted anyone. The House has, I believe, by and large worked very smoothly during this session, although there have been many pressures on members and on the staff.

Finally, to you, Mr Speaker, we have had our ups and downs as always on matters of procedure, and so on, but

certainly those do not colour the fact that we believe you have made a very fine contribution to the Speakership. There are still a couple of matters we are obviously going to argue with you about, but I am sure that will be done with the utmost courtesy and respect for both you and your office. With those remarks, I endorse the motion.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I join with the Deputy Premier and Leader of the Opposition in their comments towards officers of this place. Being an Independent, so to speak, and a member of the National Country Party, and being the only member of my Party in this Chamber, I call upon the support and advice of other officers. To that degree I thank them most sincerely for the manner in which they have helped me. They have been only too willing to assist in any way at any time to give me the advice that is necessary in the proper running of this House.

I do not wish to name every person, as both the Deputy Premier and the Leader of the Opposition have done so, but I wish to add my thanks to each and every one of them for their support. I hope that when we start the 1981-1982 session we will be able to get back to an orderly fashion and, more importantly, run respectable hours so that members will be able to have adjournment debates, and so forth. Unfortunately, in recent months, and perhaps going back a little longer than that, adjournment debate opportunities have dwindled. I do not know that that is anyone's fault, but is just something that has evolved over time. I fail to see how debate that takes after 10.30 p.m. can be rational, or how members can give of their very best in deliberations for the State. I thank you, Sir, for your impartiality in carrying out the position of Speaker, and I thank each and every member for his or her assistance during the year.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I, too, add my thanks and congratulations to those who work in this place. They are remarkable. I support everything that has been said by the previous speakers. As with the member for Flinders, at times I find myself in an odd situation, but I have never found myself unable to get assistance from someone here. I thank them one and all, and I support all of the previous comments.

The SPEAKER: I take the opportunity to respond to a number of points made by the Deputy Premier, the Leader, the member for Flinders and the member for Semaphore, more specifically as it relates to staff members. I am appreciative, in the close contact I have with all of them, of their very genuine desire to make the Parliament House community function properly and effectively. From time to time it takes its toll. I am very pleased that the chief messenger, Mr Ellis, has been restored to good health after a period of ill health during this session. As indicated, we were aware that Mr Harrison has suffered from ill health. As witnessed by his presence here last week, he is very much improved and looking forward to coming back.

Miss Stengert from the catering staff has suffered a period of illness, and we are pleased to see her back. I know that members are quite sincere in their statements relating to the service provided by all staff members.

This session has also seen the retirement of some long-standing members of staff. I speak specifically of Miss Green, a long-term member of the secretarial staff, and of Mr Ralph Warhurst, the chief caretaker, who took a very active part in looking to matters of importance in this place. There are, as members would appreciate, a number of other impending retirements but not specifically during the period from now until the House returns. It is my wish,

and that of staff members, that members have a successful and happy period of respite from duties in the House and are able to return fresh and ready for debate without malice.

I take the opportunity also to mention the point raised by the Leader relative to security. It is necessary in a place such as this that security be, from time to time, updated. The course of action taken thus far, and not exactly followed at this juncture by every member of the House or by all the staff, but increasingly so by members, is one which has been taken on strong advice from people who have the expertise to give it. It may be that some people take the opportunity to place on the identification disc a face other than their own. I make the point very sincerely and quite emphatically that it is important to look to the security and wellbeing of every member of the staff, members of the House and the community generally, who should, and I trust always will, have access to this place.

It is not a course of action that is meant to impede the opportunity for people to come into the House and, indeed, a number of measures are or have already been put in train that seek to make Parliament House more accessible to people in the community who have a need to come here or, more particularly, who would benefit educationally or otherwise from coming here. Discussions have taken place earlier this week, and I hope that in the not too distant future I will be able to suggest to honourable members on both sides how they could assist in the public awareness of what this institution is and what it stands for.

I make one further comment relative to the statements that have been made in relation to my conduct of proceedings. I believe that the members who have alluded to the conduct of proceedings here will all genuinely know that my every endeavour has been to see that no member, whether on the right or left, or whether a back-bencher or a front-bencher, has an undue advantage over any other member. With the assistance of every member of the House (which is important), that process will be proceeded with when we return.

Motion carried.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

MURRAY RIVER

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith and that such suspension remain in force no later than 6 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD I move:

That this House:

1. Supports the South Australian Government in initiating action in the New South Wales Land and Environment Court to challenge the legality of irrigation development in New South Wales.
2. Calls on the Federal Government to seek the agreement of New South Wales and Victoria to a moratorium on further Murray River diversions until a proper assessment has been made of the effect on South Australia of those diversions.
3. Supports the South Australian Government in its publicity campaigns highlighting the real problems faced by South Australia in respect of the further developments on the Murray River and Darling River

and their respective tributaries and the positive action required to protect South Australia's interests.

4. Calls on the Premier and the Minister of Water Resources to meet with the Prime Minister to express the deep concern of the South Australian people at the serious situation which has developed on the Murray River.

It has been clearly identified over recent years that there is a very serious problem in regard to the Murray River. The problem is evident in all three States in which the Murray River and the Darling River flow. The solution to the problem cannot be found or resolved between the States alone. Indeed, the Commonwealth must take the initiative and the leading role in resolving this problem. I take this opportunity to outline briefly the history of this problem over the past three years. I will endeavour to keep my remarks brief to enable the Opposition, which has sought to debate the matter in this House, every opportunity to put forward the points it desires.

This matter has been at issue ever since I have been a member of this Parliament. Little progress has been made during the past 10 years. During the previous Administration, the Minister of Works (the member for Hartley) initiated moves to have the River Murray Commission revamped and the River Murray Waters Agreement upgraded. A working party was established, and it reported a number of years ago. However, this problem has been extremely difficult, and little progress has been made in reaching finality. I believe that the recommendations of the working party would be the basis of a reasonable starting point for a rational approach to the overall use and management of the Murray River system. However, we had foundered on one or two critical points in relation to water quality and to enabling the River Murray Commission to have full regard to salinity induced by irrigation and pollution induced by industrial development.

Unfortunately, recently the New South Wales Government opposed those two areas particularly, and I believe that the amendments to the River Murray Waters Agreement hinge very much on the River Murray Commission's having the ability to examine the water quality and report on the effects of further irrigation diversions, not only on the Murray River but also on all of the tributaries in Victoria and New South Wales, and the effects on the total system. If that authority is not given to the River Murray Commission, there will be little benefit to the parties concerned from the other proposed amendments, which hinge on the ability of the commission to examine the effects of further industrial development on the total river system.

I give full credit to the member for Hartley in his efforts in relation to putting South Australia's house in order. The member for Stuart referred to that fact. South Australia has done an enormous amount of work when one considers the small degree of irrigation diversion in South Australia as compared to that in the Eastern States. New South Wales claims (and probably quite rightly so) that it is in the process of spending \$12 000 000 to \$15 000 000 on salt mitigation works. Victoria is currently spending \$8 000 000 in this regard. The claim is made in New South Wales that this sum is far in excess of what is being spent in South Australia. Practices that were put in train by the member for Hartley involved much greater cost than that. South Australia is currently initiating a total salinity control irrigation headworks programme that will cost between \$60 000 000 and \$80 000 000.

The State Government is involved in the overall Murray River salinity control programme, which was initiated by the member for Hartley. This Government is continuing

this programme, and we are refining it in various areas to obtain greater benefits than existed under the original proposal. We are not doing away with any of the recommendations; in fact, we are going a step further.

The South Australian Government is now midway through the rehabilitation of the total Government irrigation scheme. The Kingston and Waikerie works have been completed, and the works at Berri are about half completed. The Government is currently commencing work in the Cobdogla irrigation area. That is an enormous expenditure, which is very much related directly to salinity control and conservation of water. We will do away with the open canals and contain the total diversions of the irrigation areas of South Australia into a closed pipe system. Not only is the Government doing this, but also it has been involved in assisting and providing private irrigation areas with modern irrigation distribution systems.

The Renmark Irrigation Trust and the Lyrup pipeline have all been rehabilitated, and in fact they are extremely modern efficient irrigation systems. What the Government is saying is that the work being undertaken in South Australia to put our own house in order is very significant indeed. As I have said, it will cost in the vicinity of \$60 000 000 to \$80 000 000. When we compare that with the 500 000 hectares of irrigation diversion in Victoria and also in New South Wales and the sort of salt mitigation and salt diversion works that they are currently talking about, it is only a drop in the ocean in resolving that problem. That is why I say that ultimately this problem must be tackled by the Federal Government with a Federal approach in relation to what is truly a national resource, one which the Prime Minister has clearly stated on numerous occasions as being the greatest natural resource that Australia has. As such, obviously the Federal Government has a very real vested responsibility in protecting that immense national asset.

The work being undertaken in South Australia will tend to do no more than hold the line if we have a deterioration in the quality of water entering South Australia. The water quality will continue to deteriorate if more and more water is diverted in the Eastern States. We have on average a constant salinity load entering South Australia of 1 100 000 tonnes annually, and we know the sources of that salinity. We know that there is a continuing reduction in the amount of water entering this State, and a consequent lack of dilution flow to flush that load through South Australia and into the sea, which will diminish year by year.

When South Australia is on its statutory allocation of 1.85 megalitres, there is insufficient flow to produce any flow into the sea. In fact, the barrages are closed completely during a period of time, as we all know. As is evidenced to the whole of Australia, that the Murray mouth has closed up, silted up, because of lack of flow and weather conditions, and for other reasons. Principally, it is because of lack of flow that the Murray mouth has closed at this time.

That highlights that the river system is over-committed, and further irrigation diversions, whether they be in Victoria, New South Wales or South Australia, can only aggravate the situation. There have been no further irrigation diversions in South Australia or issuing of further licences since 1968, and the former Government and the present Government adhered to that rigidly. In fact, as the result of the review that was commenced just before the change of Government, there has been a reduction in the amount of water licensed to be diverted from the Murray into South Australia for irrigation purposes.

While we are reducing our allocation for irrigation diversions in this State, we have the problem across the border of massively increased irrigation diversions being proposed and granted. That is precisely why the present South Australian Government, on coming to office, took the opportunity to oppose all further irrigation diversions. I say quite clearly once again that, if Victoria were to initiate a move into the allocation of further irrigation licences at this time, this Government would be just as critical of Victoria as it is of New South Wales.

Mr Keneally: What about the water—

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: For the benefit of the member for Stuart, who will have his opportunity to speak soon and make his points, I point out that the allocation and the break-up of salt load to the various States is quite clearly identified. What the member for Stuart seems loath to accept is that the salt contributions from the tributaries in New South Wales are being contributed from that State. I do not know to whom he wants to apportion that salt load, but if he examines the Maunsell Report closely he will see that much of the salt that is attributed to South Australia is in Victoria and New South Wales. He would know by looking at a map, even if he has not been to the various locks concerned, that lock 6 is just inside the South Australian border and that all the other locks up to lock 9 are in Victoria and New South Wales.

The Maunsell Report indicates that the salt load that enters the river in that section is attributed to South Australia. That is fine from a technical point of view, because the River Murray Commission has vested in South Australia the responsibility for doing River Murray Commission work for that section. Lake Victoria is also another major contributor of salinity to the total river system. That salt load is attributed to South Australia. Lake Victoria, Frenchman's Creek and the Rufus River are clearly in New South Wales.

The member for Stuart can sit there and shake his head, but he will not convince anyone in South Australia that those salt loads are not the result of activities within South Australia. They are clearly a result of salt loads and groundwater in-flows in those States. The honourable member also insists on saying that we do not count the salt load coming from the Darling River, which is in excess of 200 000 tonnes on average, on regulated yearly flow because the Menindee Lakes are under the control of the River Murray Commission, so we should exclude that salt load and pretend that it does not exist. That is just being unrealistic, and it is absolutely absurd. As I said earlier, it is like saying that South Australia does not contribute any salt to the total river system because the whole of the South Australian section of the Murray River is a regulated river under the control of the River Murray Commission. Of course, it would be plainly absurd to even make such a claim. No-one with any sense would even try to do so. It is a matter of clearly identifying where the salt load is, where it originates, and the problem that it is creating in South Australia. It has been clearly identified what the salt load is that is coming from Victoria. We know the problems being experienced at Shepparton, Kerang, and so forth.

Mr Keneally: Well, Shepparton—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Mathwin): Order! The member for Stuart will have his opportunity.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The problems in Victoria are problems that we all recognise. The Government of Victoria at this moment (and I do not know what might be the case tomorrow, in a month or a year) has refrained from issuing further irrigation diversion licences. They were entitled to do that, as was New South Wales, when the River Murray Waters Agreement was amended to

provide for the construction of the Dartmouth Dam. On the completion of the Dartmouth Dam and its being declared operative, Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia shared equally in the waters available.

As I have said, Victoria has refrained from using the additional water available to it. I believe the Victorian Government is under considerable pressure from irrigators to allocate that water, but it has resisted that pressure, and I trust that it will continue to do so, because if further water was allocated it would dramatically aggravate the situation there because of the type of land conditions that exist, such as the high water-tables there, and it would very much aggravate the salinity load coming from Victoria if they break away from the present arrangements.

This Government will be just as critical of Victoria if it breaks away from the practice adopted of not granting any further irrigation diversion licences until there has been a complete and proper study by a competent authority on the effects of further irrigation diversions on the total river system, and particularly the downstream areas. The total Murray-Darling system is made up of two distinct zones. It is very similar to the situation in the U.S.A. and Mexico, with the Colorado River. There is an upper basin and a lower basin. The lower basin area extends into Victoria and New South Wales as far up the Murray River as Swan Hill and to the Menindee Lakes on the Darling. The lower basin was originally under the sea and carries an enormous salt load. The salt load is there, and it is one of the major problems that confronted the feasibility of the proposed Chowilla Dam. We know the magnitude of that load and the salinity of the water under the flood plains, particularly of the Murray River.

The problem is how to keep the salt load, the ground water that continually moves of its own accord back to the river, in isolation from the river. Undoubtedly, any irrigation in the lower basin aggravates that situation. However, as I said earlier, an enormous expenditure of money in South Australia by the previous Government and by this Government to control the effects of irrigation-induced salinity into the Murray River and South Australia has been put into effect and is half-way to completion. At this stage, one could say conservatively that some \$40 000 000, both in the private irrigation areas and the Government irrigation areas, has been spent, and there is still possibly another \$30 000 000 to \$40 000 000 to be spent.

All we are asking of New South Wales at this stage is that a moratorium be imposed until the necessary work can be undertaken to determine the effects. In the Land Board hearings in New South Wales, and also in the Land and Environment Court, in Sydney, it has been admitted by persons giving evidence in support of irrigation diversions in New South Wales that they do not have the answers on what effect further irrigation diversions will have on the total river system. It is proceeding blindly, without concern for the lower river users. Objections similar to those from South Australia are being just as strongly voiced by river users in the lower basin area in New South Wales, below the Menindee Lakes. The people from those areas, the divertees below the Menindee Lakes, are some of the most vocal opponents of further irrigation diversions.

There is a strong voice of opinion from the Sunraysia area. Those people are very much affected, in the same way as is South Australia. Until we can convince the Federal Government that it should step in and play a much more vigorous and important role in the key national resource of Australia, the problem will continue. All we are arguing over in South Australia is the means by which

we approach this problem. The previous Government tackled the problem for some eight or nine years and endeavoured to reach agreement with the Eastern States on amendments to the River Murray Waters Agreement that would provide the necessary authority and control to the River Murray Commission to protect the interests of the lower river users in particular. I can say only that that ground along very slowly, as I think the member for Hartley would be the first to admit. He made every endeavour, and put an enormous amount of work into trying to get those amendments through.

When the Liberal Government came to office, we were confronted with the fact that little progress had been made towards getting acceptance of the proposed amendments by Victoria and New South Wales, and we were also confronted with a major irrigation development programme in New South Wales. We took the step, through the Land Board in New South Wales, to oppose all further irrigation diversions. That has been very effective, in that it has dramatically slowed down the issuing of irrigation licences in New South Wales, much to the annoyance and frustration of that State, but, by the same token, South Australia must endeavour to do what it can to protect its own rights and its own future.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Can you explain the powers of the Land Board in New South Wales?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: When an objection is lodged, it must be considered by the Land Board. Ultimately, the Water Resources Commission or the New South Wales Government has the power to override that. The New South Wales Government is confronted there with exactly the same situation that it is frightened of in relation to approving draft amendments to the River Murray Waters Agreement. If power is given to the River Murray Commission to make recommendations and then that Government flies in the face of those recommendations, it will be seen in a very poor light. It is confronted with similar problems in relation to Land Board hearings. For the Land Board to make a decision and for the Government to overrule it would be an almost untenable situation for it or for any other Government.

This approach has achieved two things. It has slowed down dramatically the issuing of irrigation diversion licences in New South Wales, to the extent that the Government in that State has seen fit to endeavour to legislate South Australia out of being able to make objections to further irrigation diversions. If it had not been effective, then obviously the Government would not have had to legislate to block South Australia's objections. Secondly, it has had the effect of very much bringing to the notice of the people of South Australia and of Australia that a very real problem exists, and that the future and the livelihoods of at least a million people in this country are in jeopardy. Their future wellbeing is in doubt, whether they are in the Riverland or whether they live along the rivers in the Sunraysia area, the lower reaches of the Murray River in South Australia, at Port Pirie, Whyalla, Port Augusta, or in the Adelaide metropolitan area. I do not have to tell anyone in this House the extent to which the metropolitan area is dependent on that source of water.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Can you explain the Land and Environment Court? That is on top of the Land Board.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The Land and Environment Court is a section of the Supreme Court of New South Wales, sitting in Sydney. Appeals lodged as a result of decisions of the Land Board can be heard in the Land and Environment Court. In view of the decision by the New South Wales Government to legislate against the right of South Australia to object to applications for water diversion licences, we are now initiating moves within the

Land and Environment Court, in Sydney, under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, to which we believe little consideration has been given. It is significant legislation in New South Wales, requiring that the impact of further development on the rivers be accounted for. That has not been done in the past.

We are challenging the legality of the irrigation diversion licences that are being granted. We want to know whether they can be granted legally without an environmental impact statement as is required under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Can New South Wales legislate to prevent South Australia from mounting that action, or what?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: New South Wales has legislated to prevent South Australia from opposing irrigation diversions in that State. The Government has endeavoured to legislate South Australia out of Land Board hearings. While I believe that the legislation is not retrospective (and I still have more than 100 objections lodged against gazetted irrigation diversions), I believe that South Australia will still be able to be heard in relation to those objections which I lodged on behalf of the South Australian Government prior to the New South Wales legislation being passed. As I understand it, the New South Wales legislation was not retrospective. However, we are proceeding with action through the Land and Environment Court under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That legislation does not affect your right to go to the Land and Environment Court, does it?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: No, because it is under a different Act.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It gets you out of the Land Board, but—

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: Yes, but it does not restrict us from taking action, as I understand it, under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, which has far wider effects. If it can be shown that in relation to licences that are being issued no account has been taken of that legislation as is required under the law of New South Wales, then we will certainly be taking action. In fact, we are in the process of initiating action at this moment.

It is purely a matter of approach—the manner in which this Government has decided to resolve the problem, compared with the manner in which previous Governments endeavoured to do it. Every effort was made by the previous Government, with little success. I could see little point in continuing along that line, especially in view of the rapidly deteriorating situation which was being caused by the massive increase in the proposed irrigation diversions in New South Wales. I believe that we do have a common cause in this State. I certainly supported the previous Government when I was in Opposition and spokesman on water resources, but, unfortunately, we did not achieve much in that time. But I still give credit to the member for Hartley for the efforts that he made.

I believe that what we have achieved in the 18 months that this Government has been in office is quite significant. The problem is widely known throughout Australia now and the Federal Government is certainly very much aware of it. I think that if one looks at the statements made in the House of Representatives and the Senate by members of the Liberal Party, Country Party and the Labor Party, it can be seen that they readily admit that there is a problem and are continuing to call for the Federal Government to take positive action. Many Labor Senators and members of the House of Representatives come from Victoria and New South Wales. To enable members of the Opposition

to effectively take part in this debate I will curtail my remarks at this point.

I commend the motion to the House and I ask that the co-operation that has existed in the past nine or 10 years in South Australia continues to exist in the interests of South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: In relation to future applications for diversion licences which are dealt with by the Land Board and in regard to which you cannot intervene under the present legislation, do you still have the right to go to the Land and Environment Court on those matters?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: As I understand, and on the recommendations that have been made to us by our legal advisers, we will be able to take effective action under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act in New South Wales.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): In his final remarks, the Minister of Water Resources sought the co-operation between the parties in South Australia that he said existed when the previous Government was in power. That co-operation is always available to the Government if it should seek it. In fact, it was the basis of the letter I wrote to the Acting Premier two months ago asking that this House debate the issues relating to the Murray River, so that a bipartisan policy could be developed by the Parliament of South Australia that could be sent to the Federal Government and the other bodies which are concerned with the whole issue of the Murray River. I think that it is quite significant that, since we have started this debate in Parliament, the level of heat and passion that seemed to exist in the headlines of the newspapers has disappeared. I wonder whether that is because the Premier is not participating in this debate, because it is the Premier who has been grabbing the headlines with startling statements and accusations. The Opposition has not been doing that. The Opposition has been trying to get a debate started in the South Australian Parliament that would help us do all the things that the Minister has requested of us.

My comments need to be seen in the light of two statements that I will make now and comment on later. They both relate to the speech made by the Minister. First, it is surprising to me that if the Murrumbidgee and Darling contribute so adversely to the Murray River scheme the Minister and his Government are anxious for them to have a free flow into our water system. If they were bad rivers we would not want the water from them. Quite obviously, both the Murrumbidgee and the Darling in a normal year improve the quality of the water in the Murray River; that is incontestable. The Minister knows that; we all know that. The Darling and the Murrumbidgee according to the Maunsell Report both have a negative effect on the salinity input in the Murray River, that is, they increase the quality of the Murray. That is the first point.

The second point we should also take into account is the Liberal Party's policy in regard to the issuing of licences when the river is in high flow. Before the election, the Liberal Party told its supporters, the irrigators on the Murray River:

We reaffirm our policy for increased use of Murray River water by divertees during periods of free flow. This will provide greater opportunities to increase productivity and at the same time protect the interests of South Australians dependent on this source for their water supply. This action will also allow additional water above the allocation provided in the divertee's licence for the production of fodder and similar crops in times of free flow.

The point I make in relation to the Liberal Party policy in South Australia is that it is similar to that which the New

South Wales Labor Government has in relation to its own rivers and which it is implementing at the moment. It is issuing licences directly related in the main to high-flow content.

I have the breakdown of all the licences issued in New South Wales if the Minister would like to have this information. In fact, I have already read them into *Hansard*, asking that if the Government had reason to dispute what the New South Wales Government had told me about those licences it should provide the Parliament with that information so that a debate could be held on it. If, in fact, the New South Wales Government is misleading me, my Party and South Australians in the information it gives, then clearly we will join with the Government in condemning the actions of the New South Wales Government. I had a close look at what it is doing and the river systems in relation to which irrigation licences have been granted, and I am not convinced that that is currently the case. That is one of the reasons why I and the Opposition have taken the stand we have.

We do not have a great deal of disagreement with the Minister's motion. We think it is rather a pale reflection on the sort of motion that this Parliament ought to be debating. I believe that the motion which has the substance we should support has come from the Legislative Council. I am very thankful to the Hon. Mr Milne. Because of his move in the Council, we have had this opportunity today to debate this matter, an opportunity we would not otherwise have had. It is very surprising that a motion was voted against in the other place by the Government when it incorporated all the sentiments expressed by the Minister today and all the sentiments expressed by him and his Leader in the press. Yet the Government voted against it. I wonder why, because the Minister said today that he called on the Federal Government to fund the necessary salt mitigation schemes. We agree. That is part of our motion; it is part of the motion from the Legislative Council.

The Minister said that a national authority should be controlling the Murray River and the Darling River and its tributaries. We agree. That is part of the motion from the Legislative Council that the Government voted against. The Minister said that the River Murray Commission ought to have the power to control salinity, and we agree. Yet the Government voted against that issue when it was put to it in the Legislative Council. So, we find ourselves in rather a strange situation. All the Government has been saying it has had an opportunity to vote for, but it decided not to do so and voted against those points. In its rhetoric in this House, it now approves those issues, but puts forward a motion.

I give notice now that I will move an amendment, which will be along the lines of the motion that the Legislative Council has approved. That was an amalgamation between the original motion of the Hon. Mr Milne and the Hon. Mr Sumner that has come down to us. It is a very strong motion indeed, which states that South Australia's interest ought to be protected and that South Australia ought to take every avenue available to it to ensure that our water quality and quantity are protected. I do not believe that that is the case, in the motion that we have before us.

I move:

That in view of the serious threat to the quality of water in the River Murray/River Darling systems reaching South Australia, and in view of the continuing lack of co-operation from the other interested States—New South Wales and Victoria—this House—

(1) calls for the urgent establishment of a national authority to control the Murray River and its

- tributaries, whether by agreement between the State and Federal Governments, or by referendum;
- (2) as an interim measure, calls for an immediate extension of the powers of the River Murray Commission to include controlling water quality;
 - (3) opposes any upstream development in the States of New South Wales and Victoria which affects the quality and quantity of South Australia's water resources and calls on the Government to institute whatever legal proceedings, whether in the High Court or otherwise, which can be taken to safeguard this State's water quality and quantity;
 - (4) calls on the Federal Government to make an immediate vote of funds to implement the proposals of the Maunsell Report for the control of salinity in the Murray River;
 - (5) calls on the Premier to lead an all-Party delegation to meet with the Prime Minister and the Premiers of New South Wales and Victoria to express a united South Australian view and seek appropriate action on this resolution; and
 - (6) requests the Premier to take such action as necessary to organise a publicity campaign in New South Wales and Victoria to draw to the attention of the Governments and people of those States the problem of water quality and quantity in the Murray River and its effect on the people and the environment.

I call on the House to support that amendment, because it does the things that the Minister spoke about in his speech. It is a much firmer and much more appropriate motion to leave this House. I agree with all the Minister had to say. There is no disagreement whatever, and in only a very small area does the Opposition find itself in disagreement with the Government. That area is the failure of South Australia to stand up and say, 'Yes, we do contribute to the salinity problem in the Murray River. We are a major contributor. In fact, in terms of controllable salinity, we put in more than anybody else. Acknowledging that fact, we are doing what we can and we are doing very well to meet our responsibility. We would like other States to do likewise.'

It is interesting to look at the salt diversions from the other States that the Minister did not mention. He said that we put in 500 000 tonnes and we take out 300 000 tonnes. Largely, those figures are correct. New South Wales, according to the Maunsell Report, puts in 73 200 tonnes and takes out 66 000 tonnes. Victoria puts in 302 400 tonnes and takes out 140 400 tonnes. Thus, New South Wales and Victoria are both putting salt in and taking salt out in salt mitigation schemes. Everyone is meeting their responsibilities as far as they are able to do so within available resources. That is why we call on the Federal Government to provide the three State Governments with money to do the things, regardless of mitigation, that the Maunsell Report and other authoritative reports have recommended.

The Minister once again refers to the Darling River. I am not going to deny that a considerable amount of salt reaches the Murray River from uncontrollable sources. That salt is included in huge quantities of water. In a normal year 600 000 tonnes of that comes down the Murray. In an abnormal year salt finds its way into the Murray system from the Menindee Lakes that are low in volume and high in salinity, and from Lake Victoria, which also has a low volume and high salinity level. They are not controllable salt inputs.

How can you control a massive dam of water that is low in quantity and high in salinity? When the River Murray Commission allows water to flow from such a dam into our

water supply, it will obviously increase the salinity level. The point which I make and which the Minister refuses to acknowledge is that the high salinity is not the result of New South Wales irrigation practices. It is the result of a drought year, a low volume in the Menindee Lakes and Lake Victoria, and high evaporation. The problem is not because of irrigation practices. It is because of natural events over which we have no control. The Maunsell Report clearly states that position, that you cannot control nor should you need to control the low quantities of natural salt in high volumes of water. You can control the high salinity input into the Murray River from irrigation practices and ground inflows.

An interesting position was put to me in New South Wales that is worthy of consideration. The Minister has not addressed himself to it. The New South Wales people say that it is best for all Australians, in the national interest, for Governments to stop salt going into the Murray River so that you will not need that valuable natural resource as fresh water to flush the salt into the sea. They say South Australians want New South Wales fresh water to flush our salt into the sea. That, by and large, is a fairly accurate statement.

I make these statements because I believe that the suggestion that if we kept salinity out of the Murray River and kept the Murray as a low salinity river we would not need so much water as a flushing agent, is a viable one. So, we keep the fresh water in our upstream dams, to be used when needed—not to be used as a flushing agent. There is nothing magic about flushing a million or thousands of megalitres or gigalitres into the gulf in South Australia. We need to have water down the system for the ecological benefit of the river. These are factors that should be considered.

I have also discussed with the New South Wales Government the irrigation developments on its managed streams and the Darling River. Research programmes are in train to ensure that the licences that are issued will not have an adverse effect on downstream users. We in South Australia must remember that the Darling River does not naturally flow into South Australia: it flows into Lake Menindee. One of the conditions in relation to the issue of further licences is that they will not be issued unless the water in the Lake Menindee system is at a certain level. If it is below that level, licences will not be issued in New South Wales, but, if the water is above that level and if there is a high flow in the Darling River system, licences will be issued. The Darling River is normally a pretty low flowing river, and those people who obtain high flow licences for the Darling River will find that, in three years of every four, there will be a low flow and they will get no water. It is a risky proposition.

The New South Wales Government believes it can issue such licences without adversely affecting South Australia's water, so by and large it is prepared to agree to the abovementioned conditions, not as a result of the action South Australia is taking but because the Government intended to agree anyway. This matter has been studied for some four years, long before we opposed these actions. These licences had been on the drawing board for some time. The previous Premier knew about the licences and discussed the matter with the New South Wales and Victorian Governments over a period.

The Minister referred to the tremendous record of the member for Hartley in relation to the Murray River, and we all agree with that. We know of the honourable member's concern about the Murray River. One of the factors that the Minister seemed to skate over very readily was South Australia's relationship with Victoria. I was waiting for the Minister to tell me that my figures were

wrong, because, if they were wrong, I would be pleased.

In the Shepparton region of Victoria, a project is under way to reduce the water table and to return to agriculture about 80 000 hectares of irrigation land. That programme, when it is finalised, and because it involves the pumping of high saline water from the water table back into the Murray River, will put an additional 142 000 tonnes of salt into the Murray River. The Government does not seem to want to concern itself with that issue. Surely, that development must be of concern to South Australia.

It is of concern to the Victorian Labor Party. Fortuitously, yesterday I received a letter from the Victorian Labor Party asking that a meeting be held between the New South Wales Minister, the Federal shadow Minister, the Victorian shadow Minister and the South Australian shadow Minister of Water Resources to discuss this matter. Victorian people are concerned about the welfare of those who work in the district of the Minister of Water Resources, that is, the food preservers. We are concerned about those people, and we will remain concerned. If the House supports the motion, that will indicate that members of the House are concerned.

I make two brief points, because the member for Hartley will want to contribute to this debate and the Minister probably wants to reply. People who live in Adelaide and on Spencer Gulf experience a problem in regard to salinity; the Murray River irrigators experience a different problem. In the main, the salt that comes over the border is added to to some degree by salt from the irrigators' lands. By the time Murray River water reaches the Minister's area it is very saline indeed. People in Adelaide, Whyalla, Port Augusta and Port Pirie have problems not only in relation to salt input from the Eastern States (the upstream States) but also in relation to the fact that an enormous amount of salt is put into the river by South Australian irrigators.

The Minister of Health went to the Murray Lands area to launch a boat and an attack on the New South Wales Government; she put forward an entirely biased argument to the effect that, because New South Wales is considering issuing further licences later this year or next year, the quality of the Murray River water is being affected now. That is a ridiculous statement, but that is the message that is getting through to people in South Australia. I refute that: the argument should not be debated on that level. The people in the northern part of South Australia and the people in Adelaide depend on the Murray River for their water supply. The deteriorating quality of the water is to a large extent contributed to by our own irrigators. I wrote to the Minister's colleague about two months ago asking for a break-down of the spending for water filtration programmes. When she was in the Murray Lands the Minister wildly bragged about a \$3 000 000 expenditure, but we have heard no more about that. I would like the Minister to tell us when the people in Adelaide, Whyalla, Port Augusta and Port Pirie will benefit from the filtration programme which was initiated by the previous Government and stopped by this Government. That should be done.

We are greatly concerned about the Murray River. We will join in any responsible action to overcome the problem. The Murray River Campaign Committee has been established to fight for South Australian interests in the Murray River and the river as an ecosystem. The Opposition's motion incorporates three of the most important parts of the Murray River Campaign Committee's seven propositions. The committee wants a publicity programme throughout Australia—we called for a publicity programme throughout Australia. The committee wants a national authority—we called for a national

authority. The committee wants the commission to have power to control salinity—we called for that.

Our motion in part agrees with the propositions of the River Murray Campaign Committee, yet this Government saw fit to oppose the motion in the Legislative Council and to come up with a pale copy of what a responsible motion would be. We are not opposed to the Government's motion as such, but we believe that the amendment that I have moved is much sounder and more likely to have an effect. It represents the general views of the people in South Australia to a much greater extent than does the Government's motion. I ask all members to support the amendment.

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

OFFENDERS PROBATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 5 (clause 7)—After line 33 insert new section as follows:

5ba. (1) The Minister shall provide insurance upon such terms and conditions as he thinks fit for probationers in respect of death or injury arising out of, or occurring in the course of, community service undertaken pursuant to recognisances.

(2) The Minister shall provide insurance upon such terms and conditions as he thinks fit for persons appointed as voluntary supervisors of probationers undertaking community service pursuant to recognisances in respect of death or injury arising out of, or occurring in the course of, carrying out their duties as supervisors.

(3) The cost of providing insurance cover under this section shall be borne by the Crown.

No. 2. Page 5, lines 37 and 38 (clause 7)—Leave out 'from a panel of three persons nominated by' and insert 'after consultation with'.

No. 3. Page 6 (clause 7)—After line 5 insert new paragraph as follows:

(ab) one shall be appointed by the Minister after consultation with the United Trades and Labor Council;

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to. The Government accepts the amendments. I would like to relate to the House the discussion that took place between the Minister of Industrial Affairs, Mr Gregory, of the United Trades and Labor Council, Mr Fairweather, the Secretary of the Plumbers and Gasfitters Union, and me yesterday. This meeting was called after an adjournment of consideration of the Bill in the other place, and detailed discussions took place yesterday that led to the Government's making certain amendments to the Bill to ensure its smooth operation. The Bill provided for the establishment of a Community Service Advisory Committee consisting of between three and five members.

One of the persons was to be appointed by the Minister from a panel of three persons nominated by the Trades and Labor Council. In place of that provision the Government now proposes that one person shall be appointed by the Minister after consultation with the U.T.L.C. The community service order committee will formulate guidelines for the approval of projects and tasks suitable for community service. Certain criteria will be applied in the selection and approval of tasks, and these will be similar to the criteria which apply to the Home

Handyman Scheme. This will ensure that, where personal assistance is given, only needy persons will be the recipients of service under the scheme.

Tasks undertaken by offenders will not include the work normally and reasonably carried out by paid labour. In addition, it is proposed that the Minister shall appoint one person after consultation with the United Trades and Labor Council to be a member of each community service committee. This provision was not in the original Bill.

The Government also proposes to provide insurance cover for offenders and for voluntary supervisors. There will be one type of insurance policy for offenders and a separate policy with higher benefits for voluntary supervisors. It is intended that the insurance will cover medical expenses and lump sum payment for loss of life or limb, at the same level of compensation as is provided in the present Workers Compensation Act. It will also provide compensation for wages lost at a rate for which a limit is yet to be determined. The conditions of these compensation policies will be drafted by the Law Department as quickly as possible, and the undertaking has been given that further consultation will take place at a later date between the United Trades and Labor Council and me regarding specific conditions of these matters. The Government reserves the right to decide the ultimate provisions in these compensation policies.

Further, Mr Gregory asked for a letter of intent from Mr Brown with regard to these matters, and that letter has been sent to the Secretary of the United Trades and Labor Council today with copies of the guidelines of the Home Handyman Scheme. The Government is putting into effect a recommendation to have the two agreements drafted by the Law Department with regard to the policies to give effect to the insurance arrangements.

Mr KENEALLY: The Opposition accepts the Legislative Council's amendments. However, we are disappointed that we were not able to achieve this resolution when this matter was before us, when we discussed it until the early hours of the morning. The amendments are not totally what we would have moved at the time, because at the time we had not had the opportunity to discuss the matter with the Trades and Labor Council or Mr Gregory, and neither had the Minister. I am pleased that, subsequent to the debates here, the Minister has had discussions with the Trades and Labor Council, and that they have come to a mutual agreement on those areas of the Bill that affect the Council. I have had an assurance that the Government and the council are in agreement, and in those circumstances the Opposition supports these amendments, which I believe will go a long way towards ensuring that a very worthwhile scheme will be effective to the benefit of all South Australians.

Motion carried.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendments.

MURRAY RIVER

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. P. B. Arnold.
(Continued from page 4224.)

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Hartley): I want to contribute briefly to this debate. I must say that I was most impressed with the Minister's speech. I thought it was one of sound reasoning, and in fact he gave credit where it was due. I am not saying that only because he mentioned some of the things for which I was responsible while I was Minister of Works and therefore responsible for water matters in this State. I cannot help but think, when looking at both of the motions before us (that is, the one moved by the Minister and the one moved by the member for Stuart as an amendment), that is a great pity indeed that we cannot really get together on this and work out a proper course of action that would be satisfactory to both parties. That is what we are trying to spell out in the motion, namely, a proper course of action to resolve the problems confronting us in this State, in particular, so far as the Murray River is concerned. I read the paper this afternoon and I saw the cry from the Premier this morning: 'Unite and fight for the river'. We are quite prepared to do that; the Opposition has always indicated that it is prepared to unite and fight for the river so far as South Australia is concerned. That can best be demonstrated by the activities in which we were involved when the Labor Party was in Government in this State. As the Minister has quite rightly said, it was at my initiative and that of the Premier of the time, Don Dunstan, that in fact the steps that are still going on were started, and I would have hoped that they would be successful.

I was pleased to learn from the Minister during the course of his speech that we still have the right to go before the Land and Environment Court in New South Wales, irrespective of what legislation may have been introduced to bar us from getting access to the Land Board. Although that step has been taken (and I do not disagree with it), the court will not be subject to the dictates of the Government; it is a court in the true sense and therefore will be independent of the Executive and not subject to any instruction from the Government therefore should be impartial in the matter. Through that avenue, if there is any real risk, as we believe there may be, with the expansion that is going on in New South Wales, the proper course can be taken, and that is the proper venue to deal with such matters impartially.

While the member for Mitchell was Minister of Works, I gave thought as to whether we should not take some action of this kind. I was hopeful even then that we could have reached some agreement on the alteration of the River Murray Waters Act and the powers of the River Murray Commission. I thought at that time that such an action would not assist. However, I do not disagree with what the Minister of Water Resources has done. I think that it is a perfectly proper course to take. However, I would hope that it will not interfere with the negotiations that have yet to proceed to finalise the agreement to give the proper powers to the River Murray Commission in relation to quality: it is absolutely imperative that we get that. I am not privy to the exact reasons why that agreement is being held up. I believe there is some argument about whether any recommendation should be unanimous or whether or not it should be made by a majority decision.

For my part, even for it to be unanimous would be a step in the right direction, because it would allow the commission to consider the problems. I agree with the Minister that extended irrigation, industrial development, or anything else happening near or on the river will have a bearing on the quality of water, and therefore the commission would be vitally concerned. At least it could put its case and start to look at the matter. Whether or not we got unanimous agreement at that time because of a State interest, it would be advisable to see a proper investigation started and to see the argument put forward. Even that would be a step in the right direction.

I would like to see more pressure on the Federal Government, whatever its political complexion, to carry a larger burden of the financing of the great schemes that will have to take place on the river in order to minimise the problem as much as possible. I remember saying in 1975 that if we did nothing more to this river it would be absolutely useless in 20 years—and that would be the case. I agree with the Minister. South Australia has played its part in salt mitigation schemes within its own borders. It must go further, but it has played its part and will continue to do so.

I ask the Minister to put the position to the Premier. I would like the Minister to support it. If the Premier is keen on the Opposition's uniting with the Government in fighting this matter with the other two States and the Commonwealth, to put our point of view as a united body, why not have an all-Party committee of this House, under the chairmanship of the Minister, so that we can properly co-ordinate our approach, so that the Opposition can be informed, and so that we can keep our Party informed? I am quite certain that if we had such a committee we could sit down with these two motions and quickly thrash out a course of action. It would be no trouble. That is what I would like to see, and I make this as a positive suggestion. I would like to be a member of the committee, because I am certain that I could make some input, not only because of the knowledge I have, but also because of the people I know in the other States and the Commonwealth associated with this matter. I would be happy if the Premier would see fit to set up an all-Party committee of this Parliament, chaired by the Minister, so that we can co-ordinate our approach and be kept informed, doing something together to fight for this great natural resource which is so vastly important to South Australia.

For the reasons mentioned by the member for Stuart, and because the resolution that has come from the Legislative Council is a stronger one, I would prefer to support that, particularly because it mentions the role of the Commonwealth, which I would like to see advocated as forcefully as possible.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): I support the motion and oppose the amendment, and I shall briefly explain why. I am speaking for the Government on this motion, as Minister of Health, because quite obviously the issue is one of critical importance to South Australia, not only in the industrial and economic sense, but in the very sense of life and health itself. Unfortunately, I will not be able to canvass the issues that are related to health, but I was interested in the contribution of the member for Stuart as well as that of the member for Hartley, for whom all of us in this House have great respect and whose contribution in relation to water is one that we value. Nevertheless, the positive suggestion that he has just made is not a suggestion which the Labor Party made when in Government, when his own Party in Government could have had the assistance of the Hon. Peter Arnold, now Minister of Water Resources,

someone whose knowledge of the Murray River could hardly be equalled in the administrative sense as well as in the sense of experience. He is a son of the Murray River, and his knowledge of the river is unquestioned. It is both wide and deep, and his work in Government in defending the river, and looking after the State's interest in relation to the river, is something for which everyone in South Australia should be grateful.

The reasons why we oppose the amendment are that the motion which was moved in the Legislative Council and on which the amendment is based ignores the action that has been taken by the Government. The original Legislative Council motion referred to the need to take action in the High Court. The best legal advice in Australia that the Government has sought and obtained is that that course of action is not one which it should pursue. Nevertheless, the action that has been taken by the State Government in the legal sense has achieved a considerable amount. The Government, in its own resolution, sets out the course of action which it intends to take, and it does not intend to be dictated to by others who had the opportunity, for almost a decade, to set these things in motion. Admittedly, some things were initiated, but a great deal has been achieved in the past 18 months, and I want to outline briefly what it is.

The first thing the Government did on taking office was to oppose all further irrigation diversions in New South Wales. The member for Hartley pointed out that it was a question of attitude. I would like to point out to him that the sustained defence by the member for Stuart of the New South Wales attitude (it has appeared to us to be a sustained defence) is not one that South Australians would welcome. We do not believe that it is a sustainable course of action or that any spokesperson for South Australia should entertain the kind of conduct which the New South Wales Government has embarked upon.

The second principal course of action which the State Government took was to maintain the moratorium on South Australian licences and in fact to reduce the allocation of water for irrigation in South Australia. That was a major initiative, taken when New South Wales was expanding its irrigation licences. That is something South Australians cannot accept. We lodged an objection at the Land Board hearing at Wentworth, and our objection was upheld. The New South Wales Government appealed to the Land and Environment Court in Sydney, but the judgment has not yet been handed down.

In addition, the Government has vigorously publicly expressed its concern that New South Wales and Victoria appear to expect South Australia to accept 1 000 000 tonnes of salt annually as part of its statutory allocation, without any dilution of the flow. The member for Stuart referred to water filtration. I do not have the time to canvass what the Government has achieved in that respect, but it has been outlined several times in this House by the Minister of Water Resources. The single consultant has been selected by the Engineering and Water Supply Department for the planning, and the consultancy is expected to be let later this month; so we are along the road. Admittedly there is a long way to go, but we have taken the first step.

In addition, we have established a standing committee on water quality, and that is something that I think no other State has had the reason that South Australia has to do. It is necessary for health reasons for us to establish that committee, and if the Governments of New South Wales and Victoria were aware of the very deep concern for health reasons in this State in relation to water quality, I think they would be more amenable to suggestions that they should do something to limit the number of their irrigation licences. The motion which the Government has put is one that could and should be supported by the House. The amendment contains material which has already been dealt with in another place, and cannot be supported.

The SPEAKER: I inform the honourable member for Mitcham that he will have only about a minute and a quarter in which to speak.

Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I regret the tone of the Minister's speech. I think it augurs badly for co-operation between us. My support for the amendment, which is the motion passed by the Legislative Council, is principally because, in my view, the only card we have, the only force we have, is a legal force. The only thing we can do rather than talk, talk, talk, which has got us nowhere, is to take action in the High Court and to try our luck. I think there is at least a good chance that we would succeed. I cannot understand why the Government rejects that, because we have no other card in our pack to play but that one.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat.

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, Blacker, Corcoran, Duncan, Hamilton, Keneally (teller), Langley, McRae, Millhouse, O'Neill, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (18)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold (teller), Becker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs M. J. Brown, Crafter, Hemmings, Hopgood, and Payne. Noes—Messrs Ashenden, Billard, Gunn, Mathwin, and Tonkin.

The SPEAKER: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. There being an equality of votes, it is necessary for me to give a casting vote. I give the vote in the name of the Noes on the basis that the Government and the responsible Minister are involved with the carriage of the associated measures.

Amendment thus negatived.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.6 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 7 July 1981 at 2 p.m.

Honourable members rose in their places and sang the first verse of *God Save the Queen*.