HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 31 May 1983

The SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae) took the Chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

NEW MEMBER FOR BRAGG

Mr Graham Alexander Ingerson, to whom the Oath of Allegiance was administered by the Speaker, took his seat in the House as member for the District of Bragg, in place of the Hon. D. O. Tonkin (resigned).

PETITION: CASINO

A petition signed by 53 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject the proposal to establish a casino in South Australia was presented by the Hon. J.C. Bannon.

Petition received.

PETITION: EDWARDSTOWN PRIMARY SCHOOL

A petition signed by 137 residents of South Australia praying that the House ensure that no staff reductions occur at Edwardstown Primary School was presented by the Hon. R.G. Payne.

Petition received.

PETITION: TOBACCO ADVERTISING

A petition signed by 190 residents of South Australia praying that the House support any legislation dealing with the prohibition of tobacco advertising and support the rights of non-smokers was presented by Mr Mayes.

Petition received.

PETITION: RENTAL AGENCIES

A petition signed by 11 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to prevent rental agencies from charging people, looking for a place to let, any money, except for bond and advance rent, was presented by the Hon. Michael Wilson.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answers to questions on the Notice Paper, except Nos 77, 113, 139, 177, 190, 193, 194, 206, 207, 211, 221, 222, 225, 229, and 232, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

NORTH HAVEN

In reply to **Mr PETERSON** (3 May).

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Negotiations for the sale of the North Haven development to Gulf Point Marina Pty Ltd are almost concluded, and the documentation, which includes the deed of sale, the encumbrance and the mortgage over the final payment, is expected to be complete and formally signed by the end of May.

The first deposit will be a deposit of 10 per cent of the sale price of $5 800 000, that is, $580 000 at the time of signing the documentation. The second payment will be the sum of 40 per cent of the sale price, that is, $2 320 000 at settlement, which will be on or before 10 September. The third payment will be the balance of $2 900 000, 160 days after settlement, that is, 17 February 1984, and this amount will be subject to interest for that 160-day period and secured by the mortgage document. The remaining work on the documentation is basically of a legalistic nature, as the essence of all agreement was reached almost a month ago.

Gulf Point Marina Pty Ltd has advised that it is considering renaming the marina, as this may be necessary for effective marketing of the project. This should not be seen as renaming of North Haven, as that would be a matter for the Geographical Names Board, but simply the naming of a development within the North Haven area for the purposes of marketing.

The developer sees it as essential that the area be easily identified from other development areas in North Haven, and that this project be identified as easily distinguishable from development undertaken by other organisations in the area such as A.M.P. Society, North Haven Trust, and the Department of Marine and Harbors, etc.

In any event, regardless of whatever name is chosen by the developer for the harbor project, the address would still be, for instance, Gulf Point Marina, North Haven, South Australia.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Planning Act, 1982—Crown Development Reports by South Australian Planning Commission on—

I. Proposed development at the Port Pirie High School.
II. Proposed division of land at section 167, hundred of Bonney.
III. Proposed division of land at section 19, hundred of Dutton.
IV. Proposed Community Welfare Centre at Modbury.
V. Proposed classroom redevelopment at Rose Park Primary School.
VI. Proposed 275/132KV transmission development, Port Augusta-Whyalla.
VII. Proposed erection of transportable classrooms at the Gawler College of Further Education.
VIII. Proposed borrow pits for Arkaroola access road.
IX. Proposed construction of a single transportable classroom at the Mount Pleasant Primary School.
X. Proposed library and administration building for Prospect Primary School.
XI. Proposed division of land, City of Campbelltown.
XII. Proposed erection of a single transportable classroom at Unley High School.
XIII. Proposed development at Mount Gambier High School.
XIV. Proposed borrow pits for Arkaroola access road.
XV. Regulations—vegetation clearance.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1981—Regulations—Fees for number plates
II. Road Traffic Act, 1961-1981—Regulations—Traffic prohibition—Hindmarsh

By the Minister of Marine (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Marine Act, 1936-1976—Regulations—Prevention of collisions

By the Minister of Education (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. The Flinders University of South Australia Act, 1966-1973—By-laws—General by-laws, 1983.

By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. R.G. Payne)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Electrical Articles and Materials Act, 1940-1967—Regulations—Definitions.

By the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Statistical Return of Voting—General Election, held on 6 November 1982.

II. Rules of Court—Supreme Court—Supreme Court Act, 1935-1981—Summons for direction.

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. J.W. Slater)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Racing Act, 1976-1982—Amendment of the greyhound racing rules— Amendment of the trotting rules.

II. Racing Act, 1976-1981. Fees Regulation Act, 1927—variation of regulations.

III. Racing Act, 1976-1982—Greyhound racing rules—

I. Stewards

II. Fees

III. Trial Tracks

IV. Rules of trotting—Stewards fees.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. T.H. Hemmings)—

Report of the Director of the Department of Local Government on matters relating to the City of Kensington and Norwood.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: CITY OF KENSINGTON AND NORWOOD

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Local Government): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: On 22 February 1983, the council of the City of Kensington and Norwood agreed to my request that a senior officer of my department should discuss the issues raised by His Worship the Mayor, Mr J.K. Richards, with the council and administrative officers.

Members will recall that Mayor Richards had sought an investigation based on a number of matters relating to the administration of the City of Kensington and Norwood that were causing him concern. The Director of the Department of Local Government has carried out a study of the issues raised by Mayor Richards, and has had discussions with the council, individual concillors, and the senior officers of the council.

The report emphasises that the principal difficulties occurring in the council are those created by sharp differences between the Mayor and other elected members. This has resulted in considerable public debate of council matters. In the report, it is recommended strongly that each and every elected member of the city of Kensington and Norwood consider very carefully their attitudes and the part that they have played in the breakdown of relationships within the council. It is hoped that, on reading the report, all elected members will consider carefully the impact of their behaviour on the standing of local government in the community.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: FUNDING OF PROJECTS

The SPEAKER: I have to report that I have this day received the following letter from the Leader of the Opposition:

I desire to inform you that this day it is my intention to move:

That the House at its rising adjourn until tomorrow at 1 o'clock for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely:

that in view of the Premier's statement last December urging the former Commonwealth Liberal Government to provide funding for the Alice Springs to Darwin railway and water filtration projects in South Australia to create jobs, and in view of the fact that these projects have been the subject of specific A.L.P. election promises, this House, because of the failure of the Premier so far to impress upon the present Commonwealth Labor Government the importance of these projects to South Australia, calls upon him to seek an immediate meeting with the Prime Minister to urge a reversal of the Commonwealth's decision to cut funding and thus jeopardise the future of these projects.

I call upon those members who support the proposed motion to rise in their places.

Members having risen:

The SPEAKER: More than the necessary number of members having risen, the motion may be proceeded with.

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

That the House at its rising adjourn until tomorrow at 1 o'clock,

for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely, that, in view of the Premier's statement last December urging the former Commonwealth Liberal Government to provide funding for the Alice Springs to Darwin railway and water filtration projects in South Australia to create jobs and in view of the fact that these projects have been the subject of specific A.L.P. election promises, this House, because of the failure of the Premier so far to impress upon the present Commonwealth Labor Government the importance of these projects to South Australia, calls upon him to seek an immediate meeting with the Prime Minister to urge a reversal of the Commonwealth's decision to cut funding and thus jeopardise the future of these projects.

During the recent State election campaign, the Premier urged South Australians to vote for him because he wanted South Australia to win. This motion is about two vital projects, the Alice Springs to Darwin Railway and water filtration, which are now in jeopardy as a result of the Federal Labor Government's mini Budget, and the Premier has done nothing of any consequence to win them back for South Australia.

Since this Premier came to office, we have also lost a significant section of the O'Bahn public transport system to the north-east suburbs; the Murray River salinity control programme has been cut back; a vital sewage treatment plant for the South-East will not go ahead; the Honeymoon and Beverley uranium mines have been rejected, and we have lost any chance of a uranium conversion and enrichment industry; and the pipeline to bring oil from the Jackson field will go east instead of to Moomba.

These projects involve spending of well over $2 billion and the creation of many thousands of jobs. Not all the money would be spent in South Australia, but the benefits to our State would be enormous. All of these projects are now in jeopardy or have been lost because of decisions of the State and Federal Labor Governments, Governments which came to office promising to create more jobs and more opportunities for South Australia—a promise that has not been kept.

The Premier, the man who wanted South Australia to win, must share a major part of the responsibility for the loss of these projects. The Premier's failures when compared with his election promises, made only just over six months ago, make the Hitler diaries appear a paragon of credibility. But it is not only the Premier's credibility which is at stake. He has also demonstrated a complete inability to do anything about these severe setbacks for South Australia, or to take any responsibility for them.

The Premier has tried without success, (as the Bragg electors demonstrated convincingly with a 3.4 per cent swing

to the Liberal Party) to blame the former State Government for his decisions to cut back on the O'Bahn project, the Finger Point plant, and the Murray River salinity programme, and he has refused to confront Canberra on its decisions relating to the Alice Springs to Darwin railway and the water filtration projects.

As a result, we now know what the Premier meant when he told Frank Jackson in the *News* on 16 February that being Premier had been a real drag. And we know why Matt Abraham wrote in his column last Saturday that the Premier had been known to make clear to Cabinet colleagues he did not consider the job a very enjoyable one.

Quite clearly, the Premier is happy to be photographed cuddling koalas or cutting a birthday cake at the Festival Centre, as was the case last week, but he refused, last week, to go to Canberra to confront the Prime Minister over the railway and the water filtration plants. Perhaps he was afraid Mr Hawke would do to him what, apparently, the koala refrained from doing.

In the same metaphorical sense, however, members will recall one particularly memorable statement by Mr Dunstan, who threatened Mr Whitlam from a great height when Canberra had given South Australia a particularly bad deal. Mr Dunstan was not afraid to take on a Labor Prime Minister, but the present Premier obviously is. He has failed South Australia: he is afraid to face the hard decisions. He has no strength for them, as he has admitted to political correspondents.

In the same way, the Premier was afraid to offend union officials over the wages pause. He got his Minister of Mines and Energy to publicly explain the Government's decisions on the uranium industry when these were major policy matters for which the Premier should have taken the responsibility.

I also understand that he has refused to see, until August, those South-East fishermen who could suffer as a result of the decision on the Finger Point plant, and it is the Mayor of Woodville who is leading the fight for jobs at Woodville, not the Premier. His silence is deafening. Of course, before the recent State election, the Premier was eager to blame the former State and Federal Liberal Governments for the position at G.M.H., Woodville. Now that we have Labor Governments, however, the blame has been shifted offshore, to executives in Detroit.

This is typical of the Premier's whole approach to his responsibilities. He has double standards. The member for Elizabeth was right, perhaps, when he accused the Premier of treachery, of a serious breach of faith, and of not being a suitable leader. This Premier is a man who constantly criticised his immediate predecessor for not fighting for South Australia. Yet, it was Mr Tonkin who won an extra $20 000 000 at the last Premiers' Conference. It was the former Premier who led the campaign for an international air terminal for Adelaide, after beating on the Prime Minister's door for 18 months, and it was Mr Tonkin who fought for Roxby Downs when the then Leader of the Opposition was calling it a mirage in the desert and trying to have the indenture defeated. Some mirage!

The examples I have given of the Premier's double standards, of his refusal to face responsibilities and hard decisions, should concern all South Australians. They were deceived by him during the last election campaign. That is now becoming more apparent each day. No doubt, in his reply to me, the Premier will get up, as he has done when facing previous motions of this nature, and criticise the Opposition for breaking with consensus and for turning its back on the difficulties we face as a State and a nation. Well, the Premier had better find a better explanation this time, because it is the Labor Party that has broken with consensus on the projects which are the subject of this motion. The former Federal Liberal Government made specific funding commitments to allow these projects to proceed. During the Federal election campaign Labor leaders supported the railway, and said nothing to suggest that financial funding for water filtration would be scrapped. These were commitments which the Premier once also fully supported.

Only last December he released a statement urging the former Federal Government to begin or accelerate 10 job creation projects for South Australia. It was reported in the *Advertiser* on 18 December under the headline, 'Bannon's 10 points for creating jobs'. The report revealed that the Premier had sent the Acting Prime Minister a list of 10 job creation projects which he said should begin or be accelerated. Among them were further water filtration projects and the Alice Springs to Darwin railway. In his call to Canberra, the Premier complained that South Australia had frequently received a poor allocation of Commonwealth work in recent years. 'However, that simply cannot be allowed to continue,' he said. Those were the words of the Premier but last December.

What is he doing about it now? Once again he is shown to be a Premier who is heavy on rhetoric, but light on action. The railway is vital for future trade opportunities for South Australia. It can also benefit tourism in South Australia and the Northern Territory. These are long-term objectives—vital objectives for South Australia. In the short term, however, these projects will create valuable job opportunities, particularly in the Iron Triangle region, where 156 000 tonnes of steel rail and 2 500 000 concrete sleepers for the project can be manufactured—manufactured by existing facilities, by companies seeking the work to retain employees.

As long ago as 1910, the Commonwealth accepted a commitment to construct, or cause to be constructed, a railway linking South Australia and the Northern Territory. In these circumstances, it is absurd for the Deputy Premier, 73 years later, to accept the suggestion offered by the Prime Minister on Friday of yet another inquiry into this project. Some negotiator on behalf of South Australia! This is nothing more than a sham and a facade designed to delude South Australians into thinking the Commonwealth is still interested in this proposal and wants it to go ahead. If the Premier thinks this fraudulent proposal will remove his responsibility to fight for the project, he is mistaken. The Premier's notion that, when Labor Governments are in power, their responsibility to the electors is somehow less, can also be seen in his reaction to the decision to stop funding for the water filtration plants for the northern towns.

On 4 February 1981, this was a matter of life and death to the Premier, when he moved a motion of no confidence in the former Government which called, amongst other things, for work to proceed on the planned filtration of the northern water supply. Let me remind the Premier how he began his speech on that occasion. He said:

> Revelations of the last week have shown the sorry state to which South Australia can be brought, where a Government puts above all else its desire to cut back costs to save Budget expenditures, puts that desire above, in fact, the concerns of public safety and public health, which the Government has entrusted to it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: The Premier was not reluctant on that occasion to play politics with people's lives—that is what he was doing—yet, now that a Federal Labor Government has cut off the funds committed for these projects, we hear not a whimper from him. What hypocrisy! What lily-liveredness! Just over two years ago he condemned Liberal Governments, which were doing much more than State and Federal Labor

Governments are now prepared to do, within the constraints of available funds, to proceed with these vital water projects.

And, before the Premier gets up, in reply, to suggest that if the Corcoran Government had been re-elected in 1979 these plants would have been built by now for our northern towns, let me also give the facts on that. The Minister of Mines and Energy told this House during the no-confidence debate to which I have already referred that, as Minister of Water Resources in the Corcoran Government, he had been responsible for the Labor Party's promise, made at the 1979 election, that these plants would be built. However, only a month before that election the Corcoran Government had been warned by Treasury that no funds were available for the plants. This is shown in a Treasury document, dated 3 August 1979, which was circulated to all Ministers. That document made it clear that the Government's loan programme was already stretched to the limit and that substantial additional funds would have to be found if the Government decided to proceed with the water treatment programme for the northern towns. The Tonkin Government was able to allocate funds for these plants—$800 000 in 1981-82 and $2 200 000 this financial year—because of its careful and responsible financial management.

In Opposition, the Premier bemoaned the lack of progress on further water filtration for the metropolitan area. Despite the difficult financial circumstances, the former Government made available the necessary funding to allow work to proceed on the Happy Valley filtration plant, which will supply more than 400 000 residents in the southern half of Adelaide. Again, however, the Prime Minister has wielded his axe and the Premier is not offering any fight.

It is unacceptable to continue to supply unfiltered water to these areas. But the Hawke Government's decisions will not only delay completion of these plants; they will also lead to a significant escalation in costs. The Premier has said that water rates will be increased to meet this higher cost. He will tax South Australians—something he promised not to do—to pay for broken election promises by Mr Hawke, who said that he would not tamper with grants for water programmes, but has now reduced Commonwealth funding for them by $47 000 000.

Again, however, the Premier, in taking this soft option, is demonstrating his arrant hypocrisy because, throughout his period in Opposition, he constantly criticised increases in water rates. Let me quote, for example, a statement by the Premier on 3 July 1980 on increased water rates. He said, in part:

> Added to the rise in charges for electric power and for bus and train fares, it is a means of raising revenue by indirect taxation.

The present Chief Secretary said much the same thing in July 1982, referring to it as a back-door taxation policy. Those were the days, of course, when the Labor Party wanted people to believe that they could have something for nothing. The name of the game was to raise public expectations of what a Labor Government could achieve and to denigrate the achievements of Liberal Governments in the most difficult economic times Australia has known for half a century.

The Premier promised, in playing that game, that out of it South Australia would win. Well, we can now begin to count the cost of the Premier's efforts to win for South Australia and, in doing so, it becomes clear that even Glenelg has had more success this season. But even the Glenelg players have accepted their share of responsibility for their losses. The Premier will not. It is time that he realised that his Deputy cannot play an interchange role in Canberra on vital issues such as the railway line and the water filtration plants. The Tasmanian Premier and the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory were in Canberra last week fighting for grand final stakes while the Premier stayed at home to cuddle koalas and cut birthday cakes. That was an admission either of failure to persuade the Commonwealth of South Australia's case or fear and unwillingness to confront a Labor Prime Minister. It is time that the Premier faced his responsibilities; it is time that he began to fight for South Australia; it is time that he stopped breaking his election promises.

The Commonwealth's mini Budget decisions on the railway and water filtration plants were the worst Canberra-inflicted blows on South Australia since the Whitlam Government imposed a wine tax in 1975. At least on that occasion Mr Dunstan said what he thought of Mr Whitlam's decision and criticised his Federal colleague. South Australia's campaign against that measure resulted ultimately in the removal of the tax. I have also referred to how—

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): The motion that we have had today was a predictable one. I do not disagree with the substance of it. Part of the lather that the Leader has whipped himself into over the past 15 minutes I think works from the totally false assumption that the Government, and I in particular, have not made some extremely strong statements and representations on the two particular projects involved. I will deal with those in a moment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Of course, what we are seeing here is what I guess one could call the decibel principle of politics—it does not matter what you say but it is how loudly you scream and shout about it: it does not matter whether you are being unconstructive or whether you know that it is futile; as long as you are there making loud noises, however vacuous or pointless, then you must be doing a great job. I am afraid that I do not operate on that basis.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We can hear the shouting and screaming again. This is the sort of attitude that members of the Opposition have. I guess that, as they stagger around with their 38 per cent support in the community, they must try to drum up their enthusiasm in that way. I am simply saying that in these times, and in this economic circumstance, that is not the way in which recovery can be achieved.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The decibel principle of politics is nonsense, and it is rejected by the population at large. We have had enough—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are wholesale breaches of Standing Orders: it will be a question not of the decibel level of politics but of the expulsion level of politics, if this goes on.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We have had in this pathetic contribution predictable statements urging us to do something that we are already doing—a fine example of a constructive Opposition. There have been references to Hitler diaries, hypocrisy, tragedy, weakness, and so on—the full panoply goes on. The substance of the matter is not addressed: the Opposition is not interested in the real job that must be done for South Australia. It is interested only in bobbing up, yelling and shouting, and trying to make some sort of fuss. No doubt there is great pleasure in the Leader of the Opposition's room every time he manages to get himself in the newspapers or on television—that is fine; that is the job of the Leader of the Opposition. However, I suggest that the job is not simply to yell and shout abuse

at the Government of the day, but to work in some areas with the Government to do something constructive. Here are two classic examples of where our policies are identical, in cases which the Opposition could have joined with us in a constructive way in an attempt to do something about the situation. Instead, we had to put up with this 15-minute tirade of abuse.

The two matters referred to concern the funding of the Alice Springs to Darwin railway and the water filtration project in South Australia. As the first part of the motion indicates, over a considerable period of time we have strongly supported those two projects. We have indicated this in all venues, and we co-operated with the previous Government in urging support from the Commonwealth for those projects. Our record in that regard is quite clear. I can assure members of the House that we have not abandoned our support for those projects. We have not turned our backs on their importance.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: On the very night that Treasurer Keating made his statements in which he announced the cancellation of those two projects, I made quite clear that that action was unacceptable to South Australia. I made quite clear that we were opposed to that decision. Those remarks were reported: my voice is recorded on all the news media. When asked about the impact I said, 'It is a mixed package. There are some things of benefit, but there are two areas particularly where South Australia is adversely affected: one is the cancellation of, or the offer made in relation to, the Darwin to Alice Springs railway; the other is the cancellation of the previous Government's special water resources project announced in January.'

I said, 'That will disadvantage South Australia and it is not acceptable to us.' I have made that quite clear. So, this motion and the puffed-up 15 minutes nonsense to which we have just had to listen is simply urging us to do what we have been doing. I suggest that, rather than waste the time of this House, the Leader could do some more constructive things about this matter. For example, I do not object to the Leader's writing to business men stressing to them the importance of the Darwin to Alice Springs railway link.

Mr Olsen: We've done that.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I congratulate the Leader for doing that, because it is quite an appropriate thing to do. Incidentally, I am taking the Leader's motives on face value: that he is concerned about the project and he wants to encourage businesses to make their protest, as, indeed, I do.

There are things that we could have done together in relation to this matter, but that is not the attitude that we get from the Opposition—and we are not likely to. In approaching this problem we should be using logic and reason. In his address, did the Leader once look at the reasons given by the Commonwealth for knocking off these projects? Did he once try to analyse how one could match those reasons or suggest an argument that one could put against them? Not a bit! The Leader's approach is to jump up and down and say, 'I want' or 'I am disappointed,' and that is it.

The Leader does not realise that he is in a bargaining position and that he must analyse what has been said and done and match those arguments in logic. It will not be yelling, shouting or rhetoric that gets these things done—it will be the logic of our case and the efficiency of its presentation that will do it. It is about time that the Leader learnt that lesson. That is certainly what will happen.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In relation to the Darwin to Alice Springs railway link, Mr Keating said that the reason behind this decision was that the Northern Territory receives per capita payments of about five times the average level of per capita payments to the six States. He then said:

> . . . the significance of the rail project to the Northern Territory, we believe the Northern Territory Government should share with us [the Commonwealth] the cost of constructing the railway. We intend to proceed on the basis that the Commonwealth and the Northern Territory contribute 60 per cent and 40 per cent respectively to construction costs.

Mr Keating then went on to say that, if that proposal was not acceptable, the Commonwealth would provide a high standard road link from Alice Springs to Darwin by 1987 and additional rail facilities for Alice Springs to provide an efficient transport alternative. Mr Keating then gave his reasons, as follows:

> The Commonwealth is proceeding this way in light of the prevailing budgetary situation, and the fact that is plainly uneconomic to proceed simultaneously with both the construction of the Alice Springs to Darwin Railway and the major upgrading of the parallel road link.

That is a *non sequitur*. That argument is not acceptable. The question of proceeding with the two projects simultaneously is not involved. We are talking about the project that has already been announced—te project to build the railway.

We can point to immediate direct economic advantages for the Northern Territory, for South Australia and, indeed, for Australia as a whole. Those economic advantages relate, in the short term, to the actual moneys expended on materials and labour in the construction of the project and, in the longer term, in relation to the economic value of that rail link in terms of trade and commerce and access, for example, to the Lake Phillipson coal deposits, which could well be utilised in coal-powered electricity generation for Darwin. In fact, a whole range of things open up before us. They are the economic reasons. Those economic reasons were not addressed by Treasurer Keating in his announcement and, as I have said, have not been properly addressed by the Commonwealth since. Secondly, there are non-direct economic reasons why this project should proceed; those reasons, which relate to the defence potential of the project, the social potential, and the opportunity to develop the Northern Territory, do not apply without that sort of all-weather, high-speed rail link. It also relates to tourism, which, again, can provide not only direct economic benefits but also living benefits to the Northern Territory which would aid its development.

South Australia's economic future is very much tied to the Northern Territory. As I have said, there are direct benefits for South Australia from prosperity in the Northern Territory. In fact, I have made that clear in Canberra on a number of occasions. I would have thought that there was no problem at all in supporting this project and making clear that that is what we are doing.

The Leader also referred to a meeting with the Prime Minister. Incidentally, the Leader claimed that nothing has happened. The Deputy Premier went to Canberra at the same time as Mr Everingham. He spoke to the Prime Minister and made a submission to him at length. The Prime Minister produced the suggestion of an inquiry. We have made quite clear our attitude to that inquiry—an inquiry is unacceptable.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: An inquiry is unacceptable if it is based on narrow terms of reference which, in effect, prejudge the findings of that inquiry *vis-a-vis* the road and rail links that are to be made. It is totally unacceptable, and I have made it clear. On the other hand, if the Common-

wealth still persists in its attitude that it will not fund the railway without a substantial contribution from the Northern Territory or, alternatively, it will hold an inquiry to look at the situation, two approaches can be taken. One involves examining what possible contribution the Northern Territory could make and what the nature of that contribution would be. That is very much up to the Northern Territory. Mr Everingham, the Chief Minister, has indicated so far that he is not going to budge: he can dig in his heels but that will not get his railway built.

We support Mr Everingham in the proposal to build the railway, but we do not support him in simply saying that the matter is not negotiable, if the end result of that means that we will not get any railway. Tht is how it looks at the moment. The point now is that the Territorians may be able to come up with some alternative financial scheme. Obviously, 40 per cent is beyond the Northern Territory's budget and is unacceptable to it. I support Mr Everingham in his representations to the Prime Minister about it, and I make that quite clear.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Glenelg.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The other alternative to a different financial arrangement would be some form of inquiry. Let me stress again that that is unacceptable if that inquiry is circumscribed in a way that prejudges the issue. I fear that the inquiry as proposed at this stage in the terms of reference, which have not yet been spelt out, would do just that. We will make it quite clear that we will not go along with that. An inquiry must look at the so-called non-economic benefits and the time scale and, most importantly, it must begin by addressing itself to the question that, if the inquiry finds that the railway is feasible and should go ahead, what then would be the financial arrangements to be attached to it.

It would be no good having an inquiry saying that and then having the Commonwealth turn around and say that, despite those findings, it cannot make the right financial arrangements. I support completely that part of the Leader's speech, namely, that we must keep advocating this project. I suggest that we have to find a way to ensure that the railway gets built and that we do not allow the Commonwealth to get off the hook simply by standing flat footed. As to the water projects, what were the reasons used by the Treasurer? He stated:

> Following a comprehensive review of the previous Government's water programmes, we have decided not to proceed. It would have entailed the provision of $350 000 000.

These are the reasons that he gave. We should address ourselves to those reasons in making submission to the Commonwealth. He stated:

> Most of the projects in the previous Government's indicative list have not reached an advanced design stage.

That may be true of some of them but it is not true of the projects in South Australia. On the contrary, they were not only well designed but also in place as projects. The whole rationale in terms of preparation was already in place at the time they were submitted by this Government as part of that national water resources programme. So, that reason does not wash as far as South Australia is concerned. The Treasurer went on to state:

> Few had been subject to economic evaluation.

That may be true. Certainly, it is true that some projects in other States were cobbled up to try somehow to cash in on what was being offered by the Commonwealth, but that was not the case in South Australia. We prepared a fully detailed proposal—

The Hon. W.E. Chapman interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —and submitted it to Mr Fraser. It had been economically evaluated. Again, that reason of Treasurer Keating's does not stand up. He went on to state:

> And, in general, country town water supply projects were arbitrarily excluded.

In South Australia one of the key projects dealt directly with country town water supply and its quality, namely, the northern filtration programme and, again, it could be excluded from the reasons that the Treasurer had given. I will not go through the rest of his reasons, but I indicate that our approach has been to analyse those reasons, to make submissions to the Federal Government and to ensure that our message gets across so that something will be done about it.

While I would welcome any support that the Opposition could give, I think they demean their role in resorting to this sort of nonsense—a motion which I can support in nearly all respects, but of course accompanied by the abuse that says, 'We really want to support you, but we are going to abuse you so much that you will not feel like picking up our help.' If that is the way they are going to operate on these national projects, heaven help South Australia.

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

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): We have heard in this House one of the most naive statements that we have had from the Premier in many a long day. Here is the Premier getting up with this brand new consensus style which he seeks to sell to the public, not having learnt lessons from the past from any Premier who has achieved anything for his State, saying that he will not get up and criticise the Federal Government, take them to task, or do what every successful Premier battling for his State has done in the past: he will sit down and have a talk about it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: This is the new style that the Premier is introducing into modern-day politics in South Australia. How does this consensus style work out in practice? It means that one lies down and lets the other side walk all over one. That is what happened in the Government's handling of industrial disputes.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On any problem which has been difficult for the Government or the Premier, he has said, 'We will have a pow wow; we will have a talk.' What did the Government do in the case of the wages pause? The Premier was left in the starting block. What happened in the case of the Moomba dispute? Nothing. The pow wow led to nothing. This athletic Premier of ours has had some publicity as a runner. I do not know what sort of a runner he is, but he is left in the starting blocks on every issue which concerns the future of this State. He does not get off the blocks on any issues which have confronted this Government since it was elected.

The Premier has been left standing, and this is another case in point. The Premier's much vaunted strategy and tactics have been so visible that they have not even been reported. The only report I have seen in the past few days is that the Premier has disagreed with his Deputy Premier in relation to this study. He is saying, 'We do not need a study this morning.' He cut the ground from under his Deputy's feet in this morning's *Advertiser*. I must say that I find a lot of sympathy for the statement made by the

member for Elizabeth, who described his Leader as being about as strong as orange flower water.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I must say that in some regards I have a considerable respect for the fighting qualities of the member for Elizabeth. I think his politics are way out, but I do have a considerable sympathy for him when he says that this Premier is about as strong as orange flower water, because that is where he has been on this issue. What is more important to this State than the water filtration programme and the railway link to Darwin? What is more important?

The Premier says that we will have a pow wow—a study. Is he so naive as to think that this is not the way in which politicians of the ilk of the Federal Government fudge the issue? How does one delay it? One does so by having a committee or an inquiry. We know that former Prime Minister Fraser, when he was resisting the building of this railway line, suggested that it was not economic. One can mount any economic inquiry to come up with the answer that one wants, and does not the Premier think that that is what is going to happen?

There has been all this hoo-hah about the terms of reference. We know without any inquiry that this railway line is of enormous significance to South Australia and the future of this State. Why do we need to have an inquiry to tell us that? We know it, and the former Government convinced former Prime Minister Fraser of the worth of that railway line. Why is it that, together with the Northern Territory, the Premier is suddenly saying that he can understand their reasons? Why is there this apology for the Federal Government? Why does he say, 'I can understand these reasons; let us make the Northern Territory pay'? This is a national railway. Did Western Australia pay for their transcontinental? Who paid for the Indian Pacific? Who pays for these national railways? It is unheard of to suggest the Northern Territory should foot the bill for $20 a head for the railway.

We have the Premier apologising and saying that maybe they can make a contribution. What a weak stance! It is the Federal Government's responsibility to pick up the tab for this railway, and both Parties have promised to do so. Why does the Premier stand up here and apologise for Mr Hawke? Why does he stand up here and apologise for the unions? Is he so weak in the Labor movement that he cannot get up and hit them with a club occasionally, as other Premiers do? Look how Premier Dunstan operated. He had enough strength in the Labor Party to criticise his peers in Canberra from time to time. Every successful Premier I know of has done that.

What are we to get in South Australia in exchange for the water filtration programme and the railways? We are going to get a job creation scheme! Both of those are enormous job maintenance schemes. The major problem here is to keep people in work—not to build some temporary works structure to tide us over evil days. There is a transfer of funds from these two projects, which are of enormous significance to the State, to some job creation scheme. What about maintaining the jobs in the construction industry, which will be involved in the water filtration programme? If the Minister of Public Works and members of the Government are not aware of the fact that the construction industry in this State has the seat out of its pants, then they are going around in a state of complete gloom and doom as they did when in Opposition. Government members are in complete ignorance of, and have their eyes shut to, the fact that the construction industry is desperately looking for work. People are being put off in that industry, which is closing down.

The massive water filtration programmes would create work for engineers and the construction industry; they would maintain jobs—likewise the rail link. Not only are there enormous benefits down the track in terms of outlets for trade and commerce to the tune of something like $100 000 000 a year that presently goes to the Eastern States, but also there is the help for the steel industry promised by the Labor Party spokesman. What more tangible help for the steel industry is there? We had Prime Minister Hawke fronting up before an election saying, 'I will help the steel industry.' B.H.P. spent $80 000 000 in one year during the life of the Tonkin Government building a modern rail-rolling facility. What better could he do than to proceed with the railway and create jobs to keep the mills rolling, thus keeping people in work in Whyalla, yet he substituted that for a $500 000 000 job creation scheme around Australia, and the Deputy Premier gets a pat on the shoulder for that. What do those schemes do? They do not maintain any current jobs.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: You're hostile to the *Advertiser*.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not hostile to anybody. I am putting a point of view. I am saying that the history of these job creation schemes is that they are artificial and do precious little, if anything, to create permanent work. In other words, when funds run out, the jobs disappear. It is nice for local government authorities to get the local hall painted or a new council chamber built. They are labour intensive schemes and create jobs, but do they address the underlying problem? They certainly do not! For the Premier to trade in the water filtration scheme and then say that we will have to pay for it ourselves will dramatically escalate the price of water to the great disadvantage to this State. To offer a job creation scheme in exchange is lunacy. That is the position in which we find ourselves. We have the Premier not prepared to front up.

The Premier says he has a low-key consensus style, and says 'Let us argue with them. Let us debate with them. Let us analyse their reasons. It does not matter if it takes six months or a year, let us work through it.' In the meantime, events have passed us by. To suggest that the way out of this problem is to have an economic study is completely naive, or they know they have lost the game. What has happened? The Premier's statements have had so much impact that they have not even found their way into the local media, let alone the national media. What has happened? The Deputy Premier has rounded up the Leader of the Opposition from the Northern Territory to go over and have a pow wow in Canberra. I have no ill feeling for the Deputy Premier of this State, but what a high powered delegation to send to Canberra—the Deputy Premier and the Leader of the Opposition from the Northern Territory! What a high powered delegation to send to Canberra to fight for South Australia's interests!

It was a face saver, purely and simply. The Premier knew that the game was up. He would not front up himself and would not fight. At least the Deputy Premier fronted up and rounded up his colleague from the Northern Territory but, of course, it was a foregone conclusion. The Premier himself did not even front up but he sent along his deputy and they agreed that it was a good idea to have a study. What a fudge! The Premier has surely been around long enough to know that, if one wants to kill something, then one establishes a committee or an inquiry so that one can come up with the answer that one wants. It is all hoo-hah about the terms of reference. If Mr Hawke has it in his mind that it is not economic (and that is what the Treasury in Canberra has been telling him as well as the former Prime Minister), and if there are not any other considerations wider than that, then he knows perfectly well what answer will come out of this economic inquiry.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: At least until the A.C.T.U. gets at him.

The SPEAKER: I call the honourable member for Light to order.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: What deal has South Australia got out of this brand new shiny Labor Government in Canberra? We have lost a rail link.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the honourable member for Hanson to order.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We have lost the help for the water filtration scheme which we have had over many years. There has been a recognition by the National Water Resources Council that South Australia has a disability in relation to water quality. There has been help over the years from succeeding Governments in relation to help for water filtration. What is the Premier's answer? He says that we will press on and put up water rates. What a stance! What that is going to do is make water more expensive than anywhere else in Australia. Not only has he already conceded defeat but he is going to put South Australia way behind the eightball in any development because there are two things we need for development: power and water. He is going to price both of those out of the Australian league. He is certainly going to do that in the case of water by saying that he will pick up the tab for building those filtration plants. He has given the game away. Succeeding Governments (both Liberal and Labor) have always secured help in relation to water filtration. He has given this away and has substituted a job creation scheme to provide temporary employment. What a deal! What a bargain from the shiny new Labor Government in Canberra!

In relation to water quality, the Liberal Government (of which I was a part and associated with someone who knew something about water—Hon. Peter Arnold) had a positive programme of improving water quality in this State. What do we get from the Minister of Water Resources? He says that the Murray is alive and well, that there have been floods in the Eastern States, and that he guarantees that there will be no water restrictions this year or next year. What a short-sighted approach. He says that there will be no immediate political problem with the water. He says, 'She's right, the Murray is alive and well.' The fact is that we have a long-standing problem in relation to water quality in this State, and if we get a series of droughts up there instead of floods, this State will be in serious trouble in relation to water quality. That has all gone out the window and no-one in the present Government is worried about that, least of all the Minister of Water Resources.

The Labor Government says, 'This water will take care of itself. There is plenty of rain and there will be no restrictions.' That attitude reminds me very much of the gas negotiations to which I have referred once or twice before when the then Premier waved his hands in that airy fashion and said, 'She'll be right, we will find plenty of gas.' This Government is now saying, 'She'll be right; it is raining in the Eastern States and there is no problem with the Murray.' This Government and this Premier in particular is pathetic. No other word describes this nonsense, consensus, pow-wow, reasoned approach. Unless the Premier is prepared to get up and visibly fight and clobber his colleagues in Canberra in this State's interest on occasions then we will lose out every time.

He took my Party to task because Premier Tonkin went over and cried poverty at a Premiers' Conference. He said that that was not the thing to do and that Premier Tonkin should not have gone over there and said that we needed money and that we were broke. The then Leader of the Opposition seized a cheap political point and suggested that all was not well with the Budget. Premier Tonkin came back with $20 000 000 more for South Australia. Premier Bannon is going to go over with this low-key consensus, cap in hand, pow-wow approach, and believes that he will win for South Australia. Perhaps he should consider the way the much reviled Joh Petersen or Charles Court operated, whether or not a Liberal or a Labor Government was in power. He should look at the way in which the Tonkin Government operated. We had the runs on the board.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Members can laugh: we had the runs on the board. We got Roxby up and running against united opposition, and now it is the baby of the Labor Party. We will see whether it is the baby of the Labor Party after the member for Elizabeth has had a go at the conference.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must resume his seat. I warn the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I have only 15 minutes in which to set out clearly and explicitly what occurred last week. There seems to be some confusion, particularly in the minds and the eyes of the Opposition, as to what occurred. Late on Wednesday an opportunity was given for a delegation to meet the Prime Minister: that was the earliest possible notice that we received. Obviously, there could be no refusal in those circumstances to see the Prime Minister and to put the case for South Australia. It so happened that the Leader of the Labor Party in the Northern Territory, Mr Bob Collins, also wanted to put his argument on behalf of the Northern Territory. Up to the time the announcement was made, and I want the House to remember this—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The Leader can keep interjecting if he likes: he probably knows what is coming.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader will not keep interjecting. He will cease to do so.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Bob Collins, the Leader of the Labor Party in the Northern Territory, and I, as Deputy Premier of South Australia, were to lead the delegation to Hawke, and to that stage there had been no talk of Paul Everingham, let alone the Leader of the Opposition, making the trip. If Paul Everingham had thought anything of the Liberal Party in South Australia or of the Leader of the Opposition, he would have included them in any delegation. Quite simply, I believe that that was the proper thing to do. If the Leader had had the State at heart, as he pretends in this House today, surely he would have made—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: He took no action. The Leader did not go to Canberra.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The Leader of the Opposition had the opportunity to accompany Paul Everingham to Canberra to put his case. But what did he do? He stayed at home and twiddled his thumbs. He did exactly nothing. It is no good the Leader of the Opposition crying wolf in this House: he did not go to Canberra. Now he accuses the Premier of not going to Canberra when the Leader made no attempt to go himself or to send his Deputy. Let us clear up that matter.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Let us consider where the activity occurred—the matters that I put to the Prime Minister of Australia.

Mr Ashenden: Tell us what you achieved.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I will come to that point.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: That will be the shortest speech ever.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The honourable member will hear the facts: he might as well stop interjecting. From the point of view of South Australia, the most important point relates to the Whyalla steelworks. The points were listed in order so that I could explain to the Prime Minister exactly what they meant.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I believe that the Whyalla steelworks could have a very large input in the building of this railway line, and if members think that it is a laughing matter, considering the present situation in Whyalla, they may laugh by all means. Perhaps they should go to Whyalla and laugh. Another matter affecting that region is the possibility of either steel sleepers or concrete sleepers being used.

If the line was being constructed and it was decided that steel sleepers were to be used, Whyalla would benefit, and this was pointed out to the Prime Minister. However, if steel sleepers were not going to be used, almost certainly the next choice would have been to use concrete sleepers. These concrete sleepers could have been provided from Port Augusta, which has one of the major plants for making concrete sleepers, particularly in that close proximity, in any case. This was pointed out to the Prime Minister as well.

The fourth point I raised was that construction workers from South Australia would find employment on this site. Many people are employed in that area, and many were to be employed on this project. They could have been taken from that region or anywhere in South Australia, and the Prime Minister conceded that point.

The fifth point I made to the Prime Minister was that South Australian produce and manufacturing goods would have a better opportunity to be railed into the Northern Territory. In fact, I raised the possibility of Asia not being excluded from those products, a matter that has been raised with me by businessmen from time to time. I also mentioned the possible effects on tourism. I believe that if the line was opened up the tourist industry would certainly benefit. They were the six points which I raised with the Prime Minister and on which he gave me a very good hearing and, in fact, he questioned me on most of those points.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Let us deal with what Paul Everingham had to say to the Prime Minister, as I understand it, in any case. I do not know of any arrangement whereby I could have been included in a delegation with Paul Everingham. Let me say that was never arranged on my behalf, nor would I have gone with Paul Everingham.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Why?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Because of the way in which he has conducted himself. I was prepared to go with the Leader of the Labor Party from the Northern Territory. However, because of the way that Mr Everingham has conducted himself before and after, he certainly would not be getting me to any delegation with him in any circumstances, as I do not think he has behaved in a statesmanlike way. That is my belief about Paul Everingham.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Todd.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Let me say what the Prime Minister said about the proposition that Paul Everingham had put to him before the Prime Minister told me anything about his plans. Paul Everingham put to the Prime Minister that, if he were to provide 60 per cent of the $524 000 000 which the line would cost, he should provide to the Northern Territory Government (which had made very clear that it was not putting any money in at all—certainly not 40 per cent) the equivalent of that 60 per cent of the $524 000 000.

Mr Hawke (quite rightly, I believe) said to Mr Everingham, 'Where will that put the line?' Mr Everingham said, 'Well, it will be somewhere up there.' Mr Hawke said, 'You are not telling me you want the line to cut out?' Mr Everingham said, 'Well, we will have to worry about that matter when we get to it.' Is that a reasonable proposition from the Leader of a State to be putting to the Prime Minister of this country? I certainly do not think that it was. I think it was a futile and irresponsible approach to this whole matter by the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory.

Mr Lewis: You are not telling the truth.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I am telling you what I was told.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Mallee.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I said exactly that—that I had been told by the Prime Minister that that was the proposition. If I am not telling the truth, I am only relaying what the Prime Minister said to me, which I believe to be the truth. The Prime Minister then put to me the proposition of the inquiry. I know, as do most members opposite, that if one wants to bury something one has an inquiry. I do not dispute that, and I do not dispute much of what has been said here today. We know that the Opposition did it when it was in Government, and we know that other people do it. I told the Prime Minister there and then that I had no right to accept that agreement unilaterally, because I would have to consult the Premier about that matter.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Whatever he was doing, he is still the Premier of this State, and it was my duty to contact him and ascertain what he thought about that matter. I think that we should understand what was said to the Prime Minister in those circumstances. I went back to the Prime Minister and told him that, unless the terms of reference took into consideration the short-term and long-term economic effects of both the road and rail link, it would be no good having such an inquiry because, quite clearly, I am experienced enough to know what the Prime Minister could have done about that, and I am not accusing him in any way: he could have had an economic impact statement prepared clearly identifying that, so far as the economics of the Australian scene were concerned, the road programme was easily the more viable.

I believe that when we went to Canberra last Thursday the line, so far as the Commonwealth was concerned, was not going to be built. I think that the Commonwealth had made up its mind that 60 per cent was the maximum amount that could be put into building that line, and that the Northern Territory would have to put in 40 per cent. If one is caught in that situation, what does one do?

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: There is the answer from the Deputy Leader: he says, 'You tell them that it's nonsense.' What does that achieve? I could have done that; I could have said, 'That's a whole lot of nonsense.' But where would we go from there? We would still have no railway line.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Members opposite know that what I am saying is true. They probably would have liked

us to do that, but we did not take that line at all. We took the line that if there is to be an inquiry we ought to be in there putting South Australia's case. I happen to believe that, as an elected person representing the State of South Australia, I should conduct myself accordingly and represent the State of South Australia when I go on such a mission—not representing Jack Wright's views or telling the Prime Minister, 'That's a load of nonsense', coming back to South Australia and, on being asked on radio and television, 'What did you do, Mr Wright?', answering, 'Oh, I did nothing but say that it was a load of nonsense,' as the Deputy Leader would want me to say. I do not believe that that is on. We have to put some sort of case on this matter, and it is incumbent on the State leaders and on the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition to join with us in this argument rather than move futile motions seeking to do something that we have already done. We have already been across and seen the Prime Minister.

Let me say, in case there is any confusion in the minds of members opposite, that I believe that we did the right thing. After consultation with the Premier, I informed the Prime Minister that we would participate in such an inquiry only in such circumstances where he broadened the terms of reference to give us the opportunity of establishing that in the long term the railway may be the best possibility. I am not in a position to argue that.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: What are the terms of reference?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The terms of reference are yet to be decided, if the inquiry is in fact established. That is a very good question.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: You've agreed to them.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: No, we have not. We have agreed only if the terms of reference suit us.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Let me tell you what I said. There has been some argument here from the Deputy Leader about the fact that the Premier unloaded me (I think that those were his words this morning) about the inquiry itself. Let me repeat what I said on radio and on television immediately following that conference. I said:

> ... the inquiry must cover the short and long-term economic effects of both links; otherwise, we are wasting our time.

That was my public statement, which happened to coincide exactly with what I told the Prime Minister: that, unless the terms of reference were extended to cater for such a situation, obviously South Australia would not be interested.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: You've agreed to them.

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

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Let me get back to the negotiating point. It would have been a very simple matter, and I could have saved a lot of time, if I had taken the same stand as that taken by the Deputy Leader or the Leader and merely jumped up and down using a lot of rhetoric, but that would not get us our railway line, whereas the approach we are adopting at least gives us an opportunity for an input.

An honourable member: It goes nowhere.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: We shall see. It is going nowhere at the moment: I think that the Commonwealth is pretty strong about that, but if we can have this inquiry and establish the fact that in the long term it would be better for the whole of the nation, as well as merely for South Australia and the Northern Territory, the Government will have done its job.

In the short time that I have left, I simply want to point out that while I was in Canberra I took the opportunity to raise with the Prime Minister the problem concerning the G.M.H. operation in South Australia and its possible future. I asked the Prime Minister whether on 8 June he would make available Senator Button, with whom I was able to talk on the telephone when he was in Sydney. He has generally agreed to visit Adelaide on 8 June, at which time he will receive a deputation of interested people. Also on that occasion I understand that he will do what he can to arrange for the holding of a summit, for which the Mayor of Woodville has called.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister's time has expired. The time for the debate has also expired.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the House at its rising do adjourn until 11.45 a.m. tomorrow and at its rising tomorrow do adjourn until 11.45 a.m. on Thursday; and further, if the House be sitting at 1 p.m. on either day the sitting shall be suspended for one hour.

Motion carried.

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

That for the remainder of the session Government business take precedence of all other business except questions.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I oppose the motion. I know that it is traditional when a session is nearing completion that the Government moves that private members' business be discontinued and that Government business take up all the remaining time of Parliament. However, I oppose the motion on this occasion because I believe that a different situation now applies from that existing in the immediate past. I refer to the fact that the Government took action to make sure that a private member's Bill took precedence of Government business during the earlier part of the week when Parliament last sat, and that it did so without the consensus of Parliament.

I realise that in the past there has been general agreement that private members' business be handled in Government time, but on the occasion to which I refer a very contentious piece of legislation in relation to a casino was forced through Parliament in Government time while important private members' business was left on the Notice Paper.

Two notices of motion were never moved. The first was from the member for Glenelg and concerned the remarks made by the Federal Minister for Tourism (Mr Brown) about the koala and the international airport. That was an important matter that should have been debated further, even though a motion worded differently and put by another member from this side of the House had already been debated. The second motion to be moved by the member for Glenelg was that the House condemn the tactics of the Tasmanian Wilderness Society during an election campaign. That matter was never debated. In regard to Orders of the Day: Other Business, an adjourned debate on the motion of Mr Becker in relation to the South Australian Girls' Marching Association being considered as a legitimate recreation and sporting group was not further debated. Even though the Minister responsible had made some comments by way of reply, the debate was not completed. That matter is important to that group of people and to many other groups that are not recognised as legitimate sporting or recreation groups.

Also, there were two resolutions from the member for Eyre in relation to the area that he represents and to other outback areas of South Australia. One dealt with a water supply, a service that people in those areas need, and the other dealt with Electricity Trust charges. On the matter of electricity charges the Minister gave a reply, but the motion was not debated completely. The Casino Bill came from

the Upper House, as did Item No. 4, involving the Natural Death Bill, which was not completed, because Government time was not given for the handling of that private member's measure.

We were told that it was important. There was also a motion from Mr Gunn in relation to the sealing of the Venus Bay access road. That debate was not completed, even though it is an important matter for the member. I remind the House that we are elected to Parliament to represent the people and that was an important issue for the member and his district. A private member can only debate matters such as that in private members' time, but the member for Eyre was not given an opportunity to debate that matter.

Also, a motion was introduced by the shadow Minister of Transport, the member for Davenport. Then the Landlord and Tenant Act Amendment Bill was introduced by a Government member. That was an important Bill that received much press publicity. The member who introduced that Bill believed that it was important; as did those who supported him in that debate, and much concern has been expressed in the community in letters to the member and to other members. What happened to that matter, as the debate was not completed?

The Leader of the Opposition introduced a motion in relation to the wage pause. That is still a matter of concern in the community and the Leader believed the pause should be extended: that motion was not debated, either. The Ramsay Trust and its tax provisions was a matter that was supposed to be of some importance to the Government, and it was an issue that received some publicity. The Government attacked the Opposition, particularly early in its inception, in relation to that matter and said that Opposition members did not attend its launching, even though a member of the Opposition was there. Why was not that matter debated? That motion was received from another place, but the Government did not allow private members' time for it to be debated.

Another message from another place that was not debated was the National Natural Disaster Scheme. Of the Bills and motions I have mentioned, three had the same genesis through Parliament as the Casino Bill. Why was the Casino Bill the only one to be pushed through as a private members' Bill in Government time? What was the urgency behind that Bill? The community is now expressing a view about the urgency of that matter. I will not call a division in relation to this issue: I am saying that I believe that it is unfair. This situation has not occurred before. Usually, there is general consensus for the use of Government time to debate private members' business to get something through. However, the Government, by using its numbers, has started a new practice.

The Government should remember that, because individual members and Parties do not stay in power forever. The community believes that the Government should say whether it forced the Casino Bill through quickly because it was aware of a Victorian report into casinos that dealt with crime in casinos, and if it had been released before debate on the Casino Bill was completed there may have been a different result. The Government pre-empted an opportunity for Parliament to know all the facts in relation to that debate, because it had prior knowledge—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): Order! I ask the honourable member not to pursue that matter.

Mr EVANS: I will not do that, Mr Acting Speaker, if you believe that I should not do so. The Government should remember that it has set a precedent to use Government time for private members' business against the general consensus view of Parliament, in that there is normally agreement on both sides before that is done. That did not occur on this occasion, and I oppose the motion.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I point out to the Deputy Premier that there has been not only a change of precedent (as outlined by the Opposition Whip) in relation to the abuse of private members' time, but that it has been usual to give the Opposition a week's notice that that would occur. A resolution is usually moved announcing that private members' time is to cut out. Private members' time is then allowed in the following week and it ceases the week after that. As I recall, the announcement was made after private members' time had elapsed and in the past notice has been given that a resolution will be moved to cut off private members' time. Following the notice of that resolution, there is a concluding period so that private members' business can be wrapped up.

That did not occur this time. I understand that the session is coming to a close and that this is the last week, so that if any notice is to be given, it had to be given in the way it has been given, but it indicates the lack of forethought that went into the planning of the Parliamentary session and shows that private members' business was not concluded in a way that has happened in the past.

Previously, members would have a week's notice that the following week would be the last week of private members' business, and that anything they wanted to say could be said, but that has not occurred. Normally, tomorrow would be the last private members' day in terms of the notice that the Deputy Premier gave. I will not press it any further, but this is a break from tradition in the normal notice which surrounds the conclusion of private members' business. This came about because private members' time was used in the way outlined by the member for Fisher.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Used or abused?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Abused. That is a more apt word. The way it works out is that the Deputy Premier gave notice that it would conclude after tomorrow. We had no notice that we would not get a private members' day in which to finish matters.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I do not want to delay the proceedings of the House, but it should be pointed out that ever since I have been here notice has been given of the cessation of private members' business. It is my recollection, in any case, and I gave notice last week, which should have afforded the opportunity for members to have known last week, that that was the last day of private business.

Mr Lewis: We were not sitting last week.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: To put it more correctly, in the last week of sitting. If there has been a departure from the normal proceedings, which has been pointed out by the Deputy Leader, I am willing to have the position checked. I give the House a guarantee that it will not occur again.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: It's too late now.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Of course it is late, but I am trying to be fair. If the honourable member does not want me to be fair, I will sit down. If I have made a mistake, I am willing to accept it.

Mr Lewis: That will be the day!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: It makes me wonder whether a man should be fair in this place in view of the abuse one gets from time to time from some members, although not from all. I was making the point, which I think is valid, that, if the Deputy Leader is correct in his assertion, I will have the matter examined. If that is the case, I can give the House a guarantee that it will not happen again. I apologise if there has been a departure from the normal procedure.

Motion carried.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, line 41 (clause 10)—Leave out 'rate of ten per centum per annum' and insert 'prescribed rate'.

No. 2. Page 2, after line 44 (clause 10)—Insert new subclause as follows:

(3a) For the purposes of subsection (3)—

"prescribed rate" means a rate equal to—

(a) the rate (expressed as a percentage per annum) which is being charged by the Reserve Bank of Australia upon bank overdrafts on the day of payment of the amount to be credited under this section; or

(b) the rate of ten per centum per annum,

whichever is the greater.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I appreciate the depth of the explanation given by the Minister as to why the Committee should accede to his motion. I know that he is embarrassed, because it is almost exactly the proposition that was put in this Chamber and refused. However, to obtain the assistance of the Hon. Mr Milne and the Hon. Mr Gilfillan, the Government saw fit to accept a similar proposition; but I suggest that the proposition is less advantageous to local government than the proposition previously offered here. However, the end result, with which I agree, is that the ratepayer will benefit, although councils may, in future, be required to pay an interest rate greater than they will need to pay for their normal borrowings. The sooner that happens the better for all, because it will reflect a decrease in interest rates in the community. I support the amendments.

Motion carried.

SECOND-HAND MOTOR VEHICLES BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 April. Page 953.)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I responded to the call, but the member for Coles is the lead speaker for the Opposition, and will support the Bill.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): This Bill is a continuing initiative commenced by the former Government as was acknowledged by the Attorney-General when introducing it in another place. Under the Tonkin Government extensive consultation was initiated with the second-hand motor vehicle industry and other interested parties. At the time of the election the then Minister of Consumer Affairs (Hon. J.C. Burdett) had had a Bill prepared but had not had time to undertake final consultations. He introduced that Bill as a private member's Bill. Following the election, the present Government Bill was introduced. The differences between the Bill introduced by the Hon. Mr Burdett and the Government Bill are principally drafting inprovements. The private member's Bill was withdrawn. The Government Bill follows the initiative in research and consultation undertaken by the previous Government, and the Opposition supports it.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I thank Opposition members for their support of this measure. As the member for Coles has advised the House, this matter commenced during the time of the previous Administration. Indeed, much work was done by the former Government, and the present Government has taken hold of that work, has had further consultations with the industry, and has now brought this measure before the House. The second-hand motor vehicle dealer's legislation in this State has been regarded as a pacesetter. It is now almost a decade since it was first introduced, and obviously it is time for a review of the legislation. I recall being in Canada in 1975 and speaking to a consumer advocate, who said, 'They tell me that South Australia is the State where a woman can go down the street, do her shopping, meet a friend and, if her friend asks, 'What is your son doing?', she can reply, 'He is a second-hand motor vehicle dealer', and still hold her head high. I think that that position has been arrived at to a large degree in this State, where we have a reputable profession in a profession which has been fraught, throughout the world, with some bad connotations. However, we have worked steadily with the industry to bring about fair dealing in the interests of consumers.

These amendments will give a greater degree of security to purchasers of second-hand motor vehicles in this State. We live in a country where the motor vehicle is of great importance to the average household. It is, of course, of great importance to our economic base in this State, and it is essential that consumers have a high degree of security when making what is a quite substantial transaction for the average consumer. I thank Opposition members for their support of this measure.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 27 passed.

Clauses 28 and 29.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move to insert the following clauses:

Page 19—

28. (1) A fund entitled the 'Second-hand Vehicles Compensation Fund' shall be established and administered by the Commissioner.

(2) There shall be paid into the fund—

(a) the contributions required to be paid in accordance with section 29;

(b) any amounts recovered by the Commissioner under section 31;

(c) such amounts as are paid from the general revenue of the State under subsection (4); and

(d) any amounts derived by investment under subsection (6).

(3) There shall be paid out of the fund—

(a) any amount authorised by the tribunal under section 30;

(b) any expenses certified by the Treasurer as having been incurred in administering the fund;

and

(c) any amount required to be paid into the general revenue of the State under subsection (5).

(4) Where the amount standing to the credit of the fund is not sufficient to meet an amount that may be authorised to be paid under section 30 the Minister may, with the approval of the Treasurer, authorise the payment of such amount as he may specify out of the general revenue of the State which is, by virtue of this section, appropriated to the necessary extent.

(5) The Minister may authorise payment from the fund into the general revenue of the State of any amount paid into the fund from the general revenue of the State if the Minister is satisfied that the balance remaining in the fund will be sufficient to meet any amounts that may be authorised to be paid under section 30.

(6) Any moneys standing to the credit of the fund that are not immediately required for the purposes of this Act may be invested in such manner as is approved by the Minister.

Page 20—

29. (1) Every licensee must pay to the Commissioner for payment into the fund such contribution as he is required to pay in accordance with the regulations.

(2) If a licensee fails to pay a contribution within the time allowed for payment by the regulations, his licence shall, by virtue of this subsection, be suspended until the contribution is paid.

These clauses relate to money matters and the appropriate constitutional conventions apply.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair is prepared to accept the two proposals, but they must be acceptable to the Committee.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: This is literally the first I have seen of them, as the Minister moves those amendments. I think it would be appropriate if progress were to be reported, because the Opposition has not had a chance to look at these amendments.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair points out to the member for Coles that, although the amendments do not appear as far as the actual Bill is concerned, they are in the Bill in erased type. The Minister is in fact moving an amendment, as is the usual situation.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: In fact, the clauses are in the Bill but they are being moved by way of amendment by the Minister. To me, that is a contradiction in terms, and I do not understand it.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair points out to the member for Coles that they are in erased type, because they are money clauses. Does that explain the position to the member for Coles?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It explains the position, but at the same time, notwithstanding that they are in the Bill and as I see it ruled out, I would like the opportunity to read through these amendments in the interests of proper Parliamentary scrutiny before they are put.

The CHAIRMAN: The motion before the Chair is that progress be reported?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I oppose this because honourable members on both sides have had notice of these amendments for a considerable time. What these amendments embody is money matters and as I pointed out to the Committee, the constitutional conventions apply that these cannot be initiated in another place. They have been the subject of debate in the other place and have formed part of the previous Government's consideration of this measure. The working parties have reported to the Government, discussions have taken place with the industry, and I would not have thought that they were of a controversial nature. I believe that they are not controversial and that they have been fully understood by the Opposition, when in Government and now. I think there has been some degree of misunderstanding about the method by which we incorporate such matters in legislation when it comes down to this House from another place.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Having had an opportunity, while the Minister has been speaking, to check that the ruled out type is identical to that appearing in the amendments, and having also been assured by a colleague, while the Minister has been speaking, that the amendments will be examined when returned to another place, I am prepared to accept the amendments.

Mr LEWIS: So that I can understand the correct procedures of the Committee (and I do not wish to cause anyone any embarrassment whatsoever), I simply seek from you, Sir, an explanation as to the way in which it is appropriate to withdraw—

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair explained to the member for Coles that the clause is in erased type as it is a money clause, which cannot originate from the Upper House. I understand that the member for Coles has accepted that reason. The question now before the Chair is that the amendments be agreed to.

Clauses inserted.

Remaining clauses (30 to 48) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

OATHS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 April. Page 864.)

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): The Opposition supports this Bill. It was part of the former Attorney-General's programme and it enlarges the class of persons who may be appointed to act as commissioners for taking affidavits in the Supreme Court under the Oaths Act. All solicitors will now be able to act, rather than those appointed by the Governor under the Oaths Act or by the Supreme Court under the Supreme Court Act, 1935-1982, and it includes as commissioners (although this was regarded as a little contentious in the debate in the other place) Supreme Court and District Court judges, special magistrates, and others appointed by the Governor. We do know that the Supreme Court still has a right to appoint its own commissioners for taking Supreme Court affidavits. We support the Bill.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I thank the Opposition for its support of this Bill. As the honourable member has explained to the House, this measure has been in the legislative pipeline for some time. It will provide a greater level of service to the community. For those reasons, I urge all members to support the Bill.

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

CO-OPERATIVES BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 March. Page 803.)

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): The Opposition supports this Bill. Members will probably recall that this was prepared by the former Attorney-General (Hon. K.T. Griffin) and was introduced in another place as a private member's Bill. The legislation was subsequently adopted by the Government as a Government initiative and has been given Government time for its passage through both the Upper House and this House. Minor amendments to the legislation were proposed by the present Attorney-General and the Bill, as amended, is quite acceptable to the Opposition in this House.

The law was obviously in urgent need of reform. The original Act of 1923 had been little amended, and it was based on a former United Kingdom Act dating back to 1893. The first review was that of the Law Reform Committee of South Australia and, in its 41st report (I think it was) in the early 1970s, change was recommended. Quite some time was taken up before even that belated review was adopted. However, a Labor Government working party in 1978 subsequently reported to the Liberal Government in 1980, and I believe that only some four public submissions were received by that working party when they were requested. Two were received from co-operatives, and they agreed with the working party's findings in general. The co-operatives have been consulted and the Opposition supports the legislation.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I merely want to place on record one objection which came to me fairly late in the day. It was when the Bill had got into this place, so I had to write to these people and suggest that there was not much I could do unless I could convince the Government that there ought to be a change and I did not believe that that was in my capacity to accomplish in view of the point that they were making. A question was raised by one of the co-operatives in relation to clause 20, and I simply put it on the record that I had a letter from one co-operative complaining of the provisions in relation to the voting rights of members.

The Bill provides that one member shall have one vote. I think that that is the basic principle which is enshrined in clause 20, whereas the present arrangements for a number of co-operatives are such that voting strength goes with the number of votes held, so that the people who have the biggest stake in the co-operative have the biggest say. I guess that this is the old argument about who really makes the decisions. However, I was able to point out that there is a let-out in terms of existing rules not being tampered with. Clause 20 (4) states:

This section does not apply to invalidate any rule of a co-operative that is registered at the commencement of this Act.

Therefore, if the rules currently dictate that one gets one vote per share, that carries on, as I read it. I record the fact that there is still not unanimity among co-operatives in relation to the details of this Bill.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I thank honourable members for their support of this measure. It is, as has been explained by the member for Mount Gambier, a much needed rewrite of the law relating to co-operatives in this State. I am sure that the co-operative movement welcomes its being brought into the current century, although it is coming to an end because the legislation under which it currently operates has applied from the previous century.

It is an important movement in the community and has served particularly the rural industry very well. Perhaps some of the failures of the co-operative movement that have occurred have been the result of there being inadequate legislation. The points that the Deputy Leader raised in respect of voting rights exemplify some of the inadequacies that have existed in previous times about the involvement in a very meaningful way of all shareholders in the activities of the co-operative.

The point that the honourable member raised is undoubtedly a matter that was taken into consideration by the previous Government. Indeed, this Bill is an embodiment of a private member's Bill that was introduced by a member of the Deputy Leader's Party. I can only assume that the honourable member who drafted this legislation was aware of the controversy that would arise in some people's minds with respect to the concept of equal voting rights, irrespective of shareholdings. I suppose that that principle is embodied in our political system in this State.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: We have a system that elects us to this House, for the work that we do, on a very fair basis indeed. It is serving the State well, and this provision will serve the co-operative movement and, indeed, the community well. I give notice to the House that I will oppose clause 59. It has come to the Government's notice that this clause provides that the commission may exempt a co-operative, upon application, from complying with Part V of the Bill. That Part concerns accounts and audits. The clause is, in the Government's view, superfluous. If honourable members look at clause 9, they will see that a general power is provided there for exemption by the commission. This general power completely covers the effect of clause 59. So, it may be said that the measure is improved by the deletion of this clause. I draw that to the attention of honourable members and indicate that I shall oppose clause 59.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Because it is simply repetitive?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Yes. I do that so that it will tidy up the Bill in that respect. I thank honourable members for their support and commend the matter to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 58 passed.

Clause 59—'Exemption.'

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I oppose the clause for the reasons that I have outlined to the House and because of the advice that has been made available to the Government in regard to the effect of this provision as it currently stands.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I gather that there is no problem with that. I do not know whether the honourable member handling this Bill for the Opposition had any foreknowledge of this. The member for Mount Gambier has indicated that he did not. I have checked this matter: I do not know that the Opposition opposes the clause, as that is a funny way of putting it. What is really happening is that, because the provisions of the clause are spelt out elsewhere in the Bill, it is proposed to delete the clause because it is superfluous. We are not opposed to the sentiments of the clause, but the intention is to strike out the clause.

Clause negatived.

Remaining clauses (60 to 81) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

[Sitting suspended from 12.57 to 2 p.m.]

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 May. Page 1087.)

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): The Opposition supports this legislation which seeks to remove the original penalty provided in sections 14 and 38 of the principal Act. Sections 14 and 38 provide for penalties of imprisonment of up to seven years for offences related to driving. Section 14 also deals with the offence of causing death by negligent driving and section 38 also deals with the injuring of persons by dangerous or negligent riding or driving. The removal of the monetary penalty of $500 (which is a small penalty) would leave it open for the courts to provide what is really an unlimited monetary penalty in lieu of imprisonment if that is the way the court decides to act. The $500 penalty when considered against the possible maximum imprisonment of seven years is really extremely small; most ineffectual.

The penalty for unlawful wounding in circumstances referred to in the Bill is increased from imprisonment for three years to imprisonment for five years and where the victim is under 12 years at the time of the offence provision is made for a maximum of eight years imprisonment. I believe that amendment was previously under consideration by the Attorney-General in the former Liberal Government and the calling of the election prevented his introducing it into Parliament. It was overlooked when legislation was introduced by the Attorney-General during the life of the previous Government.

The Opposition also supports that part of the Bill which allows a jury to bring in an alternative verdict of driving without due care or driving recklessly or driving at a speed or in a manner dangerous to the public where manslaughter has been charged and the offence arises out of the use of a motor vehicle. We do not believe that the jury should be limited in this context in its opportunity to bring in an alternative verdict. The other provisions of the Bill are not controversial and we support them.

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

AIRCRAFT OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 3 May. Page 1087.)

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): This amendment is straightforward. It simply removes a rather silly limitation that applies in the principal Act which states that aircraft journeying from one geographical place to another shall be covered by the provisions of the legislation. Under the principal Act there was potential danger for pilots who start and finish their flight in the same geographical location, so removing the limit which applies to the original legislation adequately covers the alternative circumstances. The Opposition supports the legislation.

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

REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 May. Page 1084.)

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): The Opposition supports this Bill, which has been the subject of lengthy debate and some amendment following its introduction in another place. We note that clause 4, which is a money clause, will need to be introduced in this House and reconsidered in another place. Clause 4 re-establishes the Real Property Act Assurance Fund.

That will mean that people who have any grievance because they feel they have been subjected to loss (which would normally be quite impossible under the Torrens title system in that their title does not afford them the security which under normal circumstances it would have done) will have a right to apply for some compensation from the Real Property Act Assurance Fund. This fund was formerly in existence but it seems to have dropped out of use since the early or mid 1950s. Perhaps the Minister can advise members what sum was available in that fund when contributions to it ceased.

I believe a number of different amounts have been quoted during the past 10 to 15 years, and I am sure some Treasury line is available somewhere to the Minister which will enable him to state what amount was in the fund when contributions to it ceased. I do not believe there has been much call upon the fund. I believe it was quoted in either the second reading speech or in another place that a sum of $90 000 was collected from that fund by one gentleman who was an aggrieved party but it is quite possible that a considerable sum, possibly $300 000 or $400 000, has been lying undisturbed in Treasury. I believe this fund will be disturbed in the future because in South Australia and interstate there is evidence that more and more people are seeking compensation for, in some cases, quite improper loss of title or loss of value. Clause 4 re-establishes that fund.

During the debate, I shall raise one or two questions with the Minister. Perhaps he could also say how much will be the contribution per instrument, whether $2, $5, or $10, and what will be the instruments upon which the contributions are levied so that the fund will appreciate sufficiently rapidly to provide for claims that may be made.

Has any realistic estimate been made by the Registrar-General of Deeds of the amount required annually as a result of claims likely to be made on the fund? Immediate finance may be needed, and I assume that the Registrar-General may have some idea of whether that is so. Does the Government consider that a steady accumulation of funds over a year or two will be adequate for the needs of the fund? Will the Government have to make any special contribution to the fund immediately?

Clause 8 provides for claims on the fund, and the procedure has been simplified considerably. Formerly, it was necessary for a Governor's Warrant to be issued but now, as a result of an amendment accepted by the Attorney-General, the Governor's Warrant is no longer necessary in respect of claims of less than $20 000. However, the existing procedure applies in respect of claims over $20 000. Therefore, the procedure for making smaller claims has been simplified considerably.

Clause 14 gives the Registrar-General absolute discretion to exempt some instruments in specified classes. Will the Minister say what those specified classes will be? As originally presented to the Upper House, the legislation gave the Registrar-General that absolute discretion and there was no provision for Parliament to scrutinise and/or amend the number of classes that the Registrar-General decided to include. The amendment moved by the Hon. Trevor Griffin has been accepted by the Attorney-General, and now those prescribed classes will reach the House by way of regulation and members will be able to see what the Registrar-General is doing and may seek to amend regulations if the House deems such amendment necessary.

Clause 15 originally provided for a penalty of $500, but an amendment moved by the Hon. Trevor Griffin in the Upper House gives an aggrieved person the right to demand that the Master of the Supreme Court tax the account of a solicitor or licensed land broker in order to see whether the fees or costs charged by the practitioner had actually been charged by and paid to the Registrar-General. It seems fair that there be a penal clause, and I accept the Attorney-General's reasoning in this matter. I suppose one should not say that such a penalty would keep practitioners honest, but the penal clause is there should they transgress.

In the Upper House it was stated that the sum involved, normally between $25 and $50, would hardly warrant a person's asking the Master to tax the account, and probably the penalty of $500 might have been the simpler if more severe way of dealing with the problem, but the amendment was accepted and the legislation before us includes that amendment. The $500 penalty was clear, and we knew what was going to happen whereas now, if the Master of the Supreme Court taxes an account and finds that an offence has been committed, to whom does he report? The legislation does not say. Can the Master decide to sit on his findings and not report them to anyone? If he does report them, will he report them to the Complaints Committee of the Law Society so that that body may take disciplinary action against the offender? Is disciplinary action mandatory in the case of an offence or will the Master relate the offence to the Land Brokers Disciplinary Committee and leave that body with discretionary power in the case of the land broker charging falsely for work not done?

Generally, the legislation is acceptable to the Opposition, but I would like the questions I have raised to be answered by the Minister in his reply. It may be that clause 15, which provides for the $500 penalty, needs amending to make the wording more specific so that the Master can take definite action. If so, the Bill can be amended in the Upper House, and I will ask the former Attorney-General (Hon. Trevor Griffin) to consider this matter. As this Bill includes a money clause, it must go to the Upper House for further consideration, therefore I intend not to prolong the debate but merely to ask the Minister, when he closes the debate, to attend to the matters to which I have referred.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I thank Opposition members for their support of the Bill and the member for Mount Gambier for raising the

issues that he has raised for clarification. With respect to clause 15, the Attorney-General will consider an appropriate amendment when the Bill is returned to the Upper House, to solve the problems referred to by the honourable member. The amount in the fund seems to be a vexed question of accounting in the Public Service, and I will read to the House the reply given in another place on this matter. That should explain the problems that have arisen in trying to obtain this information. The *Hansard* report of the explanation given by the Attorney-General states:

The honourable member asked first whether the exact amount currently credited to the Real Property Act assurance fund can be specified. My response is that, as the honourable member indicated in his speech, the records kept concerning the assurance fund have been totally inadequate. Complete records of receipts by and payments from the assurance fund are not available for the years 1858 to 1887 inclusive, apart from some isolated references to successful claims amounting to approximately £2 300.

In consequence of the question, the Registrar-General had one of his officers spend a considerable amount of time searching the Auditor-General's annual reports. It appears that in 1887 £75 000 was standing to the credit of the fund, and that between 1887 and 1956 approximately £350 000 was received into the fund. There is no accurate record of what was paid out of the fund, although it is known that $90 576 has been paid out to meet claims made since the early 1960s—$87 000 to meet the claim of Mr Zafiropoulos and $3 500 to meet other claims. In 1959, the then Registrar-General, referring to the cessation of contributions to the fund, stated that it had built up to £300 000, but it is not known upon what facts he based this statement. The problem of ascertaining what is in the fund is further compounded by section 202 of the Act which provided that:

All sums of money received as aforesaid (i.e. into the assurance fund) shall be paid to the Treasurer for the public uses of the said State.

This section was repealed in 1967. The money received from 1886 on was paid into Consolidated Revenue and used as required by the State. Accurate figures of what remains of moneys paid to the fund cannot be arrived at. The passage of almost 30 years has resulted in a difficulty in obtaining accurate information and the records, such as there are, are incomplete.

I might, by way of information, note that I came across a property in my electorate, in fact on Norwood Parade, which the Norwood council apparently wishes to sell. It sought my assistance in obtaining a title because it was discovered that that property was registered not under the Real Property Act but under the old title system. So, there is obviously still some land that is not under the Real Property Act which is in the central area of the city. There could be claims of one sort or another still arising and I think this is what we are seeing with respect to the current need for these amendments.

The member for Mount Gambier inquired as to the proposals contained in this measure, and the actual levy is to be decided by regulations, but the Attorney-General has indicated in another place that the Government proposes to levy an amount of $2 per document, and I can tell the honourable member that on the specific transactions, on transfers, it is anticipated that that levy in a financial year would raise the amount of $92 000; mortgages, $85 000; discharges of mortgages, $96 000; and leases and surrenders approximately $27 000. I point out to the House that these are estimates based on that indicating figure of $2 per document, and the approximate total is $300 000 a year going into the fund.

The other question the honourable member raised was whether there would be some immediate contribution required to the fund. The Attorney-General indicated that it was not considered necessary for the Treasurer to make an allocation from Consolidated Revenue to re-establish the fund at this stage. Of course, if a large claim or a spate of small claims results in the fund as re-established being insufficient to meet such claims, then the Treasurer would assign moneys to the fund as necessary. I think the second reading speech indicated that there was some current claim in existence and I think the honourable member has highlighted the fact there could be further claims anticipated. I think my remarks, including my comments earlier on the proposed attention to clause 15, cover the questions the honourable member has raised, and I commend this measure to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

New clause 4—'The Assurance Fund.'

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move to insert the following new clause:

4. The following section is inserted in Part XVIII of the principal Act after section 200:

201. (1) There shall be a fund entitled the 'Real Property Act Assurance Fund' kept at the Treasury as part of the General Revenue of the State.

(2) The Assurance Fund shall have credited to it—

(a) any amounts which the Treasurer may from time to time assign to the Assurance Fund for the purposes of this Part; and

(b) the moneys paid by way of assurance levy by virtue of the regulations.

(3) The regulations may—

(a) prescribe an assurance levy to be paid in addition to the fees, or particular classes of fees, payable under this Act; and

(b) exempt prescribed persons, or persons of a prescribed class, from payment of the assurance levy.

(4) The Registrar-General shall keep a separate account of all moneys received by him by way of assurance levy.

New clause inserted.

Remaining clauses (5 to 15) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ACTS REPUBLICATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 10 May. Page 1410).

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I was looking for the second reading speech, of which I did not have a copy, but that is of no real significance because I have perused the legislation, which the Opposition is pleased to support. This was another of those pieces of legislation which has been considered by both the former and the present Government. The former Attorney-General in the Liberal Government had instructed the Crown Solicitor's Office to undertake consolidation of a number of Acts of Parliament that had been amended over the past 10 years, and as he pointed out in his second reading speech in the Upper House the Acts which are referred to in this legislation are essentially the ones which he had in mind. I think all members will be well aware of the importance which is attached to consolidations and it is really unfortunate that we have only had the two major consolidations, the last one in 1975, to the South Australian Statutes.

I know from personal experience and discussions with a number of interested parties that they find the consolidated version of legislation to be extremely useful, and one would hope that this work can be carried on as expeditiously as possible. Certainly practitioners, public servants and a number of people in the community are affected by these pieces of legislation, and I ask the Minister whether he can give some indication as to the pace with which future substantial consolidations might be undertaken. In view of the fact that it has taken so long to complete the previous ones, I suspect that the answer would be in the distant rather than in the immediate future. I do not think there is anything further which I can contribute and I simply support the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I thank the Opposition for its support of the measure, and the circumstances as to its current form are those outlined by the member for Mount Gambier. This is an important facilitating measure. As he says, there is a maxim in law which says that every man is presumed to know the law. Unfortunately, that is not an easy task to place on the community at large, particularly those who find it difficult to come to grips with the legalese that is contained in so much of the law of this State.

One would hope that over the years we can learn the technique of writing much simpler legislation to express the will of the people in a much clearer way so that it can be more easily understood and reproduced in a much simpler form. I would suggest that there should be more information contained in Acts of Parliament relating to the reasons behind the legislation. That is the practice in some States in the United States of America, and it is something to which we could well turn our attention. Maybe it is something that could be considered by the select committees that are being established by this Parliament to consider such matters.

The honourable member asked about the progress on consolidating the publication of Statutes. I can advise him that it is intended that all Acts will be reprinted and published in pamphlet form. At present there is no intention to publish a complete consolidation of Acts in bound volumes. A system of regular reprints of amended Acts in pamphlet form is considered generally to be more desirable than the publication of a set of volumes, even the first volume of which can be out of date before it is published. Undoubtedly, there is also involved a cost factor to members of the community in purchasing a bound volume. I trust that that information will be of interest to the member for Mount Gambier and to other members. I thank the Opposition for its support.

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

ACTS INTERPRETATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 10 May. Page 1410.)

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): The Opposition supports this Bill. The most significant aspect of it is the change in the method of citation of Acts of Parliament. At present the method of citation is to use the date of the original enactment, finishing with the date of the most recent amendment. It is realised that amendments may cause some concern to administrators, including the police, who maintain that each time they have to refer to a Statute they must then search for the amendments. Those of us who know our way through the Statutes would be well aware that in the latest edition of each of the Statutes there is an index which enables one to locate all the amendments, not simply the most recent one. Therefore, the method of referring to the index of the Statutes is really by far the most efficient means of checking for all amendments and not simply the most recent one.

The two other amendments provided by the Bill which the Opposition supports concern the instance where a statutory instruction purporting to revoke an earlier regulation is disallowed. The Bill provides that the earlier regulation sought to be revoked is then revived. This matter caused a minor furore a year or two ago when part of the Road Traffic Act Regulations was disallowed in this Chamber on the very last day of sitting. It was feared that the State would be without valid regulations.

For that reason there was an instant reintroduction into the House of the old regulations. It was suspected at the time that there might have been a day in the life of South Australia during which those regulations were not applicable. This amendment certainly clears up that doubt and makes it quite apparent that in the event of a regulation being revoked the earlier regulation will be revived. The Opposition supports the legislation.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I thank the honourable member for his comments and his indication of the Opposition's support for this measure. I know that it is a matter that is dear to your heart, Mr Speaker, as you spoke on this matter on a number of occasions during the life of the previous Parliament. As the member for Mount Gambier said, while this may appear to be lawyers' law it does impact on the community in a very real way. It is important that we have our legislation honed to the extent that is necessary to properly serve the community, and ambiguities need to be clarified. The opportunity has now arisen to open up the Acts and to deal with a number of these matters, and I suggest that this will serve the community well for some time to come. I commend the measure to members.

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

WHEAT MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 3 May. Page 1085.)

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): The Opposition supports the Bill. The Minister of Education, acting on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture in another place, referred to the Liberal Party's indication of approval for this measure when the Party was in Government. Indeed, this Bill and the next three Bills listed on the Notice Paper are supported by the Opposition. They all fall into the category of Bills that were not only investigated and reported on to the former Cabinet but also had the support of the former Liberal Government. We appreciate the initiative of the present Government in proceeding with these Bills, which are desirable in the interests of the rural community.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I thank the honourable member for his support of this measure which is a great example of the consensus which applies from time to time in this House. Obviously it is of great interest to the rural community that this matter proceed, and we wish to expedite its passage.

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

METROPOLITAN MILK SUPPLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 3 May. Page 1085.)

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): As earlier indicated, the Opposition supports this Bill. It is true that the Herd Improvement Services Co-operative of South Australia (HISCO) has been operating in the field of herd testing for some years but progressively has required Government assistance at one level or another. I have no hesitation on behalf of the Opposition in supporting the Metropolitan

Milk Board as the identified authority to effect these services on behalf of South Australia.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I thank the member for Alexandra for his support for this measure. I would also indicate my apologies to members for being absent during the passage of the Wheat Marketing Act Amendment Bill, but I understand that there were no questions needing clarification on either that or this measure.

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

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 3 May. Page 1085.)

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Following successful negotiations with the Minister of Agriculture during the latter part of 1981-82, agreement was reached for this move. Consistent with the remarks made during the previous debates on rural matters in this House, the Opposition has indicated to the Government its full support for proceeding with the amendment involved in this measure.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I thank the member for Alexandra for his comments and support for the Bill.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (WHEAT AND BARLEY RESEARCH) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 4 May. Page 1205.)

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): In supporting this amendment, consistent with the undertakings given to the House earlier today, I will clarify a matter involving grain levies or primary producer levies that are applied from time to time in the industry. The concept of striking levies for the purpose of carrying out research within the respective industries is a good one, and certainly under this new levy concept an enormous amount of consultation is being undertaken in order to now enjoy the support of graingrowers. I believe that the Government is to be commended for picking up a piece of legislation, which had been prepared and which it inherited on coming into office, and proceeding with at the request of the industry.

I place on record, however, that I do not agree with compulsory levies applying to the membership of grower organisations. I raise that subject in relation to this Bill, which provides for a levy on growers applicable for identified research purposes. That is all right, but last week in the *News* a spokesperson for the National Farmers Federation of Australia indicated that that organisation supports compulsory membership of rural organisations; that is, that all primary producers become members by legislation. I assure the House that we on this side do not share the view that compulsory unionism should apply at any industry level but that it should be on a voluntary basis, and that membership of the National Farmers Federation, the United Farmers and Stockowners or like organisations should be at the will of the person concerned and not by legislative direction.

We see all this carry-on as reported in the *News* last week about free-loaders and people who are enjoying benefits derived from lobbying by worthy organisations such as the United Farmers and Stockowners Association. I am having difficulty trying to keep my voice above that of the Deputy Premier. If he wants to put an argument forward, let him put his front to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and do so without interfering with the processes of the House.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Sir. We have successfully quietened that corner of the House, and I appreciate that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Deputy Premier to heed my call to order.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Having clarified that issue, I have little more to contribute to this debate. We do not support compulsory unionism in secondary industry, and we do not support compulsory unionism in primary industry. I would like that to be clear to those who might have been considering supporting legislation of the complementary kind that is apparently being promoted at the Federal level at this time. However, I reiterate the Opposition's support for the Government in proceeding with this measure, which is clearly identified as one providing for a levy on graingrowers for the purposes of identified research for and on behalf of that section of the industry.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I thank the Opposition for its support: that is appreciated. The member for Alexandra noted that the Bill was drafted at an earlier time, in fact, at a time when he himself was Minister of Agriculture. I would remind him that the same circumstances took place in 1979 when the then Opposition of the day was prepared to support Bills introduced by the then newly appointed Minister of Agriculture. Of course, those same Bills had been prepared by the former Labor Government. It is very worth while having this kind of commonsense approach to these fundamental machinery matters that are so important for primary industry in South Australia.

I have noted the comments made by the honourable member with regard to compulsory membership or otherwise. They will duly be noted by the Minister of Agriculture in another place, and we would be most interested to hear on another occasion the honourable member's comments on the question of membership of the Fishing Industry Council and bodies such as that. We would certainly be eager to hear his opinions on that matter, because we were quite interested to hear his comments this afternoon.

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

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (1983)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 19 April. Page 864.)

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): The Opposition supports this Bill, which contains a fairly minor amendment to the Mining Act to include a provision whereby a magistrate can serve in the Wardens Court and, as I understand it, to include also a provision allowing a retired warden to serve under terms which may not conform to the Public Service Act. Therefore, as I say, it is a fairly minor change from what I can gather and from the inquiries I have made of interested people. The Opposition supports the Bill.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy): I thank the Deputy Leader for his support for the amend-

ment, which is of a minor nature, as he described it. I think that we should not let the occasion pass without at least recording our thanks for the fine work done in the Wardens Court by Mr A.J. Starke, who is presently the Senior Warden and who, as a result of the passage of this Bill and due to retirement provisions, will no longer be functioning in that capacity in that court.

Although I have not been Minister very long, I had heard of the name of Mr Starke, who is held in high regard throughout the mining fraternity and, as pointed out by the Deputy Leader, I think that it is only fitting that his services will be available, at least for a period after the passage and proclamation of this amendment to the Act, in order to provide further assistance in the Wardens Court.

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

COUNTRY FIRES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 May. Page 1589.)

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): This Bill comes down from the other place. From the inquiries made at very short notice this afternoon, I understand that a minor amendment was introduced by the Opposition in the Council and was supported. That makes the compensation payable to persons injured in fires in South Australia subject to a new prescribed rate of some $314 a week payable retrospectively from 1 January 1983. Over and above that support for the amendment, the new Minister of Agriculture in another place (the Hon. Mr Blevins) has, as I understand from officers serving the Parliament, given an undertaking that compensation for higher than the prescribed figure of $314 a week will be met if it can be demonstrated that the volunteer fire fighter or person injured at a fire has a weekly salary above that amount. I simply seek the Minister's assurance that that is the case. Otherwise, the principles laid down in the amendment to the Country Fires Act are, as far as we can ascertain, appropriate and have our support.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I am unable to give an immediate answer on the point raised. I understand that the member for Alexandra said that it had been recorded in *Hansard* that that had been stated in another place, and if it is recorded in *Hansard* then that would be the case. I will have to take that question on notice. Certainly the points made by the honourable member are quite reasonable, and cover an important area of concern, but I am unable to give a specific answer now. I will have this matter clarified. The Bill will have gone through in the meantime, but I will seek leave to make a special statement to confirm the statement made by my colleague.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Compensation.'

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: I am not quite sure what procedures the Acting Minister will adopt. I want to make quite clear that the Opposition intends to observe the rights of the insurance company, in this case the State Government Insurance Commission, and the importance of having a base rate written into the legislation. One of the principal purposes of the amendment is to have a weekly payment prescribed in the legislation, because that has been absent for some time. The whole exercise has been run on an *ad hoc* basis. The Opposition does not argue with that, but this whole question has been raised to ensure that no person is disadvantaged.

For example, if someone earning $400 a week were to be in the short term engaged in fire fighting and as a result of injury was out of work then that person should at least enjoy his ordinary rate of pay whilst subject to injury and out of work the same way as any other person employed under the Workers Compensation Act would be reimbursed.

I understand that the balance, if any, to be paid would be guaranteed by the Government as an *ex gratia* payment over and above the prescribed rate laid down in the Act. There is no way in the world we can put into the Act all the rates of pay of persons who might from time to time be engaged in fire-fighting work, and I think this amendment will provide a satisfactory solution to the problem. I would appreciate the Acting Minister's reaffirming that position at whatever stage it is convenient for him, either during the passage of the Bill or afterwards, if that is the procedure he wishes to follow.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (REGISTER OF INTERESTS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 May. Page 1304.)

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): Whilst I am not the Opposition's lead speaker on this question nor its spokesman on the matter I am nonetheless vitally interested in the effect it will have on us as individuals, and concerned to express my particular view in relation to this question. The Opposition does not oppose the Bill, but I and some members of it find that the measure is grossly inadequate and smacks of tokenism for the sake of political opportunism.

The consequences of the Bill will be to imply that factors that can influence the attitude a member adopts in relation to his or her responsibility to the people of South Australia, whether as an ordinary member of Parliament or as a Minister of the Crown, can in some way be influenced inordinately and disproportionately by his material possessions or those of the immediate legal family.

The first point I want to make relates to that particular notion. Whilst it is capable and legitimate to understand how that could happen, there is no reason why a wider sphere of factors in a socio-economic context could not have just as great an effect on any member's opinion or decision as the factors mentioned in this Bill. The intention of the Government in preparing this measure in this way is to direct the attention of the general public to only the material possessions, or wealth, of individual members, therefore by imputation particularly to members of the Liberal Party and other people who may be elected to this place and who, like the Federal Minister for Tourism, Mr Brown, have substantial pecuniary interests in business. The majority of Labor Party members would say, and hold the view, that they do not, and that they are therefore in some way holier than an individual human being who does.

My own view is that, if a citizen has demonstrated a capacity to be responsible for his own material welfare and responsible for the way in which his business is conducted by some commercial operation of which he might be a principal, to the extent that he may be successful, it is reasonable to expect that such people are more likely to be competent when coping with problems and dealing with affairs as they relate to the general interest of the public.

I do not mean by that, unless someone has demonstrated the ability to manage a business of his own, that he ought not become a member of this place, but rather that it is

more likely that if he has been successful and prosperous in the way in which he has conducted the affairs of business outside this place before coming here, he will be likely to make a more meaningful contribution on arrival than someone who has not been successful nor ever attempted to be so.

There are other factors of even more compelling relevance to the decisions which may be taken by elected representatives of the Parliament, such as associations with other organisations that are not commercial in nature but to which the individual citizen as a member of Parliament has made a substantial commitment and from which that member derives considerable support and kudos in the public eye. Nowhere in the Bill is there provision for any disclosure of the kind of influence that such associations could have on the member after election, even though, in ensuring continued preselection, such associations would undoubtedly have a more profound influence on the decisions made by members than would the pecuniary interest of a narrow commercial association.

No member of the Government Party can disclaim the relevance of that remark. All members of the Government Party know that they are compelled to comply with the directions of organisations to which they owe allegiance and from which they will derive support for preselection. Such an organisation compels them to vote on matters in the way in which such an organisation or group of organisations decides is appropriate to the Australian Labor Party. I refer especially to the United Trades and Labor Council and the Australian Council of Trade Unions. In addition, there are the specific unions to which members opposite may have belonged before becoming members of Parliament. Those unions make up, in South Australia, a substantial part of the total voting complement in determining preselection for any member of this place who seeks endorsement of the A.L.P. Such organisations can threaten the support of a member at preselection, if that member does not in turn support the policy which that organisation or group of organisations has dictated must be supported in the interests of that organisation but which may or may not be in the public interest. To introduce a measure which on the one hand relates only to the money involved in a business venture as a background and part and parcel of the identity of the individual, yet on the other hand to ignore that substantial influence that other organisations can have on the member of Parliament is pure tokenism.

Referring to a problem which has a setting in the social rather than in the economic context, I point out that this measure requires a member to delcare not only his or her personal pecuniary interests but also those of his or her spouse and immediate family. The definition of 'spouse' is to be found in the Family Relationships Act, 1975: it literally means the person to whom the member of Parliament is married in law. It does not include a *de facto* spouse. Yet members of this place and of another place know that there are in this Parliament some people who live in a secure *de facto* relationship, and none of those people are required, under this Bill to declare the interests of their *de facto* spouse or of their family. To my mind that is a gross inadequacy in the legislation, because it means that we are literally discouraging members of Parliament to stay married if they find that marriage to be uncomfortable politically. Alternatively, we may find that the Labor Party will choose to endorse people who could not be seen to have a declarable interest in any matter that would cause the Party embarrassment, and that Party would therefore endorse people who are not married in law.

Mr Mathwin: That's shocking and astounding.

Mr LEWIS: It is worse than that: it is appalling in the way it singles out, for special treatment, those people who have chosen to become married and to accept legal and lawful responsibility for their spouse and for the offspring of their relationship in law. It discriminates against such people in favour of others who irresponsibly choose the soft option. In saying this, I do not discount those circumstances in which a member, whether male or female, may be already married and, in addition to that married relationship, have strong social ties and personal affinities, even sexual relations, with other citizens. That is, such a person is having a bit on the side. I would not have to go far around this place to name some such people. I see no need to do so, but I point out the seriousness of that situation when it is recognised that such people are more likely to have an influence on the decisions made by a member from time to time as to the way those members will commit themselves on a specific matter than can the spouse in law.

The very matter to which I have referred in contemporary times has been documented throughout history by such playwrights as Shakespeare and Chaucer. Indeed, even earlier than that we see throughout history men and women of influence (such as Antony and Cleopatra), having such relationships that had a profound influence on the policies pursued by the leaders of the countries where they ruled at the time. In these circumstances, decisions were made that affected the common welfare, even the lives, of thousands of people at the time.

It is therefore nonsense to suggest that this Bill goes anywhere near far enough in discovering for the public benefit the interest to which members owe an allegiance and from which they derive their personal identity and their psychological stability in the relationships that they have. Indeed, those pecuniary interests can be easily changed in many cases, such as the unfortunate circumstances surrounding Jeremy Thorpe, to peculiar interests. There are those who have that inclination. It is said that, if one wants to be queer, seek whatever turns one on, and one can these days, but that is not my cup of tea.

Clearly though, because those liaisons are outside what are formally accepted by society as legitimate, it will mean, does mean, and always has meant that any member who becomes involved with any such relationship is subject to the risk of blackmail, as well as being subject to the influence of that person and that person's interests and that person's attitudes, and yet this Bill completely ignores that.

I sincerely believe that the best interests of the society we govern are not going to be served by focusing our attention alone on the aspects of the kinds of things that influence members of Parliament as are contained in this Bill in its narrow preoccupation with them. I, therefore, say to the Government that it is seeking to do nothing more than engage in opportunism, to bash organisations of commercial substance and people associated with them and, in the main, largely members on this side of politics (not excluding some from the other side) in that simple trite fashion. In so doing, it is ignoring the other and more compelling aspects of influence which can be exercised over a member's decision when committed to make such decisions in this House which come from other aspects of that member's life's involvement.

Why was it so? Is it that the Government has blinkers or tunnel vision? That would be a charitable way of answering the question that I put to the House: to suggest that it simply overlooked this important and extremely relevant aspect of behaviour. I sincerely believe, as I have said, that the Government did not want to have any of its members, and their some-time, one-time, maybe relationships in human terms, in any way disclosed. It would be too embarrassing for its members: it would be too embarrassing for any future member it might otherwise seek to endorse for public disclosure to have to be made of those pecuniary interests resulting from the liaisons to which I have referred.

Had I the time during the Committee stages of this measure, I would have sought to amend it to ensure that the pecuniary interest of *de facto* spouses (male or female), whether the member is male or female, and the offspring and other relatives of those individuals with whom the member was engaged in such a liaison, are also declared and proclaimed under the provisions of this Bill in the same way as people who have chosen to live within the law as it now stands. I believe that had I been able to do so, I would have been able to test the veracity of the argument of the Government and its members by doing so.

Given the information just provided to me by the member for Kavel, my outstanding Deputy Leader, I may yet have that opportunity. We will see how comfortable or uncomfortable certain members of this place are in debating those amendments and deciding their attitudes to them, and we can test their veracity as human beings in their commitment to the necessity to protect the public interest in this narrow way by the manner that I believe I have proved by my contribution to be relevant in the same context.

In the circumstances I should leave the matter before the House so that it can give it its attention and, in due course, I will be introducing amendments in a fashion that will ensure that we can give proper consideration to the measures necessary to ensure that the public knows exactly what goes on in the bed, under the bed, and anywhere else it happens to go on.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I rise to speak on this measure with a degree of cynicism. I make clear at the outset that I basically agree with the concept that members of Parliament should divulge to a responsible Parliamentary officer matters pertaining to his or her financial interests, because there are times when such interests could undoubtedly have an effect on the way in which a member of Parliament considers and even votes on issues that come before this House.

I am more concerned with what the Bill does not contain rather than what the Bill does contain, and I would like to compliment the member for Mallee on many of the points he raised, because I share the concern that he has placed before the House in many of those areas. I am very concerned with the lack of organisation that the Government has shown in that this matter has come before the House without giving the Opposition warning that this matter was to be debated today.

Opposition members, therefore, have had little time in which to prepare a speech or put forward material that is of concern to us. I am quite sure that one of the first things that most members do when arriving at Parliament House of a morning is to look at the daily programme in order to be fully prepared for any matter that may be considered that day. I did that this morning. Also, yesterday, we were given a list of business to be considered by the House today, and it did not mention this matter.

The daily programme placed on the bench before us earlier today does not mention this matter, and yet we, as an Opposition, are expected to provide a debate on such serious matters, even though we are not treated with courtesy, and not given the opportunity to do any final preparation to ensure that any debate we wish to bring forward is completely and fully prepared.

I know that this Government, since it has been in office, has done this many, many times, and I can imagine the outcry that would occur had the roles been reversed. This matter of pecuniary interest is a very serious one, and one on which I wish to speak. I know that several of my colleagues also wish to speak on it. It is unfortunate that, because of the Government's complete lack of organisation to determine programmes in this House, it has brought this matter forward now, and the only reason the Government has done that is to save itself embarrassment because the House has completely considered all matters listed by the Government for determination today.

We started earlier: we were brought out of our electoral offices, at a severe disadvantage to our constituents. We have had to come in early and, as a result, at 3.30 in the afternoon we are considering a matter other than that which was on the Notice Paper, purely and simply because the Government is too embarrassed to move for the House to adjourn at this stage.

Mr Hamilton: Why don't you talk about the Bill?

Mr ASHENDEN: I am making some points very succinctly about this matter because I am extremely angry that this Bill was brought on this afternoon before members on this side had been given the opportunity to complete the work that we are required to do.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member please be seated? The Chair has allowed the debate to creep into matters concerning the workings of the House, which has nothing to do with the Bill before the House. The Chair has allowed the member for Todd to carry on because it was felt that he had a point to make. The Chair has allowed him to make that point and I now advise the honourable member for Todd that I have no intention of allowing him to continue in that respect.

Mr ASHENDEN: I wanted to make it quite clear to my constituents who take an interest in Parliament and who read *Hansard* that the detail that would perhaps have been made available in debate will not be as fully available as it would have been had the Government had the courtesy to advise us in the normally accepted manner of what was proposed to ensure that we would be able to provide the best argument that we possibly could.

However, I have obviously upset some members opposite, as evidenced by the way they were reacting when I was making my remarks. I think that they appreciate the points that I was making. In relation to the Bill before us, I am very concerned about aspects that have been omitted from the proposed legislation. Without a doubt the Bill is discriminatory as it discriminates against the normal relationship of marriage. I therefore do not believe for one moment that the Bill will achieve that which the Government purports that it will achieve.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: It is for cheap political capital.

Mr ASHENDEN: I acknowledge the point made by the Deputy Leader. If the Government was sincere about ensuring that the public of South Australia could rest assured that all members of Parliament were required to acknowledge any area of potential interest, I would accept the Bill. However, the Bill does not do that. In regard to the wording of the Bill one finds that the definition of 'spouse', for example, is, 'spouse includes putative spouse within the meaning of the Family Relationships Act'. In layman's terms that means that two people must be living together or cohabiting for a minimum period of five years. However, undoubtedly, there are members of Parliament both in this House and in another place who are not covered by that definition. In other words, those of us who are legally married or who have genuine putative spouses are required to put forward information which those persons who have been cohabiting for less than five years are not required to put forward. No-one can tell me that when two people are cohabiting—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ASHENDEN: Obviously I would like to make it quite clear that I am married and that I have been married for 21 years. I am proud to be married. However, I make the point that I will be required to divulge information relating to my spouse. There are members of Parliament

both in this place and in another place who will not be required to divulge interests that I am required to divulge. I am living at home with a wife to whom I have been married for over 21 years—

Mr Becker: She deserves a medal!

Mr ASHENDEN: Whose side are you on? The member for Hanson may regard this lightly, but I do not. I feel very strongly about it. I am quite prepared to divulge to this House my interests and the interests that my wife has in relation to financial matters. As far as my family is concerned I am quite happy to do that. However, I resent the fact that there are other members of Parliament who are cohabiting with members of the opposite sex who will not be required to divulge the interests of those persons. I do not believe that that is fair. Therefore, I look forward very much to the amendments that will be brought forward by the member for Mallee, which I hope will provide that this Bill will apply to all members of Parliament so that when registration of interest is made, if any member of Parliament is cohabiting with any other person, whether of the same sex or another sex, the fact that they are living together should require such a person to divulge the interests of the person with whom they are living in the same manner that I am required to divulge the financial interests as far as my wife is concerned. If any member opposite can convince me that I am wrong, I would be most happy to hear such an argument.

I believe that the public should be protected and that members of Parliament should not be in a position where they may have interests of which no-one else is aware which could affect the way in which they vote on matters coming before this House. I agree with the basic tenet and aim of this legislation, but I would disagree strongly with the discrimination evident in this legislation. I believe that what is good enough for me is good enough for any other member of Parliament. Again, I can only make the point—

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members must not harass the member for Todd.

Mr ASHENDEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The member for Glenelg raised a point that I am happy to answer. The point is that if any member of Parliament is cohabiting with any other person, male or female, then the financial interests of that person should be made available to the Registrar, in the same manner that I am required to divulge to the Registrar the interests of my wife and family. Let there be no mistake about the fact that just as pressure could be placed on a member of Parliament by his or her spouse because of financial interests, such pressure could still apply in regard to a person who is cohabiting. There is no denying that. I believe that the Government has not gone far enough in utilising the term 'putative spouse'. At this stage I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Appropriation (No. 1),
Casino,
Industrial Relations Advisory Council,
Law Courts (Maintenance of Order) Act Amendment,
Medical Practitioners,
Motor Vehicles Act Amendment,
Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia,
Supply (No. 1).

LIBRARY COMMITTEE

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

That the members of this House appointed to the Library Committee have leave to sit on that committee during the sittings of the House.

Motion carried.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (REGISTER OF INTERESTS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 1725.)

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): The main concern that I have in this Bill is the one that I have outlined in a fair degree of detail prior to the interruption to allow consideration of other business. I certainly will be talking with the member for Mallee to discuss with him his proposed amendments. If he does not have an amendment that is designed to overcome what I see as a major mistake as far as this Bill is concerned, then I certainly will be introducing an amendment to ensure that all members of Parliament are required to divulge interests of any person with whom they may be cohabiting during the time in which they are serving this State as members of this House or as members of the Legislative Council. I look forward with a considerable degree of interest to see whether any member opposite can bring forward arguments that would rebut the point that I am making: namely, that when a person is living with another person, there is no doubt at all that there is obviously a strong emotional attachment and because there is that emotional attachment I believe that the interests of the person with whom that member is cohabiting could lead to a conflict of interest in this House.

If the Government believes that a wife's interest could cause the husband (or vice versa, the husband's interest could cause a wife) to vote in a certain way in this Parliament, I believe that the same must hold true where two persons are cohabiting, not necessarily as man and wife or as putative spouse. In fact, I would take the point even further and state that I believe that where a member of Parliament was involved in a relationship that he or she did not want to become public knowledge, the person with whom he or she is cohabiting could exert greater pressure than could be exerted by a spouse in a normal marriage relationship.

I look forward to the amendments that the member for Mallee has indicated he intends to introduce. If his amendments do not cover this point then I certainly will be moving amendments tomorrow which I believe will strengthen the Bill. If the Government is sincere in what it states its aims are, namely, to ensure that there is no possible conflict of interest of a member of Parliament or his or her spouse or his or her putative spouse, then let us take it one step further to ensure that every member in this House is covered by this legislation. At the moment there is no doubt that this legislation is discriminatory because there are members in this House and in another place who are cohabiting with persons who will not be required under this legislation to divulge to the House their financial interests.

That is discriminatory and unfair, and I cannot understand why a Government would be covering legitimate marriage relationships but not at the same time covering relationships other than those which have been accepted as a normal relationship as far as family status goes. I believe that in all fairness to this House the Government must consider the points which the member for Mallee and I have raised this afternoon. I know that it causes concern to other members

of the Opposition and I would hope that the Government would be prepared to accept amendments which will be introduced to ensure that all members of Parliament are treated equally and that there will not be some members of this House who will not be required to divulge information which other members are required to divulge.

This legislation has unfortunately been introduced much earlier than members on this side had expected. It has not given us time to prepare the detailed responses that we had wished. I apologise to the members of my electorate who will be reading my speech because obviously it will not read as smoothly as it would have done had I been given the normal courtesies to ensure that, when I came before this House to speak on the matters which concern me, I was completely ready to do so and able to provide a much smoother and more flowing line of argument than I have been able to this afternoon.

Mr Ferguson: Your wife will be happy with what you said.

Mr ASHENDEN: I certainly hope that my wife would be happy with it because, as I indicated earlier, my wife and I have had a long relationship and one which I hope will go on much longer. Certainly there is no doubt at all that I believe in situations such as those purported by the Government that it wishes to cover, namely, to ensure that when members of Parliament vote in this House they can do so with the full knowledge of the Registrar and any interested persons as to whether they do in fact have or do not have an interest that could have affected the way in which they have voted.

In closing, I make it quite clear that I agree with the aim of the Bill to ensure that votes taken in this House are taken in such a manner that the interests of South Australia are put first and it will be well known if a member of Parliament has a possible conflict of interest in any situation. However, I do stress that I cannot accept the way in which the Bill is presently framed because it is selective, discriminatory, and it is not fair.

I believe that all members of Parliament must be treated equally and, therefore, the amendments which will be introduced tomorrow will, I hope, strengthen the Bill and provide stronger measures to ensure that a full register of interests is recorded as regards all members of Parliament. I look forward to the Minister's comments on this and I certainly hope that he will give very serious and positive consideration to these very important matters.

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): I rise to support the Bill as it is constituted before us today. The reasons I support it are that it is now publicly accepted that there should be some requirement for public disclosure of interests by Parliamentarians and by a wide range of other people. This wide range of other people will certainly be addressed later in this sitting of Parliament because it is not only Parliamentarians who must be seen to be beyond reproach but it is a number of other people in the decision-making area, particularly in the public arena, who also have to be seen to be acting in good faith.

I have some reservations about the reasons behind some of the original legislation. I think that if one looks at the Bill before us today, one will find that it is somewhat different to the one that the Labor Party introduced into the Upper House. I think that if one looks at the amendments moved by our members in the other place, one will understand that the Bill has gone through some radical changes from its original form. I think that this is all for the good because I believe that some of the original requirements in the Bill went far beyond what was required in this instance.

Of course, the interesting part about this legislation is that it is here to prevent that conflict of interests situation where people in the Parliament and the Ministry may be swayed by influences to vote other than in the public interest. Of course, members on this side of the House have pointed out that far wider areas of pressure can be applied to members of the Parliament and to the Government. In fact, this merely touches some small areas. Therefore, in many ways it is merely a token gesture to the public.

I also have a reservation about the Bill because of its introduction by the Australian Labor Party. There is a very good reason: for many years the Australian Labor Party has been using a very divisive tactic, especially when election time comes around. That tactic is to paint people on this side of the House as being wealthy and uncaring, and those on their own side of the House as being closer to the common man. Of course, that is far from the truth.

I was recently reminded of that when Mr Hawke said about the then Prime Minister (Mr Fraser), 'He does not care. He is a rich bastard.' I think that that was the comment he made at the time. It indicates the mentality of the man who is now our Prime Minister, because he felt that it was worth while—

Mr Mathwin: What about his yacht and some of his friends?

An honourable member: And the superannuation Bill.

Mr BAKER: I am sure that he will not change that. However, the point was made that members of the Australian Labor Party for a number of years have used this divisive technique to suggest that, because they believe that some members on this side of the House (and I can assure everyone that I am not overly wealthy) have a little more financial security than others, they have all the trappings of wealth and also have certain attributes which suggest that they do not care for their fellow man.

Of course, I think that this underlines some of the thoughts behind the Bill before us today. It is unfortunate that I have to be cynical about the introduction of this Bill because under the original proposition I could see that the conditions here could well be abused in the public arena. I think that the information supplied under the original Bill would be used by members on the other side and their supporters to denigrate people in election campaigns.

This Act, as it stands before us today and as amended by the Legislative Council, prevents much of this happening and I am very pleased with the amendments that have been carried in the Upper House. I believe that the Bill is now workable and some of my fears are no longer there. I merely bring to the attention of the House that there are several items in the Bill which may necessarily need a rethink when the Bill is in operation. The first one is clause 4 which deals with the primary return and that suggests that we are to include those sources of income which are likely to accrue in the forthcoming 12 months. If anybody knows which sources of income he can guarantee in the next 12 months, he is doing very very well. Therefore, some of these provisions are not workable. However, we will live with the fact that I presume that that section says in good faith that from what we know today we can assume that certain areas will be able to be defined and that we will be earning more than $500 in those areas. Of course, if one does not actually include an area and one actually earns $500, the question of whether one is being negligent becomes very interesting. However, I am sure that we can act in good faith in this area.

Mr Mayes: Your shares have doubled in 12 months.

Mr BAKER: I wish they would. Of course, subclause 2(b) of clause 4 relates to any organisation with which one has any involvement, and that is a ludicrous sort of requirement. I belong to a number of private organisations that certainly have no influence at all on any decisions I make, and I hope that I make a worthwhile contribution to them. Therefore, we are getting into a very strange area in this Bill

where we are required to describe in the registry almost any organisation with which we have any relationship at all.

I now move to clause 4 (2)(c) which relates to the contribution in kind. For example, I know that if I were invited interstate to give a lecture or attend a conference by some particular person, then I have automatically breached the requirement of this section. Again, that is quite ludicrous. Five hundred dollars hardly covers air fares and accommodation during a normal conference lasting for, say, one or two days. However, it is a contribution made in kind. All these things have to be declared in the return. Again, we are getting into a ludicrous situation.

I think that some tidying up will be necessary because, by the time everybody has finished filling out all these nebulous little things, there will be so much information contained in the register that nobody will even bother looking at it. That is probably quite good in many ways, anyway. Of course, we have this same sort of anomaly perpetuated in subclause (3)(b) which states:

> the name of any political party, any body or association formed for political purposes or any trade or professional organization of which the member is a member;

I think that they try to catch everything in that. I do not have the same misgivings about this Bill that I had when it was first introduced into the Upper House.

I think that it is in everybody's interest to at least have shown some faith and to provide a return as prescribed in the legislation. Other than that, I intend to support the Bill and I would hope that, after it has been operating for a period of time and after the various requirements have been met, we can tidy up some of these stupid areas contained in the Bill at present.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I would like to say a few words about this Bill, because it has been before the House on previous occasions. I express some concern at some of the implications that could (and I stress the word 'could') occur in the administration of this Bill. First of all, I would like to say at the outset that I believe that it is correct and proper that there should be a register of members' interests being held by an independent person. That person should have the right to be able to issue a certificate, if you like, to indicate to the general public that a person's affairs have been looked into and that he has no pecuniary interest, in effect. I know that that is not embodied in this Bill. However, it is a principle which I believe could adequately cover the difficulties that could occur in obtaining credibility for a member within the general community. I also think that this Bill is a hackneyed one that has been brought forward on many occasions. However, I believe that it is subject to misinterpretation and that is the part that worries me quite a bit.

I would like to quote my own instance because it is stipulated in this Bill that a person has to put down every item of land on which he should have his name, whether it be held jointly with a member of his family or anyone else, thereby implicating a third and, in some cases, fourth, fifth or sixth person. In my own particular case, prior to my marriage in 1976 I had my name on one title of land. At that time I was actively involved in the farming industry, and in general terms I was considered to be a farmer. I was certainly an active farmer prior to my entry into Parliament. When I entered Parliament, I engaged a farm manager who looked after and worked that property for me under my direction.

After I was married in 1976, I sold my farm and purchased a housing property in Port Lincoln. Also at that time, my brother suggested that I should take out a half share with him in a property (he had two lads coming on at the time), which I agreed to do. The purpose of that move was to scale down my involvement in farming but to still have an interest in it so that when I ultimately left politics, I could, if I wanted to start farming again, sell the house at Port Lincoln and buy the half share in the property that my brother and I owned. If I did not have a requirement for my share in that property, my brother's sons could buy out my half share. This was a convenient arrangement for me, because it gave me an interest in farming but I did not have all the hassles associated with the management of a farming property. I run that property as an independent unit. The effect of that was that I still did not have my name on a block of land in my own right. My wife and I then purchased a small part of another farmer's property which, in effect, we work as a hobby farm. The net result of all that is that in 1976 I was a farmer with my name on one title of land, but I have now scaled down my farming operations. In effect, I have my name on a title of a housing property, I have my name on two titles which comprise the family partnership with my brother (which in effect comprise five separate titles), and I also have my name with that of my wife on the hobby farm property.

The overall effect of all that was a dramatic scaling down of my farming operations. However, anyone who looked at the register would be entitled to think that I was accumulating a massive amount of wealth because it does not show the acreages or the purpose for which I purchased those interests. It would show a list of land titles, which could be misinterpreted. That is the problem about which I am concerned. If it went one step further and the list on the register also contained a list of mortgages, that would be another matter. I am concerned about the way in which information on the register could be misinterpreted.

Another factor that comes into this is the way in which a member of a member's family could be dragged into public debate. I do not think that is necessarily right. I also believe that the children of members of Parliament could be placed under some duress if such a register of assets and interests was available for public scrutiny. It was suggested in newspapers by wives of members of Parliament in other States that their children could be placed at some risk because of the publication of the capital assets of a parent or member of his or her family who happened to be a member of Parliament. It is not clear cut.

I support the idea of a register, although I believe that a better approach would be to have the register placed under the control of an independent person such as a judge, the Ombudsman or a person of that independence. This would mean that, if a person from the general public was concerned about a member's pecuniary interest, he could go to that independent person and say that he believed that a particular member of Parliament had a pecuniary interest and a conflict of interest in a measure before the Parliament and that he would like an assurance that that was not the case. That independent person could then go through the list of the assets and the interests of that member of Parliament and satisfy himself that there was or was not a conflict of interest. He could then issue a simple certificate to the effect that he had examined the affairs of, say, the member for Flinders, and that he did not believe that there was a conflict of interest.

To my mind that would give the public an assurance that all was fair and above board, and it would protect the individual member who might have his assets so arranged, inadvertently, that they could be misinterpreted. I believe that what we have before us will not allow the assurance to be given that many members would like. I would like the Minister to clarify clause 6. In the second reading it was stated that:

> . . . a person is not to publish (whether in or outside Parliament) any information derived from the register or statements unless

the information is a fair and accurate summary of the information in the register or statement and is published in the public interest.

I am concerned about many campaigns that are conducted over the telephone. I would like the Minister to explain what is meant by 'publish'. I was somewhat relieved when I found that one definition of 'publish' in the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* is to 'make generally known'. If that was the interpretation, I think it covers the grapevine type of campaign that occurs. This is where the smear tactics on an individual are usually undertaken. I think members of Parliament are concerned particularly about smear campaigns that go on behind the scene. The actual meaning of 'publish' is to 'make generally known' or to make known to a third party, but normally one thinks of it as meaning to put in black and white or on film.

The Hon. H. Allison: It should be defined more adequately in the Bill.

Mr BLACKER: The honourable member has suggested that it would be appropriate to have it defined more adequately than it is defined in the Bill. I think that point should be pursued further. I do not wish to go any further than to say that, if someone who is rather sinister gets hold of the register and looks through its contents, it could have the reverse effect to that envisaged. It could point out those members who have not made a success of their lives because they have nothing to put on the register.

Generally speaking, it would be expected that members of Parliament were successful before they entered Parliament. I recall that when previously in this House this subject was being debated a prominent member of the Government at that time said that he had nothing to declare. I believe that a person holding a prominent position in the Government of the day having nothing to declare is no recommendation. I am still uncertain about supporting this Bill. I support the principle of a register, but I do not support the way in which it could be misinterpreted.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I have grave reservations about this Bill, and I do not intend to support it as it is drafted. It is one of those measures that the Labor Party and certain people trot out from time to time to try to convince people that they are the great protectors and custodians of the public. If the Labor Party was fair dinkum about this measure and took the trouble to tell South Australians who had influence over the Ministers and who had a knowledge of contracts and other involvements of the Government, it would tell the public that it was not the lowly back-benchers of the Parliament but the senior public servants who had such influence.

In saying that, I do not cast aspersions on senior public servants, but I ask who recommends to Ministers what contracts should be let and who advises the Ministers on sensitive legislation. It is surely not the back-bench members of Parliament, especially those in Opposition: it is the very senior public servants. Yet under this legislation there is no requirement for such officers to disclose their pecuniary interests. Further, from time to time very senior public servants leave the Public Service and take up employment in the private sector. Although I do not say that that is wrong, I point out that such people obviously carry with them sensitive information. Yet it is the members of Parliament who are being asked to disclose their so-called interests, whereas those people are not.

I refer also to those people who, as members of statutory boards such as the board of ETSA, are involved in making recommendations to the Government on the letting of contracts. Many such boards are involved in sensitive arrangements, yet to my knowledge members of those boards do not have to declare their interests. However, if we are to follow the line proposed in this legislation, such members of boards should have to disclose their interests. Then we have the Ministerial assistants who, although not members of the Public Service, are called on from time to time by Ministers to help them and advise them on administrative matters, and I understand that those people have access to sensitive Government information; yet such people are not required to disclose their interests publicly.

We could take the matter further and deal with those people who write in the financial journals of this country. Should such people be made to disclose whether they have financial interests in private companies or to which political Party they are affiliated? After all, anyone writing in the financial journals can influence what takes place on the Stock Exchange. Despite all the foregoing, however, the Government wants to convince the people of South Australia that we as Parliamentarians are concerned about the public interest, because the Labor Party has a history of introducing this sort of legislation when things get tough. During the so-called Dunstan era, from time to time the Labor Premier used this emotional approach to divert public attention from important areas. Standing Order 214 of this House provides:

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.

Standing Order 376 provides:

No member shall sit on a select committee who shall be personally interested in the inquiry before such committee.

Those two Standing Orders already cover the subject matter sought to be covered by the Bill. At page 407 of Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice*, the following appears:

In the Commons it is a rule that no member who has a direct pecuniary interest in a question shall be allowed to vote upon it but in order to operate as a disqualification, this interest must be immediate and personal and not merely of a general or a remote character.

That quotation makes clear the practice of the House of Commons in this matter. In an article in the *Advertiser* of 22 April 1983, under the heading 'Minister's wife rebels', the following appears:

The wife of a Federal Cabinet Minister is refusing to declare publicly her financial interests because she fears her children could risk being kidnapped. Under proposals of the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, Ministers, their spouses and staff are required to make available details of their trusts, shares, assets and liabilities. The woman, who does not wish to be named, said she had no objection to making the information available to the Prime Minister in private but did not want it to be tabled.

By making the information public the children of Ministers could become potential kidnap victims, she said. The woman said she was considering taking out a Supreme Court injunction to prevent Mr Hawke tabling details of her pecuniary interests. She also was approaching the New South Wales Privacy Committee. She also intends to contact the wives of all other Ministers to gain support for her opposition to the disclosures. A spokesman for Mr Hawke said yesterday the Prime Minister was not available for comment.

I share the concern of that unnamed Federal Minister's wife. I am amazed that in this case we have a Government that is telling the people of the State that it wants the financial affairs of all members of Parliament to be fair and above board. I do not disagree with that, but as an organisation the Labor Party has not the confidence in its Parliamentary representatives to think for themselves. That Party forces every one of its members, before coming into this Chamber, to sign a pledge to vote in accordance with the Party's policy, whatever their personal views or interests, on nearly every matter that comes before them. So that there can be no argument about the attitude of the Party toward its own members, I quote that pledge, as set out in the *Constitution and General Rules of the South Australian Branch of the Australian Labor Party*, as follows:

Any member of the Party accepting nomination for pre-selection for the Senate, House of Representatives, House of Assembly or Legislative Council, shall be required to sign the following pledge:

I hereby agree to be bound by the objective, national and State platforms and rules of the Australian Labor Party and by all decisions of national conference, convention and State Council that do not conflict with such objective, platforms, and rules. I also agree to be bound by decisions of the State Executive that do not conflict with the objective, national and State platforms or rules of the Australian Labor Party or with decisions of national conference, convention and State Council.

I hereby pledge myself not to withdraw from an election contest after being duly endorsed, without the consent of the State Executive, nor to oppose a selected candidate of the Party except as provided for in rule 59. And if returned to Parliament I pledge myself to attend all Caucus meetings and on all occasions to do my utmost to ensure the carrying out of the principles embodied in the platforms of the Australian Labor Party, and on all questions before Parliament to vote as a majority of the Parliamentary Labor Party may decide at a duly constituted Caucus meeting provided that such decisions do not conflict with the provisions laid down in the previous paragraph.

I also pledge myself, if elected, not to resign without first having consulted, and obtained the consent of convention, State Council or the State Executive nor to incur any expenditure in the name of the Party, unless it has been authorised by the State Executive of State Campaign Director.

There we have it. We have a Party which is asking members of Parliament to declare their interests, yet it is not prepared to allow its own members to vote on their conscience. I believe that that course of action is quite hypocritical. Talk about democrats: that would be about the most undemocratic document anyone would be asked to sign. Here we have all this nonsense put forward about protecting the rights of the public. One could go on and select one or two other policies from this notorious document which, of course, will wreak havoc upon the Australian community in the future if and when implemented.

I have given this matter a great deal of consideration over a long period. I was a farmer before I came into Parliament, and I am still involved in a farming operation. I make no apology for that, as I am proud of my involvement, and I have very little to disclose. I am involved in a number of sections of land; I have a house block and am involved in one or two small operations. I take strong exception to my wife having to make any disclosure, and I ask the Minister what would be the position if a member's wife refused to disclose to the member her particular financial interests. Is the member going to be hauled before the courts? That will be a very interesting situation. The wife may say, 'This was a particular interest that I accrued in my own right,' or, 'I have had certain assets willed to me by my family, and it has nothing to do with anyone else.' What happens then?

Mr Mathwin: Do you think he'll punish the wife?

Mr GUNN: That is possible. A Federal Minister's wife is objecting to having to disclose her interests to the Prime Minister. What happens in relation to people who are involved in businesses whose financial position depends entirely on what time of the year it is? There are times of the year when people involved in agricultural undertakings may be operating on a considerable overdraft, whereas at another time of the year they may have considerable credit to their names. That in itself, if one had to disclose those particular involvements, can paint a picture that is not really accurate.

I also take exception to having to disclose information about family organisations, whether it involves one's brother, parents, or any other relative, which will also make very obvious to anyone that that is the position of other members of the family. I believe that that would be quite wrong and improper, yet that is my understanding of the scope of this legislation. It is quite wrong, and I believe members would be quite within their rights to refuse to give details of such matters. I believe that, if it is good enough for members of Parliament to have to disclose their interests, it is also good enough for candidates. I guarantee that the first thing some of these devious fellows, who will be standing against members on either side, will be wanting to do is go and have a look at the member's register to see whether they can make any political capital out of it, and I therefore believe that it is essential that when a person nominates he must furnish the returning officer with a declaration of his interests. I consider that that is only fair and proper, and I sincerely hope that the Government will consider this matter.

After examining the Bill, I believe that it goes far wider than perhaps many people imagine. Under clause 4 (3) *(b)* of the Bill, which refers to '. . . any body or association formed for political purposes or any trade or professional organisation of which the member is a member', do I have to declare that I am a member of United Farmers and Stockowners? I do not know what that has to do with my duties as a member of Parliament. Does that have to be declared?

Mr Gregory: If the member for Mallee wanted me to declare the union I was in, why shouldn't you?

Mr GUNN: I do not think it is relevant.

Mr Gregory: Are you ashamed of being a member? You should be proud of it.

Mr GUNN: I am proud of it, but I do not not see why it should be a provision in this Bill. I want to know whether if one becomes a patron of an agricultural society or some other organisation—

Mr Gregory: At least they know you aren't in the League of Rights.

Mr GUNN: That is more in the honourable member's line, and if he is a patron of that organisation he will have to account to his constituents; that is up to him. I want to know whether, if one is patron of an agricultural society, for instance, one has to declare that particular interest, and whether, as members of Parliament from time to time become members of various sporting clubs, it is necessary for those members to declare those particular interests. Members belong to all sorts of organisations. I wish to know whether one has to declare that one is an executive member of a particular religious organisation. Is that matter covered? These matters ought to be clearly stated when the Minister responds. Members in this House would have funds invested in Commonwealth Government arrangements, such as income equalisation deposits involving an arrangement set up under a Statute of the Commonwealth Parliament. I would like to know from the Minister whether one has to disclose such details. In relation to the amount of a person's indebtedness, would a person involved in leasing a motor car have to disclose that information? I have had it put to me that that can be argued both ways, and I should like to know whether one has to disclose that sort of information.

In relation to indebtedness, I should like to know whether, if a member owes money involving particular Savings Bank funds, that information has to be disclosed, whether it involves $5 000 owing to one particular institution, whether all one's indebtedness is grouped together amounting to $5 000, or whether it involves individual amounts up to $5 000. I believe that such matters ought to be explained by the Minister. If people are inclined to engage themselves in illegal or improper actions, I do not think that this legislation will prevent them from doing so because, as I said earlier, I believe that there are others who have more influence on Governments than have members of Parliament. Every time we cast a vote in this Chamber it is recorded in *Hansard*, which is a public document, and everyone is fully aware of what a member said and how he cast a vote. But it is those discussions that take place in Ministerial offices and the recommendations made which the general public never see and are unlikely to see and which, in my judgment, have far more influence on a

Minister, and I believe that those matters ought to be addressed.

I sincerely hope that the Minister can explain the Government's position in regard to the matters that I raised earlier concerning Ministerial advisers, public servants, and Ministerial assistants. I believe that this is important, and the involvement of people in statutory organisations is also important, because they have contact with contractors and with people who are endeavouring to sell goods and services to the Government. I have made my position on this Bill quite clear. I share several concerns raised by the member for Flinders. I want to make quite clear that members of Parliament should be people beyond question concerning any involvement in which they are engaged. To my knowledge all members of this House have acted in a proper manner in regard to their financial dealings. Since my involvement here I have not had brought to my attention any real wrong doings of members of Parliament.

As I said earlier, I was a farmer before coming into this House, and have been involved in farming activities on a farm out from Port Kenny. Since I have been a member of Parliament I have acquired one other small block and a house block in Adelaide. If I had not been elected to this place, I would probably have far wider farming interests than I have today. Everyone would know that once one becomes a member of Parliament today it is virtually a full-time occupation, particularly when representing an electorate as large as the one I represent.

Mr Gregory: There must be a lot of weeds on the farm.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): Order! I am sure that the member for Eyre does not require the assistance of the member for Florey.

Mr GUNN: No, I do not need his assistance. I can say to the member for Florey that the management of my farm is most effective. Anyone who has seen my farm or come into contact with those responsible for the management of it would agree that the property does not leave a great deal to be desired. Like the member for Flinders, I have been lucky in having a member of my family able to look after my farm in a most effective manner. In regard to this Bill, I do not intend to divide on the second reading, but unless there are significant changes to it I will have no other alternative other than to divide on the third reading.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I oppose the Bill. The basis of my opposition concerns the fact that certain interests must be disclosed. It seems strange to me that a Parliament should decide that only one aspect should be involved. Having regard to economic, social, political and religious aspects only the economic aspect is involved, with perhaps one other slightly touched on in the Bill, namely, that involving politics. Historically, it was necessary for those wishing to stand for Parliament to have a minimum amount of finance and economic security. I am not saying that I necessarily agree with that approach; I believe that the system that we have today which allows anyone to stand is certainly the more appropriate. Today, we have the situation where it seems as though it could be a liability for members of Parliament, if their pecuniary interests are excessive or are in certain companies. That seems to be a complete turnabout in regard to what is expected or required of a member of Parliament.

Various things have been said during this debate, but I want to concentrate mainly on the social, political, religious, and economic factors. Why does the Government want to restrict the register to economic interests? Why should there not be a register of social interests of members of Parliament? What is it that makes economic interests more interesting than social interests? Whenever a situation arises in the public forum about a member of Parliament it is matters concerning social interest that so often come to the fore. During electioneering various statements are made, and, unfortunately, members are criticised by their opponents for the way that they behave in a certain situation or for what they have done on a particular occasion. Many times this is sheer rumour, but it does not add to the esteem of Parliamentarians. However, if we are to look at interests of Parliamentarians, why should not social interests be declared.

In regard to the types of social interest, the first one that I believe that electors are entitled to know is whether a member is married or single, although I believe that electors would have access to that information. Secondly, they should know whether a member is living in a de facto relationship or in a normal state of marriage. Again, people might be aware of that. It could be publicised in political pamphlets put out by a candidate if a person wished to state publicly that he or she was living in a de facto relationship, in which case such a person would be being quite honest and the people voting for that person would have that knowledge.

Taking it a step further, why should not members therefore have to declare whether they are heterosexual or homosexual? That has been an issue in the past, particularly in this Parliament, and I think that voters should have the right to know where a member is situated in respect to his sexuality.

The Hon. H. Allison: Left, right or Middlesex.

Mr MEIER: So says the member for Mount Gambier. It seems an important point of discussion today. The minority group of homosexuals seems to want Parliamentarians to indicate their support or otherwise for that way of living. Therefore, I do not see any reason why the interests of Parliament in this connection should not have to be documented as well. Either we should have the whole range of interests declared, or none. Why look at economic interests only? To me that seems completely discriminatory.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Goyder is making a speech, not the member for Alexandra.

Mr MEIER: Normally, I would not respond to an interjection.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order.

Mr MEIER: In essence, I am against the whole concept of this declaration of interests, but if we are to have it, and it must go through, let us have everything brought into it. The social aspects cover the values and norms of the politician or candidate (I think that the candidature was removed in the amendments in another place so we are looking at the Parliamentarian). I believe that the values a politician holds should be clearly noted by Parliament and that we should be able to have a statement from the person as to what are his basic values and norms and this could be kept in the register as well.

Political factors are acknowledged in the Bill. One provision provides that the return would include, according to subsection *(b)* the name of any political Party, any body or association formed for political purposes or any trade or professional organisation of which the member is a member. I acknowledge that. However, that is simply stating the name of the Party of which the member is presently a member. If we wanted to take that to its fullest extent, it might not be a bad thing to get that person to state the political Parties that he or she has been associated with in the past.

This will allow electorates to look at their politicians and analyse what views they have taken over the years. In the Bill it seems to be restricted very much at present. I do not want to take excessive issue on that point, but I raise it as there are so many things which are lacking with this Bill and with which I disagree with anyway.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: We might need a family tree!

Mr MEIER: That might be coming. The religious aspect is very relevant at present because members of this House have to consider whether they want prayers said at the beginning of each day's sitting. I believe that is still being analysed. Certainly, the views of religious groups in the community should be respected. I believe that electors have every right to know what religious organisation, if any, their member of Parliament is a member of. We had the case in the 1960s when this Parliament banned or prohibited the conducting of meetings by a certain religious group. Therefore, if such a religious organisation still exists and if a member of Parliament is a member of that group, I believe that the voting public should be aware of it in case they take great exception to that religious organisation. The religious aspect has been forgotten in this Bill.

The Minister commented earlier about a family tree being brought out. I suppose, in retrospect, that that is not such a bad idea for many people because our history in Australia can be traced fairly easily. We are a relatively young country and, for many years, family reunions have become the in thing and most members would be able to trace their family history back for generations. When one thinks about it, why not have that disclosed as well? Perhaps some member did something in the past that was not to the liking of members of the community. Their family could even be traced back to the very first fleet that arrived here which consisted of convicts.

Mr Hamilton: Like Lady Hamilton, or something like that.

Mr MEIER: I would not know that. If we look briefly at the aspects of the Bill (and I know that it will be discussed in Committee) there are certain points that do not seem to make complete sense. Clause 4 *(c)* states:

> The source of any contribution made in cash or in kind of or above the amount of value of $500 . . . to any travel beyond the limits of South Australia undertaken by the member or a member of his family during the return period.

One might say that it is good to hear exactly where the money is coming from, but then we find it does not say where the money is coming from in all cases, because it says in brackets:

> . . . (Other than any contribution by the State or any public statutory corporation constituted under the law of the State or by a person related by blood or marriage) . . .

In other words, we are suddenly deciding that if the Government provides the money that is all right but, if it is a private company or some other organisation, it should be declared. I cannot see why members of Parliament should not have all moneys clearly stated if they are going overseas. We know that we are entitled to a certain amount each year but, if we are going to have a declaration of interest, let us make sure that it is everything and not just part of it as stipulated by this Bill.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: You favour none of it.

Mr MEIER: I personally would favour none in the total situation, but I see so many inconsistencies in this Bill that I cannot accept it. I do know that I can accept the total Bill. I will be interested to hear what the Government has to say.

Another point of concern is: why single out Parliamentarians? It would seem from this Bill that we are the only people in the community who apparently have some position of authority that needs to be accounted for. As has already been stated by the member for Alexandra, judges are another group who surely have very responsible positions in our society. It seems strange to me that if we have to declare these interests then they, as very honoured members in our society, could also be considered. We can take it one step further and include top public servants. Some people might argue with that and say, 'What about public servants in general?' Many public servants have access to information that is of a very touchy and confidential nature and they could certainly use their knowledge to better their interests in certain departments.

I cannot see why Parliamentarians should be singled out. One could possibly take it even further to include people in non-government positions. Those people might be in a position to further their interests because of what they know or do not know. Of course, the net result hinges on whether the Bill will cause harm to anyone. Is it a bad thing if a person endeavours to increase his pecuniary interests? Will that make him a poor person in society with respect to the way other people view him? I say, 'No'. I believe that it is every individual's right to do the best he can in society. If he wishes to advance himself in his monetary capacity, works hard at it and is able to invest in stocks or bonds, in companies, or is able to set up his own business, then good on him and I wish him every success. If that person then becomes a member of Parliament in later years, why should he suddenly be put through public scrutiny in every financial situation and asked to record it in a register?

Mr Ferguson: It is not every financial situation.

Mr MEIER: We will have a look at that a little later on.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MEIER: To me, it seems that the public is continually crying for people to come into Parliament who are well qualified and skilled in management or administration generally, so that they can hopefully apply that to the management of the State and the Commonwealth. With this legislation being introduced, people who have made a success of their lives financially are not going to have any incentive to come into Parliament because they will suddenly be told, 'All right, you made a success of your life; financially, you have got great assets, why do you not come into Parliament?' The answer would be very simple, 'Why should I, because everything I have worked hard for will be open to the public.' I say, 'open to the public', because we note that clause 5 (2) states:

> A Registrar shall, at the request of any member of the public, permit him to inspect the register maintained by him and to take a copy of any of its contents.

Therefore, it is open to the public, and we could certainly have thousands of people coming in to investigate exactly what members have. I suppose that the Government will argue that there is a protection for that, namely, that clause 6 (1) states:

> A person shall not publish whether in Parliament or outside Parliament—
>
> *(a)* any information derived from the register or a statement prepared . . .

However, how could we possibly stop a small company running off on a photo-copy, a Xerox copy, or gestetner copy, material which they have looked at and copied from the register, and then distributing it in mail boxes? One could never find out who did that. One could never prosecute them. Obviously, they would not put on it their name or the name of the printer who did it. Therefore, we have no protection there.

It could be suggested that I am possibly trying to hide something because I am saying that I do not agree with the Bill, first of all, because I do not think that it is wide enough. If we are to have this type of legislation, let us make it all encompassing. However, the main point is that I do not believe that members should have to disclose what is required to be disclosed by this Bill. I refer to clause 4 (3), which states:

> For the purposes of this Act, a return (whether primary or ordinary) shall contain the following information:

It then states some eight points which members are required to put into that register.

I have been caught a little unawares today. I wonder what is the value of this Notice Paper. I looked at it very carefully first thing this morning to check whether this Bill was coming up, because I had wanted to do a bit of extra preparation. I am told that it is only a guide, but I do not know why we do not try to have actually Orders of the Day. Perhaps I have to learn a little bit more over the coming months or years, but I was disappointed not to have more time to get a few things out. However, in the time I have had, and so that the Government does not throw it back at me, I have prepared what I believe to be an accurate return of my pecuniary interests according to this Bill and according to clause 4 (3). Mr Deputy Speaker, with your leave, I would be happy to incorporate in *Hansard* without my reading it, a list of my pecuniary interests.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair would point out that it has always been the practice (and it is in the Constitution) that, if a member wishes to seek leave to incorporate something in *Hansard,* it is usually of a factual or numerical basis. It cannot allow leave for the honourable member to put into *Hansard* without reading it any other item. Therefore, leave has to be refused. The Chair reminds the member that the ruling given by the Chair does not prevent the honourable member from reading out the pecuniary interests.

Mr MEIER: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I point out again that because of the time limit I believe that this is correct. I would like to answer the questions. The first one states:

> The name or description of any company, partnership, association or other body in which the member required to submit the return or a member of his family holds a beneficial interest.

In answer to that, it is nil. Clause 4 (3) *(b)* states:

> The name of any political Party, any body or association formed for political purposes or any trade or professional organisation of which the member is a member.

I state here that I am a member of the Liberal Party of Australia (South Australian Division). Clause 4 (3) *(c)* states:

> A concise description of any trust in which the member or a member of his family holds a beneficial interest and a concise description of any discretionary trust of which the member or a member of his family is a trustee or object.

Again, I state, 'nil'. Clause 4 (3) *(d)* states:

> The address or description of any land in which the member or a member of his family has any beneficial interest other than by way of security for any debt.

I state here, '17 Samuel Street, Maitland, South Australia, 5073.' Clause 4 (3) *(f)* states:

> Where the member or a member of his family is indebted to another person (not being related by blood or marriage) in an amount of or exceeding five thousand dollars—the name and address of that other person.

I state here, 'ANZ Banking Corporation, Robert Street, Maitland, South Australia; General Motors Acceptance Corporation, c/o Maitland Motors, Maitland, South Australia.'

Before going on, I would point out that it seems very strange to seek information which shows that a person is indebted to another person not being related by blood or marriage. Therefore, if one happens to have a very wealthy family, the Government is not interested to hear of the loans that may have occurred or any debt that one has to that person or persons. Again, it shows an aspect of discrimination.

Mr Becker: They might not lean on you.

Mr MEIER: The member for Hanson has indicated that possibly the family might not lean on one. However, that is debatable. Clause 4 (3) *(g)* states:

> Any other substantial interest whether of a pecuniary nature or not of the member or of a member of his family of which the member is aware and which he considers might appear to raise a material conflict between his private interest and the public duty that he has or may subsequently have as a member.

Although I am not fully clear on the exact meaning of that (and I will comment shortly), I believe that my answer there is, 'nil.' Returning to clause 4 (3) *(g)*, although I earlier mentioned that there are social, political and religious questions, I wonder whether the Government is endeavouring to have a loophole that all other interests would have to be declared, no matter to what they relate, with respect to the member. I wonder whether this is a loophole that might come up on future occasions. I say that we need specific details of what interests are meant there. It seems unclear to me, and I certainly hope to deal with them in Committee.

So, I have indicated my feeling towards the Bill. I have endeavoured to do it in a positive way by showing that, if we are to have any declaration of interests, let us go the whole way (if I can use that expression) and let us not limit it to purely economic matters. For the life of me, I cannot see why economic matters only are of concern to the public because, in almost all the literature that one reads during an election campaign and often prior to it, the actual monetary matters of a Parliamentarian do not come up. Other matters are stated, such as his possible lack of work in a particular area, or whether a certain part of the electorate may not have received benefits in one way or the other. It could be said that he does not live within his district, and so it could go on. I believe if a Bill of this nature has to be introduced it should cover all aspects of a member's life and not just his monetary affairs, but that would expose us completely to the public and I do not believe any person would then want to stand for Parliament.

Mr Becker: Perhaps that's what the Government wants.

Mr MEIER: I question that. I hope that the Government will have second thoughts about this Bill and see that, in its present form, it is discriminatory because with one minor exception it deals only with money matters. It is definitely a disadvantage to those members of the public who have worked hard throughout their life, who have made a success of their life and who feel that they also wish to enter Parliament, because they would then have their affairs listed on the register and open to the public.

I am also concerned about the family having to be brought into this. I am well aware that the family is an important part of a member of Parliament's life and electors continually look to a member and his family, but surely they are private individuals. It is the member who has made the decision to stand for Parliament and it is he or she who has to take the rap if things go wrong, but it seems in this legislation that a member's husband or wife has to accept equal responsibility and the family has no right of say if their father or mother happens to be a member of Parliament. Their privacy is taken away, and that seems to me to be unjust in a society where we seem to acknowledge our freedom and accept the rights of individuals to do as they wish. Clause 4 (2) *(d)* provides:

> particulars (including the name of the donor) of any gift of or above the amount or value of five hundred dollars . . .

A tax on gifts was removed many years ago, but this Bill will require a declaration of gifts received.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Too bad if a maiden aunt leaves you a bequest.

Mr MEIER: The maiden aunt would get plenty of publicity if she had left a bequest—not that she would be around to receive it. There is so much discriminatory material in this Bill. I do not think it has been well thought through and I hope the Government will retract the Bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. Before calling on the member for Alexandra, the Chair would point out that it believes that

the five minutes of the allotted time for the member to speak to this debate has already been taken up by interjections. The honourable member for Alexandra.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): A new precedent has been set in this Parliament by the Deputy Speaker. By his psuedo direction I have five minutes, and all I need is five minutes in which to address the Parliament on this subject. I have no objection at all to declaring my own source of financial interests if such a register requiring that detail becomes law within this State but I do object to a requirement to declare the financial interest or sources of financial interests, if any, of each or any of my family members.

As indicated in the final words of the previous speaker, it is the member who is sworn in in this place, it is the member who is elected and undertakes to serve in the Parliament of South Australia, and nothing in that undertaking that I gave on 19 June 1973 or subsequent to each of the elections in 1975, 1977, 1979 or 1982 required me to involve directly either my wife or any other family dependants under the age of 18 years (or for that matter over 18 years). In that context I do not agree that their business in their own personal right, in their own financial right, in their own commercial right, is or should be subject to disclosure to this place unless they of their own volition choose to do so. I do not think it is my place in a free society to declare on their behalf to a public place (and that is what this institution is) their private affairs.

I repeat that, with respect to my own source or sources of interest I place on record now that my principal financial source of interest and, given better seasons, income as well is derived from primary production, and I am proud of it. I was in that pursuit before coming into this place. I still have a direct interest in that direction and I intend to continue my interests, both physical and financial, in that direction after leaving this place. For that matter therefore, that disclosure is already on the record. I am quite prepared to put it on an official register if legislation so requires.

As I have indicated with respect to all other members of the family, and I have a big family a number of whom are still under the age of 18 years, their business and that of their mother is no business of anyone else in this place, in my view. I therefore indicate to the Chair and to those who are left in the Chamber at this stage of the proceedings that, given the appropriate amendments to encompass those views, I will support the Bill; in the absence of the appropriate amendments along the lines I have spoken about I will not support the Bill.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I support the Bill and the principles contained within it. Having read this Bill and the Bill that was passed in Victoria, I believe that one of the things that came out of them was that we were all well aware before we entered this Parliament or stood for public office that we would be open to public scrutiny, whether we liked it or not. I was aware of that, and I would suggest that all members were well aware of the fact that we would be open to public scrutiny, as would be our families.

Honourable members opposite have today expressed concern about their families. I would suggest that, if they searched their own conscience, they would see that on numerous occasions they have used a member of an opponent's family in the political arena in this Parliament. I recall my political opponents on many occasions speaking about a member or members of their opponent's family. I do not want to hear anymore of that sort of hypocrisy from members opposite. Here is one occasion where they do not want the truth to come out, as I see it.

I have no objection to making a statement of my present income or the likely source of my income during the next year. I have no objection to disclosing the name of any organisation of which I belong or in which any member of my family holds office; I have no objection to disclosing the name of any political Party or organisation or any trade or professional organisation to which I belong and I am prepared to give a description of any trust from which any member of my family benefits, any discretionary family trust, or the name of any fund, including outside contributions, in which any member of my family has an actual or prospective interest. I believe that this Bill will instil a code of conduct for members of Parliament. Much has been made by the member for Todd about putative spouses, but he did not refer to mistresses or homosexual friends.

A similar Bill to this was introduced in the Victorian Parliament in 1978 and I suggest that for their edification members opposite should look at the contents of that Bill, which was sponsored by their colleagues, to see the provisions to which they have objected in this debate. In the debate on that Bill the matter of speculative shares was referred to. It was said that such shares could be a source of income, but it was pointed out that such could be the case only if the capital gain was made from trading in those shares. It was argued that over a short period the holders of such shares could have bought and sold them and there would be no reason to include such a transaction in their declaration.

The matter of the bonus issue of shares as a source of income was raised in the Victorian debate. Can the Minister say whether bonus shares will be a source of income? Another comment in that debate, held on 12 December 1978, related to conflict of interest, and the *Hansard* (page 7737) report states:

> The Leader of the House, Sir Arthur Warner, had a conflict of interests. He installed drink vending machines on railway stations because he had a major interest in a vending machine company that sold soft drinks. Sir Arthur Rylah would have been in trouble. He had Avis Rent-a-Car depots at airports . . . Another member of Parliament, Mr McDonald, was able to sell incinerators and hand dryers to the Government because of the way he organised his company.

Clearly, that is the type of thing that the Government will look at in respect of disclosure of interests. One aspect that does not come within the bounds of the legislation relates to the contribution made to a member, for example, for entry to various clubs. Also, he may have his bills paid or may have the use of a credit card the entries on which are charged to someone else. This Bill does not cover such circumstances and I ask the Minister to deal with this matter in his reply.

The matter of family trusts has been raised. It is simple to set up a family trust in which a member has no interest: although dishonest, it is possible. Another matter raised by members of the Opposition relates to the disclosure of organisations to which a member belongs. I do not object to people knowing to which organisations I belong, but the point was made about belonging to organisations such as the N.C.C. of which a member might not be too proud.

Mr Gregory: What about the League of Rights?

Mr HAMILTON: Yes, that is another. A wife may have a private income, and when her husband brings home the pay packet, its contents are paid into her account. What if she decides to put away a large sum over the years and her husband, the member, declares that to his knowledge she has not that much money? How does he stand in those circumstances? This Bill could expose such situations as were experienced in Victoria regarding the land scandals and certain people being able to afford an apartment on the Gold Coast.

I do not intend to delay the House much longer. I see no reason why members, knowing before coming to this place that their affairs would be open to public scrutiny, should object. I support the Bill and wish it a speedy passage.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I am afraid that this Bill confuses me a little, although in principle I support the concept of the public disclosure of the pecuniary interests of members of Parliament.

Mr Becker: What about the judges?

Mr PETERSON: There is a slight difference there: we are the people who make the laws and they are the people who apply them. I am willing to declare my pecuniary interests in Rundle Mall if need be, but it would not need much paper to do so. I do not like the Bill. To me, the Bill has serious faults, including one that has been raised several times concerning the need to declare the pecuniary interests of a spouse but not of some other person with whom a member may live. In the 1980s it is possible to live with another person and feel no shame. It has been said that some members of this Parliament are doing so. I neither know nor care whether that is so: it is the business of those people. However, a member living in a domestic heterosexual or homosexual relationship with someone for less than five years may be subject to an influence stronger than that exerted by a wife or husband of perhaps 20-odd years. Such a person could wield a significant influence on a member, yet the anomaly under the Bill is that the pecuniary interests of such a person would not have to be disclosed publicly, and that does not seem fair to me.

Much has been said about the effect upon an individual member of Parliament. I agree with much of what has been said, that we are, I dare to say, public figures. We do have the responsibility of making decisions in this place that do affect the lives of South Australians and we are subject to influences; there is no doubt about that. There are two major Parties represented here and each member of those Parties is obviously influenced by Party policy. So, there is an influence straight away. There is no doubt these influences are there, so one can be influenced.

I am a little concerned also about the part which speaks of blood relationships. One does not necessarily have to declare any indebtedness to relations, or even if one uses their property for a holiday or something along those lines. What makes it so impossible that the relations cannot apply pressure? What makes it impossible that one cannot be got at through a relative? There is nothing that says that cannot be so. It seems to me that is a fault. They are two aspects that seem to me to be anomalies in the Bill.

There has been a case quoted about a Federal member's wife who declined to declare her interests because she feared for her family. I can understand that. Certainly in most cases I think there is not enough financial involvement of members to make it worthwhile but, in some cases, there may be, and that is an understandable fear. The other one I think concerns the family itself. I listened to the debate and I am perhaps putting myself on the spot: my wife has no substantial independent income. She has no independent wealth that I know of; my children certainly do not. I think the member for Alexandra said it very well: that his family have their interest, they are people in their own right, they are individuals in law in their own right.

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: That is what I am saying. The Bill is a bitzer Bill. I think these things can be covered and if we are going to do it, let us do it properly. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I would like to take the opportunity to refer to a matter which I feel needs reform. I am talking about the need to reform the encumbrance law that affects houses and properties in general. Housing estates built more than 25 years ago in the Fulham Gardens area are bound by encumbrances set up by the original developer. The original encumbrances were created to protect the general standard of the estates. The encumbrances prevented the purchaser of estate houses from doing the following:

1. Erecting more than one dwelling house to the usual outbuildings.
2. No improvement was to cost less than $11 000.
3. The area of masonry in the external walls was to be less than 50 per cent of the total area.
4. The roof of any building was not to be constructed of asbestos cement, fibreglass or any rubber or plastic composition, unless a roof had a pitch greater than 10 degrees.
5. Fences must be constructed of brushwood, masonry, timber asbestos, mesh or metal—all metal fencing had to be new, and have suitable capping.
6. All television antennae and electricity cables, or any cables whatsoever, shall not pass over the encumbered land.
7. No signs or hoardings were allowed.

The memorandum of encumbrance in these properties was secured by the following companies: Ardco Prop. Ltd, Pringle Prop. Ltd, Gladesville Prop. Ltd, Aston (Aust.) Prop. Ltd, Vila (Aust.) Prop. Ltd and Pinnacle (Aust.) Prop. Ltd, of 97 King William Street, Adelaide.

The encumbrance on the land is a perpetual yearly rent charge of 10 cents a year if demanded. These encumbrances proved to be of particular difficulty to one of my constituents, Mr D.A. Alvey, of 42 Browning Avenue, Fulham Gardens. This gentleman originally financed his home loan by way of a loan from the bank he was working for. Upon retirement from the bank he sought a transfer of his loan to a defence service home loan to which he was entitled through war service. In order to receive a defence service home loan the land needed to be discharged of all encumbrances. This is where the trouble began.

My constituent instructed his land agent to seek a discharge of the encumbrances and the problems quickly arose. He was told that, as a resuult of inadequate registration of company ownership in official records, it was impossible to execute the discharge of encumbrance and, worse still, the original six companies had been sold as shell companies to be used for any purpose whatsoever and had scattered to the four winds. My constituent then went on a search to take the appropriate legal action to discharge the encumbrances one by one. This search involved five months of work and at a cost to him of over $700 in legal fees and lost interest rates.

Part of his problems in the search revolved around the fact that two of the companies concerned had gone into bankruptcy. Help had been needed from the Corporate Affairs Commission, and eventually the two companies had been deregistered. This enabled the discharge of the encumbrances. It is known that more than 70 certificates of title are known to be affected by the same companies. Any veteran in the same circumstances seeking a mortgage with the Savings Bank of South Australia, the State Bank of South Australia or a building society would probably face the same problem.

The whole point of drawing Parliament's attention to this problem is the question of whether the law in regard to encumbrances needs to be reformed. Many new housing

estates are bound by memorandum of encumbrance. I am not critical of groups of people wishing to maintain a certain standard with their estates, but I am questioning whether an encumbrance is the best legal way of achieving it. Certainly I am critical of companies involved in encumbrances on housing estates being sold off for other purposes. Should sunset provisions be inserted in encumbrances? Certainly, many of the provisions lose their significance with the inflationary spiral. Advances in technology will, from time to time, make some building materials now considered to be unacceptable more acceptable in due course. This reform is a matter for the State Government. The former Minister for Veterans' Affairs was most disinterested when the matter was raised with him. His reply to my constituent (Mr Alvey) was as follows:

I refer to your letter of 19 January 1981 about the problems you have encountered in obtaining a defence service home loan because your home was subject to an existing encumbrance. I understand that on 3 February 1978 you lodged an application to purchase your present home, and that following a search of the certificate of title, you were advised by the South Australian Office of the Defence Service Homes Corporation that the encumbrance had to be lifted in favour of the corporation's mortgage at settlement of the loan. Following notification from you that the encumbrance would be lifted at settlement, a loan of $15 000 was tentatively approved on 15 March 1978.

I am informed that you occupied the property on 24 October 1979, and that the corporation's mortgage documents were signed on 8 November 1979. However, final settlement of your loan could not be effected as two of the encumbrances were in liquidation. It was only following their deregistration that the encumbrances could be discharged and the loan settled.

Your concern over the costs you incurred as a result of the delayed settlement of your defence service homes loan is understandable. However, I would like to explain that the Defence Service Homes Act prevents the corporation from making an advance on any property that is encumbered by a previous mortgage or charge unless specific requirements set out in the legislation are met. I am advised that one of the requirements which you had difficulty in meeting was that the encumbrance had to be postponed in its entirety to the mortgage to the corporation. You will appreciate that the requirement for the corporation to lend on first mortgage security is based on the premise that, given the concessional nature of the loan, it is appropriate for the long-term lending of public moneys to be made on the most secure basis possible. In this regard, the advantages of a first-mortgage security are obvious.

I am sorry that you were put to such difficulty and expense in having your loan settled. The problems you raised are unique to South Australia in that the charges on the land are created by the memoranda of encumbrance used in South Australia. Generally, in the corporation's experience, encumbrances are prepared to lift their charge to allow prior registration of the corporation's mortgage but, occasionally, a case arises where the corporation is unable to assist an applicant because it cannot establish priority over other charges. As matters stand, there is little I can do to overcome these types of problems but I thank you for bringing them to my attention.

This matter concerning encumbrances is of concern and an investigation into their uses is necessary. As I have indicated previously, I believe that in regard to housing estates there needs to be some type of protection and a requirement to maintain standards. It would appear to me that the sort of legality that is used in South Australia in regard to encumbrances is one of the problems that ought to be tackled. There is a need for reform by this Parliament in that area. In the short time that I have remaining, I want to refer to the announcement made by the Attorney-General to set up a privacy committee. I applaud that move. It has occurred in other States and is something that was proposed by this Parliament, but on the defeat of the Labor Government it was put into mothballs and no more was heard about it. In due course, I will refer to this privacy committee the practice of a code of conduct for revealing medical records of certain patients. There is a practice used by employers in sending workers compensation people—

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

TRAVELLING STOCK RESERVE: OODNADATTA

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's resolution without amendment.

TRAVELLING STOCK RESERVE: BALDINA

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's resolution without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

Debate resumed.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): The matter to which I refer was debated quite fully some time ago, but I again want to express my objection to the manner in which the Government brought in a private member's Bill for which it then allocated Government time for debate. Of course, I refer to the Casino Bill. This was a blatant move by the Government to dispense with the matter before the public release of the Connor Report. Obviously, the Government knew of the contents of that report and its findings before it attempted to put through that Bill as a private member's Bill in Government time.

There is no doubt at all that the Government knew of the findings. It was an attempt to hoodwink the public and to take people in the community by surprise. I refer, for example, to the churches, the 13 000 people who signed the petition not so long ago against the establishment of a casino and the hundreds of people who submitted written and verbal objections. We all know of the fiasco in relation to the poker machine provision, whereby everyone who has a poker machine in his home can now be fined up to $20 000. We know that the Government has problems in that area. I happily attended a meeting in the electorate of the member for Mawson (who, incidentally, was not at the meeting to defend herself in relation to the matter), and I gave those people present some advice on the situation regarding poker machines. There is no doubt that something will be done about it.

In the short time available to me I will deal with some of the recommendations of the Connor Report submitted to the Victorian Government. In his conclusions and recommendations, Mr Connor says:

In Victoria gambling is constantly increasing in volume, and the various forms of gambling compete with each other in such a way that gambling is being actively and vigorously stimulated.

There is a genuine unstimulated but modest demand by an indeterminate but smallish number of Victorians for casino gambling.

If by the year 1982 casinos had been fully operational and vigorously promoted in Victoria, casinos in that year would have won from gamblers the sum of approximately $117 000 000, an amount on which the State of Victoria could have levied a casino tax.

He goes on to say:

If a 4 000-delegate convention centre were to be established in Melbourne it would not be financially viable. A casino is one way in which it could be financially supported. However, the evidence shows that Melbourne does not need a convention centre for more than 2 500 delegates—

yet we in South Australia (little Adelaide!) are wanting a convention centre to hold 2 000 people—

which would probably be financially viable without casino support, or nearly so.

He then goes on to explain the areas to which he was referring, as follows:

Some beneficial social effects would follow the introduction of casinos but they would be far outweighed by the adverse social effects.

He also said:

It is impracticable for a State Government to establish all but one type of casino and undesirable for it to operate any type of casino.

His recommendations were as follows:

I recommend that maximum revenue casinos not be established in Victoria for the following reasons:

(a) they would be likely to stimulate casino gambling to an unacceptable degree;
(b) there is no substantial demonstrable demand for them;
(c) there would be a substantial risk that in one way or another they would be infiltrated by organised crime elements;
(d) they are likely to be accompanied by an unacceptable level of street crime;
(e) they are not, by comparison with certain other forms of gambling, likely to be efficient producers of revenue for the State of Victoria.

These matters have been brought up in my dealings with this matter which obviously Government members did not even bother to consider. Mr Connor then goes on to state:

I consider that the above considerations outweigh any likely benefits such as increased economic activity, increased State revenue and social enjoyment.

He then said:

I recommend that a single entertainment/convention casino not be established in Victoria for the following reasons:

He goes on to give a brief reason in relation to that matter and continues:

I recommend that resort casinos not be established in Victoria . . .

He then goes on to give further reasons for that. He said also that he had had dealings with previous Governments in Victoria, and he states:

Concerning the introduction of Tattersalls in 1953 by the then Premier, the Hon. John Cain, and concerning the introduction of the Totalisator Agency Board in 1959 by the then Premier, the Hon. Henry Bolte, I think it plain that each Premier sincerely thought he was introducing a very limited new gambling form for a very good reason and with more than adequate safeguards. In the first case, the proposal was to prevent the flow of money out of Victoria and to use that money for hospitals and mental institutions. In the second case, it was to provide an alternative for illegal bookmaking and to assist hospitals. The subsequent history of each facility speaks for itself and one reads of the original debates as though they were once-upon-a-time fairy tales. Yet each of these gambling forms could reasonably lay claim to being a soft form of gambling by comparison with casino games which are the most concentrated undiluted form of gambling.

There we have part of the report and the recommendations of Mr Connor. He goes on to say:

It could be introduced initially in a satisfactory form. It is absolutely the thin end of the wedge argument, and such arguments are not always soundly based.

The honourable gentleman went on further in this matter, but obviously because of the time restriction I cannot comment in detail on the further aspects. However, I draw the attention of members to the areas on which we, as members of the select committee, took confidential evidence from a number of members of the public, particularly members of the Police Force and criminologists in New South Wales. We gathered a vast amount of information but were able to include only a couple of pages in the casino report. Mr Connor went on to say:

I have, together with this report, submitted a brief confidential report. Some of the material in it refers to current police investigations. To refer to it publicly might inhibit these investigations and equally might inhibit the fair trial of persons being investigated. Other material refers to confidential evidence given principally by police officers concerning organised crime.

He goes on to say:

I would have made all the findings I have without hearing the confidential evidence.

There are four volumes of evidence from the inquiry into casinos in Victoria. I do not wish, neither do I have the time, to go through all those volumes, but it is quite obvious that this Government knew of the recommendations in the Victorian report well before the Casino Bill was introduced in this House. That was why the Government shot the Bill through this place before the public of South Australia could read those findings, which substantiate my argument and, indeed, confirm the findings in the Morin Report (which is the greatest report on gambling) and prove beyond any shadow of doubt that there are great problems involved in this area of gambling and that there is organised crime—

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I refer to a matter that is of great concern not only to me but also to many residents living adjacent to the waterway at West Lakes. Members will recall that on 11 May there was a press release by the Minister of Health concerning the polluted waterway at West Lakes and the likelihood that fish or shellfish taken from that water could be injurious to public health.

As a result of that press release I contacted the Press Secretary of the Minister of Fisheries and subsequently distributed approximately 4 000 copies among residents living adjacent to the waterway. The response from those residents indicated their fears as to the past and the future pollution of the waterway. In fact, while I was distributing these leaflets, a document was handed to me purporting to have emanated from the people connected with the West Lakes development project. It had no date but the document was rather revealing. In part, talking about the waterway itself, it states:

Since a static body of water such as the lake could pose a major pollution problem, it was necessary to devise a system to ensure that the lake water would remain clean.

It goes on to talk about the cycle in conjunction with the Port River and how it floods, and states:

. . . water will be flushed through the lake daily in this way, improving the condition of the Port River as well as ensuring that the lake is free of pollution at all times.

That is the operative clause to which I direct my attention—'as well as ensuring that the lake is free of pollution at all times'. As a result of putting out some 4 000 leaflets in that area, I was inundated with various requests from the constituents in the area. It is certainly not a laughing matter: it is a very serious one.

I was asked by the constituents to obtain certain information. First, why were the fish and shellfish allowed to become so contaminated that poison algae posed a serious threat to residents' and their families' health and, indeed, to the health of any other person who caught and ate such fish or shellfish? Secondly, what is the standard required for water quality in the West Lakes waterway? Thirdly, since March 1981 (when I had sent previous correspondence out to them about the quality of the water and pollution) how many tests were carried out to determine the quality of the water in the lake? Further, does the West Lakes Pollution Committee still meet and, if so, who is on the committee and what are their qualifications? If not, when was the West Lakes Pollution Committee disbanded; and, when the committee was meeting, who was on the committee and what were their qualifications?

It concerns me considerably that, try as I may, I could not ascertain some of this information. Therefore, I decided to write to the Woodville council, West Lakes Limited and four Ministers of the Government. I referred to the water quality at West Lakes as described in this document from which I quoted from the West Lakes development project people, as follows:

I have been asked to inquire whether the previous assurances contained in the document enclosed are valid.

That refers to water quality. I then asked:

If they are valid, why the given recent events?

If those assurances are not valid, will the Government enter into urgent discussions with the company developing the area and Government departments to assure the residents that the quality of the water will be maintained as promised in the West Lakes development project document?

What forms/types of stratification occurred during the recent episode, and were some areas of the waterway considered to be stagnant? If so, in which parts of the waterway did this occur?

What warnings, if any, were given to residents north of the causeway that the lake was being flushed and that the fish in the Port River were a health hazard if eaten?

As can be seen from that document, these residents were justifiably concerned about the press release that was put out. As a result of my inquiries, only yesterday I received a document dated 27 May 1983 from the Acting Town Clerk of the Woodville council. It talks about the situation that arose and the fact that the general inspectors of the council carried out patrols of the lake warning any persons found fishing of the potential hazards of eating any fish that were caught. It further states:

At no stage was the lake considered unsatisfactory for swimming or other aquatic sports. The phytoplankton involved was a species of Gonyaulax, a free-floating organism 0.5 ml in diameter. Some species of the organism produced paralysing toxin and deaths have resulted overseas. The bloom of the algae was detected by the Engineering and Water Supply Department during routine monitoring of the lake water. The Department of Fisheries contribute the algal bloom to—

high nutrient level in the water;

calm conditions;

warm day-time temperatures.

Probably a more significant factor, however, was the closure of the lake inlet from Thursday 5 May and the lowering of the water in the lake by the Department of Marine and Harbors for revetment maintenance.

On page 2, the document continues:

At the present time the City Engineer, Mr Peter Shephard, is in the process of reconstituting the Management Committee of West Lakes, as set out in the indenture, for the purpose of determining whether the current monitoring procedures are sufficient or what other monitoring procedures might be adopted for the long-term surveillance and management of water quality in West Lakes.

Quite clearly, someone has failed to do his job.The reconstitution of the Management Committee of West Lakes indicates to me that this process has not been carried out in the past. In fact, only yesterday one of my constituents, when I showed him this document, indicated to me that he believed that there was a cover-up in this area. The first part of the document sent to me by the Acting Town Clerk states:

On 15 December 1982, the City Engineer wrote to the Deputy Director, Engineering, Department of Marine and Harbors, requesting the convening of the West Lakes Pollution Committee.

I, and my constituents, would like to know what in the hell was going on in the area in the previous two years.

Mr Gregory: Nothing.

Mr HAMILTON: The member for Florey is probably correct. I believe that, given the stated facts which I have read out to the House, it could be suggested in very strong terms that people's lives were placed in jeopardy because the monitoring was not carried out in the waterway at West Lakes. I would be very interested to see the response from all those parties to whom I have written in relation to this matter. Unfortunately, time does not permit me to reflect on how I believe the previous Government was negligent.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.55 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 1 June at 11.45 a.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 31 May 1983

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

WINE PROMOTION

62. **The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture—

1. Is the Government proceeding with the previous Liberal Government programme of promoting South Australian wine overseas and, if so, in which countries is this occurring or planned to occur during the balance of the 1982-83 financial year and in 1983-84, respectively, and how much will be spent in each country during those periods?

2. If the programme is not to proceed, when was that decision made and what were the reasons for its termination?

3. How much has the Government spent in South Australian wine promotion within Australia since gaining office and how much will be spent during the balance of this financial year and during 1983-84, respectively?

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. The promotion of South Australian wine will take place in Japan during the balance of the 1982-83 financial year. The future commitments of the Government to overseas wine promotion are currently under review.

2. No decisions on the future programme have yet been made.

3. The Government's contribution to wine promotion in 1982/83 is $36 000. The contribution in 1983/84 has yet to be determined.

CLASS SIZES

92. **Mr MATHWIN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education—Is it a fact that in Government schools teaching years 8 to 10 in the Federal electorate of Kingston, 67 per cent of the classes have more than 25 students and, if so, which schools and, if not, which schools have classes of more than 25 students and what are the classes in each case?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:

Part 1 No.

Part 2:

Morphett Vale High School—69/347, i.e. 19.8 per cent of classes in years 8-10 are greater than 25 in 1983.
Reynella East High School—45/264, i.e. 17 per cent of classes in years 8-10 are greater than 25 in 1983.
Wirreanda High School—183/395, i.e 46 per cent of classes in years 8-10 are greater than 25 in 1983.
Brighton High School—137/316, i.e. 43 per cent of classes in years 8-10 are greater than 25 in 1983.
Mawson High School—18/125, i.e. 14 per cent of classes in years 8-10 are greater than 25 in 1983.
Willunga High School—38/287, i.e. 13 per cent of classes in years 8-10 are greater than 25 in 1983.
Christies Beach High School—244/603, i.e. 40 per cent of classes in years 8-10 are greater than 25 in 1983.
Dover Gardens High School—20/164, i.e 12 per cent of classes in years 8-10 are greater than 25 in 1983.
Seacombe High School—112/266, i.e. 42 per cent of classes in years 8-10 are greater than 25 in 1983.

93. **Mr MATHWIN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education—Is it a fact that 99 per cent of the Government primary schools in the Federal electorate of Kingston have school classes of more than 25 students and, if so, which schools and, if not, which schools have classes of more than 25 students and what are the classes in each case?

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD:

Part 1: No.

Part 2: Primary schools which have greater than 27 students and the number of classes with greater than 27 compared to total number of classes.

Braeview Primary School 14/16 in 1983.
Hallett Cove South Primary School 14/16 in 1983.
Happy Valley Primary School 10/17 in 1983.
Morphett Vale East Primary School 10/17 in 1983.
Morphett Vale South Primary School 4/9 in 1983.
Morphett Vale West Primary School 1/11 in 1983.
Reynella Primary School 7/17 in 1983.
Reynella East Primary School 6/26 in 1983.
Reynella South Primary School 6/14 in 1983.
Stanvac Primary School 6/19 in 1983.
Brighton Primary School 6/13 in 1983.
Paringa Park Primary School 2/14 in 1983.
Warradale Primary School 6/9 in 1983.
Aldinga Primary School 5/13 in 1983.
McLaren Vale Primary School 3/7 in 1983.
Christies Beach Primary School 8/11 in 1983.
Christies Beach East Primary School 5/13 in 1983.
Hackham East Primary School 7/17 in 1983.
Hackham South Primary School 0/8 in 1983.
Hackham West Primary School 8/23 in 1983.
Hallett Cove Primary School 6/16 in 1983.
Lonsdale Heights Primary School 10/15 in 1983.
Moana Primary School 7/10 in 1983.
O'Sullivan Beach Primary School 15/15 in 1983.
Port Noarlunga Primary School 4/12 in 1983.
Seaford Primary School 6/15 in 1983.
Darlington Primary School 6/11 in 1983.
Dover Gardens Primary School 3/13 in 1983.
Flagstaff Hill Primary School 10/20 in 1983.
Seaview Downs Primary School 8/23 in 1983.
Sturt Primary School 3/11 in 1983.

N.B. Figures collected show only classes greater than 27, not 25 as requested.

GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS

94. **Mr MATHWIN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Is it a fact that 66 per cent of the Government infant/junior primary schools in the Federal electorate of Kingston have more than 25 students per class and, if so, which schools and, if not, which schools have classes of more than 25 students and what are the classes in each case?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Information gathered is only classes greater than 27 not 25. Using this figure of 27, the answer is no.

Darlington Junior Primary 1/5 greater than 27 in 1983.
Christies Beach Junior Primary 1/4 greater than 27 in 1983.
Hackham West Junior Primary 1/11 greater than 27 in 1983.
Morphett Vale East Junior Primary 2/6 greater than 27 in 1983.

95. **Mr MATHWIN** (on notice) asked the Minister of education: Is it a fact that in the Federal electorate of Kingston 15 per cent of all primary classes and 17 per cent of all junior secondary classes in Government schools have over 30 students and, if so, which schools and, if not, which schools have classes of more than 30 students, and what are the classes in each case?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The information collected shows only the classes greater than 27 students, and it is not possible to provide any statistics for classes over 30 with the present data available. However, a survey of 5 primary schools in the central southern region revealed that 1 out of 56 classes was in excess of 30 students in February 1983. I do not feel that resources, time and efforts are warranted for further pursuit of the question.

DRIVING INSTRUCTORS

120. **The Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister of transport:

1. and 2. Why has the Minister failed to resolve the issue of rate of pay for driving instructors under the Student Driver Education Scheme?

2. Why will the Minister not meet representatives of the Professional Drivers Instruction Association to resolve this dispute through consultation?

3. How many students have missed out on driver instruction because of this dispute?

4. When will the Minister set a new rate of pay for these instructors and what will be the rate of pay?

5. What is the award rate per hour for school teachers who participate as instructors in this scheme?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:

1. and 2. Agreement has been reached with the Institute of Professional Driving Instructors Inc. to provide part-time driving instructors at an acceptable rate of remuneration.

3. As a consequence of this dispute, two courses of instruction for student drivers have been conducted involving 90 students per course in lieu of the normal 180 students.

4. See 1 above.

5. If teachers are engaged in the Student Driver Education Scheme for out-of-school hours instruction they would be paid the current award rate of $12.25 per hour.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

128. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Which Government department has attached to it motor vehicle registered No. ULA-138?

2. What action has been taken by the Minister on the allegations made to the member for Hanson and referred to the Minister by letter dated 23 February 1983 regarding the use of this motor vehicle and, if no action has been taken, why not?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. The member for Hanson was advised by letter dated 14 February 1983 that it is not the practice of the Government to disclose the ownership of Government vehicles.

2. The honourable member was also advised by letter dated 4 March 1983 that this matter had been referred to the responsible Minister for any action considered necessary if the vehicle was being used for private purposes. In fact, investigation showed this vehicle was being used for appropriate and approved departmental purposes at the time in question.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

155. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: When will approval be given for the extension of electricity supply to Wilpena Pound and Blinman?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The Electricity Trust of South Australia is not aware of any plans to extend electricity supply to Wilpena Pound and Blinman. However, the trust estimates the cost of constructing such extensions from the District Council of Hawker's system would exceed $1 000 000 and the amount of Government subsidy needed to enable tariffs equal to metropolitan rates plus 10 per cent to be charged would be of the order of $200 000 per annum.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

164. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture:

1. How many persons are employed by the Country Fire Service at its headquarters?

2. How many operational vehicles do they have at headquarters?

3. What is the total cost of salaries and wages for the headquarters operation?

4. How much has been spent on headquarters staff uniforms in the past two financial years?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. There are 39 staff positions at C.F.S. headquarters, 36 of which are filled, with three positions currently vacant.

2. Fifteen, including four special purpose carriers.

3. The total cost of salaries and wages paid to the board's permanent staff for the financial year ending 30 June 1982 was $827 193.

4. The cost of uniforms and special protective clothing for the permanent staff of C.F.S. headquarters for the past two financial years is as follows:

		$
1980-81	Uniforms H/Q Field Officers	7 785
	Protective Clothing	3 054
	Total	10 839
1981-82	Uniforms H/Q Field Officers	7 574
	Protective Clothing	4 823
	Total	12 397

In these two years a further $560 was expended by headquarters on prototype uniforms for evaluation by C.F.S. volunteer members.

POLYCLINIC

179. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary representing the Minister of Health: What facilities will be contained in the proposed Polyclinic for the southern metropolitan area and—

(a) what is its construction timing;

(b) where exactly will it be provided; and

(c) what professional and semi-professional staff will be employed?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

The report of the Ministerial Advisory Committee which examined the hospital and health needs of Noarlunga and surrounding areas recommended the establishment of a Health Village at Noarlunga with the following facilities:

- Medical/Drop-in/Crisis services
- Mothers and babies services
- Child, adolescent and youth services

- Women's services
- Family services
- Rehabilitation services
- Consulting services
- Support and facilitating services
- Information, promotion and prevention services
- Outreach services.

The Committee also proposed the subsequent development of a 100 bed hospital by 1990.

(a) The Health Village is planned to be open in mid 1985

(b) Adjacent to the Colonnades

(c) This is still under consideration.

OMBUDSMAN ACT

186. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Does the Government propose to extend the powers of the Ombudsman by repealing section 18 (1) of the Ombudsman Act and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Government is committed to an alteration of section 18 (1) of the Ombudsman's Act and is presently having discussions with the Ombudsman concerning the details of the changes.

BANK ACCOUNT DEBITS TAX

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

1. Will the Premier make representations to the Prime Minister to provide exemption from Bank Account Debits Tax where employees' wages or salaries are lodged in a bank account for convenience of the employer and, if not, why not?

2. Will the Government request the Federal Government to investigate the impact of this new tax, the creating of a 'cash society' and the subsequent security and other tax avoidance opportunities that could result and if not, why not?

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

The following is a suggested reply to Question on Notice No. 187:

1. No. The tax does not apply unless an employee chooses to have wages credited to a cheque account. Cash withdrawals from savings bank or building society accounts are not subject to the new bank account debits tax. Employees will no doubt decide for themselves whether they wish to continue to use cheque accounts or make greater use of cash.

2. Legislation to impose the tax was enacted by the previous Federal Government. The incoming Government decided to proceed with the final stages of implementation of the tax. However, it has advised that detailed review of the operation of the tax will be made in about six months. The Government has expressed opposition to this tax which intrudes into a field of taxation formerly reserved to the States.

OIL AND GAS EXPLORATION

191. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. What is the current oil and gas exploration programme in South Australia and what is the proposed expenditure?

2. How many oil and gas wells have been drilled to date in South Australia, and how many have been declared as 'producers' and at what locations?

3. What are the known reserves of oil and gas in South Australia and what is the expected 'life'?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. Current estimates are that 50 petroleum wells will be drilled and more than 2 800 line kilometres of seismic will be run during 1983. The 50 wells will include 12 exploration wells, 7 appraisal wells and 31 development wells. In 1983 expenditure on exploration drilling and seismic is expected to exceed $28 million in addition to expenditure of $20 million under the Accelerated Gas Programme agreement.

2. The first oil well in Australia was drilled near Alfred Flat in the Murray Basin Coorong region of South Australia in 1892. Since then a number of wells have been drilled as part of the local oil search, but the modern phase of petroleum exploration in this State can be said to have started in 1959 when the deep Innamincka No. 1 wildcat well was drilled in the Cooper Basin. In the ensuing twenty-three years 453 wells have been drilled over a wide area of the State, however most are concentrated in the presently sole productive Cooper Basin area, where there are now 325 completed wells of which 82 are dry holes.

3. The latest Producer listings of Proven and Probable remaining recoverable petroleum reserves in South Australia are:

Natural (Sales) Gas 79 billion cubic metres
Ethane 117 million barrels
L.P.G. 82 million barrels
Condensate 41 million barrels
Crude Oil 51 million barrels

Expected field lives of the so far discovered gas liquids and oil fields vary and depend on their size geological and engineering characteristics. Production from these fields will peak during the period 1983 to 1991 but will continue until beyond the year 2000. Natural (Sales) Gas proven and probable reserves are sufficient to satisfy the PASA gas sales contract to 1987 and the A.G.L. contract until at least 1996. These reserves are in the proven and probable categories and take no account of the undoubted potential for new discoveries, extensions of existing fields and Tight Gas Sands reservoirs. The Accelerated Gas Programme is designed to address the discovery and proving up of new gas in these categories.

SHOOTING CLUBS

195. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What regulations are planned for the control and licensing of shooting clubs in South Australia and when will such legislation be presented to the House?

2. What safety measures and protection exist for primary producers adjacent to the Port Pirie Revolver and Pistol Club and are these safety measures regularly policed and, if not, why not?

3. Could not the Port Pirie Revolver and Pistol Club be relocated to a more suitable site and, if so, what assistance can be offered by the Government?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. There are no plans to introduce legislation for the control and licensing of shooting clubs in South Australia.

2. Police have inspected the Port Pirie Revolver and Pistol Club and are satisfied that the operation of the Club does not present undue risk to persons outside the range area. However, the Club has been advised to introduce several measures to improve the level of safety in the operation of their range. There is no legislative requirement for police to ensure the safety of operation of any pistol club but the police will take appropriate action if made aware of any situation likely to affect the safety of persons in the vicinity of the club.

3. Should the members decide to relocate their club to a new site, the Police Department, in conjunction with the

South Australian Target Pistol League, will provide advice on the establishment of a new site. The Government could not provide financial assistance for such a project.

ADELAIDE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

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

1. How many passengers have arrived and embarked at Adelaide International Airport since commencement of commercial flights?

2. What is the average number of tourists per flight?

3. Has the Government had any inquiries from international air carriers to commence operations from or through Adelaide International Airport and, if so, from who and to which destinations?

4. Have Quantas or British Airways advised the Governement that they intend to increase or decrease their present operations from Adelaide International Airport and, if so, what are their reasons?

5. How much freight has been shipped to and from Adelaide International Airport since commencement of operations and what is the value of such imports and exports?

6. Has a study been made to determine the extent to which South Australia has benefited from the establishment of an international airport and, if so, what were the results?

7. What progress is now being made to promote tourism to South Australia overseas and where and to what extent is such promotion occurring?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. In the six months from November 1982 to April 1983 17 947 passengers disembarked at Adelaide International Airport and 19 014 passengers embarked.

2. 50.

3. Confidential discussions have been held with international carriers from time to time, however, authority to use Adelaide International Airport is with the Federal Government.

4. No.

5. This information is confidential to the carriers at the present time.

6. The Survey of International Visitors currently being conducted on behalf of the Australian Tourist Commission. Interviews are being conducted at Adelaide International Airport throughout 1983. Results for 1983 will be released early in 1984.

7. Considerable progress is being made in the promotion of South Australia overseas. During 1983 South Australia participated in 3 'Asia Travel Missions' conducted by the Australian Tourist Commission. Promotional activity was carried out in New Zealand aimed at both the travel trade and in co-operation with Quantas and A.T.C., a major consumer promotional campaign was mounted. Numerous familiarization visits have been hosted for travel agents, wholesalers and journalists aimed at providing direct experience of the South Australian holiday product for key personnel. It is planned to increase this activity in the coming year.

A general sales agreement has been established with 'Australian Tours and Travel' who specialise in bringing German visitors to Australia and South Australia.

Earlier this year South Australia again mounted a display at the Internationale Tourismus Borse (I.T.B.) in Berlin. Because of the growing experience of the South Australian delegation which comprised representatives of Government and the tourist industry, this year was probably the most successful for South Australia to date. Invaluable contacts were made with European tour wholesalers. Particular emphasis was aimed at the wholesalers from the high income growth markets of Switzerland, Germany and Scandinavia. In March, South Australia participated with A.T.C. in the Singapore International Travel Fair. As well as manning a display, a South Australian representative contacted key travel agents and wholesalers. South Australia has recently appointed a full-time representative with the A.T.C. in New Zealand. This is now showing major gains for the State as South Australian holidays are now presented in many of the major New Zealand outbound tour programmes. South Australia is sending a representative to participate in 'Sea Australia'—the A.T.C.'s major promotional trust in the North American market in 1983. The promotion will involve 6 trade fairs in the United States and Canada and aims to use Australia's aquatic attractions as a major promotional tool. South Australia will feature river and houseboat cruising, yacht charter and special interest tours based on fishing and skin-diving. These, however, will only form a base for creating awareness of the State's many other attractions.

SPEED LIMITS

199. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Does the Government propose to reduce the maximuim speed limit in the metropolitan area and, if so, what limit is proposed?

2. Is the maximum speed limit of 80 km/h on Burbridge Road from Lockleys to a location east of Davis Street, West Beach, considered necessary and safe?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. Means of improving the safety and amenity of residential streets, including encouraging lower vehicle speeds, are currently being investigated.

2. The speed limit is compatible with abutting development and the prevailing roads conditions.

MINERAL EXPLORATION

203. **The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: In relation to Maralinga land which the government intends to transfer to traditional owners, as announced in a statement dated 10 March 1983 by the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs:

1. How many exploration licences covering the land are currently held pursuant to the Mining and Petroleum Act, and in relation to each such licence:

(a) who holds it;

(b) on what date was it issued;

(c) on what date does it expire;

(d) what is the principal commodity being searched for; and

(e) what expenditure is committed?

2. In each of the years 1980 to 1982 how much was spent on mineral and petroleum exploration on the land, how many companies did this involve, and what were the principal commodities being searched for?

3. Did the Minister inform the Australian Mining Industry council and/or the South Australian Chamber of Mines about the Government's intentions in relation to the Maralinga land prior to the announcement?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. Exploration Licences: Only the western portion of EL No. 1076 held by Comalco Aluminium Ltd is situated within the designated Maralinga Lands. This licence was granted on 8 November 1982, expires on 7 November 1983, and causes an expenditure commitment of $75 000. Commodity sought is trona, a carbonate of sodium.

Petroleum Exploration Licences: Similarly only a small portion of PEL 23 granted to Comalco Aluminium Ltd on 27 January last extends into the Maralinga Lands.

2.

Year	Expenditure	ELs	No. of Companies	Commodities
	$			
1980	210 000	5 + part of 1	3	Uranium Oil shale Coal and trona
1981	553 000	15 + part of 2	7	As for 1980
1982	303 000	8 + part of 1	2	Uranium and trona

No moneys were spent on petroleum exploration in the period 1980-82.

3. The South Australian chamber of Mines was informed in relation to the Government's intentions.

MINING OPERATIONS

204. **Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. Since coming to office, has the minister received any applications pursuant to section 20 (3) *(a)* of the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act, 1981, for permission to carry out mining operations on the lands described in that Act and, if so what was the date of receipt of each application and what has been the response of the Minister to each; if not, has the Minister had any discussions with representatives of Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku about its attitude to mining on the lands?

2. Has Hematite Petroleum Proprietary Limited withdrawn its application, first made in 1981, for permission to undertake mining operations on the lands?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. No.

GAS RESERVES

205. **The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. What expenditure has been incurred by South Australian Oil & Gas Corporation so far in establishing gas reserves by the fraccing process?

2. What are the results to date of this work and what additional gas reserves have been established?

3. What further programme is to be undertaken?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. $8 708 000 as at 31.3.83.

2. At this time two wells have been drilled (Big Lake 26 and 27). A massive fracture operation has been carried out in the Patchawarra and Tirrawarra formations in one well (Big Lake 26). The results of these two fracs are as follows:

(a) Tirrawarra Formation

- Pre-Frac Test
  The well flowed at a rate of 2 400 000 cubic feet per day through a 24/64th inch choke at a flowing tubing pressure of 1 310 pounds per square inch.
- Post-Frac Test
  The well flowed at a rate of 5 250 000 cubic feet per day through a 24/64th inch choke at a flowing tubing pressure of 3 259 pounds per square inch.

(b) Patchawarra Formation

- Pre-Frac Test
  The well flowed at a rate of 560 000 cubic feet per day through a 14/64th inch choke at a flowing tubing pressure of 580 pounds per square inch.
- Post-Frac Test
  The well flowed at a rate of 4 170 000 cubic feet per day through a 24/64th inch choke at a flowing tubing pressure of 2 000 pounds per square inch.

The results indicate that the fracture treatment was mechanically successful. However, this does not mean that additional sales gas reserves, that is, reserves of economically producible gas, have been established. In order to establish sales gas reserves, each well will have to undergo extended flow testing to determine its productivity for long term operation. Then, using the information gained from these tests, an evaluation will need to be carried out on the economic viability of massive fraccing for production purposes.

3. Apart from the two well fraccing programme mentioned above, South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation is not planning to fund or conduct on its own account any further fraccing activities at this stage. However, as part of an agreement between Pipelines Authority of South Australia and the Cooper Basin Producers concerning the recent price settlement, the Cooper Basin Producers (including South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation) undertook to carry out a programme of exploration during the next three years costing $55 000 000. A fraccing programme for up to nine wells is included in the programme of work.

SCHOOL TRANSPORT

208. **The Hon. B.C. EASTICK** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Have the committees to review school bus operations yet been appointed and if so, who comprise the committees, what are the terms of reference and will they be seeking public submissions?

2. Has any effort been made or will it be made by the committees to obtain information from Members of Parliament and if so, by what means?

3. When is it intended that the committees will report and will the reports be made public?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

The Committee is in the process of being formed. The terms of reference are:

(a) To examine all policies regarding the transport of school children in South Australia and to make recommendations to the Minister of Education on the current applicability of each of those policies.

(b) To examine all policies regarding the payment of travelling allowances to students and to recommend the current applicability of each of those policies.

(c) To consider the existing conditions for the use of Education Department school buses for excursions and other purposes and to make recommendations regarding those conditions.

(d) In all instances where the Committee recommends a variation to existing policy which is likely to have cost implications (either by way of cost savings or additional costs), an estimate of the full year effect of each variation should be given.

(e) Without limiting the extent of the investigation by the Committee, it should also examine and make recommendations on the feasibility of a system of payment for travel by students who live within the eligible distance criterion from a school or school bus route, but who might be able to use a bus passing their way if seats were available.

(f) That the desirability of having a change to school transport policy to enable eligible students to use

'nearest bus to home or bus to home or bus to school nearest home' be examined.

(g) To consider any other matter incidental to the transport of school children not covered in the above statements, and, if the Committee so determines, make recommendations on those matters also, including costs, if applicable.

2. This will be taken up by the Committee when it first meets. As indicated in a reply given in this House on 19 April 1983, to a question asked by the Member for Torrens, submissions can be forwarded by any person and should be addressed to:

Mr T. J. Brook,
Secretary,
School Transport Review Steering Committee,
C/o Education Centre,
G.P.O. Box 1152,
Adelaide, S.A. 5001

3. It is expected that the committee's report will be available by the end of 1983. It is intended to make the report public.

EDUCATION BUDGET

209. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How much money was allocated in the 1982-1983 budget for minor capital works programmes for primary and high schools, respectively?

2. What is the average grant per primary and high school?

3. What formulae are used to allocate the money?

4. How much money remains in the budget for this financial year?

5. What is the likely funding for 1983-1984?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. $3 300 000 was allocated to schools minor works in 1982-1983. There is no separate allocation made to various types of school.

2. and 3. Minor works funds are allocated to Regions. Schools make requests to Regional Directors of Education who in consultation with Public Buildings Department list the work in priority order. No particular preference is given to high or primary schools. The funds allocated depend on the nature of the work necessary to be carried out to any school. Some expenditure of a minor capital works nature is also funded through revenue maintenance funds (e.g. asphalt of school yards and building works of under $2 000). Requests by schools for building work are submitted through Public Buildings Department District Building Officers. The Public Buildings Department sets priorities having regard to urgency and available resources. Requests for civil maintenance work (i.e. school site works, asphalt etc.) are made through Regional Directors. Statewide priorities are set by Education and Public Buildings Departments in consultation.

4. Funds are fully committed and it appears that expenditure may reach $3 800 000.

5. The 1983-1984 allocation is the subject of the Budget discussion and no figure can be given at this stage until Parliament has finally approved the Budget that will be introduced by the Treasurer in due course.

MOUNT BARKER COURT

212. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Public Works:

1. What plans does the Government have to construct a new facility or upgrade the present facilities to cater for the move of the responsibility of the court from Stirling to Mount Barker?

2. When is it intended that this work will be commenced and completed at Mount Barker?

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

1. The upgrading of the Mount Barker Courthouse will comprise extensions to the existing structure and the upgrading of existing facilities, including the provision of air-conditioning and holding cells.

2. Construction is programmed for commencement in June 1983 and completion by December 1983.

POLICE ROAD ACCIDENTS

218. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many road traffic accidents involving police vehicles have occurred over the past nine months?

2. How many deaths and injuries of policemen have resulted?

3. How many of the said accidents involved police vehicles with 8-cylinder motors and power steering?

4. How many of the police drivers involved have been given special training to handle cars with power steering?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. Accidents—172.

2. Deaths—Nil. Injuries—24.

3. Accidents—89.

4. With the introduction of power steering and eight-cylinder engines in 1980, all patrol personnel were given lectures in driving theory using a video-film developed with the assistance of G.M.H. No practical training programme was implemented.

BUSHFIRE APPEALS

223. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. With respect to the various bushfire relief appeals—

(a) how much money has been received to date from each source; and

(b) what is the number of recipients and total amount disbursed to—

(i) persons suffering total house destruction; and

(ii) others?

2. How much assistance has each bushfire area (general locality) received from these sources?

3. How much money remains and how will it be distributed?

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

1. *(a)* At 4 May 1983 the total was $8 628 077

Premier's Appeal $5 232 092
Lord Mayor's Appeal $2 150 000
NWS Channel 9 Appeal $1 064 570
Interest to 30.4.83 $181 415

(b) (i) 252—total amount approx. $770 000.

(ii) 848—total amount approx. $1 070 000.

2. Summary details of payments to each locality are not being kept; this information could be obtained from records at a later date. All payments are being made based on the needs of individuals and not related to their locality.

3. Approx. $6 750 000 of the money received to date remains for distribution and it is expected that it will be distributed by grants: approx. $400 000 for grief payments to dependants of persons who died in the fires; $800 000 as pain and suffering grants to persons who were hospitalised and who suffered disabilities as a result of the fires; and the remaining funds as grants for property losses.

EDUCATION CENTRE

224. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many people are employed at the Education Centre in Flinders Street with respect to syllabus and subject development for primary, secondary and tertiary courses (TAFE)?

2. What are the specific areas of syllabus/subject development and what are the tertiary qualifications of each person employed?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

Question 1

As regards the Education Department, this is a difficult question to interpret, for all principal education officers appointed to the Curriculum Directorate have as a part only of their duties the supervision/monitoring of syllabus and subject development. There are 13 principal education officers.

In an area of study in which a principal education officer position does not exist, a seconded teacher is appointed for a short term, two years in the first instance. There are seven current appointments.

With regards to the Department of TAFE, the following numbers of people are employed in the Curriculum Development Branch, head office:

Public Servants: 1 Superintendent, 3 PEO's 3 EO's—Total = 7

College staff:

Long-term secondments: (Two years) (Three full-time equivalent)

Short term secondments: 22 (15 full-time equivalent)

At colleges on departmental projects: 35 (15 full-time equivalent).

Question 2

With regard to primary and secondary education the areas of supervision and qualifications of those responsible for the developments are as follows:

R-12

1. a. Aboriginal Schools b. Aboriginal Studies	Dip.T.
2. Art, Craft and Design	B.A.,Dip.Fine Art, Dip.T.
3. Computing	B.Sc.,Dip.Ed.,Dip.T.
4. Consumer Education	Grad.Dip.T.,Grad.Dip. Ed.Adm.
5. Dance	B.A.,Grad.Dip.T.
6. Drama	B.A.,Grad.Dip.T.
7. Media Studies	B.A.,Dip.Fine Arts, Dip.T.
8. Health Education	S.T.D.,M.A.,M.Div., Dip. Ed.,B.A.
9. Languages other than English	B.A.,M.A.,Ph.D.
10. Mathematics	B.Sc.,Dip.Ed.,Dip.T.
11. Music	B.Mus.,Dip.Ed.
12. Physical Education	B.A.,B.Ed.,Dip.Phys.Ed.
13. Religious Education	S.T.D.,M.A.,M.Div., Dip.Ed.
14. Road Safety and Driver Education	B.A.,Dip.Ed.(Prim.), Dip.T.(Prim.)

R-7

15. Early Childhood	B.A., Dip. Ed., Dip.T. Dip. Child Dev.
16. English Language	Ph.D.,E.D.M.,B.A. (Hons.), Dip.T.
17. Science	B.A.,Dip.T.(Sec.)
18. Social Studies	B.A.,Dip.Ed.(Sec),Dip. T.(Prim.)

8-12

19. Agricultural Studies	B.Ag.Sc.
20. Ancient Studies	M.A.
21. Business Education	Dip.T.,Grad.Dip.Ed. Admin.
22. Economics	B.A.(Hons.)
23. English	Ph.D.,E.D.M.,B.A. (Hons.),Dip.T.
24. Geography	B.A.(Hons.)Dip.Ed.
25. History	M.A.
26. Home Economics	Cert.Ed.,B.Ed.(Hons.), Dip.Curr.Dev.
27. Legal Studies	LLB.,Dip.T.
28. Natural Resources Management	B.A.(Hons.),Dip.Ed.
29. Science	B.Sc.,Dip.T.
30. Social Studies	S.T.D.,M.A.M.Div., Dip.Ed.,B.A.
31. Technical Studies	Dip.T.

In addition to the above, teachers are seconded to work on particular syllabus/subject developments. Teaching experience in the area of development is an essential qualification.

Appointments to these areas, some of which are major development projects and some minor, follow. All of these are appointments for one or two years in the first instance, and only five work in the Education Centre.

Business Education
1.0 Dip.T. (Sec)
Curriculum services
1.0 Dip.T., B.A.
Early Childhood
1.0 Dip.T., B. Ed.
1.0 Dip.T., B. Ed.
Home Economics
0.5 Dip T., Grad. Dip. T.

With regard to the Department of TAFE the course under development and qualifications of those involved with course development full time are as follows:

Paramedical
Art and Design
Clothing and Textiles
Building
Hospitality
Business Studies
Health and Care
Mechanical Engineering
Engineering Electrical/Electronics
Engineering Transport
Rural
Access
Mining, and Civil Engine
Other

Computing access courses
Transition education projects

The qualifications of permanent staff (public servants) are:

Superintendent M.Ed., B.Sc., Dip.Comp.Sc., Dip.Ed., Dip.T. MACE
Principal Education Officer 1 B.A., Dip.Ed., B.Ed., Litt.B., MACE
Principal Education Officer 2 B.Tech., Dip.Ed., Dip.T.
Principal Education Officer 3 B.Ec., M.Admin., AAMI, AAIM
Education Officer 1 B.Sc., Dip.Ed., M.Sc.
Education Officer 2 B.Ed., Dip.Cont.Ed.
Education Officer 3 B.Ec., Dip.Ed.

The qualifications of college staff seconded to the Curriculum Development Branch are in general diploma of teaching (TAFE) and relevant tertiary technical qualifications. Many staff hold degrees in education and in vocational studies.

HOUSING PRIORITY

226. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing: What are the criteria, in their order of priority, for any South Australian Housing Trust applicant to obtain priority listing?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The major factors contributing to households' needs for priority housing assistance from the trust are:

- medical problems—physical and mental—which are caused or worsened by the housing situation, which contribute to difficulty in obtaining private sector housing or which require urgent housing close to a particular medical facility;
- social and related problems where family and other relationships are severely affected by the housing situation, where it is apparent that trust housing would be a major factor in overcoming difficulties and where the household would face exceptional difficulty in obtaining private housing;
- financial problems resulting in genuine and extreme hardship through low income and exceptional commitments;
- extremely unsatisfactory accommodation which is unsuitable to the needs of the household, of an exceptionally poor standard or overcrowded; and
- physical eviction where the household is forced to vacate and could not reasonably be expected to obtain suitable alternative housing.

It is the trust's experience that the majority of households requiring priority assistance experience a combination of several or all of these difficulties and assessments are made on the basis of careful review of all of the circumstances of the individual household without assigning any priorities to the various factors which contribute to the household's need for urgent public housing.

NATURAL DISASTERS

227. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. With respect to the $81 000 000 estimated cost to the State of the natural disasters occurring during 1982-1983—
   (a) how much has been expended to date on each programme and what is the breakdown of disbursement to—
      (i) individuals;
      (ii) private firms and organisations; and
      (iii) Government departments and instrumentalities; and
   (b) what is the estimated disbursement in these categories for the rest of 1982-1983?
2. What further liabilities will have to be met during 1983-1984?

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

1. See attached table.

Present indications are that the estimate of $81 000 000 may be high and that the gross cost to the Budget may be somewhat less. However, claims are still being received and the Government would prefer to wait before attempting to revise its formal estimate of the gross cost.

2. It also seems highly probable that there will be some carryover into 1983-1984. Once again, the Government would prefer to wait before attempting a formal estimate of this carryover.

NATURAL DISASTER COSTS 1982-83

	To 30 April			To 30 June
	Individuals $m	Firms $m	Government $m	$m
Drought				
Loans to primary producers	15.3	—	—	36.0
Transport concessions, etc.	1.4	—	—	1.5
Loans to small businesses	—	0.8	—	2.1
Frost				
Loans to primary producers	1.2	—	—	1.3
Bushfire				
Loans to primary producers	0.6	—	—	20.0
Fencing	0.4	—	—	2.5
Transport concessions, etc.	0.1	—	—	1.1
Loans for housing	—	—	—	4.0
Restoration of public assets	—	—	0.3	5.2
Loans to small businesses	—	—	—	0.8
Personal hardship	0.2	—	—	1.6
Loans for community facilities	—	—	—	0.4
Flood				
Loans to primary producers	—	—	—	0.8
Loans to small businesses	—	—	—	0.4
Restoration of public assets	—	—	0.7	2.4
Personal hardship	—	—	—	0.4
	19.2	0.8	1.0	80.5

SALISBURY C.A.E. REPORT

228. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What was the reason for the delay in Parliament receiving the Salisbury College of Advanced Education Report for the year 1981, which was laid on the table on Tuesday, 3 May 1983?

2. When was the report handed to the Minister or his department?

3. How many copies were printed and what was the cost?

4. What steps will be taken to ensure Parliament receives a copy of such reports within five months of the end of the financial year and, if none, why not?

5. What reports of other colleges of advanced education are outstanding?

6. When will the report of Salisbury and other colleges of advanced education for the year ended 31 December 1982 be tabled in Parliament?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. The Salisbury C.A.E. Annual Report for 1981 was printed by the Government Printer. Submission of the report to the Minister was delayed because of the necessity to rebind copies of the report.

2. 6 April 1983.

3. The number of copies printed was 350. The cost was $1 800. It is understood that the cost of the rebinding is included in this figure.

4. Section 23 (1) of the S.A.C.A.E. Act requires that the report of the S.A.C.A.E. be presented to the Governor by 30 June of the calender year following. This is considered an appropriate time constraint.

5. The four colleges constituting the South Australian College of Advanced Education have all submitted annual reports for 1981.

6. Salisbury C.A.E. and other constituent colleges of the South Australian College of Advanced Education ceased to exist at the end of 1981 and therefore will not produce annual reports for 1982. The 1982 Annual Report of the South Australian College of Advanced Education is being typeset and is expected to be available before the end of June 1983.

HEALTH COMMISSION

230. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: With respect to the provision in the Supplementary Estimates for an additional $17 000 000 for the Health Commission:

(a) what is the estimated cost of bad debts to the commission for 1982-83 by individual hospital and what was the total cost of bad debts in 1980-81 and 1981-82, respectively; and

(b) what is the estimated average bed utilisation for 1982-83 in each hospital under the control of the Health Commission and what were the comparative figures for 1980-81 and 1981-82?

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

(a) A schedule setting out actual bad debts in individual hospitals for the years 1980-81, 81-82 and 82-83 is attached. It is not appropriate to make an estimate of the total bad debts likely in 1982-83 as the timing of write-offs of bad debts is related to individual factors in respect of individual debts. In considering this schedule, it should be borne in mind that bad debts are only written off after all avenues of collection have been exhausted. The bad debts written off in each year are therefore made up of accounts raised in previous years.

(b) A schedule setting out average bed utilisation in South Australia recognised hospitals for the period 1.7.80—31.3.83 is attached.

In S.A. Recognised Hospitals, 1 July 1980—31 March 83

Bad Debts—Western Sector

	* 1982-83 $	1981-82 $	1980-81 $
Andamooka	Nil	Nil	Nil
Cook (Bishop Kirkby)	498	365	1 920
Wudinna (C.E.P.)	1 283	1 825	194
Cleve	Nil	Nil	7 320
Coober Pedy	106	4 335	278
Cowell	9 269	148	3 731
Cummins	Nil	20	3 655
Elliston	384	Nil	180
Hawker (Great Northern)	Nil	1 225	9 900
Kingscote K.I.	14	Nil	Nil
Kimba	340	170	3 210
Leigh Creek	827	360	1 100
Maitland	1 406	2 701	1 325
Marree	492	1 417	792
Minlaton	Nil	Nil	172
Ceduna (Murat Bay)	2 081	Nil	960
Oodnadatta	Nil	Nil	Nil
Port Augusta	7 210	18 064	Nil
Port Broughton	Nil	4 185	Nil
Port Lincoln	Nil	Nil	3 700
Quorn	4 856	610	2 222
The Q.E.H.	156 414	124 369	194 116
Yorketown (S.Y.P.)	515	538	Nil
Streaky Bay	77	Nil	345
St. Margaret's	1 200	Nil	12 920
Tarcoola	635	Nil	Nil
Tumby Bay	Nil	Nil	10 158
Wallaroo	2 087	20	1 760
Whyalla	29 196	10 618	150 489
	218 890	170 971	410 447

* For period 1.7.82-31.3.83

Bad Debts—Southern Sector

	* 1982-83 $	1981-82 $	1980-81 $
Barmera	14 785	45 035	2 510
Berri	2 466	9 800	11 346
Bordertown	Nil	1 245	185
Flinders Medical Centre	198 940	106 501	88 344
Kalyra	Nil	3 750	12 552
Karoonda	1 053	361	936
Kingston S.E.	Nil	70	670
Lameroo	Nil	Nil	2 258
Tailem Bend (Lower Murray)	1 425	970	2 648
Loxton	2 653	515	698
Mannum	3 886	5 180	4 626
Meningie	Nil	135	5
Millicent	3 597	Nil	Nil
Mount Barker	Nil	1 366	431
Mount Gambier	9 882	3 272	81 178
Murray Bridge	830	114	386
Naracoorte	3 870	2 345	150
Onkaparinga	Nil	Nil	455
Penola	1 687	80	105
Pinnaroo	Nil	3 425	3 699
Renmark	5 896	64	836
McLaren Vale (S.D.)	9 334	2 610	460
Victor Harbor (S.C.)	Nil	Nil	Nil

	* 1982-83 $	1981-82 $	1980-81 $
Strathalbyn	915	3 110	N.A.
Torrens House	Nil	26 375	N.A.
Waikerie	Nil	5 666	7 214
	261 019	221 989	221 692

* For period 1.7.82-31.3.83

Bad Debts—Central Sector

	* 1982-83 $	1981-82 $	1980-81 $
Angaston	316	Nil	1 053
A.C.H.	18 484	45 761	67 755
Balaklava	Nil	405	4 326
Blyth	784	6 973	1 150
Booleroo	28 Cr.	Nil	4 753
Burra Burra	2 325	1 321	1 405
Clare	5 876	Nil	Nil
Crystal Brook	894	5 337	4 096
Eudunda	6 205	Nil	2 642
Gumeracha	875	Nil	275
Gawler	960	7 769	14 052
Jamestown	Nil	527	1 040
Kapunda	Nil	290	1 661
Laura	590	250	90
Lyell McEwin	216 256	68 553	101 749
Modbury	33 880	8 415	20 801
Mount Pleasant	453	380	3 594
Orroroo	20	825	1 336
Peterborough	2 658	1 495	2 935
Port Pirie	Nil	37 758	21 040
Q.V.H.	213 840	4 799	24 821
Riverton	288	348	705
R.A.H.	130 432	52 205	49 999
Snowtown	389	Nil	Nil
Tanunda	532	15	2 224
	636 029	243 426	333 502
Total for S.A.H.C.	1 115 938	636 386	965 641

* For period 1.7.82-31.3.83

S.A. Recognised Hospitals, 1 July, 80—31 March, 83
Total Average Bed Occupancy: % of Available Beds Occupied

	1982/83 Average	%	1981/82 Average	%	1980/81 Average	%
Royal Adelaide	852.4	85.0	868.0	83.5	891.7	90.8
The Queen Elizabeth	506.6	72.5	514.9	73.3	520.5	74.8
Flinders Medical Centre	420.7	85.2	423.3	85.7	402.8	81.5
Adelaide Children's	181.9	76.6	187.3	68.4	184.8	67.4
Queen Victoria	148.5	87.4	141.8	77.9	142.7	82.0
Modbury	175.4	76.9	170.0	74.6	163.8	71.8
Lyell McEwin	132.8	73.0	139.2	75.7	143.2	77.8
Hutchinson	63.8	68.6	67.3	72.4	73.2	77.0
Southern Districts	26.0	57.9	28.2	62.7	27.8	61.8
Kalyra	57.4	95.7	59.1	90.9	57.3	95.5
St. Anthony's	23.5	74.7	19.5	60.9	22.0	68.8
Torrens House	8.7	43.7	11.4	57.0	17.7	88.5
St. Margaret's	42.5	89.1	46.04	95.9	47.4	98.8
Andamooka	0.1	1.9	0.01	0.3	0.1	2.0
Angaston	29.4	56.5	33.5	64.4	35.2	67.7
Balaklava	19.3	64.4	27.9	69.8	33.6	82.0
Barmera	30.7	76.7	31.1	77.8	28.0	70.0
Berri	22.6	70.6	20.6	57.2	20.1	55.8
Bishop Kirkby	0.0	0.0	0.002	0.03	0.1	1.4
Blyth	12.9	64.6	13.5	67.5	0.2	51.0
Booleroo	13.0	42.0	19.5	62.9	23.4	75.6
Bodertown	33.7	61.3	37.5	68.2	36.7	66.7
Burra Burra	30.3	75.7	31.2	78.0	26.6	66.5
Central Eyre Peninsula	7.1	29.3	6.61	28.74	5.8	25.2
Clare	35.3	68.4	45.7	71.4	44.5	69.5
Cleve	6.1	29.0	8.76	31.29	9.4	33.6
Coober Pedy	5.4	30.3	4.8	32.0	6.2	41.3
Cowell	13.1	65.3	13.37	66.85	11.8	59.0
Crystal Brook	18.6	62.1	19.7	499.3	21.4	53.5
Cummins	8.5	25.7	9.29	28.15	11.4	34.6
Elliston	2.7	22.9	4.65	38.75	5.6	46.7
Eudunda	13.3	53.2	14.2	56.8	15.4	61.6
Great Northern	12.4	68.9	14.95	83.06	13.7	76.1
Gumeracha	20.0	66.8	20.4	68.0	20.7	69.0
Jamestown	18.7	62.5	18.7	62.3	17.9	59.7
Kangaroo Island	16.3	54.5	19.01	63.37	19.8	66.0

S.A. Recognised Hospitals, 1 July, 80—31 March, 83
Total Average Bed Occupancy: % of Available Beds Occupied

	1982/83		1981/82		1980/81	
	Average	%	Average	%	Average	%
Kapunda	16.5	71.7	16.7	69.6	14.3	59.6
Karoonda	5.9	32.7	6.4	35.6	8.8	48.9
Kimba	9.4	39.6	11.8	47.2	11.6	46.4
Kingston	18.1	74.3	15.5	50.0	17.1	55.2
Lameroo	11.6	61.1	15.3	80.5	16.8	88.4
Laura	14.2	74.6	15.0	68.2	14.1	56.3
Leigh Creek	3.0	19.8	3.1	20.7	3.0	20.0
Lower Murray	22.2	65.3	19.1	56.2	18.4	54.1
Loxton	20.0	52.6	17.1	40.7	20.9	49.8
Maitland	19.7	59.8	25.51	77.3	25.9	78.5
Mannum	19.1	87.0	19.2	60.0	18.5	57.8
Marree	0.0	0.0	0.1	3.3	0.1	3.3
Meningie	17.2	57.2	19.5	65.0	20.1	67.0
Millicent	41.7	64.2	37.9	58.3	39.2	58.5
Minlaton	22.1	51.4	23.39	54.4	28.3	65.8
Mount Barker	34.2	68.4	32.9	65.8	30.2	60.4
Mount Gambier	100.3	66.3	117.6	60.9	130.7	61.4
Mount Pleasant	21.3	64.6	22.5	68.2	23.3	70.6
Murat Bay	22.8	65.0	17.42	49.77	20.6	58.9
Murray Bridge	49.8	62.2	53.0	66.3	55.5	69.4
Naracoorte	47.8	61.3	45.7	58.6	59.0	75.6
Onkaparinga	20.1	59.2	19.8	61.9	18.3	57.2
Oodnadatta	0.1	2.5	0.09	2.25	0.91	2.0
Orroroo	11.9	59.3	12.2	61.0	12.7	48.8
Penola	16.9	64.8	18.8	72.3	18.5	71.2
Peterborough	28.6	56.0	27.1	53.1	27.8	54.5
Pinnaroo	23.3	62.9	22.9	61.9	24.4	65.9
Port Augusta	105.1	82.1	102.16	79.81	100.8	78.8
Port Broughton	15.0	80.4	15.85	72.05	17.2	78.2
Port Lincoln	48.8	71.2	50.85	71.62	50.6	73.3
Port Pirie	103.4	69.0	105.9	70.6	103.1	72.0
Quorn	14.5	60.6	12.28	51.17	12.9	75.8
Renmark	24.6	58.7	27.0	64.3	26.2	55.7
Riverton	24.0	68.6	20.9	59.7	23.6	67.4
Snowtown	12.1	57.5	13.3	63.3	11.8	56.2
South Coast District	41.2	55.0	36.5	48.7	47.0	62.7
Southern Yorke Peninsula	21.9	66.4	23.45	71.06	26.4	80.0
Strathalbyn	24.5	64.4	24.8	65.3	24.7	65.0
Streaky Bay	8.2	43.1	9.77	51.42	11.1	50.5
Tanunda	13.6	59.3	15.2	66.1	13.8	60.0
Tarcoola	0.1	2.5	0.05	1.25	0.1	2.5
Tumby Bay	21.9	62.7	24.38	69.66	23.0	65.7
Waikerie	43.4	78.9	42.8	77.8	42.7	77.6
Wallaroo	41.0	58.7	45.86	55.25	47.0	56.6
Whyalla	158.8	78.8	154.83	67.32	161.5	65.8
	4 360.1	72.1	4 452.482	71.1	4 534.2	72.7

HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT DWELLINGS

231. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many dwellings by suburb are owned by the Highways Department in the Adelaide metropolitan area?

2. How many are owned outside the Adelaide metropolitan area?

3. How many of these dwellings are currently vacant (by suburb in the Adelaide metropolitan area and by town/locality in the non-metropolitan area)?

4. How many have been unoccupied for more than two months?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

Dwellings Owned by the Highways Department
as at 23.5.83
A. Adelaide Metropolitan Area

Suburb	Dwellings	No. Vacant	No. Vacant 2 Months
Albert Park	22 houses		
Alberton	1 house		
Ascot Park	3 houses		
Athelstone	2 houses		
Balhannah	1 house		
Belair	1 house		
Beverley	25 houses	1	

Dwellings Owned by the Highways Department as at 23.5.83

A. Adelaide Metropolitan Area

Suburb	Dwellings	No. Vacant	No. Vacant 2 Months
Blackwood	1 house		
Bowden	12 houses	2	2
Brompton	36 houses	1	1
Campbelltown	4 houses		
Cheltenham	1 house		
Clarence Gardens	2 houses		
Clovelly Park	34 houses		
	4 flats		
Coromandel Valley	2 houses		
Croydon	5 houses		
Croydon Park	2 houses		
Darlington	58 houses	3	1
Dernancourt	2 houses		
Devon Park	6 houses	1	
Dry Creek	1 house		
Dudley Park	13 houses	1	1
Edwardstown	78 houses		
	2 flats		
Flinders Park	7 houses		
Frewville	2 flats		
Gilberton	7 houses	1	
	4 flats		
Glandore	39 houses	2	1
	2 flats	1	
Glenelg North	15 houses	3	
Grange	4 houses		
	2 flats	1	1
Hackam	2 houses		
Henley Beach	4 flats		
Highbury	1 house	1	1
Hillbank	1 house		
Hindmarsh	2 houses	1	1
Holden Hill	12 houses	2	1
Hope Valley	1 house		
Kensington	2 houses		
Kent Town	4 flats	2	2
Kilkenny	3 houses	1	1
Kurralta Park	21 houses	1	
Mile End	73 houses	1	1
	9 flats	3	3
Mile End South	15 houses		
Mitcham	3 houses		
Mitchell Park	19 houses		
Modbury	6 houses	1	
Newton	1 house		
North Plympton	1 house		
Norwood	2 houses		
	2 flats	1	
Oaklands Park	4 houses	1	
	3 flats		
Ovingham	15 houses		
	9 flats		
Panorama	4 houses	2	2
Para Hills	1 house		
Paradise	2 houses	1	1
Paralowie	1 house		
Payneham	1 house		
Plympton	1 house		
Pooraka	1 house		
Prospect	2 houses		
Renown Park	25 houses	2	
Reynella	2 houses		
Richmond	2 houses		
Ridgehaven	1 house		
Rosewater	2 houses		
Salisbury	5 houses		
Salisbury Downs	1 house		
Salisbury Heights	6 houses		
Salisbury North	2 houses		
Seaton	1 house		
	4 flats		
South Plympton	1 house		
St Peters	5 houses		
Sturt	13 houses		
Thebarton	21 houses	1	
	3 flats		
Torrens Park	2 houses		
Underdale	8 houses		
Unley Park	1 house		
Upper Sturt	2 houses		
Walkerville	1 house		
Warradale	8 houses	2	2
Windsor Gardens	1 house		
Woodville North	1 house	1	
Woodville Park	14 houses		
Houses	706	33	16
Flats	54	8	6
Total	760	41	22

B. Non-Metropolitan Area

Town	Dwellings	No. Vacant	No. Vacant 2 Months
Blanchetown	2 houses	1	1
Bordertown	1 house	1	1
Burra	1 house	1	
Ceduna	4 houses	2	2
Clare	1 house		
Coober Pedy	1 house		
Coonalpyn	1 house	1	1
Coorabie	1 house	1	1
Cowell	1 house		
Crafers	1 house		
Crystal Brook	11 houses	1	1
Elliston	1 house		
Hawker	1 house		
Jamestown	1 house	1	1
Karoonda	1 house		
Keith	1 house	1	1
Kimba	2 houses	2	1
Kingoonya	1 house	1	1
Kingston, S.E.	1 house	1	1
Lameroo	1 house		
Leigh Creek South	1 house		
Littlehampton	1 house		
Lock	1 house		
Loxton	2 houses		
Lucindale	1 house		
Maitland	1 house		
Meningie	1 house		
Millicent	1 house		

Town	Dwellings	No. Vacant	No. Vacant 2 Months
Minlaton	1 house		
Morgan	1 house		
Mount Gambier	7 houses	2	2
Murray Bridge	11 houses		
Naracoorte	16 houses	4	2
Nuriootpa	1 house		
Penola	2 houses	1	
Port Augusta	34 houses	3	3
	4 flats		
Port Lincoln	15 houses	2	1
Strathalbyn	1 house		
Victor Harbor	1 house		
Whyalla	3 houses	1	1
Wudinna	1 house		
Yunta	1 house		
Houses	139	27	21
Flats	4		
Total	143	27	21