HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 14 September 1983

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

PETITION: SOUTHERN DEVELOPMENTS

A petition signed by 243 residents of South Australia praying that the House request the South Australian Housing Trust to review its proposed new development in the area adjacent to Doctors Road and Stirling Drive, Morphett Vale, and other southern developments was presented by Ms Lenehan.

Petition received.

PETITION: TOBACCO PRODUCTS

A petition signed by 1 397 residents of South Australia praying that the House not support restrictions on the advertising of tobacco products was presented by Hon. W.E. Chapman.

Petition received.

OMBUDSMAN'S REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report of the Ombudsman for the year ended 30 June 1983.

Ordered that report be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ROAD NETWORK

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Transport): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: In Question Time yesterday, the member for Davenport asked for the release of a report on road network strategy in the southern areas. Since coming to office, I have had numerous meetings on this topic with the Southern Regional Organisation of Councils and there has been an amount of subsequent correspondence. Recently, I agreed to report back to the Southern Regional Organisation on the current road network strategy, following on the Government's decision to finally remove the old north-south transportation corridor from the development plan. My officers had compiled correspondence dealing with a number of related questions and including a map and summary of the road network development strategy that is presently being formulated for the area.

I told the honourable member, in my reply, that this document would be in the post to the parties concerned today or tomorrow. The member for Davenport should now have a copy. However, on reading *Hansard* this morning, I realised that there may be some confusion as to which report was to be released. I now realise that in his question the member was referring specifically to a road network strategy report prepared by the Highways Department. That report was prepared, at my request, to examine the impact of this Government's policies on the southern areas road network. Although the report took into account the decision on the north-south corridor, it was not prepared as a definitive analysis of the future impact of this decision on road network development. This report is an internal working document and is one of a number of studies, minutes and other papers that form the working papers for our continuing strategic reassessment of the road network requirements in the southern areas.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: I challenge you to release that report.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: It cannot be—

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Will you release that report?

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

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: It cannot be read in isolation and is part of the normal—

The Hon. D.C. Brown: That's weak.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Davenport.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:—confidential advice supplied by departments to the Government. I have no intention of releasing the report to the public or to the honourable member. However, as I said previously, I have supplied the southern region and other interested parties, including the member for Davenport, with a map and essential summary of our current position in the formulation of a road network strategy for the southern areas.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

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

Pursuant to Statute—

1. Racing Act, 1976-82—Greyhound Racing Rules—Qualifying Trials.

QUESTION TIME

SANTOS

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier seek urgent discussions with Santos Limited to ensure that a major section of the Santos operation is not relocated in Sydney or Brisbane? The Premier recently assured the House that there was no question of a change in the Adelaide headquarters operations of Santos. The Premier said any relocation involved (to use his words) 'one or two of the functions currently conducted in Adelaide, particularly in regard to the Queensland operations'. The latest edition of *Santos News*, the internal newspaper produced for Santos employees, carries an article dealing with relocation of sections of the Santos operation which says one of the existing executive directors (Dr John McKee) would now direct all South Australian operations. He had been appointed to the new post of General Manager (S.A.) and would continue to be located in Adelaide. The article goes on to say:

> It may well prove desirable to relocate one or more of the other executive directors to either Sydney or Brisbane. Some part of the finance function (including a General Manager, Finance) will be located in Sydney as previously advised.

There are three executive directors of Santos, including Dr McKee. Of the others one is Company Secretary and is in charge of internal auditing, accounting, the implementation of expansion and finance (an area earmarked for transfer). The other is in charge of Queensland operations, exploration and business development. It has been suggested to me that, if these two positions were to move to Sydney or Brisbane, as the article in *Santos News* indicates might occur, the major proportion of the Santos operations would be withdrawn from Adelaide, including those vital sections dealing with finance, and business expansion and development.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This matter was raised some weeks ago in this place. The information that the Leader of

the Opposition purports to give does not take the position any further than when it was discussed in the House previously, and I stand by the answer I gave then. I do not need to institute urgent discussions with Santos because in fact some weeks ago I had those discussions with the Chairman and the Board. I have also formally written to the Board and I have received total assurances that the Santos headquarters will remain in Adelaide.

ORIANA

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Transport please inform the House what effects and benefits are likely to result for South Australian—

The SPEAKER: Order! I would ask the Premier and the Leader to stop their conversations. They are totally out of order and also rude to the member for Mawson. I would ask her to recommence her question.

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Transport please inform the House what effects and benefits are likely to result for South Australian tourism from today's berthing of the cruise ship, the P. & O. liner *Oriana*?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is perfectly in order for any Minister to answer the question. The honourable Minister of Tourism.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am well aware of the question. I listened very intently both times that the honourable member was required to put her question to the House. I advise all members of the House that I will be going to Port Adelaide (Outer Harbor) later to meet the *Oriana* and welcome the ship and the captain to South Australia. I am sure that all members would support me in doing that.

There are many benefits in both the short and the long term from the visit of the *Oriana* to South Australia. Today's visit immediately highlights the value of including Adelaide on major cruise ship itineraries, for nearly 500 South Australians are boarding the liner this afternoon. This has proven an overwhelming response, and serves notice on all international cruise operators that a handsome market for this type of holiday does exist in South Australia. Obviously, if a demand like this can be maintained, more major passenger services could be enticed to berth at Port Adelaide.

The fact that tourists are leaving our State for a holiday elsewhere should not overshadow the importance of today's visit. The *Oriana* is here for about six hours, and during that time hundreds of transit passengers will be enjoying shore excursions that will give them a brief glimpse of Adelaide and her surrounds. These tourists are from the Eastern States. Some may have been to South Australia before, others may not. Either way, they are here now, and will no doubt spend modestly during their short stay. By simply participating in the coach tour excursions that have been arranged by the Department of Tourism they are supporting South Australian companies and services. (By berthing at Port Adelaide considerable harbor business is generated.)

The success of today's visit could have all sorts of spin-off benefits. Interstate passengers may well be tempted to come back to this State for a separate holiday after a brief taste of our hospitality this afternoon. As I have mentioned, other cruise ship operators may also be enticed to follow P. & O.'s example and include Adelaide on their itinerary. Obviously, this would expose a growing number of visitors to Adelaide and South Australia. If this popularity grew, the Adelaide stop-off may well be broadened in the future to a stay of perhaps a day and a night, which naturally means we would stand to benefit even more. These are long-term possibilities, but there is no time like the present to start things moving.

The massive public relations exposure that Adelaide will gain by today's visit is most desirable. For a start, the hundreds of transit passengers will each receive a complimentary bottle of port, welcoming them to Adelaide—Australia's finest port! Who knows where those bottles might end up, but wherever they do, Adelaide and South Australia will be featured. Already there is talk of P. & O. immediately featuring Adelaide on its 1984 schedule. This is yet to be finalised, but if it does eventuate it naturally means that Adelaide will be featured in a brochure that will be distributed around the world, giving our State capital the same international status as other exotic ports. This type of inclusion will assist in the recognition and reinforcement of Adelaide's international status by both the travel industry and the travelling public.

UNIONISM

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Deputy Premier withdraw instructions that compel people participating in job creation schemes to join a union, in view of statements made by the Federal Minister, Mr Dawkins? In response to a question in Federal Parliament last Thursday on compulsory unionism applying to job creation schemes operating in South Australia, the Federal Minister said:

> The honourable member was asserting that it would be a requirement in South Australia that union membership should be compulsory before unemployed people could participate in job creation schemes. That is certainly not a requirement of the Commonwealth-sponsored schemes.

In a further explanation, the Minister said:

> The guidelines for the Community Employment Programme are the responsibility of this Government [the Federal Government]. I indicated at the time that it was not now, and would not be, a requirement of the C.E.P. that preference would necessarily be given to unionists.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: First of all, it is good to be recognised again: I have not had a question from the Opposition since the last vicious attack on me a few weeks ago. So, it is very good to be recognised. In a very important portfolio like mine, one would have thought that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:—the Opposition spokesman would have been questioning me more vigorously than has been the case.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Let's hear a decent answer, so that we can—

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: In fact, the member for Light has never asked me a question in his life about my portfolios: therefore, I do not think that he ought to be interjecting at the moment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are always out of order. The honourable Deputy Leader.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Have you had time to think of an answer yet?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I shall answer the question all right, when I have finished what I am saying. It is clear to me that the Leader of the Opposition made a very bad mistake in appointing the Deputy Leader to oppose me in this House. Clearly, the member for Davenport should have been given that responsibility, because he knows something about the relevant matters. I think that the question asked by the Deputy Leader is the first that he has asked me for about four months; so, he is either very lazy or incompetent—it is one or the other, although I am not sure which it is.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Perhaps it is both. Nevertheless, I am very pleased to get a question. I have been sitting here day after day, full of anxiety about when I am going to be asked a question, but I have had no questions at all.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, is this an example of inadequacy of an answer, a matter to which you referred yesterday?

The SPEAKER: It is a perfect example of how one's opinions can change as one changes from one side of the House to the other. But on a more serious note, it is a matter that will have to be picked up in due course by the Standing Orders Committee. There is no point of order. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Thank you, Sir, for your protection. I noticed when I was answering the question that the member for Alexandra was interposing (of course he should not have been interjecting, so I shall say that he was interposing rather than interjecting) with a comment about how lonely he felt when he was on this side of the House, and I think he described it as a chook sitting on a fence. He probably fell off after the election. Having said that—

An honourable member: You've forgotten the question now.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: No, I am coming to the question. I hope that I have prompted the Opposition to ask me some questions daily: they do not have to make a tirade of it like they did a few weeks ago. Certainly, I would like to receive a few questions to allow me to explain some of our policies that are being implemented. In relation to the question asked by the Deputy Leader, I say that there is no compulsory unionism operating in South Australia and there never has been. The only policy that this Government has is to give preference to unionists, which has been qualified—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Just a moment. Honourable members are taking on the Federal Arbitration Court when they do this; they are criticising that court and the State court. It has been the case for many years, particularly in the Federal court, that preference is given to unionists. I am fully aware of what has happened in the Federal Parliament, the question asked by Mr Porter, and the answer given by the Hon. Mr Dawkins. I have had discussions with the Hon. Ralph Willis, the Federal Minister, as late as 12.45 p.m. today. He is the Minister responsible for the C.E.P. scheme and we have decided that this question needs to be looked at more closely. He will be coming back to me with some recommendations as to how he feels about this situation.

The policy of this Government, and one in which I believe, is that if a person works in an area covered by an organisation where there are paid-up members, it is incumbent on that person to pay his way. It is done in a club, a football club, a bowling club, wherever anyone participates. If a person wants to work under conditions obtained by a union, then he has to pay. If he does not want to pay there are plenty of areas where he does not have to join a union. There are no organisations operating in those areas—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Let us examine this more closely. Looking at the *Advertiser*, which I would say is not the most radical organisation in South Australia, a person cannot work there unless he is a member of the appropriate journalists organisation. No-one can work at G.M.H.—

Mr Mathwin: It's a closed shop.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Right; it is a closed shop. Many of the manufacturing areas in Adelaide are fully covered by union membership.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: It is right, and it is clear, so far as the fundamental principles of this Government are concerned, that if anyone is to work in an organised area he has to be a member of that union. He has a choice not to work there. It is as simple as that. That has been the policy of this Government dating back to the early 1970's and I believe that it has worked extremely well. Let anyone in this House—

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The member for Todd would not know what day it was. Let us not worry about him. Let anyone in this House cite to me the last industrial dispute the Government had over someone not joining a union. Prior to this policy coming into operation, we were attending daily to stoppages all around the place because some bloke would not pay his way. A person cannot go into the bar and not pay his way or into a bowling club and not pay his way. It is the fundamental belief not only of this Government but of other people in the community that if a person is going to work in an organised area he has to pay his way.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on the next question, I am not sure whether the honourable Chief Secretary is headed towards the *Oriana*, but he will not be in the House for the rest of Question Time. Therefore, questions should be directed to the Premier.

PETROLEUM FRANCHISE

Mr FERGUSON: Is the Premier aware that the member for Davenport has sent a letter to service station managers requesting them to have their customers sign a petition calling on the Parliament to withdraw the recent increases in petroleum franchise fees? If so, will he advise the house on what action he plans to take if and when the petition is presented?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have been made aware that the member for Davenport has circulated such a letter. In fact, a petrol station proprietor who was astonished by the hypocrisy of the member's letter ensured that it was sent to my office. The letter, while it does list a breakdown of how much of the cost of each litre is attributable to various State and Federal Government fees and levies, was quite misleading in that it is clearly trying to suggest that the State Government has some major responsibility. In fact, of the 28 cents per litre which goes to a combination of State and Federal Government fees, the Bicentennial Road Development programme and the import parity levy, just over 2 cents a litre (or 7 per cent of the total) supports State Government revenue. That is the increase of 1 cent a litre that came about as part of the general tax package introduced by the Government in the face of our appalling revenue problems.

What is even more interesting about the letter is that it shows once again that the member for Davenport seems to be at odds with his Leader. Here we have a petition which asks this House to recommend to the Government that the recent increase be withdrawn and not be reimposed for at least two years. On 5 May, under the headline 'Some tax rises needed', the *Advertiser* reported a statement by the Leader of the Opposition as follows:

> The Leader of the Opposition, Mr Olsen, conceded yesterday that tax increases were needed to cover some of South Australia's Budget blow-out. He suggested that higher bus, train and tram fares and an increase in the levy paid by fuel resellers and passed on to consumers could be considered.

The Leader was announcing an alternative Budget strategy at his news conference. He said that the higher fares and

fuel levy of 1.5 cents a litre could cover the $23 million cost to South Australia of the natural disasters. That is an interesting statement indeed and contrasts very nicely with and was not referred to in this message sent to service station proprietors by the member for Davenport. That report was on the occasion of the Leader's first alternative Budget strategy for 1983. Yesterday we had a revised version of that, which made it look somewhat hollow. It seems that between 5 May and yesterday political expediency has overcome his proposal that higher bus, tram and train fares and an increase in the petrol franchise were necessary to cover the State's problems.

The honourable member has asked me what the House intends to do when it receives this petition if, in fact, it does. All members know that the Clerk reads out the terms of a petition and indicates that it will be forwarded to the responsible Minister for his consideration. We have certainly got some responsibility to respond. At this stage I can indicate that the Government will give serious consideration to responding to each and every person who signed the petition, explaining the extent to which the petrol levy was involved and, most importantly, letting them know the bipartisan nature of this impost in light of the Leader's statements. We may even send them a copy of that article.

As for the problems between the Leader and the member for Davenport, they will have to be resolved in the Party room. If the member for Davenport does present the petition as a result of the approach to service station proprietors, I can only assume that he has another alternative to the mark 2 and mark 3 versions which the Leader has presented in terms of his recipe for the recovery of this State.

COMPULSORY UNIONISM

Mr ASHENDEN: Will the Government review its policy on compulsory unionism, in view of the comments in the Ombudsman's Report tabled this afternoon? In his report the Ombudsman states:

> There does seem to be one area where the Government is acting in a manner which affects the civil liberty of individuals and this relates to the request by the Public Service Board as a result of a Cabinet decision for heads of Government Departments to forward to the Board lists of employees who do not have union subscriptions deducted from salaries or wages.
>
> Whilst I do not see it as the role of the Ombudsman to say that a Government should not take such action, or make such a policy, it does, nevertheless, cause me some disquiet as to what extent a Government may encroach upon a person's privacy and individual rights. I have more to say on the topic of privacy in the section of this report entitled 'Privacy and public servants'.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: First, I congratulate the honourable member on his fast reading of the report that has just been delivered to us but I do not praise him for his inattention to the vital questions to which he should have been listening and the answers coming from this side of the House. In brief, the answer is that we do not have a policy of compulsory unionism: we have a policy of preference to unionists. Yet again, I have had to get to my feet and tell members opposite that that has been one of the keys to industrial peace in this State.

I am not suggesting that the Opposition take my word for it: I am suggesting that it look at the practice of the arbitration and industrial tribunals of this State, at the practice of most of the major employers and at the accepted policy of a number of organisations. Let us dispose of that once and for all. I, too, have been perusing this report and have seen the reference made by the Ombudsman. In relation to this, I would say for a start that it is based on a wrong precept, as I have just suggested to the honourable member. Secondly, I refer the honourable member to the last sentence, which states:

> I have more to say on the topic of privacy in the section of this report entitled 'Privacy and public servants'.

If one turns to that, one will see the Ombudsman discussing the question of computerised information and problems that may arise from it. It will be noticed from that that the Ombudsman refers to certain steps being taken by this Government to re-establish the privacy committee, which was in operation in 1979 and was allowed to languish—put into cold storage—by the Tonkin Government and has been revived by us. A reference is made there to our establishing certain guidelines and principles in relation to the use of computerised information. That answers completely the point made on page 7 by the Ombudsman. This Government is seriously, for the first time in three years since the issue languished under the previous Government, addressing itself to this problem and, instead of carping criticism, let us get some credit for it.

VIDEO CLASSIFICATION

Mr MAYES: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Attorney-General to report on what provisions are contained within the amendments to the Classification of Publications Act to control the exposure of children to unsuitable videos? I have been approached in recent months by a number of my constituents who are concerned about the lack of classification of video material. They are very concerned about the fact that children can be exposed to all sorts of video material. I note that, as a consequence of the present position, a campaign is being mounted in the *Advertiser*, and I refer briefly to an article written by Father John Fleming which, under the heading 'Sickening, horrifying videos', states:

> On the other hand, there is no reason why we should encourage its [video material] availability in the community by giving it legal respectability and ensuring its ready distribution. Of course, most parents would not agree to their children viewing such films. But the further reality is that there is no real or effective control on that once such films are widespread in our civilised (sic) community.

The people who have approached me have requested from the Government an assurance that video material be classified.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. My colleague the Attorney-General has advised me that recently the State and Commonwealth Ministers responsible for censorship matters met in Brisbane at which the matter of the control of home use video tapes was discussed. The Ministers were conscious of the fact of near impossibility of preventing all offensive video tapes from entering Australia.

It was acknowledged that it was impossible for the Customs Department to screen all tapes, as they can arrive in bulk shipments with allegedly innocuous titles, can be carried in by passengers as single copies or be received through the post in packets. Some material may, of course, be locally made and is therefore outside the jurisdiction of Customs. With this in mind, it was agreed that control could best be imposed at the point of sale. (At the same time it was recognised that no system of control would prevent a black market in grossly offensive tapes.)

The Ministers finally agreed to a voluntary system of classification similar to that used in South Australia for the control of pornographic magazines. In short, when the legislation is amended, a prosecution will be able to be launched against a person for selling a magazine and, now, a video tape without a classification or when sold contrary to the terms of its classification.

The classification system agreed to will be akin to that used for films. The classification of video tapes submitted

will be undertaken by the Commonwealth Films Review Board. However, the classification system will differ from that for films in that cuts will not be able to be ordered, although they may be negotiated: instead, it would be placed in an appropriate category (X being a class beyond the current categories which apply in places of public entertainment but not beyond that which has been available for 10 years for home use).

The system will result in most fictional entertainment video tapes carrying advisory markings of G, NCR, or M and distribution of documentary, education type films being unimpeded. There will be a requirement for R type material to be sold in sealed bags to persons over 18 years of age, and X type material to be confined to areas where minors are not permitted.

The Attorney-General has issued drafting instructions for the appropriate legislation in this regard. The Attorney believes that this action will provide some greater form of protection for the community in that it will provide a guide as to what is suitable for home family entertainment.

Finally, I understand that many members have received inquiries from constituents on the proposed legislation. If such is the case, this explanation may be useful in any response to constituents.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr LEWIS: When did the Minister for Environment and Planning tell the people concerned that he intended to acquire their land to add to certain national parks, as reported in an article in the *Advertiser* on Monday 12 September? In that edition, an article attributed to Mr Kym Tilbrook and headlined 'Buy wetlands, says report' states:

Major additions to South Australia's parks system are proposed to protect the remaining South-East wetlands. A draft report on the future of the wetlands, which are important for wildlife and flora conservation, has recommended four wetland areas be bought to create new parks or be added to existing parks.

The article states that the report recommends that the area of Naen Naen Swamp be added to Gum Lagoon Conservation Park and that negotiations for its purchase have started. That is rather odd for a draft report.

The SPEAKER: I hope that the honourable member will get back to his explanation.

Mr Gunn: He's doing a very good job.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not need the assistance of the honourable member for Eyre. The honourable member for Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: The article details the four areas that are recommended to be bought in order to create new parks or to be added to the park system. The first is Naen Naen Swamp near Kingston whereas, in fact, Naen Naen Swamp is closer to Keith than to Kingston, and the area to be acquired from a Mr Kinnear is not Naen Naen Swamp but Nae Nae Park. The other areas recommended to be acquired are Poocher Swamp, near Bordertown; Butchers and Salt Lakes, near Kingston; and section 328 in the hundred of Waterhouse, between Robe and Beachport. The article indeed identifies the mistake in the Minister's report and states:

Naen Naen Swamp, covering 997 hectares, is one of the most significant swamps for the survival of the freckled duck.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: I am talking about the freckled duck, not members of the Labor Party, although often they could be—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Mallee to come back to the question.

Mr LEWIS: The article continues:

The freckled duck is a rare and endangered species—

and no-one disputes that—

and it is necessary to protect what remnant habitat remains for it in south-east Australia. As the landholder is unwilling to enter into a heritage agreement, acquisition is the only available option to secure future conservation.

I do not know why that report is not available to members—

The SPEAKER: Order! That is totally out of order, and before I withdraw leave (I will not withdraw leave at this stage) I will give the honourable member one final chance to complete his explanation within Standing Orders. The honourable member for Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I must know when and how the Minister told those people that he intended to acquire their land.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have now been here for 13 years, and I think that my biggest single accomplishment was in fact not needing the honourable member to repeat his question, because I kept in mind right through specifically what the question was. Since the honourable member requires specific dates and times, obviously it will be necessary for me to get a considered reply for him so that I can be as accurate as I possibly can be for his benefit. However, since the matter has been raised in a general way as well as in a very specific way by the honourable member, that press release arose out of Cabinet approval of a report that was brought down by a working party which was set up, of course, in part by his colleague who sits immediately in front of him and also by, I imagine, the member for Chaffey, as Minister of Water Resources at the time.

That committee has met and has provided a report which will shortly be generally available. Only the necessity for getting it properly set up and printed has prevented a general dissemination of the report not only to honourable members but also to the general public. During the working through of the meetings that were held and the chapters being written, it was reported to me that some areas would obviously be recommended for acquisition where we might get going even before the whole report was released. So, some months ago I initiated the whole process in relation to the Nae Nae Park (as the honourable member will have it) and Poocher Swamp.

At present I do not know where that matter specifically is, but I have no doubt that the people who may be subject to an acquisition would be aware of what is going on, because that is in the nature of the acquisition process. I do not think that there is anything particularly mysterious about a Government deciding to act on a portion of a report prior to the publication of the whole report. There was no doubt that the report would recommend that certain areas be acquired either compulsorily or as a result of negotiations with land owners. It seemed only reasonable, considering that my Party had come to power with a very strong policy on the acquisition of wetland areas, that we should set the ball rolling, even in advance of the issuing of the report. I do not see anything mysterious about deciding to move on matters which the Committee clearly would be strongly reporting on, anyway.

However, as to specific dates and times of giving information to people, I will obtain that information. As to the general recommendations in the report, which talks about a lot of areas which may be subject to acquisition in the future, of course, I would say that for the most part people have not been spoken to but that in those cases we could be talking about acquisitions or purchases which are well down the track indeed.

FLINDERS RANGES EXPLORATION PROGRAMME

Mr GREGORY: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy provide the House with a progress report on the exploration programme currently being carried out inside the western boundary of the Flinders Ranges National Park? On the basis of information previously provided by the Minister, another field trip should have been completed towards the end of August, and I would appreciate having details of that trip and any other information that can be made available.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The honourable member is quite correct in his assumption that another field trip has been completed. I thank him for the opportunity to bring the House up to date on the details concerning the important exploration, geological and geophysical work that is taking place on an organised basis inside the border of the Flinders Ranges National Park. The field trip, the second of three trips planned in the first stage of the exploration programme, took place between 15 August and 26 August. It involved two geologists and two field assistants who operated from a base camp on Edeowie Station, outside the park. During the trip, geological mapping and stream sediment sampling was completed over a section of 7½ kilometres between Bunyeroo Gorge and Edeowie Gorge. As a result, 236 stream sediment samples have been sent to Amdel to be analysed for lead and zinc and 89 rock samples have been sent to B.H.P. for petrological examination and analysis. The next field trip is scheduled to start on Thursday of this week and will continue for two more weeks. During this time, mapping and stream sediment sampling will be carried out in a section between Bunyeroo and Brachina Gorges.

During my last report to the House on this exploration programme, I mentioned that tests were being carried out outside the park to establish the most effective and least environmentally disturbing methods of carrying out the geophysical investigations which are to be undertaken during the next stage of the programme. Between 18 and 24 July a test geophysical induced polarisation survey was completed near Tea Cost Creek, about four miles north of the park boundary. This site was chosen because of the similarities of rock type and topography between this site and the terrain which is expected to be encountered within the park.

The test survey has established that induced polarisation will satisfactorily provide the necessary geophysical information. The electrode pits will measure one metre by half a metre and will be 10 cm deep. Steel stakes will be hammered into the bottom of each pit and 10 to 20 litres of water applied daily. It is not expected that any crop will arise from that watering: it has another purpose. Two such pits will be required for each survey site, but the number and location of pits needed will depend on the geological mapping and stream sediment results. At the completion of each survey, the steel stakes will be removed and the pits filled in and smoothed in such a way that the disturbance will be undetectable after the first significant rain.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to keep the House informed about the detail of and the way in which this exploratory work is being carried out in the Flinders Ranges park, having regard to the concern that was expressed originally when the Government took this step after the consideration that was given in respect of the ultimate purpose, namely, that this is support and back-up geological and geophysical work related to the search for a possible source of lead/zinc ore which can be used in maintaining employment levels in Port Pirie.

RESEARCH AND BEQUEST FARMS

Mr BLACKER: My question is directed to the Minister of Education representing the Minister of Agriculture in another place. Is the Minister able to advise the House whether the proposal released a few days ago recommending the sale of research and bequest farms (and I refer to the case of the Simms farm at Cleve) is in direct breach of the terms of the will of the late Mr Sims? If the Department of Agriculture is not able to use the property as bequeathed, does it have any legal right to dispose of the property as suggested?

The property just east of Cleve was left by the late Mr Gordon Sims for research and educational purposes. I understand that the report released a few days ago recommended the disposal of this property. My constituents are anxious that the property be used for agricultural educational purposes as bequeathed. Also, it has been stated to me that if the department is unable to use the property as bequeathed, it forfeits any right to dispose of or alter the use of such. Although the Department of Agriculture apparently does not have an adequate use for the property, it is possible that the Education Department could use the property under the terms of the will. The Minister of Education has previously accepted an invitation to inspect Sims' farm next Friday, and I assume rather coincidental to the report coming out. My constituents trust that the Minister will recognise the benefits of the use of the property as it was originally intended.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: First of all, I will have to obtain a detailed report from my colleague in another place as to the report to which the honourable member refers. Clearly there are a number of legal issues involved and any future actions by the Government will be, in the terms of Simms' farm, primarily in the area of the Minister of Agriculture. As to the educational proposition put to Sims' farm, that will be as a result of discussions between myself and my colleague in another place. I have had some preliminary discussions with the Hon. Frank Blevins advising him that I will visit the farm, and also hear the views about its future education possibilities. I will take this matter up with him again after I have had the opportunity of visiting the farm on Friday next. I am looking forward to having the opportunity of inspecting the place and hearing the views of those involved locally.

If the education possibilities are to be followed through, it would not be so much the Education Department but rather the Department of Technical and Further Education that might be interested in it. However, at this stage I cannot comment until: *(a)* we know the further views of the department of Agriculture and the Minister of Agriculture and, *(b)* after a detailed consideration and after having had a chance to see the place and to hear the viewpoint of those people whom I will meet on Friday. As to the report and the legal issues raised by the honourable member in the question, I will have a reply brought back from the Minister in another place.

UNEMPLOYMENT TRAINING PROGRAMMES

Mr PLUNKETT: Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport say whether his department is assisting in training programmes being conducted by Technical and Further Education departments? If so, can the Minister give details of the programmes, assistance given by his department, and the benefits these courses will have for the unemployed and the community as a whole?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am very pleased to provide the details as requested by the honourable member. The Department of Recreation and Sport has assisted TAFE with the introduction of the unemployment training programme in the recreation, sport, fitness and health areas. Officers of my department have been involved with designing

the programme, interviewing and selecting the candidates and conducting the special training courses. Existing departmental courses being conducted for TAFE are as follows: the Community Fitness Instructors Course; the Health and Fitness Centres Instructor Training Course; the Sports Administrators Course; and the Sports Injuries Course.

The TAFE programme is being conducted as an experiment with funding from the Commonwealth Department of Employment and Industrial Relations. Until now, 15 candidates between 17 and 24 years of age have been selected for the training programme. In line with this Government's policy and that of the Federal Government, we hope to provide specialised training for unemployed people in areas where there are likely to be work opportunities. These areas include fitness and health studios, community fitness programmes and recreation centres run privately or, alternatively, by local government. It is the intention of the Department of Recreation and Sport to become more involved with fitness programmes by providing accredited fitness instructors and fitness programme assistance in consultation with the private sector and other interested organisations. By doing this it is hoped that it will create more employment and ensure higher standards of training to promote better community health and better community fitness.

YATALA PRISON

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: My question relates to Yatala Labour Prison but I direct it to the Premier as Leader of the Government. In view of the comments in the Ombudsman's Report tabled today, will the Premier explain the progress the Government is making to implement the recommendations of the Swink Report to improve the situation at Yatala? On pages 8 and 9 of the Ombudsman's Report, comment is made about the situation at Yatala, as follows:

> In December 1982, I wrote to the Chief Secretary setting out my main areas of concern and advising him that some inmates had threatened to burn down the Yatala Labour Prison and that I, and my officers, considered that the situation currently existing in 'S' Division was potentially 'explosive'. In February, I rang the Chief Secretary to voice my concern as no action appeared to have been taken to remedy the matters which I had previously drawn to his attention. The Chief Secretary expressed his apparent concern with the situation at Yatala Labour Prison but he advised me that he was not able to take any major action until he had seen, and studied, the Touche Ross Report commissioned by his Government. He advised me that he would have to take a risk that nothing serious would happen until the report had been completed.

The Ombudsman further states:

> Unfortunately, the situation erupted and South Australia experienced the worst violence and damage to one of its prisons in recent memory. This was followed by a series of sit-ins by inmates at both Yatala Labour Prison and Adelaide Gaol.

On the same page the Ombudsman also states:

> However, I am concerned that the Government has not yet implemented many of the short term recommendations, although I gather that it supports the report. I hope that in the next financial year, the Government will see fit to spend moneys in this much neglected area.

As the Budget has been brought down, we recognise that that is not the case. I therefore ask that question of the Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member in a sense answered his own question with that last sentence. I notice that he selectively read from the Ombudsman's Report. He stopped at the sentence which states:

> At this stage I agree [that is the Ombudsman] that little could be done until the Touche Ross Report had been completed.

I am not sure what the honourable member's motive was in leaving out that sentence, but that surely is the crucial fact. Since this Government came into office and since the 10 months that my colleague has occupied the office of Chief Secretary in charge of prisons, more action has been taken by Government in terms of commitment to improve our correctional services than has been taken in three decades. Let that not be forgotten. Let it be remembered by at least two members who sit opposite, including the current Leader of the Opposition, as they had their opportunity—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —to do something about the prison system but did very little indeed. This Government has taken action. As the Ombudsman points out, in December 1982 he rang to express his concern. That was a month after we came to Government. The Chief Secretary was able to advise that we had taken urgent action in the commissioning of the report, in getting Swink organised and in assessing the situation. In February he rang again and was advised that we were awaiting the findings of this report. He said that he agreed that little could be done until the Government had received such report. In the time between then and now major steps have been taken to improve the situation in the circumstances of the greatest difficulty in the prison system. I suggest that the member look at what action took place over the past few months in relation to the reorganisation of our prison system, what commitments were made by the Government and also look at the current Budget which has put in train more than has been done in prisons and correctional services by any other Government for generations. We stand on that record and we are proud of it.

NAILSWORTH BUILDING COMPANY

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place, obtain an urgent report and advise what action can be taken against the Nailsworth Building Company concerning allegations for faulty workmanship in a house erected by that company at 61 Sir John Marks Drive, West Lakes, subsequently purchased by my constituent, Mr L. Siebel?

My constituent purchased the aforementioned property from the Nailsworth Building Company in March 1982 at a cost of more than $150 000. This type of house is called in building parlance a 'spec home'. My constituent has since that time, despite contacting the Consumer Services Branch in June 1982, received very little satisfaction from the builder concerned. The saga of events as I am advised is as follows. On 2 June 1982 my constituent lodged a complaint with the Consumer Services Branch. Mr Siebel (my constituent) provided the branch with a copy of a letter listing 11 items of complaint which had been forwarded to the builder on 10 May 1982.

On 17 June 1982 Mr Siebel advised that a person had inspected the leaking roof but no further developments had taken place. On 17 June an officer of the branch discussed the matter with a Mr Alvaro of the company concerned. It is alleged that Mr Alvaro advised that the leaking roof had been attended to but he refused to rectify the other complaints, including the complaint about the air-conditioner. An inspection by me of this property revealed a gap at least 1¼" wide in the ridgecapping of this house through which water poured into a number of rooms. On no less than 25 occasions my constituent has failed to achieve satisfaction from the company concerned.

I will not bore members with all the details but suffice it to say that on 18 April 1983 an inspection of Mr Siebel's house confirmed that five items of faulty workmanship were

still outstanding, the most serious being dampness in walls. Among other things, the air-conditioning unit specification stated that it was to be a 4 h.p. unit but a 3 h.p. unit was installed; in the shower recess because of the way the tiles were laid water seeps into the wall showing water dampness on either side of the wall in the upper hall; one window has a broken frame; cracks in the walls are in need of repair and many other small things too numerous to name are in need of correction. Finally, my constituent has put it to me that if the law is deficient in consumer protection and redress then amending legislation should be introduced to stop these alleged complaints and unsavoury practices.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I shall seek from the Attorney-General the report the honourable member has sought.

HOPE ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr INGERSON: Can the Premier say whether the character evidence to be given by the Attorney-General to the Hope Royal Commission will be the sum total of the State Government's submission to the Commission and, if not, when will the Government submission be made and is it being prepared by the Attorney-General?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The character evidence being given by the Attorney-General is in fact being given because he has been called in his private capacity by Mr Combe and relates not to the proceedings of the Commission but to character evidence, and that is not officially connected with the Government in any way. Apart from the inquiry into the specific matters concerning Mr Ivanov, the Commission at the end of that stage of the exercise, as I understand it, will go on to look at broader questions of security, the role of the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation, and other matters relating to it. The Government intends to make a submission to that stage of the inquiry at the appropriate time which will not, I understand, be for some weeks yet. The Attorney-General is in charge of working up that submission and no doubt will make the presentation, but whether in person or whether simply by a written submission has not been determined.

TELEPHONE BETTING

Mr MAX BROWN: Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport advise whether telephone off-course betting by the proprietors of Port Pirie betting shops is covered by Parliament's decisions to extend the life of such establishments and, if so, will the Minister consider amending the Racing Act to allow registered bookmakers operating elsewhere in the State to take telephone bets? An advertisement in the *Whyalla News* of 2 September stated:

Haydn Madigan's
Betting Shop
Telephone
Betting
Available

Telephone betting is now available at Haydn Madigan's Betting Shop, Port Pirie. This is a legal method of betting when you cannot attend the racecourse.

For more information contact Haydn Madigan's Betting Shop (086) 32 1102.

A few weeks before that advertisement appeared I had contacted the Betting Control Board about an allegation that a Port Pirie bookmaker had accepted by telephone a substantial s.p. bet from an on-course punter at a non-T.A.B. greyhound meeting at Whyalla. The dog on which the bet was placed won at s.p. odds which were strangely much better than any punter could have obtained on course.

If this type of transaction is allowable under the provisions of the current Act, the turnover of the bet does not assist the code or racing club in question. It would be possible under these conditions for Port Pirie betting shops, if they so desire, to operate telephone betting of all descriptions on race meetings throughout the Commonwealth and that would be of no benefit to the race meetings being conducted.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The member for Whyalla has asked two or three questions and I will deal first with the advertisement in the *Whyalla News* to which he referred. That advertisement is absolutely legal, because on 4 August I laid on the table regulations amending the Betting Control Board rules of betting. One of these amendments allows such advertisements to be placed as long as certain conditions were complied with. The conditions are that the premises bookmaker at Port Pirie who seeks to advertise may do so as long as the advertisement is approved in writing by the Betting Control Board. I understand that this advertisement by Haydn Madigan was approved by the board.

It is legal for premises bookmakers at Port Pirie to accept telephone bets at their premises. Section 79 of the rules of betting allows for telephone bets to be accepted between the hours of 9 a.m. and 7 p.m., which is the spread of opening hours. I would suggest that the telephone bet referred to by the member for Whyalla was legal. The rules of betting relating to premises bookmakers provide that the bookmaker must have a supplementary betting sheet upon which every telephone call must be recorded immediately a bet is taken, and those sheets go back to the Betting Control Board.

The honourable members asked that if these premises bookmakers are allowed to accept telephone betting would the Government consider extending that facility to other licensed bookmakers. I believe that question should be investigated a little more fully before I give a definite answer, because it involves many complicated aspects of the racing industry. It would have some effect of course on the T.A.B. turnover and it would have a tremendous effect on the turnover of on-course bookmakers. So, I am willing to look at the matter, without giving a definite answer to the honourable member's question now.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972-83. Read a first time.

Mr MATHWIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill amends the principal Act to enact a provision that should be supported by all fair-minded members, on whichever side of the Chamber they sit. For many years the workers of Australia (and I have in mind especially those in this State) have had to pay, not voluntarily but compulsorily, money into Labor Party funds by way of a sustentation fee or political levy, or both. The payment of this money to the Labor Party has been compulsory because Australian Labor Party rules provide that such a fee must be deducted from the worker's pay packet whenever the worker receives his pay, if the union to which the worker belongs is affiliated to the A.L.P. In this respect, the constitution of the A.L.P. (South Australian Branch) requires payment by the affiliated union of an annual sustentation fee of $1.35 in respect of every effective member on its books who is not a member of any other political Party or auxiliary thereof.

Since that rule was incorporated, it has been changed in respect of the amount of the fee, so that the sustentation

fee has now been increased to $1.58 for each such member. I understand that the new constitution incorporating this amount is now in the hands of the printers and that the set of rules to be issued shortly will show that amount to be paid to the Labor Party in respect of every effective member on the union's books who is not a member of any other political Party or auxiliary thereof. The sustentation fee is to be paid in advance by quarterly instalments payable in April, July, October and January.

So, although some of these union members would not know that they were paying a sustentation fee, they have this amount deducted from their pay. A recent rider in the A.L.P. rules refers to whether a member is a member of any other Party, but this is only a face saver: in theory it may sound all right, but it does not work because a member who refused to pay the sustentation fee or political levy would be a brave person indeed if he or she gave, as the grounds for refusal, membership of the Liberal Party, Country Party or Australian Democrats. So the principle of compulsory deduction of sustentation fee is wrong indeed.

After all, a worker may believe that he or she is entitled to the whole of the wage earned, in which case he or she must tell the union secretary, organiser or shop steward that he or she does not wish a sustentation fee or political levy to be paid to the A.L.P. No doubt such a person would be asked to say why not, and the Bill is built around my belief that such a person who commences work and/or joins a union should be able to contract into the situation in which he or she need not have the sustentation fee or political levy deducted from the pay packet. I would not deny the worker the opportunity to join a union: that is the right of the worker and I personally believe that workers should join the appropriate union. However, I do not believe that workers should have to pay a sustentation fee or political levy. I believe that workers should have the right, if they desire, to opt out of such payment more easily. It should be up to such workers to tell the secretary of the union, the organiser or shop steward that they do not wish to pay a sustentation fee or political levy to the Labor Party and that they wish to retain the whole of their wage.

Mr Lewis: There should be freedom of choice.

Mr MATHWIN: Yes. People should be given that freedom. I believe that the compulsory deduction of the sustentation fee or political levy from the worker's pay packet is morally wrong.

Mr Groom: Should a company be able to make such a deduction as a donation to the Liberal Party?

Mr MATHWIN: I see that I am pricking the conscience of the member for Hartley. No wonder he is embarrassed on this matter. He is hiding his head in shame, and that is no wonder when he, the honest man that I believe he is, knows that it is morally wrong for the worker to have this money deducted from his or her pay packet whether or not he or she likes it.

The rule providing that the sustentation fee shall be deducted from the pay packet of the worker represents a financial commitment to the A.L.P., and it is morally wrong that such a commitment should be allowed to continue and that the worker should not have the chance to opt out or to contract out. The sustentation fee is part of the union member's annual subscription to that union. My Bill does not provide that the unionist shall have the right to be exempted from contributing to a political Party: it merely makes such a commitment a voluntary one, and we all know that one volunteer is worth 10 pressed men. I believe that the payment of the sustentation fee or political levy should be a voluntary commitment by any worker as to whether or not he wants to pay it rather than that the worker should be made to withdraw from the compulsory payment of the sustentation fee or political levy.

Mr Trainer: He's allowed to opt out.

Mr MATHWIN: But why should he? Why should not he say what he wants to do with his own money? I wonder what would happen if my friend from Ascot Park suddenly realised that his salary had been docked $5 or $10 a quarter and if, when he investigated the matter, someone told him that it had been given to the Liberal Party. He would faint. What is the difference between opting out and opting in? I would like to enlighten the House on that matter. All members of a trade union, which sets up a political fund, are liable to pay the levy unless they individually decide to contract-out. To do this they must notify in writing to the union secretary their objection to paying this levy. However, the member must continue to pay the levy until the commencement of the next ensuing quarter (so the member is down for the quarter, anyway). This may seem a simple, normal procedure, but there is far more to it than that. It means that a member is forced to disclose his political antagonism by having to contract-out, and this in itself is an abuse of the member's political freedom. Remember, we have secret ballot for political elections.

In other words, if the person concerned belongs to another Party he has to tell it why he is doing this. Why should any member of the community have to tell someone which way he votes? After all, workers and people generally (in English-speaking countries, anyway) have fought hard and long to have secret ballots in political elections. Why should they have to say for whom they vote? Contracting-out is, therefore, liable to victimisation. People on both sides can be really bigoted, and some of them can have a certain power within a factory. Let us imagine, for instance, someone working on the line at Holden's who says to the shop steward, 'I don't really want to pay this because I am a financial member of the Liberal Party.' He would get the job of standing on his head in the boot of the car and tightening up screws for the rest of his life, or doing some other nasty little job, to teach him a lesson for daring to say that he even thought about being a Liberal.

As to the opposite situation of contracting-in, there is no hardship at all. Any member who wishes to contribute to his Party (for instance, the Labor Party) can do so, regardless of how he voted. It is entirely up to him: he does not have to disclose for whom he votes. That person is then obliged to notify the secretary in writing in the usual manner. There is nothing difficult about that matter.

The Government has put pressure on workers to join a union. Indeed, we had a report on this matter today from the Ombudsman—the most neutral person in South Australia. He has to be completely neutral, and, because of the important reference it contains, I will read his report to members. The Ombudsman himself is concerned about this matter. We see that the Government is encouraging people to join a union, and the Government says that it is preference to unionists. The Premier said today that it is not compulsory unionism. However, he did not in any way give us any clue at all as to just what is the difference between compulsory unionism and preference to unionists or the way in which people are being forced to join a union. What is the difference?

The member for Henley Beach, who has been elevated now to the next-to-front bench, has his eye on the Minister of Local Government's job. However, I would like the learned honourable member, when he gets on his feet (as he no doubt will to protect his Party), to tell us from his vast knowledge the difference between preference to unionists and compulsory unionism. In fact, I extend that challenge to any member on the other side, including my friend and former neighbour the learned member for Hartley. I would like him to tell me the difference between preference to unionists and compulsory unionism.

Mr Groom: I'd love to. I will give you a series—

Mr MATHWIN: Although he is naughty and interjecting out of his place (which I know I should not be answering), I know that the honourable member will be only too delighted to tell me all about it in his own good time from his proper seat in this House. Government departments give preference to unionists. In other words, one either joins a union or loses one's job: if one has no job, one starves. That is how plain it is.

Mr Meier: That's the freedom of choice you have: a job or no job.

Mr MATHWIN: That is right. Of course, we know that this is a high finance situation as far as the Labor Party is concerned. It is big money.

Mr Trainer: You tell us how big.

Mr MATHWIN: I will. I am glad that the member for Ascot Park has egged me on, because I did not think that I would put in all that information for the public. However, now he has forced me to do that. I will have to do that a little later on, so hold your breath for 10 minutes and you will get the good news.

Trade unionists either have to pay this sustentation fee or tell the person in charge why they will not do so. It is their money, and the terrible thing about it is that many union members do not realise that they are paying a sustentation fee. In fact, a survey conducted about four or five years ago showed that a vast number (I am guessing, about 37 per cent) did not know that the union was affiliated with the A.L.P. and that they were paying money to the Labor Party. Of course, some of them were horrified, because they were good Liberals, and it shook them to the core. Many people do not vote for the socialist Party, anyway. As I said earlier, they vote for the Liberal Party or the Country Party, and some of them might even vote for the member for Semaphore as an Independent.

Why should they have to go cap in hand to the shop steward and say, 'Please let me have my proper wages, do not dock this money from my pay, but give me my full pay'? Why should they have to ask a shop steward for their rightful return, for their full wage for the work that they have done? A person who has been working for an employer who is paying him for that work should be entitled to the money. Why should a union dock money from a person's pay? That is disgraceful, and I am surprised that members opposite are condoning that.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: I am surprised that the newly elevated member for Henley Beach supports that sort of thing. If he continues in that way, he will finish up on the back bench. If the rank and file members said that they did not want to pay money to the Labor Party an employee would have to contract out. What would happen if a person challenged this and dared to say that he was a member of the Liberal Party?

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: The member for Henley Beach is so excited because he has been elevated to the middle benches. Let me put a plain question: in regard to a trade union with a membership of, say, 11 000 members, why should not a union secretary give the sustentation fees of 5 000 members to the Liberal Party, the fees of 5 000 members to the Labor Party, and the remainder to the National Country Party, or perhaps the Independent member for Semaphore (why should he not have 1 000 of these people paying him $1.58 to help with his Party)? That is fair and right, so why should that not happen?

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: I know that they do not have to pay full membership and that those affiliated with the A.L.P. do not pay the full cost. In fact, a stab at it is taken; they say, 'Well, we have 11 000 members, so we will pay 10 000 sustentation fees.' I think that that situation is quite wrong. A fairer situation would be for an employer to decide to which Party the money should go; let him share it out.

Mr Ferguson: Where does your money come from?

Mr MATHWIN: I know that some of the money for the Labor Party comes from the big industries, so the honourable member should be careful. We know that in some cases each Party gets a cheque for an equal amount. I do not think that the member for Henley Beach would be in this deeply enough to know about it. He should have a talk with the member for Florey, who will put the honourable member on the right track. The member for Florey knows all about this business and, indeed, he would know all the answers. As I have said, all members are not affiliated with the A.L.P. Any reasonable business arrangement would provide that an employer must be given permission to take money from the wages of employees. Employees should be given the opportunity to decide whether they wish to pay a sustentation fee or political levy to a political Party.

What about migrants not previously familiar with the language who suddenly find out, when they have learnt the language and settled into their new surroundings, that they have been a member of the A.L.P. for five years? What a shock it would be for a migrant to find out that he has been a financial member of the Labor Party because he has paid affiliation fees over the years. We now see why the Government supports compulsory unionism, and the situation begins to unfold. Of course, there is more to it than meets the eye. One must realise also that there are advantages to the A.L.P. other than merely the financial advantages, which are considerable with thousands of workers each paying $1.58. The member for Ascot Park referred earlier to this matter, and I am glad now to have the opportunity to refer to the sort of money that we are talking about here. Information was published concerning Australia's 100 top trade unions, based on 1976 figures.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: The Minister asks why I do not have up-to-date figures. Although the Minister is not a trade union man, he should be aware of the fact that to obtain information on balance sheets of trade unions one has to go to the Registrar at the Industrial Court to peruse them. By law, companies must produce a balance sheet, but trade unions lodge their balance sheets with the Industrial Court to which members of the community must apply to obtain permission for perusal only. That is a sorry state of affairs.

I am glad that the Minister of Community Welfare reminded me about that, because I had forgotten about that situation. That is why I am using figures pertaining to 1976. At that time the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union had a membership of 166 160 and an accumulated fund of $1 959 973. That union is affiliated to the A.L.P., so that on those figures of nearly 10 years ago it can be seen that 166 000-odd members were paying into the A.L.P. The Australian Workers Union had 150 000 members and had accumulated funds of $4.6 million. That union, of course, is affiliated to the A.L.P., so it is supplying A.L.P. funds. The Shop Distributive and Allied Employees Union had 141 000 members in 1976. I understand that because of the push later within the shop assistants area 16 000 members were in that union in South Australia. They pay $1.58 a head to the A.L.P.

The Federated Clerks Union of Australia has 84 000 members and assets in 1976 of $1 172 701—not today but in 1976. It is also affiliated with the A.L.P.

Mr Trainer: You're wrong. You had better go back and check.

Mr MATHWIN: I have a list here, and to save the member for Ascot Park having a heart attack, I seek leave

to have that statistical evidence inserted into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The Unions—Summary of Vital Statistics

The unions—in order of membership; with accumulated funds, accumulated funds per head; and affiliations with peak council, or political Party. Note: accumulated funds are based on last available accounts. A.L.P. Affiliations are by State—not always each State, as indicated.

Union	Membership	Accumulated Funds	Funds per Member	Affiliation
1. Amalgamated Metal Workers Union	166 160	1 959 973	11.52	ACTU/ALP
2. Australian Workers Union	150 000	4 600 000	29.30	ACTU/ALP except Vic. Qld
3. Shop Distributive and Allied Employees	141 000	625 047	4.43	ACTU/ALP except Vic.
4. Transport Workers Union	92 000	1 098 551	11.94	ACTU/ALP
5. Federated Liquor and Allied Trades	85 000	970 042	11.41	ACTU/ALP
6. Federated Clerks Union of Australia	84 000	1 172 701	13.96	ACTU/ALP
7. Federated Miscellaneous Workers Union	83 000	830 973	10.00	ACTU/ALP
8. Electrical Trades Union	75 314	508 556	6.75	ACTU/ALP
9. Federated Ironworkers	68 000	1 555 453	22.87	ACTU/ALP except Vic./Qld
10. Bank Officials Association of Australia	65 000	717 563	11.03	ACSPA
11. Storemen and Packers	62 500	473 969	7.58	ACTU/ALP
12. Printing and Kindred Industries Union	56 317	1 750 000	31.00	ACTU/ALP
13. Vehicle Builders	52 000	572 993	11.00	ACTU/ALP
14. Australian Railway Union	50 000	722 000	14.44	ACTU/ALP
15. Administrative and Clerical Officers Association of CPS	48 725	740 058	15.18	CAGEO
16. Australian Postal and Telecommunications Union	47 000	680 143	14.47	ACTU/ALP
17. Australian Meat Industry Employees Association	45 399	713 677	15.71	ACTU/ALP
18. Federated Municipal and Shire Employees	44 744	625 753 (N.S.W. and Vic. only)	13.94	ACTU/ALP
19. N.S.W. Teachers Federation	43 671	1 124 294	25.74	ACTU/ACSPA
20. Hospital Employees	40 000	465 078	11.62	ACTU/ALP
21. Commonwealth Public Service Association (4th Division)	39 970	262 539	6.56	CAGEO
22. N.S.W. Public Service Association	39 712	698 667	17.59	ACTU
23. N.S.W. Nurses Association	37 200	454 982	12.23	ACSPA
24. Builders Workers Industrial Union	35 500	449 747 (N.S.W. only)	12.00	ACTU/ALP
25. Australasian Society of Engineers	35 000	850 000	24.28	ACTU/ALP
26. Australian Textile Workers	35 000	805 809	23.00	ACTU/ALP
27. Royal Australian Nursing Federation	35 000	99 517	2.84	—
28. Clothing and Allied Trades	33 000	606 586	15.16	ACTU/ALP
29. Builders Labourers Federation	30 000	—	—	ACTU/ALP
30. Federated Engine Drivers and Firemen's Association of Australia	27 942	360 025	12.88	ACTU/ALP
31. Commonwealth Bank Officers Association	26 553	270 177	10.17	CAGEO
32. Employees Association	25 806	108 500	4.20	ACTU/ALP/CAGEO
33. Municipal Officers	24 000	134 050	5.58	ACSPA
34. Health and Research Employees Association	23 663	428 556	18.10	ACTU/ALP
35. Association of Architects, Engineers, Surveyors and Draughtsmen of Australia	23 422	434 767	18.56	ACSPA
36. Victorian Teachers Union	22 572	868 815	38.45	ACSPA
37. South Australian Public Service	22 014	277 497	12.60	ACSPA
38. Australian Insurance Employees Union	19 914	94 677	4.75	ACSPA
39. Australian Shipping Officers Association	18 100	190 960 (N.S.W. only)	15.60	ACTU/ACSPA
40. Victorian Public Service Association	18 000	320 180	17.78	Aust. P/S Assocn
41. Australian Transport Officers Federation	18 100	215 738	11.80	ACTU/ALP ACSPA N.S.W. only
42. Federated Rubber and Allied Workers Union of Australia	16 000	541 390	33.83	ACTU/ALP
43. Association of Professional Engineers	15 832	95 882	6.02	ACSPA

The Unions—Summary of Vital Statistics

The unions—in order of membership; with accumulated funds, accumulated funds per head; and affiliations with peak council, or political Party. Note: accumulated funds are based on last available accounts. A.L.P. Affiliations are by State—not always each State, as indicated.

Union	Membership	Accumulated Funds	Funds per Member	Affiliation
44. Water and Sewerage Employees Union	15 000	171 646	12.26	ACTU/ALP (Wages) ACSPA (Salaries)
45. SA Institute of Teachers	14 962	346 100	23.00	ACSPA
46. Operative Painters and Decorators Union	14 000	412 738	29.40	ACTU/ALP except Tasmania
47. Australian Timberworkers Union	14 000	204 000	14.57	ACTU/ALP
48. Australian Tramway and Omnibus Employees Association	13 800	338 196	24.55	ACTU/ALP
49. Plumbers and Gasfitters Employees Union	13 300	320 000	24.06	ACTU/ALP
50. Federated Furnishing Trades Society	12 550	133 000	(NSW & Vic. only)	ACTU/ALP
51. Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners	12 500	263 932	21.00	ACTU/ALP
52. Waterside Workers Federation	12 000	1 373 732	114.47	ACTU/ALP
53. Australian Federated Union of Locomotive Enginemen	11 472	310 129	27.00	ACTU/ALP
54. Miners Federation	11 020	1 300 000	121.40	ACTU/ALP
55. Musicians Union of Australia	10 500	300 000	28.57	ACTU/ALP (Vic. N.S.W. W.A.)
56. Commonwealth Telephone and Phonogram Officers Association	9 749	—	—	CAGEO
57. Australian Boot Trades Employees Federation	8 875	459 991	49.78	ACTU/ALP
58. N.S.W. Police	8 300	644 008	83.33	ACTU
59. Food Preservers Union of Australia	8 000	165 589	21.00	ACTU/ALP
60. Federation of Australian University Staff	7 409	50 000	6.74	—
61. Victorian Secondary Teachers Association	7 400	173 068	23.38	ACTU under consideration
62. Australian Journalists' Assoc.	7 305	488 068	66.81	—
63. Federated Brick, Tile and Pottery Industry Union of Australia	7 069	46 960	7.00	ACTU/ALP
64. Technical Teachers of Victoria	6 738	—	—	—
65. Actors and Announcers Equity Association of Australia	6 500	25 000	4.00	ACTU/ALP (N.S.W. only)
66. Federated Cold Storage and Meat Preserving Employees Union	6 500	154 947	28.17	ACTU/ALP (S.A. & Vic.)
67. Federated Moulders (Metals Union) of Australia	6 000	200 000	33.33	ACTU/ALP
68. Australian Theatrical and Amusement Employees Association	5 500	119 000	21.63	ACTU/ALP
69. Union of Postal Clerks and Telegraphists	5 059	57 625	11.39	ACTU/ALP/ ACSPA
70. ABC Staff Association	5 035	841 946	16.02	CAGEO
71. Australian Glass Workers Union	5 000	201 213	45.90	ACTU/ALP
72. Professional Radio and Electronics Institute of Australia	5 000	81 073	16.21	ACTU/CAGEO
73. Federated Confectioners Association	5 000	169 163	33.83	ACTU/ALP
74. AMP Staff Association	4 563	40 000	8.70	—
75. Australian Shipping Officers Association	4 300	18 858	4.38	ACTU
76. Seamen's Union of Australia	4 300	536 518	12.50	ACTU/ALP
77. Pulp and Paper Workers	4 000	300 000	75.00	—
78. Sales Representatives and Commercial Travellers Guild	3 731	8 110	2.17	ACTU
79. Australian Institute of Marine and Power Engineers	3 129	747 000	238.73	ACTU/ACSPA
80. Commonwealth Public Service Artisans	3 010	26 734	14.00	CAGEO
81. N.S.W. Public Service Professional Officers Association	3 374	42 355	12.55	ACSPA
82. Gas Industry Salaried Officers Association	3 000	60 000	20.00	ACSPA
83. Federated Gas Employees Union	2 876	128 412	44.64	ACTU/ALP
84. Australian Federated Air Pilots	2 700	1 000 000	370.37	—
85. Merchant Service Guild	2 700	134 295	49.73	ACTU

The Unions—Summary of Vital Statistics

The unions—in order of membership; with accumulated funds, accumulated funds per head; and affiliations with peak council, or political Party. Note: accumulated funds are based on last available accounts. A.L.P. Affiliations are by State—not always each State, as indicated.

Union	Membership	Accumulated Funds	Funds per Member	Affiliation
86. Secretaries and Managers Association of Australia	2 604	34 000	13.05	ACTU/ALP
87. Motor Transport and Chauffers	2 000	26 226	13.00	ACTU
88. Federated Tobacco and Cigarette Workers Union of Australia	1 633	3 700	22.65	ACTU/ALP
89. Woolclassers Association of Australia	1 500	26 169	17.44	ACSPA
90. Flight Stewards	1 200	20 325	16.95	ACTU/ACSP
91. Civil Air Operations Officers Association	1 200	83 776	69.81	CAGEO
92. Federated Marine Stewards and Pantryman's Association	1 040	35 604	34.23	ACTU/ALP
93. Funeral and Allied Industries	880	6 383	7.25	ACTU/ALP
94. Firemen and Deckhands Union of N.S.W.	530	46 000	86.79	ACTU
95. Australasian Air Flight Engineers	404	46 681	115.54	ACTU
96. Models and Mannequins	100	100	1.00	TLC, N.S.W., ALP
97. Amalgamated Metal Workers Union	166 160	1 959 973	11.79	ACTU/ALP
98. Woolclassers Association of Australia	1 500	26 169	17.44	ACSPA

Mr MATHWIN: That table shows the financial advantages to the A.L.P. If one adds that up, at $1.58 a head, that is a colossal amount of money. I have talked about the advantages to the A.L.P. Now I will talk about the advantages to the Australian trade union bosses.

Mr Plunkett: Are you a member?

Mr MATHWIN: Yes. I am glad that the member for Peake has asked me about my affiliation with the unions, and I will only be too pleased to tell him of my association with them. In fact, had I continued in the vein I had been, I would have been a shop steward and probably been elevated to this House as a good Liberal.

The advantages to the trade union bosses are the power they have at conferences, the conferences that decide the A.L.P. policy. The more people to whom they pay the sustentation fee—and I understand that the A.M.F.S.U. has about 12 000 to 14 000 members presumably who are all paid up because of this situation I will relate—

Mr Ferguson: You're wrong again!

Mr MATHWIN: I understand that fewer than 9 000 members received a vote at the last election of that particular union. The power is that when a trade union member is at a conference and he has 8 000 members in his union, when he puts up his hand (it is not like the member in the sub-branch of the Labor Party talking with his one vote) that hand designates between 5 000 and perhaps 9 000 people. That is a marvellous example of one vote one value, the great catch cry of the Labor Party, when one man in their conference can put his hand up and vote for between 5 000 and 8 000 people! I now wish to refer to a book called the *Australian Trade Unions,* and an article written by Mr D.W. Rawson at page 177—

Mr Ferguson: That's 20 years old.

Mr MATHWIN: No it is not; it is not very old at all. Mr Rawson is a Senior Fellow, Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University, and he states:

> Though unions may seek political advantages or concessions from Labor as well as from non-Labor governments as external pressure groups, their distinctive political role comes from their additional ability to act within the Australian Labor Party. Not all unions, nor even all affiliates of the A.C.T.U. and the Trades and Labor Councils, are affiliated to the A.L.P. Indeed, those which are not include some which are very active in politics, such as the N.S.W. Teachers' Federation. While most large unions are affiliated to the A.L.P. many are not and affiliations vary both from State to State and from time to time.
>
> The trade union officials provide most of the A.L.P.'s finances, both in regular affiliation fees and in occasional donations for elections and other purposes. To a greater extent in Australia than in other countries with Labor Parties, they tend to regard the Labor Party as being the creation of the unions and therefore subject to their control. To a large extent, the Party's rules appear to recognise this. The supreme Party authority in each State, the conference, always has a large majority of delegates from the unions together with a smaller number of representatives of Party branches. Hence, if the union representatives agree to act together, they should always be able to gain control. The conferences elect the State executives and also the States' representatives on the Party's federal conference and federal executive, so that at all these levels the trade union representatives can be dominant, if they so wish to be.
>
> The other people within the A.L.P. who are obviously of great importance are the members of Parliament. On appearances, and to some extent in reality, they are subject to the State executives and conferences and therefore, at least potentially, to the trade union officials. As well as this, the A.L.P., alone among the world's Labor Parties, has accepted the principle that the conferences and executives may give instructions to the members of Parliament not only on broad questions of policy but, if necessary, on quite specific matters of tactics.

That is the situation as laid out in that book. I believe in strong responsible trade unions which are there to protect the workers, their conditions and their interests. I remind the House that most rights given to the trade unions over the years have been by the right-of-centre Parties. The history of trade unionism goes back to the United Kingdom from this country. It was a Conservative Government in the United Kingdom that gave the right to form trade unions and it was the same Party that gave the right to picket and to strike: that was given by the right-of-centre politics, let us never forget that.

Those members in this House familiar with trade union matters will not need to be reminded of the Hersey case concerning people who would not pay their political levies. That case is reported in the *Australian Law Journal* at page 419. As I said earlier, I believe in trade unions and I have many friends who are members of unions. In my time I always encouraged workers to join the trade union; I believed it only right that they should, but they are my personal feelings. However, I believe it is only right that they should refuse if they so want. In fact, I was one of a number of members on this side of the House who, when Trades Hall was built on South Terrace, gave a donation. So, a number of those bricks and stones in that great building on South Terrace are there because I and some of my friends on this

side of the House gave a donation to that building: I have a receipt to prove it.

I was a member of a trade union in the United Kingdom. When I left the United Kingdom, the night I went for my clearance to the trade union meeting, they had two minutes silence for me because I was going to Australia and they thought that I would get into serious trouble if I came here. It should not be compulsory to pay a fee by any method or means. It robs people of their livelihood and their jobs. No union card means no job, and that is unfair. Also, people should not be harassed for not paying a sustentation fee or a political levy. That is their right.

It is a short Bill with only two clauses. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 allows the person to contract-in by giving his or her consent in writing to the payment of a fee to any political organisation. That enables them to pay a levy voluntarily if he or she desires, so that in the future they will not be forced to pay finance into a political Party which they do not either support or are especially opposed to. I ask honourable members to support the Bill.

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

PLANNING ACT

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I move:

That the regulations under the Planning Act, 1982, relating to vegetation clearance, made on 12 May 1983 and laid on the table of this House on 31 May 1983, be disallowed.

A considerable amount of concern has been expressed in the community over the Government's handling of this measure. Right from the outset I say quite categorically that I am not opposed to some form of control on vegetation clearance. That is not my intent, nor has it been the intent of anyone who has contacted me. However, I am opposed to the way in which the Government has handled the matter with the wanton unnecessary restrictions it has applied. My reason for moving for disallowance is that it is the only way that I, as an elected member of Parliament, can bring on to the floor of the House these regulations under this legislation.

As all members know, these regulations were carried out under a cloak of secrecy. Very few people knew what was going on. The people most directly involved, particularly the farming organisations, were not informed. They had no means of input or communication. Another departmental office which should have had some involvement—the Country Fire Services—likewise was never informed of or involved in any considerations in the matter. The only way that I can have a say and provide the platform, which other members of Parliament similarly affected can do, is through a disallowance motion. It is not my province to move to amend these regulations as that is not possible in this debate. I can only move that the regulations be disallowed. I trust that the House will see it that way, have the regulations disallowed and reinstituted in a way acceptable to the overall community.

I am yet to come across a person who does not believe that there should be some sort of control in vegetation clearance. Everyone acknowledges that, in the past decade or two, there has been unnecessary destruction of native vegetation. In many cases that destruction has been carried out as a result of ignorance of the long-term consequences of those actions. All the land clearing that has taken place has been done on the basis of agricultural development. In that sense I do not think anyone can really point the finger and say that we should not have done it. It was undesirable in some instances but, basically, the person on the land is a conservationist by his very nature. If he does not preserve his land and the surrounding habitat, his likelihood of successful production—be it crops or stock—is somewhat diminished. By the very nature of his occupation he has to be a conservationist.

Somewhere between that level and the requirements of those on the other side of the spectrum who want every blade of grass and twig of bush preserved, irrespective of the economic consequences and irrespective of the likely effect it would have on any individual, there must be a balance. To that end that balance could only have been achieved if the Government was prepared to talk with the people directly involved and therefore bring about a rational and reasonable approach to the situation. Surely the experiences of 1976-77, when the Vegetation Clearance Report was released in October 1976, should be enough to tell any Government, Minister or departmental officer that if one wants such regulations to succeed one must have preliminary discussions, involvement with and input by the people most seriously involved.

We now have a stand-off 'them and us' situation—where those most likely to be affected by this legislation are up in arms at the Government's bureaucracy and stand-off attitude of 'You shall do as we say' rather than asking people to co-operate in vegetation control. There has not been one element of compromise shown by the Government. It is an attitude of 'Do as I say or bad luck'. There has not been one suggestion by the Government that it would look to meeting people in a compromise situation. There has not been the slightest sign from the Government to show that it is prepared to encourage or foster a reafforestation programme or incentive scheme by which primary producers can retain or rehabilitate vegetation in their areas. If the Government was genuine in its approach for vegetation control and retention, surely it is only elementary that some incentive scheme should be put up.

If we look at other countries around the world we will find that such countries are making positive moves to encourage voluntary retention of vegetation. In Canada, if a mining venture wants to become involved in a forest area, the only basis on which they could proceed is if they came to some arrangement with a conservation group or some body prepared to reafforestate or, alternatively, if they were prepared to reafforestate in their own right, subject to the satisfaction of the Government of the day. However, that is not the case with this Government. It is a case of 'Do as I say and bad luck about the consequences'. The consequences are very great. The powers under these regulations can ruin a primary producer financially. They can devastate a primary producer.

Mr Gregory: Tell us who!

Mr BLACKER: The member for Florey should be more careful.

Mr Gregory: Tell us!

Mr BLACKER: I do not wish to name individuals, but I could find examples and show the honourable member if that is his desire. Let us look at the facts of the situation. If a person has a small agricultural property of 1 100 acres which he has been developing over the past 10 years, he may have the property two-thirds developed with about 360 acres yet to be developed. He finds that vegetation clearance controls have come in. Because he has been acting diligently and handling only areas with which he can cope financially, he is then penalised. However, his neighbour, who has had contractors in, has whipped out all the vegetation and totally denuded the area and is now financially very much better off.

I referred earlier to the Vegetation Clearance Report of 1976. The Government should have learned a lesson from that report. It was basically an attitude of failure to com-

municate with those persons seriously involved in the wanton destruction of thousands of acres of scrubland, some of which has not yet been cleared up. I know that some members on the Government side will say that we have had to bring in these regulations under a cloak of secrecy to prevent thousands of acres being cleared in a hurry. May I remind the Government that controls on clearing land on the basis of soil conservation have been in force for 30 years. It is not that the primary producer is not concerned about controls, but it is the manner in which this is being done that is the problem. Since 30 May probably thousands of hectares of country have been brought down unnecessarily. By his own admission in this House the Minister has indicated that there have been many applications for permission to clear land. I believe that many of these would have been panic applications for clearance that had been lodged in great haste, and the Minister has misread that situation and said that the Government had to introduce the controls because it is now obvious that many thousands of hectares would have been cleared in the immediate future that would not have been cleared until a later date.

I very much regret that this motion has come on today because if it were brought on next week I could have referred to the *Countrywide* programme that is being televised this evening. I understand that tonight's programme highlights the wanton destruction of areas of land in South Australia that is a direct result of the Government's implementation of these regulations. I cannot pre-empt what that programme might say, but from its advertisements I understand that that is the message coming through loud and clear.

The Australian of 6 August contained an article by Peter Ward entitled 'Grasping the environmental nettle stings neighbours'. The article referred to areas in western Victoria and gave a clear indication of the Government's bungling of the situation. I think the message to the Government should be quite clear. The Government is intent on trying to do something about the unnecessary destruction of native vegetation. I think that is acceptable and I have not found one person who has said that regulations of this kind should not be applied. What the people are saying is that a Government should not be able in one fell swoop of regulations to make a property unviable to undermine a person's assets and the bank security he has. In this regard I believe the Government is subject to legal challenge in making a property unviable. I raised this matter by way of three questions to the Minister on 2 June. The third question I asked was:

> Third, if the viability of a property is so affected by Government direction, has this matter been examined by Crown Law and, if so, what is the position with the precedent that has been set with the Kangaroo Island yarloop clover case, in which the Government was found to be responsible for the viability of farmers because of advice given by it?

I do not believe I have had a satisfactory answer to that question. Everyone to whom I have spoken has said that the Government would be liable in exactly the same way as it was found to be liable in that case. If I were a farmer and the viability of my property was to be affected by these regulations, I would be inclined to take the Government to court on the same principle that a piece of land that had been purchased by me on which to carry out agricultural pursuits had then had its viability affected as a result of Government action. I understand that when Crown land leases are granted for the purpose of agricultural pursuits, that is a condition of the Crown Lands Act.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: We repealed that Act.

Mr BLACKER: I thank the Minister for that because that was put to me only the other day. It is the retrospective aspect of the regulations that is causing concern. A person could have bought the property five years ago with the full intention of developing it along the lines of a projected budget which he would have supplied to the bank in order to obtain the money to purchase the property. He would have had to do all those things and in compliance with the law of the day the bank would have made money available on that basis. How was the bank to know that one-third of that property would be taken away? There are problems to which I do not believe the Government has given the slightest thought. I do not believe that we can say that we have a Government that is genuinely concerned about the overall effects of these regulations. I know for a fact that the Government is not the slightest bit concerned about the viability of properties. I was at a meeting of the Local Government Association only a few weeks ago—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much interjecting going on.

Mr BLACKER: An officer of the Minister's department addressed that meeting. He was asked whether the department or the Government took into consideration the viability of a property when making assessments on a vegetation clearance application and the answer was 'No'. What capacity has the Government for making such a decision? I am sure that, if we looked at another vocation and the Government said that it was going to take away one-third of its earning capacity, there would be an uproar. However, the Government can do this to primary producers and that is the contempt in which they hold the primary producers of this State. May I remind the Government that probably the primary producing sector of this State stands a good chance of getting this Government out of its economic crisis. What other section of the community has the capacity to inject half a billion dollars into the economy in a few short months? That is the contempt in which that industry is being held by the Government in introducing these regulations.

I could give example after example to show why I deplore the contemptuous way in which the Government has handled the situation without consulting with primary producer organisations or the Country Fire Services, although being in close consultation with environmental organisations. The Government and the Minister have chosen to go hand in glove with one side without consulting the other at all.

I have had personal experience of the way in which the Government is handling this matter. The property in which I have a half share was pictured in the *Advertiser* in connection with an incident in which an environmentalist was criticising the district council on its vegetation clearance programme. The Minister, without consulting the district council, was reported as criticising the council. I was even more concerned that the press photograph showed the front fence of my property. I considered that that smacked somewhat of below-the-belt political action: surely the Government and the Minister had no excuse to give the district council a backhander when dealing with a property in respect of which a member of this Chamber was involved. Further, the photographs were taken in a way that was unreal: one showed the area that had been cleared and another photograph purporting to show the area before clearance was taken on another road. It may have been in a different hundred. I might not have spotted the difference but that the front fence of my property was shown in one of the photographs. From the point of view of the general community, that is the type of action being taken by the radical element.

Although criticising certain of the environmental elements, I must say that by and large most of the conservation people are fair-minded and genuine and I support them wholeheartedly. That is the part I find difficult to understand when giving the Government a piece of my mind on this occasion, because there are thousands of genuine conser-

vation-minded people in the community who deserve the full support of every member of this House.

As I have said, I believe that the Government was wrong in this matter and that my motion is the only way in which I can express my concern here. I have also expressed concern in other ways. The United Farmers and Stockowners has presented reports to the Government, apparently with little or no effect. I do not believe that the Government has acted with due concern for those involved: it has merely told them 'Do what we tell you irrespective of the consequences.'

When one looks at some of the incidental problems, one must conclude that little or no thought has been given to drains or contour banks. One of my constituents, who farms about 3 200 acres, mostly swamp land or drains, rang the department and asked what he must do to have the drains regularly cleared of scrub, principally sheoak, and whether such work came within the ambit of the regulations. Incidentally, if he did not have the drains the land would be under water most of the time. In reply, the department told him that the work did not come under the regulations.

However, when he rang them next day concerning a minor technicality and without any thought of criticising the department, he was told that the work did come within the ambit of the regulations, so I can only conclude that the department did not have a clue. The man merely wanted to know where he stood because every eight or nine years his drains must be cleared. Every time he wants to clear a drain he must apply to the department and pay the appropriate fee. There may be a wet season, yet the drains must be cleared, for instance, before a fire season starts, and then there is the wet period of two or three months.

What happens, legally, if the department directs that an area is to be set aside and later a fire escapes from that area, when the property owner has done all the necessary work in providing fire breaks? After all, the land was cleared at the direction of the Government, so the Government is surely responsible. After all, if a fire escapes from a neighbour's property, the neighbour is blamed; the insurance company goes to the neighbour.

What is meant by destruction of trees? The Minister and the Government are restricting the capacity of a property to produce stock by reducing the grazing hectarage, therefore stock will put greater pressure on the areas to be grazed so that the property can remain viable. The increased rate of stocking will affect the growth of vegetation. For instance, the stock will ring bark the trees. The same criticism applies in respect of the restriction of cropping hectarage. The logical extension of this is that the Government will place stocking restrictions on a property and so, step by step, involve itself in the management of freehold and leasehold properties.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: That was one of the policies of the previous Minister of Agriculture.

Mr BLACKER: Yes, so it does not surprise me. The Government is moving step by step into direct involvement in land use by involving itself in the management of private funds. I do not believe that such involvement should be tolerated. Another matter of concern to me is that the owner of the remaining vegetation is being loaded with the full cost of preserving native vegetation for the benefit of the local community because his neighbours have over-cleared their properties. If the Government was genuine, it would try to remedy that situation by encouraging landowners to provide areas for natural revegetation. That could be achieved by encouraging property owners, whereas it would not be achieved with the present attitude.

A few days before the regulations were gazetted, a farmer who had had discussions with the department on the basis of the voluntary retention scheme was clearing land. He had intended to leave areas of vegetation in accordance with that scheme. When the regulation was promulgated, he asked me what I knew about it, and I told him that I knew nothing about it. Indeed, I had heard about it on the radio that morning (13 May) while I was driving to Parliament. Within 20 minutes of arriving in the city I was in the Minister's office, but he did not have a copy of the regulation and said that it would be available that afternoon. If I remember correctly, I got my copy in the *Stock Journal*. The result of all this was that the genuine efforts of that farmer to voluntarily retain vegetation on that property went out the window.

He said, 'If that is the attitude that they will take, I cannot afford not to clear every arable acre that I can possibly lay my hands on, because I can do so under a permit already approved. It was under construction: the tractors were moving. I cannot do that.' So, down came unnecessary acres of scrub because of the Government's handling of the matter. That person was sufficiently concerned to undertake investigations on a voluntary retention scheme which he had set aside and planned to set aside. But, because of the Government's handling, those areas have now been destroyed. The Minister and the Government must carry that on their shoulders, and I will be watching the programme this evening with much interest because I believe that examples of that are happening all over the State and the Government must be held responsible.

The incidental arguments that we could come up with are many and varied. We have been through the minutes of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, and many of the issues are raised therein. They too should be aired in this House because, quite frankly, members of the Government do not know what they are talking about. I heard an interjection from a member opposite a while ago saying that we want every tree taken off the face of the earth. What utter rubbish! Everyone knows—

Mr Groom: No-one said that.

Mr BLACKER: The member for Unley made that statement and it is total and utter rubbish, because everyone knows that a totally windswept area will not produce good crops or good stock. That is just farming management practice. Yet that is the inane type of comment we get from so-called responsible members of the Government.

The roadside vegetation issue is another one which comes into being. It was rather ironical to have a situation with one section of the community demanding that roadside vegetation be left and another section of the community (particularly in the South-East) making equally strong demands that roadside vegetation be reduced, mainly because in the South-East fire hit the road, ran along a vegetation area (in some cases for several miles), crossed the road, and went away again. That vegetation strip was acting like a whip in a fire situation. Had there been appropriate breaks in that vegetation, maybe thousands of acres of country could have been saved from burning and from the destruction that we saw on Ash Wednesday.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: It was very apparent at Clare.

Mr BLACKER: The honourable member for Light has pointed out another example. I mentioned the South-East, and I think that anyone who has been involved in fire fighting knows full well that it is a fundamental and elementary exercise that there must be breaks in the vegetation clearance if one is to stand a chance of controlling that sort of problem. I had a number of other individual examples to which I wanted to refer. However, my time has expired. I will bring those to the House in summing up the debate. I ask members to strongly support my motion for the disallowance of these regulations.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I second the motion of the member for Flinders and, on behalf of the

Opposition, indicate support for the number of areas of concern that he has expressed. The Opposition has no argument with the monitoring of new land clearance in South Australia. We believe that, generally speaking, across the State in recent years the primary producing community has acted responsibly. However, there are always those odd occasions on which exploitation takes place and, indeed, we can see that it has occurred on odd occasions. However, it is our view that a responsible and rational approach to monitoring of new land development is desirable and that part of the schedule of regulations tabled on 12 May or thereabouts by the Minister has our support.

I have mentioned on a number of previous occasions in this House my concern for those producers who are being delayed, hampered and interfered with in their ordinary farm management and practices which they have adopted for generations in many cases in the retention of their developed or semi-developed land. In those respects, we believe that the schedule of regulations, requirements and encumbrances on a property owner have gone too far. We do not believe that the Minister and his department handled this exercise appropriately by denying access for and consultation with those who traditionally have been, are and will continue to be directly interested and involved in this subject.

It is my understanding that officers of the Department of Agriculture who have been responsible for soil conservation and other responsibilities in land development for a number of years were not consulted in this instance and, as pointed out by the member for Flinders, neither were the rural organisations of the State. I have taken on board the explanation given by the Minister for his department's denial of access to this move in the interim period and its rather secretive entry into the *Gazette* and subsequent tabling in this House. However, that is history.

As I understand it, the present situation is that, with or without panic applications, an enormous number of applications have been lodged with the department in accordance with those requirements, and there is still a significant delay in processing those applications. Of those that have been processed, it has been reported to me that some are satisfied with the approvals, albeit amended, as they have applied in each of the instances involved. From other reports, I find that action taken by the department, to wit denying the approval of applications lodged in their initial form, have caused applicants some embarrassment; indeed, in that context I mean economic embarrassment. This subject was canvassed widely by the member for Flinders. It is wrong in principle: it is morally wrong that any Government should interfere with the freehold ownership and freehold title occupancy of a property from which that owner seeks to obtain a living. I think that the encumbrances and interference extended in this instance have gone too far in that respect, and it is as a result of that extension into the ordinary management practices and operation of farm ownership that the community's reaction has been brought to our attention.

It is against that background that we, as the Opposition, see (as does the member for Flinders) no alternative in the circumstances surrounding regulation gazettal but to identify our concern as we have, and that is to support the disallowance of these regulations. It is interesting to note that, in his pre-election statement, the Premier said that he would work with farmers and growers to reduce costs and expand markets. I take that quote from page 20 of his policy speech. There has been absolutely no evidence of this, and the action taken by the Minister on or about 12 May, as it applies to this subject before us, demonstrates the lack of consultation and regard, and the insensitivity to the farming community of the present Government.

In these instances I do not reflect on the officers who are burdened with the job of processing the many applications that they have before them, because it is obvious that the instructions and the guidelines are laid down. In this instance the Government is responsible. However, if I find that the officers involved are over-stepping the guidelines laid down or that they are expressing eccentric views with respect to environmental aspect of the development of land, I will be the first to say so in this place. It does not alter the fact that it takes a great deal of experience to administer a schedule of regulations of the kind that apply, and until that experience is obtained by the officers involved it is to be hoped that they will exhibit a broad understanding of the subject and have regard for the local community experience involved. I support the motion.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning): The matter before the House this afternoon really proceeds from the report on native vegetation that was brought down in the mid 1970s. That was the first attempt to come to grips with the general problem of the degradation of the environment as a result of clearance of native scrub. Degradation of the environment arises from many sources, some of which I will refer to as I go along. There is little doubt that clearance of native vegetation has a major impact on our environment. It has always been a source of amusement to me how much attention is given to the problems caused by the mining industry arising from matters raised by some of the more vocal exponents of the conservation view, when, of course, for the most part mining activities have far less impact on the environment than does agricultural activity. That proceeds from the very nature of those activities, and indeed, had our ancestors not been prepared to clear quite significant areas of that part of the State which is suitable for agriculture, we would not have the standard of living that we have today. The question arises, however, whether that matter has now gone beyond its natural limits and should not be subject to some sort of control. In any event, the report to which the member for Flinders referred and to which I have already referred indicated that 75 per cent of South Australia's agricultural regions largely had been cleared of native vegetation proper.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: Your plans and maps on that subject are fickle, to say the least.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Is the honourable member disputing that statistic?

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: Yes, I am. Maps are produced that do not reflect the true situation.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: That is an extraordinary comment from a member who has been in this place since 1975. I would have thought that this matter would be of prime concern to him as a representative of a rural electorate and as Minister of Agriculture for three years. However, it is only now that he contends with that statistic. I take issue with that contention. In the Lower South-East, the Mount Lofty Ranges and on Yorke Peninsula the same report indicated that more than 90 per cent of the native vegetation had been cleared. From the period when those statistics were compiled until 1981, clearance did not stop: it proceeded, and, in fact, in the Upper and Lower South-East, I am reliably informed, 51 per cent of what was left of native vegetation on private farm land in 1974 was further destroyed.

What I am talking about here is the agricultural regions of the State. This does not apply to the national parks system, nor does it apply to the rangelands in the North of the State. However, the possible degradation of rangeland is another matter to which this House might want to address itself on some future occasion. I make the point that the national parks system covers only 5 per cent of the State.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: Too much.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It is extraordinary to find the former Minister of Agriculture, after all that he has just said and after all that the member for Flinders has said about the importance of retaining native vegetation and that sort of thing, making an interjection that 5 per cent of the State being set aside as part of a national parks system should be too much. It should be remembered that the Unnamed Conservation Park, which is entirely within the arid lands of this State and which does not come anywhere near the agricultural regions, accounts for a good part of that 5 per cent. In any event, the national parks system covers only 5 per cent of the land area in South Australia. Further, the rangeland areas are a separate issue from areas of habitat in agricultural districts. Many of the vegetation associations which should be conserved are not represented in the arid areas, and many species of fauna are not represented at all in the rangelands because they could not survive in that harsh environment. Therefore, the persistence of vegetation in those areas is of no use whatsoever to those species. Last week I released an excellent booklet prepared by Dr Tony Robinson of my department on the Toolache wallaby. There was only one problem—

Mr Gregory: There are none left!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: There are probably none left, as the member for Florey pointed out. It is of interest that the natural range of that creature was that very South-East area which has been so stripped of vegetation over the years. The species is almost certainly extinct because of clearance of its native habitat. If honourable members have not already done so, I invite them to look at a shocking display at the Adelaide Museum. It is shocking not because of the standard but because of the intrinsic nature of the material brought forward: a series of preserved carcasses of mammals which were once abundant in the Mount Lofty Ranges and which are now extinct in that province, and in some cases extinct, period.

During the last Parliament there were even suggestions with which the member for Alexandra (then the Minister of Agriculture) was associated to cut up the Gosse Crown Lands on Kangaroo Island, despite the attitude of the Department of Agriculture which was of the opinion that clearance would lead to serious salinity problems in the river systems that rise in that plateau area.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: Absolute rot!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member is condemning himself and his attitude with every interjection that he makes. He is cutting away completely the ground from under the feet of his colleague from that other Party over there when they are trying to make out that they are really concerned for the environment. Perhaps the member for Flinders is, but every word uttered by the member for Alexandra makes it quite clear that he has no concern whatsoever for the environment. We must accept that the public perception of this problem has changed dramatically over the years. It was once a condition for the issuing of a Crown lease that the lessee would have to clear the land. That condition was repealed by this Parliament earlier this year, without a murmur. So quietly did the legislation go through that the member for Flinders had forgotten that it had gone through. I do not blame him for that: I do not carry around in my head details of every piece of legislation that we put through.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The member for Mallee was happy with that, because it was indicative of the way public perception has changed in relation to these matters. In fact, in relation to the Bill and the regulations that we are debating this afternoon the Government has received widespread support for the initiatives that it has taken. I have received letters from interstate, overseas and from many people in the community congratulating the Government on recognising that it was high time that something was done along these lines.

We have even received publicly a fairly muted response from the Liberal Party in this matter. I really wonder how dinkum they are in the opposition that has been brought forward this afternoon. I think it has been felt that it is reasonable they not go too upbeat in this matter for fear of putting off-side many people who see this as a quite reasonable course of action that we are taking.

It is conceded that the loss of habitat is not the only factor which leads to the extinction of native species. Competition from exotic species the (feral cat, the fox, the rabbit the goat, etc.) has of course been devastating. Man as a predator has also played a part. The Aborigines probably hunted the diprotodon to extinction as the Maoris hunted the moa to extinction in New Zealand. However, European man has of course far more efficient means at his disposal for the killing of wild life. Extinction is, of course, the ultimate fate of all species but it strains one's credulity to believe that the time has run out for so many species in the past 50 to 100 years. Almost one-third of the mammal species which used to occur in South Australia are now locally extinct.

One of the problems that bedevils this debate is the different perception between the member for Flinders and me as to what is meant by the retention of native vegetation. Of course, it is in the interests of the primary producer to preserve some native vegetation on his property, but the amount that is required to be preserved for the productive aspects of that property is totally inadequate as habitat for the native species that traditionally have lived there, and that is the difference. What is meant by clearance by one person is quite different from what is meant by clearance by another person. What we are concerned to do is to preserve native habitat for the natural species in this form of province.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: I'm not concerned about primary production; I'm concerned about food production.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The former Minister of Agriculture should know full well that the future of agricultural production in this country has to be the more intensive exploitation of the existing cleared area, and not continual erosion of what is left of native habitat.

During the time of the previous Government a heritage scheme, which at the Public Service level had its origin in the late 1970s, was launched. This allowed areas of private property to be placed under protective covenants in return for rate rebates and, in some cases, assistance with fencing. It has proven inadequate as a means of protection for native habitat. By its very nature it receives a response from people who wish to protect native vegetation anyway. It does not protect the environment from the get-rich-quick merchant, nor from the insidious (I do not imply any moral judgment here) process of having a go at the bottom paddock in a slack period of the year. The method adopted by this Government to address the problem falls short of absolute prohibition.

Mr Lewis: Not very much.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I will be able to provide statistics which may be of some reassurance to the member for Mallee, because by far the greater proportion of those applications which have been brought forward have been approved, but I will turn to that in time. We have adopted a piece of legislation brought down by the Tonkin Government, the Planning Bill, and it is interesting that without that legislation we would not have been able to proceed in the way that we have proceeded, because it was that piece of legislation which enabled us to embrace land clearance

within the definition of development and, therefore, to bring that legislation to bear. So but for that legislation, the form of control I have adopted would not have been possible. This is important because the member for Flinders has suggested that he wants a balance between, on the one hand, the desire of some people to clear everything in sight and, on the other hand (and I try to quote from memory), the desire of others to preserve every blade of grass. I believe that that is precisely what this regulation does or, in any event, the honourable member has not suggested any piece of machinery which he would put in its place.

As I understand the honourable member, what he said was this: because this is subordinate legislation, it does not, as would a Bill, receive automatic debate within the House. He feels that that is inappropriate in view of the nature of what is being done here and that, therefore, the mechanism for having it debated in the House is to move this motion. That is reasonable—he has done that: no-one has tried to stop him, and no doubt the debate will proceed for some time as various members address themselves to it. He also went on to make the point that he is not able to put forward amendments. All the House can do is disallow the regulations and then leave it to the Government to come up with something better. The problem is that the honourable member has not really put forward something better: he has not indicated what form of control should be instituted which would replace what we have before us.

Mr Lewis: It's not a question of controls: it's a question of fairness.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: If it is not a question of controls, if no controls should be imposed, then the clearance which has proceeded apace over the years will simply continue. There are a few other things to which I still wish to address myself, but I understand that one or two other members want to take the opportunity of the time remaining between now and 5 o'clock to bring matters forward. Therefore, I will simply seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ELECTRICITY CHARGES

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That, in the opinion of the House, all citizens of South Australia who are connected to the Elecricity Trust grid system, electricity undertakings managed by district councils or corporations and those undertakings operated by the Outback Areas Development Trust be charged on the same basis and that the 10 per cent surcharge which applies in certain areas be abolished and those undertakings operated by the Outback Areas Development Trust which charge at a greater rate than any other country area be placed on the same charging schedule as metropolitan Adelaide.

This is the third occasion on which I have raised this matter in the House, and I look forward this time to having the matter put to a vote. This matter has not received the consideration that it should have received. Unfortunately, only a small section of the people of this State are affected by the Adelaide plus 10 per cent surcharge on electricity: a number of other places in South Australia are now charged an even greater rate than that. If it is good enough to subsidise the operation of the Adelaide Festival Theatre, the State Transport Authority, and a number of other instrumentalities operated or managed by the State Government, it is good enough for people who live in isolated country areas (some of them not really isolated) to be treated the same as the rest of the people in this State in relation to charges for electricity.

Everyone in the metropolitan area of Adelaide would agree that electricity is a basic necessity of life, and many of the people to whom I refer have already had to make a very substantial capital outlay to have electricity connected to their properties. Then to have placed on top of that an extra charge is unfair and a blatant discrimination against them. I therefore call on the House to give this matter its proper consideration. On a previous occasion I made a lengthy speech and gave a large number of examples of how this matter affects some of my constituents. I refer to the people west of Ceduna, in Coober Pedy and at Marla Bore, to mention just a few. We have the ridiculous situation that occurs in the District Council of Elliston where people have adjoining neighbours. One is paying the Adelaide-plus-10 rate and the other is supplied directly by the Electricity Trust and does not have to pay the Adelaide-plus-10 surcharge. I will quote from a letter I received on 6 April 1980 from the District Council of Streaky Bay, as follows:

Dear Mr Gunn,

Your attention is drawn to what this council believes are inequitable electricity tariffs currently being charged to consumers within certain council districts. These charges of 10 per cent above metropolitan Adelaide tariffs are of concern to council.

It is appreciated that Government policy for electricity tariffs is recommended by the Trust. However when considering this council's request for uniform tariffs and the same general conditions as per in the metropolitan areas you are asked to consider the following:

(1) Electricity used by consumers from the ETSA grid system is basically generated in only three areas within the State, i.e., Port Augusta, Dry Creek and Torrens Island.
(2) Power generated at Port Augusta and distributed to Adelaide is also supplied to this council district.
(3) Only consumers within council areas that are responsible for electricity undertakings pay tariffs 10 per cent above those chargeable in Adelaide.
(4) Accounts rendered by ETSA are based on metropolitan Adelaide tariffs, whereas an account rendered by a council is to include an additional 10 per cent.
(5) Separate tariffs currently apply within certain council areas. Such variations are dependent upon whether council or ETSA have constructed the mains. ETSA constructed mains attract Adelaide tariffs whereas councils attract the 10 per cent increase.
(6) A 10 per cent reduction in electricity tariffs should prove a significant factor in influencing both industry and people to decentralise.

This council believes very strongly that all consumers should be treated as equals. Any assistance you may be able to give to ensure that all consumers connected to the Electricity Trust grid system are charged a uniform tariff would be appreciated. A favourable reply would be greatly appreciated.

The letter was signed by the District Clerk. Copies of the letter were sent to both the then Premier and the General Manager of the Electricity Trust. I feel strongly about the way in which my constituents have been treated.

Mr Rodda: They have been treated very badly.

Mr GUNN: Yes, they have been treated badly, as my colleague the member for Victoria says. He was formerly a resident of Eyre Peninsula and is well aware of a number of disadvantages with which my constituents must contend. I refer also to a question that I asked on 19 April 1983 in which I referred to the high rate charged for electricity. The Minister of Mines and Energy indicated that there was a likelihood that the Government would be receiving a report in the relatively near future that would address the matter. We all know that the best way to gloss over the problem is to refer a matter to a committee to investigate. Nothing is done and we then set up a committee to investigate what the first committee recommended.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

Mr GUNN: The current Minister of Mines and Energy is awaiting a report commissioned by his predecessor. I started this exercise in about 1977 and pursued it with some vigour between 1979 and 1982. I will not be satisfied until I get some justice. A number of people in my electorate (at Blinman and in the Flinders Ranges) have the privilege of being connected to the grid system through the nonsense in which the Department of Environment and Planning has engaged. People west of Penong, who are entitled to be

serviced by the electricity system, do not have the privilege of paying. I have plenty to say on this matter.

The people at Coober Pedy have been selected for special attention by the Outback Areas Community Development Trust. I realise that the Trust has to put into effect the policies of the Government. In May 1983 an article appeared in the local Coober Pedy paper, headed 'Electricity charges unacceptable' and stated:

Electricity Charges Unacceptable to Outback Consumers

There has been widespread concern throughout country areas of South Australia where electricity is supplied from diesel powered generators operated by the Outback Areas Community Development Trust. Towns affected are those of Marree, Glendambo, Kingoonya, Marla, Penong and Coober Pedy.

The Coober Pedy Progress and Miners Association was contacted to ascertain what action it would be taking towards having electricity charges reduced. Mr Malliotis, the President, said that the Association had already written to the Minister of Mines and Energy seeking fairer tariffs and the reintroduction of a full subsidy to within 10 per cent of city prices; as was originally stated by the State Labor Government when the power supply in Coober Pedy was brought under State Government control several years ago.

Mr Malliotis said that he had been contacted by numerous residents complaining of power bills of $400 or more and in some cases he was concerned that severe financial hardship would be experienced by people paying their electricity bills.

The President said that when the local member, Mr Graham Gunn, was in Coober Pedy recently a very strong representation was made to him to raise the matter with the Minister as the present charges were yet another high cost that people in isolated areas had to endure. Mr Gunn made a personal undertaking to raise the matter in the House, as he felt that the question of country electricity charges needed to be resolved once and for all.

As illustrated in the previous edition of the *Coober Pedy Times*, electricity charges have increased by 30 per cent in the past 12 months. It is further rumoured that another increase will occur this current quarter. In effect, some residents could by the end of this year be paying up to or even more than $2 000 per year for domestic electricity charges. The *Times* regards this as totally unacceptable and urges residents to write to Mr Payne, the Minister of Mines and Energy, voicing their protest at the exorbitant prices.

I believe that that article clearly demonstrates the problems which my constituents face. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 31 August. Page 649.)

Mr GROOM (Hartley): This private member's Bill, which emanated from the Opposition, is detrimental both to the police and to the public. Not only does it contain serious violations of civil liberties but also it fails to provide the needed protection for police officers properly investigating a crime. In fact, if this legislation was passed it would lead to a spate of false imprisonment damages claims against the police properly investigating crimes. Instead of helping police investigatory powers, it would worsen the situation for them.

The centrepiece of the member for Murray's Bill is an amendment to section 78. Currently, under section 78 a person when arrested must be forthwith delivered into the custody of a member of the Police Force who is in charge of the nearest police station in order to bring the person before a justice for bail. This section is really an enactment of the common law. That is, that an accused must be taken without delay and by the most direct route before a justice unless circumstances reasonably justify a departure from those requirements, and note the import in the common law with regard to discretion. Consequently, already under the common law, and indeed under section 78, discretionary circumstances are permitted so that once a person has been taken to the police station that person can be removed in the course of police inquiries.

An obvious example of the way in which the discretionary power under section 78 works, which is a restatement of common law is, for example, a person who, after arrest, tells the police officer that stolen goods are located at a particular place and that his co-offender is about to remove them. Quite properly, the police are able to take that person; instead of taking him forthwith before a justice, that person can be taken to a place for the purpose of recovering the stolen goods. That is a proper application of section 78. In his second reading explanation the member for Murray said:

The third significant area of reform is the provision of a fixed post-arrest period of not less than four hours where a person may be held in police custody prior to being formally charged. The principal Act is very restrictive in that upon apprehension, there must be delivery forthwith (and I emphasise that) into the custody of the officer in charge of the nearest police station. This requirement has proven to be a serious impediment to the full and proper investigation of crimes. The impediment to police is the inability to detain and question a person or have an arrested person accompany them on related inquiries. An example of this related to Colin Creed, a former Adelaide detective. The police, I am informed, had a certain amount of information about Creed but not enough to formally charge him. This enabled him to escape to another State. If this provision had been available to police, they would have been able to detain him longer, so obtaining further evidence.

In fact, the proposed amendment to section 78 does nothing of the kind. The proposed amendment to section 78 deals only with the post-arrest situation. Creed was never arrested. This amendment would not have helped the Creed situation one iota.

In his second reading explanation the member for Murray has confused the act of arrest with a formal charge. The amendments apply only to the post-arrest situation; that is, at the point of time the police have made up their minds that there is enough to arrest, and they never reached that point in the Creed situation. As the amendment to section 78 deals only with the post-arrest situation, it could not possibly apply to the Creed situation if a similar situation arose today. It would not help the police one bit.

One of the greatest dangers to the police is in new subsection (1a) because under that section if the police sought to apply the so-called powers given to them in many instances it would lead to damages claims against police officers for false imprisonment if they tried to act pursuant to the section. When a person is arrested the arresting officer must have formed a genuine belief on the evidence collected by him or other officers that the person had committed the crime.

The drafting of this section by the member limits the section to the suspected offence for which that person had been apprehended, and not to other offences. What can the police officer further investigate if he cannot investigate other offences? The situation is quite simply this: once a police officer makes up his mind to arrest, he has a genuine belief that he has all the evidence that that person has committed the crime.

If he cannot investigate other offences, a practical situation arises. I refer to the Miller situation. In the honourable member's second reading explanation he said that it would help the Truro situation, but the honourable member had forgotten some basics, because Miller was arrested for the murder of a girl and the police took him so that he could show them where other bodies were to be found. The police were investigating other crimes, so this power is no use to the police and, if they sought to detain a person in custody after he had been arrested and they started investigating other offences, in cross-examination at the trial exactly what the lawyers for the accused would say is: 'What were you doing after the arrest period?'

In nine cases out of 10 a court is more likely to conclude that the police officer had got all his evidence at the time of arrest and, if a person is detained for, say, an extra four hours, the situation will arise whereby, even before that matter is at trial, the accused's lawyers will allege false imprisonment against the police, which will put enormous pressure on them.

So, even if the matter got to trial, the police officer would be asked exactly what he was doing during that four-hour period. He cannot investigate other offences and he has already arrested, so he has made up his mind that the crime has been committed. If a police officer arrests, he just about has everything. The lawyers for the accused may well conclude that the police officer had everything and therefore the person is in unlawful custody, and that is where the potential arises for a spate of false imprisonment claims to be taken against the police who seek to exercise any of the so-called powers under new subsection (1a).

Clearly, a police officer seeking to exercise powers under new subsection (1a) would be subject to a spate of false imprisonment claims even before the original offence for which the person is arrested comes to trial, and very smart lawyers could use this new subsection to put pressure on the police by immediately taking out false imprisonment claims for damages against them. What a mess this legislation is! What a failure to protect the police and what an erosion of civil liberties for the person on the street! I refer to the so-called power under new subsection (1c), which provides:

> A special magistrate, a District Court judge, or judge of the Supreme Court may on application by a member of the Police Force extend the period of four hours referred to in subsection (1a), but the period or aggregate period of any such extension or extensions shall not exceed four hours except by decision of a Judge.

However, under new subsection (1f) there can be further extensions. Under subsection (1f) these extensions can be made by telephone, so the cumulative effect is that there is no limitation: a person can be kept in custody *ad infinitum* merely by making telephone calls.

There is a delicate balance between needed police powers and the liberty of the individual. These new subsections simply destroy the balance and the fundamental liberties that have taken centuries to develop in countries exercising principles of British justice. I refer to the Law Reform Commission recommendation regarding such a matter to illustrate just what a blatant violation of civil liberties would occur under this open-ended situation where an accused person is detained for four hours, ringing up on the telephone, another four hours in custody, and another four hours, and so on. In an emergency situation in this country, one can imagine how those powers could be abused.

I refer to paragraph 87 of the recommendations of the Law Reform Commission, which states:

> The Commission recommends a four-hour detention limit.

The Commission also asserts that a defendant should be heard and legally represented on applications to extend time and also to be present during investigations.

Why does the Opposition not frame the legislation so as to give persons the ordinary basic liberties and include the protection of the Law Reform Commission's recommendations? Where is a person's right to be heard on these telephone extensions? Where is the right to have a solicitor present? Why has he not the right to be there when an application for extension is made?

The Hon. D. C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr GROOM: The Mitchell Law Reform Committee went further than that and dealt with a detention period prior to arrest. That is a different concept. I am dealing with the honourable member's clause, which is a post-arrest situation. Totalitarian countries would be proud of the honourable member's legislation, which allows the police to keep people in this country in custody, open ended, without any right to be heard or to have a solicitor present, and for what purpose?

Mr Lewis: You are misrepresenting the position.

Mr GROOM: I am taking the worst possible construction of the application of the honourable member's Bill, because I think that one has to decide whether or not in the worst possible situation the legislation is capable of abuse. If it is capable of abuse, one limits it. The Law Reform Commission recommended that course of action, but not the Opposition. So much for its protection of individual liberties in this country. The legislation is a mess. In his second reading speech, the honourable member said that clause 5 would solve problems arising out of the Truro murders situation, and I believe that he was referring to the Miller situation. However, it does nothing of the kind. In fact, it makes matters worse for police officers properly seeking to investigate crimes.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GROOM: If the honourable member will be patient, I will tell him what occurred in relation to Miller. Miller was arrested for the murder of a girl, and he was then taken to the City Watchhouse by the police. With the concurrence of the officer in charge of the watch, Miller was placed in the custody of police officers and taken to places where he showed the detectives other bodies. He was subsequently brought before a special justice and remanded in custody. Later, Miller went with the police officers again and helped them to locate other bodies.

At the trial, Miller's lawyers argued that the removal of Miller from the custody of the officer in charge of the watch was a breach of section 78 and, therefore, the confessions he made should be excluded. However, the court exercised common sense and the common law position and said that, although there had been an initial technical breach of section 78, because he was not immediately taken before a court, it recognised that the police did not intend to deliberately breach this section. The court admitted the confessions in the exercise of its discretion, because the common law is very sensible. It has been built up over many centuries and it is the pinnacle of our foundations of British justice.

New subsection (1a) does not help the Miller situation because, as I said earlier, the member for Murray has limited new subsection (1a), which provides:

> . . . complete his investigation of the suspected offence for which that person has been apprehended . . .

Miller was charged with the murder of a girl. Under the honourable member's amendment the police could not have investigated the other murders because they would have been in breach of the section. The honourable member's amendment to insert new subsection (1a) does not help the police one bit because of the limitation placed upon them and, if they try to go outside of the limitations of new subsection (1a), civil proceedings will be taken against the police.

The honourable member might point to new subsection (1e) and say that that is for the purpose of the investigation of an offence. However, it does not help the situation at all, because the honourable member's Bill retains subsection (1), which requires a person to be brought forthwith before a justice. The honourable member's Bill makes subsection (1) subject to subsection (1a). However, the Bill does not make subsection (1) subject to subsection (1e). New subsection (1e) provides:

> Where a person has been delivered into custody at a police station in pursuance of this section . . .

That means the whole section; it does not relate solely to dealings in relation to new subsection (1e). Only in those

circumstances can the Police Force investigate an offence. On the surface, the Bill produces an immediate conflict, because it retains section 78 (1) which states that one must bring a person forthwith before a justice, and then introduces a conflicting new subsection (1e) which provides:

> ... on the authorisation of a special magistrate, District Court Judge or Judge of the Supreme Court, granted on the application of a member of the Police Force ...

The police are immediately confronted with two conflicting sections. The courts will try to reconcile that conflict so that new subsection (1e) is likely to apply only where a person has already been brought before a court and remanded, with or without bail. That will not help the situation at all, and it will not help the Miller situation one bit.

I have agreed to limit my time, so I will skip over some of the things that I wanted to mention. There is a clear conflict and the only way to reconcile it is to provide for the new subsection (1e) to apply after a person is taken before a court. The clause fails to provide adequate protection for the police. The police need proper investigatory powers and adequate protection.

Mr Mathwin: What would you do?

Mr GROOM: If the honourable member pays attention, I will tell him. The Bill does not provide for a situation under the four-hour detention provision of an accused person saying to a police officer, 'I am not going with you.' What does a police officer do in that situation? He must use reasonable force to take an accused person to the scene of a crime during the investigation. However, if a police officer does that, under the Bill he will be sued for trespass or assault, because the Bill fails to provide a basic protection for the police and it does not ensure that they are protected and have immunity in a situation where they have to use reasonable force during their investigations.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: I thought you said that it was post arrest.

Mr GROOM: It is post arrest. If the honourable member reads the legislation he will understand what I am saying. I refer to a situation where a police officer makes an arrest and seeks to invoke, say, new subsections (1e) or (1a) and the arrested person is delivered into the custody of another police officer for further investigations. If the arrested person says, 'I am not going with you,' what does the police officer do? If the police officer uses reasonable force, the lawyer for the accused will subsequently charge the police officer with false imprisonment. Honourable members opposite can laugh, but the Bill opens the door to a spate of false imprisonment claims against the police, and I am very concerned about that.

Mr Mathwin: That comes before that.

Mr GROOM: I suggest that the honourable member talks to members of the Police Association about this to determine whether they are concerned about the Bill. The Mitchell Committee recommended express provisions to protect police officers who have to use reasonable force, but that has been left out of this Bill. Unlike the member for Murray, the Mitchell Committee knew that the police must have proper protection and that recommendation is contained in the Mitchell Committee Report. The police must have expressed power, as outlined on page 75 of the Mitchell Committee's recommendations. The Mitchell Committee expressly recommends immunity for police officers when using such force as is reasonably necessary. However, this Bill does not include that type of provision.

What use is this type of legislation when the police cannot act in a situation where an accused person says, 'I am not going with you'? It is of no use at all. This legislation has not been thought through: it has been introduced for political purposes without using the proper machinery for consultation. In fact, no thought has been given to the consequences of this Bill. I ask the honourable member to answer this question: what if a police officer uses the detention powers? I refer to clause 3 and a situation where the police detain and then release a suspect. Where then is the reasonable suspicion for detaining the suspect in the first place? What will happen in that situation? A suspect might be detained with extensions, but what will he do when he is released without being charged? The person will question why he was held in the first place. It is another unlawful custody situation and another false imprisonment situation.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I am indebted to the member for Henley Beach. The Bill is an absolute mess. In his second reading speech, the member for Murray referred to the case of *R. v. Mark Pickford.* The member for Murray said that this Bill would solve that type of problem. In that case the confession was excluded after the arrest. Clause 5 does not help the Pickford situation at all because the common law rules relating to the admission of confessions are not affected by this legislation. Confessions will continue to be excluded if they are not made voluntarily, that is, if they are made under intimidation or undue pressure. In that situation, confessions will continue to be excluded.

That is not affected at all. Therefore, if a person is arrested and detained in custody, and the arresting officer has decided that there is sufficient reason to arrest and he cannot investigate other offences, what is he investigating? During a four hour detention period there is a real danger of a concocted verbal confession or that the will of the apprehended person is overborne and he makes a confession that is involuntary. It is one of the fundamental principles of British justice, evolved over many years, over many centuries, that an accused person has the right to remain silent and is not obliged to implicate himself. If during that four hour period after arrest a police officer continues to question the accused who says, 'I am not answering any questions,' the case law is established; the confession will be excluded because that is intimidation. The police officer must stop his questions. So, what is a police officer doing during this four hour period if it is not an intimidatory situation?

I believe that the Opposition is seeking to destroy a very delicate balance that has been developed over many years, and it is sad to see this occurring. The delicate balance is being eroded. Under the honourable member's legislation, the courts are more likely to exclude any confessions that are made during the four hour detention period for the reasons I have suggested, namely, what will they do during the four hour period if it is not to be an intimidatory situation?

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Lenehan): Order!

Mr GROOM: In relation to confessions, I refer to a judgment from a very learned judge of the last century, Mr Justice Cave. His judgment is still good law today and, in fact, it has been quoted in recent High Court cases. In part, the judgment states:

> I always suspect these confessions, which are supposed to be the offspring of penitence and remorse, and which nevertheless are repudiated by the prisoner at the trial. It is remarkable that it is of very rare occurrence for evidence of a confession to be given when the proof of the prisoner's guilt is otherwise clear and satisfactory; but, when it is not clear and satisfactory, the prisoner is not infrequently alleged to have been seized with the desire born of penitence and remorse to supplement it with a confession—a desire which vanishes as soon as he appears in a court of justice.

That highlights the types of problems that the courts are faced with in dealing with confessions.

Mr Baker: It doesn't at all, because it relates to the adversary situation in the courts.

Mr GROOM: It does not relate to the adversary situation at all. In fact, clause 5 makes the situation worse for the

police. It opens the door to a spate of false imprisonment claims against the police. It does not help the Miller situation one bit; it does not solve the Creed situation, because it deals with the post-arrest situation. The honourable member confused that in his second reading speech, and he knows it, because Creed was never arrested. It makes the situation worse for the police because they will not be able to exercise properly any of their powers.

Mr Baker: Are you going to support the legislation or not?

Mr GROOM: I will come to that. It makes the matter worse because when people are in custody the courts will be more likely to exclude confessions than ever before. Simply, the provision will have the reverse effect. The legislation is seriously deficient. One of the worst aspects of it is the provision for an open-ended four-hour plus detention period. I challenge the member for Glenelg to look at the legislation: he will find that he could be detained, any member of the public could be detained or any of his constituents could be detained for an unlimited period of time. The legislation fails to provide protection for police officers properly investigating crimes: not only that, it is a serious violation of individual liberties. It is the type of legislation that is the inevitable result of no genuine desire for reform, but simply a desire for some form of political capital.

There are very delicate matters involved in this area of the law and it is high time that the Opposition woke up to its responsibilities to the people of this State and stopped trying to make political capital out of the Police Force. This legislation is a complete mess. It is impossible to support the amendments proposed by the honourable member, particularly those to section 78. The fact of the matter is that it would make the situation worse for the police. The Government is in the process of drawing up its own legislation with proper consultation with the Police Force.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr GROOM: The honourable member has just admitted the reason he brought it in was for some political purpose, not a desire to protect the community or the Police Force, but for some political purpose. There is proper machinery—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GROOM: There is proper machinery for consultation in this State for introducing legislation that deals with the delicate balance—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Will the member for Hartley resume his seat. The member for Murray will come to order and cease interjecting.

Mr GROOM: The Opposition is introducing legislation which seeks to disturb in a violatory way the delicate balance that exists between needed police powers and proper protection of the public. I urge the Opposition to withdraw this legislation, which is an absolute mess. It worsens the situation for the police, and it opens them to false imprisonment claims. I want to deal with clauses 68 and 81 on a subsequent occasion. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

NATURAL DEATH BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 May. Page 1168.)

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): This is an Act to provide for, and give legal effect to, directions against artificial prolongation of the dying process. As I have quite a few remarks to make on this subject, and as the time is extremely short, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SOUTH AUSTRALIAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT GRANTS COMMISSION

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. B.C. Eastick:

That—

(a) a Select Committee be established to inquire into and report upon all aspects of the guarantees given to the Mount Barker, Strathalbyn and Meadows councils in respect of South Australian Local Government Grants Commission funds, and alternative sources of funds, and all aspects of assistance given to councils involved in earlier amalgamation arrangements;

(b) the Committee be so structured as to be chaired by the Premier or, alternatively, the most senior House of Assembly Minister available and comprising the Leader of the Opposition or his most senior shadow Minister available in the House of Assembly, and three other members in accordance with practice, but excluding any member who served on the Select Committee on the Local Government Boundaries of the District Council of Meadows;

(c) the members of that Select Committee be required to attend as witnesses if so requested to by this Committee; and

(d) the Select Committee be required to report on the likely consequence of any future local government amalgamations or adjustments being able to succeed without there being a clear undertaking that the abnormal costs associated with the particular Parliamentary directions will be provided from Grants Commission or Department of Local Government funds.

(Continued from 31 August. Page 651.)

The ACTING SPEAKER: I call the Minister of Local Government.

Honourable members: Where is the Minister?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I move:

That the matter be further adjourned.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order. At the time the call came for the Minister who had taken the adjournment, in his absence I rose to proceed in this debate and was ignored, I suggest, with respect, by the Chair. I seek leave to proceed with the debate in the absence of the Minister who took the adjournment.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Does the Minister of Education wish to withdraw?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes.

Leave granted; motion withdrawn.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I am not aware of the situation that has caused the embarrassment of the Government in this instance, except that it is my understanding that the Minister is in the House but, for reasons best known to himself, has been reluctant in these circumstances to come forward and officially put the position of local government in respect to this subject into the *Hansard*. I would hope that, during the period that is available to me to speak on this subject, he will emerge and make his presence known in this place and, indeed, his attitude toward the subject before the Chair.

On 31 August my colleague the shadow Minister of Local Government and member for Light moved that a Select Committee be established to inquire into and report on all aspects of the guarantees given to the Mount Barker, Strathalbyn and Meadows councils in respect of South Australian Local Government Grants Commission funds and alternative sources of the funds, as well as all aspects of

assistance given to councils involved in earlier amalgamation arrangements. The motion incorporated details supporting the establishment of a Select Committee for other added purposes.

I do not wish to canvass all matters brought to the attention of the House by my colleague the member for Light on that day. However, I endorse the need for a Select Committee to be established in this instance and, more especially, as it involves not only a matter of principle that should be upheld by the Government but an undertaking which the Minister gave to the Select Committee established to inquire into the annexation issue and also in the presence of some witnesses.

Mr Mathwin: How do you think the Minister would feel about it?

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: I can understand that the Minister is clearly uncomfortable and embarrassed about the situation in which he finds himself. I feel for his position, but it does not alter the fact that undertakings of a clear and specific nature were given in the early months of this year to the respective councils mentioned. Those undertakings to date have not been upheld, despite all sorts of efforts and offers by officers, I believe, to the clear knowledge and understanding of the Minister.

The undertakings given to the respective councils involve significant sums of money, not for flippant purposes but for carrying out their responsibilities as recipients of added lands to their areas. I refer to the councils involved in that side of the question, namely, Mount Barker and Strathalbyn councils. It is my understanding that the Commonwealth Grants Commission allocations for the year 1983-84 have already been determined and details of such determinations have been circulated to all councils in the State. It is further my understanding that the allocations to the Strathalbyn council and, maybe, the Mount Barker council at this time fall significantly short of the undertakings of financial assistance given by that Minister. The undertakings to which I refer involve moneys which those councils were able to demonstrate (and it was clearly acknowledged by the Select Committee at the time) as being necessary in order to maintain the services over the areas being annexed to each. The moneys were required for the purposes of retaining and operating the equipment required in the maintenance of those respective areas. The moneys were further required for the purposes of maintaining a wage level appropriate to the employees previously engaged by the Meadows council and subsequently subject to be engaged by the recipient council.

In that context, I recall the adamant support of Labor members on the Select Committee for and on behalf of the welfare of those employees. There is nothing sinister about it. The undertakings were given in good faith and with appropriate intent. They were given for the purposes of specific and identified requirements. Under no circumstances does the Opposition accept that either of the two recipient councils should be short paid in this instance. It is not, nor should it be, in any area of the discussion suggested that the councils are after additional money for their original maintenance purposes but for the specific and identified purposes that have been outlined.

Mr Mathwin: There was a promise given.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: The promise was given, as I indicated earlier in this debate, not only to the committee members but also to the staff who were present at the time. Unfortunately, the senior staff member who was present has subsequently lost his position as Chairman of the Grants Commission in South Australia as a result of the bungling of the Minister (I put it to this House); but, also, the undertakings were given in the presence of other witnesses.

Further to that, and subsequent to the Select Committee's having its report tabled by the Minister in this House, I have made some contributions to the debate in this place reinforcing and supporting the Minister's undertakings in order to comfort the recipient councils which, over the period of the Select Committee's hearings, were given those undertakings. I have reported to councillors in my own district, in discussions with the Meadows councillors and staff, and in discussions with the staff and councillors of the Strathalbyn District Council, that those undertakings were given and assurances were given that they would be upheld, purely and simply on behalf of the Minister's own statements at the time.

Having done that during the period—not to justify, but to demonstrate the fairness of attitude that was extended during those hearings—we on this side of the House (I and my colleagues involved in that committee and in particular the member for Light) have been dumped by the Minister. So, too, have the two colleagues of the Minister from the Labor Party (that is, the members for Unley and Henley Beach) been dumped by their own Minister in this instance.

That is the situation that applied at the time, but since that time, and since the Minister has backed off his obligation and sacked and/or accepted the resignation of the Chairman of the Grants Commission, so, too, has some further damage been done. As a result of those undertakings and the failure to uphold those undertakings, an element of insecurity and a breakdown of confidence could have or, indeed, I suggest has spread throughout the rest of the local government communities. As a result of the Minister's backing away from his obligation in this instance, the future amalgamation of local government (and, undoubtedly, there are some still to be amalgamated for good given purposes) throughout South Australia has been put in jeopardy, because no council or group of councils in their right mind will enter into arrangements of amalgamation, whether it be in part of a council in the form of a ward or two or whole councils amalgamating, on the basis of undertakings from a Minister of Local Government who we know is not prepared to stick to his word.

The reflection of this on the rest of the Government has not yet been acknowledged by the Premier and his Ministerial colleagues because, once a Minister establishes in the community an understanding and an arrangement (in this case, a clear undertaking) of financial commitment and then breaks that confidence and trust and backs away from his obligations, it puts a climate of unrest and uneasiness across the rest of the Cabinet involved. For the past several days members on this side have been talking about the credibility of the Government—or, indeed, with respect to the Budget papers tabled by the Premier, the lack of credibility of the Government—and one of its own Ministers in the interim has come out and clearly demonstrated that he cannot be trusted.

Mr Mathwin: Here is the Minister now.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: I do not want to disrupt my line of debate in this instance, but, believe it or not, the Minister of Local Government has come crawling in through the back door. He still has his back to me, but he is now present. I wonder whether the circumstances allow the Minister to enter the debate and offer the House some contribution in view of the motion now before the House. If the Minister chooses—he has not yet spoken to anyone on this side of the House—to signal to us either directly or through his Whip that he is willing to comment on the motion, I would be most willing to seek leave to continue my remarks later or even conclude my remarks now. Whichever way it is, I do not mind, but the obligation is squarely on the shoulders, albeit the narrow shoulders, of the Minister to

meet his obligations. He is listed on the Notice Paper as having taken the adjournment.

It was earlier indicated to the House that the Minister was present and he has now come into the Chamber, albeit belatedly. Perhaps I should seek advice from you, Madam Acting Speaker, whether it is feasible for the Minister to enter the debate. Be that as it may, I challenge the Minister to come clean and declare in this House the position of the Government with respect to the undertakings that he gave. I seek an assurance from the Minister that the councils in question in one way or another will get the moneys consistent with the undertakings given.

Mr Lewis: He is running scared, with his tail between his legs; he could run off any minute.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: I note the comments of the member for Mallee. To say the least, it is disappointing that the Minister has chosen to adopt an attitude of contempt towards this motion before the House. Therefore, as signalled by the member for Murray, it is a contempt of Parliament itself in the way that he has behaved throughout this exercise and, in particular, today in relation to this debate. I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

NORTH-SOUTH TRANSPORT CORRIDOR

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D.C. Brown:

That this House condemns the decision of the Government to scrap the north-south transport corridor as the decision will cause major transport problems especially for the southern metropolitan region, and furthermore this House calls on the Government not to sell or dispose of any land necessary for the construction of this corridor.

(Continued from 31 August. Page 654.)

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): I happen to have a particular interest in this subject, as someone who has an electorate which would have been vivisected, smashed, carved up, totally disrupted—

Mr Ferguson: Truncated.

Mr TRAINER: No, not truncated, because this freeway is only a truncated version of the MATS plan.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I rise on a point of order, Madam Acting Speaker. Is the member for Ascot Park in a position to indicate to the House whether he is the lead speaker for the Government on this motion or whether he is only a 30-minute speaker?

Mr TRAINER: I understand that I have unlimited time under Standing Orders.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Are you going to filibuster?

Mr TRAINER: It is not a matter of filibustering, for the benefit of members opposite.

The Hon. D.C. Brown interjecting:

Mr TRAINER: I happen to have a strong interest in this subject.

The Hon. D.C. Brown interjecting:

Mr TRAINER: I am one of the two or three elected members who are most affected by the project that the member for Davenport wishes to resurrect. In the years since the MATS plan was first thrown up in 1968-69, it has gradually been whittled away as people have become more and more aware that the grandiose plan of 1968-69 was not the ideal solution to the problems of the transportation system of metropolitan Adelaide.

The north-south transport corridor constitutes the last vestiges of the 1968-69 Metropolitan Adelaide Transport Study Plan, a plan unveiled by the then Premier, Steele Hall, as the answer to all the transport problems of metropolitan Adelaide. It became a very important issue at the 1970 State election, an election which, I remind members opposite, saw the downfall of that Government. Indeed, I believe, as do many people in my area, that the MATS plan was one of the key issues that led to the downfall of the Hall Government. When it was put to the people of South Australia it was thoroughly rejected in spite of rather phoney attempts to whip up non-existent support on the part of some members of the Steele Hall Government. I would like to remind members of the actions of the then Minister of Transport, the Hon. Murray Hill, M.L.C., because at that time—

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I wonder whether, as the honourable member is lead speaker for the Government on this motion, he will table on behalf of the Minister the Southern Area Road Network Strategy Report, for which I asked about a week ago when I first debated this motion and which I have been trying to get ever since.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order, and the member for Davenport knows that very well. The honourable member for Ascot Park.

Mr TRAINER: I am not prepared to entertain the entertaining request of the member opposite.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Where's the report?

Mr TRAINER: I understand that the honourable member did very well with some reports he purloined during the election period last year. I even understand that the Cawthorne Report to which I am referring led to a little dissension between himself and the person who toppled him from the position of Leader of the Opposition that he wanted. I can understand the point of order being raised by the honourable member, because he is obviously somewhat fearful that I was about to relate the anecdote of what transpired in the case of the Hon. Murray Hill, M.L.C., shortly before the 1970 State election when the Hon. Mr Hill was attempting to whip up non-existent support for the Metropolitan Adelaide Transport Study.

At that time the *Sunday Mail* ran a little questionnaire in one of its editions, a clip-out coupon asking, 'Are you in favour of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transport Study?' In other words, 'Do you want lots of freeways chopping Adelaide asunder?' There was something very mysterious about the postal responses to that questionnaire. This was noticed by the *Sunday Mail* (which is no great friend of the Labor Party, but what happened was so blatant that even the *Sunday Mail* could not avoid paying some attention to it): it seemed that 500 responses arrive in one bundle—in the same envelope and involving only two or three samples of handwriting. A reporter from the *Sunday Mail* found this somewhat fascinating and made some inquiries. It seems that one Murray Hill had placed a bulk order with his news agent for 400 or 500 copies of that edition of the *Sunday Mail* to be supplied to him.

Mr Lewis: How many was it? Get your facts straight!

Mr TRAINER: I am working from memory of something that happened 13 years ago—it may have been 400; it may have been 500. For the sake of soothing the feelings of the member opposite, who has never been a stickler for accuracy in the past, I will change my phraseology from '400 or 500' copies to 'a very substantial number'.

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order. I take exception to the imputation directed at me by the member for Ascot Park that I have no respect for the truth or factual accuracy in presenting material to this House, and I ask that the words he used be withdrawn.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member for Mallee that the remarks attributed to the member for Ascot Park are not considered unparlia-

mentary. The only thing that the Chair can do is ask the honourable member for Ascot Park to withdraw his remarks if he so desires, and I so ask.

Mr TRAINER: I will withdraw them and merely say that the member opposite has not shown a predilection for precision.

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a further point of order. For the same reasons as I outlined requesting that the member for Ascot Park withdraw the remark that he made about me in the first instance, I ask that he also withdraw his last remark because, by imputation, it questions the credibility of my statements whenever they are, in my stated opinion, facts.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Again, I point out to the member for Mallee, for the same reasons that I gave previously, that the words to which the honourable member has taken offence are not unparliamentary, and I can only ask the member for Ascot Park whether he cares to withdraw his statement.

Mr TRAINER: In the interests of harmony (and I am someone who always likes to contribute to the harmony of this place), I would be delighted to withdraw that remark, as the member takes it as a reflection on his veracity rather than on his memory.

Ms Lenehan: He doesn't understand that.

Mr TRAINER: He has worked it out now.

Mr LEWIS: I take a further point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. That remark reflects on my integrity as did previous remarks and, by virtue of the fact that it is obviously intended to ridicule me, I ask that you, Sir, request the member for Ascot Park to withdraw those words. I know that those words are not unparliamentary and I defer to your explanation, Sir, although I was aware of that fact, but I merely ask through you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that the member for Ascot Park does not reflect on me without having some evidence to which he can refer to justify making those assertions.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Again, I point out to the member for Mallee that the words to which he has taken objection are not unparliamentary. However, I also point out two things to the member for Ascot Park: first, it is obvious to the Chair that the honourable member is baiting the member for Mallee, and that does no good for the debate; secondly, that behaviour does very little for the decorum of the House, and I put that question to the member for Ascot Park.

Mr TRAINER: I quite seriously repeat my offer to make a withdrawal in the interests of harmony, because I consider the subject to be serious. Regardless of the fact that some members opposite may not wish to hear the remarks that I care to make, the subject is of deep concern to me. As I said in my opening remarks, I represent the District of Ascot Park, which contains the suburbs of Glandore, South Plympton and Edwardstown, which would be seriously affected by this project that members opposite appear to wish to resurrect, even though they, when in Government, played a significant role in the gradual winding down of the north-south corridor. If one goes back to the remarks I made a while ago, one sees that this matter became an issue at the 1970 election. Most of the project was shelved. When the moratorium expired in the early 1980s, the now member for Torrens, who was then the Minister of Transport, did, or intended to do, almost everything along the same lines as has been done by the Government of which I am a part, but he did not take the final step, for political considerations.

I strongly suspect that even the people who support a freeway do so only if it is to go through someone else's district, particularly if that is a working-class electorate, because they apparently seem to believe that working-class electorates are made up of second-class people who constitute freeway fodder for the sake of grand designs. As an illustration of that, I would like to relate another anecdote concerning the Mitcham council, which recently came out in support of the Liberals opposite and one or two other people involved in local government in regard to restoring the north-south corridor. They are very much in favour of the people in Ascot Park, Mitchell and other Labor districts being pushed aside unnecessarily. The cruel part of it is that the projections on which the MATS plan were based have been proved to be incorrect.

In trying to bait the Government two weeks ago, the member for Davenport raised the hoary story of Monarto and said how subsequent events had made that, in effect, a white elephant. However, the very same sort of population projections upon which Monarto was based are the ones upon which the north-south corridor was based and they have been proven inadequate by subsequent events.

I was about to refer to the Mitcham council and say how people who are in favour of a freeway are usually in favour only when it is to go through someone else's territory. In 1969, when Steele Hall was in Government and Robin Millhouse was the Attorney-General, the Mitcham council had its annual bus tour of the area (a tour of projects and other things put on for the benefit of local dignatories, local M.P.s, and so on). The member for Mitcham was present as the local member (Robin Millhouse, the Attorney-General). The Town Clerk, on this tour in August or September 1969, made a special point of stopping the tour outside some very nice properties behind the Unley High School oval. He said to the various dignatories present, 'Have a look, because this is what is about to be destroyed by part of your MATS plan.'

Robin Millhouse and the Hall Government paid very close attention, because the electorate of Mitcham was very much affected by that part of the plan, as also was what was then considered the marginal Unley electorate at that time. Wonders of wonders: that section was scrubbed. But, of course, when things are different they are not the same. When it was possible 18 months ago for the final vestiges to be removed from the map altogether, they could not quite bite the bullet: for political considerations, they left it reduced from the eight-lane monstrosity to a four-lane monstrosity. The final step has now been taken, and this cruel joke has been removed from the planning of this State.

I would like to refer again to the attitude of the City of Mitcham, and I would like to quote from some papers from a conference, held by the Department of Adult Education at the University of Adelaide on 1 and 2 November 1968, entitled 'The Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study and the Future Development of Adelaide'. I refer to pages 185 and 186 entitled 'Reactions from councils'. A questionnaire put out by the City of Mitcham to its ratepayers, asking their views on a series of matters, states:

> The letter is particularly addressed to ratepayers whose properties—
>
> - will be acquired by the proposal
> - are in immediate proximity
> - are in a location such as to be affected
> - will overlook the proposed works
> - are situated in the streets which will become affected as dead ends or cut off from neighbouring localities.
>
> As well, the council invites ratepayers to comment on a wide number of matters, including—

and I will not read the whole series. I will save that for a later occasion. However, I think that the last point is a wonderful one. It states:

> Alleged disregard for the rights of thousands of private citizens who have established themselves in the residences and areas of their choice.

Is not that a different attitude from the one expressed by some of those councils and by members opposite today? I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[*Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.*]

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It deals with three matters: the power of justices to imprison, the maintenance of accurate records relating to justices of the peace, and new procedures to be adopted by a justice upon the completion of the evidence for the prosecution upon a preliminary examination. Last year, the Parliament passed legislation amending the Justices Act to prevent justices of the peace from imposing sentences of imprisonment. While that legislation was desirable in principle, it was realised soon after its enactment that there are, at present, certain practical and financial obstacles to its implementation.

On 30 July 1982, a proclamation was made by His Excellency the Governor purporting to suspend the operation of the section under which the authority of justices of the peace to impose sentences of imprisonment was removed. The Government has received advice from the Crown Solicitor that the proclamation is invalid and that, as a consequence, justices of the peace do not have the power to impose sentences of imprisonment. The Government has consulted with those concerned in the administration of the courts, the police, magistracy, Royal Association of Justices and organisations concerned with the provision of legal aid.

The Government has come to the conclusion that it is not practical to remove entirely the power of justices of the peace to impose sentences of imprisonment. This measure provides that justices of the peace have a limited power to impose sentences of imprisonment for periods not exceeding seven days. If a more severe sentence is required or warranted, the court must remand the person in custody or on bail to appear for sentence before a special magistrate as soon as is reasonably practicable. It is possible that in remote areas arrangements may have to be made for the person to be transported to the nearest court of summary jurisdiction constituted of a special magistrate in order to comply with the requirement that the person be brought to appear for sentence as soon as is reasonably practicable.

The second matter with which this Bill is concerned is the establishment of a system of biennial returns to be provided by justices of the peace. Currently there are no formal procedures to maintain an accurate record of the names and addresses of justices of the peace. Without such a record the Government is unaware of changes of address by justices of the peace and, where a justice of the peace dies, the fact of his death. Consequently, it is impossible to ensure that there is a sufficient number of justices of the peace in each area of the State to provide an adequate service to members of the public. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

The Government has recently taken steps to revise its records. The new information is accurate, and the requirement to furnish a return every two years will maintain this accuracy. A fee must accompany the biennial returns to finance the administration of the records. Failure by a justice of the peace to lodge a return or pay a fee may result in his removal from office. The Attorney-General has discussed the proposal with the President of the Royal Association of Justices of South Australia, who has agreed with the proposal in principle. The opportunity has also been taken to revise section 18 of the principal Act which deals with the removal of justices from office.

Finally, the Bill provides for amendments to sections 105a and 109 of the principal Act to effect new procedures to be followed by justices upon the completion of the evidence for the prosecution upon a preliminary examination. In a matter heard recently by Mr W.J. Ackland, S.M., two persons were charged jointly with having Indian hemp in their possession for the purposes of supplying, or for otherwise dealing or trading in that drug—an indictable offence.

At the conclusion of the preliminary examination the learned special magistrate found that the evidence was not sufficient to put the defendants on trial for that offence, but that it was sufficient to put them on trial for the offence of knowingly having in their possession Indian hemp, which happens to be a minor indictable offence. At that point the matter was adjourned to enable further instructions to be taken, and subsequently both defendants intimated by counsel that they wished the matter to be dealt with summarily, one wishing to enter a plea of guilty and the other wishing to have the matter heard and determined by the special magistrate.

Section 109 (3) of the principal Act provides that if a justice is of the opinion (after having heard the evidence offered by the prosecution) that the evidence is sufficient to put the defendant upon his trial for any offence he may (except in a case of treason, murder or manslaughter) either ask the defendant whether he wishes to plead to the charge and proceed accordingly, or proceed with the preliminary examination. In either case, the result is that the matter will ultimately be dealt with by the Supreme Court or the District Court. This is clearly an undesirable result in a case of a minor indictable offence where all parties concerned wish the matter to be dealt with summarily to avoid the additional costs involved in proceedings before the higher courts.

The Bill provides that if, after completing his consideration of the evidence, the justice considers the evidence sufficient to put the defendant on trial for an indictable offence, the justice shall review the charges as laid in the information to make sure that they properly correspond to the offences for which the justice considers there is sufficient evidence to put the defendant on trial. In carrying out the review, the justice may amend the information by substituting a charge for an indictable offence other than that with which the defendant was originally charged, amend the information to delete any charges relating to indictable offences for which there is insufficient evidence, or amend the information to include a charge relating to an indictable offence for which the defendant was not originally charged. The procedure to be followed by the justice upon completing his review of the charges is then set out in detail. The Bill thus lays down a clear and explicit procedure to be followed by the justice and removes some obscurities and uncertainties that have previously existed.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 makes an amendment to section 4 of the principal Act by inserting a new definition—a 'major offence' is defined as an indictable offence that is not a minor indictable offence. Clause 4 makes an amendment to section 5 of the principal Act. The present subsection (6) is struck out and new subsections (6), (7) and (8) are substituted. New subsection (6) provides that a court of summary jurisdiction, not constituted of a special mag-

istrate, does not have power to impose a sentence of imprisonment (except a sentence in default of payment of a monetary sum) for a term in excess of seven days.

New subsection (7) provides that where a court of summary jurisdiction consisting of justices (not being a special magistrate) convicts a person of an offence punishable by imprisonment and imprisonment is required by law or is in the opinion of the court, warranted by the offence, and the court is, by virtue of subsection (6), unable to impose an appropriate sentence of imprisonment, then the court shall remand the person in custody or on bail to appear before a special magistrate for sentence. New subsection (8) provides that a person remanded in custody under subsection (7) must be brought to appear for sentence as soon as reasonably practicable.

Clause 5 enacts new section 17a. The new section provides, in subsection (1), that a justice (other than a special magistrate) must, within three months before 1 October 1984, and each biennial anniversary of that date, forward to the Attorney-General a return containing the prescribed information, accompanied by the prescribed fee. Under subsection (2), where a justice fails to comply with the requirements of subsection (1) the Attorney-General may require him to comply within a period specified in the notice.

Clause 6 amends section 18 of the principal Act. Subsection (1) is struck out and new subsections (1) and (1a) are substituted. Under new subsection (1), where a justice (other than a special magistrate) who is mentally or physically incapable of carrying out satisfactorily his duties, is convicted of an offence that, in the opinion of the Governor, shows him to be unfit to hold office as a justice, fails to comply with a requirement made by the Attorney-General under section 17a (2) or is bankrupt or applies to take the benefit of a law for the relief of bankrupt or insolvent debtors, the Governor may, by notice published in the *Gazette*, remove him from office. Subsection (1a) provides that the name of a justice so removed from office must be removed from the roll of justices.

Clause 7 provides for the insertion in the principal Act of new section 105a. Under that new section, where a person is charged with a minor indictable offence but no major offence, the charge shall be dealt with by a court of summary jurisdiction in the manner set out in Division II and a justice (other than a special magistrate) before whom such a person appears must remand him to appear before a special magistrate. Under subsection (2), where a person is charged on information with a major offence (whether or not a minor indictable offence is included) there shall be a preliminary examination in relation to all the charges contained in the information.

Clause 8 amends section 109 of the principal Act. Subsections (2) and (3) are struck out and new subsections are substituted. New subsection (2) provides that if the justice, after considering the evidence offered in the preliminary examination by the prosecution, considers it insufficient to put the defendant on trial for any indictable offence he shall dismiss the information and, if appropriate, order that the defendant be discharged from custody. New subsection (3) provides that if, after considering the evidence, the justice decides that it is sufficient to put the defendant on trial for an indictable offence, he shall review the charges as laid in the information to ensure that they properly correspond to the offences for which he considers there is sufficient evidence to put the defendant on trial.

In carrying out the review, he shall observe the following provisions:

(a) if he considers the evidence insufficient to support the indictable offence charged but sufficient to support a charge for another indictable offence, he shall amend the information to substitute that other charge;

(b) if he considers the evidence sufficient to support some, but not all, of the indictable offences charged, he shall delete from the information those charges which cannot be supported;

(c) if he considers the evidence sufficient to support an indictable offence with which the defendant has not been charged on the information, he may, in addition to any other amendment, amend the information to include such a charge.

New subsection (4) provides that, upon completion of the review of the charges, the justice shall proceed as follows:

(a) if the defendant is charged with a major offence and no minor indictable offence, he may, in a case other than murder, manslaughter or treason, ask the defendant whether he wishes to plead to the charge in accordance with Division III or he shall proceed with the preliminary examination;

(b) if the defendant is charged with a minor indictable offence and no major offence, the charge shall be dealt with under Division II;

(c) if the defendant is charged with both a major offence and a minor indictable offence (whether cumulatively or alternatively), the justice may deal with the matter as if both charges related to major offences or, where he considers it just and expedient, divide the information into two separate informations, one for the major offence and one for the minor offence, and deal with each separately under whichever of the previous provisions is appropriate.

New subsection (5) provides that where a charge is in pursuance of this section, to be dealt with under Division II by a court constituted of a special magistrate who also conducted the preliminary examination, a witness for the prosecution who appeared personally need not be recalled except on the request of the defendant for cross-examination, further cross-examination or re-examination. Clause 9 is a consequential matter, providing for the repeal of section 124 of the principal Act.

The Hon. H. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is related to the Justices Act Amendment Bill which confers upon justices a limited power to imprison. In the course of reviewing the power of justices to imprison, it was brought to the Government's attention that many of the offences for which the penalty of imprisonment was imposed by justices were related to drunkenness. The penalty of imprisonment for drunkenness does not deter offenders or rehabilitate them. This Bill is a first step towards the desirable goal of entirely abolishing the offence of being drunk in a public place. The Government is committed to the ultimate abolition of that offence.

Section 9 of the principal Act (which creates the offence of drunkenness) was originally repealed in 1976, but that measure has never been brought into effect because of administrative and funding problems with the associated machinery for a scheme of sobering-up centres. That scheme, along with other schemes of protective custody orders, which can operate as an adjunct to the criminal justice system,

will be examined. Notwithstanding the repealing Act, the Government considers it desirable, as an initial step, to strike out the provisions of section 9 providing for imprisonment, leaving a monetary penalty in its place.

The second matter dealt with by this Bill concerns police bail. Section 78 (2) of the principal Act presently provides that where an arrested person is granted police bail he must be required to appear before a justice on the day following arrest. In most cases, when the person appears as required, the matter is adjourned to be dealt with at a more convenient time.

The Courts Department is investigating procedures to improve the efficiency of court administration in South Australia. It is envisaged that many country courts will be affected. Some will close completely, while others will be retained only for the limited purpose of periodic sitting days.

Under the circumstances, it is necessary to amend section 78 (2) to accommodate the changes which have been proposed. The amendment will enable the arrested person to be granted bail on recognizance, a condition of the recognizance being that he appear at a specified place and at a specified time (not being more than 28 days from the date of his arrest). I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends subsection (1) of section 9 of the principal Act by striking out the passages, 'or imprisonment for 14 days', and 'or imprisonment for three months.' Clause 4 amends section 78 of the principal Act. Rather than requiring that an arrested person admitted to police bail appear before a justice on the day next following arrest, the section is amended to require the person to appear at the time specified in the recognizance (being not more than 28 days from the person's arrest).

The Hon. H. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

PRISONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This small Bill makes several minor amendments to the Prisons Act which are consequential upon the Justices Act Amendment Bill. The amendments reflect the limited power to impose sentences of imprisonment conferred upon justices under the Justices Act amendments, and in this case they apply to visiting justices under the Prisons Act. Where visiting justices are justices of the peace, they will not be empowered to impose sentences of imprisonment in cases of prison offences for any period exceeding seven days. If they consider that a greater penalty is warranted, they may refer the matter to a visiting justice who is a special magistrate. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 makes an amendment to section 48 of the principal Act. Under the amendment, justices of the peace do not have the power to impose a sentence of imprisonment exceeding seven days. Where one of the justices is a special magistrate, they are empowered to impose a sentence not exceeding one year. Where neither justice is a special magistrate and each is of the opinion that a greater sentence than seven days is warranted, they may refer the question of sentence to a visiting justice who is a special magistrate. Under new subsection (5), where a question of sentence is referred to a visiting justice who is a special magistrate he may impose a sentence not exceeding one year.

The Hon. H. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This small Bill makes a single amendment to the principal Act to reflect amendments contained in the Justices Act Amendment Bill. Under that Bill justices are provided with limited powers to impose sentences of imprisonment. This Bill reflects those limitations by limiting to no more than seven days the period of imprisonment which a visiting tribunal comprised of two justices of the peace is empowered under section 44 to impose.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 44 of the principal Act by providing that a visiting tribunal comprised of two justices of the peace is empowered to impose no greater sentence of imprisonment than seven days.

The Hon. H. ALLISON secured the addjournment of the debate.

NARCOTIC AND PSYCHOTROPIC DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 September. Page 801.)

Mr RODDA (Victoria): Last evening I was addressing the House about certain actions in regard to the Department of Agriculture and its research stations. One of the most fundamental remarks made by the Premier in this respect was as follows:

> Fundamental to that strategy is the promotin of economic activity within our regional economy. Central to the Budget is the maintenance of a high volume building and construction programme by winding back the use of capital funds for recurrent expenditure. Coupled with this is a significant boost to the housing sector and the establishment of direct job creation programmes.

That encompasses a wide ambit of the debate. Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr RODDA: It is nice to be alone with the Government. I do not suppose anybody has had that privilege for a long

time. I was referring to the Premier's fundamental statement. He is now making a fundamental disappearance. I hope that that will not be the normal course of action during the next 25 minutes.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Where is your back bench, Allan?

Mr Groom: Where's your front bench?

Mr RODDA: I think they may have gone to the races. I was rather surprised to read in Monday's paper a report headed 'Research changes sought'.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Victoria is entitled to a hearing.

Mr RODDA: I refer to a committee report forwarded to the Minister of Agriculture. It made far-reaching suggestions that there should be a rationalisation of the location of some of our research stations. Kybybolite, which is in my electorate, is a recommendee for sale and for shifting its cash to Struan and enlarging Struan; I want to have something to say about that in a moment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Private discussions are totally out of order.

Mr RODDA: This is fundamental, of course, to that third paragraph in the Premier's Financial Statement, in which he talked about the strategies and the promotion of economic activity. I notice here that it says that this move would be self-funding. It states:

> The overall plan is self-funding, and so would involve no additional allocation of Government funds to agriculture.

I presume from that that the sale of these properties would finance their re-arrangement. I am being charitable when I say that because I am sure that the committee did not mean that these properties, when they become realigned, will be self-funding in what they produce. It is an ambiguous comment by the committee. Furthermore, the Chairman states (I think that Mr McColl was the Chairman):

> He had had preliminary discussions with the Treasury about self-funding for the proposed structural changes, and for operations on research centres, and he was optimistic the Government would accept that principle.

So, in fact, he is looking for self-funding on the operation of research centres. I believe that that is completely out of kilter with what we know about these agricultural places. I will talk particularly about the Kybybolite Research Centre. The residents there are particularly uptight about this. I had a letter yesterday from a lady at Kybybolite who echoes the current reaction to this announcement. She wrote:

> As a resident of the Kybybolite district I wish to protest most strongly about the proposed closure of the Kybybolite Research Centre, which has actively stimulated farming ideas and methods in this area since its inception in 1906, and has been a centre for agricultural meetings and field days. This farm has soil and water typical of the area, and is quite different from the Struan Research Centre black plains country; so the staff can help with problems in farming techniques for Kyby and areas to the north.

I will go further and point out that the Kybybolite Research Centre provides the experimentation and the know-how for the whole of the red gum country in South Australia. The letter continues:

> Now that cost structures of farming are becoming increasingly difficult, I doubt that anyone will take time off to travel all the way to Struan with a diseased leaf or a questionable insect. The closure of the centre will certainly affect the local school—almost to the point of forcing its closure. This small school has excellent staffing facilities and produces students who are ahead of their peers when they go on to secondary education. The local shop and post office will be adversely affected—another blow against struggling private enterprise.
>
> It seems that there is an ever-widening gap between city and country living standards and this proposed closure of a local focal point of activities will be just another way of reducing the standard of our community life, which seems to conflict with the aims of the Department of Agriculture set up to serve country people.
>
> We will all be pleased if you can look into the viability of the proposed sale of Kyby, purchase of more land at Struan, relocation of staff and buildings, and the loss of services to the area at Kyby.

In regard to moving this station, Kybybolite is situated on prime land in the centre of the red gum country, and has been the centre of agricultural development. Indeed, the late Sid Shepherd was the instigator of the wide use of superphosphate and the inventor of the Shepherd broadcaster, a forerunner in the application of superphosphate and the establishment of subterranean clover. Of course, this happened in South Australia at Kybybolite. There have been many eminent agriculturists who have worked there. It is a fallacy to say that this place is not warranted.

I draw attention to another factor in agriculture exemplified at Kybybolite and at Turretfield, where experiments are now proceeding. The production of oats is significant to primary industry in South Australia and is one of the main bolsters of our primary livestock industry. It impinges heavily on the comments in the Premier's third paragraph. I refer to the main varieties of oats currently grown in this State, because they include Coolabah, Swan, West and Avon—all Western Australian grown oats. Plant breeders in Western Australia do an excellent job. In South Australia we have Mr Andrew Barr, a plant breeder stationed at Turretfield, one of the areas to be closed. Presently Mr Barr has 40 new varieties of dwarf oats on trial, two of which are showing particular significance. Trials are underway on three sites in the State: in the South-East, in the Mid-North and on Eyre Peninsula. One variety in particular, not yet named, has outyielded all current varieties by 30 per cent. This is the sort of activity that Mr Barr is undertaking at Turretfield, yet this committee recommends that Turretfield should go down the gurgler.

People involved in the rural industries are fairly uptight about this report. I do not say there is not a need for rationalisation in some areas. I note that reference is made to Winkler's farm, and to Sim's farms at Cleve. Perhaps some rationalisation is needed, but the committee is treading on fairly soft corns when it talks about places like Turretfield and Kybybolite.

The question also raises its ugly head when we take it a bit further and examine the situation at Struan, which is centred on the black plains country, the permanent pasture, the strawberry clover based Phalaris pastures. I live near the high land around Struan. Most of the high land rises with heavy limestone outcrops, which are most unsuitable for agriculture. If one breaks them up the land is covered with stones and has shallow soils with only small pockets of red soil.

The other land is the deep sand dunes on which the banksia marginata grows, the subject we discussed this afternoon. I listened to the Minister for Environment and Planning sounding off about that. I have been inundated with complaints about the new regulations which the member for Flinders is so rightly seeking to have abolished. The regulations are causing problems. If we close Kybybolite, we will close a practical and dividend-giving leg of agriculture, and I leave that point for the House to ponder.

I do not think the Government will get a lot of money from the sale of these properties. This will certainly not be a self-funding exercise. Any capital generated from such an exercise would be swallowed up in reallocation costs. I have noted in the report that houses would be for sale at $5 000 each and the research laboratory at $20 000. These are salvage costs given for Kybybolite.

The Minister of Transport is in the House at the moment, and I have some comments to make that will be music to his ears. These comments relate to the Government's announced intention not to proceed with the north-south

transport corridor. I represent many people who use this State's transport system and who are most unhappy about this happening. I have a letter from a distinguished businessman from Wolseley dated 6 September, as follows:

Dear Allan—

he is a friendly fellow—

No doubt you have seen the enclosed copy of the R.A.A. *Journal* for September. It will do nothing for South Australia if the property for the freeway which has been acquired over many years is now disposed of for a temporary gain. It will in my opinion prove a very short-sighted policy. I feel that you agree with my view—

and indeed I do—

and would urge you to ask Premier Bannon to urgently reverse that decision. Recently I was in Melbourne, a city notorious for its lack of freeways. I left Dandenong and travelled across Melbourne to Bullo, a distance of 68 kilometres, 42 of which was at 100 km per hour on first the Eastern Freeway and then on the Tullamarine Freeway. I left Dandenong at 7.15 a.m. and arrived at Bullo at 9.30—2¼ hours. The first 42 kilometres of freeway would have taken 26 minutes—the other 26 kilometres took 109 minutes. If Adelaide does not get that north-south corridor working it will be in exactly the same sort of chaotic conditions in 10 years time.

That is what a distinguished gentleman who has been a part of the South-Eastern business population for a long time had to say.

Truckies to whom I have spoken know that it is taking them six moves when in traffic to get through a red light on the eastern side of Adelaide, so the Government might well come in for a lot of criticism about its decision. The Minister of Transport's department has received a substantial vote in the Budget, as it should have done because of its responsibilities. However, I will read into the record a couple of paragraphs of a report sent to me which has been compiled by the R.A.A. and which appeared in the September issue of *Motor*, as follows:

The Government's move has effectively confined future north-south traffic to using the already bottle-necked South Road, and other parallel routes.

While the Government says it is going ahead with urgent upgrading programmes along South Road, they are patchwork and will not be sufficient to meet future traffic demands.

Not only will South Road remain a bottleneck, but every parallel route is doomed to the same conditions—a nightmare on which to live, do business, and drive.

Those remarks were echoed by my friend from Wolseley when he recounted what he experienced in Melbourne this week. The Minister now has the chance of being loved forever by interstate people who like doing business in South Australia by changing his decision.

An honourable member: You'd like a freeway through your area, would you?

Mr RODDA: It would be good for us, and it would be good for the western area of Adelaide. The R.A.A. article continues:

As a major thrust in its argument to drop the corridor plans, the Government cited lower than anticipated population growth for Adelaide (1.02 million by 1991).

However, it failed to take into account that during the 10 year period to 1991, population growth in the southern region will explode by an estimated 46 per cent and in the northern region the anticipated growth is 22.6 per cent.

So, that is not falling on deaf ears. People interstate and driver-operators are taking note. When one considers the industrial development that has taken place on Grand Junction Road, one sees that there has been no dropping off in incentive or enthusiasm for people to live and to develop businesses in South Australia. I hope that the Minister gives this matter his most earnest consideration and does not sell off valuable real estate that will be required in the future. Future Governments will have to grapple with that problem if he does so.

South Australia has always enjoyed a good quality of life, but I received a complaint from one of the kindergartens in my district. I note that once again education has received the bulk of Budget moneys—$633 million plus. I do not begrudge that. The Kindergarten Union benefits from this allocation, but I received a letter from the Secretary of the McKay Memorial Kindergarten, which stated:

The committee of the McKay Memorial Kindergarten is very concerned about the proposed new system of video tape censorship classification. We are concerned about the effects this may have on the community and in particular on the children. A look at research material by the South Australian Council for Children's Films and Television on the effects of the viewing of violent programmes in the cinema or on television by children (and adults too) should make our Government tread on the side of caution. It is our belief that this proposed system would allow easier access to those in the community who are likely to be most affected (that is, our children). If there is to be no uniform method of marking the classification rating on the tapes, the consumers will have difficulty assessing the type of programme material it contains.

Speaking as concerned parents we would like to see compulsory registration on all video tapes, with a classification clearly marked. This may seem a major task, but surely the long-term benefits to the community would justify it. As for the proposal of an 'X' classification, we feel it would be an outrageous mistake to make such material so freely available to the public. Although it may be fair to say 'adults should be allowed to view any material they like in the privacy of their own homes', there can be no guarantee that those films will be viewed by only adults. There will always be some adults irresponsible towards the welfare of our children. Video tapes of extreme violence and nudity, as suggested for 'X' classification, should not be distributed at all. Our committee asks the Government not to allow this system of video censorship classification to be passed as law.

The people at that kindergarten in Penola are extremely concerned. In the time that is left to me I want to canvass quickly one or two other matters. On numerous occasions I have said that a new school should be built at Lucindale, which is one of those areas that makes a very cogent contribution to the coffers of this State. It is a growth area, and there is more agricultural development every year.

Of course, it is one of the areas of great concern regarding this coal mine. It certainly relates to what the Premier is talking about in his third paragraph. However, the Lucindale school has wooden-structure buildings, and a couple of years ago a most magnificent hall was built there. That is a spearhead to what can come in the future. The staff and indeed the parents and council do a wonderful job keeping the place in order. They have appreciated the painting that these old buildings have received in the past. However, the double units are old buildings and are totally inadequate, and the library is overcrowed. I again make this plea to the Minister. In all the years that I have been here, I think this would be the nineteenth Budget debate in which I have taken part, and this school has been on the building programme half a dozen times. I think that it has slipped off the list in the last 10 years.

We do not deny that Kingston had to have its school, and I think that everyone is grateful to the Hon. J.D. Wright (the Deputy Premier) for the stand he took in having that school built. However, this does not in any way take away the need at Lucindale. It is the only school in the District of Victoria since I have been the member (and, indeed, during the time of my predecessor Mr Harding) that has not been renewed or upgraded. The enrolments have kept up and, with the young people coming into the district, those enrolments will increase. It is an area on which the Minister could look favourably, and this would be very much appreciated by the Lucindale people.

The other area that interests me greatly (and I want to give the Government plaudits for this) is the work with which it is keeping abreast on the Dukes Highway. We were pleased to hear only last week that the engineers, as the spearhead, are shifting their abode from Murray Bridge to Bordertown, and it is anticipated that the Dukes Highway

will be completed and on stream by 1985. Of course, an adjunct to that is that plans are going ahead for the resurfacing and completion of the road from Naracoorte to Mount Gambier, and the upgrading of the road from Keith to join up with that road, virtually making it a freeway. The Minister talked about a freeway through my property, which is adjacent.

This project is appreciated by the people in the South-East, and it will help promote the Coonawarra wine industry. Plans are in hand for a motel and conference/convention centre to be built at Coonawarra, and I understand that another group of people has plans to refurbish and upgrade the old Adam Lindsay Gorddon Hotel. This is the investment which has come into our State because—

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

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): Before commenting on the Budget, I would like to pay a tribute to the Minister of Transport. He is probably feeling a little battered and bruised by the comments made on a number of decisions he has made over a period. However, I will not comment further on those decisions. I know that many of them are wrong, but I merely want to say that the service that he has provided to me as a member of Parliament has been exceptional. I have had prompt, courteous and compassionate treatment from the Minister of Transport, and I think that he shows the way for a number of other Ministers who are less prompt, courteous and compassionate.

When I had a look at the Budget structure, I must admit that I met with the same problems confronting most people. We have great difficulty in understanding the massive volume of figures, the huge amounts involved and the shifting of items between various allocation areas, and it takes an enormous amount of time to gain even the most fundamental understanding of those figures.

Tonight I want to deal with the process of budgeting. I have mentioned this before, and I will do so again. I hope that in the course of the forthcoming two years some members of the Government will grasp a few principles about the budgeting process. It is my belief that Governments rarely understand why they do things or realise the impact of decisions made and the effect of the costs foisted on the community. One thing that is very apparent with the present Budget is that the estimates of receipts on Consolidated Account for the year ended 30 June 1984 show that taxation for 1983-84 will increase by some 14.2 per cent. The Budget estimate of what the consumer price index will be for 1983-84 indicates an 8 per cent increase in the cost of living. That will mean that, in fact, $34 million over and above the estimated inflation rate will be dragged from the community and that there will be a redistribution of resources in our community. Any taxation measure imposed costs jobs.

The increase is even more phenomenal in the area of public undertakings, involving an estimated increase of 17 per cent, as against the consumer price index of some 8 per cent, which will lead to an excess drag on the community of some $16 million. In regard to recoveries of debt services, the increase is below the projected inflation rate, amounting to only 3.8 per cent. Included in some of the minor items, 'Territorial' deals with a 45 per cent increase. Members can gain an understanding of what that item really does mean by looking at the notes. A further item, of course, shows that the Commonwealth has been somewhat generous in its allocation of recurrent grants, with an increase of 11.1 per cent. The point of the exercise is that when we take more revenue than is deserved it costs jobs, and I have said that a number of times. It is encumbent on us to understand what we are taking and what we are giving back in return.

The early indication is that the Labor Government will destroy whatever improvements were achieved during the life of the Tonkin Government. I well remember that the present Premier, on assuming power, said during the first sitting of Parliament in December 1982 that South Australia was suffering under an unemployment rate of 8.4 per cent: he stated that he wanted that put on record. I am sure that he would not want South Australia's unemployment rate today put on record, as it is now about 10.7 per cent, some 2.3 per cent more than that recorded previously. The Premier wanted it put on record, although I think that in three years time that record will have to be reassessed by the community.

Whilst the introduction of programme performance budgeting over the past three years has not been a total success story in terms of changing the direction of the operation of departments, it certainly has had a very positive influence and has some particular virtues that could well be lost if the Government is not mindful of the lessons contained in the figures presented. It is probably unfair to say that this method did not reach its full potential, because it was still being developed and much of the groundwork done by Ministers will be of great value for future budgeting, provided that the information is kept up to date and the people concerned with it take due note of it.

It certainly allowed Ministers to at least understand where they were spending money allocated, and it identified items where savings could be made with a minimal loss of service. It would be quite counter-productive if the effort put into programme performance budgeting were lost. I understand that we will have some of the programme performance budgeting information available when we consider the Estimates in detail in the Committee stages.

The p.p.b. is but a mechanism for displaying items of expenditure and revenue, items which could still suffer from the same problem suffered by a number of statements in the Budget papers. It is still unable to be disaggregated to where it can be properly analysed but at least it is a start. Good budgeting practice relies not only on good information but on an inbuilt resolve to use all resources in the most efficient manner. There is now a mechanism called p.p.b. which gives some detail and will improve over time, and it is now up to the Ministers concerned to use the information to re-allocate resources within the Public Service in the most efficient manner. One of the observations I have made of Government over the past 18 years is that in some cases (in fact, in many cases) Ministers have no real understanding of where money has been spent. The information available today quite clearly gives them sufficient information upon which to base sound decisions. In the past there has rarely been a real attempt to number priorities in the light of the budgeting dollar, yet rarely is there a concerted effort to throw off the shackles of the past in respect of expenditure areas which are no longer needed.

There are four essential items to budgeting practice. The first is that every programme which has been in existence for more than three years need to be re-justified. This is called zero-based budgeting, which normally incorporates a total reassessment of each budget each year. That is not humanly possible, but certainly over a period of three years every programme that has remained unaltered over that time can be considered and has to be re-justified. All new expenditure items must go through a searching cost benefit analysis, something which the public sector has failed to consistently do in the past. Ministers must develop a system for rewarding thrift.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr BAKER: As I was saying, Ministers must develop a system for rewarding thrift so that the inclination to spend up to a Budget allocation is removed; that is very important.

The fourth item is that Ministers must communicate their willingness to make hard decisions (unlike the Minister of Health) and be prepared to shift resources according to priorities rather than maintain out-of-date programmes and add new ones when making resources available. It is the age-old problem of budgeting. The p.p.b. provides the vehicle for making decisions. I would like to extend that concept further and talk about development performance budgeting, which was an exercise upon which I nearly embarked some two years ago within the Public Service. It means that a new mechanism is developed for trading off the various areas of Government expenditure, and the Government Budget dollar is pushed into the most effective area.

We can no longer expect Governments to continue to take money from the private sector and from households without some sense of accountability. Development performance budgeting means that we can trade off teachers for economists and engineers in the form of those services required by Government. We can say that, if the demand for roads expenditure is less, we do not spend as much on roads. The resources allocated, both in the physical equipment and manpower areas, have to change with Budget allocation changes. No Government has ever embraced that concept, but it is high time that that occurred. People ask how one transfers resources and makes an engineer a social welfare worker, because the two seem to be inconsistent. There is no doubt today that the demand on social services is far higher than it has been for many years. In fact, I suppose those demands have always existed, through the depression years and in previous centuries, but they were simply not recognised. Today we recognise those demands and our approach is more humanitarian.

We have a commitment to transfer resources to areas of need. Obviously, if the physical development areas decline in standing, they must take a cut in manpower resources. That can be achieved in a number of ways. The Government must be flexible in its approach. In South Australia we have a commitment to new technology and we now have a Minister for Technology. The Minister for Technology employs a band of able people to look at new technology. They deal with such items as CAD/CAM and processes such as computer reading, which is being used in some consumer areas. They deal with many new techniques which affect the work force and the way in which we conduct ourselves. Unfortunately, many of the results are not coming back to the public sector.

When I say that engineers can be replaced or moved over to an area such as social security or welfare if so desired, it simply means that engineers in some areas are not replaced and their skills are upgraded using the latest technology. Unfortunately, we are still dealing with old technology that is years behind the state of the art. The CAD/CAM development provides important changes in the production process. That process includes the public sector, which must embrace the new technology just as the private sector must do that in order to survive. In simple terms that means that the physical development areas such as the Departments of Highways, E. & W.S., Public Works and Public Buildings can operate more effectively with fewer staff. That will free up resources for other areas of priority. Whilst we say that we can save on public resources (and we know that is possible), we must do it in a sensitive way to meet ongoing needs and new priorities. It is high time that this Government made a commitment to a new approach in this area.

I refer also to the major element in my address tonight, which relates to how one assesses whether the increase in taxation and the resultant increase in expenditure will add to the public good. Theoretically, at the lowest end of the scale we could have no Government and, at the other end of the scale, we could have a total public sector. We all know that neither system works. So, in the middle we have a public sector to provide essential services.

That means that before the public sector spends any money of the private sector or of the household there must be some rationalisation of how to most effectively use that money. A number of econometric models have been developed over a period in Australia and overseas (in United States, the United Nations and various other countries). Some common models that we have in existence today are GRIT, which is the generation of regional input-output tables; the IMPACT project, which looks at the impact of various exogenous changes on the economy; and the IMP project, which is a forecasting model. Each of them has something to say about the economy. It is unfortunate today that we do not have enough information available from those models to tell us exactly what is the impact of each different taxation measure.

It is a great pity, because we would then be able to measure the performance of Government. I know that the Government is fairly reluctant to have its performance measured. We can use a few of the developments of these computer models and put public funds into them so that we can measure the impact of revenue-raising measures, and so that we can then ask, if we increase the price of petrol, how that will flow through the economy, and how it will affect the consumer, the producer, and the gross domestic product.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr BAKER: I was discussing the use of econometric models for measuring performance. The point that I was making is that we should be able to test the impact of every revenue-raising item and the cost that it has for jobs, in the various forms in which it costs jobs. I hope that we are all aware of the flow-through effects of a taxation measure.

By the same token, we can also use these models to assess the impact of Government expenditure items. Various estimates are made of the flow-on (what we call the multiplier) effects of expenditure in various areas. It is well recognised that the construction area has a very large multiplier effect, which means that for every dollar of expenditure one gets a very large flow-on effect into other goods and services. That has in the past been a very good employment-generating area.

What happens in the public sector? The premises on which these models are built depends on the extent of over-capacity in the economy. Whilst there is over-capacity in the Australian economy in the private sector today, there is also tremendous over-capacity in the public sector.

It is time that people understood that every time we donate an extra dollar to the public sector we could be costing more jobs in the private sector. The principle is that the flow-on effect associated with the Budget dollar which goes into an area where that resource is not needed relates only to what is known as a transfer payment. In that circumstance one is giving money for no service. In effect, this is what happens in the public sector, where increased resources are provided when they are not needed. This is a transfer payment.

Estimates of the flow-on effects of transfer payments are about 1.5. This means that for every job created there is an employment multiplier of .5, that is, another half a job is created elsewhere. The price of employment is the wage paid in the Public Service; the discretionary income and the higher propensity to consume overseas imports makes the multiplier probably of the order of .3. This means that,

if we invest resources in public capital and public manpower, invariably we will come up with the equation that, for the one person employed, we will get only an extra .3 of a job out of the economy.

On the other side of the coin, on the taxation side, if we cost two or three jobs in the process for that taxation measure, we have cost Australia and South Australia employment. It seems that no Government is willing to put itself under the scrutiny of a modelling process and understand whether or not it is doing the best for the community. These mechanisms exist, although no-one has attempted to come to grips with this problem. However, it is high time that we did so. I believe not only that can we cut down on taxation and generate new forms of development in the private sector but also that we can make the public sector more efficient and meaningful as well.

We can make jobs more meaningful and give them a greater sense of purpose. Having been a public servant for about 18 years, I know the debilitating effect of no direction and of Ministers who have not got control of their portfolios, who fail to tell their departmental heads and their staff of their direction, who fail to tell their departmental heads and staff that they want certain programmes implemented, and who fail to come to grips with how those changes will be implemented.

The Premier has said, 'I am increasing taxation because it is necessary.' It is not necesary. The hard decisions have not been made—the hard decisions on how we cope when the rest of the community has to take a drop in living standard, with the Government continually taxing the non-public sector to achieve its aims. That is just not good enough.

Whilst I have some doubts about President Reagan's programmes, economic policies and his gross Budget deficit, which will cause world-wide problems in a year or two, there are some aspects that could be looked at. In fact, America has stabilised and improved its unemployment situation. There are other examples throughout the world where hard decisions have been made, where public sector limitations have led to improvements in productivity in a range of other areas.

I refer the House to the most recent edition of the *Australian Bulletin of Labour,* an excellent journal that keeps one up to date on Government policies as well as providing an assessment of the employment situation. It normally has good articles for anyone who wishes to read them and, as it is written in layman's terms, even I can understand it. The point made in this journal is that what is happening today is labour shedding, and the journal explains the process.

During a recession private firms will labour hoard, which means that they want to retain the skills and have a commitment to the labour concerned. However, as the recession deepens they can no longer afford to do this and must lay workers off. The private sector has to go through this process, a process it does not like, despite what members opposite sometimes contend, and a process they would prefer not to go through. During deepening recessions they have to go through a slimming process and become more efficient—they have to survive. I want the same mentality to come into the actions of Government. I want the Government to be slim. I want Government members to treat themselves as survivors and treat every dollar they take from the taxpayer as something special that is not their own and that they are spending on behalf of other people.

There are a number of mechanisms for achieving this, but they must start from the Premier and go through the Ministerial ranks. This happening is long overdue and perhaps South Australia can show the rest of Australia the way by taking further the changes implemented during the time of the Tonkin Government, which were worth while. There were reductions and some areas of rationalisation, and the improvements that took place during the time of that Government fed back into the community. The relative employment situation in South Australia—and I am not talking about the absolute situation, of course, despite its very limited base, improved under the Tonkin Government because of the way it attracted industry, and because of its concern about employment. That Government did not say, 'We are going to build up the public sector', but said, 'We are going to promote growth in the private sector.' As members opposite understand, it is a fundamental aspect of our system that public systems do not create wealth or public good. I will finish on this item because perhaps during the lifetime of this Parliament we will see some changes in direction by this Government. I perceive that there have been some already and that there has been a shift in priorities, but it is a bit like the rat nibbling at the big cheese—until he takes a big bite he will not sample what is possible.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): It is not my intention to go into a great deal of detail in relation to the Budget or Estimates at this time because we will all have an opportunity of doing that during the Estimates Committees hearings. Also, it will be much easier for us to determine specifics when we receive the programme papers, the yellow books, as they are commonly known in this place, and then we will be able to look at the Budget in much more detail. I can assure the Minister for Environment and Planning and the Chief Secretary, who hold the portfolios for which I am shadow Minister, that I am looking forward to seeking further information from them during the Estimates Committee hearings.

I want, first, to refer briefly to the Chief Secretary's portfolio. I spoke at some length on that portfolio during the Address in Reply debate, so I will keep my comments on it relatively brief tonight. If one looks at the Premier and Treasurer's Financial Statement presented on the introduction of the Budget, one sees under the heading 'Chief Secretary' that Police Department expenditure was $4.2 million above the Budget Estimates. Of that excess, $1.9 million was the result of salary and wage award increases. The remainder was mainly for salary costs associated with police officers' increments and terminal leave payments amounting too $744 000, increased Government contributions towards police pensions of $784 000, and the increased cost of consumables.

I will say more about police pensions a little later. Expenditure for the Department of Correctional Services exceeded Budget estimates by $1.4 million, $742 000 being the direct result of salary and wage award increases. The remainder was mainly for costs associated with incidents at Adelaide Gaol and Yatala Labour Prison (of which we would all be very much aware, particularly in regard to staffing), involving $203 000, and an increase in hospital watches resulting from an increased demand for hospital services for inmates and increased costs of consumables, amounting to $106 000. Under the heading 'Police', it is stated:

> Expenditure by the Police Department is expected to be $105.7 million in 1983-84. The department will commence work on upgrading its communications network. This will improve the efficiency of the law-enforcement system in protecting the safety and property of people in the community.

I am particularly pleased that at last the Government has taken some action in regard to the communications system. It has been recognised for some time that there is a need for an improvement. In fact, on a number of occasions in this House I have taken the opportunity to ask the Chief Secretary to look more closely at this very important matter.

I believe that the last two or three reports that were brought down by the Commisioner referred to the need for improved communications. In the Commissioner's last report, it was stated that it was seen as the very highest priority that work be done to upgrade the communications network.

I understand that about $400 000 has been set aside for that purpose, and I will be particularly interested, when the time comes for me to question the Chief Secretary further on this matter, to receive more details as to how that money will be expended. However, I repeat again that, as a result of vigorous requests that have been made by the police and by members of this House, the Government has responded, and I am pleased that that has happened. It is further stated:

A change in the recruitment procedure from a two-year to a one-year training programme for cadets will enable the police active strength to be maintained. Provision has been made for the establishment of a complaints tribunal.

I was very pleased to have the opportunity to visit Fort Largs only a few weeks ago, to look through the facilities, and to learn more about the new training programme. I was very pleased with what I saw. I must admit that I am a little concerned about that. Some of the questions that I have placed on notice relate to that subject, and I will be interested to receive replies from the Chief Secretary in due course.

Regarding the establishment of a complaints tribunal, on a number of occasions in this place I have referred to the concern of the Police Department when the announcement was first made: due to the lack of consultation between the department and, obviously, the Chief Secretary, it appeared that there would not be a senior person from the department, other than the President of the Police Association, on the tribunal. Fortunately, the then Deputy Police Commissioner, Mr Hunt (who is now the Police Commissioner), made strong representations to the Minister and some changes were made. Of course, that committee is now considering the establishment of a complaints tribunal. The document further states:

The department will continue to work with the Attorney-General's Department, the Courts Department, the Department for Community Welfare, and the Department of Correctional Services in the development and implementation of an integrated justice information system.

I am particularly interested in the progress of that system. Once again, I have placed questions on notice seeking more information about that. I was fortunate enough to have a briefing by the present Police Commissioner on that subject. I know the enormous amount of work that is involved in the establishment of the justice information system, but I am sure that the community also recognises the advantages to come out of that system. In relation to correctional services, the expenditure by the Department of Correctional Services is expected to increase from $19.2 million to $20.6 million in 1983-84. It is not a massive increse by any means and, in fact, I might have expected it to have been a little more.

We are told that the Government places a high priority on security and safety within the prison system. It will place even more emphasis on upgrading correctional services in South Australia and will have regard to the recommendations of the Clarkson Royal Commission, the Touche Ross 1981 Report and the Touche Ross 1983 (Swink) Report. I will certainly be having more to say about that. The statement continues:

The allocation provides for expansion of the Community Services Order Scheme to a further two areas . . .

I am particularly pleased to see that that will finally happen and it is most regrettable that it has taken all this time to expand a system that the community accepts and recognises as working very well indeed as an alternative to the prison system. It is a system that was introduced by the previous Liberal Government after much consideration, and it has worked well in the two areas where it was previously established. Many requests have been made by people in the community and by me in this House for that system to be expanded. I am only sorry that it is to be expanded in only two further areas. In fact, in relation to the system that has now been introduced, if a person commits an offence, is charged and comes before the court, he can be discriminated against if he lives in an area where the system is not working. If one happens to go before a court within an area where the system is working well, of course, that can be seen to be an alternative. However, in other areas they have to go back to the traditional sentences, and I would hope that the Community Services Order Scheme continues successfully.

We also learn about staffing in the new wing at the Port Augusta Gaol. Much has been said about that, and the Chief Secretary has looked to gain some credit from that. Again, it is an incredible situation where that facility was completed in September 1982 and here we are 12 months later finding that that wing (which I think will cater for approximately 40 prisoners) is still not open. We are learning only now that staff will be provided for that new wing at the Port Augusta Gaol.

We also learn of the reopening of yards 1 and 2 at the Adelaide Gaol, the provision of prisoner security at the Sir Samuel Way Building, and additional resources for the industries complex at Yatala Labour Prison. This is another situation where this facility cost the taxpayers of this State somewhere in the vicinity of $7 million, was completed during the term of the previous Government approximately fifteen months ago, and is still not open. It is incredible that taxpayers' money should be lying idle like that. Further, we are learning only now that additional resources for the industries complex will be provided in this Budget. It is no wonder that the general community is as concerned as it is about matters relating to correctional services.

If we look further, we learn that, under the heading 'Capital Works' in relation to Government buildings, a figure of $28.3 million appears. Mention is made of the police regional headquarters at Holden Hill which I passed only two or three days ago. That development is proceeding well. Then we read that major expenditures are proposed for the Department of Correctional Services. For some years there has been an obvious need for a new remand centre and a major upgrading programme at Yatala Labour Prison.

I do not want to spend a lot of time going into the very sad saga concerning the remand centre. I will simply repeat yet again for the record that, if the present Government had accepted the plans of the previous Government, the remand centre would now be well and truly on its way towards being constructed. For political reasons the present Government refused to accept the site on which it was proposed to build that remand centre and it went back to square one. Of course, we are now back to the position of considering the construction of the new remand centre. We have also learnt that there will be major upgrading programmes at the Yatala Labour Prison. In this House only yesterday the Chief Secretary announced by way of a Ministerial statement that the Cabinet supported the master plan for reorganisation of the Yatala prison. When that initiative was first announced on 9 August (it has been announced two or three times) I said that I welcomed any changes that would improve the situation at Yatala. As I said yesterday, and as I now look at the Budget papers, I repeat that I would hope that this is not just another example of window dressing by the Chief Secretary. It is impossible to determine from the Budget papers exactly from where money will be available to spend on that project at this time. When the programme papers come out I hope that

we will have an opportunity to see that more clearly. In his statement yesterday, the Chief Secretary said:

> We will press ahead with the construction schedule contained in the plan. The speed of our advance will be to the limit dictated by the state of the economy.

I repeat that it is no good jumping up and down and saying how important it is that that happens and making all of those marvellous statements, all of these magnificent Ministerial statements to the House, the media and the public, if we are not going to see a financial commitment at the same time. The Chief Secretary has now entered the House: when the yellow books come out containing the programme details I hope that we will be able to ascertain more clearly details about the money to be provided for that plan to proceed. It is not a bit of good the Chief Secretary waving his head over there, because he knows what I am talking about. We need a financial commitment. Anyone can get up and say that the Government will do this, that and everything else; it is a matter of doing something about it.

I note that reference is made in the papers to the State Emergency Service, an excellent organisation. It has been brought to my attention that there is much concern within the State Emergency Service about its financial situation. That concern is being expressed in country areas particularly. I understand that last year part of this year's subsidy was used and that that part of the subsidy is not to be replaced. That will have major effects on councils, particularly those in country areas. Councils have accepted the fact if they spend certain money they can expect to be subsidised for half of it from a State subsidy, with a maximum subsidy of $2 500. During the past 12 months councils, particularly those in country areas, have had increased expenditure demands due to fires, floods and so many other disasters that have been experienced throughout the State. This year in particular they need subsidies from the Government to enable them to proceed with upgrading fire units. I hope that, when the opportunity arises for us to seek more detail on that, the Chief Secretary will be able to provide some more information. We find in the Financial Statement that the Department for Environment and Planning exceeded its budgeted estimate by $1.9 million.

Of that excess, $1.5 milliion was the result of salary and wage award increases and the Ash Wendsday bush fires, and an increase in general operating costs accounted for most of the remainder of that excess expenditure. I am sure that all the State would appreciate the problems resulting from the Ash Wednesday bush fires, involving our national parks and, especially the Mount Lofty botanic garden which was to be, and I am sure still will be, a major attraction in this State. It is something of which this State will be very proud but, of course, it was devastated during the Ash Wednesday bush fire. However, we look forward to an improvement in that area.

The Government has increased the sum set aside for conservation and is continuing to provide for protection, development and maintenance in this area. An allocation of $19.4 million is made for the continued development of the vegetation retention programme, which is an area in which I was particularly interested during my term as Minister for Environment and Planning, and it is an area in which I will be looking for more information from the Minister when the opportunity is provided.

Also, there is the development of an Aboriginal heritage programme, and I will be seeking more information in regard. The allocation of $2.4 million under 'Minister for Environment and Planning, Miscellaneous', includes a grant of $460 000 to the Royal Zoological Society of South Australia, and a grant of $82 000 for the agistment of animals at Monarto. I am particularly pleased that the present Government has continued with the project, which will be of immense benefit particularly to tourism in this State when the open range at Monarto is developed. It will not only assist the people of that area with the spin off that results by people coming into that area as tourists, but also provide a great deal in helping people understand more about the activities of zoology in the State.

When the Labor Party brought out its policy I was rather interested in a number of matters that were raised. Under the specific points, it refers to the fact that it will undertake a 'complete review of the presently accepted environmental impact assessment scheme with a view to replacing it with a system that accepts certain forms of development as inevitable but subjects them to a cost-benefit analysis taking into account social as well as economic consideration'. I am not quite sure what that means, I do not know whether the Minister knows what it means, and we have not seen any action taken at this stage. In connection with a review of the Planning Act, whether or not it is his intention to make some changes in e.i.s. procedures under that legislation, I do not know, but I will be particularly interested to see what happens.

The second specific point was to 'ensure that the Environment Protection Council has adequate resources properly to fulfil its role in identifying environment strategies for South Australia'. That is a very interesting point, particularly when one considers that there have been some moves within the department to amalgamate the Environment Protection Council with the Planning Advisory Committee, and I understand that much concern has been expressed by both of those groups. It seems rather farcical to me. Originally, in one of the policy papers of the Labor Party, it was intended to upgrade the Environment Protection Council and to provide a full-time Chairman for that council.

That seems to have gone completely out the window. The Government was looking at a proposal to amalgamate those two departments. I would be disappointed if that were to happen. The E.P.C. is an important watchdog and serves an important purpose in environmental protection in this State. I was very pleased indeed with the changes we were able to make to the structure and composition of that council when we were in Government, and I was pleased with the work that it was doing. As far as the Planning Advisory Committee is concerned, I could say likewise, although it was in the early stages when we came out of office, but that committee was working very well indeed.

A need certainly exists for the Planning Advisory Committee and the Environment Protection Council to have greater integration. That could be brought about or fostered by an exchange of members, by arranging joint task forces for the investigation of issues of mutual interest and by operating administrative support for both bodies out of the same office. I would be very sorry to see the amalgamation of these two bodies, which are both serving the Government very well indeed. I hope that that matter will be laid to rest by the Minister.

We also learnt that the Labor Party intended to provide management plans for reserves, including specific recommendations in regard to staffing levels and proper management of those areas. I am not aware that that is happening at this stage, although I may be wrong. I would be particularly interested to see how that is going to come about or work. It may be that the Government is able to do that, and it may be a good thing. At this stage, however, it is not happening, and I would be interested to know how the Government intends to proceed in this matter.

We have learnt that the Government is about to continue to upgrade the interpretive services and restore the previous Labor Government's programme for the development of the Cleland Conservation Park. It was one of our greatest and highest priorities to upgrade park interpretive services

generally within the Department of Environment and Planning. In setting up the community information service in that department, the previous Liberal Government did more to let people in this State know what the Department of Environment and Planning was about than had any other Government. That was particularly the case in relation to national parks. As to the previous Labor Government's programme for the development of Cleland Conservation Park, when I asked a Question on Notice of the Minister as to what the Labor Government intended doing that we were not doing, I got a very brief answer which told me absolutely nothing. I presume that that specific point means very little.

We then learnt of the establishment of the framework for an environmental survey of the State. We were proceeding with that, and I guess the Government picked up that policy from the previous Government. This Government is going to mount a campaign to green Adelaide streets and upgrade the Torrens as part of the linear park. My colleague the then Minister of Water Resources announced that in about the middle of our term in Government. I certainly announced the greening of Adelaide and the State in the very early part of our term in Government. We then learnt that this Government is going to redraft the Aboriginal heritage Bill as well as the clean air legislation. While I was Minister the then shadow Minister (and now Minister) made great play of the fact that the Liberal Government was doing very little in both those areas. We introduced legislation, and it seems incredible now that those two matters do not seem to be of great importance to the present Government, as we have heard nothing more of them. Certainly no indication has been given that we are about to see the legislation introduced.

The Government was also going to extend the provisions of the beverage container legislation. I am not quite sure how it can do that. Again, I asked the Minister what he meant by that and how he was going to do it, but he was unable to provide any information. We were looking at the application of the heritage agreement's programme that was introduced by the previous Government to enact legislation relating to environmental pollution to ensure the effective management of the production, importation, storage, use, transport and disposal of toxic substances. I was pleased to see that that was going to happen because that, too, was a policy of the previous Government, and we were well down the track in regard to that matter.

In the two minutes remaining I refer to two matters that are of great concern to me: first, the review that is being carried on with regard to the planning system. Again, I remind the House that I requested the Minister for Environment and Planning to keep me informed in regard to continuing changes that were likely to be made in relation to planning legislation. When I was Minister I kept the present Minister (the then shadow Minister) informed of developments in that area. It appears that the current Minister does not have the courtesy to extend that same provision to me and inform me about what is going on. Again, I bring that to the notice of the House and hope that he will grow up a little and provide the opportunity for me to be advised in that matter.

Finally, I am particularly concerned that we have not been informed of the likely outcome of changes that are being made or the review that is being carried out in relation to the Urban Land Trust. There is much concern in the community (and I share that concern) that we may be looking at the rebirth of the Land Commission. If that happens, I assure the Minister and the Government that private developers will certainly be up in arms, and I will share their concern. It was the previous Liberal Government that brought private developers back into their own in this State. They handle their responsibility well, and I for one am keen to see that continue.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Klunder): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): This evening, in my Budget address, I will deal essentially with matters concerning the Department for Community Welfare. I find it amazing that the Premier, blaming the former Liberal Government for his inherited overdraft, seems to have completely overlooked the fact that we have an amazing feature in the Budget papers for this year. Page 59 of the Auditor-General's Report draws attention to the fact that the net cost of recurrent operations, including grants and concessions, was $62.2 million. That is an increase of $13.2 million for the Department for Community Welfare, or an increase of 27 per cent in one year. That is an amazing over-run, and it indicates that something is radically wrong in the Department for Community Welfare.

I suggest that the Minister and his Director-General should immediately initiate an investigation into the administration of the Department from the top downwards. The Auditor-General pulls no punches: he points out that payments for grants and concessions ($27.2 million) increased by $8.6 million, which may seem an innocuous enough observation when one realises that many people are in trouble in South Australia today with the massive increase in unemployment and in people seeking assistance, and that electricity concessions to pensioners, which were introduced for the first time in the last financial year, also cost $2.3 million.

That concession was an election promise made by both major political Parties and both Parties included those estimates in their pre-election considerations. At page 60 of his report the Auditor-General states:

> The review of procedures in operation in branch offices revealed a divergence from those promulgated by central office in the provision of emergency financial assistance payments.

I assume from the massive over-run in emergency assistance grants that there is something radically wrong with the accounting procedures and probably there has been an extremely loose set of procedures involved in regional offices, quite different from those intended by the Treasurer and laid down in departmental guidelines circulated by the Director-General. Obviously, there is a great need for the financial administration of the department to be examined, and I hope that the Minister will initiate an inquiry immediately, as I said a few moments ago.

The election commitment to the electricity subsidy, substantial as it seems, nevertheless seems to omit many needy people in the community. I have received solicitation from many people who have been unable to obtain the additional electricity subsidy. For example, whilst a married couple is able to apply for subsidy and obtain it, an elderly lady living with an invalid son (and both receiving a pension in the same way as a husband and wife) is ineligible for the subsidy, yet the husband and wife meet the subsidy requirement.

There is an anomaly there. There are a number of other anomalies that have been drawn to the attention of the Minister and the Treasurer, but there has been no indication at all that those anomalies will be covered to make those people eligible for the subsidy. As I said a few moments ago, the Premier blames the former Liberal Government for his inherited overdraft, yet there has been a massive over-run just in one department alone. I believe that this permitted over-run is simply the result of the Government's coming to office and having made wild promises in the pre-election period—promises which no responsible Government could have ever kept and promises which were grossly under-estimated in value. I recall that in the education area

alone there were tens of millions of dollars difference between the reality and what the Labor Party promised to provide in increased eucational facilities. There were great differences between the fact and fiction tht was promulgated before the election.

The reason for the over-run is that the former Government had a Budget Review Committee which met weekly and analysed and examined the performance of each Government department. At the end of each month it asked departments to account. If departments looked like over-running—not if they did over-run—they were asked to cut back and work within budget. In the case of the present Government, that procedure was not followed. No Budget Review Committee was instituted by the incoming Labor Government and, as a result, departmental heads and their junior officers in many cases have simply run riot causing massive over-expenditure across a whole range of Government services.

That was to be expected because sound administration has to start from the begining. I do not believe that this extravagant Labor Government ever gave any departmental heads any indication that it would act strictly and keep them working within budget. They thought that the cornucopia had opened and, when the 1982 election was over, they thought that the present Government would begin printing money. Obviously, it cannot do that.

There is no way that the Premier can blame the former Liberal Government for this happening. It had taken electricity concessions into consideration in its $15 million estimated overrun for the last financial year. It had also made some tens of thousands of additional dollars available for womens shelters—a mere pittance when compared with the $13.2 million overdraft that the department faced at the end of the last financial year. I believe that the former Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. John Burdett) would certainly have kept his eye on his department and never permitted a circumstance such as that to emerge. I believe that the Auditor-General's Report would have then been vastly different. That massive overdraft is only one aspect of this line.

I believe that our State Minister should be strongly tackling the Federal Minister about the Department for Community Welfare in South Australia being used by the Federal Government (which has installed computers, and, of course, a good tool always blames the workman; it is never wrong), because people are coming to my office complaining that, when they need assistance, the computer is causing a problem and that it can never draw a cheque fast enough for people in dire straits who are in an emergency situation. In the South-East, the number of unemployed has increased from 1 250 in April 1982 to 2 300 at present, an increase of 1 000 in 12 months, yet the present Government said that it would resolve all South Australia's unemployment problems. That increase of 1 000 in the number of unemployed people is contributing to a situation across the whole of South Australia where so many more people are in trouble because of their dismissal from their work or retrenchment and urgently need money.

Very few people have sufficient money set aside when they are dismissed so that, when that happens, they are in urgent need of assistance and go to the Department for Social Security, which is ostensibly the department responsible for helping them. However, they cannot obtain a counter cheque from the department. What happens? These people immediately fall back on the Department for Community Welfare for supplementary assistance grants and for cheques to be made available with money from the State coffers.

This money is reimbursed over the following few weeks. Naturally, the computer takes a while to be programmed and to start spewing out the cheques involved, so very often it is five to six weeks before the State Government is reimbursed with this money. I suggest that, if the onus for such payments was firmly thrust back upon the Federal Government (where it rightly belongs), the Department for Community Welfare would be able to more effectively employ its staff and its funds. There is a duplication of services here that is absolutely unnecessary.

I ask the Minister of Community Welfare to drew this fact to the attention of the appropriate Federal Minister so that the Federal Government assumes responsibility for the immediate payment of social service benefits when people apply for them. It is no good his saying that the computer cannot handle matters as quickly as it should, because there should be sufficient federally appointed and paid staff to provide counter cheques to people.

I know that on occasions when I request this sort of assistance it is available, but only under sufference and not as something to which people who are unemployed are logically and naturally entitled. There is a reluctance on the part of the Federal Gvoernment to admit that these people are its responsibility. That simply is not good enough, so, if the Minister lobbies his Federal counterpart strongly (a Minister who is of the same political pursuasion), perhaps he will get somewhere and some substantial relief will be provideed for his department.

I noticed earlier this year when the Community Welfare Act was proclaimed that that proclaiming was done amidst great ballyhoo. One would have thought that the Minister had reinvented the wheel because he was so enthusiastic about this legislation, which the former Cabinet had approved, the former Minister had passed and which was proclaimed in May 1983. It had passed both Houses in 1982. In fact, the former Liberal Government provided funds in the 1982-83 Budget to commence operation of this Act by 31 March 1983, but it was delayed a couple of months by the present Government.

Although the present Minister basked in a glory that was not rightly his, nevertheless I believe that the work performed by the previous Minister of Community Welfare in ensuring that that Bill passed through both Houses was highly commendable. We now have a much better Community Welfare Act, and I can rightly understand the enthusiasm of the present Minister when he was at the proclamation of the Act in May this year.

I would also congratulate the present Minister on releasing a number of informative pamphlets and booklets that were long overdue advising pensioners and other underprivileged groups of Federal and State entitlements. I am not sure, but I would think that this is probably the first time that such a comprehensive list has been available in a single, clear, concise booklet. That is a bouquet for the Minister among the brick-bats, and there are quite a few of those to follow.

I now refer to the additional amount of $35 000 that was made available during the last financial year for the Budget Advisory Service, the allocation having been increased from $109 000 to $150 000. Literally thousands and thousands more people are unemployed and more people are on the verge of or are actually going through bankruptcy in South Australia. This State is facing one of the worst financial situations in Australia since the 1930s (the Depression years) and, of course, that is despite the fact that the Premier, when he came to office, stated that he had all the solutions to South Australia's financial ills. But that was a lot of codswallop. The Premier did not have the answers.

What has the Premier done to help these people who are experiencing financial problems? There is not much additional legal aid available for these people at either State or Federal level. The Budget Advisory Service, which I regard as one of the more indispensable branches of the Department for Community Welfare, was run at a cost of $150 000 last year. This year, only $150 000 has been allocated in that

regard. Yet, would you believe it, a departmental circular that was released just a few weeks ago pointed out that in the 10 months to the end of April 1983 a total of 2 715 new clients had sought assistance in South Australia. That figure was compared with 1 754 for the corresponding period last financial year.

Already, in that 10 months, there has been an increase of 55 per cent in the number of people seeking financial counselling. So with a 55 per cent increase in 10 months, which would probably run at about 65 per cent over a full year, the Minister has allowed precisely the same sum for the current financial year as was allocated in the previous financial year. Obviously, that is a mere pittance.

I have heard plenty of complimentary comment from people, such as those who are working in the South Australian courts, who maintain that the Budget Advisory Service is most valuable provided that is properly staffed by dedicated and competent operators. Obviously, the courts realise that there are massive problems in regard to debt counselling and bankruptcy. People are going through the hoop every day of the week. Before the courts examine debtors, they require a reliable financial statement to consider precisely how to deal with the people before them. It is quite obvious that a lot of social workers find it extremely hard to advise on budgetary matters. They are theoreticians and are college trained. A lot of social workers spend a great deal of time sitting around theorising rather than attending to the practicalities. There are quite a lot of trendy theorists in the Department for Community Welfare as well as a lot of dedicated and competent people.

Obviously, the departmental officers are quite unable to cope with the spate of people who are in financial troubles. There is no doubt at all that the Minister is ignoring the magnitude of this problem when he continues to provide such a sum. I believe that the whole of the part-time service in the Budget Advisory Service of the Department for Community Welfare runs to the equivalent of 12 full-time officers.

As I said, he is providing a few counsellors and they are not just 12 full-time officers who are properly trained. They are people who are available on (and I will give the House the conditions of employment) a casual basis with no guarantee of a minimum number of hours or continued employment. They are told that employment will be by hiring by the hour, and payment will be made for time worked only. They are available on a rate of pay of $9.28 an hour, which also includes evening interviews and non-payment for annual leave, sick leave and public holidays. They can use their private vehicles and put in a mileage claim. But, I ask you: the counselling of people who are approaching bankruptcy is one of the most complicated areas in which anyone could possibly be involved, yet these people are asked to come along on that part-time basis, paid a mere pittance with no guarantees of continuous employment, and it is highly unlikely that one would obtain very many people with the skills that are really needed by the poor and needy of South Australia.

The Minister certainly needs to have a good look at that because if he provided adequately trained, reimbursed and permanently employed budget advisers, I am quite sure that a lot of his other problems would diminish and the amount of work which is stalled in South Australian courts would certainly be lessened. I hope that the Minister will take heed of that and do something about it, although he will have to get money from another line, and from where would he obtain it?

I turn now to the massive provisions for motor vehicles on the 1983-84 line: $1 million is set aside. No doubt, if he appoints more staff, the Minister will make them a lot more mobile, too. I suggest that, if he purchased fewer motor vehicles and spent the surplus money on people (particularly in the Budget Advisory Service), then he would be better advised. The Auditor-General also had some scepticism about the use of vehicles. On page 59 of his report he drew attention to the fact that vehicles were taken home overnight, contrary to Public Service Board guidelines. Records of vehicle usuage were not forwarded regularly to the central office, and he said that the current usage statistics were not a factor considered in determining fleet size. Once again, it seems that the administration of the Department for Community Welfare and the Minister (he is the one who is ultimately responsible for the department) are not really worried about the way that the department is run. Officers seem to be doing their own thing on an *ad hoc* basis, and accountability is once more in question. I drew attention to that massive $13.2 million over-run, and here is another example of lack of control.

I would not worry too much if the Auditor-General's next comment was really all that relevant, because he says that departmental officers advised him that some vehicles were used after hours—some vehicles (and notice that we are spending $1 million on cars so 'some' is not really very many). In other cases he said that they were taken home because there were no secure garaging facilities at or near departmental premises. That is fair enough. Locations were requested to forward vehicle usage returns regularly and the size of the motor vehicle fleet is under constant review. I do not know how constant the review is when we are spending $1 million without having reviewed anything.

The point I make is that, while some vehicles are used after hours, one of the major complaints I have had about departmental officers is that all too frequently one simply cannot get hold of Department for Community Welfare social workers after 5 o'clock. There has been an increasing tendency during the life of this Government for D.C.W. social workers to work from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. The crucial time when people really need them is after 5 o'clock when husband, wife and children should be all together for counselling. This is the time when one cannot find a Department for Community Welfare worker for love nor money because they are extremely reluctant to publish anywhere their after-hours number.

I suggest that the Minister is neglecting something by allowing an overrun of $13 million (27 per cent) and by not allowing people who could well be employed in counselling after hours to put in an application for overtime. If the Minister put on fewer additional staff and allowed the people who are employed to claim some overtime for the essential work that they have to do in following up into the evening day cases, then I suspect that the Department would be running a heck of a lot better. Obviously, many things are quite radically wrong and they certainly need to be investigated.

In regard to the family maintenance trust account system, the Auditor-General points out that a review and evaluation conducted on the internal control procedures associated with the computer system revealed that there were inadequacies in the procedure, once again related to data entry, access to computer held information and accountable stationery. It sounds as though the Department is being run by accident rather than by design. Almost everything that one looks at has something wrong with it. Page 60 of the report refers to staffing costs at Magill Home. This is a beauty, because members will recall that Magill Home was due to have been closed and used for alternative purposes. This was during the life of last Liberal Government. Everything was proceeding pretty smoothly with the residents of the home, I believe, being reasonably agreeable.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: This is the nursing home, not the hostel.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: That was the nursing home, yes. We note that the amount of overtime worked was significant. In that regard the Auditor-General states:

- the number of nursing care hours per resident in hostel accommodation appeared to be disproportionate to the number of nursing care hours per patient in infirmary accommodation;
- advantage was not being taken to fully utilise infirmary beds funded by the Commonwealth.

Once again, it seems that the unions have taken control; that they are really in charge of departmental premises, and that the Minister has another problem on his hands. What does he intend to do about it? Will he take action to ensure that the amount of overtime worked is less significant and that proper advantage is taken of Commonwealth money, or is he simply going to let the Commonwealth be let off the hook? It seems as though he is quite happy to do that. The more I read and the more I investigate the matter of the D.C.W. operations, the more I wonder what the Minister and his Director-General are really about. Are they in charge of the Department? Do they really care how the Department is run, or are they quite happy to let the junior officers do the job for them, and do it ineffectively as far as financial accounting is concerned?

I believe that the Auditor-General (in fact, I think that it was the Acting Auditor-General who made these comments) has been particularly generous in the mild nature of his comments. I am quite sure that if some very serious attention is not paid to this whole matter during the present financial year then the Auditor-General will be more severe in his comments next year. Of course, we will be keeping a close eye on departmental operations, if the Minister does not do so within the next few months.

The Minister and the member for Ascot Park tried to belittle a comment that I made regarding Parents Who Care in saying that that is an organisation that had been disbanded and that really it is the Family Rights Association. I was well aware of that. I have been corresponding both with the Parents Who Care and the newly formed Family Rights Association for quite a considerable time. In fact, I received a letter from the Secretary of Parents Who Care and the lady who subsequently became attached to the Family Rights Association advising me instantly of the formation of the new organisation which runs concurrently with the old organisation. That organisation has not been disbanded.

Whether the Minister was being flippant, cynical, or simply trying to belittle what I said does not really matter. I do not think that the Minister can ignore the fact that I placed a petition before the House not long ago (I think it was in the same week when he was making his rather scathing comments about my efforts). That petition contained 735 signatures. The Minister has said that very few people are involved in the Parents Who Care organisation: in fact, a vast number of people in South Australia are vitally concerned about what happens to youngsters once they have been removed from parental care for one reason or another by the Department for Community Welfare.

There are a great number of questions which I would like to ask the Minister, but if I took the remaining three minutes to do so (there are at least 20 of them) I would run out of time before I got very far. Apart from that, it would give the Minister some warning of what will happen in the Budget review sessions in a couple of weeks time, so I will perhaps save those question for him.

Mr Gunn: Give him a nice little surprise!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Yes. I hope that he can answer them satisfactorily because a lot of them deal with matters which have not been dealt with either in accordance with the former Act or with the newly proclaimed Act. From what I can see from correspondence with a whole range of people (some 30 to 40 concerned parents) is that the Minister has been hedging and avoiding taking issues to court. There are many things that he will have to answer for sooner or later. He refused to institute a Parliamentary inquiry into his department and I can understand why, when, after reading the Auditor-General's Report, we find that there are so many things which are of a highly questionable nature.

There are a whole range of other issues that I would liked to have aired this evening. If I had another hour to spare I probably would achieve something, but I will close there rather than open another subject. I give the Minister notice that the comments that I have made this evening, along with a whole range of other matters, will be the subject of quite serious questioning when we enter into the Budget session on 6 October. I hope that the Minister comes along, with his Director-General, well and truly prepared to give factual answers, and if he cannot give satisfactory answers then, once again, to reconsider the possibility of instituting a very comprehensive inquiry into the workings of his Department. If he does not do that, and if the answers are unsatisfactory, obviously we will have to think of some other measures to elicit the truth.

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

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): For the benefit of the Minister of Housing, who was the No. 1 quorum caller during the term of the previous Government, I draw your attention, Mr Acting Speaker, to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr GUNN: I did not want to disappoint the Minister of Housing, because he is on record as calling for a quorum at the most inconvenient times during the past three years. I wanted to remind him of how foolish he was on those occasions and to repay him the compliment. I do not intend to do it on a regular basis.

Mr Trainer: He won't be doing it any more in Opposition.

Mr GUNN: He will be; there is no doubt about that. If ever there is a Minister who is assisting the Opposition—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

Mr GUNN: Yes. I believe his term in the Ministry will be limited as well. However, I want to take the opportunity this evening to briefly address myself to some of the matters contained in the Premier's Budget.

It gives members the opportunity to discuss matters affecting their electorates. This evening we are discussing the appropriation of some $2 550 million—a considerable amount of money. I wish to briefly examine how that will affect my electorate. Having read through the Premier's accompanying documents I find that, unfortunately, nothing has been done to alleviate the surcharges on electricity. No funds are available to extend the water systems in those parts of my electorate which lack adequate supplies of water. We have a further impost on petrol and fuel which is so vital to those people who live so far from the centres of population.

Unfortunately, the Government will not agree to creating a year 12 class in a number of schools in my district. I am disappointed with its refusal in that matter. The situation at Streaky Bay is unfortunate and unfair and there is no justice in it. I am surprised that the Minister and his Department would adopt such an unfair attitude to people situated so far from Adelaide. They do not have the resources to send their children on to Adelaide in many cases. The school has facilities and excellent staff. There is no logic in the

decision—it is most unfair. I am very disappointed and I intend to have much more to say about it in the next few weeks. I have evidence to back up what I say. I hope the Minister will take the time to examine the situation and do something about it.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: If you've got the evidence, we'll certainly look at it.

Mr GUNN: It has been supplied to the Department.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The evidence supplied didn't stand up.

Mr GUNN: That is different from the information I have been given. I wish to deal with one or two matters which are causing me concern. In my electorate one or two decisions have been made which will have a detrimental effect on the economy of this State for a long time into the future.

I refer, first, to the Pitjantjatjara and to the demands for unreasonable payments for exploration which Hematite Petroleum wishes to carry out. The demand for $2 million front-end payment to allow that mining company to go in and carry out exploration work was not only unreasonable but also foolish and is having a detrimental effect on exploration over all South Australia. The demand was quite contrary to the understanding and the spirit of the Pitjantjatjara legislation. During the negotiations leading up to that legislation, it was never envisaged or considered that there would be front-end payments. It is something that the mining industry will not accept in any circumstances. It is obvious that, if these demands continue, the legislation will have to be amended as a matter of urgency; otherwise, South Australia will miss out.

The other matter to which I wish to refer is the foolishness of the Government in regard to the Honeymoon project. The third matter is the so-called blockade at Roxby Downs and the action at Canegrass Swamp. These matters are having a detrimental effect on the confidence of this State and are affecting its growth. The protest at Canegrass Swamp has been organised by Europeans and professional Aborigines and not by people with a traditional association with the area. If one reads the evidence of the Select Committee which investigated Roxby Downs, one finds that it was made very clear that there were no significant sacred areas in that part of South Australia. These people have set about in a most devious and disgraceful fashion to frustrate the project in the hope of getting large amounts of money from the Government. That is what it is all about. They believe that the company—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr GUNN: The Minister is a fool—we know that—and we will discount what he says. He knows nothing about the subject. Those people waited until the company had started construction of the road and they thought the company would then have no alternative but to meet their demands. I heard an Aboriginal man speaking on the radio the other day clearly stating that there were no significant sacred sites there and that, as far as he was concerned, the road could go through.

We know who they are, certain members' colleagues also know who they are, and they know what the problem is. European lawyers, who are hanging on the coat-tails of the Aborigines, are causing the trouble, not the genuine Aborigines. It is about time that the people of this State were made fully aware of the facts of this matter. We all know what has happened in the North-West Reserve, and if ever there was a group of people for whom I feel sorry it is the Aboriginal people there. Their spokesmen tell us from time to time that they want—

An honourable member: You're a racist.

Mr Ashenden: Don't be stupid.

Mr GUNN: I did not hear what he said.

Mr Ashenden: He said that you are a racist.

Mr GUNN: We know that wherever the honourable member goes he is regarded as clown No. 1. I do not want to disappoint him: he can make all the uncharitable comments that he likes to make about me. I could not care less, but I will state the facts to the House. I would have had dealings with more Aboriginal people than the honourable member has ever seen. I bet that he has never had them in his home and that he has never worked with them; so, he should not call me a racist. He knows nothing about the subject. Some of us who were brought up in these areas have forgotten more than the honourable member ever knew or is ever likely to know. So he should not make smart alec comments on subjects about which I have some knowledge. A great disservice was done to to the Aborigines in the way that certain people set out to manipulate them. It is quite disgraceful, and it is having a detrimental effect on the Aborigines and on the people of this State. We on this side of the House believe that the Aborigines should be treated fairly and should be given justice. The legislation passed by the Tonkin Government was supposed to be the most enlightened legislation passed anywhere in Australia.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: In the world.

Mr GUNN: In the world.

Mr Ashenden: Don Dunstan would have agreed with it. It's basically what he wanted.

An honourable member: You let Don Dunstan speak for himself.

Mr Ashenden: He is traipsing around the world; we can't catch him.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Klunder): Order!

Mr GUNN: It was a realistic attempt to bring justice. Everyone knew that there would be problems; there have been problems, and they have to be sorted out, but what people did not expect was that certain people would be unreasonable. Those instances I have cited have had a detrimental effect on this State, and I am most concerned about the matter. At a future time, when the evidence is read, all responsible members will be concerned about it. It was important that those matters be brought to the attention of the House.

People with ulterior motives are involved in promoting these sorts of demonstrations and claims. I really believe that they want to make things difficult economically for this country, and I particularly believe that these people are quite devious in the way that they are operating. I was very interested to read in the *Australian* on Friday 2 September an article headed 'Russia is behind uranium and dam demos, says scientist', because it is a matter which ought to be considered. The article states:

> Russia is inspiring and partly funding protests like those over the Tasmanian dam and Roxby Downs, and the anti-uranium campaign in general, a nuclear scientist claimed yesterday. The object of the exercise, according to the senior lecturer in nuclear engineering at the University of New South Wales, Dr Leslie Kemeny, is to retard Australia's economic development. Dr Kemeny said in Sydney, 'There are names known to me of people who have spent time in the Soviet Union and who have been trained especially for this kind of disruption.' And in Perth, the Leader of the Western Australian Opposition, Mr O'Connor, warned that the conservation movement had been taken over by 'ratbag' elements.

He is completely right. The other interesting thing to note is that a lot of these protests are held during school holidays. It is rather significant to note those who have the time to attend these demonstrations during school holidays. It is most interesting when one looks at who is involved. Those matters are important.

We were told in South Australia that, with the election of a Hawke Government and of a Bannon Government, milk and honey would flow and everything would be all right. What have we got? The first thing that we should look at is at what Mr Hawke promised:

Promise: Income tax cuts six million workers.
Reality: No tax cuts but progressive increase as wages rise.
Promise: New 6 step tax scale.
Reality: Old tax scale.
Promise: Increase tax threshold to $5 000.
Reality: No change, threshold still $4 462.
Promise: Increase pensioner tax threshold to $5 893.
Reality: No change.
Promise: Increase spouse and sole parent rebate.
Reality: No change.
Promise: No new capital gains tax.
Reality: Section 26(a) amended.

They are going well. The next promise is a great one—cheaper petrol by John Bannon and Bob Hawke. They were going to tango so well aided and abetted by Bill Hayden and one or two others. Up went the price. Other promises included:

Promise: No devaluations.
Reality: $A devalued 10 per cent.
Promise: No change to superannuation.
Reality: Increased tax on super lump sums.

The $750 000 that the Australian Teachers Federation invested in the Labor Party was a good investment, on which they will be getting a good return in 10 or 12 years time, especially when Leonie Ebert and Mr Len Davey retire. The promises continued:

Promise: Raise pension to 25 per cent of average wage.
Reality: Still 22 per cent.
Promise: Index fringe benefit income levels.
Reality: Means tested on asset basis.
Promise: Reform 'absurdly' restrictive family income supplement income test.
Reality: No change.
Promise: Pension increases to be 3 months earlier.
Reality: No change.

That is a brief resume of what Bob said he would do. I now wish to give a brief resume of what John Bannon will do, and I refer to his policy speech of 25 November 1982. I do not know who prepared the speech or who was advising him but, if it is the same people who helped them get into trouble when the Government was in Opposition, what mess will they get the Labor Party into now that it is in Government? Certainly, I do not wish to misjudge them or be harsh, but this is what Mr Bannon stated:

> The A.L.P. will not introduce new taxes nor increase existing levels of taxes in our term of office.

Great stuff! He continued:

> We will not allow State charges like transport fares, electricity and hospital charges to be used as a form of back-door taxation.

Suddenly the member for Albert Park is sitting quietly but he was one of those who had much to say in three years in Opposition. The then Opposition members talked much about the Housing Trust and said what a terrible thing it was to allow Trust rents to go up. This caused considerable consternation in the Labor Party. Indeed, one member has got into a real quandary over that. Although I cannot find the relevant quote, I understand that the member for Whyalla is to have a motion of no confidence moved against him because he supported Premier Bannon, and his local A.L.P. sub-branch is moving this motion because the Government is not putting into effect its promises. It is not up to me to tell them how to run their affairs, but already the member for Whyalla has upset Councillor Murphy, and I understand that Councillor Fleming is also upset with the honourable member. He did not have many friends at the last election and soon he will run out of friends altogether. That is his problem, but I am sure that, with the assistance of his Federal colleague and the Hon. Mr Blevins, they will work something out.

I wish now to indicate exactly what the Premier's taxes mean to the people of South Australia. Gas charges have increased by 11.8 per cent, water and sewerage charges by 11 per cent, Housing Trust rents by 10 per cent, and electricity charges by 12 per cent. We do not know what the new financial institutions duty will bring in, but transport fares have increased by 47 per cent, the price of petrol by 1c a litre, insurance by 2 per cent, the price of spirits and wine by 3 per cent, the price of beer by 3c a bottle, and the price of cigarettes by 18c a packet. That is not a bad start in nine months of Government!

I sit on the Subordinate Legislation Committee, and this morning the swag of regulations dealt with all involved increased charges. Yet the Government was not going to use back-door methods! Up went all the charges. What a jump! For a Party that was not going to increase charges, it has not done a bad job.

I have mentioned the increase in electricity charges and how it has affected my district. Increased fuel charges will also have a detrimental effect, because people in my district have to travel long distances. Also, freight is payable on many articles that come into the district. Every article carried, whether for 50 kilometres or 500 kilometres, will cost my constituents considerably more than is the case at the moment. I realise that Government's, like individuals, have to cut their cloth according to their income, but I believe that it was not only unwise but foolish of this Government to mislead the people of this State purely for the purpose of attracting enough votes to get into Government and then, on gaining Government, forgetting the things that it had said. That type of behaviour does not do this institution any good. People laughed at Prime Minister Fraser when he said, 'Put your savings under the bed', but the way that this Government is going never a truer word has been spoken. The Government is getting at the poor old pensioners and it now appears that public servants might have been better off with their money under the bed.

Mr Hamilton: What a stupid remark, 'Poor old pensioners'.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Mathwin): Order!

Mr GUNN: The honourable member can interject as much as he likes; he will have an opportunity later to comment on, or object to, what I have said. I make it clear that I believe that the promises made by this Government before coming to office were unwise and foolish. It unduly raised the expectations of the people of this State. We recognise that this State and the country as a whole has had the worst drought in Australian history, that there were bush fires that no-one could have foreseen and floods, all of which combined to create great difficulties. Everybody recognises that these problems ran the State Government into a great deal of expense. I recognise, as the Leader has said, that the Government was entitled to recoup that money, but I believe that some of the promises made and some of the courses of action taken by the Government have made it difficult for a number of people in this State.

I have just found a piece of paper dealing with Housing Trust rents, to which I referred earlier, that mentions a 10 per cent increase in rents. I refer to an article in the *Sunday Mail* headed 'Whyalla's Max is in trouble.' According to the article, it seems that a Councillor Fleming was browned off with his local M.P. who went along with Mr Bannon's administration to boost Housing Trust rents. When one considers the State Budget in conjunction with the recent Federal Budget, particularly in relation to increases in petrol and other costs, one can see that they will both have a definite effect on people in my district. However, if the cost increases provided money for some urgently needed extra services I would not mind.

I referred earlier to problems with the extension of year 12 classes to certain schools in my district. I believe that when considering this matter the Government should look closely at what happens in isolated communities. We all know that certain sections of those communities are in a position to send their children to other parts of the State and to Adelaide to gain adequate year 12 schooling. Unfortunately, there are people who cannot afford to do that, even with the assistance of isolated parents allowances, both

State and Federal. There are people who do not wish to send their children away from home because in many cases when children are sent away from home to do their year 12 schooling they never return home. That is a problem that people are concerned about. I turn now to Streaky Bay, which is a relatively small school possessing good facilities. I have been provided with considerable information by the Streaky Bay School Council in relation to this matter. On 25 August the Streaky Bay school received a letter from the Education Department, as follows:

The request from Streaky Bay Area School to conduct year 12 classes for 1985 has been carefully considered by the Regional Director and officers of the Curriculum Directorate. Obviously, there are many factors to be taken into account, for example, enrolment projections, a viable range of subject options, cost effectiveness, teacher qualifications and experience and buildings and equipment. You, your staff and the school council have been aware of at least some of these factors and have taken the trouble to provide useful information.

Experience has shown that estimates of year 12 retention are not realised in terms of actual enrolments. Streaky Bay estimates which reflect the hopes of parents and the estimate of student potential by teachers, represent a much higher percentage of retention than is normal in similar schools with a small secondary enrolment.

Those who do remain until year 12 will require a broad range of options to meet their needs if equality of educational provision is the aim of the school. To achieve this, very small classes, plus additional staff and facilities, will be needed. While recognising the social and educational desirability of five years of secondary education, the Education Department is concerned at the resource implications of a proliferation of small year 12 groups. It is doubtful whether a year 12 at Streaky Bay will be either cost effective or capable of providing for the educational needs of students with a range of abilities and job futures. I am fully aware of the concerns of parents, students and teachers associated with Streaky Bay Area School. However, at this stage, I cannot support the establishment of a year 12 educational programme in 1985.

That is an official reply. What has not been considered is that a number of students who would otherwise do year 12 at Streaky Bay will now receive no year 12 education at all and they will not continue their education. Unfortunately, they will leave school, although a few may stay on for another year. The employment opportunities are limited. I received the following information in that regard:

Enrolment projections:—based on parent responses and modified (reduced) to take into account 'local knowledge' re family patterns in going to colleges and student abilities—see copy of *Gazette* notice attached re retention rates.

I understand that throughout South Australia there will be a considerable reduction of about 5 000 students next year in any case.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: In primary schools.

Mr GUNN: Yes, but there will be 5 000 fewer students in the system.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: There will be an increase in secondary schools.

Mr GUNN: That is right—some 1 500, I believe.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Some 1 500 to 2 000.

Mr GUNN: Yes. The people of Streaky Bay are aware that their facilities are a bit cramped, but they were successful in obtaining another building and I was advised when I was there the other day that a further building would assist. However, the school can cope quite adequately. Regarding equipment, the school states:

Given a two year lead time we could budget to get the extras needed—we understand that there is no such thing as a year 12 establishment grant.

The Streaky Bay school would be more than happy to receive similar facilities as those available at Leigh Creek. I am very pleased that Leigh Creek has facilities for year 12, but the Streaky Bay people believe that they are in a similar position and could cope in the same way. There has been a population explosion at Leigh Creek, but the Streaky Bay people believe that the information that they supplied and other relevant information in relation to this matter more than justifies the establishment of year 12 facilities.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: One problem is that the estimate of the retention rate for the year 12 cohort seems to be much higher than the State average. They estimate that 52 per cent of the year 12 cohort would stay on in 1985, and that is much higher than the State average.

Mr GUNN: That is probably true, but other matters should be considered. Streaky Bay is about 560 kilometres, at least, from Adelaide, and Ceduna is about 100 kilometres from Streaky Bay. If students were to attend the school at Ceduna, they would have nowhere to board—even people coming from west of Ceduna face a problem in that regard. I have already explained the difficulties to the Minister. Unfortunately, I do not know the answer. There is a real problem and the two factors that I have mentioned must be considered.

At this stage the lack of job opportunities in the area is a real problem, and I say that to the Minister with all the best intentions in the world. I am not getting up tonight to unduly whinge about it. However, I really believe that there are teachers with qualifications and, if one looks through the list of qualifications, one sees that there are a number of people with very high qualifications and experienced teachers. I believe that they ought to be given the opportunity. From what the staff and principal have told me, they are keen to give it a go, and I believe that they should be encouraged.

One other thing has to be taken into consideration. The area has experienced a couple of poor years, and that always has an effect on parents sending their children to Adelaide because (the Minister knows this as well as I do) it is jolly expensive to send students particularly to be boarded in the private system in Adelaide. I appeal to the Minister to relocate one of those buildings as soon as possible from Wirrulla and Haslam to Streaky Bay. That is the first step, and there are buildings.

I know that the Regional Director is doing his best, and I have every confidence in him. I have found him to be a most reasonable and responsible officer in all the discussions and dealings that I have had with him. I have no complaint whatsoever, and I know that he has a difficult role to play. I suggest to the Minister that, if something can be done, at least give them the opportunity to give it a try. I cannot see what harm will come because I believe that, if it was implemented, it would assist a number of people. It may only be a dozen or so, but I think that if we can give those children the opportunity to have at least some proper form of year 12 training, it will be better than nothing. That is one of the reasons why I was so determined when the Liberal Government was in office that there was some assistance from the State Government for isolated children. I was concerned that the son of a person working at Cooke and all those isolated parts of the State which I represent should be given the opportunity to have secondary education.

I have been concerned about these matters for a long time, and I sincerely hope that the Minister and his department will have another look at them. I know that the Director-General is concerned to do his best to help, and I appreciate his problem. He was fortunately in Ceduna the other day, and I think that the people there were pleased that he was given the opportunity to come over and open the community library. It gave them the opportunity to speak to him. The Director-General is well known and liked at Streaky Bay, and I have always found Mr Steinle to be a reasonable and responsible person. I hope that the Minister, the Director-General and the people in the Curriculum Division reconsider this matter and come up with an answer which will assist my constituents at Streaky Bay. I look forward to taking part in the deliberations of the committee.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Klunder): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): At the commencement of this debate, the response by the Leader of the Opposition clearly indicated to this House the alternatives that the Opposition believes should have been adopted under the economic circumstances that now exist in this State. For example, he demonstrated that, because of the failure to control expenditure by this Government, more than $23 million was overrun last year in departmental expenditure. This was purely brought about by the fact that the incoming Government released the pressure off Government departments in relation to the requirement by the previous Government for Government departments to operate and live within their means.

That is fundamentally the basic problem that exists in South Australia now. Anyone who has ever been out in the real world and had to make ends meet in any form of small business undertaking would realise that one has to live within one's means. In other words, one has to cut one's sail to suit the cloth that is available. One cannot get blood out of a stone. There are numerous examples of where this Government believes that the answer to all its problems is merely to increase taxes and that that will solve its budgetary problems. Nothing could be further from the truth because, in reality, in the economic situation that exists now, there is no way on earth that some of the industries and small business people who have been asked to pay the increased taxes imposed on them by this Government can pay those increases and survive. I will give some examples.

Increasing taxes to meet Government inefficiency (in other words, the present Government's passing the buck to the people of South Australia and asking them to make up for its inefficiency) will simply not work under the financial conditions that exist in South Australia at present. It makes no difference whether one is running a State, a small business or any other enterprise—the basic principle is exactly the same: one either lives within one's means or one goes under. However, in this case it will not be the Government that will go under at the moment, because that will not occur until the next State election. What will go under will be numerous small business enterprises in this State that are unable to meet a commitment which should have been met and honoured by the Government and which is now being passed on to small business, in particular, in South Australia.

The Leader of the Opposition clearly spelt out what a Liberal Government would have done. Basically, we would have continued in the direction in which we were going for the three years when we were in Government, namely, that of maintaining rigid control over expenditure. One of the principal announcements made by the Premier was that the Budget provided for an increase in funds for housing. However, it is an increase for housing funds at the expense of other capital works areas. The Premier claimed that expenditure for that purpose provides a significant boost to the capital works programme in South Australia. That is just not so. If one compares the proposed programme with the previous programme one finds that there is virtually no increase whatsoever in the total capital works programme, if one allows for inflation. The Government has taken expenditure from key projects in South Australia like the O-Bahn system which is of vital importance to the people living in the north-eastern suburbs of the metropolitan area. Those people have been left completely in the lurch because they will not have adequate transport in years to come.

The Finger Point sewerage facility is of great environmental importance, and it is important to the future of the fishing industry in this State. One of the principal rock lobster areas in this State is in jeopardy and, what is more, we could very easily lose the lucrative U.S. export market from that key resource. It is recognised as a world-wide product, and it is produced in South Australian waters. Certainly throughout the United States it is renowned as being premium lobster, as it is throughout the world. The entire industry is in jeopardy as a result of the action that has been taken.

Environmentally, the Government's decision is totally unacceptable to the people who live in that region. I acknowledge that very few members of the Labor Party live outside the metropolitan area, so I can appreciate that they have little concern for those who live in country areas. There are two aspects to this matter. One is the environmental problem that is being created along that area of coastline, and the other concerns the enormous damage occurring to the fishing industry in that area and the fact that we could easily be faced with restrictions being placed on the rock lobster industry, which is principally an export earning industry. The situation in which the industry currently finds itself is very similar to the situation that could easily develop, if we are not careful, in relation to the citrus industry—an industry with a great deal of potential for export earning for South Australia in particular.

South Australia is the principal citrus producing State in Australia and produces the premium quality citrus that is recognised overseas. However, by the same token, if there is any increased likelihood of fruit fly getting into the citrus producing areas of this State, then the market which is slowly but surely being developed for export citrus will be at tremendous risk. That is why I gave notice in the House not so long ago that the Government should maintain the existing fruit fly inspection facilities in South Australia. The citrus industry might be regarded as a joke by the Minister of Housing, but it is not a joke as an export earner and as far as the economy of South Australia is concerned.

It is an important industry in this State and one in which there is potential to develop. Since South Australia does not fully meet the requirements of the Australian industry as far as consumption of citrus products is concerned (in other words, there is a short-fall in the domestic production of citrus), there is room for expansion in that industry. It is one that we must protect at all costs and, therefore, that industry, if we are not careful, along with the other fruit industries in South Australia, could be in jeopardy if the Government is to relax the present standard that has been in existence for a long period of time, in the interception of fruit fly coming into South Australia from the other States.

Going back for a moment to my opening comments in relation to the Government's approach of increasing taxes, with the belief that that will solve all of its problems, one needs only to look at the Premier and Treasurer's Financial Statement at page 25 in relation to the Engineering and Water Supply Department, where it states:

> Revenues collected by the Engineering and Water Supply Department are anticipated to increase from $154 million in 1982-83 to $177 million in 1983-84. That improvement follows an increase in the price of water from 37 cents to 45 cents per kilometre.

That is a 22 per cent increase. No worries, just increase the cost of water by 22 per cent! No concern is given whatsoever to the effect that that will have on industry and on the lives of domestic users throughout South Australia. No study has been undertaken to determine the economic effect on South Australia as a whole. It is a simple minded approach: 'We need X amount of money so we will just put up the cost of water by 22 per cent from 37c to 45c a kilolitre'.

Exactly the same attitude is being expressed in relation to the irrigation industries, but in this instance the Government has increased the water rates not by 22 per cent but by 28 per cent. Anyone who has any knowledge of the irrigation industries, particularly the horticultural industries in South Australia, realises that there is no chance of many of the irrigators involved in that industry being able to meet that 28 per cent increase in costs. Only some three or four

weeks ago in this House I referred to a statement on that very subject made by a leading figure in the wine grape-growing industry, Mr Alan Priest, when he referred to the fact that some 60 irrigators in South Australia producing wine grapes under irrigation were presently receiving sustenance payments to enable food to be provided to the families of many of them.

The increase of 28 per cent in water rates amounts to an increase of between $500 and $1 000 per farm unit in the irrigation areas. That is absolutely absurd when the Government is already making sustenance payments to a number of those irrigators and, at the same time, increasing irrigation rates by 28 per cent. That amounts to between $500 and $1 000 increase, which is a virtually impossible cost for a significant percentage of the irrigators to meet. More and more irrigators will go to the wall as a result of that action. The anticipated increase stated by the Treasurer in his statement will not eventuate. It is a theoretical amount.

No exercise has been done to determine whether or not the irrigation industries in South Australia have the ability to pay that additional $500 to $1 000 per unit. One cannot get blood out of a stone. If the industry or the irrigators do not have the money and are virtually bankrupt, the Government cannot get the extra $500 or $1 000. It means that many more families will be out on the street. That does not solve anything and will not provide the revenue required. Under the economic circumstances that exist, we have to live within our means. That is not occurring under this Budget. That principle has been applied right throughout the Budget. I am referring only to one or two instances, but the same principle has been applied across a wide range of taxation increases and other statutory charges. It is quite plain that this will not achieve the result for which the Premier is looking.

In the Auditor-General's Report on page 111, referring to irrigation and drainage, the responsibility of the Government in that area is spelt out and reference is made to the operation, as follows:

> The charges raised $3 137 000 . . . represented 85 per cent . . . of direct operating and maintenance costs. Other costs were $8 826 000 . . . Rates outstanding at 30 June 1983, were $1 289 000 . . .

That was an increase of $371 000 over the amount owing in the 1982 year. The outstanding rates (in other words, the rates that growers and irrigators have been unable to pay) have dramatically increased from 1982 to 1983; that is prior to the imposition of the further 28 per cent. That figure will further dramatically increase and will mean that the anticipated figure about which the Premier is talking will fall way short of the $177 million which he anticipates he will receive from the charges made under the Engineering and Water Supply Department. It is a hopeless situation to continue along the path taken by this Government.

In further backing up what I have been saying, I refer to the 1981 census, which clearly indicates that, taken across the board, a higher percentage of people in the irrigation areas are on a lower income than in the rest of the State. If we look at figures provided by the 1981 census we find that 70.8 per cent of the people in the Riverland area are in the income bracket between $1 000 and $10 000, as compared with the State average of only 64.5 per cent. So, there is a significantly greater percentage of low-income families in the irrigation areas of South Australia then there is in the whole of the State.

If we look, then, at the figures between $10 000 and $26 000 we find the reverse situation: that a higher percentage (some 29 per cent) of the people of South Australia fall into that bracket across the State, but in the irrigation areas only 23.3 per cent. So, quite obviously, a much higher percentage of low-income families is in the irrigation areas of this State, which bears out what I am trying to say: that the Government will not collect the revenue that is anticipates because it is not there to be collected. All that the Government will achieve by implementing this sort of measure is to leave an industry further decimated as a result of its action.

We recognise and appreciate that the E. & W.S. Department provides a wide range of services throughout South Australia, but if we look at the Department from a straight-out irrigation point of view and exclude the other duties that it has to perform, and compare it with some of the operations of private undertakings in the irrigation areas, we find that the costs are very much higher. What is more, the irrigators, whether they are in a private situation and pumping directly from the river themselves or in a scheme such as the Renmark Irrigation Trust or under the State Government irrigation areas, still produce the same products, sell on the same markets and have the same returns.

It is absurd for the Minister to say that he will recover the costs of operating the Government irrigation areas when to do so would mean that his charges would have to be dramatically higher than those of private irrigators and of irrigators involved in combined private irrigation schemes. The Renmark Irrigation Trust is a good example of an efficient operation, when one compares the area being irrigated by it with the areas operated by the State Government. When one draws a comparison between the staffing levels and the overheads, the products being produced per acre are just as high in the Renmark Irrigation Trust area and other private areas as they are in the Government area. Yet the cost per hectare of operating in, for example, the Renmark Irrigation Trust area is significantly lower than it is in the State Government irrigation areas.

As I said, I appreciate the fact that the E. & W.S. Department provides many other services than just irrigation in the country areas, such as advisory services and domestic water supplies for the towns, but, by the same token, if the Government and the Minister want to compare the irrigation undertakings, they have to compare them on a like basis.

It is no good trying to place on irrigators in Government irrigation areas a burden far in excess of the burden carried by irrigators in private irrigation areas. If irrigators in private irrigation areas believe that the system is being inefficiently run, they have the power to remedy that at the next election of board members for the irrigation trust area.

However, irrigators in Government irrigation areas do not have that right. They cannot make that demand. If they do demand that E. & W.S. Department overheads be reduced to a similar basis, it will have no effect at all on the Government. It is ludicrous for the Minister to say that irrigators in Government irrigation areas have to pick up the total cost of irrigation inefficiences existing under Government irrigation schemes. What is more, as I have stated frequently, this just does not occur in other parts of the world. In fact, there is a significant Government contribution in that regard.

If one looks at the total scene of the Government's responsibilities regarding water quality in this State, one sees that, at the moment, the situation is appalling. The Government is spending significant amounts in areas where the public at large can see some result. However, the Government is failing to continue to combat the hidden problem, that is, the salinity problem. That problem does not show up. One can filter the water, but that does not take out the chemicals, the chlorides which are in the water and which ultimately cause real damage in relation to irrigation, domestic use and industry.

Until the Government faces up to its responsibilities, it is providing a total dis-service to this State. I recall about two years ago the present Chief Secretary moving a motion in this House seeking support for what was known as the Jacobi Bill, which sought the implementation of an Institute of Fresh Water Studies through Federal Parliament. That

motion was solidly supported by the present Government and, interestingly, although that legislation (which I supported as an adjunct to the work done in the total salinity control programme) had certain virtues, since the present Hawke Government came to power in Canberra we have not heard a word about the so-called Jacobi Bill.

What happened to the Institute of Fresh Water Studies, which was to be of immense value in regard to the salinity problems of the Murray-Darling system? I do not know, but I would like to know where the Federal Government stands on this matter and what representations have been made to it by the South Australian Labor Government since it came to office. Much noise was made about the so called Jacobi Bill about two years ago, but we have heard little since. It is a clear indication to me of a lack of sincerity by the present Government in facing up to its responsibilities in this area. Until such time as we get back to the basic essentials of what is required in this State, the situation will deteriorate and go from bad to worse. We will not attract new industry to South Australia if we cannot guarantee above all else an adequate supply of good quality fresh water and a good power supply.

Both these commodities are in doubt in South Australia, yet they are fundamental necessities so far as industry is concerned. If there are not adequate supplies of fresh water at a reasonable cost and power supplies in an area, industry is loath to set up in that area. The basis upon which Sir Thomas Playford developed South Australia's industrial base was that he could guarantee a good quality water supply and an adequate power supply. There is no guarantee of those things the way the present Government is going.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: It can't even guarantee the sittings of the House.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Yes, they are in doubt, too.

Mr Ashenden: And there is an incompetent Minister on the bench—what else can you expect?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Klunder): Order!

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: The fundamental approach put forward by the Leader of the Opposition as the way this Government should be going in the present economic climate is the correct way to go. Anyone who has had experience in small business (or business of any size) would recognise that one cannot get out of one's troubles by merely increasing charges. If one is producing a product and increases the price, thereby causing people not to buy it, one is virtually out of business. That action is comparable with Government's increasing taxes to throw the burden of its own inefficiency back on to the people of South Australia rather than grasping the nettle and, with good, prudent management, getting down to the basics of what economic management is all about. We have not seen any sign of this whatever from this Government since it came to office. It is approaching this whole matter naively, thinking that merely increasing taxes will solve all its problems and acting without any financial base whatever. With industries struggling to survive, there is no way on earth that that strategy will solve a Government's problems. It will certainly not solve the problems of industries that are trying to create South Australia's financial base. I strongly suggest that the Government accept the alternative of the Leader of the Opposition.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable Minister of Housing.

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

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. If the House adopts the course put forward by the Minister, we effectively destroy the opportunity for the remaining members of the Opposition to participate in this Budget debate. I ask you, Sir, to rule that the Minister is incompetent in the action he has sought to take in this House.

The ACTING SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The honourable Minister has to move the adjournment of the debate. The honourable Minister of Housing.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I have already ruled that the honourable Minister will move the adjournment of the debate.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Mr Acting Speaker, I am on my feet seeking to take a point of order.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Very well, the honourable member for Alexandra.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Sir. Supporting remarks made by the member for Light, I respectfully point out to you, Mr Acting Speaker, that the action proposed by the Minister will effectively close the debate before the House, and accordingly I move the adjournment of the debate.

The ACTING SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The point of order taken by the member for Alexandra is exactly the same as that taken by the member for Light. I am calling the Minister to move the adjournment of the debate.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Mr Acting Speaker, it is inappropriate to do that, and I move that the debate be now adjourned.

The Hon. B. C. EASTICK: I take a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. You have indicated a course of action that you expected of the Minister of Housing. Unfortunately, that is not the course of action that the Minister took when he got to his feet. The motion that is currently before the House, which was moved by the Minister of Housing, is that the House do now adjourn. I ask you, Mr Acting Speaker, to rule that a member on this side of the House or on the Government side has the opportunity to adjourn the debate but not the House.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: The Chair requires a motion to adjourn the debate. I call the Minister.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: It is ordinarily the procedure for the person next in line to speak to adjourn the debate.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I have not called the member for Alexandra. I ask him to resume his seat.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I wanted to explain the situation.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I will call the honourable member when I want him to speak.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I take a point of order to explain the situation, Mr Acting Speaker.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The honourable member will resume his seat.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Motion carried.

At 10.44 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 15 September at 2 p.m.