HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 16 June 1982

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

PETITIONS: CASINO

Petitions signed by 157 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Federal Government to set up a committee to study the social effects of gambling, reject the proposals currently before the House to legalise casino gambling in South Australia, and establish a select committee on casino operations in this State were presented by Messrs Billard and Glazbrook.

Petitions received.

PETITION: PIE CART

A petition signed by 387 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose the proposed restricted trading hours of the Adelaide railway station pie cart was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: COMMUNITY WELFARE OFFICE

A petition signed by 148 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to retain the Hindmarsh Community Welfare Office as a full branch office and review the needs of the entire western region was presented by Mr Abbott.

Petition received.

PETITION: HOUSING TRUST RENTALS

A petition signed by 22 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide local venues for the payment of South Australian Housing Trust rentals was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Before calling for questions, I indicate that any questions which normally would go to the Minister of Agriculture should go to the Minister of Industrial Affairs. Any questions which would normally go to the Minister of Water Resources should go to the Deputy Premier.

PREMIER'S TALK

Mr BANNON: Will the Premier now talk to this Parliament for a few minutes on a matter 'effecting' the future well-being of every South Australian, and use his paid time on television tonight to take up my challenge of a debate on matters of immediate importance to this State, including unemployment, assistance to home buyers, State finances, education and health cuts, and the exodus of 15 000 South Australians from this State? If he will not do that, why not? A moment ago the Premier declined your invitation, Sir, to make a statement to this House, yet this morning in the *Advertiser*, and I understand, too, in this afternoon's edition of the *News*, a large advertisement was published which reads:

> The Premier would like to talk to you for a few minutes on a matter effecting—

a very useful training in the three Rs, obviously, according to the Premier—

> the future well-being of every South Australian.

That advertisement was unattributed. It carried no authorisation. There is no indication of whether it was placed by the Government, the Liberal Party, or some private group, and there was no mark of any advertising agency. Several weeks ago, when I released stage I of Labor's economic plan for South Australia, I challenged the Premier to a debate on television on the real issues affecting every South Australian. The Premier declined that invitation. He would not face me, but I am told that tonight, in a paid, scripted, stage-managed, carefully rehearsed television commercial, we are going to hear the Premier talk about something of interest that he ought to share now, today, with this House.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I understand that that advertisement has caused the Leader some difficulty today. I understand that he has been jumping up and down. I am quite surprised to hear the overreaction that has transpired. To come to a lead question in the House on this matter is quite amazing.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: He is a bit toey, isn't he?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Well, I understand that at one stage during the proceedings before the press conference he hurriedly called after he had heard that something was to be said tonight, he said, 'I want a debate.' Someone said, 'A debate about what?' He said, 'Whatever it is he is going to talk about.' Really, I make the point that the Leader of the Opposition seems to have forgotten something fairly fundamental about the proceedings in this place, which is that the television medium is not the place for debates. This is not a school, and this is not a school exercise. There is no way that the debates that the Leader so desperately seems to want (and I do not know why) are going to go on on television. The place for proper debate on all these matters that the Leader has just listed, and, again, has misrepresented, which we are now becoming tremendously accustomed to, is this Chamber. The debate has already been carried on in this Chamber and will continue to be carried on here. Indeed, I have some answers that may interest the Leader of the Opposition again today. As for the advertisement in the newspaper this morning about what is to be said this evening, the Leader will have to contain himself in patience.

HOUSING SHORTAGE

Mr GLAZBROOK: Will the Premier say what is the present position of the Government's housing programme in South Australia? The Opposition, as we have heard, has been very critical of the housing shortage in South Australia. It has accused the Goverment of cutting back housing funds. Is this, in fact, true?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No, that is not true, but, again, that is not uncommon for members of the Opposition. At the present time, although there is a critical shortage of housing funds, I am happy to report that the State Government is spending a record amount in 1981-82 on housing. We have been able to do this by the mobilisation of non-Budget funds. We have used some innovative methods of raising funds and putting them into the housing area. With the reserves that have been set aside in recent years, it has been possible to maintain our efforts in the housing area in real terms; as I said, we are spending a record sum in 1981-82.

In fact, this financial year the South Australian Housing Trust construction programme will be in excess of $110 000 000 and the State Bank concessional home loans scheme will exceed $86 000 000. That is a record and is something that gives us some heart and some hope of catching up on the back-lag. The number of multi-unit dwellings on which construction is starting is also increasing, much to the delight of the *South Australian Builder* of May 1982, and I refer honourable members to the editorial in that publication. It sets out the position very well and acknowledges that the position in South Australia is getting to be better than the position in the other States.

UNEMPLOYED WORKERS UNION

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Minister of Public Works say whether the Government will continue to assist with the provision of accommodation for the Unemployed Workers Union, and, if it will not, why not? I understand that on 9 June the Public Buildings Department advised the Secretary of the Unemployed Workers Union that its premises in Gawler Place will be demolished in the near future and that the Public Buildings Department is unable to grant the union continued occupation beyond the end of July. I would like to know whether any alternative provision has been made for the Unemployed Workers Union.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: First, I will explain the reasons why the Public Buildings Department has asked the Unemployed Workers Union to move. The reason is that the new fire brigade building is about to go ahead on what is the traditional Wakefield Street site where Government cars have been parked in the past. As a result of that, it is necessary for the Government to find other long-term accommodation for its motor vehicles. The honourable member will agree, as a former Minister of Public Works, that a very large number of vehicles has been parked in Wakefield Street.

The Government has been negotiating with a number of parties for potential Government car parking space. Some of those involved the premises in Gawler Place. In fact, one such negotiation is proceeding with the Baptist Church. One way or another, the Government proposes to use that site in Gawler Place as its long-term car park. Whether it is to be constructed by an outside agency, using partly privately-owned and partly Government-owned land (which would be sold, of course, to the outside body), or whether it is to be done through Government agencies has not yet been decided and depends on the various negotiations that are proceeding.

However, the situation will shortly be critical, because we need to be off the Wakefield Street site by the end of August, if I remember correctly. Therefore, the Government is preparing the site and we have given the occupants the required one or two months (I think it is one month) notice that we will need that space. I am aware that there was an agreement between the Government, signed by the former Government, and the union and I realise that anything this Government would do would need to take that agreement into account. The Government is looking for other accommodation for the unit.

However, I also express a concern or two, the first being that, since that agreement was reached between the former Government and the Unemployed Workers Union to use Government accommodation, I have been disturbed to find that the Unemployed Workers Union has, if you like, become a political Party, because it decided to run a political candidate in the Boothby by-election. I do not believe that the Government should be in the position of handing out free accommodation to political Parties. Certainly, if that is the sort of role the union sees for itself, the Government will have to look seriously at what commitment it makes to supplying free Government accommodation.

There have been one or two other concerns, which I know that the Minister of Community Welfare has taken up, because certain grants are made from his department. The Minister has expressed concern about some of the activities in which these people have been involved and to what extent they should be financially backed by the Government in the light of what they see as their role.

The final decision about whether or not we supply any accommodation to the Unemployed Workers Union in the future is yet to be made, and it depends on a number of factors, including what the union sees as its role and also whether or not suitable accommodation is available. I cannot indicate at this stage whether or not alternative accommodation will be found. There is a very valid reason, as I have said, why we need that accommodation urgently, and I expect that the bulldozers will be moved in some time in August to start preparing the site for the Government car park.

CAPITAL WORKS

Mr OSWALD: Will the Premier say what is the present position of spending on capital works in South Australia? The Opposition has repeatedly claimed that the building and construction industry is in dire straits because of the lack of Government spending. The Leader of the Opposition has at the same time criticised the Government for spending what he calls the State's reserves.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Opposition and the Leader of the Opposition have fallen into the trap of looking at only part of the picture and ignoring the total picture, which is not uncommon—this seems to be something that the Opposition does all the time. Whether members opposite choose to do that or whether they just do not understand, I do not know. In summary, taking into account all public sector capital expenditure, the Government is spending more on construction and housing projects, not less, as the Opposition continually asserts.

If members opposite want to bring up these facts, they should use all of the facts and should not present half truths, which distort the picture completely. I think someone once said that half truths are a more vicious form of lies than any other form of misrepresentation. Members opposite are indulging in half truths which distort the situation completely. Looking at the level of Government expenditure and the combined effect not only of capital and revenue expenditures but also of Budget and non-budget sections, the position becomes quite clear. I have already said earlier this afternoon that the amount spent on housing this financial year has been a record sum.

Regarding the capital works, the Electricity Trust is applying its reserves towards the cost of construction of the Northern Power Station, a major project which is vital to the future of this State; the State Transport Authority, of which the Minister is very proud, is now using reserves placed with it a year or so ago for the construction of the north-east busway, and other construction projects are in train, such as the railcar depot. Other new projects which have been announced, such as the new fire headquarters, the new S.G.I.C. city car park, the D.T.A.F.E. city college, the aquatic centre and the remand centre, as well as providing excellent new facilities for the public of South Australia, will certainly assist the construction industry. Statutory authorities have been used, as a matter of normal practice, to building up their reserves over a number of years under the semi-government programme in readiness for construc-

tion projects. The Festival Centre Trust, the cultural centre trusts and now the Metropolitan Fire Service headquarters are all examples of this planned buildup of reserves for use in construction and building projects in the future.

It is absolutely absurd and totally ill-informed for the Opposition to complain that reserves are being spent, when that is exactly the reason why the reserves were put aside in the first place—to be spent on specific projects at the appropriate time. It is equally absurd to say that the total public works programme has been reduced. In fact, taking everything into account, it has increased, and increased most significantly. Despite the efforts of the Opposition to run down the achievements of this Government by half truths, the truth is now filtering through. Vast sums are being invested in South Australia, and our State is on the road to recovery. Regarding the effect on the building and construction industry, I can do no better than to read the editorial of the May issue of the *South Australian Builder*, to which I have already referred. I am sure that the member for Morphett will find this interesting, and I hope that other honourable members will, too. The editorial in the *South Australian Builder* states:

> Hear the good news.
>
> An international terminal is to be built at Adelaide Airport. The Telecom headquarters building in Adelaide is to proceed to construction. The number of multi-unit dwellings on which construction is starting is increasing. While this is not an indication that the whole picture for the industry is rosy, these items do show that the whole future for the industry is not dark and gloomy, either.
>
> But looking beyond those items, the State's small business men are showing renewed confidence, if the March quarter 1982 non-residential building approvals can be taken as a guide. There were 451 approvals in the under $200 000 value category during the quarter—an improvement of 83 per cent on last year and representing 11 per cent of such approvals for the whole of Australia and 10 per cent of the total Australian value of such jobs.

That is more, I might say, than our population share. The editorial continues:

> In fact, during the first quarter of 1982, South Australia accounted for 10.5 per cent of all non-residential jobs with a value of $1 000 000 or less approved in Australia. However, while the State still seems to be missing out on its share of 'the big ones', there is, nevertheless, an underlying level of confidence in the construction of those buildings that are the 'bread and butter' of much of the industry.

That statement comes from the building industry itself, from the journal of the building industry, and it is a very good indication of the confidence that is now building up in the building and construction industry in South Australia, particularly when the state of that industry is compared with the state of the industry in other States.

EDUCATION BUDGET

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Is the Minister of Education making representations to the Budget Review Committee opposing the proposals of that commmittee to cut $4 500 000 from the next education budget and $750 000 from the further education budget? I have been reliably informed that the razor gang, also known as the Budget Review Committee, is proposing that there be a cut in the Education Department vote in the next Budget of $4 500 000 and a cut in the TAFE vote of $750 000.

Last year, on 25 March 1981, I issued a press release calling for the Minister of Education to be appointed to the razor gang during its consideration of education votes. At the time I stated that it was important to have the Minister charged with the responsibility of education on that committee, indicating that there existed the real danger that if that were not the case then 'it is possible that educational goals may be overlooked and cuts could result.' I further said that the Minister should be participating in any such investigation 'so that the social costs and benefits of education will be considered first'. My call for the present Minister to be included in the razor gang deliberations was not a vote of confidence in his personal ability, rather a reflection that the Minister of the Crown—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member now, by using quotes of a previous press release, is starting not only to comment but to debate the issue. I ask the honourable member to come quickly to the point.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I apologise for the transgression; in fact, in the last sentence I was not quoting from a press release but making a comment that it was a reflection that the Minister of the Crown handling education, if involved in that committee, would be under an obligation to represent the interests of education. Now that the razor gang appears set to attack education again—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: —it is essential that someone is in there fighting on behalf of education.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I begin by saying that I am extremely delighted that the member for Salisbury has totally discredited an impression given by a former Premier of this House that the State's Budget would be reduced by one-third, which of course would have been an absolutely ridiculous situation to consider, with one-third off the Education Department's budget meaning the dismissal of 5 000 teachers, for example, together with 2 000 ancillary staff. That simply highlights the ridiculous nature of the speculation that has been rife in the community, but which is mainly being put around by almost panic-stricken past, present, and probably other members of the Australian Labor Party. I am not sure what is going on. I can assure the honourable member that representation has already been made to the Treasurer by the Minister of Education and by senior officers of his department for a fair share of the cake.

I think that it bears careful consideration by all members of the community that over the preceding two years there have been alleged cuts in education: but the reality, of course, can easily be ascertained after recourse to those important documents which are lying around the House, and I refer to the Auditor-General's annual reports which show that there have been no substantial cuts in education. The Government has more than beaten the best efforts of the previous Government in 1977, 1978 and 1979 when education spending did not come even two-thirds of the way towards the then c.p.i. indexation figures.

This Government over the last two years, in spite of the wicked allegations that have been made, has come along with indexation, has more than met it, has spent increasingly more on education; it was 25 per cent of the State's budgetary allocation in 1975, and it is 33⅓ per cent of the State's budgetary allocation for the current financial year. So, if the honourable member is trying to imply that this Government will continue to go backwards, let me remind him that we have continued to go forward in educational spending—

Mr Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Yes, representations have been made to Treasury. The question that he asks highlights the ridiculous campaign that has been going on for the last 2½ years. What is in the Budget papers will be known when the Budget is handed down, which will be a little later in the year.

HERITAGE PRECINCTS

Mr RANDALL: Does the Minister of Environment and Planning intend to declare any more heritage precincts within

this State? The Minister, as I understand it, has power under the Act to declare such areas from time to time.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: To answer the question, yes, we are considering more areas that could be set aside as heritage precincts in South Australia. The member would be aware, as has been indicated, that the Minister has that responsibility under the Heritage Act but this has not been taken up until very recently when we declared an important part of Port Adelaide as South Australia's first heritage precinct. Of course, the site of Port Adelaide was established as the colony's major port back in 1840, and it was an obvious choice for a heritage precinct.

We are considering other areas at this stage, but the member should be aware that much consultation needs to take place before such an area is set aside, particularly with local government. In the setting aside of the Port Adelaide heritage precinct, the Port Adelaide city council was very much involved and is to be commended on its input and involvement in relation to that project. So, consultation is currently taking place with local government authorities, and we are looking at specific areas on Yorke Peninsula and in the lower South-East as areas that have been recommended to us for inclusion as heritage precincts.

The announcement of the heritage precinct for Port Adelaide has been very well received indeed, it is seen as a forward step in protecting the heritage of this State; so it should be, because that area is most significant. The area was selected because it is part of the physical, social and cultural heritage of this State, an important part, particularly because of its significant aesthetic, historical and cultural interest. That, of course, would be the basis of any area being set aside as a precinct for the future. So, to answer the question, the Government is considering further areas. Personally, I would like to see further areas dedicated very soon.

GAS SUPPLIES

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy explain why he has consistently failed to give the House and the people of South Australia the true picture with respect to likely further quantities of gas which may be available for use by South Australia after 1987? Members are aware, from statements by the Minister, both outside and inside the House, that he has consistently maintained that at some magical date in 1987 in respect of gas all is lost for South Australia.

He has had an explanation associated with that which I will not go into at the moment, but in order to explain my question I believe I need only quote from a letter I have dated 10 June 1981 which is signed by Mr D. H. Nimmo, General Manager of the Pipelines Authority of South Australia, and addressed to Mr R. Thomas, General Manager of Santos, as he then was, at North Adelaide. The letter states:

> Dear Mr Thomas,
>
> Thank you for your letter dated 22 May 1981 requesting further information on ETSA's proposal to reduce their requirement for natural gas at Torrens Island up to 1987 in order to extend supply beyond that year. ETSA have now advised me that, as a broad indication, their anticipated reductions would be—
>
> by transferring generation from Torrens Island to Port Augusta now, 10 per cent of ACQ [annual contract quantity] for each year 1982 to 1987 (total, say, 60 per cent);
>
> by conversion of boilers at Torrens Island to coal firing, first conversion effective 1984, 10 per cent of ACQ in 1984 rising to 50 per cent in 1987 (total, say, 110 per cent)
>
> thus releasing 1½ to 1¾ years gas supply (based on current ACQ's) for use after 1987, assuming the decision to convert to coal firing is made almost immediately.
>
> This would also seem to be an appropriate time to raise with you another related matter. Sagasco's gas purchases in recent years, although always greater than the contractual minimum of 80 per cent, have been considerably less than the full annual contract quantity. In the same way as ETSA are contemplating the use in years after 1987 of gas reductions occurring up to 1987, would the producers be prepared to agree to a similar arrangement in relation to Sagasco's shortfalls? I would appreciate an opportunity to discuss these matters with you so that I can provide a reply to ETSA and Sagasco.

Clearly, that letter indicates that the Minister ought to have been aware of alternatives with regard to South Australia's gas supply after 1987 of which he has made no mention in this House or to the public of South Australia.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Quoting that letter cold, as the honourable member has done, simply indicates that he has no appreciation whatsoever of the situation facing South Australia in relation to gas supplies and the alternatives available to ETSA. I am well aware of the contents of that letter and of the context in which it was written.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Why didn't you tell the House before?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Because the honourable member did not ask me this question before, but I will certainly tell him now. Everything I have told the House previously in relation to our gas supplies is the absolute truth, and I will elaborate further.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You didn't mention that.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am about to. The Electricity Trust has to make plans now for future generating capacity in South Australia after the new northern power station is commissioned, the first 250 megawatts in 1984 and the second 250 megawatts thereafter, within a year or two. However, decisions have to be made now in relation to the base load which will apply in 1990 as to where the next 250 megawatts will come from.

That letter was written in the context of uncertainty in relation to our gas supplies in the Cooper Basin according to the contracts currently extant which were written by the previous Labor Government. One of the alternatives canvassed in that letter quoted by the honourable member was that Torrens Island be converted to burn coal. That would be black coal imported from New South Wales.

It was necessary for the Electricity Trust of South Australia to make all the contingency plans and do all the costings in relation to the catastrophe, and it would be nothing less, which would hit South Australia if, in fact, this or any other Government is unsuccessful in renegotiating that stupid contract with New South Wales into which the Labor Government entered. Those sums have been done, and the letter quoted was written in that context. Torrens Island power station is basically a gas-fired power station; it can burn oil, but the cost of that is prohibitive. When that gas runs out, if the alternative is to convert Torrens Island to burn coal, which would be imported from New South Wales, we would have to downgrade the rating of that station by about 25 per cent, and I believe that that would have the effect of doubling electricity tariffs in South Australia. If it did not do that, it would nevertheless have a dramatic effect on the cost of electricity to consumers in this State. It is in the context of that problem with which I am currently grappling in relation to these gas contracts that that letter was written.

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the honourable member had asked me, I would have told him, but the fact is (I am not sure that it is not even mentioned in the Electricity Trust's annual report) that that sum has been done as one of the alternatives available to South Australia if, in fact, those gas contracts are not renegotiated. There is not enough gas yet discovered to satisfy the Sydney contract. In fact, between 600 and 700 billion cubic feet of gas has yet to be discovered between now and 1987 to satisfy that

contract, which the Labor Party wrote to the year 2006, before any further gas is available to South Australia. The Government sees this as a matter of urgency. I am personally involved in the negotiations with A.G.L. at the moment.

Mr Hemmings: That's bad news.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, this Government has been successful in negotiating a liquids scheme, which is highly advantageous to this State. It has also been successful in negotiating a Roxby Downs indenture, which is highly advantageous to this State. I am quite convinced that this Government will be successful in negotiating a rewrite of the arrangements in relation to gas, but the legal position and lack of any sort of business expertise or common sense in negotiation by members opposite are so apparent in these gas contracts that, as I pointed out to the House before, the former Premier was warned not only by Government officials at the time but also by Bob Blair.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Let me refer to *Hansard.* Former Premier Dunstan took full credit for writing these contracts, against the warning of public servants, and also one of the producers, namely, Mr Bob Blair, of Delhi, with whom I have spoken. He does not mind his name being used, because it is in the minutes of the meetings which I have read. This Government sees as a No. 1 priority the assurance of gas supplies to this State after 1987. I believe that that is probably one of the most difficult legacies which the previous Government left us, and it left us plenty. I have been talking to the Minister of Mines from the Northern Territory; despite other matters which are pressing in on this Parliament, I have been negotiating in relation to our obtaining gas from the southern part of the Northern Territory. I had discussions as late as this morning and will be meeting him in the near future. As a backstop, I have had discussions, as I say, with A.G.L., the people who have the contract for Sydney. The Premier and I have had discussions in Queensland in relation to gas supplies, and only last week I had further discussions with the Bass Strait producers about a proposal for a gas line to go to Western Victoria. We are negotiating on the feasibility of extending that line, in the first instance, to Mount Gambier, where the Gas Company has lost money, quite frankly, in providing gas via l.p.g. We are exploring all those possibilities. We would dearly like to have a gas spur line to Whyalla, where the Gas Company is also losing money.

However, we cannot do that, because of the stupidity of the gas contracts with which we have to wrestle. All the question indicates is that the honourable member opposite has no conception at all of what is going on in relation to contingency plans with which the Electricity Trust, the Pipelines Authority and the producers are grappling in relation to alternatives which may have to be followed in relation to the Electricity Trust of South Australia, all of which will have a dramatic impact, in my judgment, on the price of electricity in South Australia. It is this Government's intention to see that that situation is overcome. Lord help us if members opposite were on the scene and writing contracts of the type to which I have just referred. That letter indicates some alternatives which I sincerely hope we never have to follow in relation to the Torrens Island power station.

NEW INVESTMENTS

Mr ASHENDEN: Can the Minister of Industrial Affairs give any details of the new investment being made by the Adelaide-based Seraphic Company at Beverley?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am delighted to announce that Seraphic has announced that it intends to invest about $2 000 000 in its operation at Beverley. The purpose of that investment is to install a new glass-toughening furnace. Here is a South Australian company, faced with a fair degree of competition from both interstate and overseas, with sufficient confidence in this State's and also Australia's economy to go ahead with this $2 000 000 investment. It is a roller hearth toughening furnace which will improve the finished product and the output of the plant. This will ensure that Seraphic can cater for the growing domestic appliance demand in this State.

Mr Whitten interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: In particular, as the honourable member who just interjected across the House would realise, glass seraphics are now a very important element in domestic appliances, and—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Industrial Affairs.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Members opposite do not seem to be too pleased with some very good news. They seem to be upset that here is yet another company making a significant investment in this State. I am delighted to say that Seraphic, which is part of the Pilkington-A.C.I. group in this State, has a great deal of confidence in South Australia. This is an investment which will secure an industry which otherwise would have been threatened, and I am particularly delighted that this Adelaide-based company is able to compete on both overseas and interstate markets.

ALLIED ENGINEERING

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister of Environment and Planning reconcile his statement to me yesterday that a Cabinet subcommittee will be set up to investigate the problems of Allied Engineering at Royal Park with his answers to my questions in this place on 23 September 1981 and in correspondence to my office of 7 October of the same year? As I recall, the Minister advised me yesterday that as a result of a Cabinet decision a subcommittee is to be established consisting of himself, the Minister of Industrial Affairs and the Minister of Housing to further investigate this vexed question. On 23 September last year, in this place, I asked the Minister a question, as follows:

> Will the Minister of Environment and Planning undertake to confer with the Minister of Industrial Affairs to ascertain what requests for financial assistance for relocation have been received from the firm of Allied Engineering at Royal Park, and what assistance is available or has been offered to that firm for relocation purposes?

In part, the Minister replied that he had already had discussions with the Minister of Industrial Affairs. He further stated:

> We are looking into various matters of how the problem can be overcome.

On 7 October, in reply to my letter to the Minister of 28 August 1981 regarding the same firm, the Minister, in part, stated:

> I apologise for the delay in replying. It is my understanding that an unsuccessful relocation attempt by Allied Engineering has led the firm to experience financial difficulty. However, the company has not submitted information stating that it cannot afford to retain the services of a noise consultant.
>
> Allied Engineering has advised the Department of Environment and Planning that it does not intend to employ a consultant, specified as the condition of the exemption. The Government will consider what action it should take when the time is appropriate. I am advised that the matter is currently being examined by the Department of Trade and Industry.

As I explained in this House last week, as a result of a deputation and because of assurances that the Minister would put this matter before Cabinet in an attempt to

overcome this very vexed question, my constituents would now like to know when the Government subcommittee will hand down its decision, as they have informed me that once again they have been fobbed off—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON: —by what they consider—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON: —to be an incompetent Minister.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Albert Park knows full well that comments of that nature will not be tolerated by the Chair. The honourable Minister of Environment and Planning.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I guess that is what we have come to expect from members opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The member who has just asked the question would be very much aware of the circumstances. He has referred to this matter as a very vexed question. He would be aware from discussions that I have had with him personally and from discussions I have had with his constituents that much consultation is taking place in regard to this matter. I point out to the member that it was his Government that brought down this legislation and it was a Minister in the previous Government who indicated during evidence that was given to the select committee established to discuss that legislation that the legislation would not in any way affect the operations of any existing industries.

The commitment was made at that time. I will not say that it is an easy question to answer, because it is not, as the member realises. I have indicated to him that we will look into every aspect of this matter. Discussions have taken place with my colleague and they will continue to take place until we are able to look into assisting. I want the House to know that the commitment was made by the previous Government, which recognised the problems. There is plenty of evidence to suggest that that Government believed that those problems would continue, because the file refers to many incidents, indicating that the previous Government experienced problems in this regard, just as there are problems in regard to one of the matters to which the member has referred today.

I have already spent a great deal of time listening to the member and to a deputation that included his constituents. When we are able to bring down a report on this matter, I will do so, and in the meantime I see no problem at all in consulting with the Minister of Industrial Affairs and the other member of the committee that has been set up. When we finalise the situation and when I am in a position to bring back a report to the member, I will do so.

LAND LEASES

Mr GUNN: Will the Deputy Premier, representing the Minister of Lands today, say whether it is still the Government's intention to legislate to allow people who currently hold marginal perpetual leases to convert such leases to freehold title? Many people have been concerned for some time that they are able to freehold certain sections of their properties that may be held under a straight perpetual lease but that some of these leases have attached to them areas of land that are held under marginal perpetual lease and currently they cannot freehold such areas. It would be advantageous to the people concerned if the legislation could be amended so that freehold title could be obtained for all marginal lands in this State.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: As a general statement, this Government, as a matter of policy, believes that it is desirable that citizens of this State hold land under freehold title. We know that that is not a view shared by our opponents opposite who have a different view, namely, that the more goods and property held in the name of the State the more it suits their purposes, but we on this side of the House quite unashamedly believe in private ownership of homes, land and property, in clear contra-distinction to the policies of those members opposite. I would think that, as a result of the deliberations by members opposite last weekend, the view I have just expressed would highlight even further that philosophical difference.

If my memory serves me correctly, the answer to the honourable member's question is 'Yes', but I will obtain a more detailed report from the Minister of Lands. I am sure the honourable member will be quite satisfied with that report. It never ceases to amaze me what amuses members opposite when they are obviously in deep trouble.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Mr PETERSON: My question is supplementary to a recent question on natural gas. Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether it is intended by Asahi, in the proposal for a petro-chemical plant, to use natural gas as the generating fuel in the plant? When the plant was first proposed, one of the suggestions was that it be located within the Semaphore electorate. I took the opportunity at that stage to speak to the principals of that company, and my recollection is that they said that part of the proposal was to use natural gas as a generating fuel for the plant. I would like clarification about whether that is right, and if it is and if gas is in such short supply, why should the company be looking at that proposal?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The fact is that the agreements entered into, again by the previous Administration, set aside, I think, 217 billion cubic feet of gas for a petro-chemical plant. That is perfectly clear in the agreements, but what is not clear is what would happen to that gas if the petro-chemical plant does not proceed. The proposal in relation to the petro-chemical plant at the moment is as was originally envisaged, because they are the terms entered into by the previous Administration. I certainly take the honourable member's point; it will be a matter of final decision involving, first, a legal determination of what happens to that gas at the end.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: It's three or four years supply.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Are members opposite saying now that they were stupid in writing that original agreement? Are they also saying that they were stupid in relation to that gas supply? The fact is that final decisions in all of these matters will be made when the feasibility studies in relation to the petro-chemical plant are completed. I know I keep complimenting the honourable member. It is not hard to do that when one takes stock of the quality of the questions, and I do not want to embarrass him, but that is about the most sensible question in relation to gas I have had in the past year.

ARTIFICIAL REEFS

Mr BECKER: Will the Chief Secretary advise the House of the success of otherwise of the artificial reefs built off shore at Glenelg North and Henley Beach and the subsequent research of fishery resources in St Vincent Gulf? Some years ago artificial reefs were built, using used motor vehicle tyres, located in the vicinity of Glenelg North and Henley Beach, to encourage new fish breeding grounds. I also understand that some of the best whiting grounds were located off West

Beach. Over the years allegations have been made to me of the loss of seaweed, and other natural feeding grounds for fish have been eroded because of the large amount of water and effluent discharged in the area from the Glenelg North treatment works.

I am now concerned about allegations that the size and number of whiting have been declining in St Vincent Gulf in the past decade. A letter to the Editor in today's *News* raises doubts of the Minister's previous reassurance that whiting were not in danger of being fished out. Furthermore, this matter raises the question of research into our fishery resources, particularly in St Vincent Gulf, and the effect of the artificial reefs. I also understand that consideration was given some years ago to a suggestion that a research laboratory of the Fisheries Department should be built next to Marineland at West Beach. The Minister may be aware that activities at Marineland with dolphins and seals, in so far as breeding, training and research are concerned, are highly regarded overseas.

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: The honourable member raises a series of questions relevant to the management of the fishery and fishing in St Vincent Gulf. In relation to artificial reefs, the department has monitored the effect of those reefs and will continue to do so. Preliminary advice indicates that, in relation to schnapper breeding grounds, they have served some valuable purpose. Of course, the honourable member would be aware that artificial reefs are not a natural breeding ground for whiting. The critical aspect for whiting is seagrass beds, which is another question altogether.

I am sure the honourable member, as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, would realise that, despite the fact that old tyres are placed down, there is still a cost involved in establishing artificial reefs in the gulf area. Whilst I would be pleased to see further reefs placed through St Vincent Gulf, provided finances are available to do so, we will undertake that particular course of action.

In relation to whiting stocks, processors have given advice to us that, in fact, there has been a depletion of stock in hand. Whereas at this time last year there were approximately 1 000 boxes in one particular processor's factory, there are currently four, which indicates that demand is keeping pace with supply. We are unable to build up stocks for winter months, coming into the Christmas period, but that does not mean to say that the gulf is depleted totally of whiting stocks. What it means is that the demand has possibly increased. In addition to that, whiting migrate extensively throughout the gulf, and perhaps the fisherman referred to in the *News* today is fishing in the wrong spot for the whiting, or has the wrong tackle.

In relation to the development of research laboratories, I believe that the Department of Fisheries ought to be able to have good data available to it to provide, with the Government, for the effective development of management policies for the fishery of this State. I would like to see further research work and, to assist that either a research vessel or a laboratory established in this State, funds permitting.

The current Fisheries Bill will provide the Government with flexibility in its management policies for the fisheries. South Australia has been recognised throughout Australia as having one of the best managed fisheries in Australia, and the Government intends to continue that practice.

AMDEL

Mr PLUNKETT: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy explain why Amdel, at Thebarton, is crushing ore during the night? A resident whose property is near Amdel telephoned me last Friday to tell me that, for the past three months, Amdel had been crushing ore through the night until 5 a.m. The lights had been on and a yellow smoke was belching from the plant. Considerable noise coming from the works was worrying and disturbing the nearby residents.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The answer to the first part of the question is that Amdel is crushing ore at night because it has to work overtime. That adds weight to the point made yesterday by the Minister of Industrial Affairs, when he mentioned some of the increased activity at Amdel because of its reputation, not only Australia-wide but world-wide, as a body of international repute. Amdel undertakes a wide range of work, and one area of expertise is the analysis of ore produced with a view to developing methods of metal extraction; it has a world-wide reputation in this field. That work involves the grinding and crushing of ore. In a sense, I think it is pleasing that we have an enterprise in South Australia which finds that it has to work around the clock. That is the answer to the first part of the question. I do not think the honourable member should complain, at a time when employment around the nation is depressed, that at least one industry has sufficient work to keep it going continuously.

The second part of the question relates to difficulties being experienced by nearby residents. I am not talking about the manufactured difficulties of the member for Hindmarsh (Mr J. Scott); I am not talking about the sort of mischievous and misleading untruths which are noised abroad frequently by Mr Scott. I do not class the honourable member in that category; quite frankly, I think the honourable member is a cut above that, and I take his question as being genuine. If there is a genuine complaint in relation to the noise—

Mr Plunkett: Of course there is.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The point is that if it was a complaint by Mr Scott, quite frankly I would not believe it, because every other complaint he has made has been found to have been groundless. If it is a genuine complaint from local residents, I am only—

Mr Plunkett: Why are they crushing and grinding ore at night?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I would not mind it if a few members opposite went through the crusher; they might come out better for it. I will be only too happy to take up the complaint if the honourable member—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: —would give me details of the people who are complaining about the level of noise emanating from the Amdel operations. I will then take up the matter with Amdel management to see if the problem can be ameliorated. However, I am rather pleased that Amdel has the volume of work it has to keep it going.

SMALL BUSINESS ADVISORY BUREAU

Mr SCHMIDT: I direct my question to the Minister of Industrial Affairs. In Saturday's paper an advertisement was placed by the Small Business Advisory Bureau—

The SPEAKER: Order! What is the question?

Mr SCHMIDT: I am asking the Minister of Industrial Affairs about the advertisement which was placed in the newspaper. I would like to know what response the Government has received from that advertisement and what service is being provided by that bureau. Last year I invited the Minister to speak to small businesses in my district and at that meeting he undertook to appoint an adviser to the Noarlunga Economic Development Board. Since then a considerable amount of interest has been shown in the work of the Small Business Advisory Bureau.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The Small Business Advisory Bureau has undertaken an advertising campaign in the two daily newspapers as well as in the *Sunday Mail*. The first of those advertisements appeared last Saturday. It was headed, 'Starting your own business? Why not talk to a counsellor from the Small Business Advisory Bureau about your plans? Counselling is free.' The advertisement gives some details about the bureau. The advertisement is specifically directed to these people who want to set up a small business, and it has been interesting to see that the number of daily inquiries has lifted substantially; in fact, it has more than doubled what it was previously, and yesterday 78 inquiries were received for advice in relation to the setting up of small business or some other related matter. That is pleasing, because generally the daily average runs at 32 inquiries. That trend has continued today, and I think that that highlights the recognition of the excellent service being given by the bureau, and particularly by Mr Peter Elder, who now heads it.

I think the question asked about the services provided by the bureau. It gives basically consultancy advice on how to set up a small business, advice on matters such as leasing, what matters should be looked at in relation to entering into a franchise arrangement, where to seek expert advice on matters like financing or legal problems, and also there is a provision for specific studies to be undertaken if the bureau thinks it vital to the success of the small business, in which case the Government will pay about half the cost of that consultancy. That is called a small business consultancy grant.

The bureau is also undertaking an education programme. The bureau will hold a series of seminars in the metropolitan area and in country centres. I am delighted to say that, as the honourable member already knows, one such seminar is to be held at the Reynella Community Centre, Reynella, on Tuesday 29 June, from 4.30 to 7.15 p.m., and small business men in the Reynella, Noarlunga or other southern metropolitan areas will be invited to attend. The seminar will highlight many areas of immediate concern to small business, such as difficulties in raising finance. Part of that seminar is being devoted to the subject of a positive approach to raising finance, while another part will be directed towards solving the problems faced by small business men. I hope that the honourable member will pass on to small business men in his district the fact that that seminar will be held, and I think that they will benefit greatly from attending and seeing what services can be provided by the Small Business Advisory Bureau. Small business plays an essential role in our community and in the economic growth of our State, and we as a Government would like to see it succeed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: ALLIED ENGINEERING

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr HAMILTON: During a reply from the Minister of Environment and Planning, an interjection was thrown across the floor by the Minister of Industrial Affairs in which he stated that he believed that I wanted to close down the firm of Allied Engineering. I categorically refute such an allegation. If the Minister had been listening, and if he had followed up the information that I have provided to this Parliament in the last 2½ years, he would have known that on many occasions I have pointed out clearly to the Parliament that we do not want to see this firm closed; in fact, the firm has indicated quite clearly to me and to the Minister, by way of correspondence, that, if the Government is prepared to relocate it, it wishes to expand and to provide more opportunities for employment for people in that area. I categorically refute such an allegation, and I would hope that the Minister would not make such inane remarks in the future.

At 3.10 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Mr O'NEILL

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

That two weeks leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Florey (Mr O'Neill), on account of ill health.

Motion carried.

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Second reading.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill has been prepared to provide further procedural changes to improve the administration of courts of summary jurisdiction. A procedure has been created by which a person who applies to have a conviction set aside and who is the subject of a warrant of commitment in that matter may be released from custody whilst that application is proceeding. The decision whether or not to release the applicant pending the hearing of the application is one for the court. It is similar to the case of a person in the same situation who lodges a justices appeal against a conviction or penalty.

A more efficient system of payment of fines and sums adjudged to be paid has been created in this Bill. The present procedure, which is difficult to administer, has caused some problems for clerks of court where the complainant to whom moneys are payable has moneys tendered to him. It is frequently difficult for the justice, who has been asked to issue a warrant, to satisfy himself that payment has been made to the appropriate person. The Bill has been drafted to provide for the payment of a fine or sum of money adjudged to be paid to the clerk of court in the first instance and then for disbursement to the complainant where appropriate. The Bill provides for receipt of moneys and payment out of them. The clerk will receive all moneys and then be responsible for their disbursement. A warrant for non-payment of a fine or sum adjudged to be paid will be issued upon the production of a certificate of the clerk that the moneys have not been paid to him.

The other amendments contained in this Bill arise out of minor administrative problems which the Courts Department now foresees in the implementation of the Justices Act Amendment Act, 1982. There is an amendment providing for the suspension of the operation of provisions of that Act. The reason for this amendment is that arrangements for implementing particular amendments are likely to take longer than others. The Courts Department was created in 1981, at which time the Registrar of Courts of Subordinate Jurisdiction, under the Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926-1981, was made responsible for the administration of courts of summary jurisdiction. Therefore, responsibility

for the appointment of a temporary clerk of court is more appropriately that of the Registrar as an administrative function than that of a magistrate as a judicial function.

The procedure which was created for the institution of appeals provided that the notice of appeal should be served upon the Supreme Court. It is more appropriate that it be served at the court of summary jurisdiction by which the conviction, order or adjudication the subject of the appeal was made. Administratively, it is considered that it would be more convenient for the appellant to lodge his notice of appeal with the court of summary jurisdiction from which he is appealing and for that court to transmit the necessary documents to the Registrar of the Supreme Court.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 2 of the Justices Act Amendment Act, 1982, by providing that the operation of any specified provision of that Act may be suspended. Clause 3 provides that this measure is to come into operation immediately after the commencement of the Justices Act Amendment Act, 1982. Clause 4 makes an amendment to section 3 (which sets out the arrangement of the Act) consequential upon amendments provided by clause 10. Clause 5 inserts into the interpretation section a definition of 'the Registrar', being the person holding or acting in the office of Registrar of Courts of Subordinate Jurisdiction under the Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926-1981. This definition is presently contained in section 9a (1) but is now required for the purposes of other provisions of the Act.

Clause 6 strikes out subsection (1) of section 9a which contains the definition of 'the Registrar'. Clause 7 amends section 42 of the principal Act which provides, *inter alia,* for a special magistrate to appoint a temporary clerk of a court of summary jurisdiction. This provision was inserted by the earlier amendment Act of 1982. The clause amends the provision so that such appointments are to be made by the Registrar. Clause 8 makes an amendment to section 76 that is consequential upon amendments proposed by clause 10. Clause 9 inserts new section 76b, providing for the release of a person who is in custody as a result of a conviction or order but is making application under section 76a (which was inserted by an earlier amendment Act of 1982) to set aside the conviction or order. The clause provides for release from custody in these circumstances subject to the person entering into a recognizance to appear at the hearing of the application to set aside. Clause 10 inserts a new section 79a regulating the payment of fines and sums required to be paid as a result of a conviction or order made by a court of summary jurisdiction. The proposed new section requires any such payment to be made to the clerk of court in the first place in all circumstances and, where the amount is to be paid to the complainant, for the clerk to pay the amount to the complainant. At present, where an amount is ordered to be paid to the complainant, payment is required to be made directly to the complainant, leaving the clerk dependent upon advice from the complainant that default has occurred. Clause 11 amends section 82 of the principal Act which provides for certification that default has been made in payment of a fine or other sum ordered to be paid by a court of summary jurisdiction. The amendment proposed by the clause is consequential upon the proposed new section 79a. Under the amendment such certification is to be provided by the clerk in all cases. Clause 12 amends section 171 of the principal Act which provides for the manner in which justices appeals are to be instituted. Under the clause, notice of appeal is to be lodged with the clerk of the court of summary jurisdiction by which the conviction or order subject to appeal was made.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD secured the adjournment of the debate.

FISHERIES BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's message intimating that it insisted on its amendment No. 2 to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: I move:

That the disagreement to amendment No. 2 be not insisted on.

The Fisheries Bill is an excellent piece of legislation and has received, I am pleased to say, general support from the Opposition Parties in the Parliament. It is a blueprint for the future of the South Australian commercial industry and recreational fishing interests. It is essential that it completes its passage and comes into operation as soon as is practicable, so that proper management policies can be developed for fisheries throughout this State. The Government, although unhappy with the resultant slight to public servants, therefore will not insist upon the disagreement to the amendment in this Chamber.

Mr KENEALLY: We are pleased that the Government has eventually seen the light, in a sense. I must say that it takes a great deal more work and effort to convince this Minister of the rightness of our situation than it took to convince his predecessor. But, Sir, for a very short time, thankfully, we will have to suffer that difficulty. The amendment that we moved, as the Minister now accepts, improves the legislation. It gives the people of South Australia greater protection in a very important area, and it would have been much more useful to the Parliament and a much greater consolation, in a sense, to the South Australian electorate, if the Government had not been so intransigent. Nevertheless, all things have come out well in the end and we are pleased that the Government now supports what was in the first instance and has been all along a very good amendment.

Motion carried.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 31 March. Page 3801.)

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill dates from that extraordinary period back in March when the Government made a series of about-turns on matters that it had set its face against constantly over some considerable period. There was the matter of Sunday trading of hotels, the casino, the appointment of Mr Millhouse to the Judiciary, and the question of disclosure of interests Bills, a pecuniary interest Bill, as it is often known, being introduced into the Parliament. There was quite an extraordinary series of about-faces on matters about which the Government previously had expressed very strong opposition or reservations.

It was even more extraordinary in the case of this Bill because, on the very day on which it was introduced, after months of dilly-dallying by the Government, a private member's Bill relating to the same subject in the name of the Hon. Mr Sumner had been denied a second reading in another place by the Liberal members in conjunction with the Australian Democrat member in the Legislative Council—the same day that a Bill was introduced in this House. So, there is a very peculiar background to this Bill. When one examines its terms, one realises perhaps why the Government made its about-face. It knows that there is a public demand for this sort of legislation. It knows that there is popular support for it. It knew that its actions in opposing the second reading in another place would be criticised and, in fact, would probably result in a bad electoral effect, for it. So, to get on top of that, it introduced this toothless

measure in the Lower House, to try to give an appearance of doing something about this important matter, which affects public probity, to cover the problems Liberal members have got into by their opposition to it in the past, and some of the matters raised in the time in which they had been in Government.

Let me sketch the history of my Party's approach to proposals on pecuniary interests in South Australia. This is now the fourth or fifth measure that has been before the House. In 1977, we attempted to enact legislation to establish a register to cover members of Parliament, candidates, and families, quite wide ranging, which lapsed before the Parliament was prorogued in that year. In 1978, we reintroduced that measure, and the Bill was heavily amended by the Liberal members in the Legislative Council.

The main differences, of course, related to the question of public disclosure. They are very happy indeed, they assure us, to have pecuniary interest made the subject of a register, providing no disclosure is made of it. Of course, the point that we had constantly stressed is that, without that public disclosure, these measures are useless. I will come to that point more fully in a minute. So, the 1978 Bill failed. In 1979 we tried again, and again provided for public disclosure. Again, the Liberals amended it to have a register available only to the Speaker and President, a secret file, under the control of two officers of the Parliament, but not available in any other way. That application failed.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr BANNON: I am referring to the 1979 Bill (I will clarify that for the member of Mallee), where the Liberals amended it to have a register made available only to the Speaker and the President. That Bill failed. Then we come to the end of 1979 and the term of this Government. A number of questions raised by us on the matter in the House of Assembly were answered fairly unsatisfactorily. I will come to that in a minute, too. But, in October 1981, my colleague in another place, Mr Sumner, introduced his private member's Bill, despairing of any action being taken by the Government on this matter. Debate on that measure limped through very slow stages. Indeed, there was a considerable reluctance on the Government's part to bring it to a head, because of course its avowed intention was to defeat it, and it as unsure of the electoral consequences of that. But, finally, as I mentioned, on 31 March 1982, Government members voted as a bloc against that Bill and at that same time introduced this inadequate measure in the Lower House (not in the Legislative Council, interestingly enough).

I suggest that our record on this matter has been quite consistent and our approach quite strongly pursued in this Parliament. We on this side have nothing to hide, nor do we think that there should be anything to hide. Members on the other side, however, while professing some sort of agreement with the principles, have constantly blocked any attempt to have such a measure introduced, and, finally, when producing their own legislation, have ensured that it is quite inadequate.

There is nothing new about such legislation. There have been many developments in recent years overseas in response to public concern in this area. Since 1975 there has been public disclosure in the United Kingdom of members of Parliament's interests. In Victoria, under a Liberal Government, there has been public disclosure of members of Parliament's interests since 1978. In that State, the details of the register can be published in the press. That goes way beyond the measure we have have before us today. One can understand the Victorian Government's embarrassing position: with the land deals revelations and the other problems it has had, it found it necessary to show a little more positively than this Government has that it was prepared to have the whole question of disclosure properly displayed before the people. As I say, the Victorian legislation has been in operation since 1978.

In New South Wales the question was put to a referendum in 1981. I think that the results there will demonstrate to some extent why this Government knows that it must try in some way to avoid public odium on the matter. The question asked of the electors of New South Wales was:

> Do you approve of the Bill entitled 'A Bill for an Act to Require Members of Parliament to Disclose Certain Pecuniary Interests, and other matters'?

That was a Bill that goes well beyond the one before us here today. The voting on that referendum was: 'Yes', 2 389 981; 'No', 388 830; and about 148 000 informal votes. That meant that 86 per cent of the formal vote was cast in favour of a Bill for an Act to Require Members of Parliament to Disclose Certain Pecuniary Interests. That was a very clear statement of public opinion on this matter. I suspect that there is no particular peculiarity in New South Wales or Victoria on this matter and that that view is shared by electors in South Australia.

Overseas, of course, there are other examples of these Acts. In the United States, where there are many Legislatures with many members of Parliament or Congresses, they have had public disclosure since 1968, and that includes capital gains. Following the Watergate scandal in 1976, other legislation was proposed in the Senate expanding that public disclosure provision to cover candidates, judges and all members of Congress.

I refer now to the Bill that this one displaces. I use that term to refer to the Bill introduced in another place by my colleague, the Hon. Mr Sumner, a perfectly sustainable measure which members on the other side in another place refused even to amend but simply voted out on the second reading, and let this Bill come before this House. The first Bill, introduced on 21 October 1981, provided for public disclosure and covered candidates as well as M.P.'s and families. It created the office of Registrar of Members' Interests and provided that those interests would be published as a Parliamentary paper. In other words, there was to be a full public disclosure in a form that was accessible.

Fines of up to $5 000 were provided for false information or failure to provide information, but there seem to be no such penalties provided in this Bill; they have been dropped. That measure, as I said, languished on the Notice Paper and was debated once or twice during the period until the end of March 1982, when it was defeated. It was even denied a second reading and spoken of by those few Government members who intervened in the debate as having no merit whatsoever; yet we have this measure before us today.

Our policy has not changed; we strongly support public disclosure of interests; indeed, we think it should extend beyond M.P.'s and candidates. There could be a strong case made for it applying to senior public servants, Ministers' staff and journalists accredited to Parliament and their immediate families. Why should we involve such a wide-ranging group? We suggest that conflict of interests does not necessarily relate to legislation but can also occur in the case of administrative decisions.

Mr Lewis: What about trade union secretaries?

Mr BANNON: Yes, indeed, if trade union secretaries are involved in these administrative matters they, too, should be required to disclose on this register.

Mr Lewis: And local government clerks?

Mr BANNON: Yes, if they are involved it could be extended to them. I am saying that this is a theoretical basis on which this sort of legislation rests. This measure is a first step, if it is amended in the way I suggest in a moment, but one must look beyond that to where decisions are made and to access of people to information about administrative decisions. Indeed, at the local government level, members

of councils are required to withdraw their chair in appropriate instances, and there has been talk of a need for a proper disclosure of interests there.

Conflict of interest does not just occur with Bills before the House: it can occur in the case of administrative decisions, and therefore one can see the ambit of this Bill being extended. Perhaps one can even make a case for including persons covering stories that have political impact: if they have some direct interest in those stories, perhaps those interests should be disclosed as well. Therefore, a rule of public probity should be that if you have some direct influence in some cause you are advocating you should declare it—it should be made patently clear—and you should not shelter under neutrality or a professional calling which disguises the fact that you also have a direct interest.

In this sense, I believe that members of Parliament should take the lead, and that is why this measure should be made more relevant and more appropriate. The approach of the present Government has been singularly lacking in this area. I have already referred to its constant refusal when in Opposition to accept such measures. The matter was first raised by us in October 1979 during the very first session of Parliament after the election. On 11 October the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked about share ownership in the Western Mining Corporation. He asked whether or not the Premier would reveal to Parliament the pecuniary interests of any members of his Government, senior members of the Mines and Energy Department or members of the Uranium Enrichment Committee as regards shares in Western Mining Corporation or in other companies currently engaged in exploration for uranium in South Australia, and indicate when they were purchased. The Premier replied:

I take that question very seriously because it is most appropriate. It was a matter, I think, taken up almost at the first meeting of Cabinet or even earlier. An instruction has been issued and agreed to by members of Cabinet that they will disclose any such interests they have and will take immediate steps to dispose of those interests.

The Premier then went on to say that he did not own any shares other than, he said, 1 000 of some obscure name 'which I cannot remember and which I do not think are worth more than the paper they are printed on'. But he assured us that he had a register of his Ministers' interests. That was all very well, but no disclosure had taken place. On 16 October the Deputy Leader was forced to ask a further question, and an instruction had been issued, according to the Premier, in that answer given on 11 October. It appeared that the full information had not been given, and my Deputy asked at page 68 of *Hansard*:

Will the Premier reveal whether or not senior officers of the department ... own or have owned shares ... and whether the Minister of Industrial Affairs has yet disposed of his shares in the Western Mining Corporation following statements accredited to him on radio the day after I had questioned the Premier in this House on Ministers' pecuniary interests?

I thought the Premier's response was very interesting indeed because, as my Deputy pointed out, when he asked his question on 11 October, the Premier's response was as follows:

I take that question very seriously, because it is most appropriate.

Yet the previous day, when the revelations concerning the Minister of Industrial Affairs had been made and legitimate questions were asked, the Premier was quoted in the *News* as saying:

The Opposition had not wasted any time in dragging its politics down to the gutter level.

He referred specifically to the question about pecuniary interests, the very question, he said, which was most appropriate and should be taken seriously. How the Premier could suggest that on the one hand it was a serious and appropriate question and that on the other hand it was politics at gutter level, I am still waiting to hear, but certainly his answer to my Deputy did not make that clear. We did not receive a satisfactory response from the Premier. Indeed, the Minister was forced to make a personal explanation (page 72 of *Hansard*) concerning the shareholding which he had in Western Mining Corporation and which he said he had disposed of on 3 October.

The debate, the questions and answers, the way in which the information trickled out, and the fact that the Premier on the one hand saw it as appropriate and then as gutter politics, all point up to how a public register, with those interests recorded, could cut through all this. There would then be no innuendo, rumour or problem, because whatever had happened to any shares would be clear public knowledge. But, no, the Premier insisted that it was appropriate to keep a secret register of his Ministers' interests.

Further, on 13 November, the Premier was asked whether he had actually obtained this report that he said he would obtain, and he replied:

I have obtained a report. I am satisfied there is no conflict of interest.

The Premier added that he had adopted the approach of 'having the declarations and list of interests registered and lodged in my department where they are open for scrutiny if any conflict of interest arises'. I suggest that that is not satisfactory. The Premier said he was satisfied that there was no conflict of interest; he was satisfied, but there is no way that any independent people could check this matter. A problem arose then when questions were asked concerning the Minister of Water Resources. On 11 June 1980, the Premier announced an expansion programme for John Shearer Limited at Kilkenny. It emerged that that project involved Government assistance through the Housing Trust factory development scheme, a very appropriate and proper form of assistance for a very successful venture. The Opposition asked the Premier on 12 June whether he had ensured that no member of the Government Party stood to gain direct financial advantage from this arrangement and, if he had, what action he had taken.

In reply, the Premier indicated that the Hon. Mr Laidlaw, M.L.C., had had an interest, which he had declared. The Premier accused the Opposition of innuendo. That was very interesting, because the Premier's only reply was to the effect that Mr Laidlaw had an interest, which he had declared; indeed, he had, and everyone knew about it. Mr Laidlaw had behaved as he has always behaved throughout his public life—very properly indeed. It was only when a further specific question was asked, whether the Minister of Water Resources owned 10 000 shares in John Shearer Ltd, and whether he had informed the Premier, that further information came to light. The Minister stated:

The Premier and Cabinet are totally aware of my situation in regard to that company. I made a full statement to the Premier which is in writing and which is available for the Cabinet and everyone in South Australia to see.

The Premier in his answer completely omitted any reference to the Minister's shareholding. Perhaps he hoped that no-one would mention it or perhaps, as he said rather lamely, he had been so distressed by any inference concerning Mr Laidlaw that he had forgotten to mention it. Who knows?

Again, I make the point that, if a proper register was kept and if it was subject to public scrutiny, none of this would have arisen. We are talking about a period in October and June 1979 and 1980 respectively, a long time before this Bill was introduced. The Government has done nothing about it, despite the questions raised then and despite the action of my colleague in another place. Clearly, that is totally unsatisfactory.

Mr Lewis: Are you imputing improper motives to those people?

Mr BANNON: I do not think that the honourable member has understood my point. None of this would have occurred; there would be no suggestion of honourable or dishonourable motives if an Act was in force and if interests were disclosed in a register. The same applies to anyone in this House: that sort of question could not be raised, because it would involve public scrutiny and notice. Surely that is the principle on which we are working.

The Bill is clearly inadequate. It certainly does not go to the extent to which my colleague in another place provided in his Bill, which was treated with scant regard by the Government. This is a very limited proposal. It extends beyond Cabinet members, who apparently at present have to supply information to the Premier, to members of Parliament and their families only. It does not consider other people who may be involved in public decision-making. There is no public register, and this is really the gravest point of all. It is a secret document, and surely the Premier and his Government must understand that a public register is very necessary to protect the interests of the community. If the register is secret, there is always suspicion that justice is not being done. The examples I gave earlier in regard to New South Wales, Victoria, United Kingdom and the United States all include the provision of public registers and disclosure.

Many conflicts of interest can occur. But we really have no idea who will have access to the information and what control there will be over the accuracy of the secret list. How can it be checked? Who will provide the test to ensure that it is adequate? The Government's Bill provides only for information to be made available on members' pecuniary interests if relevant to a Bill before Parliament. As I have pointed out, so many administrative decisions and other decisions are made by Ministers within departments, and by members of Parliament on committees, and conflicts can arise. Surely there should be provision for scrutiny in those situations.

The Bill provides for registration of any income source or financial benefit during the preceding 12 months that is greater than $500, interests in real property, interests in incorporated or unincorporated bodies or trusts, travel outside South Australia that is not wholly funded by the Government, the use of real property not owned by a member of Parliament or family, and any liability exceeding $10 000. Again, there is no provision for a check of that information, or its scrutiny by public sources that may be able to vouch for its authenticity or for mistakes. Further (and again this is in contrast to the Bill introduced by the Hon. Mr Sumner), no fines are provided for non-disclosure. One is simply deemed guilty of contempt. Certainly, a penalty is attached to that, but surely fines would be an appropriate additional incentive to ensure that that accuracy is maintained, totally and completely, by the members of Parliament who are named on the register.

To be able to look at the register, members of Parliament or the public would have to apply for a certificate indicating that the inquiry was relevant to a Bill before the House. There are limitations all along the way. At present there is very limited public information on pecuniary interests. Shareholdings of members of Parliament who are directors of public companies are on record and they can be checked, but there is very little else available, and this Bill, by providing for a secret register of this kind, will not add to that information at all.

Pecuniary interests legislation is a vital reform. It is one of the many needed to raise the standing of Parliament and public confidence in it; it is one much in demand and, as I have pointed out, 86 per cent of the voters in the New South Wales referendum felt that the measure was something very worthy of support. It can be linked up with a number of other areas of public life that ought to be attended to as a matter of some urgency. Again, that is something that this Government has shown no inclination whatsoever to do.

There is the question of disclosure of the source of political donations. It was very interesting to see the Premier claiming that an anonymous group known as Friends of South Australia can pay for his television time. We do not know who they are, we do not know whether they are using shareholders' funds with the permission of the shareholders, or under what basis they are providing finance to the Premier. There is absolutely no information about that because there is no requirement at law for there to be disclosure as to the source of those political donations. I refer to advertisements that appeared today. This paid advertising time for the Premier referred to no organisation, institution, group or authorisation. Surely that sort of thing is improper and ought to be covered by legislation.

We had an example of that in regard to the group that I think calls itself a Group of Concerned South Australian Citizens, which advertised in support of the Premier last year. They were not prepared to put their names on the advertisement and say who they were. We discovered that the space had been provided for this group by the Myer Emporium Limited of South Australia, and no doubt there are a few others who supported it. Surely such groups should be required to state who they are, who is giving them support, and on what basis.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I draw to the honourable Leader's attention the fact that we are discussing disclosure of interests.

Mr BANNON: That is correct, Mr Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Leader is starting to stray somewhat from that particular matter and I hope therefore that he will link up his remarks.

Mr Mathwin: Tell us how much the trade unions pay towards your funds.

Mr BANNON: In fact, what the trade unions pay is provided in the published balance sheets of the A.L.P. They have a contribution that is fixed by levy every year, and that is public knowledge.

Mr Mathwin: What about the slush fund?

Mr BANNON: I would suggest to the honourable member that, if this legislation was expanded to provide for what I am advocating, there would be no problem about putting any of those donations on it. We accept that and support it. I suggest to the member for Glenelg that we have been quite consistent on this matter: we will make such disclosures and will support the legislation. The limit on electoral spending and the funding of elections all ought to be included in this.

It is quite extraordinary that these things can go on and I refer to the inequalities that they produce in terms of public funding, which the Government and, indeed, the Liberal side of politics are very happy to encourage, because they benefit enormously from it. They know the disadvantage in which it places those on this side of the House. We are not able, at the snap of a finger, to buy prime time on television, donated by our wealthy friends. We are not able, at the snap of a finger, to take over the space of some of our leading commercial organisations to obtain a prominent full-page advertisement in a newspaper during the early stages.

These are facts of life, but we will win elections despite those disadvantages. I am still suggesting that we ought to have full public disclosure of all these things. This legislation is totally inadequate; it is not even a start. I would suggest that the amendments that are to be moved by the Opposition later in the course of this debate, whilst improving the Bill, still do not go far enough.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill and I support the concept of Parliament having a record of the actual financial interest of every member and the source of income, but without disclosure of the total amount or, in some cases, the exact source. I would be happy in the Leader of the Opposition was advocating a change in the law to eliminate the possibility of nominee shareholding. If any member of Parliament can formulate a proposition that can do that, quite clearly, without causing any other problems, I would be quite happy to support it, as I have looked at this matter and have had discussions about it. I would be happy to eliminate that area from the area of share trading, which would mean that one of the Leader's biggest areas of concern would be eliminated.

I have never supported the concept of nominee shareholding, and so, if the Leader of the Opposition or any other member of Parliament can come up with a proposition, I would support that. I say that categorically, as I have been concerned about that aspect for a long time. Such a provision would eliminate the possibility of members of Parliament or any other persons, public servants and otherwise, having shares in a particular company and their being able to hide behind a nominee shareholding. I have been told that in this area there are some difficulties when initial transactions are being negotiated and that there may need to be some nominee shareholding for a short period of time.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I should point out to the honourable member for Fisher that he is straying somewhat from the provisions of the Bill currently before the House and I therefore request that he link up his remarks.

Mr EVANS: I will now link them up for you, Sir. One of the concerns about wanting members to disclose their interests is that they may hold shares that are not able to be traced through the normal register of shares because they are held by a nominee. I am simply making the point that, if this is one of the concerns and one reason why an extension of this Bill may be introduced into Parliament at a later date, there is another way of tackling the matter. That is why I was speaking about that matter. I believe that it is in the community's interest and it is one of the greatest concerns of people who are not closely tied to Parliament, namely, that they are not able to go to the companies register and check who owns particular shares. I link up my remarks on that basis, namely, that that is one of the ways of covering that aspect.

In regard to this Bill, the Leader of the Opposition argues that his Party would like to go further than the provisions of the Bill allow, and perhaps allow any individual to walk into Parliament and ask the person in charge of the register if he or she can look at the declared interests of a member. If that person happened to disclose that material unfairly or with malice, he or she would be liable to some penalty, but that means nothing in this world where we have what I might call politically-motivated animals. I am talking not only about politicians, but also, about people in the street who are not members of Parliament but who set out deliberately to attack a member. Such a person might do the research on a member's interests and, with sheer malice at any particular time, go out and disclose such interests. Such a person may not have a cent in the world or be concerned about serving a sentence in gaol, but may merely be some political activist trying to make a point.

There is no way in which such person can be punished at all, because punishment is the thing that such a person may want to gain publicity. Such an event would be a way for them to publicise a cause while at the same time throwing dirt at some person who had achieved his or her cause. In fact, the financial or pecuniary interests that a member has may not in any way cause him discredit, but certain information, if used at any particular time or shown in the news media at any particular time, could give the impression that there was something unfair or unjust about it. Subsequent investigations may prove that such is not the case, but the harm would have already been done. That is what a political activist would want to do, namely, cause such harm whether a person is a member of the Liberal Party, Labor Party, or any other political Party.

Mr Trainer: That's right, before your preselection.

Mr EVANS: I missed the comment by the honourable member, but he said something about preselection. The actual disclosure, even if it is made before preselection, can then be used to destroy the person's opportunity in total. I say that to give any person the opportunity to walk into Parliament and look at the registry of the pecuniary interest of a member could be most damaging to the person or the person's family at any particular time, or at a particular time when a subject being debated in the public arena shows that that person has an interest there. That may be quite a valid, lawful, and just interest, but it could be manipulated, as those who belong to this place often see how information can be manipulated unfairly. I do not accept that concept at all.

The Leader of the Opposition also said that he believed that the disclosure of the pecuniary interest should go further. I believe that he was talking in that case about public servants, or people who may be in a position of power where a decision by them may be of benefit to their interest, or if they have the opportunity to convince somebody in a higher position that a certain decision should be made that could be to their benefit. That may be the next stage if this stage is successful. I do not disagree that that may be the next stage, but we must be a little careful about how far we go with Big Brother. I believe the Government is taking the right step by going as far as it is going now.

I take the point that the Leader of the Opposition has mentioned just a little further. It does not have to be a pecuniary interest. For example, we know that in some areas the old school tie carries some weight; it is quite obvious that that is the case. We accept that a person who may be the head of a department is told of a bright young male or female who wants a position in that department, the applications are going through, and they happen to have the same school tie or belong to the same lodge, or their parents belong to the same lodge, Lions Club, service club, or union, if there is a tie back through the union. That person has a slight leg in, all other things being equal and sometimes all other things not being equal.

Mr Trainer: I don't think the old school tie applies with young females very much.

Mr EVANS: We know that goes on within our society, and the member who has interjected knows that it goes on within the union movement. He knows that, when certain people are looking for a position or promotion from the union movement through the A.L.P., they quite often have a better chance of achieving those goals than somebody who comes from the rank and file and has never been active within that movement. It may be some member way down the end of the line of the Party, who has never been a member of the union. That person's chances within the structure of his organisation are less. We know that. I am not saying it is bad but I am saying that the disclosure, if we want to take it that far in the future, should be of total membership, whether it be lodge, union, the P.L.O., the League of Rights, or whatever it may be. It should be the total disclosure—

Mr Trainer: But they tell us they don't have any members.

Mr EVANS: I do not know whether they do or not, because I am not a member to know, but if the honourable member is a member and knows that for a fact, he has an advantage over me. I would accept that argument later on

if this proposal, as the Government has it, works satisfactorily, but if it means that even the Government proposal ends up making Parliamentarians nothing more than a shooting target for knifing, I believe we will have proved that such a progression in this way disadvantages and does not help democracy.

Unfortunately, if a person is successful, not only in monetary terms but also in the particular field in which the person strives and turns out to be successful, and in sport or achievement in that area, there is always that section of society that wants to knock the person, not because what he or she has done is bad and not because overall the person could be discredited. The reason is that that section of society is not disciplined to set out to achieve a goal or does not have the capacity but ends up with a chip on the shoulder and decides it should discredit the person who has achieved success.

We will never change that, but I do not believe we should give people the opportunity to tear down those who have achieved success unfairly to any greater degree than has been the case in the past. The Government's Bill goes far enough to guarantee that the Parliament has at its disposal complete information on the persons pecuniary interest and the source, and it is available upon request for people to check whether a particular member has a pecuniary in a proposal. A certificate will be issued to the member in regard to whom the inquiry has been made and also to the person who is seeking to obtain the information.

I believe, knowing the political motivation of all political Parties and knowing that the obligation will be on the individual member of Parliament to disclose that information and make it available on register, that that is as far as we need to go now. That could be put to the test and we could prove that it is not used unfairly or not used by the news media or the information is leaked out to be unfair or with malice that may harm the individual or families. Let us not forget that we are also asking for disclosure of the interests of the spouse. We can worry about the Family Act and talk about a putative spouse but I do not think that covers all the situations in life today where couples live together. We have people who could do quite well in arrangements without having to disclose the interest of the partner, because the Family Act as we know it does not cover all the aspects.

We know that people have close and long-term relationships whereby somebody who wanted to be devious could disclose, even under the Opposition's suggestions on this Bill. I congratulate the Government for going this far and putting this proposition to Parliament. I ask Parliament to accept this and to prove, first, whether there is enough fairness in society and enough control in the system to make sure it will work to a reasonable degree. I support the Bill as it is.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): Our American cousins, or at least a good proportion of them, are wont to suggest that free enterprise capitalist society and Parliamentary democracy are either side of the one coin. I think they are quite wrong in that particular contention, since Parliamentary democracy is part of an ordered political realm whereas free enterprise capitalism is a very disorderly realm. Nonetheless, it is a claim they make. Quite apart from those theoretical considerations any attempt to sustain that point must take issue with two particular problems which capitalist society brings to the Parliamentary democratic struggle.

The first of these is the inequality of resources available to the individuals and Parties involved in the Parliamentary struggle. This is something that my Leader has touched on in his remarks. It is often remarked upon that for the most part Presidents of the United States come from an extremely wealthy background, and that there is no way in which it is possible in these days for other than an extremely wealthy person to be elected to the Presidency or, indeed, to the Congress of the United States.

The difference in wealth between Jimmy Carter and President Reagan was merely one of degree. Reagan had more loot than Carter, as one would expect of a Republican as opposed to a Democrat, but nonetheless it was merely a difference of degree. Before one generalises too much, one must remember that the Democrat Kennedys were far more wealthy than most of the Republicans who were around in their day or even now. There is that problem, the problem of inequality of resources available to the individuals or to the Parties competing within the Parliamentary sphere. The only real resolution to that problem is one I will not develop now, because it is not covered by this Bill. That is the public funding of election campaigns, which is well established in other countries of the world and which of course has been recently adopted in New South Wales.

The second problem which is raised for Parliamentary democracy by a society that buys and sells things is the possibility of politicians being placed in a position of a conflict of interest, and it is that matter to which this Parliament sporadically has been addressing itself in recent years. It is sometimes suggested by cynics that a change from Government to Opposition or in the other direction brings a change of outlook, a change of focus; that a political Party that has seen a particular issue in one way from the point of view of Government can quickly turn around in Opposition and see it from another point of view. I am afraid that we have to admit that from time to time the activities of Governments and Oppositions would tend to lend some truth to that cynical point of view.

I do not think that that charge can be laid on either of the major political Parties in respect of this particular matter. In Government and in Opposition, Labor has been adamant that some form of disclosure of pecuniary interests on the part of Parliamentarians should be part of our Statute laws, and in Opposition and in Government the Liberals have opposed that until we now have the exceedingly watered-down measure that has been placed before the Parliament by this Government, one which I would suggest is a mockery of the whole concept of this disclosure of pecuniary interests and really is no concession at all to the point of view which has been extended not only by members of my Party in Government and in Opposition but also by political analysts and commentators around the world.

Let us argue the merits of this case; let us not suggest that there has been any inconsistency in this matter. From my viewpoint, the stand that my Party has taken in this matter has been consistently good and the stand that the Liberals have taken has been consistently bad. I recall Mr Arthur Calwell once bewailing the fact that the Liberal Party for the most part comprised slow learners, that they had come very slowly to the advocacy of the concept of full employment in our type of economy. I am not quite sure what from the grave Mr Calwell would say about that matter now, but certainly it is true that in the time that I have been in this Parliament I have seen the Liberal Party dragged, not screaming, but with a great deal of reluctance, to an acceptance of a series of constitutional reforms and it is a great pity and it would have saved a great deal of the time of Parliament—

Mr Trainer: Not with a bang but with a whimper.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Indeed. A great deal of time would have been saved if some of these reforms had been acceptable to the Liberal Party years before they were because what we have seen, in effect, is a dusting off of the old speeches, a re-enactment of what is almost a ritual playing out of a charade year after year until the inevitable giving way occurs. If members on the other side doubt what I am

saying, I invite them to consider the whole concept of Legislative Council franchise and the way in which that was resisted year in and year out, with the same sort of arguments coming from both sides of both Houses until it was eventually conceded.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Mathwin): Order! I would like the honourable member for Baudin to link his remarks to the Bill.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Indeed, Sir. I am making the point that I believe that this is a matter that will eventually be fully conceded by the Liberal Party in both Houses of Parliament. It seems to me that it is a great pity that that Party is not prepared here and now to concede the point of view which we are putting and which political commentators outside have put. I have instanced an example of where there were many years of resistance to a democratic reform but eventually and inevitably the Liberal Party was prepared to give way, and I assume there is no way now they would repudiate the concept of adult franchise for the Legislative Council. As a second example (and I will stop here; I do not think I need to hammer the point), on the concept of one vote one value in the drawing up of Lower House districts, surely there is no way in which the Premier or his Party would, in any future redistribution, repudiate that concept.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to come back to the Bill.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Indeed. I am making the point that on many issues—and I have instanced two, which have been at the centre of political controversy for most of the time I have been interested in politics in this State—the Liberal Party has resisted change but has eventually given way. I am prepared to concede that in time the Liberal Party will give way in relation to this particular matter. It will see that as much as the other matters that I have placed before this House in the past 10 minutes this is a principle that has to do with fairness in the conduct of political affairs and public decisionmaking.

The member for Fisher raised the matter of certain political activists who, with the advantage of having public disclosure of these interests, would be able to manipulate this information. I wish that he had been able to draw out the scene that he was attempting to paint for us to try to explain to us how in fact that would happen. I am blowed if I could see how it would. If, for example, the member for Fisher (I have no idea as to any property holdings or interests he has) has a holiday house at Beachport, that will obviously be on the register and we have to assume that these political activists will at some time that is extremely delicate for the member, during an election campaign, at preselection time, or something like that, come out with the thunderous statement that the member for Fisher has a holiday house at Beachport. I would imagine that that would be treated with a stifled yawn around the district. It may be that the member for Newland has 500 B.H.P. shares. How much sleep is going to be lost in his district or elsewhere by that staggering disclosure?

It seems a pity that the member for Fisher, in attempting to make a point, was not able to draw out the point that he is trying to make. He was not prepared to say just how this sort of disclosure could be embarrassing to a member in the circumstances that he described and, secondly, in any event, does not the member of Parliament have his remedy either in the fact that we (and surely this is readily admitted) have easier access to the media than these so-called manipulators outside, or in the fact that the member may possibly have the means to take legal remedy if an individual goes so far as to misuse the information that the honourable member has made available under Statute that his assets—

Mr Trainer: It may be a problem if B.H.P. stood for 'Bottom of the Harbor Pty Ltd'.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Possibly, but that is not the case. Where is the point the member for Fisher is making? It seems to me that he was attempting to paint a scene, was not able to fill in the details, and finished up not making any point at all. One of my colleagues earlier asked me to assure honourable members that his disclosure would be to the effect that he owns a 1977 Datsun 180B and that he, his wife and the Savings Bank of South Australia all have an interest in a house and the piece of dirt upon which that house has been built.

Again, that is hardly a staggering disclosure. I have to admit that there was a time when I was sunk deeper in the mire of capitalism than he, in that I held a nominal share of the *Workers Weekly Herald.* I received no dividend from it. I was on the board and was required, under the articles of the company, to hold that share. When I left the board, no doubt for people far more skilled in journalism than I, it was necessary that I surrender that share. No doubt, it would be necessary for me to declare such a thing under any Statute law of the type that, for example, my Leader is considering. But, it seems to me that there is no great embarrassment involved in this sort of declaration. One simply wonders why it is that members of the Liberal Party are so coy in the way in which they approach these matters, so coy indeed as to, I believe, by the measure we have before us, place our Speaker and his opposite number in another place in a very difficult position.

We are left with a secret register, the administration of which is placed in the hands of the officers of the Parliament. Now, Sir, I am well aware that every Speaker under whom I have served in 12 years has been well able to distinguish between himself, as a member of a State electorate and the representative in that State electorate of a political Party, and, on the other hand, himself as the Speaker of this Chamber and all that that carries with it. But, nonetheless, it cannot be denied that offices in this Parliament go to members of the ruling political Parties. They are Party-political people in the way that does not always obtain in other Parliaments. I do not want to suggest that under any Speaker I have served there would be any impropriety in the use of the register or, indeed, that there would be any great pressure on those individuals as to the way in which they administer, but the potentiality is there.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Would you prefer it to be in the hands of the Clerk?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: We would prefer it to be public. Of course, if we are restricted to that choice, it seems to me that, yes, it would be better that it was in the hands of someone who was not an elected official at all. But, we simply cannot understand why the Government of the day has to be so coy, nor why indeed the Liberal Party in Opposition ran away from this issue, why it continues to run away from it, as evidenced by the puerile piece of legislation that we have had placed before us.

So, when will the Liberal Party come out and really say what it fears? When will the Liberal Party be prepared to supply real reform in this matter? It seems quite obvious to us that it will oppose any amendments that we wish to bring forward in this matter. That is a shame, because eventually I know the Liberal Party will get around to supporting this.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I support the Bill, because its contents are very similar to what I indicated I would support when a disclosure of interests Bill was before the Parliament under a different Government. I have listened with interest to the comments of the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Baudin. I take up the point that the member

for Baudin raised about confusion that may exist in a full disclosure of interest. I raise the point from my own position, about which I have no hesitation in talking, to illustrate how certain things can occur.

Some six years ago I had my name on the title of one piece of land. Since then, I have disposed of that land and have reduced my interest in a farming activity to probably considerably less than half of what it was. In so doing, I took up a farming partnership with my brother, who subsequently became the key man in the operation. So, I had a half interest in a farming property near Port Lincoln. In those parcels of land, one part had three titles and one had two. Also, I have a home in Port Lincoln in which I reside, and a small piece of grazing property in my own name which, if you like, is a hobby farm on which one day I hope to live.

To an outsider with access to the register it would appear that, whereas six years ago I had my name on one piece of land (which was 2½ times the total area of what I have now), I have gone from one piece of land to four pieces of land, yet my farming interests are less than half of what they were. An outsider could not interpret it in that way. In those circumstances, I do not believe that the full disclosure of a list of members' interests can necessarily be interpreted, nor can any guarantee be given that it can be interpreted, in a fair and proper way.

Disclosure of interests can be carried through to many smaller issues. A member of Parliament, for example, is quite disadvantaged in terms of some events which occur throughout the State. For example, he cannot tender to the Government for used equipment or the disposal of property, or anything like that. He cannot avail himself of that. He cannot receive royalties from a gravel pit on his property being mined by the Highways Department or the local council. If he is doing that, he then has a pecuniary interest. He is, therefore, in trouble even if he receives that. It does not matter whether an organisation cuts up his property; he cannot receive money for that because it would conflict with his role as a member of Parliament.

The issues are very complex. I, for one, in terms of tendering for surplus Government equipment and buildings, have had to say that, prior to my entry into this House, I often tendered for used equipment and buildings. In fact, most of the farm buildings on my properties and my brother's properties have been acquired by tender from Government instrumentalities. That ceased immediately I entered this House. I was then unable to participate in any further tendering procedures. In fact, it got so close that a member of my family did tender for some surplus Government property after I came into this House, and the Minister of Works at the time called me across, asked me what my association was with that person, and politely suggested that, if my family wanted to become involved in that way, they should perhaps go through their in-laws. In other words, they should get the name out of the tendering system. People who still have an interest in their former vocation, whether it be farming or whatever, have very real problems.

Another issue I believe should be raised when talking about disclosure of interests by members of Parliament, should it occur as proposed by the Opposition, with full disclosure made available, so that any person could walk in off the street and take a photo copy of that material and use it, if we should get to that, I believe that would be wrong. A member going to the polls could be opposed by a series of candidates from other political Parties who would have full disclosure of the assets and interests of the sitting member; yet, that same sitting member of Parliament would not receive similar information. The interest could then be disclosed. I am really saying that political candidates should be treated in a like manner, so that if this were to occur, as suggested by the Labor Party, and members' interests were disclosed in a public forum, candidates interests should be similarly disclosed. I believe that that would be fair and reasonable, yet no-one seems to have raised it.

Mr Bannon: Yes, it was raised in the Hon. Mr Sumner's Bill.

Mr BLACKER: The Leader indicates that it was raised in the Hon. Mr Sumner's original Bill. There are anomalies in the whole programme. I believe that the general public has a right to expect that any member of Parliament is sitting in this House in an honourable capacity; in other words, they do not have interests that will prejudice their decision making. To that end, how far do we go in disclosing every little bit of information? I believe that, if a member of the public wants to know whether a member has pecuniary interests, he should be able to go to a register and have a certificate presented to the effect that a member does not have a pecuniary interest in a particular matter.

I do not think it should go any further than that. I do not believe that all the ins and outs of a member's personal and private affairs should be disclosed on a public platform. As long as a guarantee can be given to a member of the public who so requests that there is no pecuniary interest that should suffice; otherwise the liberties of individual members are virtually non-existent. I support the Bill because it does pave the way to giving some guarantee to the general public that members of Parliament have no pecuniary interests in certain matters and provides an avenue for members of the public to further inquire into the affairs of a member if it is believed that a conflict of pecuniary interest does occur. I support the Bill.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to take part in this debate, as I share many of the concerns and views of the member for Flinders in this matter. As one who has been quite opposed to legislation of this nature for a long time (I believe it is a gross breach of a person's privacy), I am prepared to support this Bill as I believe it is a reasonable compromise. The suggestions put forward by the Leader and his colleagues, in my view, are a blatant breach of the rights and privacy of a person.

Mr Bannon: What have you got to hide?

Mr GUNN: I have nothing to hide and I challenge the Leader to try to dent my integrity. We have listened this afternoon to a disgraceful attack by the Leader, endeavouring to impute improper motives to the Minister of Water Resources in a quite scurrilous fashion. Unfortunately, in recent times the Leader and his colleagues have resorted to gutter politics. The last thing they want is the truth, and they come into this place and make the wildest allegations, hoping that some of the mud will stick. That is the sort of tactic that the Leader has adopted and it does him and his colleagues little credit. My holdings are easily established; anyone can find out the assets I have. However, I do not believe that I should be placed in a position of having to publicly declare what my family has and what my wife has.

Mr Bannon: You are a member of Parliament, a public officer.

Mr GUNN: Yes, and the people who elected me accept me as Graham Gunn. That is how I was elected. Before I entered this place those who wanted to inquire knew the holdings I had. They are the people who can make a judgment every three years. I have never objected to being asked questions in public about my interests, but I do not see why I should have to say to my wife that she shall declare her interests. What happens if a member's spouse refuses to do that? Will the Leader and his colleagues draw them up before the bar of this House?

Mr Bannon: That is covered under subsection (2).

Mr GUNN: That is what the honourable member is asking. I want to follow up what the member for Flinders had to say on this matter. In legislation of this nature, particularly as proposed by the Leader, the member for Flinders and I would have to declare the holdings and involvement of other members of our families. What right has the public to know the holdings of another member of my family?

Mr Bannon: It has the right to know about you.

Mr GUNN: By doing that there would be many cases where a member would have to disclose the holdings of another person which are in no way related to what takes place in this Parliament. That is a quite disgraceful proposition and something I will never support; I make that quite clear. I really think that the proponents of this wide-ranging legislation ought to have a look at Standing Orders, which have operated for so long. Standing Order 214 states:

> No member shall be entitled to vote in any division upon a question in which he has a direct pecuniary interest, and the vote of any member so interested shall be disallowed.

Let us look, also, at section 50 of the Constitution Act, which states:

> If any person, being a member of the Parliament—
>
> *(a)* directly or indirectly, himself or by any other person whatsoever in trust for him, or for his use or benefit, or on his account, enters into, accepts, agrees for, undertakes or executes in the whole or in part, any such contract, agreement, or commission as aforesaid; or
>
> *(b)* having already entered into any such agreement or commission, or part or share of any such contract, agreement, or commission, by himself, or by any other person whatsoever in trust for him, or for his use or benefit, or upon his account, continues to hold, execute, or enjoy the same, or any part thereof,
>
> his seat in the Parliament shall be and is hereby declared to be void.

That is a pretty wide-ranging and clear inducement to members to make sure that they are not personally involved.

Let us take up what the member for Flinders explained. Prior to my becoming a member of this House, the Highways Department, as it normally does, came along and said it wanted to quarry certain material which was on my property. The occupier-owner has little choice. If one argues the department says, 'Well, of course, you realise we can have the area declared a stone reserve, so therefore you're bound.' In such cases, the person concerned has no control over what is done. It is not a matter of wanting to enter into an agreement; one is forced to enter into an agreement and on its terms. The honourable member should take that into account.

The Leader ought to refer himself to Erskine May, who goes into this matter of pecuniary interest in great detail. It is my understanding that one member of the House of Commons has refused to declare his pecuniary interests and to date no action has been taken against him. I am doubtful if action ever will be taken against him, because the powers that be are not game to challenge that member on that matter. It was interesting to listen to the member for Baudin this afternoon and to hear what he had to say about Parliamentary democracy, casting aspersions in the learned way that he does in relation to the free enterprise system. I say to the member for Baudin that, under the socialist system he would advocate, there is no democracy. Under the total State control that he would wish to exercise over this community there is no democracy, because no-one has any choice; big brother dictates. Let him understand that.

What the Leader and his colleagues appear to be so incensed about is that people are prepared to finance groups, are prepared to finance political Parties, and because some of those groups are not prepared to finance the Labor Party members opposite want to try to make life difficult for them. If Australian Labor Party members were such democrats they would not have a clause written into their platform (or whatever they like to call it) virtually compelling people to make compulsory donations to the Labor Party. Many many people who belong to trade unions support the Party on this side of the House but, because of the way in which the rules of the Labor Party are drawn, they have to pay a sustentation fee to the Labor Party. If they are so concerned about those issues, why do they not alter the situation? Let the Leader, in his lucid fashion, explain in clear and precise terms where he stands. Why do they not have a contracting-out system instead of forcing the issue?

An honourable member: That is a very obscure comment.

Mr GUNN: Of course it is obscure as far as the honourable member is concerned, because tens of thousands of people are forced to make a compulsory donation to the Labor Party against their will. The honourable member knows that that is correct.

Mr Trainer: There is a contracting-out system.

Mr GUNN: What happens when those who have courage to do so approach their friendly union organiser? Some of my constituents told me the other day that so-and-so is trying to do all he can to make them buy a raffle ticket to support the Labor Party because they are members of a union.

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on both sides will know that there is nothing in the Bill that relates to political Parties.

Mr GUNN: I certainly do not want to disgress from the Bill, but there are a number of matters to which one should certainly address himself on this occasion. I believe that the South Australian Parliament has been most fortunate over the years. To my knowledge, there has been no conflict of interest. If we are to enact this sort of legislation, we should look very closely at a number of other people, because I do not believe that the average back-bencher has the same influence as has a senior member of the Public Service.

If members of Parliament are to be compelled to disclose their interests, the people who advise the Government of the day, those who are involved in drawing up the contracts and those who have access to all this information, should be in the same position. The back-benchers certainly do not have access to that information: I doubt whether the back-benchers in any Government have that access. Therefore, if the legislators are to be forced to expose their interests, serious consideration should be given to those other people.

As a matter of principle, I do not believe that this Bill is necessary. However, I suppose one could say that there is some public expectation that we must be seen to be beyond reproach and, therefore, if we are to carry it that far, it is absolutely essential that those other people be considered. It is then a matter of how far down the line one should go. I do not believe that that information should be public: it should be made available to the Minister concerned or to the Premier so that the Cabinet has access to that information.

Further, what about the people who write the political columns in the newspapers? They should be objective. Are we to say that all politics teachers should declare their interests so that their pupils could judge for themselves whether the teachers are unbiased in their accounts of political activity and political philosophy handed on to their students? Once the procedure is started, it has no end. Where is the line to be drawn? Therefore, the whole matter should be handled with great care.

Much has been said about public funding. I sincerely hope that a great deal of consideration is given to this matter before we embark down that difficult road. The Leader has said a lot about expenditure of public funds. The people of New South Wales are committed to spending more than

$3 000 000 for the funding of political Parties at elections. I believe that a political Party should be able, if it has support, to raise its own revenue.

Mr Trainer: The New South Wales Liberal Party is asking for it.

Mr GUNN: Let me make my views very clear. I believe that the $3 000 000 that has been expended in New South Wales could be better expended in a number of other areas which would be of greater benefit to more people. In conclusion, I hope that the Labor Party will consider this measure on its merits, because it is a responsible attempt to bring some common sense into the argument. However, I also believe that members of Parliament, like any other people in the community, are entitled to privacy. Their families are entitled to the same rights as is every other citizen, and it is a fundamental right in this community that people's privacy should be protected and their private affairs should not be subject to the scrutiny of others.

Mr Crafter: Why didn't you agree with the privacy legislation when it was introduced in 1972?

Mr GUNN: The honourable member was not here then, and he is not likely to be here after the next election. I would be quite happy to debate that matter with him at any time.

Mr Trainer: Why don't you do it now?

Mr GUNN: Because it would be contrary to Standing Orders: I must relate my remarks to the Bill before the House; otherwise I would be quite happy to do so.

Mr Lynn Arnold: How did your remarks about sustentation relate to the Bill?

Mr GUNN: They linked up very well, and when the honourable member reads *Hansard* tomorrow, he will see that that is the case. I believe that the amendments moved by the Leader do nothing to improve the Bill. They are unnecessary and, in my view, would discourage many people, who have a great deal to contribute to the Parliament, from coming into this place. The A.L.P. has the attitude that, if a person is successful, he should be got. I believe that we should not underestimate that point.

An honourable member: Who said that?

Mr GUNN: The manner in which people in this House have attempted, for a long time, to pull down and destroy anyone who has been successful, particularly in agriculture, business or commerce, has been deliberate. The associates of those people in the union movement have set out to castigate and destroy them. I think one could make that point without fear of contradiction.

If members of Parliament are to be forced to disclose their interests, candidates should also have to do so. If a person offers himself for election, on nomination he should be put in the same position. It would be quite intolerable if the sitting member was forced to declare his interests and candidates were not. If we were to accept the views of the Labor Party, a number of people who have extensive involvement in commerce and other areas would say, 'I do not believe that my family and I should have our involvements made known.' Those people would decline the opportunity to make themselves available, when in many cases they could have made a great contribution not only to this Parliament but also to other Parliaments. I entirely agree with what Sir Charles Court had to say: the Labor Party believes that, if a person is successful, he should be pulled down. The A.L.P. does not want successful people in Parliament. That view reflects the tenor of the amendments and the attitude adopted by the Labor Party for a long time. With those reservations, I support the Bill.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I thank honourable members who have contributed to this debate. On re-reading the second reading explanation, I find that almost all of the questions that were raised were more than adequately answered in that document. However, I would like to make a few comments. I am fascinated to hear the Leader of the Opposition bemoaning the fact that the A.L.P. is unable to attract financial support from certain groups in the community. Perhaps if the Leader of the Opposition and his Party had policies that were attractive to those groups in the community they would attract financial support, and perhaps they should change their policies.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Fortunately, it is still a free country and people can support whom they wish. They do not have to be subjected to the vilification and abuse which flowed from the Leader to a certain group of people who espoused policies with which he did not agree.

Mr Trainer: Your policies are up for the highest bidder?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It seems to me that the remedy is in the Leader's hands, and there is certainly no excuse—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am interested to hear these interjections, because they really show up members of the Opposition for what they really are. The outburst that the Leader of the Opposition made was rather disgraceful, I thought, when he referred to certain advertisements on Roxby Downs recently. The people who support that point of view have every right to be heard and they have, indeed, even more right not to be abused by people using a position in Parliament.

Mr Langley: Which city firm was it?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley had his opportunity; his next opportunity will come during the Committee stage.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am surprised that the member for Unley, a gentleman of undoubted ability as a former Speaker, should adopt the attitude that is so clearly apparent from his interjections. We are talking about the institution of Parliament; we are talking about the behaviour of members of Parliament and, if the former Speaker wants to contradict my respect for members of Parliament generally, that is up to him. I happen to believe that in the South Australian Parliament we have a very fine record of service and members with a very fine reputation, and I hope that that will always be so.

In my view, the people who are at very real risk are people like the Leader of the Opposition who seem determined to put their credibility at risk by misrepresenting the facts in most everything they say. In his speech, he maintained that we did an about-turn in March.

Mr Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I think the Leader should know, unless of course more than three people wrote the speech that he made, that this matter is one that has always been of concern to the Government; the Government has always made quite clear that it would introduce legislation of this kind. The Government has never expressed opposition to legislation of this kind provided that it was responsibly drafted and set up. Indeed, the approach that we have adopted is consistent with our attitude towards such legislation ever since it was first introduced, and certainly during my time in this House.

The approach that has been adopted, which is that a private register should be kept under the responsible guidance of either the Speaker or the President of the respective Chambers, is an approach that was promoted by the Federal select committee. Again, I refer the Leader to the second reading explanation. It was the member for Elizabeth who took that select committee report and recommendations made by the Federal Government and turned it into this

rather Draconian form of legislation which the Leader is now advocating. I must say that I am impressed to hear that the Leader of the Opposition is so vigorously supporting the concept that was first put forward by the member for Elizabeth. The Leader says that this legislation is toothless. I do not agree: I cannot possibly agree. The thing that the Leader has overlooked completely is a matter that was very well ventilated by the member for Eyre.

Mr Trainer: Oh!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I suggest that the member for Ascot Park have a very good look at the Constitution, in which, as the member for Eyre has pointed out quite clearly, there has always been every safeguard to prevent anyone taking an unfair or illegal advantage by any conflict of interests which might arise with the business of the House. As the member for Norwood well knows, that provision has been there for many years. Standing Orders, which also apply, match in with those provisions in the Constitution Act and the two of them together already provide very strong penalties—the ultimate penalty, indeed, for a member of Parliament, because his seat can be declared void if he is found guilty of any conflict of interest or of benefiting in a pecuniary way from his membership of this Chamber.

What we are dealing with now is not a question of penalties or how these provisions are going to be policed: we are dealing with the relatively simple matter of how it will be established to the satisfaction of everyone concerned, whether or not a member has interests which could provide a conflict situation in respect of any legislation about which he has a say. That is all it is, and that is all that is necessary. The Standing Orders and the Constitution Act provide all the other safeguards and the teeth that are necessary. I repeat: the penalty, the voiding of a seat, could not be any tougher.

Let us get rid of this criticism that there are no teeth in this legislation: there do not have to be any teeth. What this legislation does, and the concept that it puts into effect, is that there will still be some respect for the privacy of members, which is totally consistent with their position and with the requirement on them as members of Parliament to be subjected to appropriate scrutiny. I would suggest that the Leader of the Opposition should privately inquire from some of his own members whether or not they believe there should be a totally public and published register of interest, because I know that there are some members on his own side of the House and elsewhere, and certainly members of his own Party, who have very strong reservations about that. I do not blame them, because I believe that there should be some privacy, and just because someone enters public life it does not mean that that public life opens up all their affairs totally to public scrutiny. This measure is a way of balancing that fundamental right to privacy, even for members of Parliament, against their undoubted public duty to be seen to be above reproach. The Leader talks of a secret register—secret, because I suspect that he believes that that is a rather sinister word.

Mr Bannon: Secret means not open to the public.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Let us examine what the Leader said. The register is to be open to the public through an officer of the Parliament—and a most senior officer of the Parliament. It is a requirement that every member put his assets and all the other details on a register. That register is available to the Speaker or to the President, and it is available, second hand, through the Speaker or the President to someone who has a legitimate right to inquire, and a certificate will be given. What the Leader does not like is the fact that the full details of the register will not be made public so that anyone can pore over them and twist them around and use them, as we have seen so many things used by members of the Opposition in recent times, to try to discredit members of Parliament.

Inherent in what the Leader said was a suggestion, which I feel sure he did not really intend, that he has little confidence in the Speaker or the President of the day. I certainly hope that that is not what he meant. I am sure that he would not reflect upon the Chair in that way, but nevertheless that was the point that he was making. How on earth could one find people more suitable than officers of the Parliament (the Speaker, the President, and I think it was suggested that it could even be the Clerks of the House)? I would not be at all worried if it were the Clerks, but I believe that it should be someone in a responsible position whose duty it is to examine the register when a query is raised and who can say, 'Yes, there is a conflict of interest', or 'No, there is not.'

Nothing could be more satisfactory than this situation. I repeated that it balances the rights that everyone has of privacy against the undoubted responsibilities that members of Parliament have to be seen to be above reproach. The Leader of the Opposition has foreshadowed some amendments. I am sorry, I cannot see in any way how they can improve the situation, but the time to talk about those will be when the Bill reaches the Committee. I once again commend this legislation to members. It is in a form which I am quite convinced will adequately, and more than adequately, meet the needs for which it is designed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1) (1982)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1) (1982)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LIBRARIES BILL

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

Bill received from the Legislative Council with the following message:

The Legislative Council draws the attention of the House of Assembly to clauses No. 19 and No. 30, printed in erased type, which clauses, being money clauses, cannot originate in the Legislative Council, but which are deemed necessary to the Bill.

Bill read a first time.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment and Planning): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

It provides for the administration of public libraries and library services in South Australia. It also repeals the Libraries and Institutes Act, 1939-1979, and the Libraries (Subsidies) Act, 1955-1977. The Bill represents a complete and thorough

rewriting of legislation governing public libraries in this State. It is a milestone in the development of a modern public library system in South Australia, and a comprehensive basis for future development of this vital community service. A comprehensive review of the legislation governing library services was carried out following the 1978 Report of the Library Services Planning Committee. The Planning Committee laid out a development programme for a modern public library system throughout this State. This development programme has been proceeding steadily, as the greatly increased number of public libraries around the State testifies. Many significant changes in both policy and administration have taken place as part of that development programme and this has necessitated legislative revision.

The legislative review has been a process of extensive consultation with all interested parties. The working party which prepared the initial brief for this Bill, included representatives of the Libraries Board, the Institutes Association of South Australia and the Local Government Association. Subsequently, all the bodies involved in library services provision have been further consulted and invited to comment on draft legislative provisions.

The principal objectives of this Act are to achieve a co-ordinated system of library services that adequately meets the needs of the whole community; to promote and facilitate the establishment and maintenance of public library services by Local Government Authorities; to promote a co-operative approach to the provision of library services, and to ensure that the community has available to it adequate research and information services through access to resources available within and outside the State.

The Libraries Board of South Australia is the body charged with the responsibility for the management and planning of public library services in this State. A significant redefinition of the functions and responsibilities of the Libraries Board is undertaken in this Bill. The responsibilities of the board for policy formulation, planning, development and promotion of library services are clearly defined and highlighted. The existing legislation refers principally to the management of property and books, but does not encompass the broader role which the Libraries Board now undertakes in the development of the public library system. The Libraries Board will of course retain its powers related to property management, application of funds voted for library purposes, and the management of the principal public reference and research collections of this State in the State Library. In the performance of its functions, the Libraries Board will be subject to the general control and direction of the Minister. However, a qualifying clause has been included to clarify that Ministerial direction may not be interpreted to enable any exercise of political control or censorship of the content of the library collections, or access to those library and information resources.

A most important initiative is implemented in this Bill with respect to the composition of the Libraries Board. The Bill provides for three members of the eight-member board to be persons drawn from local government, either elected members or officers. Two of these local government representatives will be nominated by the Local Government Association of South Australia. This gives formal recognition to the vital role and heavy financial input of local government in the provision of public library services, and assures the continued representation of councils' views to the policy making authority.

The Bill provides for the payment of State Government subsidies to local government authorities or other approved bodies for the establishment and operation of public library services. Subsidy allocations will be approved by the Minister following recommendations by the Libraries Board. The detailed provisions relating to subsidies in the present 'Libraries (Subsidies) Act' have proved somewhat restrictive in recent years to the public library development programme. The Bill therefore provides a broad enabling power for the payment of subsidies as the Minister sees fit, with the objective of providing greater flexibility to enable the most effective use of available funds.

The Bill introduces an historic change with respect to the administration of institutes in South Australia. The Bill effects the transfer of the responsibility for the management of institutes from the Council of the Institutes Association of South Australia to the Libraries Board. The Council of the Institutes Association itself first put forward this proposal in 1973, as the most effective means of co-ordinating all the library facilities of the State under a single administration. For the last 100 years or more, the institutes have fulfilled a vital role in the provision of library and other services to their local communities. However, institutes have increasingly found that they are unable to provide the broad range of services expected of a modern library, and have recognised that available resources should gradually be redirected towards a single public library system. It has been an accepted policy for some years now that institute libraries should be gradually phased out as comprehensive public library services are developed throughout the State.

The assumption by the Libraries Board of the responsibility for institutes is therefore a continuation of the increasing level of co-operation which has developed between institutes and the public library system in recent years. It will integrate all library facilities under one administration, thus facilitating the provision of comprehensive public library services for the people of South Australia. The continuing involvement of institutes in the administration of their affairs is ensured by the creation of the Institutes Standing Committee to the Libraries Board. Half of the members of this committee will be elected by the Institutes Association, and the committee's role will be to advise the board on all matters pertaining to institutes. This will provide a formal avenue for the Institutes Association to present its views. The Institutes Association will continue as the organisation covering all institutes, but as an unincorporated association. This is because the transfer of responsibility to the Libraries Board involves the vesting of all rights, liabilities and property of the association in the board. This transfer is made with the clear provision that any assets or property must be used by the board for the benefit of institutes.

The Bill establishes therefore the broad framework for dealing with the operations of institutes. The majority of the detailed provisions dealing with institutes' operations in the Libraries and Institutes Act have been omitted from this Bill. The intention is that the detailed aspects of the operations of individual institutes should be dealt with by regulation under the Act. Such regulations would be drawn up by the Libraries Board following consultation with the Institutes Standing Committee. The Bill also provides for the provisions of the current legislation to continue to apply to the operations of institutes, until a date to be determined by the board, when new rules could be drawn up if that is seen fit. For the purpose of the continuation of the current provisions, the Libraries Board will assume the functions and responsibilities presently undertaken by the Council of the Institutes Association.

The provisions of the Bill relating to public records form the legislative basis of many of the functions of the South Australian Archives. Provisions empower the board to accept public records into its custody and require prior notice to be given to the board by any public office which intends to destroy or dispose of public records. In addition, specific reference is made to the role of the Libraries Board, through the Archives, to seek to ensure the efficient management of

public records and to select and care for public records worthy of preservation.

The provisions of the Bill are principally an updating of current provisions. However, it has been recognised that there is a need for a proper legislative framework to govern the work of the Archives, within the context of a comprehensive records management programme throughout Government administration. A review of this matter has been initiated, with a view to the possible enactment at a later stage of specific legislation dealing with archival services and related records management functions.

Great advances have been made in recent years in providing modern public library services throughout South Australia. This Bill facilitates the continuation of the public library development programme, and provides for the maintenance and improvement of the central State Library and archival collections. The long planned integration of the administration of institute libraries into the public library structure will now be achieved. The Bill establishes a sound and rational management structure, together with the opportunity for flexibility and innovation in the provision of these community services.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 repeals the Libraries and Institutes Act and the Libraries (Subsidies) Act. Clause 5 contains definitions required for the purposes of the new Act. Clause 6 provides that the new Act binds the Crown. Clause 7 states the objectives of the new legislation. Clauses 8 to 13 provide for the constitution of the Libraries Board. The board is to consist of eight members. Of these three are to be persons with experience in local government. Clause 14 sets out the functions of the board. Clause 15 provides for the appointment of subcommittees. Clause 16 empowers the board to delegate its powers or functions.

Clause 17 provides for the preparation of budgets setting out the proposed expenditure of the board. Clauses 18 to 20 are financial provisions of the usual kind. Clause 21 provides for the Minister, on the recommendation of the board, to pay subsidies for the establishment, maintenance or extension of public libraries and public library services. Clause 22 provides for the appointment of staff. Clause 23 provides for the constitution of the Institutes Standing Committee. Clause 24 sets out the functions of the standing committee. Clause 25 provides for allowances or expenses for standing committee members.

Clause 26 provides for the constitution of the Institutes Association. Clause 27 sets out the functions of the association. Clauses 28 and 29 deal with the regulation of institutes. Clause 30 exempts land held by or on behalf of an institute from land tax. Clause 31 provides for the deposit of public records with the board. Clause 32 prevents improper dispersion or destruction of public records. Clause 33 empowers a court of summary jurisdiction in certain circumstances to make an order for delivery up of public records.

Clause 34 empowers the board to appoint places for the custody of public records. Clause 35 provides delivery of copies of material published in South Australia to the board and to the Parliamentary Library. Clause 36 provides for the affiliation of certain societies with the board. Clause 37 deals with gifts or bequests to libraries operated under the auspices of the board. Clause 38 empowers the board to provide courses of training in librarianship. Clause 39 describes penalties for a person who unlawfully damages, removes or interferes with property of the board. Clause 40 provides for the determination of conditions on which library materials are to be lent, fines for contravention and fees for certain services. Clause 41 provides for summary disposal of offences. Clause 42 provides for an annual report on the work of the board. Clause 43 is a regulation-making power.

Mr BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 June. Page 4458.)

Mr CRAFTER (Norwood): The Opposition supports this measure, which has been debated fully in another place and which brings about some refinements to the present classification of publications legislation that applies in this State, and indeed brings the legislation into line with the movement in other States towards some uniformity in this area of law throughout Australia. Obviously there is substantial advantage in having uniformity in this area so that there is a degree of certainty from State to State.

There is a marked change in the Government's policy in the implementation of this Bill in this form from that which pertained prior to the last election. We have seen a succession of changes in Government policy in these so-called moral areas. The Opposition commented in another place on that matter and pointed out in some detail the changes that have taken place in the Government's attitude.

The most concerning aspect, from the Opposition's point of view in this matter, is the desire of the responsible Minister, the Attorney-General (although in Opposition he was not the spokesman on these matters) to have his views heard before the decision-making body vested with the responsibilities for classification of publications. It is of concern that the Minister has a propensity, which he has shown in a number of other areas of censorship, to have his views heard in these matters. There is no doubt that the Minister has a right to make his views known but it would appear that he has tried to give those views much greater force than I would have thought was desirable for the Minister in these circumstances.

The Minister, along with all of us in this House, I suggest, does not possess any better qualities, characteristics or training that would enable him to make a decision of this nature than any other member of Parliament would have; indeed, it was pointed out that he does have a degree of accountability to the electorate for decisions he has made, or for errors that he may be perceived by the electorate at large to have made. It is interesting to note, however, that members in the other place face the electors only every six years, whereas Ministers and members of this place face the people much more often. Members of another place can face the electors much less frequently than every six years, depending upon circumstances. So that really is not a strong argument to advance as far as abuse of that Ministerial direction to the tribunal is concerned. The tribunal is not bound by any direction given to it by the Minister but, of course, the words 'to have due regard' have judicial meaning, and any responsible tribunal would pay close attention to such a direction given by the Minister.

The other matters contained in the Bill will be of benefit to the community at large. In particular, the reduction in the number of classifications, the way in which the material that comes into the *quasi* pornographic category is displayed for public sale, the restriction involved in the way in which it will be sold and from what premises it will be sold, are obviously provisions that are widely accepted in the community. I am sure that there is little opposition at large to those provisions. The Opposition supports this measure.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

I wish to thank the Opposition for its support.

Bill read a third time and passed.

REGISTRATION OF DEEDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 3 June. Page 4300.)

Mr CRAFTER (Norwood): The Opposition supports this measure, which tidies up some aspects of the current Registration of Deeds Act and provides for an improvement in this facility. There is nothing controversial about this legislation, which is another minor matter, perhaps involving lawyers' law and the administration of a very narrow area of the life of this community. However, it is important that our laws be updated from time to time, and this will make for the smoother operation of this aspect of the law.

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

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).
(Continued from page 4696.)

Mr CRAFTER (Norwood): The Opposition supports this measure. It provides for a number of quite significant amendments to the smooth running of the courts in this State, and it does overcome some difficulties that have arisen in the administration of justice and, in particular, in respect of the payment of fines and moneys into the courts and to litigants as a result of judgments of the court. There were some anomalies even in this amending legislation, but they have been tidied up in another place.

The only point that I wish to raise in dealing with a Bill of this nature is the suggestion put forward to this House in debates, I think last year, by the member for Playford that perhaps it is time that Parliament considered establishing a standing committee to examine Bills of a legal and technical nature.

That would then save both Houses time in debating these in some detail. They are of interest, but only to a small section of the community. Perhaps they could be scrutinised in more detail by a specialist committee of the Parliament, and its recommendations could be brought to the Parliament. It is very rarely that Bills of this nature are considered along Party lines. They are often matters of consensus, and often of sharing experiences and information by members is interesting in proper formulation of laws, particularly with respect to the administration of justice.

We see, once again, in this matter some clarification and overcoming of anomalies of inaccurate drafting that have occurred in the past. That is a cost to taxpayers and takes up Parliament's time. It may be that a committee, as has been suggested, can solve some of those problems. It is a point that is worth any Government taking on board, particularly when we are looking at saving costs and streamlining our Parliamentary procedure. The Opposition supports these amendments to the Justices Act.

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

FURTHER EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 3 December. Page 2321.)

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I am considerably concerned that this matter is being debated this afternoon. I was advised that it was to be debated tomorrow afternoon. My speech planning, such as we all appreciate having time for, was targeted for that date. Now, I have been given 10 minutes notice that the matter was coming up this afternoon. I give notice that I will go through as many points as I have been able to gather from copious notes I have collected over the months. The balance that I do not have the opportunity to speak on this afternoon, because of the brevity of notice and the time I am expected to keep within, will be referred to my colleagues in another place for their attention when the matter comes before that House.

That complaint having been lodged, I indicate that the Opposition opposes the Bill as presently before the House and that we will, accordingly, vote against it at the appropriate opportunity. The Bill seeks to remove from the principal Act Part V which deals with licensing of certain institutions by which further education is provided. It has been touted by some as being an exercise in deregulation, an aim that this Government has laid much by. Sir, it is certainly true that there is never justification for needless regulation. There is never any excuse for paperwork or bureaucracy where it is to no end, but some regulations exist for a purpose. Some exist with a goal. We in the Opposition believe that the spirit of the regulations contained in Part V of the principal Act indeed serves a purpose.

I am now advised that, in fact, I will be able to complete my speech, and I appreciate the consideration of the House managers in that regard. The opening comments I made now stand in a different context. Deregulation, as I have said, is the aim of the Bill, but we believe that deregulation in this context is inappropriate. It is not because we are opposed to deregulation *per se*, in any context, but it is just that it is not suitable in this Act. I mentioned a few moments ago that some of the institutions and organisations with which I have had contact have indicated their grave concern about this matter as well. It was suggested by the Minister that this piece of regulation could be removed because there were protections already provided in two other Acts of Parliament. One was the Consumer Transactions Act and the other one was the Industrial and Commercial Training Commissions Act.

I will, in the course of my speech, deal with the manner in which both those do or do not provide alternative cover to that which would apply with the removal of Part V of this Act, but suffice to say at this time that we do not believe that they do provide sufficient cover. At the outset, I make this point in the context of the many organisations about the advisability of introducing this piece of deregulation. A large number of the private organisations made the point that they felt they were victims of inadequate consultation by the Government in preparing this Bill. I do hope that the Minister, in his reply to the second reading debate, gives some idea of exactly what consultation did take place from his office in this matter.

It has been a criticism very often raised against the present Government that consultation is lacking. That is not always a fair criticism. I know that some pieces of legislation receive fulsome consultation. I take this opportunity to commend the Minister for the consultation processes he is embarking upon with regard to amendments dealing with the Public Examinations Board. However, what may be praise in one instance need not be praise in every instance. In this instance, it certainly is not. What is regulation seeking to do? As I say, it is seeking to license certain institutions that provide further education. It is seeking to provide against them a sanction that, if they do not live up to the terms of that licence, it can be removed, thereby limiting their effectiveness to provide further education facilities.

The point has been made that, indeed, there are many private institutions of further education that operate without licences, that the system that presently applies is somewhat

anomalous, and that, in fact, licensing is being used by some as an advertising plus, a kind of good housekeeping accreditation. In fact, the situation is that the Minister does have very real powers under that Act. First, in applying for a licence, the applicant is required to furnish the Minister with whatever information the Minister may require. The Minister needs to pay attention to these matters and be satisfied about them: first, where instruction is to be given otherwise than by correspondence that the premises in which the instruction is to be given are satisfactory; secondly, that the instruction is to be given in a proper manner by competent instructors; and thirdly, that the instruction is to be provided at reasonable fees.

If those three matters are satisfied, the licence can be granted. That is quite appropriate, because it gives the Minister the power to protect the interests of consumers who use the facilities of such an institution. It must be remembered that, while a great many of the prime further education facilities are of a very high standard, maintain good reputations, and are eager in their design to maintain a good reputation, there has been the occasional institution in times gone by that that has not been quite so rigorous in its attempt to protect the public good.

I am pleased to see that the member for Flinders is in the House, because he would recall one such institution we had in this State, the nefarious University of Boston, as I think they called themselves. They posed as a further education institution and provided degrees some years ago. One had to pay a certain sum of money (I forget the sum now) to get either a knighthood or a degree from that institution. The point has been made that that institution was so ludicrous that it could not have possibly had any credibility in this State. Everybody clearly knew about the University of Boston, and no-one saying 'I have a degree from the University of Boston in Port Lincoln and please employ me' would achieve a reasonable audience.

The point I want to make is that anyone taking a degree from that institution would have been quite at liberty to have flaunted that degree anywhere else in the world. There have been numerous examples in years gone by and quite recently of people who have committed fraud by pretending they have qualifications they do not have or by posing certain qualifications they do have as having much more worth than they actually have. The problems that are inherent in any checking back for any employer, government or non-government, are very difficult indeed.

Imagine the considerable difficulties that would be had by an employer elsewhere in the world in trying to find out the details of the former University of Boston in Port Lincoln. In fact, the University of Boston was a very interesting case, because it has been proposed that one of the protections that exist as a result of this amendment is that people can act under the Consumer Transactions Act, say they have studied at a certain further education institution and are dissatisfied with it, and therefore are aggrieved and wish to take out a complaint as a consumer of further education services.

That is fine, but the problem with the University of Boston was that somebody seeking to perpetrate fraud in another part of the world would not, in fact, be an aggrieved consumer. That person would, in fact, be a willing partner in that exercise, on the one hand, the University of Boston having provided these for sale degrees and the person buying the degree would probably have motives that were not entirely honourable. Therefore, it would not be in his interests to complain, so there would not be any complaints.

However, under this Act, as it stands, before being amended, there was still the power for the Minister to determine that a licence could, in fact, not be renewable or, more powerfully than that, that the licence could be cancelled or suspended. The other point that should be made with regard to institutions like the University of Boston is that it does not really come under the cover of the Industrial and Commercial Training Commissions Act, because that Act really refers to industrial occupations. It does not refer to those that are not of that nature, so quite clearly that institution would have sailed merrily by any of the safeguards as they are now seen to apply after this Bill is passed. That is a very sorry state of affairs.

Fortunately, the University of Boston, for other reasons, ceased to exist for very long at all and the principality in which it was sited very soon found the wisdom of rejoining this Commonwealth, and I am pleased about that. The situation, as I have said, could have applied that it could have gone on. We do not know what other institutions of a like kind will exist in the years ahead, nor do we know what institutions of that kind may be around at the moment. It is because of that small element that would seek to discredit further education that we should be vigilant in the legislation before us. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

COMPANIES (APPLICATION OF LAWS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

BUILDING SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (1982)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I move:
That the House do now adjourn.

Mr SLATER (Gilles): The matter I wish to draw to the attention of the House this evening is the subject of the proposed sports institute in South Australia that will operate from 1 July. It will be based at the Underdale College of Advanced Education and, I understand, will run along similar lines to the institute in Canberra. I want to make clear that I support the concept of a sports institute and I trust that the institute will provide opportunities for young athletes to have specialised training and specialised coaching to improve their performances in the area of high performance in sport at both national and international level.

The Sports Institute Board was announced by the Minister of Recreation and Sport recently. The board consists of Mr Geof Motley, Chairman, Mr Michael Nunan as Director, and Jess Jarver as Coaching Director. The other members are Howard Mutton, Peter Bowen-Pain, Ken Cunningham,

Denis Glencross, and Marjorie Nelson. I want to make quite clear that I cast no reflection on those appointments. They are people who have participated in, been involved in, and contributed significantly to sport, both in this State and in national competition. They also have administrative ability.

I do, however, agree with comments made by representatives of women's sporting groups who have argued, very correctly, that women are not fully represented on this particular Institute of Sport board. I want to quote some of the comments that have been made by representative groups. An article in the press yesterday claimed that the Institute of Sports was being branded as sexist by women's groups. Even the Women's Adviser to the Premier has accused the Minister of Recreation and Sport, Hon. M. M. Wilson, of not following Government policy in selecting men to fill seven of the eight top positions at the institute. The report states:

> I am very disappointed that policy has not been followed through in this case. I have spoken to the Minister on the matter and he said that as far as he was concerned the best people had been appointed, Ms Wighton said. Ms Wighton's angry response to the naming of the board has been echoed by other women representing a wide range of community and sporting groups.

Those groups include the South Australian Women's Keep Fit Association, the Y.M.C.A., the Australian Council for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, the Sportswomens Association of South Australia, and the South Australian Institute of Teachers. Comments were made by the ACHPER group, which called the board appointments conservative and, indeed, unrepresentative of the current potential administrative expertise and sports participation and achievement of girls and women in South Australia. The report further stated:

> Women's Adviser at the Institute of Teachers, Ms Eleanor Ramsay, said, 'This is an extremely disappointing and retrogressive step, while executive officer of South Australia Women's Keep Fit, Ms Jenny Bonnett claimed, 'Women's sports lose out all the time, and here we go again.'

I agree completely with the remarks made by those people that women are not adequately represented on the Sports Institute board. In addition, a journalist from the Adelaide *News* even more strongly criticised the appointments to this board. Under the heading, 'Let's pack up for interstate', Helen Menzies stated:

> The way things are going, slightly more than 50 per cent of South Australia's population may as well pack up its bats and balls and move interstate. The board which will manage the State's exciting new Institute of Sport was announced by the Minister of Sport, Mr Wilson, on Friday. The chairman of the board is a man, so is the director, and the coaching director, and four of the other five board members.

Those comments from womens groups, journalists, and so on, indicate very clearly the disenchantment and anger that exist in relation to those appointments. For example, there are 60 000 netball competitors in South Australia. That is as many as participate in Australian rules football, or probably more. South Australia is the champion State in Australia at both senior and junior levels of netball, which indicates very clearly the standard here. I can cite many other examples where women participate as equally as men. Two examples are in swimming and in athletics.

I ask the Minister to consider closely the appointment of three additional females to the board and to ensure that the board represents womens sport in South Australia. That proposal is fair and reasonable and would provide the opportunity for women to express their views in regard to sport in this State. In addition, although the institute is to commence operation on 1 July this year, I take it that it will be some months before scholarships are awarded. When those scholarships are awarded, I hope that women receive an equal opportunity to participate at the institute. The scholarships should be awarded on an equal basis.

If one looks at the results over the years of top level competition, in the field of excellence in sport women have won more medals both in national and international competition than have men. It would be fair and reasonable to appoint three additional women to the Sports Institute board and to ensure that scholarships are awarded equally to both sections. I agree with the comments made by various womens groups and I trust that those comments will be noted by the Minister of Recreation and Sport, so that Government policy will be directed towards equal opportunities in relation to appointments to the board. If this does not occur, one could assume that the Government's policy of equal opportunity is just a sham.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I wish to draw attention to three matters this evening. The first is to knock down the ridiculous arguments presented by the member for Albert Park in his recent grievance speech in this House. If the honourable member was representing, as indeed he is charged to represent, the constituents in his district in what they consider to be their best interests, then I put to them through him that they are misguided and mistaken in their judgment of what are their real best interests and that they are out of kilter with the opinions of most other South Australians about the matters on which the honourable member expressed his opinion in the course of that debate.

The honourable member attacked Mr Nigel Buick about the advertising that that man undertook at his own personal expense and of his own volition during the election campaign in August and September 1979. The remarks made by Mr Buick sheeted home the blame for the increased libertarian views and irresponsible behaviour of that very small minority element in our society that resulted in the escalation of the crime rate in South Australia from where it had been in the 1960s and early 1970s, on the lowest of the scale in Australia, to amongst the highest in Australia.

All I have to do is remind honourable members in this place and the general public of South Australia that it was the Labor Premier, the Hon. Don Dunstan, who said, 'If you do not like a law, break it.' That is exactly what he said. He implored people to do that in certain circumstances. If that is not an open invitation to flaunt responsibilities as citizens—

Mr Langley: And take the consequences, he said, as well.

Mr LEWIS: They may take the consequences, but what about the other citizens who are adversely affected by their irresponsible behaviour? When a Premier says a thing like that and when other members of that same Government do likewise in the way they treat their wives and abuse the laws of this place, it is small wonder that there was an increase in crime under that Government.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: The incident to which I refer was well documented in the press, particularly in the *Sunday Mail.* If honourable members do not recall that, I invite them to scrutinise the record.

The second matter that I want to speak about this evening is a fairy story, which goes as follows: once upon a time there were seven men working seven machines for 40 hours a week. Unfortunately, there was also one man who had no work, and he was called unemployed. The union thought the problem over and said, 'Why not let seven men work 35 hours, then the one man can be employed to make up the seven times five hours lost?' The men said, 'Good, provided it does not cost us any pay.' The company said, 'That is no good, I'll have to pay out eight pays and buy one more machine for that man to work for the same amount of work. If I do that I will have to put up my prices.' The union said, 'You can pay the increased costs out of your profits.'

So, the company manager said, 'That will leave only $6 500 for shareholders and new equipment.' When the manager did his comparisons he found that the profits were so destroyed that the shareholders said, 'What about our interests and our money? We will take it out of the company and put it in the bank.' And they did, and the manager said, 'Well, I cannot get a return on the money that I have got invested here either, so I might as well sell off the plant and equipment and sack the employees and put my money in the bank and get 8¾, 10, 12, 15 or 20 per cent, because it does not pay me to leave it invested in the factory.' But the union said, 'Aha, but there are benefits that you will have to pay us if you sell the factory in the way of redundancy and—

Mr Slater: Do you not mean entitlements?

Mr LEWIS: Obsolescence—the only thing in this world that any person can be certain of is the fact that one day they will die: nothing else is a right or an entitlement. The rest is all dependent upon governments. To take up my story again: the union said, 'We insist that the men work a 35-hour week.' And so the poor beleaguered, stricken manager said that it would be agreed that they would do so, and he thought the matter over: 'If I am going to buy a new machine and have to pay out more for the same production, perhaps it is now economical to purchase that new machine that produces twice the output.' And he did. So, then six men were working the machines and two were unemployed. The company costs were still more, so the manager said, 'Why not let the the new machine work three shifts?', and he did.

So, now there were three men working the new machine on three shifts, two men working the old machines, and three men unemployed out of the original eight men. Meanwhile, a company overseas, which still had its employees working 40 hours or more a week, found that it could ship its products to Australia and sell its products at less cost than the Australian product, even after paying freight. So, tne Australian shareholders and the manager finally decided that, since they were losing money and had no further value in the assets, the factory was sold, closed up, and those eight men were out of work and all lived unhappily ever after. That is the story of the problem that we have in Australia at the present time: the greed and the ignorance of the representatives in the trade union movement in failing to explain the consequences of the unreasonable demands they are placing on the economy (and the employers within that economy) are deliberately creating unemployment, whether they know it or not; that is a fact. We have a phenomenon in Australia at present which is described by economists as a 'real wage overhang'; that is to say, everyone could have a job, prices could fall, and people would not lose their standard of living, if only we realised that we live in a world and not in isolation.

The third matter I want to refer to arises out of a controversy that has developed in the township of Meningie, which depends on the waters of Lake Albert for a large part of its economic wellbeing. Lake Albert was created as a permanent fresh body of water by the installation of the barrages across the Murray River mouth inland from the Coorong earlier this century. Those barrages are now about 60 years old. A new irrigation industry was established around that lake some 20 years ago, beginning with the investment by Sir Barton Pope when he installed irrigated lucerne on a grand scale and pelletising the resultant product for sale. Dairy farmers have subsequently developed the area under irrigation and those two industries have flourished side by side. Their very existence depends upon the survival of Lake Albert as a reasonably suitable source of irrigation water. The regrettable consequences, however, of that lake's being a blind appendage in the lake system have produced a situation in which the increasing levels of salinity are reducing the production of the farmers' pastures and lucerne crops.

I drew attention to this fact during an informal conversation with the Minister of Water Resources shortly after my election, and we determined that there should be some investigation of the matter. I then raised the matter with him formally on 9 October 1980 and the *Hansard* record of that day (page 402) shows that point. However, very recently I have been attacked by a member of that community (who claimed to be a spokesman on behalf of the rest of the community), as being inept and having failed to perform in the interests of that community. I wish to point out to members of the House and to the general public that at no time prior to that attack on me appearing in the *News* of Thursday 10 June had I ever received any correspondence whatever from any member of that community.

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

Mr LANGLEY (Unley): I was very pleased to hear my friend from the Mallee speak so kindly about unions once again. He also got on to the usual topic about matters surrounding the last election: well, it was the last election for some members opposite. I am glad that the honourable member brought certain matters to the attention of the House tonight because it prompts me to say that I have been in Parliament some 20 years, and I have never seen such libellous advertisements in any papers as those which appeared prior to the last election. I hope that it does not happen again because it was something beyond anything that had ever occurred before. Mr Nigel Buick's articles were something out of this world.

They were so close to libel that it did not matter; I am sure he went to a lawyer before he went ahead with that. I was surprised to hear the member for Mallee speaking about the workers getting something, but not mentioning the profits of the employers—it was a one-sided idea. Some business men and women vote Labor.

I would like to speak on two points tonight: education and unemployment. One thing that will hit the Government hard at the next election whenever that is going to be—

Mr Randall: Soon.

Mr LANGLEY: The sooner the better; the sooner the member for Henley Beach will be on his way out. I went door-knocking at Henley Beach the other day and I was surprised with what happened. I had one great thing in my favour: many people down there knew me. They did not think much of the member for Henley Beach, but perhaps he will be coming to my electorate on a return visit.

Mr Randall: Which street?

Mr LANGLEY: I will mention the street to the honourable member later on. I can assure the honourable member that it was quite a successful venture.

I received a short answer from the Minister of Education saying that nothing will be done at the Black Forest school until 1984. He said that that was in the next triennium. I can assure the Minister that, before the last election the usual thing was done concerning schools in my electorate, which were said to be poor. It was a good gimmick from the Liberal Party, especially when one looks at what has happened in the district over a period of years under both Governments. I can assure honourable members that work was done at the Goodwood Primary School, at Black Forest (not very much), at Unley and at Parkside. However, during the era of this Government almost nothing has been done because maintenance work must be done. Recently, the Government made a move to interfere with kindergartens. What happened there? The Government backed off.

Members interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: Yes. It has lost hundreds of votes, especially in my district, through that. The Minister has been saying that his Government has spent more on education than have other Governments. It may be that he can twist the figures like the Premier can, but the Minister is almost at rock bottom. When people come to my office the first thing they talk about is housing; the second is education.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: The Minister can have his say if he so desires, but he should wait till the next election. I told him the other night that I would not go to Mount Gambier, because he said he would win down there. I do not want to go down there because I cannot be there for the victory.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: The Minister can say what he likes; I am telling him what I think will happen. I am not always right, but the Minister has been wrong more times than he has been right. I will not hear any more from the Minister, because I will not be here.

I turn now to the Premier of this State. This afternoon he was having a little sneer at me concerning my interjecting, saying that I was a former Speaker. I can assure the Premier that, when I was Speaker, he was not frightened to interject at any time, and if ever a person in this House talked about doom for this State it was the present Premier. If he wants to speak like he did this afternoon, I can return facts to him in a similar manner. I can assure him that in spite of his figures concerning jobs he has created, we still have the highest unemployment rates of the mainland States.

Sir, I can assure you that the unemployment figures are going downhill. The Premier is going downhill. I must admit that the polls are not always correct, but he is pretty low at the present time. I do not know what he is going to say tonight. I will be listening intently, half asleep! As far as I am concerned what he says tonight will be of no consequence if he keeps on this way. When he was the Leader of the Opposition the doom was always on. He talks about the Government of the day, saying that nobody is going to be idle. Every honourable member opposite knows that the books have been diddled. I suppose that is not very good.

Everybody knows that they have had these cut-backs; that is what the Minister of Education said about the Black Forest Primary School. Most people know that the Premier is trying to boost this up as much as he can, but he has transferred money from the Loan Account to general revenue. That means that nothing can be built, nothing is being done, and the people of this State know that.

Mr Slater interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: Yes. They know they are going nowhere. They will be going out in the next election; the opinion polls show that. The member for Mallee talked about advertisements in the paper—

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: The Minister loves unions; he loves S.A.I.T.; he loves them all; but the people do not love him and neither does S.A.I.T. I will not get personal with the Minister, because he has a job to do. If I were Minister I would not resign; I would stay on as long as I could because it will not be very long before he will be out.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: If he wants to interject I can give him as much as he likes to give me. Unemployment is a great thing as far as some people are concerned. I can assure the members in this House that, since the advertisement has been in the House concerning uranium, I have not had one letter. I have been around to several members, and they have not had one letter.

Mr Slater: I had one; it was in favour and it was crossed out.

Mr LANGLEY: I have spoken to other members, and they have not received any at all.

Mr Slater: It shows you what a joke it is.

Mr LANGLEY: It is no joke; it is a serious matter. The uranium matter is serious. It is a wonder they did not sent 27 cents pinned to the paper. I have not received one in the post.

Mr Randall: I will send you one if you want one.

Mr LANGLEY: The honourable member can send me one if he likes. I know how biased he is, because he is not allowed to do what he wants to do.

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

Motion carried.

At 6 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 17 June at 2 p.m.