HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 21 September 1983

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

PETITION: TOBACCO COMPANY SPONSORSHIP

A petition signed by 56 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose any legislation to prohibit the sponsorship of sport by tobacco companies was presented by the Hon. J.W. Slater.

Petition received.

PETITION: SALT CREEK SCHOOL

A petition signed by 180 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Minister of Education to meet with representatives of the Salt Creek School Council to discuss the retention of the school and bus route was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME

ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

Mr OLSEN: Does the Premier agree with the Electricity Trust that South Australia will find it increasingly difficult to maintain competitive electricity tariffs and, if he does, will he review Government measures that have an impact on electricity tariffs, particularly the levy on the Trust and the revised arrangements for repayment of the Trust's Government loans?

Ever since the establishment of the Electricity Trust in the 1940s, South Australia has had very competitive electricity tariffs. In its latest report, the Trust has warned that it will become increasingly difficult to maintain this position because of rising fuel prices. This applies both to the cost of natural gas and the cost of providing alternative fuels for extra generating capacity that will be necessary in future.

The latest statement by the Trust on fuel prices suggests the need for further Government action to protect South Australia's competitive position in relation to the other States. The Government's decision to rearrange the borrowing arrangements of the Electricity Trust will cause tariffs to rise by up to 6 per cent if the full cost of more than $12 million is to be recouped this financial year.

A review of the Government's decision to increase the Trust's interest repayments on Government loans and abolition of the Government levy would reduce the Electricity Trust's annual cost by more than $32 million. This would have the effect of reducing the average family power bill by $25 a year, and save industrial consumers more than $8 million.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Government is certainly aware of the importance of maintaining a competitive edge in relation to electricity tariffs: it is important for our industrial and economic development and, of course, for the benefit of the individual consumer and household in this State. We are the first Government to have introduced, in relation to South Australian consumers, an extensive electricity concession system, which has proved of immense benefit to many needy people in the community. We would like to extend that system further, but its cost means that that cannot be done in the short term.

It is ironical that I constantly get representations (and I imagine that my colleagues, the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Minister of Community Welfare, also get representations) from members opposite to extend that concession system when, in fact, the system we introduced not only went very much farther than the one suggested by the previous Government as part of its election policy, but also has been criticised in terms of cost by those same members opposite who are writing to us to urge an extension of the system. However, by now we are getting fairly used to such extraordinary hypocrisy.

In relation to competitive tariffs, the chief reason for increases in the cost of electricity, both recent and pending, is the very great increase in the cost of natural gas as a result of the agreement that was reached by the previous Government. That is a three-step agreement that locks us into a certain level of tariff increase over the next two or three years. The effectiveness of that agreement has been highlighted by the recent arbitration in relation to Australian Gas Light prices when a much lower price was brought down and, having been locked into that arrangement, we cannot do much about it.

Over the past four years, tariffs in other States have risen substantially (well over 100 per cent in the Eastern States over two or three years) and, except for this vast increase in the price of natural gas, we have managed to maintain electricity tariffs at a reasonable level in this State. Naturally, the Government wants that to continue, and that is why my colleague commissioned the Stewart Committee to inquire into our ongoing power options and to consider what we will do in relation to the location of our power supplies.

My advice is that that will help the Government and the Electricity Trust to contain tariffs in future. For these reasons, I am confident that our tariffs will remain competitive. When my colleague has been able to assess the report, he will bring down recommendations that will ensure that South Australia retains its competitive edge in this regard.

O-BAHN COST

Mr KLUNDER: Can the Minister of Transport say why the costs for the O-Bahn project have risen from $79 million to $98 million? In an article in last night's *News* a headline stated that O-Bahn costs had soared by 25 per cent and were more than expected. The article was based on the Auditor-General's Report, which showed the present cost estimate of $98 million compared to $79 million when the project was announced in 1981. It also stated that the original estimate for the project was $68 million, plus $4 million for landscaping along the Torrens River, and $7 million for the purchase of land.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I thank the honourable member for his question because I, too, was surprised to see that headline that gave the impression that the cost for the O-Bahn project had blown out to a considerable extent. This, in fact, is far from the truth, and is an obvious example of people reading figures and coming to the wrong conclusion. The original estimate in May 1981 for the O-Bahn project was $68.5 million, and included costs of the bus fleet plus an additional $4 million for the linear park. In August 1981 approval was given for $661 000 to be added to the estimated project cost, caused by revised estimates of foundation costs in the outer section of the busway. At that stage there was a total estimated cost of $69.2 million.

The only variations that have occurred since then have been those caused by inflation. On the experience of the team to the middle of this year, the inflation rate applied to this form of construction was about 13 per cent per

annum, which generally explains the difference in costs quoted by the Auditor-General. In fact, the budget estimates prepared orginally by the team are accurate, and take into account the continuing inflation level as experienced so far. The present estimate for the complete cost of the busway, including the cost of the bus fleet, the linear park, and estimates for completing a guided trackway through to Tea Tree Plaza, is $93 million. This compares with the figures in the Auditor-General's Report, which has an additional cost of $7 million included for land held by the Highways Department. Far from exceeding the budget estimates, the project is now running under budget by about $1.7 million.

NATURAL GAS PRICES

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Does the Premier agree with the Federal Treasurer that the Federal Government should have responsibility for natural gas pricing around Australia, and that Australian natural gas prices should be raised closer to world parity? Whilst Mr Keating is the Labor Party's spokesman on resources, he has made statements several times about natural gas supplies and prices, and the role of the States in the pricing of natural gas. For example, in the *News* on 9 May 1979 he was quoted as saying that a national pricing policy must be formulated to obtain maximum benefit from Australia's gas reserves. This idea was one of the options canvassed in an article in the *Advertiser* this week when the question of gas pricing in South Australia was discussed. One of the options available to the Government was that there be a price set by the Federal Government. Mr Keating also said that gas had been used for base load electricity generation in South Australia and Victoria, because the prices set were artificially low. Later, in 1980, he was quoted in *Rydge's* magazine as saying publicly:

> Gas prices are abominably low. While I believe Australians should not pay a world price for gas because they are entitled to some benefits from their natural endowments, I don't believe disparity between local prices and world prices does very much for sensible energy policy. The gap ought to be closed—not closed up—but drawn closer.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is a totally misleading question. When the Deputy Leader embarked on it, asking whether I agree with the Federal Treasurer's statement on a number of things, I thought, 'Well, that is odd; I am not aware of his having made such a statement as Federal Treasurer and, if he had, I certainly would be interested in it.' Of course, as the explanation developed, it turned out that, as is the common practice I guess of the Opposition, the Deputy Leader had been calling up somewhat old and dusty files on statements made in other circumstances. Admittedly, it is fairly recent in his terms: it is 1979 (it could well have been 1973 or 1969), and that is the statement that he is talking about. It is absolute nonsense to ask such a question during Question Time here today, in 1983, with all that has happened since 1979 in relation to energy world wide. To stand up and produce some fusty statement and say, 'Does he agree with the Federal Treasurer's statement and ergo his policy?' is absolute nonsense.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: All I can say is that my Government certainly supports a rational and a national resources policy. It would be very much to the good of this country if we could establish such a thing, but a major prerequisite is to ensure that the States and their interests are fully protected and that we are consulted at all stages of such a process. I understand that that is the current policy of the Federal Government and, instead of his calling up statements at other times in other circumstances and in other capacities, I would have been more interested in the Deputy Leader's referring to me the current thinking of the Federal Government, the current Minister of Minerals and Energy and the current Federal Treasurer. They have not flagged to me any particular concerns in this area, and we will wait until they do so.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: We are interested in your current thinking.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader interjected on at least four occasions during that question and on three occasions during the preceding question, and I would ask that some restraint be shown.

EAST-WEST AIRLINES

Mr WHITTEN: Does the Minister of Transport support the introduction of the proposed new air service between Adelaide and Melbourne by East-West Airlines? There has been a great deal of publicity recently regarding the lower costs of travel by air that could induce more tourists to come to Adelaide, as well as assisting the people of South Australia with the advantage of lower fares.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I am not sure whether the member for Price is supporting a general reduction in air fares or whether he is supporting cheaper travel for the Public Works Standing Committee. However, in answer to the question, I support any airline which will provide a satisfactory service to the travelling public at a competitive air fare. This competition is welcome, because it brings about cheaper fares to those members of the South Australian travelling public who do not mind taking a little longer to reach their destination. I understand that the proposed service suggested by East-West Airlines intends to call at Mount Gambier, and I expect that that would be supported by the member for Mount Gambier. I believe that any service that offers greater alternatives and cheaper rates must certainly be encouraged and supported.

INTEREST RATES

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: In view of his statements before the last election, does the Minister of Housing believe that building societies should reduce their home interest rates in line with recent movements in savings bank rates and, if so, has the Government expressed this view to the building societies? In July 1982 the former Government declined to approve an application from the building societies for a 1.5 per cent increase in home interest rates. However, this did not prevent the present Minister of Housing and the present Premier, as Leader of the Opposition, from making repeated calls for further action to be taken to limit interest rates. Bank interest rates have been reduced by half of 1 per cent in the last week. For the purposes of consistency with the views that the Minister of Housing expressed as shadow Minister before the election, I would like to know what the Minister has done in regard to calling on building societies to take similar action.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Premier.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Do not be pathetic!

The SPEAKER: Order! Any Minister may answer any question.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The question was incorrectly directed, as I would have thought the honourable member, with some considerable experience of this Parliament, would have known. In regard to matters concerning interest rates and financial matters of building societies, the Premier and Treasurer has not only power but

negotiating responsibility; in relation to the Building Societies Act, the Attorney-General is in charge of the corporate affairs area. In relation to specifically house lending activities of building societies, and so on, the Minister of Housing has responsibility. The honourable member's question was directed towards the matter of interest rates and their change, and as such is within my purview, although, naturally, the statement made previously by the Minister of Housing in his former capacity of shadow Opposition spokesman on housing, and statements that the Minister of Housing has made subsequently are in accord with Government policy.

I advise the House that the building societies are considering their position at the moment. Last week I had a meeting with representatives of the building societies to discuss generally the change in interest rates at the bank lending level. At that stage those changes were being worked through the system. There has been no final commitment made by a number of institutions, and the building societies were considering their position in light of that fact. I expect that at some time later this week they will be in a position individually to come back and suggest what action can be taken in terms of their view of the market. At the appropriate time announcements will be made.

WOMEN'S ADVISER ON SPORT

Mrs APPLEBY: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport inform the House when the appointment of a women's adviser in the Department of Recreation and Sport will take place? Recently the Minister agreed to appoint a women's recreation and sports officer to develop and promote sporting opportunities for women. As a similar appointment was made under the previous Labor Government, the reinstatement of this position is deemed to be a major priority by those with an interest in the development of women's participation in recreation and sport.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: As the member for Brighton so rightly said, on a previous occasion in this House I indicated quite clearly that it was my intention to appoint to the Department of Recreation and Sport a women's recreation and sports officer, and I point out that it is still my intention to do so. This will be in conjunction with the reorganisation of the Department that is currently being undertaken. I hope that I will be in a position soon to make a definite announcement about the appointment. I think that it is important to further promote and develop sporting opportunities for women. The appointment of such a person to the Department to assist in that regard certainly would be a step in the right direction. As the member for Brighton said, the previous Labor Government had a person in the Department as a women's recreation and sports officer. That is still part of the present Government's policy, and I assure members of the House that that will be fulfilled as soon as possible.

MORTGAGE RELIEF

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: How does the Minister of Housing reconcile the Labor Party's election promise that it would give assistance to 4 000 families facing difficulties in meeting mortgage commitments with the fact that as at 30 June this year there were only 252 recipients of mortgage relief under the scheme being administered by the Housing Trust?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: There will be a major announcement within the next two weeks concerning the matters raised by the member for Torrens.

CO-GENERATION

Mr GREGORY: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy provide the House with some basic information on the process known as co-generation and the potential it holds for South Australia? Co-generation is increasingly being mentioned as a more efficient method of extracting the maximum possible energy return from a given amount of fuel. This is clearly important at a time when both the costs of fuels and the real cost of energy are rising. Co-generation was mentioned in the joint feasibility study by the Department of Mines and Energy and Sumitomo into the possible gasification of Wakefield coal, and I would be interested in knowing more about its potential in South Australia.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I thank the honourable member for his question, and I agree completely with his view that we need to be maximising the energy return we get from each tonne of fuel. Co-generation is certainly an area which is receiving a great deal of attention world wide at the present time, particularly in the United States, where several large manufacturers of power generating equipment have made major steps forward. As the member indicated to me that he had an interest in this area, I am glad to be able to give the House the additional information that I have obtained because, frankly, I knew the term 'co-generation', but I did not have much knowledge of the technology associated with it. Put simply, the fundamental advantage of co-generation is this: when an industry has a requirement for both process heat and electricity, co-generation systems use less fuel to meet a given objective than that required to produce heat and power separately.

As I understand it, there are two basic types of co-generation systems. The first, bottoming, uses the waste heat from high temperature industrial processes, such as steel, glass, clay and foundry operations to produce electricity. These systems use no fuel in addition to that required by the production process. The second, topping, is used where the industrial process calls for process steam or hot water. Such processes are found in the food, manufacturing, textiles, paper, plastics and chemical industries. These systems use fuel in addition to that used for the industrial process, but this additional fuel is converted into electricity at an efficiency rate about two or three times better than conventional methods.

Figures provided by my Department conservatively estimate co-generation potential in South Australia at about two to three petajoules a year—representing about 10 per cent of the electrical energy currently generated by the Electricity Trust. The upper limit is estimated at just under six petajoules a year. If South Australia's co-generation potential were to be fully realised, it is estimated that 53 per cent would occur in industries associated with chemicals, petroleum, coal, and basic metals.

Fabricated metal products, wood and wood products and paper products would account for about 22 per cent, with the remainder being achieved in other industries, commerce and in such large institutes as hospitals. If South Australian industries set about achieving their potential for co-generation, it is estimated that it would involve a capital investment of about $170 million for plant which would produce approximately 200 megawatts of power. Clearly, this is a significant investment, but the savings which would be achieved are equally significant. Co-generation already exists in a number of industries in South Australia, and there is no doubt that it will play an increasingly important role in the future.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT JOB CREATION

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Will the Minister of Local Government say what progress the Government is

making to implement its election promise to introduce a regional employment training scheme through local government? Before the election, the Premier promised a direct job creation scheme through local government. He said that under such a scheme local councils in a particular region would form themselves as a group employer to take on (or where appropriate, indenture) apprentices, who would then be subcontracted or seconded to individual employers for periods of three months to four years. The Premier said that the scheme would enable many firms to employ and train apprentices. However, there is no reference to its introduction in the Budget documents which the Government has published.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I recall the scheme which was suggested by the Western Region. The Government has picked up that scheme which has been referred to the job creation scheme under the auspices of the Minister of Labour. A member of my senior staff is on that committee, and we are working towards implementing that scheme as soon as possible.

SMALL BUSINESS

Mr MAYES: Will the Premier report to the House on the initiatives being taken by the Labor Government to assist small business in South Australia? I would like to refer to comments I heard on the A.B.C. over the weekend which were attributed to the Leader of the Opposition and which apparently suggested that the Opposition was considering a review of the Small Business Advisory Bureau. On page 14 of today's *News* the Leader of the Opposition is reported to be considering a review of the Small Business Advisory Unit and suggesting that it should be upgraded. This question is of great interest to the 400 to 500 small businesses in the Unley district.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank the honourable member for drawing my attention to these somewhat extraordinary statements by the Leader of the Opposition. As the honourable member has mentioned, the Leader is dealing with two areas: the upgrading of Government assistance to small business through what he terms the Small Business Advisory Unit in today's paper; and the question of legislation which he claims is needed to control the leasing of South Australian retail premises. Both these objects are very worthy indeed, and ones that we canvassed before the last election.

In relation to upgrading the Small Business Advisory Unit (and let us in a spirit of bipartisanship refer to this), the Leader should speak to his colleague the member for Davenport, who, as Minister of Trade and Industry in the previous Government, did upgrade that Advisory Unit into a Small Business Advisory Bureau. The Leader is therefore a couple of years behind the times in terms of that aspect of the upgrading. If he is able to confer with his colleague and catch up with what the Government of which he was a member did, perhaps he might go further and recall events of almost a week ago. I know that that is a fairly long time span, and perhaps the Leader has some problems over that. However, a week ago I released a comprehensive and extremely productive report of a working party into small business. At the same time, I announced the commitment of this Government to implement a key recommendation of that report, namely, the establishment by legislation, which will be introduced in this financial year, of a small business corporation. There are numerous advantages attached to this which are fully canvassed in the report. It was certainly part of our election policy before the last election. It has been examined, and its implications have been studied by a skilled working party. The announcements have been made and the report has been released. I commend it to the Leader's attention. Work is already going on in respect of that matter.

The second part of the Leader's statement was that legislation is needed to control the leasing of South Australian retail premises. Again, he is suffering from an extraordinary lapse of memory. His Government established a working party in 1981 to study the problems associated with retail shop leases. The matters they investigated concerned the methods of determining rental, whether the landlord should receive part of the goodwill on the sale of the business, whether the landlord should charge key money on the bond, and the question of the tenant's right of renewal. All these things are being raised today by the Leader as fresh issues on which a future Labor Government would legislate.

So, in 1981 the study group commissioned by the Government of which the honourable member was a member reported to the then Liberal Government, but that Government decided to take no action. Absolutely nothing happened! Yet, as large as life, the Leader of the Opposition, who was a member of that Government, stands up and tells us today that in September 1983 he will introduce legislation. However, we have already taken action in this regard. When the Labor Government came to office, it was apparent to us that these problems caused by lack of action by the previous Government must be reviewed. The member for Hartley introduced a private member's Bill that addressed itself specifically to this problem.

The Small Business Advisory Council, which reports to me as Minister of State Development, also made recommendations on this problem. Following that, the Government has, in fact, taken up the honourable member's Bill and the recommendations of that committee. Indeed, the working party also commented on that aspect, and we are working to ensure that the legislative framework is devised if necessary to do something about these problems. I assure members that this Government is acting in the matter and that, as a first step, we will move to establish a small business corporation. I suggest that the Leader not only do more and better research but find out what is going on in contemporary terms concerning the Government in power, and check to see whether or not his Government took action in this matter.

RAMSAY TRUST

Mr BECKER: I direct my question to the Minister of Housing. Since the failure of the Ramsay Trust, has the Government discussed with the directors of the Trust the matter of another debenture issue?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: No.

HERBICIDES

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture, say whether local councils or Agriculture Department officers are instructing farmers to use toxic herbicides against their better judgment? Recent newspaper reports have suggested that local councils in New South Wales and in Queensland, as well as the Victorian Lands Department, may take action against landowners who do not take steps to eliminate designated noxious weeds. An interpretation of 'reasonable action' is that landowners spray with the herbicide 2.4.5-T, a very suspect substance, whereas certain landowners are resisting the idea of using any herbicide at all to control weeds.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will refer this matter to my colleague for a considered reply, because many important issues are involved. However, I am concerned to hear, by

way of interjection during the question from the shadow Minister of Agriculture, some doubt cast on the veracity—

The SPEAKER: Order! There have been far too many interjections this afternoon.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Certainly, Mr Speaker. I was interested to read, in the article referred to by the member for Henley Beach, of an example in New South Wales where a Mrs Fisher was advised by her local council in that State (and this concerns local government in other States, not just what may be happening in this State) to use the chemical Frenock in and around dams and water courses as well as in other areas on her property. When she checked the safety data sheet supplied by the manufacturer of Frenock (I.C.I.), she found that it stated:

> If contamination of crops or water courses has occurred, advise emergency services of State Department of Agriculture . . . Frenock is not registered for use on food crops, so such usage would be illegal.

The council advised Mrs Fisher to kill a certain weed with Frenock and plough the dead plants into the soil as mulch.

The I.C.I. safety data sheet mentioned that the product was slow to biodegrade and that, therefore, it would not be an appropriate course of action. I make those comments because close attention must be paid to the safety guidelines for the use of chemicals for any purpose, let alone for agricultural purposes. The person in New South Wales was stating that, on the one hand, she was being advised by the manufacturers to take a certain course of action and, on the other hand, she was being advised by a local government authority to take another course of action. These matters need thorough examination. However, I would be happy to bring down in due course a considered reply from my colleague in another place.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT GRANTS COMMISSION

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Is it the intention of the Minister of Local Government to reply in the debate today involving Order of the Day: Other Business No. 4? My colleague the member for Light moved a motion in this House on 31 August relating to local government funding.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have taken advice, and that question is not an appropriate question to ask because—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not need the assistance of the Deputy Premier on this matter; I am taking advice from the table officers. It is not an appropriate question, as it is asking a Minister of the Crown to disclose certain intentions which he may or may not have in what I understand to be private members' time. I rule the question out of order.

CLEAN AIR LEGISLATION

Mr TRAINER: In view of yesterday's question about a smell from an unidentified source that had been affecting metropolitan Adelaide over the past few days (I know it was suggested that it was the member for Glenelg not changing his socks), will the Minister for Environment and Planning say when the clean air legislation will be introduced into the Parliament and whether such legislation will address the problem referred to yesterday?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I rise on a point of order. I believe that the House will find a Question on Notice dealing with that matter.

The SPEAKER: The advice I have been given is sensible, and I propose to follow it, bearing in mind that it was used by my predecessor. Has the honourable member found the question?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Yes, Sir, it is question No. 74.

The SPEAKER: The most sensible course to adopt is for the member for Ascot Park to bring his question to the Chair so that I can check it against the Question on Notice, and I can then give a sensible ruling. In the meantime I call the member for Todd.

PLUMBING CONTRACT

Mr ASHENDEN: Will the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place, inform me when his colleague will provide an answer to my letter to him of 25 July concerning a constituent of mine who was the subject of a dispute over plumbing work? Will the Minister assure the House that, when the answer is forthcoming, it will be provided to me directly? The letter to which I refer relates to a most important problem involving my constituent and requires urgent advice. I first wrote to the Minister on 25 July, and since that time I have followed up the matter with his office on a number of occasions. On 8 September I was advised that an answer would be in my hands within a week. That week is well and truly up, and I am sure that the situation that I now briefly outline will show the House how important it is that this matter is determined immediately.

My constituents engaged a plumber to undertake work at their home. The work was unsatisfactory in several ways and, accordingly, they approached the Department of Consumer Affairs for assistance. An officer of the department called and inspected the work that had been undertaken and agreed that some aspects of the work were unsatisfactory. My constituents have provided me with a letter from the Department of Consumer Affairs indicating that a considerable degree of work was still to be undertaken, and that the plumber had agreed to undertake certain work by 22 April this year. Despite the assurances in that letter by the officer from the Department of Consumer Affairs that he would put as much pressure on the plumber as he could to have that work done, and despite the assurances of the plumber that the work would be done, the work was not done and has still not been undertaken.

The plumber has now taken my constituents to court, and I am advised that evidence given in court by an officer of the Department of Consumer Affairs was contrary to the statements he made in the original letter to my constituents. At this stage, a magistrate's court has handed down a decision against my constituents, and a larger amount than expected is required to be paid by them to the plumber, despite the fact that an independent quote indicates that $560 would be required by another plumber to rectify work undertaken by the first plumber.

My constituents are not able to make the increased payment required, and offered to pay the plumber in instalments. In fact, they forwarded the plumber two cheques as part payment for the work done, and were prepared to pay an amount up to what was a reasonable amount for the work that had been undertaken correctly. The plumber returned those two cheques, and refused to accept them as payment towards the work. Now it would seem that there is every likelihood that bankruptcy proceedings will be undertaken against my constituents. They have been advised that, if this were to happen, their home could well be sold to pay the debt to this plumber.

I am sure that the Minister will realise that it is a very complicated matter and one for which my constituents should have had assistance from his office in considerably

less than two months. I have asked that the advice from the Minister's office be forwarded to me directly in view of a statement he made on radio this morning that he would be making direct contact with my constituents. I believe that, as I have been pressing the Minister for so long on this matter, any reply that is forthcoming should be made available to me in order that I can adequately counsel my constituents.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the honourable Minister, I must say that I have shown great tolerance, particularly towards the end of that question, because it was debate, comment, and several other matters. I ask members on both sides of the House to try to avoid that.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. I will refer it to my colleague the Minister of Consumer Affairs for his consideration. I point out, in answer to the honourable member's criticism of the alleged delay, that it would seem that this is a long and protracted matter. It is the subject of litigation and I think there has been a hearing and a judgment brought down in the local court.

In normal circumstances, the Department of Consumer Affairs does not act where there is litigation and where court proceedings are involved, such as the circumstances to which the honourable member has referred. I will put to my colleague that the honourable member would like to receive the department's response before his constituents receive it, although I imagine that his constituents would want to receive that advice as quickly as possible.

CLEAN AIR LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER: I now call on the honourable member for Ascot Park. I have had an opportunity to look at his question, and I think that it is clearly distinguishable from Question on Notice No. 74. I ask the honourable member to slowly read it to the House again.

Mr TRAINER: I will rephrase the question very slightly to make—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TRAINER: —crystal clear that the thrust of it is not in contradiction.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TRAINER: In view of the question asked yesterday regarding a smell from an unidentified source that has affected metropolitan Adelaide in the past few days, is the Minister able to say whether the clean air legislation to be introduced into Parliament will address the problem referred to yesterday?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes, the Bill will clearly address the matter of odour—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Bill will clearly address the matter of odour, although I make the point that, if you cannot detect the source, you have no-one to prosecute.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister was asked to investigate the question of smells, not Bills.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mallee is out of order.

RURAL HOUSING

Mr MEIER: Will the Minister of Housing say what benefit, if any, rural areas will receive with respect to new Housing Trust houses or flats built in country towns, in light of the announcement in the Budget that the Government will provide a significant boost to the housing industry by way of a major increase in the public sector housing programme?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: This year the Housing Trust will build more than 3 100 homes throughout South Australia. A real emphasis is given to the country areas and, as I have said many times, through the joint venture programme in co-operation with country councils, flats have been built for elderly people in country areas.

Mr Hamilton: The honourable member should have listened to the contribution that I made last evening.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: As my colleague the member for Albert Park said yesterday, country councils are contributing more than those in the metropolitan area in regard to building homes and assisting the Trust in building accommodation for elderly people. I can assure the member for Goyder that the city area will not be given priority: the Trust's building programme applies to areas throughout the State, and I am sure that in the next six months the honourable member will see in his own district evidence of an expanding building programme.

ENTRY TO PRIVATE PROPERTY

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Chief Secretary confer with his colleagues the Attorney-General and the Minister for Environment and Planning to determine what legislation is necessary to permit officers of the law to enter private premises when necessary to disconnect burglar alarms? Recently, I received a complaint from an irate resident at West Lakes who complained about the fact that police were unable to enter an adjacent, unattended property to turn off a burglar alarm. My constituent advised me that the owners of that property were on holidays, that the burglar alarm on their property was audible regularly over a period of days, and that during the evenings and at night her children and her husband experienced great difficulty in sleeping. I raised this matter with the Minister for Environment and Planning, and in his reply to me dated 16 September 1983 he stated, in part:

> I refer to the matter you raised with me recently about a constituent who had been disturbed by the regular sounding of a burglar alarm in an unattended house. There is no provision under the Noise Control Act to regulate the use of alarms, and the Chief Secretary has confirmed that the police are unable to intervene as they may not enter premises without permission.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I shall speak with the Attorney-General and the Minister for Environment and Planning to ascertain whether appropriate legislation can be designed to overcome the problem to which the honourable member referred. I recall going on patrol with the Police Force, and one of the problems pointed out to me by the patrol officers was the frequency with which burglar alarms went off, particularly in industrial and commercial premises. However, when that occurs there is always someone who can be contacted so that the alarms can be disconnected. This is not the case in private houses, particularly where the occupants are on holiday, perhaps interstate or elsewhere, and if a burglar alarm is set off, for whatever reason, and does go for days, one can imagine the inconvenience and annoyance that would create for the families living nearby.

It is a problem that I believe ought to be addressed: I take the points that the honourable member raises. I will discuss this matter with my colleagues, and also with the Police Department, which obviously would have a fair bit of data on this matter, because of the frequency with which members of the Police Force are faced with it.

It is true that police officers cannot enter domestic or private premises without permission. I do not know whether

or not people who have burglar alarms in private houses and who go on holidays can contact the police before they leave, and arrange that if, during their absence, the burglar alarm is set off that the police do have their permission to enter the premises to see whether it is merely a malfunction, or whether there has been some interference with the premises. It might be a wise precaution for people to take before leaving on holidays. If they do not take that precaution, then the police have no legitimate power to enter. I will have the matter investigated and I will bring down a report for the honourable member.

WOOL SHIPMENTS

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Can the Minister of Marine say whether it is true that all South Australian wool, purchased by Japanese millers and jumbo dumped at Port Adelaide, is containerised and dispatched from Australia via a Melbourne port and not through our Port Adelaide facilities? If this is the position, and Port Adelaide facilities are being by-passed, can the Minister ascertain the reason and advise the House what action his Government is taking to alter this position and to attract that significant volume of business through our local port facilities?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The question that the honourable member raises is now being considered by the Department of Marine and Harbors.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: It must be or it must not be. You should be able to say yes or no.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: We intend to fight this issue for the benefit of the State and for its importance to the economy of South Australia.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: Is it true that you have—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I will bring down a considered reply to that particular aspect of the member's question. However, this matter is being considered, and we have not yet decided or determined what our approach to the matter will be. I reiterate that we intend to fight this issue as hard as we possibly can for the benefit of South Australia.

LEGAL AID SERVICES

Mr MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ascertain from the Attorney-General exactly when it might be expected that the proposed full-time office of the Legal Services Commission will be opened in the City of Whyalla? I have been much involved in the need for this full-time office, and most eager to have the office operating as soon as possible. The Attorney-General recently announced that Whyalla (and I believe Port Noarlunga) are to have full-time offices, and I hope that this may be achieved before the end of the year.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in the rights of his constituents. Having recently visited Whyalla, I can well understand his concern that people in provincial cities such as Whyalla are not disadvantaged by distance from Adelaide, particularly with respect to their obtaining essential services, and I would include the right of representation before the courts as being an essential service. I know this is a matter that has occupied the time of the Attorney-General and the Legal Services Commission, and it is a matter of high priority that there be decentralisation of this very successful service in the community. I will obtain a report on the precise details for the honourable member.

SALINITY CONTROL

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Will the Premier say whether the Government will take the initiative and sponsor an international symposium on salinity, irrigation and drainage as it affects the Murray and Darling Rivers system to take place in Adelaide in 1986 as a technical and scientific contribution to the South Australian Jubilee 150 Year celebrations? Recently I attended two conferences on this subject in the United States, one at Salt Lake City and the other at Jackson, in Wyoming. The attendance of Australians at those international conferences on this subject has generated much interest by overseas engineers and graduates of other disciplines in the Murray-Darling salinity problem. As the State Government is responsible for water quality it is considered that such a symposium on an international basis during 1986 could be of significant value not only for South Australia but for Australia.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is an interesting idea and one that is well worthy of consideration. I will refer it to my colleague, the Minister of Water Resources, to do more detailed work on it and we can then provide some response.

LIBRARY STAFF

Mr LEWIS: Does the Premier approve of the way in which his and other Ministers' research assistants stand over and demand assistance from the Parliamentary Library research staff to the exclusion of the contribution they can make towards requests from back-benchers?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I presume the question is based on an article which appeared in the *Sunday Mail* concerning the use of library research facilities, and which stated:

> Mr Bannon allegedly makes significant use of the service—even though he is not supposed to—and the library folk suspect his staff are trying to make their own jobs easier.

I do not know whether that is the reference to which the honourable member is referring. If so, it is extraordinary and I would suggest also that the article itself is not at all well based. I am told that the information that appeared in that article which was purported to be sourced by Library staff did not in fact originate in the Library. Indeed, I would have thought it would be quite improper if Library staff had in any way issued statements or responded to questions from a member of the press.

I would be concerned if any member of the Parliament in his capacity as a member of Parliament sought information from the Library service to then in turn convey it to journalists or others outside with a view to creating articles of that kind. I must say I was extremely concerned about the reference to the Library and the basis of it. My advice is that that was not information supplied by the Library. The article was erroneous and therefore I do not think the question is worth pursuing.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Justices Act, 1921. Read a first time.

Mr MATHWIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I believe that most, if not all, members will support this Bill because it deals with a matter that concerns us all. Even

if a member has not been involved directly in this matter, he or she must have read or had related to him or her details of the hardship and frustration that can be caused to a victim by the granting of bail to the accused in certain cases. I am a member of the Victims of Crime Organisation, which is doing a valuable service in the community.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: An excellent organisation.

Mr MATHWIN: Indeed it is. It concentrates on the welfare of victims of crime who believe strongly that too little is being done for the victims who suffer most. In certain areas measures have been devised over the years and much thought has been given to ensuring the protection of the accused. Indeed, we should never forget that a person must be presumed innocent until proven guilty. However, even if that assumption is valid, we must never overlook the urgent need to protect the rights and feelings of the victim. It is little wonder that a press report in the *Advertiser* of 14 July 1983, dealing with the statement by a Mrs Mykyta (Chairman of the Victims of Crime Organisation in South Australia), states:

She said her organisation was seriously concerned that in some cases bail was granted too easily by the courts. 'Very often a person is given bail even though the arresting police officer has a gut feeling that the guy will go out and commit the same crime again,' she said. 'And as we know only too well it does happen, particularly in cases of child molestation and domestic violence.' . . . There is a view that some people get bail too easily. . . . Mrs Mykyta gave the example of a family who, she said, had suffered greatly when a person—who had admitted killing a member of the family—had been granted bail.

That case is typical of many. There is no doubt that the Attorney-General (Hon. Chris Sumner) is also very much concerned about this matter, as evidenced by the following report in the *News* of 7 July 1983:

Mr Sumner said he was aware of public disquiet in recent cases in which people charged with serious offences had been released on bail. . . . a case in January involving a man charged with raping a girl, 16, and indecently assaulting a schoolgirl.

Mr Sumner said he had been shocked by the decision to release the man on bail. The alleged indecent assault had occurred while the man was on bail for the alleged rape. 'The criteria must be looked at, to try to establish procedures for a more objective assessment of eligibility for bail,' he said.

Just to show how much the Attorney-General is concerned about this matter, I refer to another article which appeared in the *News* of 28 December 1982 and which states:

Granting of bail to a man charged with the indecent assault of a young schoolgirl 'deeply concerns' the Attorney-General, Mr Sumner. Mr Sumner said today the Crown had vigorously opposed granting bail to the man who had been convicted of attempted murder and was on bail on another rape charge. The man, who appeared in court last week on the indecent assault charge, had served six years of a 12-year gaol sentence for the attempted murder of a young girl. Mr Sumner said the Crown had done all it could to stop the granting of bail. 'It is entirely a matter for the court to decide,' Mr Sumner said. 'We opposed bail and will do so again when the case resumes in court.'

Bail was granted to the man by Mr G.E. Carter, SSM, in the Christies Beach Court following a successful application in the Supreme Court.

This is the area about which I, too, am most concerned: the criteria used when granting bail. I now refer to a press release dated 10 September 1981 (two years ago):

A man charged with having raped a girl, six, at Norwood Oval about two years ago was released on bail yesterday. The man, 41, a maintenance worker, appeared before Mr N. Manos, SSM, in the Adelaide Magistrates Court charged with having raped the girl on 18 August 1979. The man also is charged with having been in a public place, Norwood Oval, with the intent to commit an indictable offence on 15 August this year. Mr Manos granted $2 000 bail with two $1 000 sureties . . .

I am concerned about such cases as these, and I am sure that all other members are concerned about them. Obviously, the Attorney-General is concerned about this matter. Another press report which appeared in 1979, and which is headed 'M.P. slams bail for rape charges', states:

The Community Welfare Department was attacked today for not opposing bail when a youth appeared before the Juvenile Court on two rape charges. A Liberal M.P. said the youth, who was being held at McNally Centre, was officially under the department's care and control. 'Yet they did not oppose bail and he was released into the community,' Mr Mathwin said. 'And while he was out on bail he was arrested and charged with another case of rape.'

I was very much concerned about that situation, and I am certain that other members would likewise be upset and wonder what they could do about the matter. It is for that reason that I have introduced this Bill: to stop this sort of thing going on and to give the Crown the right to appeal against release of the accused on bail when the accused is charged with having committed certain serious acts within the community. I now refer to the third report of the Mitchell Law Reform Committee which states, at page 48:

Where a person is charged with murder it is not customary to grant bail, but bail may be granted, usually in circumstances which are exceptional. The Supreme Court has an inherent jurisdiction to admit to bail any person charged with an offence. If bail is refused by a court of summary jurisdiction then an application for bail can be made to the Supreme Court whether the charge is for a summary or an indictable offence . . .

In South Australia it was at one time the exception rather than the rule to grant an accused person bail during his trial. For some years the Attorney-General has not opposed bail, except for cause. The result is that many persons on trial are granted bail . . .

The main ground for refusal of bail is and should be the likelihood that the accused will not attend upon the hearing of the charge against him if he is granted bail. The risk of non-attendance may be looked at in the light of the seriousness of the offence, the strength of the evidence, and the severity of punishment prescribed. Other grounds for denial of bail are the likelihood that the accused will commit other offences, the danger that he will attempt to molest witnesses or tamper with evidence, that his detention in custody will facilitate police inquiries, and finally for the protection of the accused.

I believe that the points raised by the Mitchell Committee have not been considered fully by the courts in recent times. I believe that in some cases, including those to which I have referred, the courts have made a mistake in not considering the situation referred to in the committee's third report and what has been laid down by authorities in other jurisdictions to which I shall refer. At page 51, under the heading 'Statutory prescription as to bail', the following appears:

Neverthless we think that there is a need of some statutory guidance to those sitting in courts of summary jurisdiction.

At page 53 of the Mitchell Report, the following recommendations appear:

(b) We recommend that a court be empowered to refuse bail where it believes, upon reasonable grounds, that there is a real risk that the accused will abscond and that the court in reaching its conclusion may consider, among other matters, the seriousness of the offence, the apparent strength of the evidence for the prosecution and the severity of the punishment prescribed for the alleged offence.

(c) We recommend that the court be empowered to refuse bail where it reasonably believes that there is a likelihood that the accused, if granted bail, will molest witnesses or tamper with evidence.

In the cases to which I have referred (and there are other cases) the fact that death has occurred or could occur has petrified some of the victims. I now refer to a book entitled *Criminal Procedure*, by John Bishop, which I have obtained from the Parliamentary Library. Here again, under the heading 'Bail on Preliminary Remand', at page 106 we read the following:

The principles on which bail decisions should be determined during a period of remand have been referred to in a number of cases in England and Australia. The general principle emerging from these cases is that where a magistrate refuses bail the Supreme Court will generally be reluctant to interfere with the magistrate's decision, unless there is some special or unusual ground for granting bail; for example, the remand is for an unusually long period.

I believe that the courts in this State have not taken note of that reference. Indeed, the one and only criterion they have been using over the past few years is whether or not a person is likely to turn up for trial. That has been the main thrust in any argument on an appeal. When there has been an appeal against bail, the person who has been refused bail will apply immediately to a Supreme Court judge. In almost every case that I know of, bail has been granted under that criterion, namely, that, whatever the previous trouble may have been, excluding murder, the person concerned has been released and has never jumped bail. I believe that that is wrong from the victim's viewpoint. We have the opportunity to alter that situation. It is the Government's right, through the Attorney-General's Department, to oppose an appeal against a decision not to grant bail. Under the heading 'Criteria of Bail' on page 110, it is stated:

For well over one hundred years it has been generally accepted that the probability of the accused appearing at his trial is central to any bail decision. In 1854 Coleridge J. said in *Re Robinson:* 'The test, in my opinion, of whether a party ought to be bailed is whether it is probable that party will appear to take trial . . .'—

that was back in 1854—

In 1898 in *R v Rose* Lord Russell C.J. said: 'It cannot be too strongly impressed upon the magistracy of the country . . . that the requirements as to bail are merely to secure the attendance of the prisoner at his trial.'

On the same page and under the same heading it further states:

The test of whether an accused would appear at his trial proved far too general in practice and the courts proceeded to propound a number of more specific criteria in order to resolve the fundamental question. These criteria included: the gravity of the offence charged; the severity of the penalty for the offence; the strength of the prosecution case and probability of conviction; the accused's previous criminal record (if any); and the accused's background and community ties. An examination of the authorities reveals that these matters are regarded as important because they bear on the question whether or not the accused will answer his bail. In *R v Scaife* Coleridge J. observed that, whether before or after committal for trial, bail for accused persons is 'for the purpose of ensuring the certainty of their appearing to take trial', and it is 'on that count alone that it becomes important to see whether the offence is serious, whether the evidence is strong, and whether the punishment for the offence is heavy'.

On the question of the seriousness of the offence, the following comment is made:

The point is, however, that the court hearing an application for bail is not primarily concerned with the question of the accused's innocence but rather whether or not he will answer to his bail. Looked at this way the court's approach makes sense, because a person facing major charges has more incentive to abscond than a person accused of a trivial offence.

That explains a great deal because, as I will illustrate to the House shortly, that situation is occurring in South Australia with people on bail. On page 112, under the heading 'Severity of the Sentence', the book goes on to state:

Thus, an offence carrying a substantial term of imprisonment may be of particular significance where there is an overwhelming case against the accused and the accused has an extensive criminal record, for, in these circumstances, there is every inducement for the accused to flee if granted bail.

That again is definite proof of the situation referred to, quite rightly, by Justice Mitchell in the recommendations in her third report. Under the heading 'Criminal Record' on page 113, the book states, in part:

The criminal record of an applicant for bail has an important bearing on the success or otherwise of his bail application. A criminal record is important because of its relevance to the sentence that may be imposed should the applicant be convicted.

That further explains the situation. Under the same heading, it is stated on page 114:

In *R v Wakefield* Cross CQS said that there were two reasons why persons with long criminal records commit further offences whilst on bail . . .

That is certainly applicable in South Australia. In fact, it is applicable generally but certainly in this State because I know and have heard of such cases. It is further stated:

. . . First, further offences are necessary to pay for legal representation at trial; and second, further offences have little or no effect on the ultimate penalty for the original offence. His Honour added: '. . . whatever the causes, judges of the court are confronted time and again with the situation where offences—often a multiplicity of them—are committed by persons at a time when they are currently on bail'.

That undoubtedly occurs in South Australia. I have been told of a number of cases of that nature as outlined in the book, which further states:

Atkinson J. put the matter rather more bluntly in *R v Phillips* when he said: '. . . Magistrates who release on bail young housebreakers . . . [should] know that in 19 cases out of 20 it is a mistake'.

They are straight hard facts from a person well versed: a judge in the courts. That matter is so important that I reiterate that passage I have just quoted. If anybody needed proof, that is it. Any members who have had any experience with the courts would know that that situation applies in South Australia. I ask the House to reflect upon the points I have put forward and I could quote many similar instances.

Offenders like the notorious Colin Creed could well have been released on bail at times. People charged with breaking offences and with other offences have offended while out on bail. I know from my own experience that often people out on bail commit further offences such as breakings. They try to raise more finance to pay expected costs, fines or fees imposed on them by the court for the offences for which they are out on bail. I know of a case where a person, over a period of time, committed between 18 and 24 house breakings. He has committed further breaking offences while he has been out on bail. Whilst he has not been caught, he has been observed in suspicious circumstances around shops, and so on, in the early hours of the morning. Vast amounts of video equipment, valued at high prices, have been stolen from houses, as people can raise much money from stealing such equipment.

As I have said, that is often done to get finance in anticipation of the fines that will be imposed. It is a very fine line as regards proof of guilt. Of course, people involved in drugs are certainly susceptible to this sort of thing. When they are released on bail they have to service their particular drug habit, and if they are already pushing drugs they need the money to do so, or they need the drug itself to service the habit. So what do they do? They break into pharmacies, doctors' rooms and residences, cars, and the like—more breakings.

As I said earlier, under the present criteria in this State in general, people are let out on bail because the only criterion considered is the fact that they have a good record in relation to turning up at their trial. We all know that people are placed in custody, in the main, to make sure that they will attend court when their case comes up. Courts regard all people as being innocent. When the case is proven, even before they fix the sentence, further evidence is given of other alleged previous offences such other offences are then considered only after the case is proven. On the other hand, the victim could well be in fear of repercussions, and in some instances it is nothing short of torture. I could quote many such cases to the House, but suffice to quote perhaps merely two.

I refer in particular to a case four years ago when four accused men and the wife of one of them were convicted of rape. They accosted a young girl behind the Hilton Hotel after it had closed and when instruments used by members of a band were being put into a van. I think that it was about 2 a.m. and, with the words, 'You'll do,' they dragged her off into a panel van and took her away to a home unit.

The police were alerted and eventually crashed into the unit at about 5 a.m. During that time, that girl was subjected to some shocking acts. I heard about this, as the girl's mother contacted me. I took an interest in the case and, in fact, went to the court several times to try to give some moral support (for what it was worth) to the girl concerned. It was a shocking situation. The accused were released on bail and, as I said earlier, the episode started just after 2 a.m. on the day in question. The police eventually crashed into the premises at 5 a.m., and the first thing they did was apprehend the accused. Another policeman and a policewoman took the girl (the victim) to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital for a medical examination and generally tried to help her. Eventually, after being delayed at the hospital waiting to be attended to by doctors (a gynaecologist, etc.,) and social workers, the girl was returned home at 11 a.m. By that time, however, the accused were out on bail and at home. I believe that that is a disgusting state of affairs, which must be stopped. I believe that this Bill, which I hope is supported by the House, will stop that sort of thing happening.

I quote another case where a man had threatened on a number of occasions the family of a young 16-year-old girl whom he had raped. He threatened them with a beating and then threatened to kill them if they dared report him. He, too, was released on bail. In each of these cases, which I know a lot about, the family and the girl were petrified. The parents tried to keep the girl indoors and would not let her outside the house, and sometimes this goes on for months. In the first case I related, the family eventually received some financial assistance from the then Attorney-General, Mr Griffin. The girl was packed off to Darwin out of the way while these thugs were walking around Adelaide. Two of them came from New South Wales, and during the period to which I am referring they went on a holiday to New Zealand, while the girl remained petrified and wondering about the outcome.

The 16-year-old girl in one of the cases to which I have referred had to go interstate at her own cost because she received no help in that situation. The parents telephoned me in desperation about what they could do. The accused was at large and going about his business freely, while the girl and her parents were absolutely petrified. She was a prisoner and was being dealt with far more harshly than the accused. The accused would have been out telling mates all about it. In that case, the family received phantom telephone calls in the middle of the night and all sorts of threats. The telephone would ring at 2 a.m. or 3 a.m. and there was no-one at the other end of the line. Members of this family were victims, while the accused was out free.

No-one else but the accused or their mates (whom they would have put up) could be making those nuisance or phantom telephone calls. That is the situation, and I believe that it must not be allowed to continue. I know that the Government is sympathetic to this matter (I think that every member would be) and is having a report compiled in relation to bail, among other matters. However, I believe that, if action is to be taken, it has to be taken quickly. We cannot wait for another 12 months or two years for this to come about. I think that it has to happen quickly, and that is why I have brought in this Bill.

Dealing with the Bill, clause 1 is the short title. Clause 2 amends section 163 of the principal Act by inserting the following new subsection:

(1a) The Crown may appeal to the Supreme Court against an order of a justice admitting a person to bail or certifying for the admission of a person to bail.

Clause 3 amends section 164 of the principal Act. Clause 4 amends section 171 of the principal Act and defines the manner in which an appeal is to be instituted. Clause 5 amends section 177 of the principal Act. In presenting the Bill to the House, with all sincerity I ask members to look at the situation quite independently, to think about it in their own mind, and to seriously consider supporting the amendments to this Act so that certain people in the community—the victims—will not have to go through such purgatory as has existed in the past. As I said earlier, the main purpose of the Bill is to allow the Crown the right of appeal against bail being granted in certain cases.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

FRUIT FLY

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I move:

That this House considers the road blocks operated by the Department of Agriculture to be a significant barrier against the introduction of fruit fly into South Australia and calls on the Government to maintain the inspection facilities at or above the present level.

I raise this matter because of the enormous importance to South Australia, particularly to the fruit-growing industry, of the protection that is afforded by these road blocks in South Australia in intercepting fruit fly coming into this State from other States of Australia. I am aware of the fact that the member for Alexandra asked the Government by way of a Question on Notice (dated 20 September 1983) about its intention in relation to road block inspections for fruit fly. To that question he received the following response:

It is the Government's intention to maintain fruit fly road blocks at all existing inspection sites.

It is of concern to me, the Riverland Local Government Association, and all fruit producers in South Australia that not only are these fruit fly inspection facilities maintained but also that they be maintained on at least their existing level or in fact above it. There is no doubt whatever that the fruit fly inspection facilities that have operated in South Australia for many years have been largely responsible for keeping fruit fly out of South Australia (certainly, out of the key horticultural commercial producing areas of this State). The fact that in the past the Government has seen fit whenever there has been an outbreak of fruit fly in the metropolitan area of Adelaide to go to significant lengths to eradicate such outbreaks is to be commended.

However, any suggestion of a reduction in the level of protection provided to the industry by means of the road blocks is to be deplored. Concern about this matter has been conveyed to me by people in the fruit-growing industry and by those in the Riverland Local Government Association who readily recognise the implications and the effect that an outbreak of fruit fly would have on the fruit-growing industry in South Australia, and particularly on the Riverland itself. Not only would it destroy the production of much of the fresh fruit in South Australia but also it would create an embargo on the export of that fruit to many places outside South Australia.

It is imperative that the fruit fly blocks be maintained at their existing level. One has only to refer to the Bureau of Statistics figures for 1982 to find that in South Australia a total of 46.3 million hectares of fruit was produced in this State. The gross value of citrus fruit produced in South Australia for the year ended 30 June 1982 was $31.6 million. Home fruits, which include apples and pears, were worth $15.5 million; stone fruits, $18.9 million; and grapes for table wine and drying had a value of $70.9 million in direct production in South Australia. The total value of fruit production in this State was $142.3 million.

Mr Lewis: What about tomatoes?

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: The statistical data to which I am referring refers only to fresh fruits and does not include

tomatoes. In fact, it includes tropical fruit, such as bananas, passionfruit, pineapples and strawberries, but it does not include tomatoes. Therefore, in addition to the fruits comprising that total value of $142.3 million, there would be other fruits that would be readily affected by fruit fly. We in South Australia appreciate the level of protection that has been afforded the industry in the past, but many people are fearful that that level of protection might be reduced. South Australia can ill afford a reduction in that protection, and I urge every member of this House to support this motion.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): In seconding this proposition I want to underline and endorse the importance of the threat of fruit fly to the security of thousands of families in this State and to the convenience of many thousands of people who enjoy the benefit of growing their own fruit at home. Nothing could be more revolting than to pick a piece of ripe fruit from the garden and then after having take a bite from, say, a delicious and attractive peach to find that one has a mouthful of maggots.

That would be exactly the result of any relaxation of our efforts to keep fruit fly, both Mediterranean and Queensland fruit fly, out of South Australia. We spend hundreds of thousands of dollars a year in fruit stripping operations and other control measures associated with fruit fly eradication with the use of insecticides and insect trapping measures for checking to see that there are no adult fruit fly insects on the wing.

For us to forgo our surveillance at the boundaries of South Australia, where we have been so successful in the past in intercepting large amounts of fruit infested with fruit fly, would be simply ridiculous and unsalutary in its indifference to the efforts made in the past. However, it is to be regretted that the present Government contemplates doing that. That is made more reprehensible by virtue of the fact that the Cain Labor Government in Victoria has removed its road block system, and so therefore we will now find that fruit will come from Queensland and New South Wales, infested with fruit fly, straight through Victoria to South Australia.

If there are no road blocks at our borders, such fruit will not be intercepted. The most important part of the operation of those road blocks, apart from intercepting infested fruit, is bringing to the attention of the travelling public the vital importance that we in South Australia attach to the retention of our freedom from this insidious pest of our horticultural crops.

It would not only cause great inconvenience to suburban householders and other families who grow their own fruit, but also it would ruin our export industries that depend upon fresh fruit. Our export industries have a high reputation for quality, particularly for our tomatoes sent interstate and, more particularly, in overseas countries to which we send large quantities of fresh fruits such as citrus. These places require us to be able to guarantee that there is no fruit fly (nor has there been any fruit fly) in the immediate vicinity in which citrus fruits have been produced. It would be a disaster to us, and it would be quite wrong for us to allow the travelling public to think that we no longer cared. That would be demonstrated if we close down the existing road blocks.

In view of what Victoria has done, I believe that we should immediately increase the surveillance on our borders to ensure that no motorists enter South Australia without understanding the serious threat posed to our fruit and plant industries by exotic diseases that we do not have now.

In conclusion, I refer to the shocking indifference of both Ministers of Agriculture in this Government for the way in which they have ignored my request for information and reassurance about the retention of our road-block system during the time that this Government has been in office: that is, the Hon. Brian Chatterton and the Hon. Frank Blevins. I, with the Pinnaroo Chamber of Commerce, and several private citizens, have been in contact with their office, and yet it has been impossible for us to get any assurance whatsoever as to what is to happen, in spite of the fact that on 20 May the present Minister, the Hon. Frank Blevins, wrote a letter to me in response to correspondence I had with him about the Pinnaroo fruit fly road block. I received this letter, although dated 20 May, on 6 June, in which he said:

> Any decisions for change shall not be made until the review is completed and it has been made available for comment by those members of the public affected by it.

He further said:

> It is anticipated that the review shall be completed in June 1983.

We still have not received that report, nor have I had any further communication from the Minister's office about where it is and what he proposes to do, even though it is now widely known that he intends to reduce the number of people and the hours that those officers will attend at road blocks at least along our eastern border and, for all I know, and in all probability, at Ceduna as well. I think that that position is deplorable, and that this House and its members should take account of the concern brought to our attention by the member for Chaffey, and ensure that this Minister of Agriculture understands the seriousness with which all of us regard our fruit production industries, and our personal convenience in being able to enjoy such clean fruit, reliably grown in our own home gardens.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

EXCISE TAX

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I move:

> That this House condemns the Federal Government for introducing an excise tax on rectifying spirit used in the production of fortified wines, and the devastating effect it will have on the grape growing and wine making industries, particularly in South Australia; and further, condemns the Federal Government for not honouring its pre-election commitment and calls on the Prime Minister to rescind the excise.

It would seem, as a result of the meetings with industry and representations generally that have been made from this State to the Federal Government, that the Federal Government is adopting a 'head in the sand' attitude, having made this commitment in its Budget without fully recognising and understanding the implications of what it has done. It is now not prepared to withdraw from that position, even in light of the effects it will have on a principal industry in South Australia.

Many people in the wine and grapegrowing industry in South Australia have spelt out clearly to the Prime Minister and the Federal Treasurer the effect that this tax will have on the wine and wine producing industry in South Australia, and also the devastating effect that it will also have on the already hard-hit wine-grape growing industry in the State.

There has been a surplus production of wine grapes particularly in South Australia for several years, as a result of successive Federal Governments introducing excessive levels of excise on the brandy industry and, since South Australia is the principal brandy producing State in Australia, it has naturally hit harder in this State than in any other place. Also, as most of all brandy produced in Australia is produced in the Riverland, there is a real economic problem, without additional imposts being imposed.

Recently, I have referred several times to the figures provided in the 1981 census that clearly indicate that the level of income of people in the Riverland is much lower than is the average of the State. In other words, the percentage of people on low income in the Riverland is much higher than is the average for the rest of the State. Now, as there is another impost imposed on grapegrowers of South Australia in the main, and also the wine producing industry in this State, I think that the message is clearly spelt out in a statement and comment made by the General Manager of Yalumba Wines, when he said:

> Unfortunately for our company the imposition of the $2.61 per litre alcohol excise has horrific consequences for this company. We have been advised that the duty must be paid within seven days of the spirit usage in the product.

That means an up-front payment that must be made to the Government within seven days of the actual fortified wine being produced, even though that wine may not be marketed for many years. Not only is there a burden of carrying the cost of the excise but also the interest on that money that has been paid to the Federal Government is lost when there is little chance of recovering that money for many years. The General Manager goes on to state:

> At an average 16 per cent spirit added component the duty per finished litre of fortified wine is 42 cents. This is greater than the great cost component of the wine. Simply stated, the excise is an equivalent of about $190 per tonne for grapes used to produce fortified wines, and that the payment must be made at the time of production and subsequently financed during maturation.

The rate of $190 per tonne is more than the average price per tonne now being paid as set by the Prices Commissioner in South Australia for most of the wine varieties produced in this State.

In one fell swoop the Federal Government has imposed an excise on the industry that is greater than the cost of the base raw material used in the production of that end product, the fortified wines. Anyone who suggests that it is a small impost obviously has no concept whatsoever that it is actually more than the value of the grape used to make the wine. The comment from the General Manager of Yalumba Wines continues:

> Financing costs and evaporation losses during wood ageing for between four to 15 years for tawny ports would be totally at our cost. Unless we will be permitted to hold and mature fortified wines unbonded for subsequent clearance and duty payment at the time of leaving our cellars, we simply do not have the capacity to finance this imposition, and would have to substantially withdraw from fortified wine production.

As Yalumba Wines is a large producer of fortified wines in South Australia and that is a major part of their production, this excise will have devastating effects on that particular company and also on the growers supplying the fruit. Much of the fruit that is delivered to the Yalumba winery is produced under irrigation in the Riverland, so not only will this tax have a tremendous effect on that particular winery because of the level of its production of fortified wines but also it will have a devastating effect on growers who supply that Barossa winery. In a telex to the Prime Minister the Chief Executive Officer of Consolidated Co-operative Wineries Ltd, Mr Pendrigh, spelt out the effects this excise will have on his winery at Berri in the following terms:

> The excise tax on grape spirit used in fortifying wine will have a very severe effect on the Riverland district of South Australia and this company in particular. The effect of this excise will be (1) to increase the working capital required by distillers and fortified wine manufacturers to pay this duty up-front on production which will on average require at least two years maturation storage and will subsequently increase their interest bill. For example, this company will have to increase its borrowings by $3 million in the next two years to finance this tax.

That is $3 million that will not flow back to the grapegrowing industry in South Australia and the grower-shareholders of Consolidated Co-operative in the Riverland. The telex continues:

> 2. The result of 1. will be:
>
> (1) An increase in the cost of fortified wine at the winery of about 45 cents per litre, which is equivalent to the current cost of production, that is, it is effectively a 100 per cent tax.
>
> (2) To increase the retail price of the average bottle of port by 75 cents, and increase the retail price of a 2-litre flagon from about $4.50 to $6.50.
>
> (3) To increase the cost of fortified wines exported from Australia to the extent that these markets will be lost.
>
> (4) These increases will start to be felt immediately as spirit is taken to adjust existing stocks.
>
> 3. The effects of 2. will be:
>
> A reduction in consumer demand and lower volume sales of fortified wines in Australia, and the loss of valuable export markets even with drawback due to interest charges.
>
> 4. All these will culminate in:
>
> (1) Fewer grapes being used for fortifying spirit and fortified base wine manufacture.
>
> (2) A further reduction in the use of already sadly underutilised distilling equipment.
>
> (3) A worsening of the financial position of distillers who are already suffering from a severe downturn in locally made brandy sales due to continued unfair competition from cheap dumped French imports.
>
> (4) Further unemployment in the distilling industry, and a further deterioration of the already near poverty conditions of many grapegrowers.
>
> 5. The tax is, in my opinion, a clear breach of the Labor Government's unequivocal promise not to tax the wine industry, and its effects will be far worse than any one has so far predicted . . .
>
> 7. My company is one of the very few 100 per cent Australian-owned wine and brandy manufacturers of consequence, and we presently make 25 per cent of all Australian brandy and 10 per cent of all Australian fortified wines. We will suffer greater damage and hardship than any other of our foreign-owned competitors as a direct result of this excise.

The General Manager of Yalumba Wines, representing a proprietary company, and the Chief Executive of Consolidated Co-operative Wineries in the Riverland have clearly spelt out the same message about the effects the excise will have on the wine and brandy making industries and also on grapegrowers in particular. The Federal Government has adopted a head in the sand attitude. It has been spelled out quite clearly to the Government that the damage that will be done will be far in excess of the revenue to be gained from this tax, and yet to date the Government has refused to acknowledge the situation that has been spelt out perfectly clearly to all concerned. I trust that all members of this House will support this motion, and that it be a clear indication to the Federal Government that this tax will have far reaching consequences on all sections of the wine industry in this State.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support what the member for Chaffey has said. As honourable members know, my district is one of the major wine producing areas of this State, so that any legislation in relation to wine is of vital concern to many of my constituents and, of course, to me as their representative. This motion comes in the context that the Labor Government went to the polls earlier this year with a clear unequivocal promise that it would not institute any tax on wine.

I think all records have been broken, not only by the Federal Government but also by the Governments of New South Wales, Victoria, and this State, in terms of politicians making election promises with no intentions of keeping them, and then setting out to institute tax measures they promised they would not institute. There is no clearer example of that than this wine tax. A clear, unequivocal commitment was given by the now Labor Government that no wine tax would be imposed if a Federal Labor Government was elected. Yet, in its first Budget a wine tax has been imposed. I believe that, for that reason, the Federal Gov-

ernment deserves the condemnation of this House. Moreover, I believe that the tax has been ill-considered.

At first glance it seems to some observers that the tax would have no profound effects on the industry but, as people have become more aware of the effects this tax will have, it has become quite clear that it will have profound effects on the industry, particularly on the hard-pressed industry in South Australia, which is the primary wine producing State. The member for Chaffey, who has just spoken, represents and has represented for many years a major section of the South Australian wine producing areas of this State. Likewise, I represent and have represented for many years another major wine producing area of this State.

I do not believe that the Commonwealth Government, its spokesmen or its advisers, have thought through the consequences of the imposition of this tax. One problem in the wine industry is that fluctuations are immediately reflected in an adverse impact on growers, whereas some other primary industries are protected to a greater extent from market fluctuations. The brewing industry is concerned about the level of excise imposed on the products of its industry. I understand that point of view, especially when a comparison is made with taxes on the same industry in other countries: the Australian industry appears to be heavily taxed.

I am not arguing from the point of view of the retail industry, but I have in mind the end result, which is the return to the growers who provide the primary produce on which the excise is levied, and in this case I also have in mind the wine producers. The grain-growing industry is projected to a certain extent against fluctuations because of its national marketing structure. I have some barley producers in my district and their marketing process is such that taxes do not seem to have the same impact on them as they do on the grapegrowers. If the tax is imposed on wine, there is an immediate flowback by way of impact on the growers because of the way the grapes are produced and marketed. This has led to considerable difficulty over the years in relation to the sale of grapes in South Australia and that has been acknowledged by successive Governments.

Indeed, a former Labor Government introduced minimum price control in respect of grapes produced in South Australia. That was legislation unique in Australia, but it was an acknowledgement that there were peculiar difficulties in the marketing of this primary product. I point out that a Labor Government clearly acknowledged that a minimum price was required by grapegrowers so that most of the grapegrowers in this State could remain viable. I know of no other primary product in respect of which that applies: it is an acknowledgement of the fluctuations from year to year of the sale of this perishable commodity. The product cannot be stored as grain can be: it must be disposed of quickly, but sometimes it cannot be disposed of readily. The difficulties in this regard have increased in recent years. The pricing arrangements initially introduced by a Labor Government in the 1970s come under constant review but, as far as I know, no-one has come up with a better scheme, although refinements were suggested while my Party was in Government.

The excise tax referred to in the motion will affect not only the winemakers but also the growers. Some wineries in my district could not take the quotas that growers have become accustomed to over a number of years. In a bumper season a large quantity of grapes could not be sold. Adverse seasonal conditions have taken care of this in recent years, but grapegrowers are having difficulty in placing their crops because the demands on the wineries have had to be constrained for a number of reasons, including the high interest rates of recent years.

After the vintage, the wineries carry large stocks of wine with no immediate return on them, yet they are compelled by law to pay the growers the first instalment by the end of June and the final instalment during September. Therefore, the tax referred to in the motion imposes immediate difficulties on some wineries in my district. The member for Chaffey has already quoted from a telegram received from the board of a major winery in my district. The impact of this tax on that winery is unsustainable in terms of current production because that winery is a large maker of quality port, which requires storage for a period of up to 12 years, although the tax running into millions of dollars must be paid well before then. The capital involved in this industry must be serviced, although there is no return from the process of manufacture until the time of sale. Not only will that winery have to restrict its operations: the problem will be exacerbated because they will not take in the usual quotas of grapes from growers in my district. Those quotas were cut last year (some were cut right out) and this year they will be cut even further as a result of this tax, and this at a time when the economic condition of this industry is far from buoyant.

For the reasons I have given, I believe that this tax is ill advised. Why impose taxes that will put more people out of work at a time of economic difficulty when we should be doing all we can to stimulate and encourage viable production? This tax was ill conceived. A non-alcoholic wine is made at a major winery in my district. During the manufacture of that wine the juice is fermented for a period because that process acts as a preservative. I am informed the best way to preserve the non-alcoholic wine is to use this fermentation process. However, that alcohol input is to be taxed, too, which seems to be an unacceptable situation because the alcohol is used only as a preservative during the process of manufacture of a wine that is non-alcoholic when marketed.

The member for Chaffey and I entirely agree on this motion, and I hope that all other members will agree with us that this tax is most ill advised and should be removed. I will not support the suggestion that has been made by isolated Government spokesmen that this tax should be replaced by another tax with a less adverse effect on producers. The industry cannot stand any such tax or any general tax at present because of the difficulties in marketing the product at this time. The Commonwealth member for Wakefield does not agree with the imposition of such a tax. We do not believe that any tax should be levied on wine at present, and we are fortunately joined by a number of Labor spokesmen in this regard.

I only hope that they have not got their tongue in their cheek; this is not play-acting. I hope they are not going through the motions of doing something about a wine tax, as the Premier did when he went to Canberra with great fan-fare on the Friday before the Budget was presented, when he said that he was trying to stop the wine tax even though we knew (and he would have known) that the Budget papers had already been printed. I hope it is not another exercise like that. I am certain that anybody who has the interests of South Australia at heart—particularly the interests of the constituents we represent—will support the motion.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

WATER AND DRAINAGE RATES

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I move:

That this House condemns the Government for its irresponsible increase of 28 per cent in water and drainage rates in Government

irrigation areas, especially at a time when unemployment in the Riverland has risen by 100 per cent over the past year and grower returns are at an all-time low, and calls on the Government to:

(a) rescind the 28 per cent increase in water and drainage rates;

(b) instruct the Director of State Development to determine what increase in rates, if any, the irrigation industry can withstand; and

(c) limit an increase only to a level which the Government can clearly demonstrate that the irrigators can sustain.

I gave notice of my motion some time ago, and following that I introduced to the Minister of Water Resources a deputation that included representatives of the United Farmers and Stockowners Association and the Murray Citrus Growers Co-operative Association to discuss this very point. At the time of that deputation, another matter discussed with the Minister related to applying an additional 12 per cent over and above growers' allocations of water for the last year to enable growers, who operated properly and under good management practices, to irrigate and look after their properties properly without any imposition of a fine or penalty rate for having exceeded their allocation of water.

On that occasion the Minister agreed to that request, which was in line with action I had taken the previous year when, because of the drought, I applied an additional 12 per cent allocation to all users of water from the Murray River in South Australia. However, on this occasion the Minister limited it to growers in rehabilitated Government irrigation areas on the basis that growers in the unrehabilitated areas, he believed, received more than their entitlement of water because of not having a metered outlet. We were able to convince the Minister that that was not necessarily the case because the majority of citrus grown, whether under the rehabilitated Government irrigation areas or not, in the main is produced using sprinkler irrigation. As such, it makes no difference whether the grower is on a rehabilitated section of a Government irrigation area or an unrehabilitated area. Since the crop is produced under sprinklers the grower in the main would have installed a 2-cusec pump which would limit the amount of water that the grower was able to take from the open channel system by virtue of the pumping equipment he had installed.

The Minister accepted that positive line of argument, which was based strongly on engineering facts. Therefore, the Minister agreed that consideration would be given to citrus producers in the unrehabilitated area. The other main point put to the Minister on that occasion was that he should withdraw the 28 per cent increase in water rates because of the inability of the industry to meet that increased charge. He agreed to refer the matter to the Premier for Cabinet consideration. That deputation took place on 29 August and, to date, we have had no response from either the Minister or the Premier. I believe we can take it that the Government is not prepared to consider what is proposed in this motion, namely, that the 28 per cent increase in water rates be rescinded until such time that the Government has been able to have the Director of State Development determine whether or not the industry has the ability to meet the increased charge.

One does not have to look very far to be convinced that the industry cannot possibly meet such a significant increase. Over the years the growers have sustained marginal increases in wine grapes. For example, in many instances in stone fruit production there has been a significant drop over the years. However, the growers have been confronted year after year with the normal c.p.i. and inflationary increases of this country. The value of the product they are producing under irrigation in some instances has dropped and, in other instances, has risen by only 3 to 4 per cent per annum, which may be 6 or 7 per cent below the inflation rate. There is no possibility of the industry meeting the 28 per cent increase at this time.

The Government should have carried out the investigation prior to making a decision off the cuff that it wanted a 28 per cent increase in water rates in Government irrigation areas. It was a decision taken without any study of whether or not the industry had the ability to meet such a charge. One only has to look at the situation in regard to the Department of Agriculture and the rural industries assistance scheme administered by that Department. We can look at debt reconstruction, farm build-up, farm improvements and household support, all areas wherein the Government, through the Department of Agriculture, is supporting the fruit-growing industry and trying to assist by providing finance.

On the other hand, we have the absurd situation of the Government concurrently increasing water rates by 28 per cent and the Federal Government instituting an excise tax on rectifying spirit for the production of fortified wines, which completely nullifies any benefits the Government has been able to produce by way of assistance through debt reconstruction, farm build-up, farm improvements, and household support. The fact that household support is needed indicates the plight of the industry. One only has to look at the comment of Mr Alan Preece in the *News* of 16 August, wherein he stated, 'Growers will have to turn to hand-outs'. That is quite so and is, in fact, the case right now. Many growers are existing on hand-outs. For the Government to proceed to impose that 28 per cent increase—which will amount to a $500 to $1 000 increase—on many growers whose current average income is probably less than $5 000, will mean that an increase of that magnitude will have devastating effects on the number of bankruptcies, particularly in the irrigated area of the Riverland and other parts of Government irrigation areas in South Australia.

I return to the point that it is absolutely absurd, and clearly indicates the lack of foresight and research that the Government is undertaking, when it implements and proceeds with taxes of this nature. It is being done without the necessary research to determine whether the industry has the ability to pay. We will find that the number of properties on the market in Government irrigation areas throughout South Australia will once again dramatically increase over and above the very high level of people whose properties are on the market at present. These properties are not on the market because the growers want to get out or leave the industry.

They are on the market because the banks have told them that they have no alternative and they have been forced to place their property on the market, which means not only their property but also the family home and everything else that goes with it. The social effect that this 28 per cent increase will have on irrigators in Government irrigation areas is still to be fully felt. However, in light of the present situation and the number receiving assistance from the Government, it is absolutely ludicrous for the Government now to turn around and assist on one hand and then wipe out the growers on the other hand by imposing a 28 per cent increase.

I have said it before in this House: one cannot get blood out of a stone. If the growers had the money and were capable of paying it, they would be more than happy to meet the costs involved. However, the average return on the products produced under irrigation has increased in some cases by between 2 per cent, 3 per cent and 4 per cent a year during the past 10 or 15 years, compared to cost increases of 10 per cent or 12 per cent. Therefore, every year the grower gets in a more difficult position and now, to be confronted with a 28 per cent increase, the number of properties that could be forced on to the market and the

plight of the people generally in the Government irrigation areas will be devastating, to say the least.

Once again, I call on the Government to rescind this 28 per cent increase, to do what has been suggested in the resolution, to instruct the Director of State Development to determine what increase in rates, if any, the industry can sustain, and then, if it is warranted or if the industry can sustain any increase, to impose a new rate for water supplied in Government irrigation areas based on the ability of the industry to pay. I am not suggesting for one moment that there is any grower in the Government irrigation areas looking for a handout. However, if the Government insists on proceeding with this 28 per cent increase in the same way that the Federal Government is proceeding in relation to the excise on rectifying spirit for the production of fortified wines, there will be a double impost, and the effects will be twice as great.

One only has to study the provincial press and the land agents' advertisements, and one only has to discuss this matter with land agents in the Government irrigation areas to know how many properties they have for sale on their books. This clearly indicates the absolutely chaotic financial situation in which growers in the Government irrigation areas find themselves. I call on the Government to rescind that 28 per cent increase in water rates, and to carry out a study as to the ability of the industry to pay the rates and, if there is a capacity of the industry to meet the increase of the present rate that was paid last year for water rates, then that should be applied. However, unless it can be clearly shown by the Government as a result of a detailed study, then no increase should occur for irrigation rates during the present financial year.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMPULSORY UNIONISM

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

That this House condemns the Government for its policy of compulsory unionism under the guise of preference to unionists and requires the Government to withdraw all instructions designed to give effect to their compulsory unionism policy.

I think that every member of this House knows precisely what I am referring to in relation to the compulsory unionism policy of the Government. The Premier and the Deputy Premier particularly protest far too loudly, of course, but they protest loudly that they are really not on about compulsory unionism but preference to unionists. However, their interpretation of preference to unionists means that if one does not join a union, one does not work. They say that there is a choice inherent in their preference to unionists policy.

The Hon. H. Allison: Pure semantics.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Absolutely. The choice is quite stark: members of the public either join a union or they do not get a job, and they call this preference to unionists. Every right thinking and fair minded person in South Australia knows that it is a clear policy of compulsory unionism in respect of all people who have the self respect to want to work. The Government has implemented this policy with some alacrity since it was elected to Government. I think that most honourable members are aware of the directives that have gone out from this Government in relation to its compulsory unionism policy. Let me refresh members' (Government members particularly) memories in relation to some of these directives. In relation to ancillary staff, a directive headed 'Ancillary staff—Preference to unionists', states:

Principals are informed that Cabinet has directed that when recruiting ancillary staff, a non-unionist shall not be engaged for any work to the exclusion of a well conducted unionist if that unionist is adequately experienced in and competent to perform that work. This provision shall apply to all categories of ancillary staff seeking employment in this department. However, before a non-unionist is employed the principal shall obtain in writing from that person an undertaking that an appropriate union will be joined within a reasonable period of time after commencing employment.

It is suggested that a declaration as shown below is appropriate for this purpose. This declaration, to be typed or written on a separate sheet, should be attached to the Application for Employment—Ancillary Staff (Form ED092) that is forwarded to the Ancillary Staffing Clerk of the Personnel Section.

Cabinet also desires that, where possible, present employees who are not unionists be encouraged to join appropriate unions. It is not intended that this instruction should apply to the detriment of a person who produces evidence that he is a conscientious objector to union membership on religious grounds.

This instruction is to take effect immediately. This procedure outlined will apply until such time as the current Application Form for Employment—Ancillary Staff (Form ED092) is amended to include this declaration.

I have a copy of the form that applies to another department that requires this undertaking. This form, used by the Department of Further Education, states:

The Department of Further Education offers considerable scope for job interest and individual career development. You are invited to supply further information about yourself which you feel is relevant to the position you seek and which sets out details of your interests, social activities or community involvement.

Stamped on the document to be filled in is the following undertaking:

Should this application be successful I hereby undertake to join an appropriate union within a reasonable time after my appointment.

What sort of a choice is that? In the first instance, preference is to be given for employment of a person if he or she is already in a union. So, that is the first hurdle that one must jump. If non-unionists seek employment as ancillary staff members of a school, the first barrel is levelled at them if they are not already members of a union: if someone else fronts up who is already a member of a union that person will get the job.

The next barrel of the shotgun pointed squarely at these people concerns the fact that they are asked to sign an application to join and stay in a union and that failure to do so means that they do not get the job. Is the Government seriously suggesting that that is a policy of preference to unionists? The choice is quite clear and quite starkly pointed out in my opening remarks. Any decent free-thinking citizen who desires to work has no show, no choice—he simply will not get a job if he does not undertake to join and stay in a union. That is purely and simply compulsory unionism for all who wish to work, that is, those in the community who are responsible, comprising well in excess of 90 per cent of the community.

Of course, it does not stop there. The matters already referred to are serious in a so-called democracy, in a free society that purportedly subscribes to the United Nations Charter of Human Rights wherein there is a clause relating to freedom of association, that a citizen will be free to choose the organisations and associations that he cares to join; that he will have freedom of religion and be entitled to practise the religion of his choice; and that he will have freedom of association. The Government's action is a direct affront to that principle. But the Government has taken it even further: it has sent out a directive to permanent Heads of Departments in regard to union membership. This is a new innovation. The previous thrust was apparent during the life of the previous Labor Government.

In answer to a question, the Premier gave an untruthful answer when suggesting that this type of thing leads to enhanced industrial relations. That is not true. Directives in this regard were rescinded by the Liberal Government, of which I was a part, and it had the best record of industrial relations, bar none, for the preceding 13 years, which period included the whole compass of the previous Labor Government. To suggest that the Labor Government's directives contributed to industrial harmony is clearly untruthful, although that was suggested in answer to a question asked in this House within the past month. The directive to permanent heads on 13 April 1983 stated:

Information for Unions—

As a result of a Cabinet decision, Heads of Departments are requested to forward lists to the appropriate organisations indicated below which show the name, classification and location of employees or officers who do not have union subscriptions deducted from their wages or salaries.

United Trades and Labor Council—All weekly-paid employees

Public Service Association of South Australia Inc.—(1) *All Public Service Officers and (2) Salaried staff employed by the South Australian Health Commission.

Royal Australian Nursing Federation—All staff employed under the provisions of the Nursing Staff (Government General Hospitals) Award.

It is requested that the information be forwarded at quarterly intervals and that the first lists be forwarded as soon as possible. The above organisations have been advised of this memorandum, and their attention has been drawn to the fact that, as some employees and officers pay their subscriptions privately, departmental records will not show them as union members.

We have not only compulsory unionism under the guise of preference to those applicants for jobs who are in unions but we now have further insidious pressure being brought to bear in relation to the advancement of public servants, nurses, and others within their chosen careers in terms of their having membership of an appropriate union.

Mr Lewis: They bash the kids up at school, too.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know about that. The member for Mallee may have some further information of which I am not aware. What I am saying is that this is a further insidious action in applying pressure to public servants in that if they wish to advance in their chosen careers they had better join a union. It does not say so in so many words, but everyone in this House understands quite clearly the implications of having to provide this information. I understand that a number of permanent heads were quite incensed.

I shall refer in a moment to some other people in the service who are disturbed. We all know that during the life of the Liberal Government quite blatant political resolutions were put forward by the Public Service Association and the Teachers Institute in relation to political matters. There was nothing covert about it: it was done quite openly. For instance, I remember the Public Service Association declaring an anti-uranium stance, that South Australia should have nothing to do with uranium mining. That resolution was passed by the delegates who happened to be attending the meeting at which that resolution was put forward. That led to a great deal of discomfiture: particularly to the then Minister of Mines and Energy. The direct political activities of those two associations led to a great deal of discomfiture and displeasure, although it evoked more than displeasure and distaste. Revulsion was felt by a very considerable number of members of those associations, and a considerable number resigned. I know of people who resigned from those associations because they disagreed not only with the content of the resolutions but also with the direct political activity being encouraged by leaders of those associations. They disagreed with this kind of direct political intervention.

Mr Hamilton: How many—five?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member may be privy to union information that I do not know about, but certainly there were more than five within direct earshot of my Ministerial office. Those people were most disturbed about those events. All of this is occurring in a so-called free society and in a so-called democracy. Pressure is being placed on people to join a union (those already with a job) because of a fear of being denied advancement in their careers if they do not do so. Out has gone this directive and it is completely intolerable. It is an attempt by the Government to force people back into a union, and I am referring to those people who resigned in the past for quite clear conscientious reasons because of their distaste for the activities of their so-called representatives and distaste that their money was being used to fight political campaigns for the passage of resolutions with which they did not agree. Of course, now a significant number of Labor Party members do not agree with those resolutions, but it suited their political motives at the time. Employees are having intolerable pressures put on them. Lists are being supplied, and employees know that their names are being recorded as part of the process of getting those people back into the unions. That is a travesty of any semblance of a free society.

Of course, the reaction to this has been quite marked. Various spurious arguments were advanced by the Premier, and particularly by the Deputy Premier, when questioned on this matter of the membership of unions. The fact that closed shops exist in this State and in Australia does not validate the fact that they exist. In fact, democracy is denied in the name of peace (it is the Neville Chamberlain argument: peace at any price—give away your freedom for peace). To my astonishment this happened quite recently in the building industry. An agreement was reached that no subcontractors or anyone else could be allowed on a construction site in metropolitan Adelaide unless they joined the appropriate union. That has been ratified by the employer group; I find that appalling.

Mr Lewis: Sick!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is sick in a free society, but so effective are the guerilla warfare tactics of unscrupulous unions to see that the community and the individuals within the community bend to their will that employer groups cave in under the intense economic pressure put upon them in these difficult financial times. I find that a cause for very great concern in a so-called democracy. I find it also of very great concern that this Neville Chamberlain doctrine of peace at any price, or peace to stay afloat, is being acknowledged and acceded to.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Effectively, it is the end of democracy. We have seen Britain go through the cycle. Fortunately, I believe the wheel has turned in Britain to a certain extent. However, succeeding Labour Governments were incapable of governing in a democracy without the concurrence of the bosses of the union movement; it is as simple as that. I believe it has got to that in South Australia. The Labor Government in South Australia is incapable of governing without the concurrence of the bosses of unions in this State, and I find it intolerable that in a so-called free society people no longer have freedom of choice as to whether or not they will join an association.

If I may widen these remarks for a moment, not only is it happening in the area of government, but I have had numerous phone calls from employers and others where the unions are active, particularly in this climate of high unemployment where unions are losing members, and intolerable pressures are being brought to bear on those employers when their backs are to the economic wall, when they really have to sink or swim. Pressure is being put upon them for closed shop agreements, intolerable pressures, where their supplies are being cut if they do not come to heel in relation to a

closed shop agreement. There is no way a Government should be embarking on that course, in my view, in a so-called free society.

When the Liberal Party is again successful at the polls in this State, which will be whenever the Government wishes to front the electorate of South Australia with its record of non performance, non decision making, and when the day of accounting comes for their enormously long list of broken promises, one of the first actions of a Liberal Government will be to rescind all of these instructions which are such an affront to any decent South Australian citizen who has any sense of fair play.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

KINGSTON LIGNITE DEPOSIT

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I move:

That this House opposes the mining of the Kingston lignite deposit until and unless:

(a) the inadequacies and inaccuracies of the environmental impact statement are rectified; and

(b) an indenture Bill (which defines adequate provisions for compensation to the Kingston community, the Lacepede District Council and private landholders who may be affected by the development) is passed by this Parliament.

That is simple enough and straightforward. In commencing my remarks today about this matter I want to reassure members of this place that there is overwhelming evidence as to why each of them should, in all conscience, support this proposition. There are two outstanding professional responses to the environmental impact statement, one of which was prepared by a group of people acting as consultants to the District Council of Lacepede who reviewed that environmental impact statement at the expense and, naturally, the request of the district council. Those people include the Urban and Environmental Planning Group (Review Co-ordinators). The infra-structure of the project as outlined in the e.i.s., the economic and social impact assessment, was done by Mr Paul J. Drechsler, Bachelor of Arts (Geography and Biology) from Flinders University who is a planning consultant. He was assisted by Mr Timothy Warwick, who has a Bachelor of Arts in Planning from the South Australian Institute of Technology. The geotechnical and hydrogeological assessment for the Lacepede District Council was made by Coffey and Partners Pty Ltd, and the particular professionals from that company were Charles F.R. Fitzhardinge, who holds a Bachelor of Science degree from Sydney University, and a Bachelor of Civil Engineering degree from Sydney University, and who is a geotechnical engineer. He was assisted by Michael O. Hillman, Bachelor of Engineering and Master of Engineering (Science), both degrees from the University of Western Australia, and is a groundwater engineer. The ecological impact assessment of the e.i.s. was made by Megan Lewis, who has an honours Science degree from the University of Adelaide and also a Master of Environmental Studies degree from the University of Adelaide.

The other report made in response to the e.i.s. was compiled by the so-called 'Kingston U.F. & S. Watchdog Committee', the members of which were Messrs M.G. McLaren, K. McBride, P.S. Rasheed, J.D. Ratcliff and P.J. England. Among their qualifications is a Bachelor of Agricultural Science degree. For instance, Peter England, who wrote the report for the committee, has not only a Bachelor of Agricultural Science, as does another member of the committee, but also a Diploma of Agricultural Economics and a Master of Economics, both from the University of New England. He is a member of the Australian Institute of Agricultural Scientists.

Those two reports state what I have simply summarised in this motion. They have been very professionally prepared, and no engineer or other well qualified person who has seen those reports has found any grounds upon which to differ from the conclusions that those professional people have come to about the inaccuracies and inadequacies of the e.i.s.

It is always regrettable that an e.i.s. about such a project is sometimes used as a selling document for the project rather than an objective professional assessment of the proposal. In this instance it transgresses into the unprofessional area of bias by attempting to sell the proposal to mine the lignite. I will quote briefly from the report prepared for the District Council of Lacepede. The first paragraph of the conclusions and recommendations states:

The respondent—

the groups of professionals on behalf of the district council—

believes that the e.i.s. and the associated background papers do not form a suitable basis on which to make an adequate and meaningful assessment of the impact of the proposed development. This is due to the number of contradictions, omissions and inconclusive and unsupported statements and assumptions found in the e.i.s.

I must say that is exactly how it struck me when I first read it. I had with me my highlighting pen, and I had marks on every page after I checked the references where I found unsupported, unprofessional and unscientific statements being made throughout the e.i.s. The conclusions also stated:

It is acknowledged by the respondent that it is inevitable that some deleterious impacts will be associated with the proposed development. These, of course, have to be balanced against the measures the proponent—

the mining company—

intends to take to overcome these problems and the desirable impacts that are attributable to the development. Regrettably the e.i.s. does not contain sufficient details on the advantages to the local community of the development and the measures to be undertaken by the proponent to enable this assessment to be made.

A further point that was made, among a large number of other points which I believe I must check, is as follows:

A firm commitment should be made by the proponent and the State Government as to the type and amount of assistance that will be afforded to the respondent—

the district council and the rest of the community—

in providing the infra-structure, services and facilities required as a result of the project before formal approval is given.

This is not covered in the e.i.s.: it relates to the second part of the proposition I have put to the House today. Surely, it is unfair in the interests of that community and the district council that they will be put to substantial expense in the form of not just a few hundred thousand dollars or a couple of million dollars, but millions of dollars. At present the e.i.s. does not countenance where that money will come from, so the District Council will have to provide this infra-structure to support the rapid expansion of the population in Kingston which will break the existing ratepayers unless the terms by which that expense will be met are to be written into an indenture Bill to be put through this Parliament. It is just not fair to adopt the present e.i.s and allow the project even to go on ice before proceeding for some time, unless and until those terms for reimbursement are determined.

Looking at the other factors which only in summary support the proposition which I commend to the House, I point out that the e.i.s. has failed to recognise in any way, shape or form the future value of groundwater resources in that region as regards the enormous number of diverse applications to which it could be put. What is more, there are serious errors in modelling the dewatering for the mine

if it is to go ahead and the associated impact on the underground water resources.

Furthermore, the consequence of these errors in the modelling seriously underestimates, in my judgment and in the judgment of professionals who have also looked at the proposal, the extent of the groundwater draw-down, not only vertically but horizontally as it extends through the aquifer away from the mine site. In addition, no account is taken at all of the contamination of the Dilwyn aquifer. That is an artesian aquifer that might result from the leakage of brackish water from the above coal aquifers or from the possibility of the intrusion of seawater. Nowhere is that question addressed. Further, the e.i.s. under-estimates the effect that the draw-down on the groundwater reserves would have on agricultural productivity and cost.

Additionally, the e.i.s. fails to assess realistically the economic impact of the groundwater draw-down both in the immediate context of existing industry and any future development of industry. It is also important to recognise that in no event should mining be allowed to proceed without those compensation assessment procedures being first determined, established and incorporated in the indenture Bill, otherwise South Australia and its taxpayers will be put to enormous expense trying to resolve matters that would end up in court and drag on for years and years.

If we do not do that in the fashion I have indicated in the motion, we will find that landholders are bludgeoned into accepting the terms of settlement and compensation offered to them by the mining company by virtue of the certain knowledge, first, that they will not have a farm and, secondly, they will not be able to sell their farm to anyone else and get the capital to go elsewhere and earn their living. So, they will have to accept what is offered or bleed to death.

I now want to reinforce the remark and the assessment I made by referring to the statement by the watchdog committee about the errors in the model as they relate to the underground water draw-down model. To illustrate these inadequacies that are to be found in the e.i.s., I point out that it is simply not possible to assess fully the underground water draw-down model, as the details of its construction as a mathematical model are not presented in the e.i.s. That is a clear illustration of what I have referred to as the inadequacies of the e.i.s. I urge the House to support the motion and, as I wish to illustrate further the necessity for its adoption, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

FINGER POINT SEWAGE DISPOSAL

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I move:

That this House views with great concern the threat to the health and well-being of residents of Port MacDonnell and the threat to the abalone, crayfishing and tourist industries, and seeks immediate reinstatement of the Finger Point sewage disposal scheme to the current public works programme as requested by South-East residents and local government bodies, and as previously committed by the Liberal Government, for completion in 1986.

With the massive support of local councils in the South-East, especially the Mount Gambier City Council, the Mount Gambier District Council, the Port MacDonnell District Council, and other very interested and involved local councils, as well as with the support of the South-East Professional Fishermen's Association, the South-East Regional Association, the South-East Recreational Fishermen's Association, and all the electors and ratepayers of the South-East, I rise once again to raise the matter of the Finger Point effluent disposal scheme.

I am well aware that the Premier has highlighted a number of requests made to him for capital works. He has tended to decry such requests on the ground that his Government is well and truly over-committed. He has, on a number of occasions, attempted to lay the blame for such over-commitment at the doorstep of the former Liberal Government. I simply remind the general public and members of this House that we have only to look at the estimated cost in pre-election terms (estimated by the Labor Party in its pre-election commitment) of the education policy initiatives at around $9 million and the actual cost of such initiatives at about $22 million to $23 million. One only has to look at the budget for the Department for Community Welfare for 1982-83 with an allocation of just over $50 million and a reported overrun in the Auditor-General's Report of some $13.7 million to realise that the faults, far from being those of the former Liberal Government, are as a result of a complete lack of control and mismanagement on the part of the present Labor Government. To suggest that we can be held responsible for the overrun of almost $14 million in one relatively small department is absolutely ridiculous.

In referring to only two departments in which there have been either massive overruns or under-statements of costs of Labor Party initiatives, I have absolutely no qualms about raising the matter again on behalf of the people in the South-East, in particular those within the District of Mount Gambier. Furthermore, I was delighted that, on two occasions recently, the Leader of the Opposition has reaffirmed his support for the Finger Point effluent disposal scheme and has reminded the House that such a scheme remains top priority for the Liberal Party and that, upon return to Government after the next election, we will again reinstate the scheme and give it the pride of place that it really deserves. I also remind the House that the $200 000 spent by the former Liberal Government in 1981-82 in planning and design for the project was followed by a $500 000 commitment for 1982-83. The commitment was the second financial commitment towards a completion date of 1986, but that $500 000 commitment was taken away by the present Government and spent elsewhere.

I do not know whether the Government is talking with tongue in cheek when it allows the Minister of Agriculture and others to say that the scheme is not really as important as the Liberal Party has made it out to be. One only has to look at the writings of international people of repute, such as Thor Heyerdahl (the explorer who drifted from North Africa across to America on a straw raft—the *Ra*), who, in a book he wrote after that voyage, commented that the oceans of the world were suffering from massive pollution. He pointed out that, even in the middle of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, he had found substantial areas of pollution from oil and other refuse dumped by passing ocean vessels or material emanating from coastal cities. Such material was drifting across the surface of the world's great oceans and causing a massive problem. He said that it was already beyond the danger situation and that we are facing a national catastrophe.

Only recently a member of the Labor Party connected with the Public Works Standing Committee which investigated the Finger Point sewage scheme commented by way of interjection when I last raised the subject that the matter was not really as important as I was trying to make it out to be. That is ridiculous. The situation of any city of the size of Mount Gambier, pouring out to sea raw and untreated effluent from a population of some 25 000 to 30 000 plus industries (which would raise the effluent to the equivalent of a city of 100 000 to 150 000), must be considered not only a national disgrace but also a world disgrace. For the honourable member to have interjected that other cities in Tasmania, Victoria, and New South Wales were or are

discharging effluent in a like manner is certainly no consolation to world environmentalists who regard far smaller problems than this to be very critical. To say that several wrongs are making the Mount Gambier sewage discharge problem into a right is completely ludicrous. Once again, I have reintroduced the topic. I have more substantial points to make, but, in view of the swift passage of time this afternoon, 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 14 September. Page 847.)

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): The *Hansard* record on page 847 of 14 September 1983 will show that on that occasion I sought permission of the House to conclude my remarks at a later date. I pick up the debate embracing my colleague's motion for the proposal for a Select Committee into local government. Members will recall that on 14 September I addressed the House about a situation principally involving the Minister of Local Government and his mishandling of a matter involving funding to two councils following the annexation of lands from the Meadows District Council area to those respective councils at Mount Barker and Strathalbyn. Whilst the debate was before the House, the Minister of Local Government, for reasons best known to himself, chose to be absent from the Chamber for the greater part of it. However, at or near the conclusion of my remarks, he did appear and showed a degree of contempt both to the subject and to the members present, and by his attitude it was understood from this side of the House that he had no intention of responding to the motion of the member for Light.

Since then, I have learned from the Government Whip that the Minister of Local Government still is not prepared to respond to remarks made about the issue from this side of the House but, again for reasons best known to himself, he has declined to enter this debate until 19 October. I do not know what is so magic about 19 October, or the reasons for the gross delay in a response from the Government in this instance, but it does not alter the fact that (for whatever reasons) the Minister of Local Government has breached a Ministerial undertaking, embarrassed certain recipient councils (those two councils that I mentioned in particular), and, indeed, the members of this House in relation to his breaching of the undertaking. He has put officers in the Department of Local Government to an enormous amount of work and worry and, as revealed by the Minister himself, among other things in the department, his own Director of Local Government has withdrawn from his position as Chairman of the South Australian Grants Commission—whether by resignation or by request I am not quite sure. Certainly, there has been a lot of distress, disturbance and now delay in the Minister's handling of this matter.

I indicated to the House when I spoke previously on this subject that, whilst it is of some concern to us all that a Ministerial undertaking has been breached, the secondary effect of this issue, I believe, will have some undesirable impact on councils which may have been at this time or may be in future considering amalgamation or at least severance and receding and annexation of part or parts of councils. In those circumstances, a council's gain is another council's loss, and a recipient council of additional ratable area and responsibilities needs certain assurances from the Department of Local Government, in particular from the Minister representing the Government of the day, that appropriate funding arrangements are made in order to uphold and fund the new responsibilities taken on board.

Whilst we have a Minister whom we cannot trust (and that is clearly the situation in this case, as has been demonstrated), councils throughout South Australia will be fearful and indeed, I suggest, reluctant to take his word in relation to undertakings in the future. In that respect, I think that it would be in the interests of us all, as individual Parliamentary representatives, and in the interests of this institution generally if the Minister were to hasten to tidy up this grossly untidy affair, meet by some funding means or another the obligation to the councils which received the specific undertakings, and explain to this House the unfortunate albeit clumsy circumstances that led to the present situation.

We all make mistakes, and quite clearly the Minister has made a mistake in this instance. I think that there are several courses of action that a Government or a Premier may take when Ministers bungle the administration of their departments in the way that the Minister of Local Government has bungled his affairs on this occasion. However, the quicker the matter is clarified and tidied up, I repeat, the better it is for us all. One or two members on this side of the House have interjected and I think, despite Standing Orders, appropriately interjected, with the expressed desire that he be sacked. I accept that those calls by my colleagues to have the Minister of Local Government in South Australia sacked are undoubtedly a reflection of views expressed in their respective communities. From local government level within several electorates that I know of, there is a significant and alarming degree of concern about the way in which the Minister of Local Government is handling his portfolio. It is on that basis that I would expect, if the subject were canvassed and at all understood by local government authorities out in the big paddock, that the call would come from them to sack him as indeed the call has come several times today and previously from my colleagues in this place. My colleague the member for Mallee is a State representative in a very large Assembly District and within that area he has a significant number of local council bodies.

Mr Lewis: Yes—21.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: I am aware that the local member is in close touch with the 21 councils that exist in the District of Mallee, the elected members and their respective staff members from reports that we have had from the Mallee District. Accordingly, I accept that what he says is probably a reflection of the views he has heard about the

performance (or lack of performance) of the Minister of Local Government.

I am not seeking to exploit the situation or to in any way reflect on the personality of the Minister. He may well be a highly respected citizen and elected member of his district. I have no grounds on which to argue against that. However, in his capacity as a member of the Cabinet and as the Minister in charge of local government affairs in South Australia he is a disaster. While the Minister of Local Government holds that position in today's Cabinet he will continue to be an embarrassment to his Government colleagues, to members on this side of the House and, indeed, to this Parliamentary institution. He is not capable of carrying out his duties in that high office.

I hope that on 19 October, or whenever it is that he responds to this matter, he will come forward and admit where he has gone wrong. It is to be hoped that he will indeed mend the situation that is currently causing disarray, that he will give this House an undertaking that he has met his obligations to the two recipient councils to which I have referred in regard to finances and in every other sense following their acceptance of land annexed from the Meadows District Council, and that he will clarify and clean up the matter once and for all.

It is my desire and that of my colleagues on this side of the House that the member for Light's motion receive the support it deserves. It is that a Select Committee be established in this place to investigate and identify and report to this Parliament on the events that took place in relation to this debacle. It remains to be seen whether or not the Minister fronts up to the situation and relays to this House on 19 October the facts of the matter, and whether or not he gives this House an undertaking that the money has been paid or will be paid to the councils involved. The situation has been around long enough, and I hope that the good sense of this institution prevails in supporting the member for Light's motion.

Mr TRAINER secured the adjournment of the debate.

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 14 September. Page 849.)

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): I want to make some further remarks about this matter of the Opposition's condemnation of the Government for not retaining the north-south corridor that was originally part of the old 1968-69 Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study (better known as the MATS Plan). For a decade and a half, a line on the map has haunted the south-western suburbs. That spirit has now been exorcised, but for so long that abstract line on the map has created disruption to the communities which it traversed.

It is very easy for highways engineers to lay down their abstract plans. To me their approach is somewhat reminiscent of the planning of military chiefs in war time, particularly those who moved massive armies in the First World War. I have seen a very colourful description of that approach whereby a writer described, as he called it, the 'irresistible pencil of the Chief of Staff'; this irresistible pencil, which traversed the map with no problems, did not halt for barbed wire, it was not slowed down by mud, and it took no account of trenches or of corpses as they piled up. It is also reminiscent of what A.J.P. Taylor in his *History of the First World War* called 'cigar butt strategy', whereby at the meeting of Chiefs of Staff someone would point at the map with his cigar butt and say, 'We will go in there.'

That approach does not give sufficient cognisance of the impact on the people whose lives are affected by these plans. The plans live on long after the basis upon which they were formulated has been changed, if insufficient flexibility is not brought to bear. I will refer again to that subject shortly. The military analogy seems to be somewhat appropriate in this case. It is not that I have a particular bent for military things, but it seems appropriate, because the MATS Plan, which has been around for such a long time since its formulation, affecting so many decisions that have been taken since then, reminds me of the Schlieffen plan of the Germans during the First World War. If the member for Hartley can just control his mirth, I will point out that that predetermined the way in which so many events happened. Colonel Schlieffen had been dead for the best part of a decade when August 1914 arrived but, in effect, his dead hand was still on the trigger because he had formulated the way things would have to go, and all the plans were then structured around that one central plan. It was not surprising that highways engineers should have been quite enthusiastic in the 1960s to formulate a plan such as the MATS Plan. It was not surprising—

Mr Baker: Did you ask the Parliamentary Library to dig out this relevant information?

Mr TRAINER: I take that as a most serious reflection on my capabilities. I cannot understand why the member for Mitcham should find it surprising that a former history teacher should refer to one or two historical analogies.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr TRAINER: He may have difficulty in understanding many things. I shall refer to the honourable member's district and to things that did or did not happen with freeways in his area if I have time to do so; otherwise I will refer to that matter when making a few further remarks on 19 October. As I was saying before I was so rudely interrupted by the member for Mitcham—

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that we can return from general discussion to something remotely like that provided for in Standing Orders. The member for Ascot Park.

Mr TRAINER: Thank you, Mr Speaker, I very much appreciate your protection in this regard. It is not surprising that highways engineers should have had an enthusiasm for practising their art. It is not surprising that in the 1960s they enthusiastically embraced the concept of applying freeways throughout the breadth and depth of Adelaide. It is not surprising that highways engineers since then have naturally wanted to perpetuate that concept. Social engineers look at such matters slightly differently, because they give as much importance to the impact of such proposals on people as they give to the implementation of those sorts of grand plans, particularly when the justification for those plans has long since faded into the distance. I want to refer to an article by Peter Ward published in the *Sunday Mail* on 2 March 1980, entitled 'More gravel rash from freeway plan'. The Liberals have had their fingers burnt more than once with their enthusiasm for freeways in other people's backyards. The article states:

Steele Hall lives to regret it. Murray Hill's fingers are still feeling burned by it—

if time permits I will make some remarks about that in a moment—

Some of the State's top traffic engineers are still sour about it. And Transport Minister Michael Wilson—who wasn't there at the time—knows enough about it to be very careful.

Remember, this was written in 1980, a few months after the former Liberal Government came to power. The article continues:

Nevertheless the Tonkin Government and its officers are taking a hard look at that old perennial, the north-south freeway. It is one of the bits of the MATS Plan which some will remember was one of the bits of the 1962 Metropolitan Adelaide Planning Report—

which again brings to mind the analogies I made of plans living on long after the original justification for their being formulated has vanished—

In its original form it starts near Salisbury, zips down through Dudley Park, Devon Park, Renown Park, Brompton, Hindmarsh and Thebarton, and then slices through Ashford Park, Mile End South, Kurralta Park, Edwardstown—

that is an area that particularly concerns me—

and Clovelly Park—or thereabouts. Then it dives over the hills and down into Noarlunga, where it stops around about the Colonnades Shopping Centre. That was its original form. That is what, I am told, is being considered again—

because the highways engineers are still determined that their dream will come to fruition and naturally, at the end of the 10-year moratorium in 1980, they brought a certain amount of pressure to bear on the then Minister of Transport. The article continues:

A senior traffic engineer in the Highways Department is preparing a 'discussion paper' to put before the public to open the whole debate again. Very good—

says Peter Ward—

just like the public participation we had with the NEAPTR Plan. And the trouble with the current covert operation is, I am told, simply this: once again the narrowest range of options is being considered to make sure public participation results in a predictable decision.

You can't blame Michael Wilson for this—yet. After all, he has to plan for the future and has to rely on the advice of his professionals. His staff say that, of course, no decision has been taken at any point, and that a range of options is being considered.

The Highways Commissioner, Keith Johinke, on the other hand, says that final decisions, as is proper, are taken by the Ministry. Yes, a north-south 'transportation facility' is being considered but the unknowns are 'money and community objectives'.

'It's not inconceivable that the north-south facility will be a road containing a railway or bus lanes—it's too early to say anything,' he adds. And that's where the matter really rests. Well, almost. Because in the meantime the 'discussion paper' is being written, houses on the old route have been bought and quite a number bulldozed.

And this is the part which caught my eye:

And the engineer charged with producing the paper has been talking about how public pressure for the 'facility' in, say, Noarlunga can be organised so that public pressure against it in, say, Edwardstown, is nullified.

That is quite strange. Indeed, I found it very interesting when I located that item, bearing in mind some of the statements that have come from the southern metropolitan region Chairman, who is the Mayor of Meadows. Peter Ward then goes on to ask the question:

How many people are involved? One estimate has it that 700 householders in Edwardstown are affected.

Apparently 700 householders are not considered at all by the member for Davenport, who would like to see them just pushed aside by the irresistible pencil of the north-south corridor. The article continues:

Certainly, many millions of dollars have already been spent by the Highways Department buying up houses on old MATS Plan routes as was the Labor Government's policy. And the fact is that, despite what the Dunstan Government said, the MATS Plan in its entirety was not scrapped but merely put under wraps.

This bears on what I said a moment ago regarding the dedication of certain people towards their dreams:

According to social scientists who have been watching these manoeuvres, the real problem is that the State traffic engineers who advised the MATS Plan consultants are still there and have 'a deeply emotional commitment to MATS and its philosophies'.

Their job is building roads—the bigger the better the challenge—and they really wish the energy crisis, petrol prices, small cars, zero population growth, and changing patterns of urban living would stop making so many problems. It was much better in the days when you could predict unlimited expansion in road use. At the moment—

and this is in 1980—

the Highways Department believes that by 1996 Adelaide's population will be about 1.12 million and 'a saturation level of 500 cars per 100 persons' will be reached by then. Those figures are based on assumptions put out in 1975 by the Premier's Economic Intelligence Unit and in fact over-score by 23 000 the 'most likely' population projection for 1996 made in those relatively booming days. Further, the figures were for the 'Adelaide Statistical Division (including Monarto)'. Remember Monarto?

The member for Davenport has not forgotten Monarto: he mentioned it the other day. However, the same sort of figures that led to the error of Monarto have led to the lack of adequate justification for perpetrating the north-south corridor. The article continues:

To defend their position, the engineers point to an increase in the use of cars and a decrease in the use of public transport greater than the figures predicted by the MATS Plan. But, as the social scientists say, you can do anything with figures if you want to justify your existence.

Peter Ward goes on to say that he is not arguing against more roads or even freeways, but he says:

But what I'd like to see is a real open consideration of options such as widening or building over or making an expressway of South Road, and other existing major transport routes, that won't have a detrimental effect on the metropolitan area. The old MATS Plan north-south corridor-facility-freeway-whatever certainly will have a detrimental effect.

But at the moment, despite all the proclamations of innocence I've heard out at the Highways Department and at the Minister's Department, I reckon they're dangerously close to locking themselves into a corner again.

The idea was eventually scrapped. The Labor Government had the guts to bite the bullet and abolish that particular section of the corridor, something that the previous Government came so close to doing but just could not do, because the Liberals seemed to have a little bit of excessive enthusiasm for freeways in other people's electorates—in working class electorates. Last week I related to members the story of what happened in the case of the bus tour that the Mitcham City Council ran in 1969, and how the Town Clerk pointed out all those areas that would be destroyed by the Hills Freeway. At that time, the electorates that would have been affected were the old electorate of Mitcham (which was held by the then Attorney-General, Mr Millhouse), the electorate of Burnside (which was held by Joyce Steele) and, in addition, it would have severely affected the Unley electorate which at that time they hoped to win. That section was quickly dropped from the MATS Plan, but they left those areas which affected Labor Party electorates.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: It didn't go through the old Burnside electorate.

Mr TRAINER: It affected it; it does not have to go through an electorate to affect it. Last week, I mentioned that the then Minister of Transport had had his fingers burnt by trying too enthusiastically to push forward the barrow of the MATS Plan, and at that time the member for Mallee seemed to cast some doubt on some figures that I was reciting from memory. I stressed that at the time I was working entirely from memory. Since then I have located the appropriate press clippings in the Parliamentary Library. He also challenged me on a couple of other things, but I will not bother about that. The *Sunday Mail* on 23 May 1970 carried this heading 'Minister Pushes MATS in quiz' and stated:

No-one can say the State Transport Minister, Mr Hill, is not enthusiastic about the MATS Plan and freeways. And his conviction about the merits of the Government scheme made him buy 500 copies of the *Sunday Mail* with the 'Adelaide 2000' questionnaire coupons. He gave out 400 of them to friends for entry in the questionnaire coupons.

The answers and comments written on those coupons declared support for the freeways and the MATS Plan.

The *Sunday Mail* had a fine response to its invitation to readers to say how Adelaide should be developed in the years until 2000.

In preparing a statistical analysis of the entries, for use at the Adelaide 2000 seminar at Adelaide University this weekend, the *Sunday Mail* sorters noticed that a large number of entries were in similarly addressed envelopes in the same writing—and hand delivered.

Mr BAKER: You said this before. I rise on a point of order.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr BAKER: We have heard the same statements from the member on a previous occasion; they are unaltered from what was said previously, and it is the same speech.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The honourable member for Ascot Park.

Mr TRAINER: In response to that challenge—

The SPEAKER: Order! I asked the honourable member not to respond to a point of order that has been over-ruled. The honourable member for Ascot Park.

Mr TRAINER: Thank you, Sir. The *Sunday Mail* article continues:

Details of the entrants suburbs, number of children, and other circumstances were different, but all said 'Yes' to the question: 'Do you want to see freeways in Adelaide and suburbs?' And in the section for comments on 'What I would like to see most in Adelaide 2000' all proclaimed the advantages of the MATS Plan.

Previously received entries, including 400 that came in on the first day, showed that 62 per cent were against freeways and 38 per cent were in favor. The *Sunday Mail* felt that the new trend in the entries could be stretching coincidence a little too far, and could unbalance the results to be offered to the seminar.

A check with the circulation department of the *Sunday Mail* showed that a block order of 500 copies of the relevant issue had been made by a sub-agent at Hyde Park.

Mr Speaker, you pointed out to me that I cannot respond to a point of order that has been disallowed, but I stress that the reason why I am quoting at this stage from this clipping is that last week, earlier in the debate, a member by way of interjection cast aspersions on my memory in this regard. The article continues:

Acting on other information, the *Sunday Mail* asked Mr Hill about the coupons, and he admitted that he had bought the papers. Mr Hill said: 'When I first saw the survey announced in the *Sunday Mail*, I thought that there would be many thousands of replies to the questions contained in it. A number of people approached me and said they were concerned that both sides of the story should be put, and they asked me whether they could help by distributing the questionnaire to their friends. I said I thought they could be of assistance, and to help them I ordered 500 copies of the *Sunday Mail*, which I obtained from my local shopkeeper.

I gave out about 400 of these, and I do not know how many have been returned. I am surprised to learn now that only about 1 500 replies in all have been received, and I am sorry if in any way my friends' replies have unbalanced the survey because of the action I took . . .

Actually, I expected many thousands of replies to be sent in, and this I thought had been confirmed by a report that appeared in the *Sunday Mail* last week which said that thousands of Adelaide 2000 questionnaire entries are now being processed by computer.

In any case, I intend to follow up as closely as I can the discussions taking place this weekend under the auspices of the Town and Country Planning Association.'

The quotation continues:

The *Sunday Mail* said last weekend that thousands of entries were being processed. This estimate was arrived at when the sorters had a pile of questionnaires which had not been counted, and on an estimate of the entries still coming in. Adelaide 2 000 seminar organisers believe they now have a true sampling of public opinion. Before full statistical analysis was undertaken, they rejected hundreds of bogus and suspicious entries.

The Town and Country Planning Association was somewhat incensed at the actions of the Minister in that regard. The *Advertiser* of 25 May carried a heading 'Call on Hill to resign' and the article, referring to the Association's criticism of the Minister for lowering the dignity of his position, states:

This meeting condemns the reported action of the Minister of Local Government in using his office in an attempt to abort the outcome of the questionnaire on Adelaide 2 000 and considers that this connivance and contrivance by a Minister of the Crown lowered the dignity of the position, and calls for his resignation forthwith.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: That was 14 years ago. What has that got to do with the motion?

Mr TRAINER: It shows that the Liberals do not understand what it means for those people who were to be the freeway fodder for their grand designs, in the same way that a former shadow Minister of Transport (who was quoted in the *News* of 2 July 1979) did not seem to have any empathy or sympathy for the people affected by such grandiose plans. A delightful article by Tony Baker on that matter was headed, 'Energy Crisis? Rubbish, says Ted Chapman, who wants . . . more cars, and bigger roads'. It refers to his advocating more motorway or freeway constructions.

That last central section of the MATS plan—the north-south corridor—was all but scrubbed last year when the then Minister of Transport (the member for Torrens) scrapped the eight-lane super highway plan and substituted in its place a four-lane plan. However, on 24 February 1982, he said, 'There is no certainty that the freeway will be built.' That is the sad part. There is no certainty that any freeway will ever be built. Yet, that phantom is something the Liberals want to continue in existence even though the Minister himself in 1981 stated that a north-south freeway for the city was unlikely.

I have a great deal to say on this matter and I have only scratched the surface. The motion particularly concerns me, as my electorate will be one that will be chopped in half, disrupted, hacked around and shattered by any reinstatement of the north-south corridor. I understand that some people on the other side wish to make remarks on other matters, and therefore I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

NARCOTIC AND PSYCHOTROPIC DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Australian Royal Commission of Inquiry into Drugs, of which the Honourable Mr Justice Williams was Commissioner, recommended in its 1980 reports to the Governments of the Commonwealth, Victoria, Queensland, Western Australia and Tasmania, that greater attention should be given by Governments to the 'money aspect of illegal drug activities'. That Royal Commission made recommendations in respect of both the powers of investigators and the powers of courts.

The Royal Commission of Inquiry into Drug Trafficking, of which the Hon. Mr Justice Stewart was Commissioner, this year affirmed the recommendations by the Williams Commission that the courts should have power to order the confiscation of the assets of convicted drug offenders. During 1982 the Liberal Government was developing legislation to focus on the proceeds of criminal drug activities, and leading up to the November 1982 State election it gave a positive commitment that it would introduce legislation to empower the courts to confiscate the assets of drug offenders. Subsequent to the election the Leader of the Opposition, Mr John Olsen, indicated that, if the Labor Government did not introduce that sort of legislation in the first session of this Parliament, then the Liberal Party would do so.

The Bill, which was introduced by the Hon. K.T. Griffin, M.L.C. (the shadow Attorney-General in another place), implements both the election commitment and the post-election public commitment to give wider powers to the courts in respect of drug offences. The Williams Royal Commission, in concluding that because of the scale of the illegal drug problem it is essential 'that the money aspect of drugs and crime receive greater attention', saw the justification for this conclusion in the following considerations:

1. Following the movement of money towards and away from the illegal transaction assists in appreciating the ramifications of the activities of a particular organised group. It may lead to the identification and ultimately the conviction of those who otherwise remain aloof from the criminal activity but who have a major impact on it—those whose effects on the illegal drug trade far outweigh their numbers—the financiers and organisers. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

2. It is money and the further accumulation of money, resources and assets which money permits, which underpins the groups of criminals who are engaged in this illegal importation, production and trafficking of drugs. Thus:

- money renders the group less vulnerable to successful law enforcement action. The loss of a shipment is not fatal to a group which has accumulated sufficient money and assets to finance the acquisition of a replacement shipment and arrange for its illegal importation, continuing its activities notwithstanding the particular loss of the operating funds and expected profit;
- money finances methods which make the task of law enforcement most difficult. A shipment of drugs may be split among a number of couriers to minimise the effect of one being caught. A person whose background is unlikely to attract attention from the authorities can be offered sufficient to induce him to act as a courier. The extra cost of trans-shipping goods can be borne so that they enter Australia from a place not normally associated with drugs.

3. Money facilitates the corruption of authority—not only in Australia but also overseas—and so facilitates the illegal activity.

4. Money gives access to expertise and to equipment to facilitate the illegal activity. Thus the evidence received by the Commission establishes that those engaged, particularly the upper levels, in illegal drug production, importation and trafficking may have recourse to the best legal and accounting advice. Those giving the advice are not necessarily aware of the illegal activity. They may believe they are advising legitimate businessmen, such is the aura that access to large sums of money creates and the influence it commands. Sophisticated equipment may be acquired, for example to permit law enforcement radio communications to be intercepted and overheard.

In addition, that Royal Commission also points out that those involved in the illegal drug trade do not restrict their criminal activities to drugs. It states:

The evidence received by the Commission shows that it is more than likely that profits from criminal activities such as illegal betting and gambling finance drug trafficking or the illegal importation or production of drugs. It is also more than likely that profits from drug trafficking later finance other criminal activities such as prostitution and pornography. Funds generated from any or all of these criminal activities may be invested in business enterprises of varying degrees of legitimacy.

Examples given by the Williams Royal Commission suggest as much as $16 million leaves Australia each year to buy heroin to supply Australian addicts and that 'when the proceeds of that supply and their leaving Australia to be laundered are taken into account the figure could be as high as $100 million'. And the profits, too, are enormous. Recent reports of marihuana crop discoveries in South Australia, running into multi-million dollar values, reinforce the assertion that the proceeds are enormous. Add to this the fact that a number of persons involved in the drug trade in South Australia have, over the past three or four years, been apprehended and convicted (the most recent being Mr Conley for illegal heroin trafficking, bringing the stiffest penalty imposed by the courts in South Australia for this offence—15 years imprisonment) and it can be seen that South Australia is not untouched by the activities of illegal drug traffickers.

Support by recent Royal Commissioners for the establishment of a Crimes Commission with wide powers, and wider powers for enforcement agencies highlights the wide community concern about the problem. It is against this background, therefore, that this Bill is introduced into the Parliament to accelerate action of those matters affecting illegal drug trafficking. The scheme of the Bill is to provide (in clause 4) for a court to be empowered to make a sequestration order against the property of any person who has been charged with an offence against the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act where the court is satisfied that there is 'reasonable cause to believe that, if the person charged is convicted of the offence, certain money or real or personal property of the person charged or of a related person or body would become liable for forfeiture to the Crown under this Act'.

A sequestration order thus freezes the assets of the person charged or a related person, gives the court management powers over those assets and, when the person is convicted, allows the court to order forfeiture of those assets to the Crown. Under the proposals in the Bill, the onus lies upon the convicted person to prove that the money or real or personal property is not liable to forfeiture, a provision which is necessary in these circumstances because it is only the accused person who has direct access to the facts. The Bill also recognises that criminals may seek to distance themselves from immediate possession of the property derived from criminal activity by using various devices to keep property out of their names, whilst still retaining direct or indirect control. It is for this reason that the Bill gives the courts power over the assets not only of the offender but also a 'related person or body'. That description includes:

(a) a spouse, parent, brother, sister or child of that person;

(b) a person who is cohabiting, or has at some time since the commission of the alleged offence cohabited, with that person as his husband or wife *de facto;*

(c) a corporation of which that person is, or was at any time subsequent to the commission of the alleged offence, a director;

(d) a corporation in which that person or his nominee holds, or held at any time subsequent to the commission of the alleged offence, shares entitling him or his nominee to cast more than one-half of the maximum number of votes that might be cast at a general meeting of the corporation;

(e) a corporation the directors of which are accustomed to act in accordance with that person's instructions, directions or wishes;

(f) a corporation that is, for the purposes of the Companies (South Australia) Code, a subsidiary of a

corporation referred to in paragraph *(c)*, *(d)* or *(e)*;

or

(g) a trust of which that person is, or was at some time subsequent to the commission of the alleged offence, a trustee, or in which he has a vested or contingent interest as a beneficiary.

The Bill recognises that, after a charge has been laid and until it is heard, the assets need to be managed. Accordingly, it gives the court powers with respect to management and control of the property, and the Government's own inherent powers allow it to obtain information with respect to such property.

The powers given by the Bill are wide but in dealing with the vicious illegal drug trafficking, where financiers at the top are more likely to be untouched by investigations and legal proceedings, I am sure that all of the community will accept the necessity for the powers given in this Bill.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 defines 'related person or body' to an accused or convicted person for the purposes of the amendments which follow, and relate to the property in respect of which a sequestration order or forfeiture order may be made by a court. The definition recognises the complex arrangements which criminals may enter into to minimise the risk to themselves whilst retaining ultimate control of the property.

Clause 3 deals with section 14 of the principal Act. Section 14 sets out the powers of the court upon a conviction being recorded against a person and includes the power to order forfeiture of certain assets. This clause widens the court's powers. Clause 4 empowers the court to make a sequestration order against the property of a person charged with an offence where there is a reasonable cause to believe that if the person charged is convicted, property would be liable to forfeiture. Where a conviction is recorded, the onus is upon the criminal to prove that the property is not liable to forfeiture. The clause prohibits dealing with the property, the subject of such an order, unless it is in accordance with the court's order. If the person who is charged is acquitted the sequestration order is discharged.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LEGAL SERVICES COMMISSION 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 proposes amendments to the Legal Services Commission Act in relation to three matters. The Legal Services Commission Act does not expressly permit members of the Commission who are legal practitioners to accept assignments to provide legal assistance. At present, a vacancy exists on the Commission and potential candidates for the vacancy have expressed reservations about accepting an appointment on the ground that an appointment may prevent them and firms of which they are members from accepting assignments to provide legal aid.

The second matter dealt with by the Bill concerns a requirement under the Act that an appeal against a refusal to grant legal aid be heard by five members of the Commission. It is often inconvenient for five members to make themselves available at early notice for this purpose and the Bill provides that, in the case of an appeal, three members constitute a quorum. Finally, the Bill deals with a problem which has confronted persons conducting investigations under the Legal Practitioners Act. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

The Bill provides for the communication of information and the production of documents to persons who are authorised by law to require such disclosure or inspection. Previously such disclosure or inspection was not permitted under the secrecy provision of the principal Act. That provision is amended to facilitate disclosure and inspection in these circumstances, and in certain other clearly defined circumstances. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 makes an amendment to section 8 of the principal Act by inserting new subsection (1a) which provides that, when hearing an appeal against a decision of the Director, three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum of the Commission.

Clause 4 inserts new section 9a in the principal Act. The new section provides, in subsection (1), that a member of the Commission directly or indirectly interested in a transaction entered into by or in the contemplation of the Commission shall disclose the nature of his interest to the Commission and must not take part in any deliberations of the Commission with respect to that transaction. A penalty of $1 000 is provided in respect of infringements of the provision. Under subsection (2), such a disclosure must be recorded in the Commission's minutes. Subsection (3) provides that, notwithstanding subsection (1) or any other law, a legal practitioner who is or is employed by a member of the Commission, practises in partnership with a member of the Commission or is employed by a body corporate of which a member of the Commission is a director, shareholder or employee may be assigned to provide legal assistance under the Act. Where such an assignment is made in the ordinary course of the business of the Commission, and in accordance with the criteria ordinarily applied by the Commission, no disclosure is required under subsection (1). Under subsection (4), where a disclosure is made by a member, or a transaction is such that no disclosure is required, the transaction is not void on any ground arising from the member's interest and the member is not required to account for profits arising from the transaction.

Clause 5 makes an amendment to section 13 by adding new subsection (3). The new subsection provides that a person to whom a power is delegated under the section must not exercise such a power in relation to a transaction in which he has a direct or indirect interest. Clause 6 repeals section 31a of the principal Act and substitutes a new section 31a. Subsection (1) provides that the new section applies to a member or former member of the Commission, an employee or former employee of the Commission, a member or former member of a committee established by

the Commission or a person who has been engaged in an audit of the Commission's accounts. Under subsection (2), a person to whom the section applies shall not communicate information concerning the affairs of a person acquired by reason of his duties under the Act, or produce to any person a document relating to the affairs of another person furnished for the purposes of the Act. A penalty of $1 000 or imprisonment for six months is provided. Under subsection (3), subsection (2) does not prevent a communication made by a person to whom the section applies—in the ordinary course of carrying out his duties under the Act, in accordance with an authorisation of the person to whose affairs the communication relates, in accordance with the rules governing discovery of documents, in accordance with a requirement of a court, tribunal or judicial or *quasi*-judicial body, in accordance with a requirement of a person invested by law with power to require disclosure of the information or in accordance with a requirement of the Commission.

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

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

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.

Before the commencement of the Supreme Court Act Amendment Act, 1983 (assented to earlier this year), the fees payable in respect of most proceedings in the Supreme Court were fixed by rules of court under section 72 of the Supreme Court Act. The amending Act provided that the fees formerly fixed under section 72 would be fixed in future by regulation. However, there is one remaining category of Supreme Court fees, namely, those payable in the testamentary causes jurisdiction, which are still fixed by rules of court—in this case, rules under the Administration and Probate Act. The purpose of the present Bill is to provide that these fees will also be fixed by regulation. When this Bill has been passed into law it is the intention of the Courts Department to recommend an increase in fees in the testamentary causes jurisdiction in accordance with a recent Cabinet decision to increase fees in accordance with rises in the cost of living. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 adds a new provision to section 130 which makes it clear that regulations under that section may extend to the fees payable upon proceedings in the testamentary causes jurisdiction of the court. Clause 3 makes a consequential amendment to the Administration and Probate Act, 1919, to remove the provision empowering judges to fix fees by rules of court.

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

INHERITANCE (FAMILY PROVISION) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill effects a simple amendment to the principal Act, the Inheritance (Family Provision) Act, 1972. The purpose of the amendment is to include within the range of persons entitled to claim the benefit of the principal Act the brother or sister of a deceased person who cared for him or contributed to his maintenance during his lifetime. The principal Act provides that a person who is entitled to claim the benefit of the Act may apply to the court for an order making a provision in his favour out of the estate of a deceased person. The court will not make such an order unless the applicant is left without adequate provision for his proper maintenance, education or advancement in life. Section 6 of the principal Act lists the classes of persons entitled to claim the benefit of the Act. At present it includes the spouse of the deceased, a person who has been divorced from the deceased, a child of the deceased, a child of the spouse of the deceased and for whose maintenance the deceased was responsible, a grandchild of the deceased or a parent who cared for the deceased during his lifetime.

In a case recently brought to the Government's attention, a person died without having made a will. She was survived by a brother and a half-sister. The half-sister had died previously, leaving two children. The deceased's estate was distributed in accordance with the rules of intestacy under the Administration and Probate Act, 1919. The result was a distribution between the full brother as to one half and the children of the half-sister as to the other half. The result was possibly not just as the deceased had had no contact with the half-sister or her children, whereas her full brother had made some contribution to her maintenance. While the cases in which a person would have a proper claim against the estate of his brother or sister are rare, they do nevertheless occasionally occur. The Bill will, therefore, enable the court to make appropriate provision from the estate of a deceased person in such a case. I seek leave to have the detailed 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 section 6 of the principal Act by inserting new paragraph *(d)* which includes a brother or sister who cared for, or contributed to the maintenance of, a deceased person within the range of persons entitled to claim the benefit of the Act.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.C. Bannon:

That the House note grievances.

(Continued from 20 September. Page 948.)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I want to say this evening how I feel for the people of South Australia and more particularly those in small businesses on the Victorian border, because of the Victorian Government's decision to give a $250 bonus to new car buyers where the purchase has an 85 per cent Australian content. Whilst it is a gimmicky approach, and one which will be beneficial to Victoria (and to some aspects of the motor car industry), it will be a disaster for new car sellers who trade in close proximity to the border because it is quite clear that the number of motor vehicles purchased in Victoria by people from Mount Gambier, Naracoorte, Bordertown, and Renmark will increase.

The greater number of purchases at the additional discount figure will occur in places such as Horsham, Hamilton, Portland, and Mildura. What is fish for one is fowl for the other: I am fully appreciative of that fact, but it will be to the detriment of small business in South Australia. Likewise, the decision by the Victorian Government to impose a 10 per cent tax on wine will have a distinct influence on those people in South Australia who are dependent on the wine industry for their livelihood. It will have an effect on the grower, it will certainly have an effect on the wineries in South Australia and, in turn, the multiplier effect that always applies will mean that advertising agents, transport operators, other agencies, and other employees will be adversely affected by the Victorian Government's initiative.

I am not suggesting for one minute that the South Australian Government should seek to emulate the Victorian Government's actions. I do not believe that it would be in the long-term interests of South Australia for that to occur. Clearly, the Government has another problem on its hands and one that it will have to approach quickly for the benefit of small business in South Australia, and, through the impact on small business in this State, the impact that it will have on the South Australian economy as a whole.

I turn now to the area that I want to particularly refer to this evening, that is, the fact that the Government has emulated a deficiency that it produced for the South Australian public in the mid-1970s. I refer to the creation of new initiatives without making proper provision for the servicing of those initiatives. Members who have been here for some time and indeed the public generally who, during the early to mid-1970s were attempting to receive title to property, recognised that there were quite often delays of upwards of two years (18 months was quite common), and obtaining a title in anything under nine months was almost unique.

A great deal of the problem arose from the fact that the then Dunstan Government changed the rules in respect of subdivision and the manner in which titles were to issue, and failed miserably to provide staff or redeploy staff. The important issue that I want to home in on tonight is the importance of redeploying existing staff into purposeful employment, more particularly purposeful employment that will allow new initiatives to be effective and not detrimental to those members of the public who are indirectly involved.

I refer to the situation in relation to the new vegetation regulations. Large numbers of people have made application to be permitted to continue what has been the livelihood of their families for 100 years or more. I am referring specifically to wood cutters in the Murray Mallee areas of Blanchetown, Morgan, Robertstown, and Loxton. Many of those people have had properties in their families for over 100 years: successive generations of families have properly farmed their leases. They have properly pollarded the timber and have maintained their integrity and employment for members of their families and others. Again, the multiplier effect comes into it in relation to the transport industry and the distribution industry in the Adelaide area, and they are now being denied the opportunity to continue a practice that is essential for their very existence.

I am not suggesting that there are not sound reasons for addressing this matter in some areas, but I am concerned that, in creating this new set of regulations, the Government has failed to provide adequate staff by means of redeployment so that the requirements of people covered by the new regulations are quickly addressed. By way of example I refer to the experience of people living in the area that I represent, in the Eudunda and Robertstown area. They lodged their application on 24 May, although as at last Saturday (17 September), they had not received authority to continue the operation from which they obtain their livelihood. In the interim they had made a number of telephone calls and had visited the office in Adelaide on a number of occasions. They had received a number of promises from staff about what would take place and when it could be expected to happen. But it was all to no avail.

Finally, last week they were told that the map that had been submitted with the application, and which had been in the hands of the department since 25 May, was not adequate and that they would have to recommit another map. At the instigation of the Minister, these people had clearly indicated on their application that it was urgent. Those people who were in urgent need of consideration were asked to state that it was an urgent application. Upon making inquiries, the people to whom I refer had been told that their application was not present in the file; they had made a journey to the department and found that their application was on the bottom of the non-urgent file, notwithstanding the fact that stamped across the application, and very clearly associated with it, was a request by them that it be treated urgently, which was done at the instigation of the Minister.

I am not damning or demanding more out of the people who are responsible for the operation of the business of the department than can be justly expected of them, but I am damning the Government which, once again, has created a new area of initiative without properly manning the necessary facilities, causing a great deal of difficulty to the people in South Australia who are required to keep body and soul together in various other areas of employment which are almost impossible to obtain, or to undertake activities associated with their industry at long distance from their homes when it is not a convenient or cost effective operation for them.

We were aware of those sorts of problems unfolding during the previous Dunstan Government; we are still in that position today. We are passing legislation that is not being proclaimed because, after its passage, it is found that the manpower or the resources needed to give effective control to its operation are not available. A number of pieces of legislation on the Statute Book have not been proclaimed. The measure in regard to the management and inspection of buses comes to mind. That was passed having all due regard to the need for that legislation, although we still have a situation where our buses are not being inspected because the Government of the day has failed to redeploy the necessary resources. It is important that such redeployment occur to facilitate the effective operation of legislation passed by this House.

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

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): The Federal Government must be urged to introduce as quickly as possible regulations and controls covering the insurance broking industry within Australia. I want to make quite clear that I support the role of the broker in the insurance industry. In many instances it is impossible for a normal insurer to utilise that which is available on the insurance market without the assistance of a broker. Parts of the insurance market are accessible only to the broker and are inaccessible to a client on a direct basis. Perhaps the best known of these is Lloyds of London, but many international insurance companies deal only with brokers.

Secondly, it is part of the broker's job as a professional to be fully conversant with the insurance offerings available in Australia and overseas. Individually, each company has its own concept of underwriting, its preference for types of risks, and its judgments of the premiums to be charged. The broker should be acquainted with all these characteristics,

which alter from time to time, depending quite often on the economic circumstances.

Thirdly, and perhaps most importantly, it may be that the client's requirement is not met by any of the available offerings, and he may need a proposal tailor-made to his requirements and marketed with the appropriate underwriter. Many clients and business people and, indeed, from my own experience, unions, have not the available time and have not the research available to them to carry out negotiations on their behalf.

Other benefits available to an insurer by using a broker are that an insurer on his own often does not have the buying power for the volume of insurance that may be purchased, and it is often very handy to be able to utilise a broker in the event of handling claims. The broker is a very useful tool in the business world and for individual people seeking coverage, and it is not my intention to downgrade the role of the broker at all.

In recent years, however, there have been a series of problems arising from the utilisation of business people, and lately the general public, in the use of brokers within the insurance industry. One of the problems alluded to is the fact that the discovery has been made that insurance brokers are not forwarding insurance premiums paid by the client to the insurance companies and there is a gap—quite often a long gap—before this occurs. The Criminal Law Journal of November 1980 has this to say on page 366, and I quote:

> Not surprisingly, certain self-employed brokers have failed to forward premiums to the insurance houses. Sometimes premiums are belatedly sent on; in the meantime, the broker uses the money received from the client, as he wishes, usually for his own ends. Sometimes moneys are never sent to the company by the improperly acting brokers, who are likely, of course, to comprise only a small number of the persons who do operate in this field. The practice is not uncommon, though, as one suspects.

The *Business Review Weekly* of 20-26 August 1983, on page 6, had this to say:

> By far the worst feature of the Australian insurance industry is not the companies, but the brokers. At the moment, there seems little to stop anyone setting up as a broker, taking money from a gullible public, negotiating long payment terms with insurance companies, and using the money to buy expensive cars in the meantime.

The next greatest problem associated with the broking industry relates to the number of bankruptcies in this area. There have been an extraordinary number of bankruptcies in the broking area in Australia. For example, the *Australian Law Journal* tells us in its November 1980 issue that 27 known broker insolvencies occurred in Australia between 1970 and 1979. Since 1979 further spectacular insolvencies have occurred.

The former Minister in the Tonkin Government responsible for this area (the Hon. Mr Burdett) stated in the *Advertiser* on Friday, 22 May 1981:

> Many consumers have found they are not insured after paying premiums to a broker who has gone bankrupt.

He has further stated that there was a need for the regulation of the broking industry.

Several other problems arise; for example, unqualified people can enter the broking industry. There is nothing to stop anyone hanging out a shingle stating that they are an insurance broker and commencing business. There are brokers who advertise in a way that suggests that they are actual insurance companies. Thus the customers believe that they are insuring with the broker when, in fact, the broker then further contracts insurance to other insurance companies. There have been complaints by insurance companies against unethical brokers.

The State President of the Life Insurance Federation of Australia has warned the public against dishonest insurance salespersons who may be costing life-policy holders hundreds of dollars by persuading them to dump their old policies in favour of new contracts. He has stated that the practice of 'twisting' was an increasing problem in the industry. Unethical brokers were deceiving policy holders into thinking they would make more money insuring under another company's policies. Unethical salespersons had misrepresented the investment earnings of two particular companies by stating that the client could earn twice as much in bonuses by changing the policy. What some brokers fail to mention to the insurer is that they would have to pay establishment costs on the new life insurance.

The Australian Law Reform Commission in report No. 16 on insurance agents and brokers in 1980, produced an excellent report on this particular side of the industry. Draft legislation for the regulation of brokers and agents was prepared and published by the Law Reform Commission. That legislation was tabled in the Senate by the then shadow Attorney-General, Gareth Evans, in 1981. It was passed in the Senate but it was never presented to the House of Representatives. The former Fraser Federal Government was not prepared to go ahead to control the insurance brokers.

In the *Advertiser* on Thursday 11 June 1981 it was reported that the then Federal Treasurer (Hon. J. Howard) told Parliament that the Government had rejected a Law Reform Commission report which had called for the regulation of the activities of insurance brokers. To his very great credit, the then responsible Minister (Hon. Mr. Burdett), stated that South Australia would go it alone so far as the regulation of the broking industry is concerned. The former Minister of Consumer Affairs commissioned a working party on a development of the code of conduct for insurance intermediaries, and that committee produced an excellent series of recommendations that would provide for control and guarantee including compulsory indemnity insurance and the keeping of proper accounts and balance sheets.

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

Mr BECKER (Hanson): It was interesting to hear the comments of the member for Henley Beach, and I will have something to add in a moment. One issue that has concerned me for some time relates to the use of Government motor vehicles. Indeed, I was surprised to read in the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1983 (page 59), in regard to the Community Welfare Department, the following statement:

Control and Utilisation of Motor Vehicles

The review of the control and utilisation of the departmental fleet of motor vehicles identified inadequate fleet management in that—

- vehicles were taken home overnight contrary to Public Service Board guidelines;
- records of vehicle usage were not forwarded regularly to the central office; and
- current usage statistics were not a factor considered in determining fleet size.

Following a referral of these issues, the Department advised that—

- some vehicles were used after hours and in other cases vehicles were taken home because there were no secure garaging facilities at or near departmental premises;
- locations were requested to forward vehicle usage returns regularly; and
- the size of the motor vehicle fleet is under constant review.

It is proposed that this matter will be reassessed by audit next year.

Whilst I appreciate that the Public Accounts Committee for 12 months or more has been investigating the use of light motor vehicles within the Government, it was certainly a concern to me that the Auditor-General would make such

a specific comment on the use of motor vehicles within that department.

Most members of Parliament receive complaints from time to time from persons wanting to know why Government motor vehicles are being used outside normal hours, especially when they see families in Government vehicles, or when they see Government vehicles at sailing clubs, bowling clubs, picnic resorts, and so on. Every time I have received a complaint I have passed it on to the Minister of Transport, because it is fair and reasonable that his attention should be drawn to the complaint so that the Government can investigate the matter. Therefore, I was quite amazed to receive from the Minister of Transport recently the following reply to one of my letters:

> Thank you for you letter . . . concerning the alleged misuse of Government motor vehicles . . . As I have advised you previously, it is not the practice to divulge the ownership of Government motor vehicles although any complaint with regard to the use of a particular vehicle that might be received is referred to the controlling Minister for investigation or any action which may be appropriate.
>
> Since the introduction of the special blue number plates for Government motor vehicles there has been a large number of complaints from the public about the apparent use of Government vehicles for private purposes. All such complaints have been investigated, and in practically every case it has been found that the cars in question were being used for proper purposes.

The Minister goes on to say:

> These investigations have proved to be very time consuming and are a waste of the limited Public Service manpower resources. There seems to be a misconception by the public that if a Government vehicle is sighted outside of accepted office hours it is being used for private purposes. However, there are many instances where such vehicles are used outside of such office hours in the person's normal course of duties. The incidents which you brought to my attention in your letter have been referred to the appropriate Ministers for investigation.
>
> Yours sincerely,
> Roy Abbott, Minister of Transport

I take exception to the terms of the first sentence in the last paragraph written by the Minister, or the public servant involved: it is typical bureaucratic snow that we have had to come to accept and experience in South Australia over several years. There is no doubt that in departments such as the Community Welfare Department, in a crisis care situation members of the social worker staff in particular are required to use Government vehicles after hours, transporting persons from one location to another. Also, the officers concerned are expected to use the opportunity to take young children in their care for day outings. Certainly, I do not object to that, and I doubt that anyone would object to it, especially where it is properly explained. However, it is a known fact that there has been wholesale use and abuse of the Government motor vehicle fleet. About 200 cars could be withdrawn from the Government fleet, which could result in a saving of about $2 million a year to the Government.

No attempt is being made to do that. I am concerned when I see remarks in the Auditor-General's Report indicating that he believes there is illegal use of Government motor vehicles. I am also concerned that the Minister of Transport should adopt the attitude that the investigations are a waste of time. The blue number plate was introduced for a specific reason, and it is an excellent idea: it is part and parcel of accountability.

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

Mr BECKER: The Minister who objects may also complain about number plates given to the Ministerial fleet. I can agree with the Minister that it was a very dangerous precedent to have special number plates for the Ministerial fleet.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: What number were you?

Mr BECKER: Number 21. The drivers complained that they were subject to a considerable amount of abuse, particularly on the roads. They were forced off the road and put into dangerous situations on occasions. I have no objection to the removal of those number plates. I believe that the time has come when we must look seriously at the use of Government motor vehicles, as they are a tremendous cost to the State—somewhere in excess of $10 million a year. About $9.4 million is to be spent acquiring several hundred motor vehicles this financial year. I hope that, if the Government is going to spend $9.4 million on replacing 800 motor vehicles, the vehicles it purchases will be made in South Australia—in other words, by General Motors-Holden's or Mitsubishi—although I do not believe that that will be the case.

Government departments and statutory authorities have been purchasing motor vehicles from other States, involving all sorts of makes and models. It is about time the Government, if it were genuine in supporting General Motors and Mitsubishi, did something positive. Mitsubishi has been quietly reducing its work force. Earlier this year a large number of executive personnel were retrenched from Mitsubishi. Nothing was said either in the press or by any union. General Motors-Holden's has only to sneeze or cough and it is in all the trouble in the world. I have no sympathy for the company because, if it designs a poor model which it cannot sell, that is its problem.

The Commodore has done well on road trials and during testing. It is a tragedy for General Motors-Holden's that it has been unable to sell the car. Surely the South Australian Government could support General Motors-Holden's more strongly than it does or has done in the past. If we are to have a large motor vehicle fleet (something like 800 cars in the metropolitan area alone and about 200 excess vehicles) to be used only to go to and from work with the greatest use being in the lunch hour, we should insist that we get value for money. I hope that the State Government will spend the $9.4 million wisely and, if it can bring about savings, well and good.

In regard to the insurance industry and brokers, we will have a great opportunity to discuss the matter when the Government enacts its new workers compensation legislation. Last Thursday I asked a question about job creation schemes contributing $1.1 million towards workers compensation premiums in advance of spending the money allocated by the Federal Government. At that stage the Government allocated only $1 million but the Premier has been given $1.1 million. I hope, as the member for Semaphore says, that the Government will support local industries.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I do not think it is anything to be proud of that we are hanging around in this place at this hour of the night for a grievance debate or for anything else. I take this opportunity to outline my view on the sittings of the House on this or on any evening. On a number of occasions since coming here in 1973 I have made my position quite clear regarding the sittings of the House after the sun goes down. There are less than a dozen people in this House at this hour, and it is not unusual that that number be present during the night sittings. In a 47-member Parliament, for a miserable few to be assembled to keep the House together to grieve and for other purposes, is not good enough.

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Members opposite can interject if they like, but I believe that the truth of the matter is that the only members who do not support my view about sitting earlier in the day and getting up at 6 p.m. are those who are not prepared to admit it.

Mr Peterson: I support it—I have a home to go to.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Thank you. There is a supporter from Semaphore, and I believe that there are supporters in the ranks of both sides of the House. It is absolutely ridiculous that we in this Parliament stick to the tradition of meeting at 2 p.m. and rising at 10 p.m. or later, sometimes at midnight or later and, indeed, on occasions the next morning. It is downright stupid to proceed in those directions, and it is about time that those who feel that way stood up and said so.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Thank you. I appreciate the members of the Government who come to their feet to show their support for this proposal. I am told by good authority from the staff that if the Parliament sat at 11 a.m. and rose at 6 p.m. on the three traditional sitting days of Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, we would have more hours of sitting than if we started at 2 p.m. each day and went to some ungodly hour of the night as we do on Tuesdays and Wednesdays. Really, there is no excuse and there is no justification for our being in this place when we are droopy-eyed and unable to apply ourselves satisfactorily to the job that we have been given. I believe that out there in the big paddock, in the field of the public, a sensible programme of sittings for this House would be widely supported. Indeed, as far as I am concerned, that change should be adopted.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: That means you want Question Time at high noon.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: The details are irrelevant. The simple sense of the subject I raise is that we should go to work and go home with the rest of the community that we represent and we should not continue to commence work at 2 p.m. and work until all hours of the night.

Mr Lewis: I would support that.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: I thank the honourable member for that support. Other members may be alert at this hour or at 10 p.m., midnight, or beyond, but I am not, and I do not propose to condition myself to be alert at those times. Before coming into this place, it was never my practice to get up late or to work late, but I and my colleagues in the rural community put in a day's work for a day's pay in that vocation, and I am quite happy to do that in this place.

However, I am not happy with the procedures that we currently adopt, and the quicker we drop that age-old tradition and adopt a programme of working within the hours I have suggested or thereabouts the better. And let me not be seen to be too rigid about fixing the time table because, as most members of this House would know, I have been the most easy-going fellow in the outfit. I have been very flexible and reasonable, prepared to adopt the majority view. I repeat, put to the test, asked individually and collectively, I believe that the majority of members of this Assembly would agree to the hours prescribed.

There may be an objection from the honourable Speaker or from the staff—I do not know. However, it is high time that we put it to the test and it is high time that we floated this idea deliberately and positively with a view, as I say, to coming back to a bit of good sense. There is a multitude of subjects to which I could refer during the given 10-minute grievance address in which we all have the opportunity to participate following the Appropriation Bill, but really—

Mr Groom: The Upper House sits at the right hours.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: The suggestion in reference to the Upper House is one that some may wish to adopt, but it would be going from bad to worse as far as I am concerned. However, it is obvious what my feelings about the situation are and I make no apologies for them. I do not want to go to the Upper House: and if I go out of this House, I go home to the farm. In the meantime, it is frustrating enough in Opposition, without adding salt to the wound; indeed in the situation in which we are for the time being, but I hope not for too long, I believe that it is a golden opportunity to place on record my feelings about the sittings of the House, or at least the time table that is adopted. On that note, and as a form of protest, it is not my intention to proceed with any other subject associated with the Appropriation Bill or that which gives us license to speak on this occasion.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): I advise the House that it is my intention to take up the full 10 minutes, because I have a considerable amount to bring to the attention of members and, particularly, to the attention of the Government.

Mr Becker: You're a night owl.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am not a night owl, but I appreciate that there is an opportunity which is now provided for me to have my say, and it is my intention to do just that. There are two matters particularly to which I want to refer tonight. The first concerns a letter that I received from a constituent, which relates to the services provided by the S.G.I.C. It is a very concise letter from a constituent who obviously is very well informed on the subject, and I want to bring it to the attention of the House.

I have forwarded a copy of the letter to the Premier and the writer of the letter has forwarded a copy to the Minister of Community Welfare. However, it is not the first time that I have received a letter on this matter and I think that it is time that it was brought to the attention of the House. The letter states:

I am the proprietor of a baby sitting agency named—

and I will not refer to the name, but it is an agency in my electorate—

Every licensed agency in South Australia is required to have two references and a medical certificate from each person registering as a baby sitter, to interview that person and keep details of name, address, phone number, age and any relevant experience. It is required that no-one under 18 years of age is registered and that a public liability insurance cover is held by the proprietor of the agency or separately by each individual sitter within that agency.

It has become increasingly difficult to find an insurance company who will write an insurance policy until it seems that is going to be impossible. I am at present insured with the Federation Insurance Company who will not renew my present policy.

I wrote to Mr Crafter, Minister of Community Welfare, on this matter who was advised by the General Manager of S.G.I.C. that that company would write a policy for a baby sitting agency but on a very selective basis.

I do not satisfy S.G.I.C.'s very selective basis (I do not intend transferring all other insurance to them), so it will not consider my applicant. Blackmail! Big brother treatment! Competition needs to be keener than that! Outrageous! And from an insurance company whose slogan is, 'Working for you.'

Now as far as I know, the licensing of agencies in South Australia came about in the early 1970s following the incident in Sydney where a babysitter kidnapped a child and was missing for a few days. So the agencies here in South Australia wanted to assure the public that they (the agencies) screened their babysitters as best they were able, put forward what seemed suitable requirements and insisted that the Government regulate agencies according to these requirements.

To my information, only one claim has been made on an agency's policy in all these years. I would like the regulations reconsidered and questioned as to whether insurance is necessary. It is too expensive, for an individual person to consider, hence she would have to discontinue her services as a sitter; for agencies, it is another gross expense which has to be absorbed—not an easy factor when the booking fee from each job is small.

For my own agency, I consider it is most important that I recommend only reliable, capable, dependable persons who continually drive defensively. This is more important than knowing that there is an insurance policy as a standby which can be called on to pay up. I cannot afford morally or good name wise to have any lesser situation occur so my 'insurance' is choosing the right characters as sitters. This is definitely what customers prefer, also.

Another requirement for the annual renewal of an agency's licence is that it does not register anyone under 18. If this is a suitable lower limit, then the upper limit should be 60 years. But there are good exceptions outside these limits which makes this regulation less than suitable.

While at secondary school, more and more girls are getting working experience in child care situations, some are doing child care courses of study at school and at post secondary colleges and institutions and the National Safety Council conducts an excellent child care course. Surely a person who has satisfactorily completed a suitable course, could be of the quality I mentioned earlier. Altogether then, I recommend that the insurance requirement be dropped and the age limit be dropped to 17 years. I have sent my recommendations to Mr Crafter, also.

That letter is written in a most concise form. I would be particularly interested to know the Premier's thoughts and the thoughts of the Minister of Community Welfare on this matter. I am particuarly concerned about the reference to S.G.I.C. As I said earlier, I have received other letters in a similar vein. It is a matter that concerns me greatly.

I now put another matter to the House in the form of a question to the Minister for Environment and Planning. I would very much like to know about the current situation regarding the delegation to district councils of development control in the Mount Lofty Ranges watershed. In September last year, the South Australian Planning Commission and I, as Minister, advised district councils within the watershed area that the delegations sought by the councils would be provided. I received representations from a number of councils. Because of the advice that I received from the department and the comments made by the councils concerned, I felt that it was only proper that councils should be allowed to receive this delegation. It turns out that the delegations were not valid because, apparently, they referred to draft development control regulations. This matter is causing much concern and councils are rightly anxious to know what is happening in relation to this subject.

I understand that the councils of Stirling, Onkaparinga, East Torrens, and Barossa, which are all concerned about the erosion of their powers in regard to this matter, are seeking a deputation to the Minister for Environment and Planning in an effort to have the matter sorted out. Previously, councils had the authority to determine the result of applications in the watershed zones in their areas, including land divisions, industry, motels, residential flats, caravan parks, and so on. I believe that they handled that responsibility very well indeed. However, we are now in a situation where these applications of the type that I have just mentioned concerning the watershed areas must be determined by the Planning Commission and not by the local councils concerned. Most of those councils have employed on their staff fully qualified planning personnel and have developed policies and principles that are now contained in development plans. When these people came to see me seeking a delegation of this responsibility it was on that basis that I decided to approve that request.

Because of the lack of time on this occasion I will refer to that matter again later. I ask that the Minister of Environment and Planning consider this situation very closely to determine exactly what is the attitude of the Government and what is his own attitude to this matter. I would strongly suggest that the councils in the watershed area have the qualifications and that in the future they should be given the opportunity to determine the outcome of applications that are made in this area. If a deputation is made to the Minister I would hope that he will receive that deputation favourably.

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

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I support the statements made by the member for Alexandra, which is an unusual attitude for me to take, I suppose, but what he said on this occasion does make sense. Referring to the stupid hours that we spend in this place, I point out that I have worked in other jobs on day shift, evening shift, midnight shift, split shifts and double shifts, but I have never put in hours such as we do here (at times) for less result. I agree that we must look seriously at the standard of work produced from the hours that we put into this place.

Tonight I want to raise the matter of shop trading hours, which is one of the worst areas of legislative definition in this State. This subject involves more and greater problems than any Government is prepared to grasp. A problem that comes to mind concerns a situation that exists in my electorate (where I try to look after people all the time). In this regard I refer to an advertisement which appeared in the local Messenger Press newspaper of 14 September (last week), under the heading 'Local business prosecuted for weekend trading' and which was inserted by the proprietor of a furniture warehouse at Semaphore, Mike Cullen, as follows:

Browsing for furniture at the weekend at Cullens Warehouse at Semaphore has almost become an institution, and not just for people living in the area. 'We have an exceptionally good local trade,' Mike Cullen told me, 'but about 40 per cent of our trade comes from over 5 miles away—and we have a lot of country folk who find it much cheaper to buy here, and get goods freighted. Even with the freight costs, they still save money.' Since legislation to the Shop Trading Hours was altered in 1978 and small businesses were allowed to open at weekends, Cullens have been open on Sundays and public holidays, allowing customers to browse at their leisure. In 1980 the legislation was altered again, and a floor space of 200 square metres was imposed—anything over this size was no longer considered to be a small business. 'How much furniture can you display in 200 square metres,' Mike said, 'that's only an area 40 feet by 55 feet. We don't have highly priced furniture, and we don't have a few samples on show which customers have to order from.

We carry our stock on the showroom floor. To give you an example we have over 80 lounge suites on show, besides all the wall units, bedroom suites and bedding etc. We need lots of floor space, and our customers need weekend shopping so that they can select their furniture together—it's working people who buy furniture, and in most cases the weekend is the only time they can get out together.' Looking through the hundreds of signatures and comments collected on a petition, signed by supporters of weekend trading, this fact is very obvious. When the size restriction was imposed in 1980 officers from the Department of Labour and Industrial Affairs informed Cullens that they must cease weekend trading. 'We closed at weekends for 10 weeks,' said Mike, 'but our opposition was still open. Our turnover dropped by 30 per cent. Much bigger businesses than us were open, and getting away with it. We decided to re-open and we operated for two years, without interference.'

That was in the life of the previous Government, I might add. The quotation continues:

'The saddest part is, that when the Labor Government came into office in this State, that's when we started to get harassed. We voted for the Labor Party because of its commitment to small businesses—but it's just been a smack in the face as far as we're concerned. There are big businesses who have registered themselves as four different companies for example, who are then classed as four businesses—each allowed to have 200 square metres; then there are other businesses smaller than the required size, such as video outlets, who have as many as 12 employees when the maximum number is three, and they are trading at weekends. As far as we can understand, we are being singled out because another party has made complaints against us. There are many businesses who would not open at weekends even if they were allowed to, but unfortunately, they don't want anyone else to open either. We know the 'Silent Majority' are with us—the trouble is, they're too silent.'

Shop trading hours is a complex issue, whatever the outcome of the court hearing . . .

and I might mention that he has been prosecuted—

on 22 September, the overall mess will not be altered one iota.

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I am not mentioning the court case; I am just saying that there is one. The advertisement continues:

With an ironical smile, Mike said, 'Well I know one thing—if they send me to jail I'll have more rights and a louder voice as a prisoner than I have now as an individual.'

The advertisement is completed by a picture of the proprietor with a sign saying:

Wanted by Department of Labour. His crime? Offering service by selling discount furniture at weekends, and trying to create employment.

It goes on to say:

This State Government is denying us the right to operate our own business at weekends, because, although we are a genuine small business, we have a large floor area. Small business gives you a fair deal—give small business a fair deal. If you enjoy shopping at weekends, and believe in free enterprise, don't let small businesses like us be wiped out!

It says, 'Voice your disapproval—contact your local M.P.', and I can tell you, Mr Speaker, that they did.

The real problem, as I see it, is that shop trading hours, for premises with a floor area of 200 square metres, do not make sense at all. It is just an arbitrary figure that has been picked out of the air, and it does not apply with any reason to anything. The premises that they are operating at Semaphore were the premises that were available; as a matter of fact, it is the old Oldfields bakery. It is a large area. There is not much that one can do about that; the area is there; one must use what is there. He uses the warehouse as a sale-room. Everything is on display; there is no way of his breaking the business up.

I have a letter from the previous Minister, who laid out the conditions under which other people were operating, and I believe that in some cases it is just a matter of a paint line on the floor that makes the difference. It has been suggested to me that companies that were oversized divided themselves, just formed another company with the same principals, registered another part of a building, and then operated in exactly the same way, falsely claiming to be separate entities.

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: Parafield Discount, of course, is one that has been named to me many times. The letter that I got back said that there are no partitions dividing the shops; lessee agreements which have been signed by each shopkeeper clearly indicate the floor area occupied by each shopkeeper. Clearly, it is not valid; it is just a way of getting around the law. As always, when there is a law there are always people trying to get around it.

To get to the real point of this: there is a demand for this type of shopping. The warehouse itself has had a petition there. (I have only a section of it here) and well over 1 000 signatures were collected on that petition in the shop. These are people who have been in there because they want to shop on weekends. It is interesting to look just at this section that I have here and see the spread of people: I notice that there are people from Swan Reach, for instance, from Willaston, Woodville, a lot of local people, of course, Clearview, Athelstone, Hackney, West Croydon, Torrensville, Blair Athol, Grange, West Lakes, Fulham Gardens, Loxton, Whyalla Norrie, Findon—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: He's a tourist attraction.

Mr PETERSON: He is. There is an interesting aspect, one which I have not thought of before. Perhaps we can declare him a tourist attraction and give him an exemption. The comments put on the petition by the people who signed it are very pertinent, and ones that the Minister should look at. I know that Governments do not want to touch shop trading hours; I know that they are frightened of it, and would like to get rid of it and get it off the plate and let somebody else worry about it. It has been suggested by the current Minister that the Industrial Commission should look after it: perhaps that is the way to do it. As long as the employees are employed correctly, under the right terms, conditions and rates of pay and the jobs are created, why not? Why should they not open? I cannot see why not if the jobs and rights of the workers are protected. This limit of three people is a weird one; I thought we were out to create jobs, not knock them out. If one wants to employ five people, employ them, as long as they are employed correctly. Some of the comments from the petition are these:

Only time available for workers.
The best available time for the average working man.
We work nights and days.
Weekends. The only time to shop.
Small business need to trade.
Pretty crummy idea—but what do you expect from a Government?

They were not specific, it was 'a Government'. Other comments are these:

Small business needed for trade.
Most convenient.
How can I spend money when I work during the week?
Only opportunity to shop on weekend.
Only time I have to browse.
Only time for me and my family to shop.
Family and I like to shop together on the weekends for furniture.

The petition is here, and I have quoted only a small section of it; it has to be considered. If I were selling fish I could do so from a phone box—nobody would care. However, if I sell furniture I cannot operate because I occupy more than 200 square metres; it does not make sense.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time now having expired, I call on the honourable member for Mallee.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): Tonight, before I take up some specific matters that affect the constituents I have the pleasure to represent in this place, I want to provide them with some answers to some questions which are constantly raised by them in their conversations with me and knowing, as I do, that because they are outside the normal reach of good television and radio reception in the majority of the electorate (for instance it is impossible to get F.M. transmission) they read *Hansard*—and it is not provided by me. They are quite diligent about this.

When I spoke to other members about it, they were surprised to learn that that is indeed the kind of thing with which a significant number of people in Mallee are preoccupied in their interest in what goes on in the world around them. One of the commonly occurring questions is what proportion of women are there in the work force and by giving the answers to this question provided by the Australian Public Affairs Institute, I do not imply that there is any problem relating to either men or women working. They are people, and they are all entitled to jobs according to their competence and suitability to do those jobs. However, the question is asked, and for their information I am advised that the amount at present is 40 per cent. It was 30 per cent in the 1960s; 15 per cent in the 1950s; and 8 per cent during the 1940s, post war.

Unemployment costs are another item about which they often seek information. For every 100 000 unemployed people, the benefits paid cost the Government $379 million. I point out to the members in this House that economists refer to those payments as transfers. Naturally enough, if people are not employed, they are not paying income tax and, accordingly, on the other side of the ledger there are reduced income tax receipts of $380 million. There are lower indirect tax receipts because of the smaller disposable incomes to spend on those goods to which indirect taxes are attached: that amounts to $99 million. Altogether the figure of $858 million for every 100 000 people amounts to $8 580 a year for every person who is unemployed.

It is an illness in our society that certainly has to be overcome. The simplest way to overcome it, as I have

pointed out to this House before, is to get rid of the real wage overhang. I am asked from time to time where the controversy rages about the good sense or otherwise of retaining the service of the railways and just what is the cost of maintaining the railway system. People ask this question with a view to trying to reduce that burden on the taxpayer, a burden of about $16 000 a year for each job in the railways.

That is what it costs the taxpayers of Australia. In Victoria and New South Wales each job is subsidised to the extent of $16 000, which is a heck of a lot of money. Members of the public need to remember that one of the costs not brought into account so readily in making comparisons between the tonne cost of freight over the same distance from centre to centre between rail and road is that, whilst railways cost so much per tonne for the freight and then they add on what it costs in addition in the form of the deficit in the railways, the charge made by the road freight carrier does not bring into account (apparently they are not aware or alert enough to bring into account) the cost of providing the road.

Sure, people who drive trucks along the roads and carry freight pay their registration fees, but that is a nominal fee now on interstate plates anyway (it is only $6 a year) and, accordingly, the road network has to be maintained. True, it is for the benefit of other motorists as well as those people who are hauliers but the cost of the road surface would not be as great if it were only for private cars and lightweight trucks for highway freight carrying.

Another interesting question concerns the number of Australians who work in small business, because 25 per cent of people are employed in small businesses with four or less employees. An additional 13 per cent of people are employed in businesses with five to nine employees. We have heard much recently about the on-costs of providing each job, particularly in the comments of my Deputy Leader in the course of his grievance. I refer members and others interested in the general public to his remarks made yesterday on that topic, which I summarise thus: an employee on a wage of $354 a week (between $17 000 and $18 000 a year, allowing that many people have overtime, shift allowance, site allowance or so on in their job) is not receiving an inordinately large amount.

I point out to the House that, on an average wage of that much, the employer must find an additional $155 to cover the costs of providing that job, that is, $8.85 an hour, which requires on additional outlay of $3.89 an hour. I hear the silent majority scream to me from the other side of the House saying that not many people take home $354 a week. True, a fair amount of tax is taken out before the cash goes in the packet. Yes, one needs to remember that what is in the packet is not in fact what people are paid. I regret that the Minister of Water Resources has left the Chamber. I thought we had the benefit of his company; certainly, we did when I began my grievance.

I wish to draw attention to a very pressing problem in the electorate of Mallee, namely, the need for an adequate, appropriate, reliable, healthy and potable supply of water. That need is met in the metropolitan area and more populous parts of South Australia. The general public takes if for granted and accepts the amounts of taxation dollars spent in subsidising the provision of that water. Indeed, they cry out for that water to be filtered. In Mallee there is no water and, wherever it is provided, none of it is filtered in any case.

I am distressed to find that the Government still ignores the pleas of those people who live in the communities of Strathalbyn, Hartley, Woodchester, South End in the South-East (not far from Millicent), Karoonda, Moorlands, Bow Hill, Perponda and other areas of the electorate, not to mention the other inadequate water supplies that exist in a number of other towns where the pressure drops to nil on a hot day. People fill up jugs and other utensils in the morning when they have water pressure in the tanks to do so. It is immoral that we filter water to make it look better when it is no healthier whilst other places have no reticulated water supplies at all and make their contribution nonetheless to the taxes collected and spent in the course of providing water.

The other matter I wish to mention tonight before my time runs out is in regard to the necessity to secure the income of fishermen of the South-East by the immediate restoration of the Finger Point sewage treatment works to the public works programme this year. We cannot risk the multi-million dollar industries of abalone and crayfish fishing by allowing raw sewage to pour into the sea in the revolting fashion that it now does. We need to have a lake city fun run in which the Premier can participate in order for him to see the mess on the beach.

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

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): Tonight I wish to refer to the importance of tourism for the ageing sector of the market—

Mr Hamilton: Hear, hear!

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: —which I believe is a sadly neglected sector of the market.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Do you think the member for Albert Park is one of them?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: No. The House recognises the interest in tourism of the member for Albert Park. I have already noted that, in his speech to the House yesterday, he made passing reference to the issue. In so doing, he sought approval to insert in *Hansard* a number of statistics relating to the composition of the aged in Australian society. I do not wish to add to those statistics but, for the purposes of my case, I will quote from an article which appeared in the *Australian* on 22 April this year and which summarised the situation in the national sense as follows:

> In the next 20 years the number of people aged 65 and over will grow two-thirds to 12 per cent of the population.

I suggest that most people in the House right now will be part of that segment and will contribute to the two-thirds increase nationally. According to the Bureau of Statistics report, our aged population will expand from 1.4 million in 1980 to 2.3 million by the year 2001. The article raises the question of how we will cope with the increased social and financial responsibility that will inevitably be placed on society, which has developed into a subject of frequent debate. That debate, invariably, focuses on two areas: first, income maintenance and, secondly, health services.

To my knowledge not much interest has been shown in the recreational needs of the ageing sector of the population, nor has much planning been done to meet and anticipate those needs to ensure that proper provision is made for people aged 65 and over—a growing number of such people in a world where technology will have transformed many of the functions now being carried out and where the ageing population will also be accompanied by an increase in numbers of part-time workers in terms of their search for proper recreational facilities and travel.

The excellent publication issued by the South Australian Department of Tourism entitled 'International and Domestic Travel in South Australia, Visitor Characteristics, 1981 and 1981-82' at page 76 features statistics dealing with the life cycle of intrastate travellers in South Australia in 1981-82. The basis of this survey was the number of trips taken and the life cycle stage of the people who took the trips. Single

people aged between 14 and 19 years numbered 402 000 and made up 12.7 per cent of the total, and single people aged between 20 and 34 years numbered 438 000 and made up 13.8 per cent of the total, the biggest segment. Various other segments of single people aged between 35 and 54 years, married people with children, and married people without children were referred to.

Married people aged 55 years and over with no children (I assume that the term 'married' embraces widowed people) numbered 338 000 and comprised 10.7 per cent of the total. That is already a significant section of the market, and it will be very much more significant, yet the tourist industry, with a few notable exceptions, has not appreciated the nature of this market nor the potential for its growth and development.

A few days ago most members of this Parliament would have received a letter from the Executive Officer of the South Australian Council on the Ageing (SACOTA) introducing himself to members of Parliament and seeking discussion with members on any aspect of his work that might be relevant to their representation. I met with the President and the Executive Officer of SACOTA, because I believed that they would have much information that could be useful to me in my role of promoting tourism in South Australia. SACOTA promotes the establishment of senior citizens clubs and provides a follow-up advisory service. There are now some 184 clubs in South Australia with a membership of about 30 000 people, which is a very significant interest group. An over-60s education association also meets regularly. I have addressed that organisation, and rarely have I had the pleasure of speaking to such an interested, alert and responsive audience.

SACOTA organises concessions for members buying from certain small businesses through a 'passport to better buying' club. Its services include counselling and advice; information and referral, including information on travel; organisation for social action and advocacy; personal financial management counselling; public education and awareness, including conferences and seminars; recreation for the aged, including concerts and festivals; retirement preparation; and special interest group promotion. In other words, all the functions of SACOTA could be related in one way or another to the provision of tourism and travel services for its members. When considering the membership of 30 000 people, it is important to understand the characteristics of this section of the population, particularly the membership of the clubs. Most of the members would be on fixed incomes and most of the wage earners would have received a superannuation payment, some of which would have been spent on a major trip. Most of these people have a very keen appreciation of the value of what they are buying.

They are very discerning in terms of selecting products, and that includes holidays and travel. Many of them grew up and were educated and trained at a time when standards of service were important, so standards of service are something which are very much taken into account by the ageing. They have a keen appreciation of natural beauty and landscape. They are among the most mobile and vocal sections in the community. I am now referring to club membership, not necessarily the 65-year olds and those over that age generally.

Some of the clubs within SACOTA have the capacity to organise day trips and package tours for their members; others do not, and I think that there is a magnificent opportunity for some private entrepreneur to establish a consultancy and provide a service to those clubs. However, the most important factor that I think should be taken advantage of is the capacity of these people to provide a magnificent survey sample which could well be used by the Department of Tourism, possibly through the auspices of the South Australian Tourism Industry Council, to conduct a survey on the attitudes on the over 60s to tourism and travel by using the courtesy of the SACOTA clubs and the organisation.

The department could fairly economically establish attitudes within this State of the over 60s to the preferences, priorities, frequency of holidays and the average amount spent on holidays by people in that age group, and could consequently obtain information which would be of inestimable value to the tourism industry and the South Australian Government in terms of planning for the future of which we will all be a part, and in terms of enlarging and enriching the opportunities for fulfilment and recreation among the over 60s.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I listened with a great deal of interest to the contribution of the member for Coles, and perhaps at a later time I will be able to contribute more to the subject about which she spoke. However, in the brief 10 minutes available to me now, I would like to address a subject in which members would be well aware I have taken a great deal of interest. I refer to the South Australian Film Corporation, which operates in my electorate in the old Philips complex at Hendon.

Those members who have read the Budget document will have noted that the Government proposes to reinstate funding to a level of $400 000 for the production of Government films by the South Australian Film Corporation. We all know that this involves documentary production for Government departments and instrumentalities. Although this figure has fluctuated over the years, reaching a figure of approximately $732 000 in 1979-80 and dropping right down to a figure as low as $232 000 in 1982-83, it is interesting to see that the Government has allocated some $400 000 for the next financial year.

For those of us who perhaps take the South Australian Film Corporation for granted, I think that we should be reminded of some of the films that have been produced by the Corporation. Some of those include *Sunday Too Far Away* (which is in profit), *The Fourth Wish, Storm Boy, Blue Fin, Money Movers, Breaker Morant* (another one that has gained world-wide recognition), *The Club,* and *Freedom.* Films in which this State has an investment and co-produced include *Picnic at Hanging Rock, The Last Wave, The Irishman, Weekend of Shadows, Dawn, Pacific Banana,* and *The Survivor.* The input is considerable, and I will come back to that matter later.

Programmes produced for television include *The Harvest of Hate, Sand of Love, The Plumber, Sarah Dane, Under Capricorn,* and *The Fire in the Stone.* Of course, *The Fire in the Stone* received some recognition in the *Advertiser* of 20 September in relation to a special function at Coober Pedy. It is worth while noting that the production costs of that feature amounted to $1.7 million. The film, which was jointly produced by the South Australian Film Corporation and the Australian Children's Television Foundation, was based on a novel written by Colin Thiele, whose earlier works inspired the films *Storm Boy* and *Blue Fin.* Current productions include *Reunion* (a mini television series) and a cinema feature *Robbery Under Arms.*

We have also seen the completion of 245 short documentary films in South Australia. All documentary production is contracted to local companies working under the South Australian Film Corporation. Apart from the senior positions, 22 other people are employed in the library and in clerical and technical work within the State Film and Video Library of South Australia. In addition to the people employed in staff positions or on fixed-term contracts for

lengthy periods, the South Australian Film Corporation engages freelance writers, researchers, composers, musicians, film technicians, acting talent and artisans to meet specific short-term needs for the industry.

I raise this issue tonight because of my concern in relation to an article that appeared in the *Sunday Mail* of 28 August this year under the heading 'Unkind cuts for movies'. The article refers to comments by Miss Janet Worth, the South Australian Film Corporation's legal adviser. She expressed concern over unkind cuts in relation to investments that had been made in the movie industry on the understanding that the investments would accrue certain benefits to the investors. Unfortunately, I believe that the advice given to the previous Government was such that much confusion was generated by the legislation and, subsequently, urgent meetings occurred all over the place to provide dispensations for those people who had committed money based on the promise of benefits for investors.

Unfortunately and regrettably, I must offer some criticism of my Federal colleagues because, as I understand it, since that time the benefits promised to the film producers of this country were reduced following the mini summit. That is regrettable because I believe that many people (particularly those in the corporate sector) who invested their money under certain conditions have found that the money they invested will not provide the incentives offered under the prospectuses.

We have seen a reduction from 150 per cent to 133 per cent in the tax incentive offered. Some people may say, 'Stiff cheddar; it does not really worry us because we do not have that sort of money.' However, that is a big investment in the film industry in this country. The Federal Government provided the Australian Film Corporation with some $5 million. I have been told by sources within the film industry that my colleague, the Federal Minister, has not yet visited South Australia. I hope that he visits South Australia to look at our film industry some time in the future and that he will talk to the management and staff of the South Australian Film Corporation at Hendon.

I believe that he would be enlightened by discussions with those people at the corporation who, in my view, from my knowledge of the industry, are very committed people. I believe that those people at Hendon can offer criticisms to my Federal colleague in respect of the latest reduction in the incentives that were offered previously to the Film Corporation. The changes that have occurred in the legislation federally would, I suppose, be analogous to the changes that have taken place to Medibank over the past seven or eight years. I find very disturbing these sorts of alterations, particularly in the corporate sector, which I believe would be now rather foolish to invest money in the film production area. My view is supported by an article that appeared in the Australian *Financial Review* of Tuesday 30 August, which stated, in part:

> The FTPA said last week: Even now, with the 150 per cent scheme operating, the film industry is in a depressed state, with only seven feature films financed for the current financial year.

Many of the people who may well have invested money during the time that the previous incentives existed would now be better advised, I suggest, to place their money on the short-term market if they want to make profits. I hope that my Federal colleague, Mr Cohen, will come to South Australia and talk with those in the film industry about these matters. Many people in the film industry are upset about these changes.

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

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): Tonight I will again refer to the matter of taxation. First, I refer to an A.L.P. resolution passed at the last A.L.P. convention held on the Queen's Birthday this year. This resolution was referred to in that bastion of independent journalism, the Labor *Herald* (so it could not possibly be wrong!), wherein it took up some 93 lines, some seven short of the century. Surprisingly enough, the resolution was moved by a Mr C. White and seconded by J. Bannon. Many statements were made to the A.L.P. convention, but the thing that concerns me is the nature of those statements. To give the gentlemen some credibility, to begin with a statement was made that:

> State convention declares that the initiatives undertaken to date by the State Government in the areas of job maintenance assist in satisfying the preconditions to the issues addressed in convention 1982 resolution 105.

I can only presume that resolution 105 (which I do not happen to have a copy of) suggests that the State Government should create unemployment, because since the Bannon Government has been in office a deterioration in the employment situation has occurred. When the Labor Government came into power, unemployment in South Australia was at a figure of 8.4 per cent, but recently it reached 11 per cent, although I understand that the figure has now dropped slightly. The rhetoric indulged in at the convention is marvellous. The resolution to which I referred further states very lucidly that:

> The convention recognises that job creation programmes in pursuit of the commitment to full employment demand measures in which such programmes and their stated objective are not denied necessary funding by inevitable economic contraction which results from attempts to control inflation and unemployment simultaneously.

It is obvious that the mover and seconder of the resolution are very strong economists. Most other economists agree that public sector deficits contribute to both inflation and unemployment: inflation because large deficits cause liquidity problems (that means that the Government has to take money out of the money market to control the money supply), and taxation by definition increases unemployment. So, the first two items are utter rubbish.

We then come to item 3, which suggests that the State Labor Government is on an expansionary economic strategy and which outlines the various items that they believe are important. I must admit that they have some wisdom here because two items in that resolution have some relevance. But, the interesting items are numbers 1 and 2. Item 1 states:

> Undertake an employment development strategy directed to the areas of greatest social need.

The greatest social need is to create jobs and to provide people with employment and dignity. That is not accomplished by increasing taxation and feeding it to an overly fat public sector. We achieve improvement only if there is a consistent and lean approach to Government. Item 2 states:

> Provide funds for employment development, with particular emphasis on the public sector.

We have already seen that the public sector has done rather well. Businesses in South Australia and right across Australia are not doing particularly well, but the public sector has done rather well at the expense of the private sector and private households. I say this by way of explanation. These are the preliminary remarks put on record by Mr White and Mr Bannon before they came to the major policy items which they believe will assist in this area, because they recognise that taxation must increase.

How will they achieve this taxation increase which they believe is necessary and which we in Opposition totally reject? There was a further statement made, as follows:

Taxation policy must be progressive and equitable. The following measures will therefore be referred to the proposed State Government inquiry into the State's revenue base and revenue-raising capacity.

The items include removal of pay-roll tax. We can all applaud this measure because we know that pay-roll tax is an anti-job measure. One of the unfortunate parts of taxation that perhaps members on both sides of the House can agree on is that pay-roll tax takes away from the capacity of employers to employ more people.

Then we get into the more substantive items because that is a loss of taxation and would not help the Labor Party's strategy to place more funds in the public sector. Mr White and Mr Bannon believe that the introduction of a progressive State-raised income tax supplement may be a worthwhile means of achieving this aim. I asked the Premier in a Question on Notice whether he intends to do anything on this measure and, surprisingly enough, the answer was 'No'.

The third item involves the introduction of an effective tax on wealth and capital gains, the fourth the re-introduction of succession duties on the rich only, the fifth (which the Government is implementing, by the way) the introduction of a financial transactions tax, and the sixth the reintroduction of land tax on extraordinarily highly rateable properties. What concerns me is that we have the Premier who was involved in a motion before the A.L.P. conference, putting up the proposition of taking away further moneys from various sectors of the community, but when the Question on Notice was broached his answer was 'No' or 'Not yet considered'. So, either he is being a sop to his friends in the A.L.P. convention or he is again misleading the people. It is of great concern to me that these motions can be put up before a convention and agreed to. Members of that Party will insist that these motion be implemented. The Premier has, in fact, seconded this 93 line motion, and one can only guess the impact created by doing that.

I now raise the matter of taxation because, as the Leader has pointed out, the current Budget strategy is very fragile; it depends on a number of components. I am certain that if one of these components does not live up to expectation (if, for instance, wages are not kept within reasonable limits) the Premier will again have to raise taxation. He has already foreshadowed in his motion to the A.L.P. Convention what those areas of taxation will be. Perhaps they were only passing thoughts because, as I said, on three occasions he said 'Not yet considered.' However, it must be of great concern to the people of South Australia that some thought is being given to these taxes. The Premier has stated that he will not introduce a number of these taxes and has already given a promise about succession duties. He will have to see his Federal counterparts about tax on wealth, and capital and land tax is the other measure that has been mentioned. The most interesting matter is the introduction of a progressive State-raised income tax supplement, which the Premier has said he will not introduce. However, it concerns me that the Premier has been a party to such a proposition.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): This debate gives me the opportunity to raise two matters. The first I want to deal with is a particular case under the vegetation clearance regulations. A constituent of mine made application on 25 May 1983 to clear sections 30, 31 and 42 of the hundred of Catt in the District Council of Ceduna. My constituent has about 400 acres cleared on his 4 000 acre property (I am not sure how many hectares that is). He has not yet received a reply to his application, but has received a green acknowledgment only form headed 'South Australian Planning Act 1982 development control regulation' which states that a decision has not yet been made. This constituent is annoyed and concerned that he has had to wait so long for a decision to be made as he wishes to proceed with his development and feels that he has been messed around. I understand that there have been a number of people in that area who have received a decision from the department about similar matters.

I have had a chance to examine the answer that the member for Mallee received from the Minister for Environment and Planning, which states:

The responsible area for assessing clearance applications in the Department for Environment and Planning for the South Australian Planning Commission is the vegetation retention unit of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. The unit currently includes 10 scientific assessment staff and six support and managerial staff whose duties include various aspects of the work involved.

That is 16 people engaged in monitoring and examining these particular applications. I understand that there is a rule of thumb that people have to retain 30 per cent of the vegetation on their properties. In my constituent's case, if he was given permission to clear the rest of this land at this stage, I believe that he would be satisfied. It is not good enough if, because this person is a long way away, the department has adopted the attitude 'Out of sight out of mind', because now is the time of the year when this person can develop his country to bring it into production and 400 cleared acres is not enough—he requires more land. He has some 4 600 acres of land, most of which, I understand, is arid. I sincerely hope that the appropriate officers do something about this matter. I know who these officers are, but do not wish to name them in the House. However, unless my constituent receives a reasonable response to his request in the near future, I will have no alternative but to make far more uncharitable comments and to start naming people.

Another matter that concerns me is that my colleague the member for Hanson made comments about light aircraft using Adelaide Airport. As a member who uses Adelaide Airport as much as anyone in this House, I believe that there is a need to upgrade that airport. Certainly, if extra facilities can be installed to assist light aircraft, that should be done as soon as possible. Unfortunately, the member for Hanson, who has been aided and abetted by the member for Peake on a number of occasions in this House, seems to have some emotional fixation about Adelaide Airport. Together, they seem to be quite paranoid about it.

Of course, the member for Peake will not have any further worries about Adelaide Airport because after tomorrow he will be abolished; he will not have any further problems and he will not have to worry about it. Therefore, we will not have to listen to the honourable member working himself up into a lather and performing in the House as he does. True, it is good entertainment to listen to him, but it is not particularly enlightening material that he brings to the attention of the House.

First, I say to the member for Hanson that he should bear in mind that most of the people who purchased houses close to the airport knew of the airport's existence before they moved there. Secondly, in my judgment it is one of the best placed airports in the world. People can land and get to the centre of the city very quickly.

Mr Ferguson: It is all right if you don't live nearby.

Mr GUNN: Most people knew before they purchased their houses that the airport was there; it has been there for a long time. From my understanding, aircraft manufactures today have much lower noise levels than did their predecessors and that will certainly be the case in the future. Certainly, as a member representing a large electorate and dependent on aircraft travel, I say that the quicker one can get on to the aircraft and to one's destination, the better it is for all concerned. If one sits in a light aircraft for two or

three hours after a long day, one wants to get home or on to business as soon as possible.

Therefore, I hope that both those members give more consideration to the needs of others before they start attacking light aircraft. I was approached today by pilots who, to put it mildly, were most annoyed by comments about light aircraft using Adelaide Airport. They believe that the comments made are inaccurate and grossly incorrect. I hope that the members concerned will contact some of those people. I have had a long association with companies such as Opal Air, who have given great service to the people of the North and Rossair services, Ceduna, and it is only in the last few years that Ceduna people have had the opportunity of a daily air service. My constituents do not want anything done to interfere with their rights.

Commodore Aviation now provides extra services to Port Lincoln and, if members go to Adelaide Airport at 6 a.m. they will see the bank of planes going out every morning and the hive of light aircraft activity setting out to service the whole State. In many instances these light aircraft are providing a daily return air service to people in isolated areas of the State which have never previously had such a service. People in those areas appreciate it. The member for Peake and the member for Hanson should bear that information in mind.

These days one can fly to Hawker and back in the one day. I refer to the services operating to allow people to get to the channel country, who go from Adelaide to Port Augusta and up to Leigh Creek, through to Queensland, via the Birdsville Track every weekend providing mail services for residents in those areas. People in those areas do not want their services interfered with or aircraft operators being unfairly attacked in this manner. I could go on and comment about one or two other people, charter business operators who have given good service to those areas. Certainly, I have been pleased to be associated with them and was most surprised to read the comments expressed in yesterday's *News*.

Before concluding my remarks, I wish to return to the subject on which I commenced my speech, namely, vegetation clearance. When the Minister comes before the Estimates Committee, I hope he is in a position to answer questions and is well briefed on this subject, as I wish to raise a number of matters with him. I will refer to the disgraceful decision which the Department for Environment and Planning has undertaken to renege on an undertaking which the member for Murray made to my constituents at Calca. The Hon. Mr Wotton agreed to lease a section of a national park which was illegally obtained in the first place—another of the many disgraceful acts in which the current Minister has involved himself. It is obvious that officers in the department did everything possible to slow down the drawing up of the lease (deliberately, in my view) in the hope that there would be a change of Government so that they could set about preventing those people receiving justice. Two tennis courts were involved and the land was owned originally by the Roberts family. However, the Minister and his officers can tell me nothing about it. I live almost alongside the area. The officers involved should be named and exposed for the mean and miserable trick they have inflicted upon my constituents. I do not intend to cease raising the matter until justice prevails.

My constituents want only a couple of hectares of a very large park. The district council has gone a great way in assisting them. It agreed to close all the roads in the park so that the national park gained extra land that way. Certain people on the Eyre Peninsula National Parks Advisory Committee have also behaved disgracefully. Fortunately, most supported the application by the District Council of Streaky Bay. I intend to raise the matter with the Minister at great length unless he can assure me, at the beginning of the proceedings, that the matter has been resolved in a satisfactory way and that my constituents have received the justice to which they are entitled. The situation has gone on for too long. They have been unfairly treated for long enough.

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

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I raise again a matter about which I spoke in my Address in Reply speech and again in the Budget debate a few days ago. A parent, expressing great concern, has written a letter to the Premier, as follows:

Dear Sir,

Enclosed is a letter outlining the basic case of one of our members. This case is, to all of our members, a very disturbing though recurring incident in which your Party's welfare policy is very lacking. We are led to believe, by various articles published in the newspapers, that your Party's policy is to prevent minors from being placed in moral danger. Since this first letter was written, the mother of this child has been assured by the Department of Community Welfare that this child is not in moral danger.

If this is the case, could you please explain to us why the girl, at the age of 15½ years, has had to have an abortion? We are very sure that if one of your children was in this position you would say she was in moral danger. If you would not, then we can only apologise to the rest of South Australians for voting for a Party with such obviously low moral standards, and a Party which holds the family unit in such a low position of importance in our social structure. As an association, we find the attempt to whitewash the Department of Community Welfare, by bringing in another public servant (namely, the new Ombudsman), quite a stupid politically expedient measure.

Why your Government will not have a public inquiry into this department only shows it has something to hide. If it has nothing to hide, why all the attempted whitewash in the press, and the circulars sent to some residents of this State? We believe that the money wasted by these weak attempts at covering up could be better used in dealing properly with cases such as the one quoted.

We hope you will not allow one of your Ministers to cover up for the mistakes of his department any longer. We believe the parents of the community deserve better, and the family unit is the most important part of our social structure.

I quoted that letter because I have twice asked the Minister of Community Welfare, first by way of question and secondly by way of debate in this House, whether he would initiate an inquiry into his department, but on both occasions the Minister has refused to do so. This letter from the Parents Who Care association referred specifically to one of a large number of letters that have been submitted to either the Premier or the Minister of Community Welfare. A letter, a copy of which was sent to the Premier, addressed to the President of Parents Who Care, stated:

I read your article in the paper about your daughter. My heart goes out to you, as I have the same trouble with my daughter. She was 14 when she went: she's now 15. The welfare told me the same as they told you and refused to help. We know she's living with a 27-year-old man, smoking dope. And the welfare says she's in no moral danger. I don't think that's any environment for any girl. The woman she's living with is an unmarried mother with a young girl. She lives with a man. She also has other young girls there that take off from home.

That lady concluded:

The house you say your daughter is in sounds very much the same house as my daughter is in.

She names the suburb, but I have no intention of giving the location of the house, because that may identify the case too specifically. That letter was one of several that I received. Another letter, from a parent who has been in frequent contact with the Minister, possibly with the Premier, and certainly with me, states:

My child ran away from home on 5 January 1983 and we do not know where she is. We have reported her missing to the Missing Persons Bureau at Angas Street. They refuse to help us. The Welfare Department got in touch with us to say that our

daughter was going into hospital: when asked what was wrong with her, we were told she had stomach pains. We found out later that she had had a miscarriage. The hospital refused us visiting rights and rights to a medical report.

We also reported this to the Ombudsman and he informed us that as far as he could ascertain the Department for Community Welfare had handled the case correctly. My case is substantiated with all relevant documents. The Minister has made my writ ineffectual by discharging my daughter and not going before a court to establish my rights in law.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: What about the rights of parents?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I thank the honourable member for drawing to the attention of the House that parents have some rights in the upbringing of their children. The parent concludes by saying that he believes that the Minister is frightened of being challenged in court and asks that I use his letter specifically to bring his case before the House. Those are just two parents who are concerned. I recall that the member for Ascot Park, when I previously raised this matter in the House, pointed out that the Parents Who Care organisation was nigh on defunct and had been replaced by another organisation. In fact the Family Rights Association and the Parents Who Care organisation are both concurrently writing letters to me; they both exist, although the Family Rights Association is an off-shoot of the original Parents Who Care organisation.

Both organisations are greatly concerned for young people and, as I pointed out only a few days ago, a petition with more than 700 signatures was presented to the House and is now part of Parliamentary property. The parents are desperately worried that when youngsters can be taken away from home and placed in either Ministerial or departmental care they can still be subjected to a whole range of temptations and possible wrongs and that, in all probability, they would be much better off left in the care of their parents. In any case, the parents claim that the Department all too frequently acts in haste and that prior consultation and discussion with the parents might result in a much more satisfactory solution.

Among the range of questions which are asked, the most important ones are: are children adequately supervised by the Department for Community Welfare once they have been removed from parental care, and who is responsible—is it the departmental officers; is it the Director of the department; is it the Minister? With one pregnancy and one abortion quoted in two letters this evening and the fact that parents are not advised of what is happening and not asked to discuss these matters with the department, the allegations are made too frequently for there not to be a considerable amount of truth in them.

Parents are fearful that sexual misbehaviour and possible temptation to take drugs could be a major feature of their children's lives when they are taken away by Department for Community Welfare officers and placed in houses which are sometimes of questionable integrity. Separate groups and individuals connected with those groups have written a host of letters. I mentioned before that I have received 20 or 30 individual letters from parents, and I do not have time to list the 15 or 20 questions which I will be putting to the Minister in the Budget sessions in a couple of weeks time. However, I ask the Minister once again to reconsider his two or three refusals and I ask him to consult with the Premier with a view to acceding to the requests of these parents and initiating an inquiry into the Department for Community Welfare immediately.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I take this opportunity this evening to refer to a report which I regard as very important and significant and which has been handed to the Government of South Australia. The report, dated March 1983, is the report of the committee which was set up in November 1980 as a result of a great deal of dissatisfaction by people involved in the pleasurable pastime of occupying shacks in this State. Mr Speaker, you will probably well remember that in about 1980 there was considerable concern in the community about the future of the tenure of existing shacks that were classified as unacceptable. Therefore, in November 1980 the Government decided that a composite committee would be established to look at this very complex problem. Over the past 10 years, during the so-called Dunstan decade, this problem has proceeded from year to year without any real progress being made to resolve the problem.

As I said, in 1980 we established a review of the classification of non-acceptable shack sites in South Australia, and the report to which I referred is the final report which was handed to the Government in March this year. The report was compiled by a committee which was headed originally by Mr Gordon. However, the following year Mr Gordon tendered his resignation and Mr R. Elleway became the Acting Chairman of this committee. He also happens to be the Assistant Director-General of Lands. The committee also comprised Mr Butler (the Deputy Surveyor-General of the Department of Lands), Mr Lothian (Manager, Conservation Projects Branch, Department of Environment and Planning), Dr J. Rolls (Senior Chemist, State Water Laboratories, Engineering and Water Supply Department), Mr J. Madigan (Chairman of the Shack Owners Association), and Mr G. Tucker (Chairman, Central Yorke Peninsula Council, representing the Local Government Association).

I would like to say from the outset that this committee has been extremely successful. I believe that it has handed down a report that will very much satisfy the interests of all concerned and, as one can see by the composition of that committee, it covered most interests in South Australia. In particular, in setting up this committee the Tonkin Government recognised the real interest and concern of the Local Government Association. In fact, councils around the coast of South Australia and along the Murray River where most of the shacks exist also recognised the special interests of the Shackowners Association of South Australia.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: What is the present Government doing with the report?

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: That is precisely why I have raised the matter this evening. The report was handed to the Government in March this year. Six months have passed since that time, and the shackowners of South Australia are still awaiting a decision by the present Government on whether or not it intends to accept the recommendations contained in the report. The report deals with about 4 200 shacks in this State. At the moment, under the previous arrangements, 894 shacks are classified as acceptable, and some 3 300 shacks are classified as non-acceptable. That involves a large number of families in this State whose recreational or leisure pastime is very much involved with the occupation of shacks.

We are now confronted with what I believe to be an excellent report. I believe that the recommendations contained in the committee's report recognise the interests of all concerned. It is beyond me why the Government is again dilly-dallying and will not come out and make a decision and let the shackowners of South Australia know exactly where they stand. I believe that the proposed policy as a result of the reclassification recommended by the committee is acceptable to all sections of the community. Quite obviously, it was not possible for the committee to grant the tenure that all shackowners would have liked for every shack site and for every shack in South Australia. By the same token, what has been achieved is a credit to those concerned.

What is more, I believe that the report has the general acceptance of the shackowners of South Australia. As I have said, the occupation of shacks in this State is an important

part of South Australia's way of life and of great importance to those involved. In previous years the fact that no decision was taken about the future tenure of shacks contributed greatly to the run-down condition of many of the shacks in South Australia in the areas classified as being unacceptable. The committee has done away with that terminology and has adopted new references in relation to shacks in South Australia.

The first committee recommendation in the report relates to the fact that we now have acceptable and life tenure sites. Recommendation No. 17 states:

The existing policy should apply unchanged for those shack sites recommended for acceptable and life tenure classifications.

2. Sites with 30-40 Year Leases

The committee generally is of the opinion that sites in this category, although not suitable for freehold, warrant more security of tenure than offered by the life tenure classification. Accordingly, the policy restrictions applied in life tenure areas could be relaxed to coincide with the term of tenure offered.

That is merely an indication of the recommendations contained in the report. I understand, from discussions that I have had with persons involved in the preparation of the report and from those who have seen it, that most of them are extremely happy with it. It is beyond me why the Government has continued to fail to come to grips with this report, make a decision on it, and let the people of South Australia (particularly the shackowners of this State who in the past have been confronted with unacceptable shack site tenures) know exactly where they stand. They should be able to enjoy the tenures as recommended in this policy.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I have before me this evening an architect's plan of the redevelopment of Elder Park. I am sorry that this plan cannot be incorporated in *Hansard*, but by its very nature that would be an impossibility. However, this plan will be available to all members, and I would encourage all members to avail themselves of it. A copy of the plan has been sent already to the Adelaide City Council, and a further copy is about to be sent to the Minister of Tourism I believe either tonight or tomorrow morning.

This evening I want to direct my remarks specifically to the Minister of Tourism and the Minister for the Arts. Those are the two Ministers who will be able to assist in bringing to fruition the concept of the plan that we are about to present to them. I give the plan my specific support: it is a plan with which I have been involved for some two and a half to three years in its formulation, and I have had personal discussions about it with individual members of the City Council. I have also discussed it with the Minister of Tourism and with the departmental head. From my discussions with the Director-General and with members of the Department of Tourism, as well as with individual councillors, it is clear that the plan is receiving support. However, it goes only so far, and that is our great difficulty. I do not think I need remind members of the history of Elder Park in detail, but I will briefly canvass the history of the park. I think we would agree that Elder Park is one of Adelaide's premier tourist attractions and a popular place to which families can go. It is a delightful area of peace and tranquility close to the city of Adelaide.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: It is also the home of *Popeye*.

Mr OSWALD: Yes, it is the home of *Popeye*, and I shall develop that important aspect of the park later. We would all recall the transformation of Elder Park with the construction of the Festival Theatre some years ago, and more recently with the extension of the theatre's Riverside Restaurant. Historically, nothing much has happened in the park since 1981 in regard to its potential as a tourist attraction. In 1981 Mr Keith Altman, who is the proprietor of the *Popeye* organisation, as an entrepreneur in his own right, recognised the great tourist potential of the Torrens and he sought approval to replace the old *Popeye* with three new *Popeye* vessels at a cost of $180 000. It is quite admirable that a private operator had sufficient faith in the tourist potential of that area to invest that money. Members would know, of course, that Mr Altman is a constituent of mine. He has been involved with the Torrens River for many years. Not only did he introduce the fleet of *Popeye* vessels on to the river but he also introduced a new breed of paddle boats. These were followed by a second type of paddle boat oeprated by another person who upgraded his paddle boats as well.

In the few minutes I have available to me I want to bring to the attention of the members of the House, and particularly the Minister of Tourism, details of Mr Altman's vision for the future development of the park. I hope that the Minister of Tourism will make available a grant from the allocation of grants for tourist development proposed by the Government in the current Budget. I point out to members that for a long time I have been a supporter of Mr Altman and have made representations on his behalf to the Minister of Tourism. Until now we have received only moral support, but I hope that after the plan has been perused all members of the House will actively give it the support it deserves.

In explaining the plan, it must be stated that there is a vast untapped tourist potential in Elder Park. There has been a great reluctance on the part of various authorities who have been approached over recent years to give the necessary approvals to entrepreneurs such as Mr Altman to go ahead and upgrade the area, and this is a shame. We have had opportunities here to see upgrading of the park and vast sums of money spent down there, but, unfortunately, it is not receiving the support that it should from the appropriate authorities.

At the moment, Mr Altman operates *Popeye* from a landing, as members would all know, in the centre of Elder Park, and he operates his fleet of paddle boats from a point tucked away on the eastern side of the City Bridge. There is no legal or moral impediment whatsoever to prevent Mr Altman from bringing his paddle boats around and operating them from Elder Park, but unfortunately the appropriate authorities have been reluctant to give him that approval.

This plan, which I will make available to members, provides for a reconstruction of the bank of the Torrens River between Elder Park and the City Bridge, which would allow the paddle boat operation to be brought around where it would be on view to the public coming down King William Street and entering the park. It also calls for the upgrading of the Elder Park kiosk. As members would know, the range of take-away foods in that kiosk is extremely limited. What we are proposing is that the outdoor patio in front of the existing kiosk be enclosed and the types of take-away food be progressively upgraded. Unfortunately, at the moment if anyone wants certain types of take-away food in Elder Park—as compared with the old days when we had the old kiosk there and one could take one's family, buy what one liked, and sit out on the lawns and eat it—one has to go back up to the city proper to buy one's take-away food. If Elder Park kiosk could be upgraded with the assistance of a grant from the Minister of Tourism, and also with the assistance of the Minister of Arts in liaison with the Festival Theatre Trust, we could see a new image created down in the park, where people would once again go and use the park as a tourist facility, for which it has tremendous potential.

I would like to leave members with a vision, then, as Mr Altman sees the park; namely, the *Popeye* operation with the new *Popeyes* operating from the landing and the reconstruction of the bank between the landing and the City

Bridge (which would allow two paddle boat operators to operate from the park on the lake on an equal commercial footing). The Festival Theatre kiosk, which is a drinks and ice cream set-up at the moment, would be upgraded and would be a much larger organisation with a larger range of products. Also, in the park we could see gaily painted caravans selling other types of food. The problem is that, when one argues that a kiosk is available east of City Bridge, that kiosk is at the moment being renovated and upgraded for an up-market menu and will not be available for the types of food that the general public will want to buy down in the park. The other problem is that it is out of Elder Park and is not seen by the public.

Elder Park is one of Adelaide's major tourist attractions. I will not say that it has been allowed to die, but we have entrepreneurs who want to develop it. This is the point that I am making here tonight for honourable members: we have entrepreneurs who wish to develop Elder Park. Whether it be local government bureaucracy or elsewhere, I will not cast aspersions this evening, but they are being prevented because the appropriate authorities are not giving approval.

This plan is imaginative; it deserves the fullest support of members of the House. It will improve the park and bring people back into the park. We have to consider it in the light of the demands of children and their families to go elsewhere. For example, the Magic Mountain at the Bay and the Hallett brickworks both draw people away, but I would not like to see Elder Park start to lose clientele. We must do what we can to build up the park, and I would call on honourable members to support Mr Altman in his representations to both the City Council and to the Minister of Tourism so that grants can be made available to make this park something of which all South Australians and Adelaide people can be very proud.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mrs APPLEBY (Brighton): The subject I wish to inform the House on this evening is women in recreation and sport. It appears that very few members of the community are well informed on the benefits of grants provided under the Department of Recreation and Sport. From information acquired from the Department's 'Leisure Activities Survey', women's participation in recreation and sporting activities differs significantly from those of men.

There is a much higher participation of recreation activities at home than in sports participation for both men and women. However, the active participation in non-organised sports by women is half that of men. Rather surprisingly, though, 41.81 per cent of women participate in organised sport, which is just slightly below that of men (58.19 per cent). Women's participation in both recreation activities at home is 54.35 per cent, while men's is 45.63 per cent, and the participation in activities away from home 50.41 per cent for women and 49.59 per cent for men. Therefore, in terms of time, men's and women's recreation activities are remarkably similar.

The department has assisted the development of women's opportunities in South Australia through both its funding programmes and the development of projects by departmental staff. In the recreation area, three year grants have been given to improve the development of women's recreation groups, including Girls Brigade, Girl Guides, S.A. Women's Keep Fit, and the S.A. Marching Girls Association. Furthermore, many of the administrators appointed under the scheme are women. As well as those above, I refer also to the South Australian Skiers Association, the Radio for the Print Handicapped, the Camping Association, and Recreation Association for the Disabled. This has given women the opportunity to develop leadership, and personal growth in the recreation area. The department supports these appointments by six monthly meetings with a small training component, and 'review' meetings which provide an often welcomed opportunity to discuss the difficulties and the successes of their role. Recreation grants can be obtained from the department for innovative programmes and desirable recreation equipment. It is a $1 for $1 funding programme, and at present applications are made at any time. Some of the programmes that have been funded in the areas of women are the equipping of a softball team of Aboriginal women in the Riverland, integration of Vietnamese girls into a Girl Guide troop in Pennington, self defence equipment for the Rape Crisis Centres for women, camp costs for ethnic women, and calisthenics groups.

In the area of women and children, the department has funded kindergyms for young children (an activity which requires strong parental involvment) and the establishment of a playground association by the funding of a project officer for six months. Large numbers of programmes have been equipped for elderly women through senior citizens centres.

The department acknowledges that much more developmental work with women is required to assist them to gain the confidence, skills and motivation to take up the opportunities that are available to them in recreation. To this end, the Minister has announced that he will appoint a Women's Co-ordinator in Recreation and Sport. This person's role will be to actively integrate programmes to develop women's leisure opportunities throughout the State.

Through the example of the South Australian Women's Keep Fit Association, the potential of women in meeting their own recreational opportunities with professional assistance can be demonstrated. From a small group of women an association was formed in September 1973 to promote health and fitness for women. In February the following year the association ran its first fitness courses, 26 courses in 10 suburbs, catering for over 580 women.

Also in the same year the instructor training courses commenced involving 44 instructors. The association is now a viable, non-profit-making organisation employing three full-time staff and run by an executive of nine women. This year a brochure and poster on the available women's recreation opportunities will be published. A good understanding of the salary subsidy scheme in sport will give a basic recognition for the work done in the sports area. Under this scheme, Government funds are provided to State sporting associations to employ a part-time or full-time administrator or coaching director. Out of a total of 29 sports to receive subsidies, three are exclusively for women. The South Australian Sportswomen's Association, which is a service organisation, also receives a State Government subsidy under the scheme.

The Sports Administration Centre will be extended to provide access to clerical and printing services so that additional State sporting and recreational groups can improve communications and raise their standards of administration. A number of womens sports administrators are accommodated at the centre and a number of sports and recreation organisations have employed female administrators. All women's sporting bodies are eligible to apply for grants administered by the Sport Development Unit. These include junior coaching, education training programmes, competition assistance and development programmes for coaches and

administrators. The South Australian Sports Advisory Council is made up of nine members, four of whom are women. Various subcommittees also have a number of women representatives in their ranks.

The South Australian Sports Institute Board has three women members, two of whom were appointed by the Minister last July. During 1982-83 the Institute offered 120 scholarships, 61 for men and 59 for women. The Institute's role is to provide sophisticated training programmes, expert coaching and modern equipment to enable sports people to be competitive at national and international levels. There have been great initiatives taken in recent years to provide women with greater access to facilities and resources offered by sports organisations. It is an attempt to lessen the discrimination that has existed within sport and an attempt that this Government fully supports. Three South Australian women are currently representatives on national sports organisations. They are netball and basketball player Jenny Cheeseman, who is on the Australian Sports Advisory Council, fencing administrator, Robyn Chaplin, and athletics coach and administrator Wendy Ey. They are members of the Confederation of Australian Sport. Women are becoming more active through their involvement with children's sport. This has helped them to develop a greater awareness of the need for family fitness, especially through the development of skill levels in their children.

In conclusion, some sportswomen are now accepted by the media on an equal basis to men, for example, women's tennis, swimming (at major tournaments such as the Olympics), and golf are popular spectator and television sports, but there is still a significant imbalance in media reporting of women's sports. No longer are there the same prejudices against women competing in physical activities. Women now run creditably in marathons whereas, in the early 1970s, long distance running was for men only.

In the more traditional sports, women participants dominate in only one sport, that is, netball; whereas men dominate in six, namely, football, bowls, cricket, hockey, soccer and yachting. Only in basketball, golf and tennis are the numbers relatively equal. There are changing attitudes toward the role of women in Australian society.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable lady's time having expired, I call the member for Unley. The member for Mallee.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): If the Speaker calls the member for Unley, how do I know that I am to speak? I then lose a minute of my time.

Mr Trainer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I ask the member for Ascot Park to not interject, particularly out of his seat. The honourable member for Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: I regret that the honourable lady whom we have just heard made those remarks and found it necessary to read every word she said. I have made that point earlier this session. It is now nine months or more since the election. I would have thought that it was about time members were able to demonstrate some capacity to coherently hang together ideas in a form acceptable—

Mr Mayes interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: —and meaningful. Gratuitous comments or insults I do not hear, as I am a bit deaf. I am sorry that I am unable to take up the point—I do not know what it was. Reading a speech like that prevents the record—if for no other sake than the sake of historians—from indicating the aptitude of the individual member and indicating the mores of the day and the kind of speech used by the individual member representing the electorate as a reflection of that kind of electorate. That is no reflection on the competence of the individual member who may be making a speech. It is just a way in which *Hansard* will be useful to future historians in determining, not only individual characters, but also the way in which people speak about ideas spontaneously arising in their minds at the time they were so doing on behalf of the communities they represent.

Another part of the speech that concerned me was that it referred to a large number of new spending initiatives.

Mr Trainer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is traditionally the members' adjournment debate. I ask that there be the least possible amount of interjection. The honourable member for Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: They are sophisticated spending programmes to which the member is referring and which she is advocating. They are thin on the ground and I hope that they are not to be interpreted as an indication of the way in which the Labor Party would encourage the community to expect Governments to take it—the community. We clamour for Governments to spend more on things that we believe will benefit us personally and, at the same time, require those Governments and politicians to promise to reduce taxes. The two are the complete antithesis of each other. That ultimately means that we demand higher incomes in order to meet the cost of those taxes, we end up getting more cash in the wage packet, but we find that there is less spending power per unit of currency of which it is comprised.

By demanding those higher and higher incomes we forget about or have no regard for the effect that it has on the employment prospects of our fellow citizens, the inflation rate or interest rates. Altogether, I find that ignorance of the science of economics at its most basic level appalling. It is not my idea of sensible politics, of course, and although I know it is the right of everyone to have a different view of things, I just wish that those views could be consistent with what is known to be scientific fact and not a statement, as it were, of the opinion that the world is flat, flat, flat, regardless of the fact that it has been demonstrated to be round.

The world is not flat, it is round: Governments do not create wealth, people do that. We have to remember that when we speak about or commend Governments for making expenditure on programmes that will invariably and inevitably end up costing more of the money that we have earned, taken from us either in the form of taxation or reduction in the real spending value of the currency that we get as a consequence of inflation.

I refer now to a couple of points made earlier by the member for Light in the grievance debate. While I am distressed about the macroeconomic consequences of the new tax to be imposed on wine by the Victorian Government, in that I believe it will probably adversely affect consumption, because while movements of price on wine at the margin do not significantly affect demand and therefore demand is fairly price elastic, an impost of that size immediately on wine will affect consumption, I am sure. Of course, in the of Padthaway and Coonawarra region, there will be a dramatic increase in cellar door sales as Victorians who are regular consumers of wine take a weekend off to cross the border to visit that part of the State, to do the round of the wineries, and to buy the wine that they wish to consume for the ensuing period before they make their next visit.

However, t at will hardly offset the cost of the loss ot sales of new cars in regard to the people whom I represent and who run new car selling firms in the communities along the State border. Those people will have a very hard time indeed. The new car retailing businesses in towns such as Keith, Bordertown, Lameroo and Pinnaroo and also the towns in the Riverland will have a hard time, and that is really hitting below the belt. I do not know the solution to that problem, but the position does not seem to be fair.

I will leave that matter and refer to areas where I see some waste and relative inequity and inappropriateness of the kind of project on which Governments spend money when it could be spent, for instance, to provide adequate water supplies for most of the communities in my electorate to which I referred in the grievance debate. I notice that about $170 000 will be spent on landscaping of the Princes and Dukes Highways and the South-Eastern Freeway. That is appalling, because in the past graders and other earth-moving equipment have denuded the volunteer vegetation from the site for which allocation of funds has been made for landscaping. After the area has been graded and is nice and level, and after the soil has been taken away and all of the natural voluntary vegetation has been denuded, truck-loads of topsoil are brought in at great expense. The soil is spread out and painted green with water paint so that in the six to eight weeks while grass and other vegetation germinates that area looks nice. Public money is spent, and that is abominable, when there is a grossly inadequate supply of water (which is fundamental to the maintenance of good public health) in many of the communities which I represent.

The last matter to which I want to refer is not quite related to that, but almost so. At present, the use of babies' disposable napkins is causing a problem throughout the electorate. Highways Department employees have to get the crappy nappies out of the litter bins along the highways fter they have been there for some time and dispose of them. That is not a very pleasant job, but even less pleasant is the consequent effect that irresponsible parents are having by pitching the things overboard from houseboats and from their cars where they have picnicked on the shore of the Murray River and leaving them there to foul the water. Just imagine what it is like if one is a water skier and one comes off one's skis to be confronted with one of those damn things when one surfaces. It is not uncommon, and it is a real problem that needs to be addressed in the very near future before it not only detracts from the appeal of Murray River as a tourist destination but also adversely affects the quality of our water supply in River towns and elsewhere in Mallee.

Mr MAYES (Unley): I would like to address one particular point. However, I would like to make some comments prior to that. I think that the honourable member for Mallee's comments were ill-timed and poorly put with regard to his reflection on the contribution made by my colleague the member for Brighton. I do apologise for interjecting during his speech in the grievance debate. Unfortunately, I could not resist the opportunity because of the nature of his comments and I think that what the member for Brighton was saying about the role of women in sport, and in particular recreation, are comments which are very important and which members of the House should take note of. It is a rare opportunity that members of this House have to listen to one of our few women members, and I think that we ought to pay them the respect of listening. Whether we have been here for nine or 10 months, some of us are perhaps more competent and more able on our feet and may have the particular skill and ability to deliver an important point. I think that it is insulting—

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MAYES: I might suggest that the member for Glenelg perhaps ought to write his speeches more carefully. I have sat here for many hours and listened to his comments, and I have not always been fully embraced by the remarks that he has made. Therefore, I really think that the comments were poorly timed and that what the member for Brighton had to say was important and worth listening to, and I support those comments.

I have noted from the *News* tonight that our Premier has been successful in his campaign to have the fortified wine tax lowered. I gather from the press reports that there has been a reduction announced by the Premier of almost half the fortified wine tax—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have commented before that this is a special time and interjections are especially out of order.

Mr MAYES: I think that we ought to pay attention to the efforts of the Premier in succeeding in getting this reduction to $1.50 per litre of fortified alcohol in wine. So, it is good news in the late news on the A.B.C. tonight for the South Australian wine industry.

In the few minutes remaining, I turn my attention to some comments made in the press by the member for Hanson in regard to what is taken as a derogatory term. I refer to qangos, or non-government bodies (however they want to be described), because I think that we ought to look at what those non-government semi-autonomous organisations offer in terms of service to this community. In the *Sunday Mail* of 7 August 1983 in the 'Onlooker' column, the member for Hanson was quoted as saying that the annual interest payments for the so-called qangos (I prefer to call them statutory authorities) run up debts totalling more than $1 000 million at an annual interest payment of $100 million.

I take issue with that point. I am doing some research on that statement by the member for Hanson. I cannot understand how he arrived at that figure, unless he is a super-genius at calculating and working out from the Auditor-General's Report and from the Budget figures the outgoing and ingoing payments and the debt structures for statutory authorities, because I think it would take some weeks to obtain even an approximate figure. However, even a figure of 20c in the dollar sounds extraordinary. I would like very much for the honourable member to detail how he arrived at the figure of $100 million.

It is simple to stand on a pedestal and make accusations about organisations. However, it is very hard for organisations to defend themselves. It is easy to advocate a particular point of view that appeals to the base level of the taxpayer, that is, the taxpayer's pocket. If we come forward on issues such as statutory authorities (some 267 of which operate in this State) with comments that they are not running efficiently and are not operating to the benefit of the community, the whole group of statutory authorities, whether it be the Housing Trust, State Theatre Company, Festival Theatre or the Lotteries Commission, cop it in the neck. They are often accused of inefficiencies and of not performing their tasks efficiently.

Members of Parliament and members of the public, whatever their standing in life, should be careful and accurate when they accuse organisations of incorrect accounting or misconduct in regard to their objectives or commitments to their financial statements. I believe it would be almost impossible, if one looks carefully at the member for Hanson's comments, for one to extract the figure that has been mentioned without going through an extensive exercise. I am informed that it would take up to a week for a full-time senior Treasury official to prepare a figure for Parliament.

I hope that I can make a careful and educated analysis of the figures in regard to the interest debt and the outgoings and ingoings of statutory bodies. The member for Hanson also said:

> For every dollar the State levies in taxes, almost 20c goes towards the interest bill on the massive debts owed by the authorities.

The authorities have their own power to go out and borrow under Government control. The member for Hanson also

said that statutory authorities were involved in a range of activities and that people were ignoring many of the benefits that they brought to the community. I refer to organisations such as the State Theatre Company, for example, and the important artistic benefit that it brings to the community of South Australia. That organisation is essential because it provides an important cultural backbone to our State, and it has made us a State to be proud of in terms of the cultural community.

However, if we say that the State Theatre Company borrows 20c in the dollar towards servicing its debts and we do not look at the services that it provides and measure its benefits against its cost, we have no idea what the benefit amounts to. If we say that it costs 20c in the dollar and we lump it together with other statutory authorities, we completely miss the point of looking at the benefit to the whole community. I believe that the member for Hanson's comments are irresponsible.

The article also states that the member for Hanson has been a controversial Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. I think that there has been a lot of debate in the community about public accounts. Anyone involved with a Public Accounts Committee automatically receives the stamp of authority and is recognised as having genuine skill in accounting and financial expertise. That may not necessarily go together; I am not sure that that goes hand in hand. I would be very cautious about accusing statutory authorities of being quangos, which is a very derogatory term. I think it is important to put on the record just how important some of those organisations are. For example, I believe (having once been an employee of the Trust) that the South Australian Housing Trust is one of the best housing commission organisations in Australia, and we ought to be proud of it and not make derogatory comments about it.

I also picked up in the Ombudsman's Report that he feels that he should take a part in suggesting and recommending which quangos should continue and which should get the bullet. I suggest that the Ombudsman might be stepping beyond his normal role in doing that. I believe that his role is to look at people's grievances and complaints in regard to statutory organisations, for example. I believe that he plays a proper role in doing that. However, I think that it is the role of the Government to review the operations of statutory bodies, and the present Government will do that. If the Government believes that they are inefficient, I am sure that it will review such matters and suggest alterations and recommendations to change the operations of such organisations. It is outrageous to suggest that an organisation such as the Housing Trust is soaking up taxpayers' dollars.

Motion carried.

At 10.26 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 22 September at 2 p.m.