HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 18 August 1983

The SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: MARIHUANA

A petition signed by 18 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any legislation which will legalise or decriminalise the use of marihuana was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITION: KANGAROO PRODUCTS

A petition signed by 95 residents of South Australia praying that the House support moves to ban the export of kangaroo products was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

CUMMINS AREA SCHOOL

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence on Cummins Area School (Library/Resource Centre relocation and fire damage restoration).

Ordered that reported be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: URANIUM MINING

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Today the Honeymoon joint venturers were advised that their request for compensation has been refused. The reason for that decision is absolutely clear. The Mining Act confers on me as Minister a discretion to grant or refuse a mining lease, and that discretion is not fettered by the fact that the applicant may hold existing tenements. There is, therefore, no legal obligation to compensate.

The joint venturers' decision to proceed to a pilot operation is evidence of their recognition of the commercial risks associated with the project. These risks derive from a number of sources including technical feasibility, economic viability, market potential, environmental acceptability, ability to meet operating safety standards, and changes in Government policy, whether State or Commonwealth. Any costs associated with such commercial risks should be borne by the proponents, not the State.

Cabinet also took a decision to refuse an application for a retention lease to the joint venturers at Beverley that incorporated a request for conditions which would permit the construction and operation of a semi-permanent, skid-mounted pilot plant. The Government can see no justification for permitting activities under a retention lease that it would not permit under a mining lease. However, the Government is still prepared to recognise South Australian Uranium Corporation's interest in the deposit through a retention lease subject to appropriate conditions.

The Government has now formulated clear guidelines for both retention leases and exploration licences that will be applied to all companies engaged specifically in exploration for uranium. Retention leases over any uranium deposit will be available for the maximum permissible term of five years. There will be a right of renewal, but it will not be unconditional. There will be no requirements for further development work. Exploration, including additional drilling to define an ore body, will be acceptable. Pilot operations or push-pull tests are prohibited. Other work will be considered on application. There will be only minimal reporting requirements where projects have been placed on a care and maintenance basis.

Since the Honeymoon decision in March, several companies have requested release from or reduction in work commitments over their licence areas. While it is quite reasonable that these companies would want to maintain their interest in the more prospective areas that they have identified, particularly where they have found mineralised intersections that are not ore grade, it is not in South Australia's interest for a large area of the State's prospective mineral lands to be tied up indefinitely without work commitments because, while these areas may be prospective for uranium, they are also prospective for other minerals.

While it is quite reasonable that these companies would want to maintain their interest in the more prospective areas that they have identified, particularly where they have found mineralised intersections that are not ore grade, it is not in South Australia's interest for a large area of the State's prospective mineral lands to be tied up indefinitely without work commitments because, while these areas may be prospective for uranium, they are also prospective for other minerals.

Under the guidelines, explorers who have applied for a reduction or release from work commitments will be given until 31 December 1983 to evaluate their leases to determine which prospective areas they wish to retain. Explorers who apply in the future will be given three months or until 31 December 1983, whichever is the longer, to make this evaluation. The Government will then negotiate realistic commitments for the reduced area on a case-by-case basis. Any application for the renewal of an exploration licence where the primary target is uranium will be treated exactly the same as an exploration licence where the primary target is any other mineral.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Before calling on questions, I point out that questions normally directed to the honourable Premier should be, in his absence today, directed to the honourable Deputy Premier.

ASIO

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Deputy Premier say whether his Government has made a submission to the Hope Royal Commission and, if it has, does that submission call for the abolition of the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation, as advocated in this House yesterday by the member for Elizabeth? If a submission has not yet been made, when will the Government make one, as it is required to do by a decision of this year's Australian Labor Party State Convention, and will that submission call for the abolition of ASIO?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The Government has not made a submission, but one is being prepared at present. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition will have to wait for that evidence to be given to the royal commission to know what is in the submission.

SCHOOL FIRES

Mr KLUNDER: In view of the large number of school fires during the past few months, will the Minister of Education say what security measures he intends to introduce to solve this problem?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I find that comment from the Opposition particularly unfortunate, as I would have thought this problem was one of such great magnitude and seriousness that all members would have appreciated hearing any information on it. The Government is concerned, as I hope all members are, about the situation. A short time ago I was reported in the press as having asked for an urgent investigation of the options available to us to solve the problem.

A report has been prepared and several options may be considered. One is the high frequency silent security alarm. Another option, rejected by the report, concerned the appointment of on-site caretakers, but that suggestion was rejected because in other States it has not worked, and the services of on-site caretakers have been dispensed with. Another possibility was the appointment of nightwatchmen on school sites, and yet another concerned the placing of caravans on school sites so that they may be occupied by people who would not take protective action but inform the police of any suspicious circumstances they might note.

As a result of the report, I asked that the suggestion of nightwatchmen be considered further. Secondly, we would have to clear up some implications in respect of the caravan proposition before moving in that direction. Thirdly, as to the silent security alarm system, I said that we should prepare immediately a draft Cabinet decision for the Government to consider. That has been done, and I hope that Cabinet will be able to consider the matter next Monday.

Although silent security alarms are successful in terms of the apprehension of people on school sites for purposes of vandalism or causing school fires, they are not without their problems. First, they record the breaking into buildings rather than any damage or arson committed outside the buildings, so they do not necessarily result in a high apprehension rate in those instances.

However, they do prove themselves to be more successful than some of the other methods that might be available. Some schools in South Australia presently have installed these systems and we have partly based our evidence on that, and also upon the evidence of experience in other States. Of course, it will not be possible to install such systems in every school in South Australia but the proposal is that they be installed in a number of unnamed high-risk schools, in other words, schools that by various means of risk management assessment are deemed to have a potential for arson or vandalism. I hope that that matter will be resolved next Monday.

But, may I say that no solution that we are able to come up with will eliminate the risk of fires in South Australian schools because no system will be absolutely foolproof. However, we have a major obligation to reduce the serious impact to the State on the losses that are being sustained. In the last financial year the loss in terms of buildings and contents was in excess of $4 000 000; the previous year it was in excess of $1 000 000. In addition to that, there is another very important loss that is sustained that is not easily quantifiable and that is the loss to the students and teachers concerned in each school.

I had the opportunity to visit one school the day after a serious fire hit one of the classroom blocks and that highlighted some of these points. Students in one class had been asked to take part in a project the week before bringing in information that related to themselves and what they had achieved in their lives. They were doing a sort of personal biography, more or less. Many of the students had brought in their sports trophies, personal mementos and artifacts that meant a great deal in sentimental terms to them. The tragedy was that all of them had virtually been melted down and destroyed as a result of the fire. One cannot quantify the cost to individual students.

One of the teachers at that school had been completing a thesis and very nearly had it ready for presentation. The teacher had stored it at the school building because it was considered a safe place and all the work she had done over a considerable time had been wiped out. Another teacher who had been in the teaching force for 15 years had kept most of her lesson preparation material at the school because that was where she found it most useful and all of that work was destroyed. We talk about the millions of dollars and the serious impact on the State's resources. It has a serious impact on State expenditure, but in addition we have the very real impact upon the students and teachers concerned. I raise the matter that the Government is working as fast as it can and we hope that we can achieve a satisfactory resolution but repeat the point that no resolution will be 100 per cent sure of eliminating any fires in our schools.

HOPE ROYAL COMMISSION

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I ask a question of the Acting Premier. In view of the seriousness of the member for Elizabeth's allegations in this House yesterday concerning the conduct of the Hope Royal Commission, will the State Government submission to that commission contain the following: first, that Mr Matheson's alleged ASIO cover is given a higher priority by Mr Justice Hope and the Federal Government than the basic civil liberties of an Australian citizen; and, secondly, that Mr Justice Hope has taken a narrow view that his commission is limited to national security matters?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The matters raised in this House yesterday by the member for Elizabeth are matters of his opinion. That has nothing whatever to do with the Government. As I said earlier to the Deputy Leader, the Government submission is not ready and it is in the throes of being examined now by the Attorney-General and will duly be made to the commission.

UNDERGROUND COAL GASIFICATION

Mr WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy provide the House with a progress report on the underground coal gasification study currently being undertaken by the Government? I refer particularly to the study being undertaken on the underground gasification of Leigh Creek coal announced last December. This investigation is clearly important to the State, and I am sure all members would appreciate having any additional information available.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I thank the honourable member for the question. Because of his interest in the matter, he let me know in advance and I can provide an up-do-date briefing on this rather important feasibility study. The technical and economic feasibility study into the underground gasification of Leigh Creek coal has been under way since early this year. It is being carried out by Shedden Pacific Pty Ltd for the Department of Mines and Energy and ETSA, using $50 000 granted by the National Energy Research Development and Demonstration Council.

The objectives of the study, which still has about a month to run, are to ascertain the suitability of Leigh Creek coal for underground gasification by detailed appraisal of the

geological characteristics of the deposits; to assess available underground gasification technology as it applies to Leigh Creek and to estimate the cost of electricity generated from such a source; to develop a detailed programme for a semi-commercial scale pilot test; and to recommend on the desirability of proceeding to a field test.

The study to date has concluded that prospective underground gasification activities should be focused on Lobe B where 120 000 000 tonnes of coal not amenable to conventional mining techniques is potentially available for *in situ* gasification. Such reserves would theoretically support a 250 mw power station for 25 years. For the purposes of the study, a specific area has been selected with a minimum cover of 200 metres of overburden to ensure gas sealing, as a preferred site for pilot scale studies to produce gas for a 70 mw gas turbine power station. A preliminary economic appraisal of the 70 mw test has indicated that the total capital cost would be of the order of $90 000 000, and the levelized cost of electricity generated would be between 3.5 cents and four cents per kilowatt hour. Members would realise that is a very significant figure. All this, of course, is some distance in the future and will depend both on the outcome of the present study and a further programme of work which is now being planned and for which funding is being sought. While it is considered that the proposal is technically feasible, there is a need to confirm certain geotechnical assumptions which have been derived from existing Leigh Creek data. This confirmation will be sought from a programme of drilling in the selected target area, estimated to cost about $150 000. The study consultants, Shedden Pacific Pty Ltd, are seeking a grant of $50 000 from Senrac to commence the drilling programme this financial year, while the Electricity Trust and the Department of Mines and Energy are seeking a further grant of $100 000 from the National Energy Research Development and Demonstration Council for the balance of the drilling programme.

After this work has been completed, it will then be possible to make a decision on whether we should move to a pilot scale study. However, it would be fair to say at the moment that the continuing staged development of a pilot scale proposal leading to fuelling a 70 mw gas turbine generator is considered by both the department and the Electricity Trust to be worth pursuing. Apart from the more immediate potential from the Leigh Creek coalfield, such a trial would provide valuable experience for the longer term development of the vast Cooper Basin coal deposits which are so deep that they are unlikely ever to be exploited by conventional mining methods.

HOPE ROYAL COMMISSION

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: In view of his statement in this House yesterday, is it the intention of the member for Elizabeth to appear before the Hope Royal Commission to give evidence upon the following matters: whether Mr Laurie Matheson is a nark for ASIO; whether Mr Matheson approached ASIO about Mr David Combe before Christmas—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. Pursuant to Standing Order 123 of the Standing Orders of this House and referring, in particular, to that part of the rule which confines questions to any public matter connected with the business of the House, I rule the question out of order.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I rise on a point of order. The subject matter of the member for Light's question was canvassed in the House. In view of that fact, it is a matter of importance to this House.

The SPEAKER: Order! My explanation is this: it is not a question of importance what importance either I may attach to it or others may attach to it. It is a question of the Standing Orders of the House and, if honourable members open their Standing Orders, they will note that it must be a public matter connected with the business of the House, and I rule very clearly that the Hope Royal Commission and matter connected with it is not a matter connected with the business of this House.

Before any other honourable member rises I would like to add one further point, namely, that under the Constitution of the Commonwealth there is a clear and definite responsibility cast on the Commonwealth, and removed from the States, to deal with national security, defence and external affairs. I believe that all three areas are embraced in the Hope Royal Commission, and could not be dealt with by this House with any effect under the Constitution.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Does your ruling mean that members on this side of the House are not allowed to ask questions in this place on subject matter that has been canvassed in this House?

The SPEAKER: No, certainly not. Indeed, when the Deputy Leader of the Opposition commenced the day's Question Time he put a question that was properly framed because it dealt with matters connecting the Government with the Labor Party, which, of course, it represents, and in turn connecting that with the Hope Royal Commission. What I am ruling out of order is the specific question. Each question will have to be looked at on its own merits.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: On a further point of order, Sir, I submit to you that the question asked by the member for Light bears directly on the subject matter that was canvassed in a debate in this House yesterday and that it does not stray from the subject matter contained in that debate.

The SPEAKER: I refer the honourable member to Standing Order 123. I would not be putting ideas into anyone's mind, but there is an obvious construction in the first two lines of that Standing Order: there is a clear differentiation between an Address in Reply debate or a grievance and other matters that could (and I stress 'could') come before the House.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I take a point of order, Mr Speaker. By your interpretation of the point of order, are you suggesting that it is not proper for any member of this House to seek to assist in determining the integrity of a member of the State of South Australia, and I refer specifically to Mr Young? The matter canvassed before this House by the member for Elizabeth, which is the point of the question that I now put, concerns a claim by the member for Elizabeth that Mr Young's character and integrity were in question. Therefore, the purpose of this questioning is to determine whether in fact Mr Young should or should not be supported by the people of South Australia.

The SPEAKER: I give the following careful answer: I am ruling that the question is out of order for the reasons that I have already given. I would indicate that if notice of motion were given, in the circumstances to which the honourable member alluded, depending on the terms of the notice of motion, that would probably be a different matter.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I wish to move to disagree to your ruling, Sir.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable Deputy Leader to give the Chair a copy of the motion.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to because the matter is one of concern to this House.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

Opposition members: Yes, Sir.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr Speaker, I move this disagreement with reluctance, because the Opposition had no real complaint about the manner in which you have conducted the business of this House since becoming the Speaker. However, on a fundamental question such as this, which is a matter of vital importance to this House and to every citizen in this State, I have no option but to move disagreement on behalf of the Opposition.

This matter was one of concern to this House, first, because it was raised in this very House last evening. The subject matter of this question was raised in this House by the member for Elizabeth, who took the 10 minutes he had in the grievance debate in question to canvass these very matters. That makes it a matter of concern to this House in the first instance. In my submission, the issue is even broader than that, because the whole question of security services is not confined as a matter of interest or principle to the royal commission: it is a matter of importance to every citizen in this State, and it is of particular importance to State Governments and State Legislatures because of the attitude that they may care to adopt in relation to our security services. One does not need to go back very far to see ample evidence of that. In fact, the Acting Premier has stated this afternoon that it is the Government's intention to make a submission to that royal commission; that makes it a matter of concern to this House.

The fact that the Government of South Australia is going to put a view (which presumably is the Government view) on behalf of the people of South Australia is certainly a matter of very great concern to me and the Opposition, as well as to the members of this Chamber and the people of this State. To suggest that this is not connected with the business of the House is, in my view, spurious. The demise of a previous Administration in this State was, in my judgment, very much bound up in this question of the attitude of Government to security services and, of course, then the attitude of the public of this State to ASIO and security services. The sacking of a Police Commissioner was intrinsically bound up with the attitude of Government and of that officer to our security services. Therefore, Mr Speaker, I cannot in the wildest stretch of my imagination concur with your view that this is not a matter concerned with the business of this House, when the Acting Premier has stated that the Government is in the process of making a submission on this very matter to the royal commission.

This has been a matter of continuing interest. It has been a matter of the business of this House ever since I have been here. A former member for Mitcham was intimately involved in this question, as was former Premier Dunstan. The matter was canvassed in this House, it was the business of this House on numerous occasions, and it was the subject of a Police Commissioner's report to Parliament and to members of this House. To suggest today, after the matter has been specifically raised by the member for Elizabeth, that it is not the business of this House is, to my mind, just not facing facts as they pertain to this House and to the public of the State.

The matters raised in the House relate to whether Mr Laurie Matheson is a nark for ASIO; whether Mr Matheson approached ASIO about Mr David Combe before Christmas; whether it was Mr Matheson who consistently reported on Mr Combe to ASIO; whether there was a bug outside of Mr Ivanov's home when he had a conversation with Mr Combe on 3 April; whether it was Mr Matheson who gave Mr Combe documents to pass on to Mr Ivanov; and whether it was Mr Matheson who informed ASIO of the fact that the former Special Minister of State, Mr Young, gave information to Mr Eric Walsh on 21 April about Mr Ivanov and Mr Combe. These subjects have been raised.

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable Deputy Leader is beginning to stray from the motion.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I submit, with all respect, that these matters are of vital concern to this House, to the Government, and to every citizen in this community who has a view on how security services should be conducted in this nation.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): That is about the weakest argument disputing the Speaker's ruling I have ever heard since I have been in this place, and that is 13 years, and the faces of members on the Opposition benches are showing that clearly. I emphasise that the Government does not in any circumstances run away from this issue.

The Government will answer any questions, if the Speaker considers them to be in order, and I make that point strongly and validly. As I understood the question, the member for Light asked the member for Elizabeth whether he intended to give evidence at the Hope Royal Commission. I think that is the gist of the question, and that is where I believe it falls down, because Standing Order 123 states:

> At the time of giving notices of motion, questions may be put to Ministers of the Crown relating to public affairs; and to other members, relating to any Bill, motion or other public matter connected with the business of the House. . . .

I put to you, Mr Speaker, that your ruling is correct. I cannot see how the intention of the member for Elizabeth about giving evidence to the royal commission is the business of this House. Surely that is the right of the member for Elizabeth, if he wants to do so. I am not advocating that he does or does not, but surely any member has the right to make any submission he likes without being interfered with by members of this House. That is what the question is about and I do not consider that the intentions of the member for Elizabeth are matters for this House.

I want to make our position clear. We are not ducking the issue and we are not running away. I have answered specific questions, and I have answered questions the Opposition has asked me right from the beginning of this spoof, and that is what it is doing. It is pulling spoofs all the time.

The SPEAKER: Order! Now the Deputy Premier is straying.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I want to make clear that the Government is not in any circumstances running away from questions on this or any other matter. I regret that the Speaker's ruling had to be disputed, because I believe that he is doing an excellent job, as do all Speakers. I suggest that, in order to overcome this problem, the member for Light will write out the question and pass it to the Speaker so that he can examine it and, during Question Time, decide whether or not in the cold light of looking at the question that it is in or out of order.

The other valid point I make is that the Speaker has made clear to the House that he does not intend, as a general rule, to prevent questions of this nature: in fact, he allowed the first two questions of the day. He said in his own defence earlier, when speaking about the disagreement to the ruling, that he would treat every question on its merit. That is a proper answer for a Speaker to give and the Government strongly opposes the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Oswald, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (22)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, M.J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright (teller).

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: On a point of order, Mr Speaker is the question I delivered to you now in proper form so that I may accept the request of the Deputy Premier to put it to the House?

The SPEAKER: No.

BUS SIGNS

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Transport say when the Government intends to install 'give way' signs on the rear of State Transport Authority buses? As the Minister is aware, I have investigated this matter in New South Wales, Victoria, and New Zealand, and have found that the signs work effectively. Will the Minister advise when the Government intends to install these signs and whether it is to be on a trial basis or permanently?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The short answer to the honourable member's question is that we intend to introduce this particular system in about one month's time. All members will be aware that the member for Albert Park has shown great interest in this matter for a long time, and has discussed it with me at some length. In turn, I have discussed it with the Road Traffic Board, with officers of my department and officers of the Police Department.

As buses have some difficulty in pulling away from the kerb-side into the traffic flow, I have agreed to install courtesy signs that read, 'Please give way, thank you' in a bright fluorescent colour on the back of all buses. However, I emphasise that they are a courtesy or advisory sign only and the buses have no legal right of way because of them. I hope that all motorists will respond to those signs and create a much safer traffic flow where these buses are involved. I spoke to the Chairman of the S.T.A. Board today, and he is expecting that in about one month's time the signs will be ready to be placed on all buses in the system and that they will reduce the accident rates on our roads.

HOPE ROYAL COMMISSION

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: My question is to the member for Elizabeth. In preparing the statement made to this House yesterday—

The SPEAKER: Order! I am not calling the honourable member to order, but the call is to other honourable members because I am finding it hard to hear her. Would the honourable member recommence the question?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: In preparing the statement made to this House yesterday, did the member for Elizabeth consult Mr David Combe, the former special Minister of State (Mr Mick Young), or people purporting to represent Mr Young or Mr Combe or their interests?

The SPEAKER: Order! In compliance with Standing Order 123 as upheld by the House today, I rule the question out of order.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I rise on a point of order. Standing Order 123 states:

> At the time of giving notices of motion, questions may be put to Ministers of the Crown relating to public affairs; and to other members, relating to any bill, motion, or other public matter connected with the business of the House, in which such members may be concerned.

I understand from your statements earlier in response to other points of order that this matter, which is the basis of the question I have asked, is a public matter connected with the business of the House.

The SPEAKER: No, I am sorry, I do not want to interrupt the honourable member, but she has stated the direct opposite to what I said. I ruled, and the House upheld my ruling, that it was not a matter connected with the business of the House.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: On a further point of order, as I understand it, the matters raised by the member for Elizabeth yesterday in a speech to this House constitute a public matter connected with the business of this House. Are you saying, Sir, that my understanding that a speech made in this House yesterday connected with the business of this House is not, in fact, a matter connected with the business of this House and is therefore out of order?

The SPEAKER: I have already dealt with that point as well. I may have said a little too much at the time, but I made it perfectly clear that there is a distinction between something said in the Address in Reply or grievance debates, or something like that compared to another avenue. I will not spell out what the avenues are for honourable members: they can make their own selection of what they may be. I have ruled, and the House has upheld my ruling, that the question is out of order, and I cannot add any more.

Mr BECKER: I rise on a point of order. As a matter of public interest and a matter before the House, you may recall, Sir, that last Thursday I asked a question of the Premier in this House in relation to the Government's policy on telephone tapping. After Question Time, the member for Elizabeth gave a personal explanation and you, Sir, said that you would look at this issue. You stated:

> Certainly, I will consider the matter as requested by the honourable member. Clearly, there are serious connotations in his personal explanation, and I will bring down a report in the near future.

Therefore, I believe that there is a link between the member for Coles' question and this whole issue.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do remember that and, clearly, what I said at the time was that (I made the same point then as I did today) the bugging, as far as I could ascertain anyway, was coming from Canberra, not from Adelaide. In any event, it was being conducted by a Federal authority. What I promised the honourable member to do was to see whether I could ascertain (and that is a near miracle, if I could do it) whether or not something like that was going on. I suppose that, if it is going on, they are hardly likely to tell me. There is no point of order. The honourable member for Coles.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the last phrase of Standing Order 123 which, in qualifying the words 'public matter', states:

> . . . public matter connected with the busines of the House, in which such members may be concerned.

It is quite clear that the member for Elizabeth is concerned in this matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! I believe that this is now a flouting, not just of me (I am not in the least happy about the situation that arose today on being adjudged in my own cause), but of the House and of the Standing Orders. The honourable member is continually raising the same point that I had ruled against.

INSURANCE PREMIUMS

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Minister—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not be harassed.

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Minister representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs inform the House whether some

finance and insurance companies are indulging in unfair practices of charging higher insurance premiums for members of the public purchasing motor cars under hire purchase? Mr Speaker, with your leave and the concurrence of the House, I wish to explain my question.

An honourable member: Question!

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister for Community Welfare.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. His interest in consumer affairs is clearly evidenced by his speeches and questions in this House since he has been the member for Henley Beach. The honourable member gave me the courtesy of providing me with a copy of the question that he intended to ask me today in my capacity representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place. As he has been denied the courtesy of explaining his question, it is only proper that I should do so.

The question which the honourable member sought to raise is a matter of some seriousness and, no doubt, touches upon many thousands of South Australians. The honourable member intended to ask (and explain to the House) whether some finance and insurance companies are indulging in the unfair practice of charging higher insurance premiums for members of the public purchasing motor vehicles on hire purchase, as opposed to cash or other forms of payment.

The honourable member has received information that some hire purchase companies receive commissions for referring customers to insurance companies for comprehensive motor car insurance. Constituents have informed him that car salesmen also receive handsome commissions on both hire purchase contracts and the insurance. An extra charge of up to $100 per car is suggested to the honourable member to be not uncommon in these circumstances.

Presumably, that cost is then passed on directly to the consumer. Obviously, the thrust of the honourable member's question is that, because such consumers require hire-purchase, they are people of lesser means than some others in the community. The honourable member goes on to explain that people who are able to obtain overdraft finance or a personal loan or who have the resources to make those purchases themselves, do not have to pay that extra premium. The honourable member has indicated that he has made some inquiries and that he understands that this practice does not apply to the State Government Insurance Commission. These are obviously matters of importance and concern to consumers in South Australia and I will refer them to the responsible Minister in another place for his investigation.

ROYAL COMMISSIONS

The Hon. H. ALLISON: My question is addressed to you, Mr Speaker. Will you, Sir, please investigate whether or not the Commonwealth Royal Commissions Act of 1902 overrides the absolute privilege of members of this Parliament to make such statements in Parliament as they think fit about the conduct of commissions constituted under that Act? With your concurrence and that of the House—

Mr Trainer: Question, in view of the antics of the member for Mallee.

The SPEAKER: 'Question' has been called. The honourable member will resume his seat.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is a very serious question. I heard a brief report of the comments of Mr Justice Hope today and every honourable member will know the implication of this on the whole of the constitutional framework of Australia. I consider that it is my bounden duty to make the most thorough investigation and to seek urgent and appropriate advice. I give the full undertaking sought. I do not require the honourable member to further explain his question.

RACING

MR GROOM: Is the Minister of Recreation and Sport aware that representatives of country racing clubs are disputing the formula proposed by the controlling authority for racing in this State, in particular, the South Australian Jockey Club, for the distribution of funds during the forthcoming year? Can the Minister explain the basis of the formula proposed by the S.A.J.C.?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am aware of the dispute that exists between the country racing clubs and the racing control body, the South Australian Jockey Club. It is unfortunate that in the year 1982-83, when a record T.A.B. allocation was given to racing, this dispute in relation to the S.A.J.C. and the provincial clubs on the one hand and the country clubs on the other hand should have occurred in relation to the method of distribution. The previous two-year agreement between the Jockey Club and the country clubs was based on a fixed percentage of 11.5 per cent. The new proposal for distribution between the clubs, based on four constituent criteria, is as follows: the first is the charge on administration by the Jockey Club; the second is the training subsidy; the third is the 4 per cent of the T.A.B. turnover of clubs which conduct T.A.B. racing; and the fourth is a calculation based on stake money. The matter that appears to be the most in dispute is that concerning the calculation based on stake money, which in actual fact provides for a differential of 5c in the dollar.

The calculation is designed to improve incentive to the industry by providing a general increase in stake money to metropolitan, provincial and country clubs. In all normal circumstances, on the information and the calculations provided, it should be noted that the South Australian Jockey Club proposition would ensure an 11.5 per cent distribution for the country clubs. If it were related to the 1982-83 year it would show that the country clubs would be about .05 cents in excess of the South Australian Jockey Club provincial club stake money. This figure is well below the 5 cents limit proposed under the new formula, and it is not likely to exceed that limit and, as a consequence, the 11.5 per cent will be available for distribution to country clubs in 1983-84.

The South Australian Jockey Club is the controlling authority in racing, and it is regrettable that matters such as distribution to various clubs cannot be settled in a more amenable way. As the Minister of Recreation and Sport I have some jurisdiction in the matter because section 56 of the Racing Act provides that the Minister must approve the formula for distribution.

I have given long and earnest consideration to the formula proposed and I have had representations from both parties. I believe that the formula proposed by the South Australian Jockey Club is a fair and equitable one. In due course, if the proposal is not seen to be equitable, in the interests of racing generally, it must be reviewed. Experience shows that we must ensure that the country clubs receive their fair share of the distribution. However, it is most unfortunate that it should occur at a time when the highest distribution of T.A.B. (in the 17-year history of T.A.B.) occurred, as I said yesterday, when I tabled the report of the Totalizator Agency Board for the year 1982-83.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am always prepared to give credit where credit is due. I remember quite well the com-

mittee of inquiry which was set up by the previous Government. Whilst in Opposition I supported most of those recommendations and, indeed, some of the innovations that took place at that time (especially the T.A.B. innovations) were certainly advantageous to the racing industry in general, particularly the after race pay-outs.

Mr Trainer: Are country clubs guaranteed 11½ per cent?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Previously country clubs were on a minimum of 11½ per cent. Under the new formula, they are practically guaranteed that same amount but there is a formula involved which will provide an incentive to country clubs to increase their stake money in line with provincial and metropolitan racing. I give credit to the previous Administrations for doing what they could to assist racing generally. However, I point out that in the past 12 months the industry itself has pulled itself up by its boot straps, stake money has improved and there are a number of combining factors which have enabled that to occur. Some of the innovations by Government have been advantageous to the racing club particularly, but it is very unfortunate that the constituent clubs within the racing industry should dispute a matter of this nature at a time when it has the largest distribution which has ever occurred in the history of T.A.B. I believe the formula proposed by the Jockey Club is fair and equitable, and the country clubs will receive their 11½ per cent.

TEACHER HOUSING

Mr MEIER: In relation to the recently announced massive increases in rental for teachers occupying Teacher Housing Authority houses, will the Minister inform this House what the guidelines were for the rent increases which are to apply from October? Why was the method of determining these rent increases not negotiated with SAIT before being announced; what percentage rent increases were recommended; and if the maximum increases were to be 19 per cent, why have many Teacher Housing Authority rent increases exceeded 20 per cent, rising to as high as 29.4 per cent?

The SPEAKER: Before calling the Minister, I think that the honourable member's question went very close to being in breach of the standing ruling of the Chair that there should not be such a multiplicity of questions that it becomes a catalogue. However, in the circumstances, I will ask honourable members to note that rather than take more Draconian action. The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It is interesting that the member for Goyder asks another question on this matter following one last week. Now we see that not only does he believe in little elves in the middle of the night being able to achieve all the things that people ask to be achieved: he also does not have the capacity to listen to answers given in this place.

I indicated that the matter he raised before this House was not in terms of the guidelines, and I asked him to bring it to my attention and we would investigate that issue. I repeat that point. If the honourable member has examples that are not in line with the guidelines for rent increases, I ask him to bring them to my attention and we will have the matters investigated, and on investigation of the matters we will get back to him and reply to him on the issue.

I am also somewhat intrigued about this matter, because the honourable member brought something to my attention during the week and I did canvass with him what the guidelines were. Apparently, I must have been mumbling under my breath. I will say it again: the Government has approved a rent increase for Government employees in Government housing, and that rent increase had a number of facets to it. One of them was that it would apply from October; another one was that the rent increase would be about 19 per cent; and a further facet was that the rent increase would not be greater than $8 per week. They are the guidelines.

One important point needs to be taken into account in regard to teacher housing. Teacher Housing Authority rents are calculated over a 42-week paying year for a 52-week rent year. In other words, the rent allocated to a house on an annual basis is not divided by 52 weeks, as it is in all other Government employee situations, but by 42 weeks. In that situation, being divided over 42 weeks, the $8 maximum per week increase in Teacher Housing Authority rents is in fact $10 per week. They quite clearly are the guidelines. I ask the honourable member, if he has any examples different from that, to bring them to my attention.

The outcome of all that is that the revenue return on Teacher Housing Authority houses should be the same in proportion to Housing Trust rentals as with other Government employee housing. The member for Hanson would be well aware of how that kind of formulation has been arrived at in the past and no doubt amply supports it.

The other matter raised last week by the member for Goyder was why there allegedly had not been any consultation with the Institute of Teachers in this matter. I am intrigued that he has become the envoy in this Chamber for that organisation. I have not noticed that they have formally appointed him in this matter. I gave an undertaking that the matter of determining how rent increases would be made, the formula by which we would make calculations, would be referred to them for their opinion. I indicated last week (again, I have to apologise to the House that I am repeating myself, but I obviously have to) that the Government Employee Housing Authority report was being opened up for public discussion, and it is my earnest desire that the South Australian Institute of Teachers will be one of the groups that will give us its opinions about the proposals raised in that report.

That report raises a number of propositions about how we should calculate rent on all Government employee housing. I think that there are a number of serious anomalies in the way rents are calculated for Government employees around South Australia. There are clearly anomalies in trying to work out how much rent should be paid for a house in a country area away from any settlement and in some situations in settlements as well. I myself have found that as I have gone around South Australia. Recently I visited two Teacher Housing Authority houses, one right in the middle of Ceduna and one out further on the West Coast with only one other house near it, and the rents were the same for both those houses. I accept that there is an anomaly in the way that the formulation leads to an equality of rents between those two houses. I hope that the Government Employee Housing Authority report examination will help resolve those issues.

PYRAMID SELLING

Mr MAYES: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place to investigate whether pyramid selling schemes for the marketing of diet foods are operating in South Australia, and, if so, what action will the Minister take to prohibit these schemes? The *News* on 17 August contained an article headed 'Pyramid diet food sales banned', indicating that the New South Wales Government has banned the selling schemes by which diet food is being marketed. The article states:

A pyramid selling scheme used to market wellknown diet foods throughout Australia has been banned by the New South Wales

Government. The prohibition order has been issued under the New South Wales Pyramid Sales Act of 1974, the first time the Act has been used to ban a trading scheme.

To quote the New South Wales Minister:

The marketing programmes are not based on the selling of the products but on the luring of people into schemes in which the returns to the sellers are dependent on recruitment rather than sales.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. All members would be aware of the difficulties that this State, and indeed other States, experienced in the 1970s with respect to pyramid sales, including the various techniques that were used at that time and the disadvantages that they brought to many people in the community, many people who could not withstand that economic disadvantage. The matters raised by the honourable member are important because it may be that these schemes may not yet be established in this State and that appropriate preventative action can be taken by the Government to warn the community of this type of sales programme. However, I will make sure that this question is referred to the Minister of Consumer Affairs for his attention.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: OLYMPIC DAM

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I thank the House for its indulgence. I wish to set the record straight concerning allegations which were made in this House by the member for Kavel on Tuesday evening and which reflected if not on me then on my departmental officers. It is in relation to a practice on which this Government has a very clear policy. Last Wednesday evening the A.B.C. programme *Nationwide* featured a segment on the Olympic Dam project and the potential dispute between the joint venturers and Aborigines in relation to sacred sites.

A portion of that programme involved two documents which had been written in the time of the previous Government, one being a Cabinet submission and the other being a letter sent by the former Premier to Mr Hugh Morgan, of Western Mining Corporation. There was an implication that there are other documents in the hands of the A.B.C. because reference was also made to a minute of a meeting on 17 September 1980, although that minute was not produced. As a result of that programme, I was approached the following morning by the media for a statement. I made a statement to which the member for Kavel took vigorous exception both in a statement to this House at the end of Question Time on Tuesday and again in an adjournment speech at the end of the day.

In relation to his comments about me personally and the discharge of my Ministerial responsibilities, I make no comment. His remarks have washed over me and have been treated with bored indifference by the media. However, one matter canvassed by the honourable member cannot be allowed to go unchallenged. I refer to his comment on the alleged leaking of these documents or, as he put it in his statement on Tuesday afternoon, the convenient leaking of these documents, followed by the words 'As I have said, that cannot be attributed directly to the Minister.' Later in the day, however, in his speech on the adjournment, the ante seems to have been upped a little, because the honourable member said:

As I said, contemporaneously with his statement—

and that is factually incorrect, but I will return to that—

were some convenient leakages from his department, I suspect in relation to, first, a letter from the previous Premier (Mr Tonkin) to Western Mining Corporation and, secondly, a Cabinet decision quite unrelated to that. They were handed to some media representatives to cause discomfiture for the now Opposition and to try to take some heat off the Minister.

I fail to see in what way I was under heat, but we will let that pass. His statement continues:

I thought it was a very grubby exercise by the Minister.

I have certain documents before me now and I shall detail how they came into my possession. My first indication of what was happening here, was when, with some members of the Opposition, I was in the visitors' lounge watching the *Nationwide* programme on Tuesday evening. I knew nothing about that programme before it went to air. In the light of that programme, I gave the following instruction to a member of my staff the next morning: that it was not the habit of this Government to embark on fishing expeditions among the files to see what might turn up, but that, as this had now become a matter of public comment, and since indeed actual details of the documents had been quoted, it was important that the Government have access to those documents so that we could properly address their contents should we be required to do so either in the House or outside. I instructed that Ministerial officer to speak to the Director-General (Mr Phipps) in these terms: that a search be instituted specifically for those documents and for no other, except that there was a reference that one of the documents related to an earlier document that may have come from the former Minister for Environment and Planning because it was commenting on information from his former department.

I must say that the department had a dickens of a job finding the material. Indeed, in relation to that further document I eventually called off the hunt because it seemed to me that Public Service time was being spent to no good effect. However, in the event the documents before me were uncovered. I have done nothing further with these documents, except to comment on the *Nationwide* programme. I should also indicate that my staff also contacted the staff of my colleague the Minister of Mines and Energy, and they were experiencing similar problems in uncovering any relevant documents. In the event, the documents were finally found in the Department of Environment and Planning.

The three documents are as follows: first, there is a transcript of the *Nationwide* programme, which also refers to the meeting of 17 September 1980 minutes, although those minutes did not appear on that programme (I have not tried to find those minutes). Secondly, there is a copy of a letter from former Premier Tonkin to Mr Morgan (marked DME SR5/6/116), and the contents of that letter are as reported on the *Nationwide* programme. Thirdly, there is the Cabinet submission dated 24 July 1980, which is initialled by the former Minister of Mines and Energy (DME SR5/6/116). The contents of that document are as detailed on the *Nationwide* programme.

I thought it was important that I should set the record straight. A reasonable person could put the construction on the honourable member's second set of statements on this matter (that is, those made in his speech on the adjournment) that either a member of my department, possibly on my instructions or without my instructions, had leaked this material for the intention stated or that I had stage-managed the whole thing. Members will recall the words of the Deputy Leader, 'contemporaneously with'. In fact, the honourable member should know that my statement was made at least 12 hours or more after the *Nationwide* programme.

The Premier, when Leader of the Opposition, was addressing himself to a situation where the previous Government had clearly gone on a fishing expedition in the files, and he said that this was a most undesirable practice and one that his Party would not undertake when in Gov-

ernment. We have not done so on any occasion of which I am aware and certainly not on this occasion.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MINISTER'S REMARKS

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister for Environment and Planning seeks to misrepresent what I said in this House.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: I quoted it word for word.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister has quoted what I said in this House and then misrepresented it. Let me recount the facts for the benefit of the Minister. I do not deny that I described the Minister's part as a grubby exercise, because I was completely misrepresented by the Minister, and that was the subject of my explanation in this House two days ago. The Minister attacked my role as Chairman of the select committee, although at the time he praised my chairmanship. He has now suggested that he inherited problems as a result of the actions of the previous Government. That was what I described as a grubby exercise.

The Minister has sought today to point up a direct leakage, but I observed that there was a convenient leaking of documents which had been misconstrued in the media. I do not resile from that statement. If the Minister seeks to find a direct link between his behaviour in misrepresenting my role as Chairman of the select committee, as well as the role of the former Government, and that of the media, all well and good. It was a convenient time for those opposed to the project to have those documents in the public arena.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: The documents were leaked under your Government.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I challenge the Minister to prove that. At all events, those documents, if leaked, had been stored up by those who wished to misrepresent the role of the former Government in relation to these matters. I do not resile from the statement I made that it was a convenient time to do it, when this confrontation at Canegrass Swamp occurred. Indeed, I do not resile from anything I said. I would have hoped to get an apology from the Minister in view of his complete misrepresentation of my role and that of the former Government. I am glad to hear that he now disclaims any knowledge of the leaked documents, but there was a separate exercise in the leaking of documents at a time convenient to those who wished to stop the project and denigrate the former Government. If that is just a coincidence, so be it, but the Minister cannot resile from the fact that he completely misrepresented me and the former Government, and that was the import of what I was saying. Nor do I resile from the fact that the publication of these documents and the misrepresentation of them was also convenient at this time to those who are opposed to the project.

The SPEAKER: Order! Call on the business of the day.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 17 August. Page 326.)

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this debate. In so doing I indicate to the House my deep regret at the passing of the late John Coumbe. When I entered this Chamber in 1968, John Coumbe had just been appointed Minister of Works. During the time that he was Minister of Works he was of tremendous assistance to me in my district largely because of its nature and the department for which he was responsible.

I can well recall one of the first significant problems that was brought to my notice and one with which I had to grapple on becoming a member of this Chamber: that was a problem that developed in the township of Barmera in relation to what is known as the chironomid midge. The midge not only was having an enormous effect on the day-to-day lives of the people in that community, but also it was having a devastating effect on the tourist industry.

The midge results from a blood worm type of creature that breeds in low-oxygen content waters on the bottom of lakes and lagoons. The community had been trying for some time to resolve this problem, and it was not until I brought this matter to John Coumbe's attention that he indicated to me that he believed he had the answer to it. What is more he, through the E. & W.S. Department, certainly did have the answer, and proceeded to treat the midge in the Barmera area in Lake Bonney.

So, I have a very keen memory for the contribution that John Coumbe was able to make in assisting me, certainly in my early days as a member of this Chamber. I also indicate to John's family my sincere regret at his passing, and offer my condolences to them.

One of the most unfortunate and regrettable occurrences in South Australia in the past two or three months has been the confrontation between the Labor Government and the fishing industry, and it is probably easy to recognise why this has occurred. This is traditionally a free enterprise industry, which is now confronted with an Administration and a Minister who is dedicated to the socialist philosophy and who intends to implement those philosophies within that industry.

The turmoil that the Minister of Fisheries has created as a result of his action not only affects the fishermen themselves, their future and livelihoods, but has a marked effect on their families, including their children. When we look at the turmoil that has been created in that industry because of the philosophies of the present Government, and above all, the philosophies of the present Minister, the threats placed on that industry that still exist can be described as straight-out blackmail, when one considers that the Minister has put quite clearly to the industry, 'You either accept the increased fees that I have indicated, up to a 200 per cent increase, or we will increase the number of boats operating in the fisheries, we will redistribute the profits from licences, and we will not allow any transfer of licences.' They are some of the threats that the Govenrment has placed on the fishing industry.

Until the Minister comes to his senses and realises that the fishing industry in South Australia has developed over many years on a sound basis, that it is essentially a free-enterprise industry which is the only way it can effectively operate, and return some stability and confidence to that industry, then the State as a whole will suffer. Not only are the fishermen placed in this invidious position as a result of having security taken away, but when it comes to the lending institutions that provided much of the finance to enable fishermen to operate effectively with the modern equipment that is required, then the industry is totally undermined. If there is no right to transfer or sell one's interest in that industry, the actual capital invested has absolutely no basis of security whatsoever.

The Government has already created a precedent in this area concerning security of tenure and the right to transfer a licence. Before the State election I had regulations prepared in relation to the Water Resources Act that would enable irrigators diverting water from the Murray River to transfer or sell their interests in their licence. Until that time it was necessary, if an irrigator wished to transfer part of his water entitlement (and this water entitlement can be classified as part of a public resource) which is an entitlement that an individual person has, then the person holding that licence was required to dispose of portion of his land and at the same time he could transfer a portion of his water licence. The regulations enabled and recognised that a person holding a water entitlement had the right to transfer to another person any part of his water entitlement, so long as that transfer did not adversely affect other irrigators or have an adverse effect on water quality of the Murray River. So, that principle has clearly been established.

Those regulations were not enforced before the change of Government, but following the change of Government the present Government introduced the regulations that I had drafted. The Government has accepted in principle the fact that a licence holder has the right to transfer that licence to another person for whatever negotiated monetary reward might be agreed to between the two parties. It is fundamental that a person with a large commitment to any industry must have the right to be able to transfer and sell that interest, otherwise the assets that that person has are absolutely worthless. As I say, this principle has been accepted by the present Government, and it is time that the Government recognised that fact and applied the same principle to the fishing industry.

Members would probably be aware that, under the arrangements that exist within Parliament, members have the opportunity to travel not only within Australia but also overseas. I appreciated the opportunity that I have had in the past two months to travel overseas for about 18 days under that arrangement. The purpose of my travel last month was to visit the United States to attend what I regard as two extremely important conferences: one was in Salt Lake City on developments in relation to control of salinity in rivers.

Many people and experts attended from many parts of the world. The second conference was held the following week in the State of Wyoming at Jackson, and was in relation to irrigation and drainage. However, members would be well aware that, during the years I have been in this House, I have had a real and particular interest in the total Murray-Darling system and the importance of it to South Australia. I have tried to impress on this House the dependency of this State on not only the amount of water we receive from the Murray under the agreement but also the vital importance of the quality of that water.

Last evening I made a brief reference to the study, which has been completed, in relation to Lake Albert at the mouth of the Murray River in South Australia. I tried to point out how important the quality of the water in Lakes Albert and Alexandrina is to the people of South Australia. It does not merely affect the people living around the shores of those lakes.

The overall problem of salinity and the manner in which it is handled was the subject of the first conference held in Salt Lake City. It might be worth mentioning that several Australians attended that conference, and some excellent papers were delivered by representatives from Australia and were well received in that world scene.

However, in the time available to me this afternoon I want to indicate the progress made in the United States, particularly in relation to controlling the salinity problem in the Colorado River, and also indicate the similarity that exists between the Colorado system and the Murray-Darling system. Many of the conclusions reached and practices employed over there to come to grips with the salinity problem can largely be applied to the Murray-Darling system in Australia.

To give some background, I refer first to a document that I brought back from the United States Department of Planning. It is referred to as the 'Process for Colorado River Basin Salinity Control'. The introduction to this document states:

The Colorado River Predicament and Progress.

Salinity has long been recognised as one of the major problems of the Colorado River, but in the early 1960s the amount of water delivered to Mexico fell dramatically and the quality deteriorated. In 1964 the Colorado River dried up as it went from the Mexicali Valley of Mexico to the Gulf of California. The river was and still is essentially consumed. Mexico gets the last 10 per cent of the Colorado River water to irrigate about 450 000 acres (182 000 ha) of crops and to provide municipal water to about 1 500 000 people. The clear snowmelt water originating 1 500 miles (2 415 km) upstream in the Rocky Mountains picks up about 10 000 000 tons of salt a year as it traverses the seven basin States.

I think that that sets a scene not dissimilar to the scene in South Australia, namely, that South Australia is at the bottom end of the Murray-Darling system in a similar situation to Mexico.

While in the United States, I was able to obtain a most important document. I had discussions with people involved in the production of this document, which is called 'Colorado River Water Quality Improvement Programme'. This is a status report from the Bureau of Reclamation to the United States Department of the Interior, and this document clearly sets out whence the salinity originates. It is interesting to note that the build-up of salinity in the river system is similar to the build-up and proportions that make up the salt problem in Australia.

Of the total salinity load in the Colorado River, 47 per cent is considered to be derived from natural sources (being groundwater and surface run-off in the main), and 37 per cent is attributed to irrigation: that is, virtually 37 per cent of that contribution is as a result of poor irrigation practices. The recognition of poor irrigation practices has resulted in the Government coming to grips with this problem in two ways: first, 47 per cent from natural resources is regarded as off-farm projects to combat the salinity; the 37 per cent attributed to irrigation is regarded as on-farm works necessary to combat the salinity problem at its source. The total make-up of the salinity load is: 47 per cent from natural sources, 37 per cent from irrigation, 12 per cent as a result of evaporation from reservoirs, 3 per cent from exports, and 1 per cent coming back from municipal and industrial developments. The report states:

Physical and Economic Impacts:

The high salt load of 9 000 000 tons annually adversely affects more than 12 000 000 people and about 1 000 000 acres of irrigated farmland in the Lower Colorado River basin in the United States. In this area, the total damages attributable to salinity in the Colorado River system as of January 1982 were about $113 000 000 a year. By the year 2010, without control measures, these damages would amount to about $267 000 000 a year. These economic impacts are based on Bureau of Reclamation studies, which showed that annual direct and indirect losses amount to, in January 1982 dollars, about $513 300 per mg/L increase in salinity at Imperial Dam. The losses associated with municipal and industrial use occur primarily from increased water treatment costs, accelerated pipe corrosion, and appliance wear, increased soap and detergent needs, and decreased water palatability. The EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) recommends that drinking water contain no more than 500 mg/L of total dissolved solids. For irrigators, higher salt concentrations cause decreased crop yields, altered crop patterns, increased leaching and drainage requirements, and increased management costs.

Therefore, the Government clearly recognises the effect that this is having on the industries in the United States, and it clearly indicates what the effect will be by the year 2010.

If the present programme was cut off tomorrow with no further salt mitigation work being undertaken, then the salinity level at Imperial Dam would rise dramatically, significantly reducing the ability of the Colorado Valley to provide much of the United States' fresh fruit and vegetable requirements. If that occurred, obviously the demand placed on limited resources would mean that the cost of fresh fruit and vegetables in that country would rise dramatically.

It concerns me that the attitude coming through clearly from the present State Government is one of complete lack of understanding of what salt mitigation works are all about. The present Government in South Australia believes that salt mitigation works undertaken constitute a direct handout to irrigators. Nothing could be further from the truth. The value of rehabilitation works in the Riverland was recognised by a former Premier of South Australia (Hon. Des Corcoran) about 12 years ago when he first started rehabilitation of the Government irrigation areas in South Australia.

Subsequent Governments have continued to assist private irrigators in the subsidisation of their distribution systems as well. Former Premier Corcoran recognised the value of such work, but it seems that he was the only member of the Labor Party who truly recognised the value of the work undertaken. The real value of that work was to reduce the total salt load coming back to the Murray River in an attempt to protect the quality of water for all South Australians. The old distribution systems were inefficient and created large volumes of water that went into the ground water table creating this salt movement back into the river.

This principle is recognised in the United States, and the State and Federal Governments are carrying out works to reduce the salt load moving back to the rivers. However, the attitude expressed in South Australia at this time, and by the Minister of Water Resources, is that this work should be undertaken and paid for by the irrigators. In the Government irrigation areas the irrigators are responsible for water on their properties: it is the responsibility of Government to deliver that water in a satisfactory manner to the boundary of the irrigator's property. This was well recognised by the former Premier when, upon commencement of the programme, he stated quite categorically that no irrigator would be disadvantaged as a result of the rehabilitation of the irrigation distribution systems. The work was undertaken as a salt mitigation project in the interests of the State, not necessarily being undertaken for the benefit of the irrigators by making life easier for them.

In fact, the present Minister of Water Resources, when increasing water rates by 28 per cent, said that the Government must recover operational expenditure and also get back what it has spent in relation to rehabilitation. This does not occur anywhere else in the world: certainly not in the western countries in which I have spent considerable time examining this situation. If that were to be the case, the cost of the products produced under irrigation would be so expensive that it would be impossible for the average person to ever be able to purchase fresh fruit and vegetables. They would be totally out of reach.

During the term of office of the Tonkin Government, in regard to the rehabilitation programme in the Riverland on Government irrigation areas, I made a variation to the arrangements that existed under the Labor Party, by providing on-farm grants. It did not cost the Government anything: it was an option. The irrigator could opt to take the grant in lieu of what it was costing the Government to connect to the grower's existing irrigation distribution system. The biggest failing of the Labor Government's policy was that it was perpetrating a bad irrigation system within the farm itself. The grant enabled growers to put the money that would otherwise have gone into the connection process into a new irrigation system: what we called an improved irrigation practice. Many growers took up that option, and we now have many more sprinkler, micro-jet, and drip irrigation systems operating in the Riverland as a result of that policy.

Unfortunately, the present Government has cancelled the programme for the rehabilitation of irrigation distribution systems. In fact, the only remaining work to be undertaken is the completion of the Chaffey system, which was started many years ago but which unfortunately was stopped when only four-fifths completed. On completion that project will give those irrigators involved an opportunity to irrigate within a properly scheduled time for irrigating.

At the moment the system is an absolute disaster because it is not complete and, because it is a new irrigation distribution system, it cannot work properly until it has been completed. In fact, at the moment the irrigators in that area are worse off than they were before the Government ever began the rehabilitation work in the area. At least that small area will at long last be completed, but the disturbing fact is that the Government has halted all further capital works pertaining to Government rehabilitation irrigation systems. I believe that is largely because the Government just does not understand what it has done.

I think that the Government is convinced that a rehabilitation system is of benefit only to growers themselves: that is completely false, and the real benefactors of the rehabilitation system are the people of South Australia. Until such time as the Government recognises that, the quality of water in this State will continue to deteriorate.

Another point worth recognising concerns the acceptance of the fact that the principal cause of salinity, other than that from natural ground water in-flows into rivers, is a result of inefficient irrigation systems and methods used to irrigate properties. In fact, in the United States the authorities significantly contribute to the cost of on-farm irrigation systems. It is recognised there that irrigation improvements are vital to the salinity control programme, and they have what they call cost-sharing arrangements between the Government and the irrigators: the Federal Government provides 75 per cent of the cost of new irrigation systems, with the irrigator providing 25 per cent of the cost.

That is done on a grant basis. They have come to recognise, quite rightly, that it is far cheaper in the long run to treat the cause of the problem, which is on the farm, rather than to for ever spend enormous sums on tube well interception schemes to intercept the ground water moving back to the river, and to be forever confronted with that cost as well as the disposal cost.

The improved irrigation systems have the effect of reducing the initial amount of water that has to be diverted from the river in the first place. It reduces the amount applied to the land down to the requirements of the plants. It significantly reduces the ground water coming away from the irrigated area and thus carrying the salt load back to the river. Until such time as the Government in Australia (and I refer to the State and the Federal Governments) accept that assistance for on-farm improved irrigation practice is the key, or one of the very significant keys, to the whole salinity problem, then we are not going to make much progress.

I now refer further to the document 'Colorado River Water Quality Improvement Programme' and the United States Department of Agriculture's 'On-farm Irrigation Improvement Programme' which states:

The Soils Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation are working together to co-ordinate the salinity control programme in the Colorado River Basin. Each agency however plans, funds and implements its own programmes. The cost effectiveness of the United States Department of Agriculture's on-farm programme complements

the cost effectiveness of the Bureau of Reclamation's off-farm programmes.

There are two components, the on-farm component and the off-farm component. The document continues:

In many cases, the on-farm control measures cannot work properly unless the off-farm measures are implemented concurrently. While there are some localised differences the salt removal potential of on-farm programmes is similar to those of the off-farm features. For instance in the Uinta Basin the on-farm programme is expected to reduce the salinity at Imperial Dam by at least eight milligrams per litre while the off-farm programme is anticipated to reduce the salinity about seven milligrams per litre. Implementation of the Department of Agriculture's on-farm irrigation improvement programme is now under way with two types of irrigation source units in operation: Grand Valley in Colorado and Uinta Basin in Utah. The following provides a brief status of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's activities:

The Department's implementation efforts are being administered under the existing programme authorities. Financial assistance and landowner cost sharing funding are being provided through specific appropriation language for the agricultural conservation programme within the agricultural stabilisation and conservation service. Technical assistance funding is provided through the soils conservation service conservation operation technical assistance programme. The Grand Valley project began in 1979 with the Uinta Basin project starting in 1980. Major salt conservation service technical assistance is directed to on-farm irrigation water management and salinity control planning. Practice design and installation, plus follow-up water management assistance to improve irrigation efficiencies and to reduce deep percolation. Major practices receiving agricultural conservation programme cost sharing assistances are ditch lining, pipe lines, land levelling, sprinkler systems and the structures for water control.

It is clear from what they are doing in the United States that it is an ongoing programme and that unless it continues then the level of salinity would dramatically increase. Unfortunately, we have seen in Australia in the past six months not only the State Government backing off from the salinity control programme in South Australia, but we have seen the Cobdogla rehabilitation programme dropped, the Moorook irrigation rehabilitation programme dropped, and also the cancellation of what is a vitally important part of the salinity control programme in South Australia, and that is the Lock 2 and Lock 3 ground water interception proposals which the consultants, Coffey & Partners, indicated could very efficiently intercept about 60 000 tonnes of salt and stop it from entering the river.

The Lock 2 and Lock 3 ground water interception scheme certainly would not benefit the large proportion of irrigators in South Australia. It would be of enormous benefit to the diversions from rural areas such as stock and domestic supply, the northern towns, certainly Adelaide and also irrigators below Morgan. However, the principal benefactors of that programme would certainly be domestic and industrial consumption.

It concerns me greatly, and I think it would concern any other thinking person in South Australia, that if the salinity control programme is to stop (and it virtually has) then it will take many years to get it under way again. The experience in the United States is that it is an ongoing programme, one that cannot be backed away from and one, that, unless they keep up the capital works programme of mitigation works, then the problem will get out of control and that cannot be allowed to occur. Looking at the situation as far as metropolitan Adelaide is concerned, I quote from an article which appeared in the weekend edition of the *Australian* headed 'Halve salt in your food—new warning'. It states:

A national health survey wants Australians to halve their intake of salt, and says manufacturers should cut down on the amount of salt added to processed food. The report has been prepared by an expert working party and submitted to the National Health and Medical Research Council. It also recommended that the sodium content of drinking water should be no more than 5 mmol a litre, with a long-term objective of 2.5 mmol a litre.

I highlight the word 'sodium' because normally when one talks about salinity one talks about totally dissolved solids. In this instance, as far as this health report is concerned, it is referring to sodium content. The report continues:

There was evidence from two studies that an elevated sodium concentration of drinking water may be associated with higher blood pressures in children. In both South Australia and Western Australia the overall sodium concentration was much higher than in other States, exceeding 4.35 mmol a litre (recommended by the United States National Academy of Sciences) on occasions in some cities and on the average in others. Adelaide had the highest sodium concentration in water of any major city with an average of about 3.5 mmol per litre.

Although Adelaide already has the highest sodium concentration in its drinking water (which is clearly a health hazard), we are confronted with the situation that this will continue to rise because, if the salt mitigation work that is vital to be undertaken should not proceed, then there is no alternative but that the salinity levels in the Murray and South Australia will not remain at the present level but will continue to rise because of the added demands being placed on the river system by the three States, South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales. Unless the Federal Government is prepared to reverse its present attitude in relation to priorities and makes available the necessary funds to enable these States to carry out the salinity control programme, and make funds available to enable irrigators to convert to modern irrigation systems, not only will the irrigation areas be adversely affected further as far as their financial ability to exist is concerned, but the cost of the essential food products produced under irrigation will continue to escalate.

It is obvious that, if the costs of controlling salinity are going to be placed on the irrigation industries (which does not happen anywhere else in the world other than under the philosophy that currently exists in the Labor Party of South Australia), the cost of essential foods, fresh fruit and vegetables will certainly soon be out of the reach of most people, particularly low-income families. That is just not acceptable in a developed country. Adequate access to fresh fruit and vegetables is a right and a necessity for every family in Australia, as it is in any other developed country. That will not occur unless we are able to control the salt in our major water supply and maintain our irrigation industries.

The importance of what I have been trying to say is that the philosophy that has been expounded in the past few months by the Bannon Government that the irrigation industries will have to meet the on-going costs is just not acceptable and it is not required in any other part of the world. The level of assistance given to the irrigation industries in the United States is significant. It is far more than what is provided in Australia. The contribution being made to the overall salinity control programme in the United States is massive compared with the minute contributions being made by Governments in this country. We have a river system which is larger than the Colorado system, although the demands on it are not as great; I acknowledge that. If we do not continue with a control programme and give the River Murray Commission the necessary approval and the funds to combat the problem, then the quality of water will continue to deteriorate. All resolutions of the problem need an enormous lead time to control salt effectively. In the next 10 to 20 years we will have to continue with a programme that will have to be started immediately because any deferment will be disastrous to the long-term benefits, particularly to South Australia.

The fact that the Federal Government has backed off from this programme and that the State Government has virtually abandoned it leaves South Australia in a desperate situation regarding future water requirements, both from a quality and a health point of view. I think the article in the

Weekend Australian clearly indicates the problem which will occur. Adelaide already has the highest sodium content drinking water of any capital city, and that is something to which the Government should be addressing itself.

If the Government is concerned about the health, welfare and well-being of the people of South Australia it should realise that any contributions being made to control the salt problem are not purely for the benefit of a few irrigators in South Australia. That is just not the case. Any salinity control measures introduced to the total system are for the benefit of all people. The health and welfare of a million people in metropolitan Adelaide, in the northern towns of your own area, Sir, are critical, and if the Government does not face up to that it is totally abdicating its responsibility. Once the level of salinity is built up and continues to rise, the lead time required to reduce that level is so great that the damage to health that can be done in the meantime is enormous.

In concluding my remarks on this matter I just want to make one brief reference again to the document put out by the United States Department of Agriculture in its Planning Process for the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control. In conclusion it stated:

> The planning and implementation of a Colorado River Salinity Control Program during the last decade has changed the course of history and reversed the degradation of the finite Colorado water supply by salinity. Important policy and costly decisions are being made in attempts to mitigate the impacts of salinity. It is absolutely essential to U.S.D.A. planning and implementation that the plans with greatest net benefits and with acceptable on farm practices be selected from a broad array of opportunities. U.S.D.A. salinity control planning of needed onfarm irrigation improvements on individual units is essentially completed. Implementation is progressing on 3 of the 12 units.
>
> The U.S.D.A. onfarm salinity control program is receiving positive reviews for cost-effectiveness, and the planning experience gained in this activity will be most helpful in formulating and justifying future salinity control programmes. This planning experience should provide know-how to help irrigated agriculture overcome the salinity problem and not follow past civilisations into oblivion.

When referring to past civilisations going into oblivion they were referring to the Indian irrigation projects that existed in the region of Phoenix in what is now the State of Arizona where hundreds of years before white man arrived in America the Indians had vast irrigated areas. As I understand it, they were extremely efficient for that time but ultimately the salinity problem got on top of them because they did not have the technical know-how that is available to us and ultimately the irrigated areas went out of existence because of salinity. The point that they make is that with the know-how that is available today there is no reason and need for irrigation industries that now exist to pass into oblivion as occurred in past generations. I have pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): I support the motion. I was recently involved in a study tour to observe the implementation of community services by the Aboriginal community. To this end I travelled to the Northern Territory and visited a number of communities around Katherine and Kakadu National Park. I wish to take this opportunity to report on Aboriginal community organisations, particularly the Kalano which is located at Katherine. It operates under a self-management policy and it is an example to other Aboriginal communities and the rest of the Australian community on how Aboriginal people can be responsible for successfully delivering a range of services to their own people.

I was most impressed at Kalano because it was implementing concrete policy and programmes to solve some of the major problems that face Aboriginal people in Australia today. The history of Aboriginal people in Australia has been forbidding and it is unquestioned that they have been exploited and their culture misunderstood. The failure of people to understand traditional land value, management structures and cultural heritage and beliefs of Aborigines has accelerated the breakdown of our Aboriginal society.

The introduction of alcohol has had a devastating effect on our Aboriginal social system. To my knowledge, whilst Government-sponsored programmes have been implemented to secure the betterment of Aborigines, most Aborigines today have not benefited but remain lost between their traditional life and the new European world. However, the Kalano Aboriginal has clearly grasped the nettle and is implementing a programme which can be a pattern for the rest of Australia. I believe that this programme will go a long way to solving the fundamental problems of education, health, employment, housing, alcoholic abuse, and self management which face the Australian Aborigines.

Kalano was established in 1974 following meetings of Aborigines living in Katherine who felt they needed an efficient organisation to represent their views and fulfil their needs. The objects of Kalano are to relieve poverty, sickness, helplessness, and alcoholic depression and dependency. The programme helps Aborigines achieve a totally self-supporting community with balanced development and viable and economic projects in industries. It also helps promote the welfare and development of the association, and provides for education and educational training. The success of housing, health, employment and other services is enhanced by the activities of association members. The community also rosters the preservation and development of traditional and other cultures as well as the recreational activities of members. Through the association's activity, houses have been built for the occupation of members and additional accommodation for Aborigines visiting Katherine during the wet season and on other occasions has been provided.

As Kalano has grown, its services have been extended to serve the outlying Aboriginal communities. It became readily apparent that the existing health and welfare services were unable or unwilling to provide all the Aborigines with the services they required. Kalano obtained land and used it as a large experimental farm and as an economic base to provide a range of services for the Aboriginal community. Kalano became a major centre for the Government's health and welfare programmes, and the development under self-management policies was largely controlled and administered by the Aborigines themselves in an effort to obtain their goals.

From my visit to Kalano I believe that there is no doubt that such a self-management system is far more effective in achieving results by way of effective services for the Aborigines. Kalano is controlled by an Aboriginal council and all members of the staff, except the resident doctor and nursing sisters, are Aborigines. The Aboriginal management staff and the council effectively combine to set the policy and to ensure that the services are delivered.

This example clearly shows the benefit of allowing Aboriginal communities to decide the basis and the nature of their future development. The emphasis is on Aboriginal participation and consultation, and there is no question of a Government officer asking the community to implement a policy that is inappropriate to the needs of that community. The policy at Kalano is self-management, which is a complete turnaround from the policy adopted with respect to some other Aboriginal communities which virtually depend on the Government or non-Aboriginal officers to make decisions and implement programmes. There have been many instances where non-Aboriginal people employed by Aboriginal communities have not possessed the necessary qualities and attitude to work in their community. Such employees cause social and administrative problems for the

Aboriginal communities involved. Through their historically negative contact the Aborigines have developed a deferential attitude to their non-Aboriginal counterparts who have lived and worked in their communities, and there are some instances where non-Aboriginal employees have assumed control and direction of community programmes to the detriment of the community.

In those circumstances the Aboriginal community itself has been loathe to censure or terminate the services of such unsuitable non-Aboriginal employees, leaving it to the Government to intervene only when a crisis occurs with the consequent breakdown of services. Such a situation cannot and is not allowed to occur at Kalano, where the Aboriginal community itself has assumed the sole responsibility for developing Aboriginal initiative and action to meet their own needs and comply with their own wishes.

In view of the practical achievements at Kalano, I suggest that it can be used as an example to show the worth of Aboriginal people trained to implement programmes in Aboriginal communities, and some of the problems associated with wrong, discriminative attitudes held by influential Government people in the Northern Territory. The Katherine Aboriginal community consists of about 300 permanent town residents, between 80 and 120 transients, and about 300 residents on nearby camp communities, some of which, such as Binjari, are about 50 kilometres from Katherine. The main basis at Katherine is a 160-acre experimental farm in which crops such as corn, water melons, tomatoes and seed are grown. The farm in used as a rural training ground where individual Aborigines may acquire agricultural expertise. Regular crops are established and rotated to produce cheap rural products for distribution within the Katherine Aboriginal community. The farm was also established to provide activities within the scope of alcoholic rehabilitation programmes.

In addition to the farm, Kalano has an administrative centre that provides certain community services and fulfils functions as well as alcohol rehabilitation. The Kalano community services comprise water supply, rubbish collection, a pickup service, shopping, and the provision of wood for Aborigines in the community. In respect of all these activities, the emphasis is on working with people and helping then to service their own group.

Kalano has also established centres where the Katherine Aborigines can engage in leisure activities and other activities appropriate to their recreational and cultural expression. A small activity centre is now providing programmes in basket weaving, sewing and silk screening, and there is a workshop where traditional activities such as wood carving can be engaged in. The workshop also doubles as a training centre where Aborigines can acquire skills in carpentry, boat building, welding and mechanical work. In attempting to counter boredom and also to reduce the number of offences committed by young Aborigines and to complement the alcohol rehabilitation programme, Kalano has embarked on a sporting and social programme.

Kalano has established an activity social centre which is run during the evening under supervision. Many young Aborigines attend this centre, and this has helped reduce the boredom, which is the major cause of young people offending. At present, social activities at Kalano include record and piano playing, dancing, table tennis, darts, eight ball, film and television watching. Three nights each week up to 100 community members attend video screenings in a social centre which is a converted farm shed.

The health of Aboriginal people in many respects is intolerably poor. I have seen Kalano's new health clinic and the way that that community is solving its own health needs. The new clinic is being opened today by the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Clive Holding, so it is very appropriate that I should be making this speech in Parliament today. The Kalano health clinic was established because members of the Katherine Aboriginal community were having problems using and relating to the health services provided by the Katherine Hospital. Many Aboriginal people could not understand the hospital-based system and were reluctant to use the hospital. Often they let minor complaints go until the problems were so serious as to necessitate hospitalisation. In addition, difficulties in communication led to poor understanding between patients and hospital staff.

Kalano has gradually extended its health services since 1980. The number of services to patients, the services provided in or near people's homes and the degree of control by Kalano leadership over its services has increased. The Kalano administration building was completed in 1979 and the first doctor consultation was recorded in May 1980. Prior to this, health workers had been employed at the community health centre in town, the first starting in 1972.

In September 1981 the Aboriginal health workers shifted to Kalano on a full-time basis, along with the Health Department sister. During the time medical services were provided by Health Department doctors, the only involvement was one morning a week. In 1981 the Kalano leadership made plans for a new health centre and sought the services of a doctor full time. There was considerable conflict with the broader Katherine community about these proposals, but support in Darwin and Canberra underwrote Kalano's success. There has been a big change in respect of the health workers. In May 1982 the sister and the senior Aboriginal health worker changed roles. The health worker was put in charge of the service, and the sister was to act more in a training capacity. They have doubled the health worker's staff to six in the past 12 months, which includes two men. In July 1982 the new doctor arrived and the former aeromedical doctor withdrew.

The new doctor works under contract to Kalano and is responsible to its executive director. The director is in turn responsible to the Kalano committee, which is elected by the Aboriginal people. Since its operation the Kalano health clinic has helped improve the health and welfare of the Katherine Aboriginal community and has assisted in patient-hospital staff relationships.

Many Aboriginal people do not feel threatened by the clinic's informal environment and use other Kalano services while at the clinic. The detection of symptoms at an early stage has improved and, if hospitalisation is required, the familiarity and rapport established with the clinic staff, aid people in adjusting to the hospital environment. They have a firm anchor to attach to through talking to clinic staff during their regular hospital and camp visits. The Kalano clinic is an example of how Aborigines can do things successfully the way they wish. They have selected a programme and the design of the buildings themselves, even down to the final choice of wall colour. For example, the architect and the department insisted that the wall be painted red, as they mistakenly assumed that this was the colour Aborigines preferred. It took the community considerable argument to get the colour of the walls changed to yellow, which is the colour the community itself wanted. This is only a minor problem but an example of how people assume things and do not consult with the Aboriginal community.

It has become increasingly important that there be Aboriginal involvement in the design, control and delivery of health care services. With some of the cultural beliefs and practices, Kalano can help non-Aboriginal people involved in health care understand Aboriginal attitudes to pain and surgery, fear of hospitalisation, modesty, unwillingness to be separated from family and country, the role of traditional healers, the differing needs and roles of Aboriginal men and women—all these cultural beliefs need

to be taken into account in the design and implementation of health care programmes. Services must modify and adapt to Aboriginal values and needs. The assumption cannot be made that it is only Aborigines who must change.

Another problem facing Kalano and other Aboriginal communities is the high level of unemployment of their members. In many communities it is easier to count those who have jobs than those who are unemployed. The current level of unemployment of Aborigines is related to the fact that at present adult Aboriginal education and training opportunities are non-existent. Insufficient emphasis is placed on the creation of employment opportunities to replace unemployment benefit handouts; there is a lack of understanding of Aboriginal work ethics which causes many problems; and there is a lack of dedicated people who are willing to make it a vocation to work alongside Aborigines and help them organise industries and meaningful activities where they can work at their pace and style.

Many agencies do not realise that Aborigines would much sooner have training and employment in their own communities or that families and elders strongly disapprove of young people going away for training and schooling. Kalano has solved its unemployment problems through training programmes and getting people to work to improve their housing and community.

It is interesting and encouraging to visit an Aboriginal community which owns its own land that it is farming, to see the community creating produce and products for its own use and for sale. I was impressed by the way it applied that enterprise and provided jobs, rather than receiving unemployment benefits. The Kalano association has grown. It supplies a wide range of services. These include the provision of firewood and water, rubbish collection in the camps, the farm, and the extensive housing programme. There is a shop, a pick-up service for alcohol abusers, a social worker and a cash distribution centre for pensions and other cheques. All these activities were established as the community itself saw the need for each one.

I would now like to thank the contacts that I had in Katherine, consisting of all Aboriginal people, namely, John Ah Kit, who is the executive director of Kalano, Norman Rosas, who is also an executive officer, and, last but not least, an Aboriginal social worker, May Govern, whom my wife and I found to be one of the easiest and most pleasant persons to whom we have spoken for many years.

Unfortunately, I have to turn to a more unpleasant subject which still involves this area. I refer to the racist attitude. When I took my study tour, I intended to look at two things. One of the problems facing Kalano in their endeavour to improve the plight of the community members is the failure by the European section of the community to understand what they are trying to do. Unfortunately, in Katherine, like so many other rural towns, there is an undercurrent of racist attitudes. The feelings are so strong that the people do not even bother to talk to the Aboriginal people and understand what they do. A very good example of this is the public comment of the Northern Territory Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, Les MacFarlane. Les is the elected representative of that area and, as such should represent the entire community. Unfortunately, he has published material which indicates his lack of understanding of Aborigines and which has been seen to be deliberate actions of racial incitement. Through his media comments, he has published statements which have been designed to have the effect of lowering the regard which people have for Aborigines in Katherine.

Some statements which he has published in the local newspaper were brought to my attention. For example, Les MacFarlane refers to Aborigines as 'black fellows' and Charlie Perkins as a 'super black fellow' in a derogatory manner. In the Katherine *Advertiser,* Les MacFarlane has stated:

> Aboriginals are backward people; sure they have their spokesmen, like Charlie and Neville, on higher salaries than mine, and a Garry Foley, but 95 per cent are not only deprived as many other Australians but without motivation to succeed.

He further writes:

> A disturbing feature of Aboriginal development is their right to spend money they never earned on whatever they wish, with no reckoning at all, with no goal in sight.

A typical example of his lack of understanding is his statement that Kalano is deliberately promoting apartheid, which he sees as 'separate' development. He states that Australia is no land of milk and honey even now, but one hell of a lot better than all other countries and not because of Aboriginal involvement. It is disturbing, at least, to see such an influential and important member of the wider community making such racist and irresponsible statements. These statements call his public position and the Liberal Party of the Northern Territory, of which he is a member, into disrepute. He has explicitly stated some damning racist statements in the press. These statements imply that Aborigines are inherently inferior to the rest of the community in terms of intellect or other skills.

An example which came to my attention was a blatantly racist poster which he displayed for a considerable period of time outside his Parliamentary office in Katherine. It was a poster calculated to inflame racial hostility, and had no place in a democracy which prides itself on equal opportunities for all people. These public statements by Les MacFarlane, that a racist label is no worry to him, are actions which cannot remain unchallenged. 'Being called a racist these days does not worry me a scrap,' he said. It is time the rest of the community took issue so that people in such prominent positions are brought to realise that such statements cannot be tolerated in today's society.

It is unfortunate that a continuation of such public statements divides the community, hindering the real tackling of the social problems facing Aborigines and ultimately will lead to a breakdown in communication between the sections of the wider community.

Through my observations, Kalano stands not for separate development but for involvement of Aboriginal people in the management of projects affecting them. They expressed to me the recognition of the good value of other cultures, and they actively promote the maintenance of their own culture and its values. They expressed to me the fact that they are Australian citizens of Aboriginal descent, and they wish to be acknowledged with the same rights and responsibilities and were willing to assume their obligations, which are the duties of all other Australian citizens.

In conclusion, organisations such as Kalano exist to create Aboriginal initiative and promote Aboriginal involvement. The primary role of Kalano and other Aboriginal associations should be a depth of communication with the Aboriginal people. Through Government funding and support, Aboriginal communities can implement more employment and adult education programmes to assist and enable Aborigines to take up increasing responsibilities for managing and carrying out their own affairs. Aboriginal organisations should be open as an effective aid towards Aboriginal self-management, rather than being used simply as a vehicle to implement Government policy. In order for permanent facilities to be developed, it is necessary that Aboriginal people have security of land tenure.

Establishment of the Kalano clinic on a full-time basis will go a long way in solving Katherine's Aboriginal health problems. The close working relationship being established between Kalano and the Department of Health will lead to full utilisation of existing resources and emphasis on pre-

ventive education. Special works projects, such as the one just begun on the farm by Kalano, will provide training opportunities and help organise appropriate industries. Aboriginals prefer training and employment on their own communities.

The main role of Government agencies should be to support Aboriginal community organisations and provide essential services such as education, health, employment, housing and better living conditions. In addition to providing such facilities, the Government needs to provide a source of professional knowledge and expertise to Aboriginal associations. This will assist in community relations and guide the associations to possible sources of funding.

Through joint management of projects by the associations and Government agencies, Aboriginal involvement, responsibility and participation will be increased. A joint approach will give Aboriginal associations a say in the control, management, design, delivery and evaluation of Aboriginal programmes.

There is also an important role for local town councils. The attitude that Aborigines are the sole concern of the Aboriginal community organisations and various Government departments has to be changed. Town councils should realise that it is in the wider community's interest that Aboriginal problems be solved. The present poor understanding in remote towns between Aborigines and non-Aborigines will not disappear but will become more severe if nothing is done. Immediate intervention by all concerned parties is required. The town council can provide vital support in race relations by acting as a mediating link between the disparate town communities. For this to occur there is an urgent need for open and effective communication between town councils and Aboriginal associations.

In Katherine, the European community generally observes with distaste the consequences of underlying Aboriginal problems and tends to be critical rather than constructive in its comments about the situation. Many opinions on race relations and Aboriginal welfare work exist and no co-operative spirit or consensus appears to be evident. Aborigines in the Katherine area, and especially those in the town environs, have not accepted their conditions of almost total dependence on service agencies and Government handouts. One of the main problems of the Katherine Aboriginal community is discrimination. The problem is visible, creates racial tension, and has resulted in condiserable tension in the whole community. Bigotry is open, alive and well in Katherine.

It will be a long hard road to any worthwhile changes. Kalano has a vision for the future and is involved in an intensive community work programme to improve the situation in the Katherine area. They need support, not continual harassment and intimidation from influential people, such as Les McFarlane, who is the Speaker of the Northern Territory Legislative Assembly. His actions and statements are disgraceful for a public figure.

Les McFarlane's comments reflect an attitude which sees Aboriginals as a separate species, 'the Aborigines', rather than as Australian citizens of Aboriginal descent with the same rights and responsibilities as all other Australian citizens. Les McFarlane has lost the support of most Aborigines in the Katherine area. His statements call into disrepute both his public position and membership of the Liberal Party. In this day and age a public representative holding the high office of Speaker in the Northern Territory Legislative Assembly should be condemned for expressing such damning racist attitudes.

I am not attempting to score points against the Liberal Party. I am simply explaining to the House the depth of ignorance in the community about Aboriginal issues and Aboriginal culture generally. A great deal of work has been done in South Australia to change this situation, but there is still a long way to go. It is the duty of us all to fight racism in our community, and to foster it is the ultimate in irresponsibility.

I do not want to take up too much of the time of the House, but I want to mention briefly my visit to Kakadu National Park while I was on my study tour. I am afraid that I did not have a great deal of time to spend there, and I did not have a four-wheel drive which one requires to see many parts of the park. Kakadu National Park is a vast wilderness area covering some 6 000 square kilometres of some of the most scenic and untouched areas left in Australia, if not in the world. The country varies from sandstone escarpments with rugged skylines and majestic waterfalls to beautiful wetlands where countless millions of birds and waterfowl live and breed. These vast wetlands are the result of monsoon rains from November to March, which is the beginning of the Top End life support system.

I refer now to the involvement of Aborigines with the operation of that park. There are 20 European rangers and eight full-time Aboriginal rangers. There are four Aboriginal trainees undertaking the course which finishes in September 1983. Those trainees will then become full-time rangers. Further, there are four Aboriginal cultural advisers. Unfortunately, because I had no four-wheel drive and because it was a holiday weekend, being Northern Territory Cup week, I was not able to speak to many of the Aboriginal people there, as I would have liked to have done. However, I certainly would like to return to that park and spend more time there at some later date.

Mr RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (PETROLEUM PRODUCTS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (TOBACCO) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Housing): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): I wish to criticise the Government for the obvious change in direction in its policies that has been evident in the House over the past few months, and I refer to the shocking breaking of promises that has occurred in the short time since the Government took office last October.

The Government has hit where it hurts most—the pocket. The effect on the ordinary working people of this State is devastating. People now realise that they have been conned—they have not been fudged. They believed the Labor Party Leader in the gearing up for the State election when he publicly made promises. They believed him when he told them that if his Government was put into office that it would not raise taxes during its first term of office. That was a distinct promise made to the people of this State and, as we know, he has already broken several promises.

Looking at the A.L.P. policy document under the heading 'Southern Policy Package', the then Leader of the Opposition on page 4 stated, 'We will give priority to upgrading transport corridors to the neglected southern area of Adelaide.' That is in the area of my district, the member for Mawson, the member for Brighton, the member for Morphett, and also the member for Baudin. 'The neglected southern areas,' I believe is quite correct. It has been neglected not only by this present Government but by the previous Government, and the Labor Government which held office for the 10 years before that. It is recognised as the 'Cinderella' area of Adelaide. The then Leader of the Opposition further stated:

The first priority of a Bannon Labor Government will be to re-examine the proposed north-south corridor. Despite the present Government's grandiose promise, the project has been marked by indecision and procrastination. Our objective will be to provide for enhanced public participation—

'Public participation'; and yet this Government entertained five different council mayors from the southern region the other evening and they were told where to go. They came out empty handed and they were given no promises in relation to their concerns and the axing of the north-south corridor. The Premier said in his policy speech, 'Our objective will be to provide for enhanced public participation and to ensure that the facilities are not unduly disruptive.'

We should link up those remarks on page 4 of the promises for the southern area with the remarks made on page 3, where it states:

A Bannon Labor Government will ensure the further development of walking—

he is going to do that all right, in the southern districts—

cycling—

if the roads jam up any further now or in the future, particularly Brighton Road, we will have to get our bikes out, because there will be no room on the Brighton Road. He also suggested that horse riding could be considered. If one reads between the lines it can be seen what the then Leader of the Opposition was actually alluding to. At page 5 the document states:

Feasibility studies have already shown that bus services to the south must be upgraded. They have also shown that some lines should be reopened and new rail links constructed. Labor will direct that work proceeds to the next stage of planning.

We are perhaps being taken along the same lines as the previous Minister of Transport, Mr Virgo, when he said that he would electrify the line to the south. There were to be double-storey trains, with an upper and lower deck, which would not have been able to get under the railway bridges!

Members interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: While the Government continues to con the little people of this State, I will stand here and protect them, not like the member who, when on-the-spot fines were discussed, did not have the guts to put his head in this chamber. The member for Albert Park has not opened his mouth on the 20 per cent increase being introduced by the Government for on-the-spot fines. Continuing from the policy speech, the then Leader of the Opposition stated that there would be 600 more teachers employed in our schools—there has been just over 200 teachers. On transport he said 'Our priority will be to keep fares down, and it will attract and retain passengers.' What has happened with fares? Fares have increased an average of 47.6 per cent, and will bring in $6 000 000 to this State, and yet the then Leader of the Opposition said 'We will keep fares down to attract people onto public transport.' He went on to say that the arts had been effectively marking time for the past three years. The Tonkin Government brought in a scheme to upgrade the museum that this Government has almost wiped off the board. It will upgrade the museum in a small way, not the great scheme that was passed when we were in Government, approved by the Public Works Committee of which the member for Price and I were there to see. Page 21 of the policy speech states:

Unlike the Liberals we will not allow the State charges like transport, fares, electricity, and hospital charges to be used as a form of backdoor taxation.

The hospital fees have been increased by 20 per cent which will yield $20 000 000; ETSA charges have increased by an average of 12 per cent yielding $38 000 000. The average increase in fares of 47.6 per cent will yield $6 000 000, and the water rates increase of between 16 and 22 per cent will yield $26 000 000. They have increased, and notice has been given that they will increase further. What about the little man's relaxation? The Government will increase the cost of cigarettes and tobacco, and that measure will yield $17 300 000. The cost of petrol has increased, too.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I refer to a matter that is more important than the dribble we have become accustomed to hearing from the member for Glenelg. It is a matter that concerns me, and I am not afraid to be critical of the Government should the need arise. I was disappointed to receive information today from the Research Library, where I was looking for a breakdown of criminal statistics within my district, only to find that the information that I obtained related to the 1981-82 financial year.

I find it disturbing that I cannot get up-do-date figures from the research library. On the bottom of the information supplied to me it says that the source is the micro-fiche files on selected offences reported or becoming known to police and recorded on a quarterly basis. I find it rather amazing that as a member of Parliament I cannot get up-to-date figures on crime and could be provided with figures for only the 1981-82 financial year. I would question the provision of a research library and people in the research library if we are to provide this type of information to back-bench members of this Parliament.

This question has to be addressed by our Government and I hope it will be examined closely. I do not believe that I should have to ring around to every division, particularly my own division C1, to gather this information. I might be able to get the information I want and that is not good enough. I want to know what is happening in my area. I want to know the breakdown of the figures in the respective suburbs so that I can be aware of the problems and allay some of the fears that are abroad in the community. I raise this question because of the information that is being published in the *Weekly Times* in my district. In the issue dated 10 August, it stated:

Under siege, curfews, vigilante groups are new issues of concern.

When I was in Opposition I opposed the setting up of vigilante groups and I oppose it now. It is not good enough when people are prepared to write this sort of garbage on the front pages of newspapers and to talk in terms of vigilante groups. Although they try to justify this I do not believe it is good enough to have this sort of material in which they talk about vigilante groups.

I saw the situation in the West Lakes area in the middle of last year and I strongly oppose people talking in terms of vigilante groups and, whilst the newspaper referred to 'people out there, or a survey reveals that people talk in terms of vigilante groups', I do not believe they should be talking in that way. I think they should be looking at the real issue, which is the way we should be combating crimes instead of giving people ideas; whether intentionally or not, that message comes across to me from that sort of material in the local press. It is not good enough. On page 2 of that edition it tried to justify what it was saying by ringing up

other people in the community. I am far from satisfied with that sort of journalism.

I am also concerned about the correspondence I received from a constituent on 8 August in relation to the passing of fraudulent cheques to small businesses. My constituent raised the matter with me on the telephone and subsequently sent me correspondence about the matter. He pointed out in part of his correspondence that a cheque had been passed on to him and he found that another cheque had been passed in the same shopping centre for the amount of $600, but the person who had passed the cheque is believed to be a professional con man and was well known to the local constabulary.

He pointed out that in talking to a detective he had learned that this person had numerous previous offences on his record, both here and interstate, and they all related to fraudulent use of cheques, the latest being as recent as April and his closest was at the Port Adelaide branch (he named the bank). The latest involved the Kilkenny branch of the bank, only three months later and three miles away, which raises a question of just what is required for the opening of a cheque account.

On further inquiries to the police he asked what were his chances of getting back the clothing that resulted from the issuing of the cheque. He was told that legally the person who had passed the cheque was the owner, and the owner of the small business was told that as he had accepted the cheque as payment that gave the person who uttered the cheque the right to use the goods. He also pointed out:

> I am unsure of the penalties handed down for this offence but in his previous offence he was fined, which was paid and I guess he kept the goods. Legal costs prevent us from pursuing these cases as experience shows they normally have no money anyhow.

My constituent also points out the ways in which he believes this matter should be pursued to protect the interests of small business. I do not necessarily agree with what he puts forward, although I will quote them. He says:

> A better form of identification is needed, namely, photos on licences to ensure people cannot falsify documents.

I do not support that view after having had discussions with a number of my colleagues as we are aware of some of the problems associated with such a system. He also said:

> What responsibility should be imposed on banks for issuing cheque accounts? Why is it a shoplifter is not entitled to goods he or she may have taken, yet a person who sets out with the intention of passing false cheques to obtain goods is by law entitled to keep anything acquired providing a short gaol sentence is served or a fine paid.

I do view with concern the situation in which my constituent has found himself. If a small businessman does not take a cheque under modern business practices he will probably lose many sales. They are in a catch 22 situation. If they do take cheques they could well find that the cheque was fraudulent, but if they do not take cheques they could lose sales. I believe this issue has to be looked at and some constructive suggestions or a system be arrived at to protect the small business man.

I was of the belief that a small business man could telephone a bank and ask if sufficient funds were available to cover a cheque that was being presented, but I am led to believe that that is not the case. I hope the Attorney-General will be able to give me some advice that I can pass on to my constituents so that they can protect themselves against these practices.

Finally, I would like to commend the previous Government and this Government for the work that is being done on the extension of the Red Hill bridge which will connect with Bower Road, which is in my district. This will ease congestion for not only Semaphore Park and West Lakes residents but will certainly direct away a lot traffic during the football season and in particular during the finals when there is much traffic in that particular area.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Yesterday in the debate on the Appropriation Bill I signalled to the House my concern about examples of incompetency within the Departments of Lands and Marine and Harbours in particular. I signalled also in that debate my concern for certain delays that were occurring within the Department for Environment and Planning. Collectively, the delays of that kind are not only costly to the public purse but also costly, frustrating and damaging to the private sector. Collectively, the continuation of those incompetent acts and inefficiencies within the departments could ultimately lead to losses of many thousands of dollars to the private sector, if not drive potential developers out of this State.

We have heard much about developers drifting to other States because of the great attraction offered by those States, especially Queensland, although I do not know that in the present political climate many South Australians go to Queensland. Be that as it may, I have received reports that there needs to be some brushing up and today, as part of an on-going campaign, I shall cite yet another two examples of the kind of incompetence referred to in yesterday's debate.

To demonstrate the first, I refer to correspondence from a district council in my electoral district, dated 22 July 1983, when the district council wrote as follows:

> This council is becoming increasingly concerned with the enormous amount of paperwork, time and expense involved in processing applications under the new planning system introduced in November 1982. This is especially so for councils who do not have an S.D.P. which provides for 'permitted' and 'non-permitted' development, where every application except minor development has to be advertised. Furthermore, the new procedures in giving third party rights to objectors is another time consuming, expensive and delaying mechanism for all parties, especially the applicant, where a case in point in this council area is an applicant who received council approval in 1982. The decision was appealed against and even at this time, 19 July 1983, the applicant is still waiting for a decision. We were told that the new system would be simpler for the applicant and easier for developers—if this is so, then something has gone radically wrong with the system or we have all been deceived by it. The new system has become a monster of paperwork with very few benefits to any of the parties involved in processing applications—the old system of I.D.C. was a far superior method of control than the existing system as far as this council is concerned. It is hoped that these matters will be constantly under consideration in order to cut out the unnecessary and allow all parties to proceed without undue red tape and delays.

If there was ever a case of a bungling bureaucracy growing, it is in the Department of Environment and Planning and it is the responsibility of this Government, as it is of any other Government, to ensure that a growth factor of this kind and the cumbersome delays that result are curbed in the interests not only of the Government but of the public of this State.

Secondly, as an illustration of bungling within a department I cite a case concerning the Lands Department. If there ever was a bloody rabbit warren, it is the Lands Department, and to get results from the Minister of Lands or his staff is a task that has to be experienced to be believed. It is incredible. Listen to this case which relates to one of my constituents. I prepared details on this for use during Question Time today but, unfortunately, I did not get a call during Question Time, so I take advantage of this grievance debate to state details of this case publicly.

I challenge the Minister of Lands to supply to the House details and date of lodgement of his request for a Crown Law opinion on matters pertaining to the freeholding of perpetual lease 9634 in respect of sections 411-426 inclusive, hundred of Dublin. If he will not supply those details, will he at least provide the House with the date of lodgement

and explain the reasons for the gross administrative delay surrounding this subject?

It has been reported to me that delays within the Lands Department and the Department of Environment and Planning are costing private sector planners, developers and investors hundreds of thousands of dollars, and causing frustration to the point of serious hampering of development with consequent loss of employment for many who genuinely wish to get on with the job. I refer to an application lodged by one of my constituents on 19 September 1982 to freehold land. As a result of the change of Government in early November, I contacted the Lands Department to see whether the freeholding policy of the previous Government was to be honoured by the incoming Government, and I was assured that it would be to the extent that applications already on file by the date of the election would be processed in accordance with the policy of the previous Government, but no commitment would be made beyond that. However, having gained that assurance, which applied to the case to which I am referring, I wrote to my constituent and confirmed in the words of the officer—

Mr Mathwin: A senior officer?

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Yes, and a respected officer, who said that there would be no problem in relation to the four matters in respect of my constituent's application. Acknowledgement of that application was received by my constituent on 14 April 1983. Among other things, the Director-General of Lands informed him that the perpetual lease had gained approval for freeholding and the purchase price was stated. Everyone was very happy with the result, albeit frustrated by the delay.

The next letter to which I refer was from the applicant saying that he accepted the offer received from the department. That letter was dated 9 June, well within the statutory three-month period and, indeed, only two months after the offer had been made. Then he received a letter signed by Jack Richards. Everyone knows Blocker Black Jack from the Lands Department: he blocks everything coming to his notice. In this letter he said, in effect, 'Sorry fellows.' In particular, the letter states:

> Further to my letter of 14.4.83 an attached acceptance form regarding your application to freehold perpetual lease 9634 . . . that offer to freehold is now withdrawn.

So, after a commitment received from the department and its acceptance by my constituent, Black Jack has withdrawn the authority. Subsequently, on 12 July 1983, my constituent went ahead and paid the purchase price which was accepted by the department and in respect of which I have a receipt for $780.

Believe it or not, when we went on deputation to the Minister of Lands a few weeks ago, he said, 'It's too hard. I have referred this matter to the Crown Law Office and am waiting for a response before we go ahead.' This gross delay is an example of incompetence within the department for which the Government must be held responsible. It is the sort of thing that is happening throughout the system and is typical of what I referred to in this House yesterday. Indeed, throughout the life of this Parliament I will continue to city the incompetence of this Government and will seek redress.

Motion carried.

At 5.19 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 23 August at 2 p.m.